



# **SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL COUNCILLORS' BULLETIN ISSUE DATE 5<sup>TH</sup> NOVEMBER 2003**

## **CONTENTS**

### **IMPORTANT INFORMATION FOR COUNCILLORS**

1. Forthcoming Committee Meetings  
(Please note the 9 am start to the Cabinet meeting on Thursday)
2. Training Courses:
  - The Leadership Challenge
  - Constructing Trust: Economic, psychological and practical insights into working relations between politicians and officers
  - Scrutinizing Finance
  - Modernising Full Council: New Political Management arrangements
  - Creating and sustaining Public Value – The Fourth way?
  - Decentralising Government: Choice, Communities and the role of Local Authorities
3. Information on Temporary Closure of the Post Office, 73 High Street, **Melbourn**
4. Information on South Cambridgeshire Parish Plans
5. Information regarding new address for CALC
6. Information on new member in the Democratic services Department
7. Call-in Arrangements

### **CABINET – 30<sup>th</sup> October 2003**

#### **Decisions Made By Cabinet**

3. Communities facilities project manager post
4. Housing renovations assistance
5. Joint appointment – health policy and land use planning co-ordinator

### **SUSTAINABILITY AND COMMUNITY PLANNING PORTFOLIO HOLDER MEETING REPORTED FOR INFORMATION**

1. Minutes from 20<sup>th</sup> October 2003

### **CAMBRIDGESHIRE COUNTY/CAMBRIDGE CITY/SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE ENVIRONMENT AND TRANSPORT JOINT STRATEGIC FORUM REPORTED FOR INFORMATION**

1. Minutes from 15<sup>th</sup> October 2003

### **OFFICER DECISIONS REPORTED FOR INFORMATION**

1. Historic Buildings Grants

## **JOINT PORTFOLIO HOLDER DECISION BETWEEN PLANNING & ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT AND HOUSING**

1. Consultation Draft PPG3: Housing

## **PLANNING AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT PORTFOLIO HOLDER DECISIONS**

1. Removal of Pay and Display (St Peters Road), Installation of Toucan crossing in Huntingdon Road and dual foot ways on Huntingdon Road, **Cambridge**
2. Prohibition of waiting, **Bassingbourn**
3. To amend the South Cambridgeshire Scheme of Charges for building regulation applications



## **ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH PORTFOLIO HOLDER DECISIONS**

1. Approval of expenditure at **Elsworth**
2. Approval of expenditure for second phase study on **Bourn Brook**

## **RESOURCES AND STAFFING PORTFOLIO HOLDER DECISIONS**

1. Irrecoverable debts in respect of Non-Domestic Rates
2. Provision of bailiff services

## IMPORTANT INFORMATION FOR COUNCILLORS

| <b><u>COMMITTEE MEETINGS</u></b>  |              |   |   |
|---|--------------|---|---|
| <b>FROM 10<sup>th</sup> TO 14<sup>th</sup> NOVEMBER 2003</b>                      |              |   |   |
|  |              |   |  |
| <b>MONDAY 10<sup>th</sup><br/>NOVEMBER 2003</b>                                   | <b>10 AM</b> | <b>INFORMATION AND<br/>CUSTOMER SERVICES<br/>PORTFOLIO HOLDER'S<br/>MEETING</b> | <b>OFFICE OF FINANCE<br/>&amp; RESOURCES<br/>DIRECTOR</b>                           |
| <b>TUESDAY 11<sup>th</sup><br/>NOVEMBER 2003</b>                                  | <b>10 AM</b> | <b>NEW OFFICERS WORKING<br/>GROUP MEETING</b>                                   | <b>COUNCIL CHAMBER</b>  |
| <b>WEDNESDAY 12<sup>th</sup><br/>NOVEMBER 2003</b>                                | <b>2 PM</b>  | <b>PLANNING POLICY<br/>ADVISORY GROUP MEETING</b>                               | <b>COUNCIL CHAMBER</b>  |
| <b>THURSDAY 13<sup>th</sup><br/>NOVEMBER 2003</b>                                 | <b>9 AM*</b> | <b>CABINET MEETING</b>  | <b>COUNCIL CHAMBER</b>  |

\*Please note the 9 am start to the Cabinet meeting on Thursday

### **Training Courses**

| <b>Name of Course</b>  | <b>Description</b>  | <b>Date and Venue</b>  |
|--|---|--|
| <p>The Leadership Challenge.</p> <p>This conference is jointly provided by the East of England Regional Assembly (EERA) and the Employers' Organisation for local government</p> | <p>The conference provides opportunities to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Hear how authorities in and beyond the region are tackling some of the leadership development issues facing politicians and officers in local government</li> <li>• Share information about a variety of leadership development opportunities</li> <li>• Shape a learning and development framework for this region that responds to the needs of current and future leaders</li> </ul> | <p>Monday 17<sup>th</sup> November 2003, Q-Ton Forum, Cambridge</p>                  |
| <p>Constructing Trust: economic, psychological and practical insights into working relations between politicians and officers</p>  | <p>The course integrates theoretical developments into the nature of trust and its relation to risk and professional expertise with research on developing the best working relations between politicians and officers.</p>   | <p>Thursday 20<sup>th</sup> November 2003, University of Birmingham, Edgbaston.</p>  |
| <p>Scrutinizing Finance</p>  | <p>The course will look at the overall process of effective overview and scrutiny and how the financial implications of the authority's decisions can be effectively scrutinized</p>  | <p>Wednesday 26<sup>th</sup> November 2003, University of Birmingham, Edgbaston.</p> |

## **Training Courses continued**

|   |   |  |
|---|---|--|
| Creating and sustaining public value – The fourth way?<br><br>IGPM Annual Conference  | This conference will examine the proposition that emerging theories of “public value” and of “values-based leadership and public management” can potentially provide a clearer rationale and a more powerful catalyst for the reform and improvement of governance and public services  | Thursday 27 <sup>th</sup> November 2003, London SW1                            |
| Modernising Full Council: New political management arrangements and the changing role of full Council.                              | The seminar will explore key issues for the development of full council which will include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The changing nature of local representation and government</li><li>• New personnel and features for the council meeting</li><li>• Relationships with the executive</li><li>• Relationships with overview and scrutiny</li><li>• How to redesign full council from a meeting to an event</li></ul> | Wednesday 10 <sup>th</sup> December 2003, University of Birmingham, Edgbaston. |
| Decentralising Government: Choice, Communities and the Role of Local Authorities<br><br>NLGN 2 <sup>nd</sup> Annual Conference 2004 | Key issues at the conference will include: delivering choice, improving partnerships and the use of local government freedoms to innovate locally. There will be 3 main sessions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• New localism – One Year on</li><li>• Communities, Localism and Local Authorities</li><li>• Promoting Choice</li></ul>   | Thursday 22 <sup>nd</sup> January 2004, Central London                         |

More details on the above course can be found by contacting Lucie Edginton, on (01223) 443026 or [lucie.edginton@scambs.gov.uk](mailto:lucie.edginton@scambs.gov.uk)

## **Information on Post Office Closure, Melbourn**

73 High Street, Melbourn, Royston

The Post Office, Melbourn, Royston is temporarily closed from the 21<sup>st</sup> of October 2003, due to the contract with the Post office's agent coming to an end. We have been advised that this branch will remain closed until further notice. There are 2 other branches within a 2.5 mile radius; Meldreth Branch, 80 High Street and Royston Branch, 36 High Street.

Any queries should be addressed to:

Dave Pickering  
Retail Line Manager  
Post Office Ltd  
c/o National Consultation Team  
PO Box 2060  
Watford, WD18 8ZW

Or phone the Customer Help line on 08457 223344

## **Information regarding new address for CALC**

The Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Associations of Local Councils are moving on December 8<sup>th</sup>. The office will be closed from December 5<sup>th</sup> to December 10<sup>th</sup> inclusive.

The new address is:  
33 Stephenson Road  
St Ives  
PE27 3WJ

It is not known currently if they will be keeping the same phone numbers.

## **Information on new staff member, Democratic Services Department**

From the 3<sup>rd</sup> of November 2003, the Democratic Services Department has a new member, Lucie Edginton. Lucie has previously worked for a local Management Consultancy providing business services to the Pharmaceutical Industry. Lucie Edginton will be responsible for assisting Councillors with any training needs that they have and for the production of the weekly bulletin. You can contact Lucie Edginton, on (01223) 443026 or [lucie.edginton@scamb.gov.uk](mailto:lucie.edginton@scamb.gov.uk)

## **Call-In Arrangements**

The Chairman of the Scrutiny Committee or any five other Councillors may call in any executive decision recorded in this bulletin for review. The Democratic Services Manager must be notified of any call in by **Wednesday 12<sup>th</sup> November 2003 at 5pm**. All decisions not called in by this date may be implemented on **Thursday 13<sup>th</sup> November 2003**.

*Any member considering calling in a decision made by Cabinet is requested to contact the Democratic Services Section to determine whether any relevant amendments have been incorporated.*

The call in procedure is set out in full in Part 4 of the Council's Constitution, 'Scrutiny Committee Procedure Rules', paragraph 12.





| Parish Council Name | Made enquiry about parish plan | Representative attended parish plan network evening | Had visit from Parish Plan Officer | Formed Steering Group | Made Vital Villages Plan Application | Made other funding application | Started to undertake plan | Completed Consultation | Written Plan (date in brackets) | Undertaking actions | Market Town | Old Community Appraisal | Village Design Statement | Paving the Way |
|---------------------|--------------------------------|---|------------------------------------|-----------------------|--------------------------------------|--------------------------------|---------------------------|------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------|-------------|-------------------------|--------------------------|----------------|
| Longstanton         | ✓                              |   | ✓                                  |                       |                                      |                                |                           |                        |                                 |                     |             |                         |                          |                |
| Meldreth            | ✓                              |   | ✓                                  |                       |                                      |                                |                           |                        |                                 |                     |             |                         |                          |                |
|                     |                                |   |                                    |                       |                                      |                                |                           |                        |                                 |                     |             |                         |                          |                |
|                     |                                |   |                                    |                       |                                      |                                |                           |                        |                                 |                     |             |                         |                          |                |
|                     |                                |   |                                    |                       |                                      |                                |                           |                        |                                 |                     |             |                         |                          |                |
|                     |                                |   |                                    |                       |                                      |                                |                           |                        |                                 |                     |             |                         |                          |                |
|                     |                                |   |                                    |                       |                                      |                                |                           |                        |                                 |                     |             |                         |                          |                |
|                     |                                |   |                                    |                       |                                      |                                |                           |                        |                                 |                     |             |                         |                          |                |
|                     |                                |   |                                    |                       |                                      |                                |                           |                        |                                 |                     |             |                         |                          |                |
|                     |                                |   |                                    |                       |                                      |                                |                           |                        |                                 |                     |             |                         |                          |                |
|                     |                                |   |                                    |                       |                                      |                                |                           |                        |                                 |                     |             |                         |                          |                |
|                     |                                |   |                                    |                       |                                      |                                |                           |                        |                                 |                     |             |                         |                          |                |
|                     |                                |   |                                    |                       |                                      |                                |                           |                        |                                 |                     |             |                         |                          |                |
|                     |                                |   |                                    |                       |                                      |                                |                           |                        |                                 |                     |             |                         |                          |                |
|                     |                                |   |                                    |                       |                                      |                                |                           |                        |                                 |                     |             |                         |                          |                |
|                     |                                |   |                                    |                       |                                      |                                |                           |                        |                                 |                     |             |                         |                          |                |
|                     |                                |   |                                    |                       |                                      |                                |                           |                        |                                 |                     |             |                         |                          |                |
|                     |                                |   |                                    |                       |                                      |                                |                           |                        |                                 |                     |             |                         |                          |                |

Nov 03



# CABINET

At a meeting of the Cabinet held on  
30<sup>th</sup> October 2003 at 10.00 am.

PRESENT: Mrs DSK Spink                      Leader and Conservation Portfolio Holder

Councillors: CC Barker                      Environmental Health Portfolio Holder  
                  RF Collinson                      Sustainability and Community Planning Portfolio Holder  
                  Mrs EM Heazell                      Housing Portfolio Holder  
                  Mrs DP Roberts                      Community Development Portfolio Holder

Councillors RF Bryant, Mrs SA Hatton, Mrs J Hughes, SGM Kindersley and Mrs BE Waters were also in attendance, by invitation.

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Dr DR Bard (Planning and Economic Development Portfolio Holder), JD Batchelor (Information and Customer Services Portfolio Holder), RT Summerfield (Resources and Staffing Portfolio Holder) and from the Finance and Resources Director.

---

## Procedural Items

---

### 1. MINUTES

The Leader was authorised to sign as a correct record the minutes of the meeting held on 16<sup>th</sup> October 2003, subject to the following amendments:

Minutes (Minute 1, paragraph 3)

“...This Council was likely to be vulnerable on sheltered housing as it had considerably more per head of population than the other Councils...”

Public Art Policy (Minute 5, paragraph 4)

“...A mandatory commitment to public art could add considerable cost to Housing Association developments and...”

Cambridge Office: Staffing Issues (Minute 6, paragraph 1)

“...would be adequate to serve ~~that~~ the number of visitors...”

### 2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

None declared.

---

## Decisions made by the Cabinet and reported for information

---

### 3. COMMUNITIES FACILITIES PROJECT MANAGER POST

The Community Development and Sustainability and Community Planning Portfolio Holders both supported the creation of a new post to lead the development of community facilities in the strategic developments within the District, at Northstowe and on the fringes of Cambridge City. Members were advised that there was already a sufficient workload to merit the new post. Experience at Cambourne confirmed the

importance of organising community facilities and supporting community development from an early stage.

**Cabinet AGREED**

- a. to the creation of a new post of Community Facilities Project Manager within the current financial year, subject to a request being made to the Infrastructure Partnership for funding the post from the Communities Fund; and
- b. that, in the event of the Infrastructure Partnership not supporting the immediate creation of the post, to recommend to Council that the post be funded by this Council.

**4. HOUSING RENOVATIONS ASSISTANCE**

Cabinet, at its meeting of 5<sup>th</sup> June 2003, had deferred for further investigation a proposal for zero interest loans up to £20,000 for renovation works for owners and landlords. The report updated members on the situation regarding housing renovation grants handled by the Home Improvement Agency and recommended the introduction of a new limited scheme of renovation loans. Members' concerns from 5<sup>th</sup> June, that landlords should fund necessary works due to the commercial basis of renting property, had been addressed and the proposed policy was restricted to cover owner-occupiers only.

With regard to renovation assistance money being recycled once a property was sold, Councillor Mrs EM Heazell queried whether a loan would be repaid if such a property were inherited. The Head of Community Services explained that the Council would seek to reclaim the money if it could identify inherited properties. The terms of any loan would be for the current owner only. It was thought possible to include a condition that the loan be repaid if the property were inherited.

Councillor CC Barker urged the Council to be sympathetic if a young person inherited a property and struggled to repay the loan amount in full. The Head of Community Services suggested that the relevant service Portfolio Holder be granted the discretion to consider cases and repayment terms. Suitable guidelines would be necessary to assist the Portfolio Holder and to inform the public how such cases would be considered.

It was confirmed that the means test was an assessment of income, capital and savings, and that the loans were not restricted only to applicants on benefits.

**Cabinet AGREED**

- c. a new policy of zero interest renovation loans for owner-occupiers only up to £20,000, subject to a test of resources, to enable exceptional cases to be approved within existing budgets; and
- d. that any case for altering repayment terms or waiving repayment of a zero interest renovation loan on an inherited property be delegated for consideration and decision by the relevant service Portfolio Holder, subject to guidelines being published.

**5. JOINT APPOINTMENT – HEALTH POLICY AND LAND USE PLANNING CO-ORDINATOR**

The Council's contribution towards the joint appointment of a Health Policy and Land Use Planning Co-ordinator would ensure that the health elements of new developments were properly considered. The Environmental Health Portfolio Holder commended the report and noted that the other partners, Cambridge City Primary

Care Trust (PCT), Cambridge Improving Health Partnership (including Cambridge City Council) and the South Cambridgeshire PCT, were all prepared to contribute.

Members agreed to highlight this forward-thinking and joined-up appointment to the Comprehensive Performance Assessment (CPA) Inspectors.

Cabinet **AGREED** to:

- e. endorse the approach to integrating health policy with land use planning to ensure potential positive and negative public health and health service impacts of major land use proposals and policies were identified and influence the development pressure problems exerted on the Cambridge Sub-Region as outlined in the report; and
- f. contribute £8,000 annually for two years (2003-2005) from the public health capacity building money to fund this joint Health Policy and Land Use Planning Co-ordinator Post.

---

### **Standing Items**

---

#### **6. MATTERS REFERRED BY SCRUTINY COMMITTEE**

The Scrutiny Committee had not yet considered the Access to Services Best Value Review and thus a report would be brought to a future Cabinet meeting.

At its meeting of 23<sup>rd</sup> October, the Scrutiny Committee had agreed with the Cabinet's decision not to contribute towards a feasibility study for a swimming pool at Linton. At the same meeting the Committee had discussed Section 106 agreements.

#### **7. RE-LOCATION OF OFFICES TO CAMBOURNE**

Nothing to report.

---

**The meeting ended at 10.30**

---

## SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

### SUSTAINABILITY AND COMMUNITY PLANNING PORTFOLIO HOLDER MEETING

At a meeting held on Monday, 20th October 2003 at 10.00am

#### PRESENT:

|  |  |
|--|--|
| Councillor RF Collinson (in the Chair) | Portfolio Holder                                 |
| Cameron Adams                          | Strategic Development Officer                    |
| Chris Bethell                          | Planning Policy Officer (Tourism and Monitoring) |
| Nick Grimshaw                          | Conservation Manager                             |
| Maggie Jennings                        | Committee Administrator                          |
| Simon McIntosh                         | Head of Community Services                       |
| Clare Roberts                          | Tourism Officer                                  |
| Councillor DSK Spink                   | Leader of the Council                            |

Apologies for absence were received from Iain Green and Jane Thompson.

#### 1. MINUTES

- 1.1 The Minutes of the meeting held on 17<sup>th</sup> September were approved as a correct record, subject to the following amendments:

Minute 3.1 – should read *Simon Alper* and not Sam

Minute 5.1(a) – penultimate bullet point – delete the word *and* between the words Community Plan for Climate *and* Change.

#### 2. MATTERS ARISING

- 2.1 Minute 2.2 (Climate Change Menu Programme Workshop) – With the agreement of the Chief Executive the workshop scheduled for 24<sup>th</sup> October had been postponed until July 2004 due to the Council's forthcoming Comprehensive Performance Assessment (CPA) and the office relocation to Cambourne.
- 2.2 Minute 2.3 (Health Policy/Land Use Planning Post) - It was noted that the post would be considered by Cabinet on 30<sup>th</sup> October 2003.
- 2.3 Minute 5.1 (a) (Timetable/process for finalising the Community Strategy) – The dates for considering the strategy had been amended and the draft would be considered in December with a final agreement made in February 2004. It was noted that the Climate Change Action Plan would not now be referred to in the Community Strategy due to the postponement of the above.
- 2.4 Minute 6.1 (Learning Partnership meeting) – RC and SM had attended the meeting on 24<sup>th</sup> September. It had been agreed that liaison with businesses was required and networking events would be held.
- 2.5 Minute 7 (a) (EMMA Day) – The Portfolio Holder noted that the European Mobility Management Day had proved very successful. Concern was however expressed that the Members' allowances system did not encourage the use of public transport.
- 2.6 Minute 7 (c) (Self-build Solar Workshop) – Approximately 12 people had attended the meeting on 8<sup>th</sup> October which had contained an excellent presentation from the facilitator. It was not clear from the meeting whether a sufficient number of residents had signed up for the workshop scheduled for 29<sup>th</sup> November. **CA to action**

- 2.7 NG enquired if design guidance was available in respect of solar panels and CA informed the meeting that guidance was yet to be issued nationally and therefore decisions concerning Listed Buildings should currently be considered on a case-by-case basis.
- 2.8 The Portfolio Holder requested that the issue of the installation of Solar Panels in Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas be considered by the Conservation Advisory Group. **NG to action** (CA to attend the meeting)
- 2.9 The Portfolio Holder informed the meeting that he had had discussions with the Chief Executive on the provision of a Planning Officer responsible for sustainability. The Chief Executive had agreed to consider such a post within the CIPs process for 2004/05.
- 2.10 Minute 8.1 (Rainwater harvesting) – No further action had been taken. **CA to pursue.**

### **3. TOURISM UPDATE**

#### Accommodation Grading

- 3.1 The Portfolio Holder reported to the meeting, a letter he had received from Councillor Mrs J Smith, which expressed her concern on behalf of one of the landladies in Linton regarding the costs involved in achieving quality grading. CR explained that the public had indicated that they wanted quality accommodation and the costs of the grading had been recognised by the City Council by giving a £70 one-off payment towards the costs involved. CR undertook to respond to the letter. **CR to action**

#### Cambridge and Beyond Guide

- 3.2 CR would be project managing the guide for publication in January 2004. The brochure would be re-named as 'Visit Cambridge' and would include articles on South Cambridgeshire, particularly emphasising important sites in the district. **CR to liaise with NG**
- 3.3 CR reported that the website had been re-branded and was now [www.visit.org.uk](http://www.visit.org.uk). At the request of NG, CR undertook to investigate the possibility of booking accommodation on-line, together with a possible discount. **CR to action**

#### A Day in the Countryside

- 3.4 CR distributed copies of the brochure and informed the meeting that it had been advertised in the South Cambs magazine. Copies would be available in South Cambs reception area and libraries around the district.

#### Discover Cambridgeshire

- 3.5 A new County Council brochure would be published next month promoting the area.

#### Trumpington Park and Ride

- 3.6 CR informed the meeting that the tourist information section of the Park and Ride had been very successful and would bring the statistics concerning usage to the next meeting. Unfortunately a telephone dedicated for tourist bookings was not available, however CR undertook to pursue the possibility of installing one. **CR to action**

#### P&R Signposting

- 3.7 It was reported that the signposts on the A10 advertising the tourist information centre required removal during the winter months, however additional signs for the M11 would be required for 2004. The County to be contacted to arrange these matters. **CB to action**

#### Web kiosk

- 3.8 CR reported that the City Council were considering the provision of a web kiosk to enable tourists to book accommodation on line. The Portfolio Holder expressed his support for the project and CR undertook to advise the City. **CR to action**

### **4. DUXFORD IMPERIAL WAR MUSEUM – A REQUEST FOR GRANT AID**

- 4.1 Consideration was given to a request from the Imperial War Museum for a grant towards a project to be named AirSpace and involved the redevelopment of one of the hangars. Additional details were requested and it was agreed that prior to consideration by Cabinet, NG/SM and CR would liaise and contact the Director of the museum for clarification on specific issues. The County Council also to be contacted for possible funding from the education budget. **NG/SM/CR to action**

### **5. KEY LOCAL STRATEGIC PARTNERSHIPS BOARD ACTIONS**

- 5.1 The updated version of the Board's action plan was noted and that SM was considering the allocation of lead officers for the individual aims of the Board.
- 5.2 Funding of the LSP was discussed and the necessity to include provision in the CIPs process. NG suggested that aims of the LSP be cross-checked with proposed budget provision and amended if necessary. **SM to action**

### **6. COMMUNITY PLAN – BMG RESEARCH REPORT**

- 6.1 SM advised the Portfolio Holder that most responders to the survey agreed with the Partnership's overall vision and short-term aims across five areas of provision. This appeared to be in line with Members' views.
- 6.2 Attention was drawn to 'other actions to take' and in particular the improvement of public transport generally that the responders highlighted. It was suggested that as a solution, 'post buses' could be used as in other parts of the country.

### **7. CIPs**

- 7.1 Items for inclusion in the CIP were indicated as follows:

- Achievements
  - Short Breaks Brochure. 10 thousand copies had been produced and distributed here and overseas
  - Publication of subsidy for accommodation grading
  - Production of 2003/04 accommodation brochure underway
  - Success of the Park and Ride Tourist Information Centre
- Issues to be addressed
  - Website information to be updated
  - Re-branding of Cambridge and Beyond guide
  - Completion of a Community Strategy
- Planned Improvement
  - Park and Ride Web kiosk
  - Revenue Resource Proposals/Additional resources

- Village Mobile Warden scheme
- Project Officer re Community Strategy
- Planning Officer for Sustainability

7.2 SM requested that any further items for inclusion in the CIP be forwarded to him as soon as possible and in order to finalise the contents of the CIP, a meeting was arranged for 30<sup>th</sup> October immediately following the meeting of Cabinet with RC/DSKS and NG.

## **8. SUSTAINABILITY ISSUES UPDATE**

### CRNN

8.1 CA reported that the £1500 secured from ECOVER had been exhausted and further funding was therefore to be investigated. It was anticipated that future funding for 2003/04 could be obtained from the re-cycling initiative. **CA to action**

### Climate Change Menu Workshop

8.2 The workshop had been re-scheduled for July 2004.

### Self-build Solar Workshop

8.3 See minute 2.6 above.

### Sustainable Development

8.4 NG reported that John Koch, the Appeals Manager/Special Projects Officer was developing a policy for sustainable development as a result of a site earmarked in Fen Drayton. Various sustainable development sites existed and in particular it was noted that one in Nottingham was particularly innovative.

8.5 The Portfolio Holder noted that although Fen Drayton was not included in the Local Plan for additional houses, a development of affordable housing could be achieved. At the request of DSKS, NG to check with Planning Policy on guidance that may have to be taken into account during any possible development of the site at Fen Drayton.

## **9. ANY OTHER BUSINESS**

9.1 None received.

## **10. DATE OF NEXT MEETING**

10.1 The meeting will be held on Tuesday, 18<sup>th</sup> November at 10am in CR1.

The meeting closed at 11.55am

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

**Date:** Wednesday, 15<sup>th</sup> October 2003

**Time:** 14.30 – 17.20

**Place:** Kreis Viersen Room, Shire Hall, Cambridge

**Present:** County Council  
Councillors T J Bear\*, S F Johnstone\* and A Kent  
Officers: K Baldwin J Onslow G Hughes and R Sanderson (Secretary)

Cambridge City Council  
Councillors J Durrant, N Harrison (Chairman) and G Stuart  
Officers: P Studdert and B. Human

South Cambridgeshire District Council  
Councillors D Bard (Vice Chair)\* J Batchelor and R T Summerfield\*  
(Substitute for D Spink)  
Officers: K Miles and M Monk

CALC  
Councillor M J Mason

\* Attendance for part of the meeting only

**Apologies:** Councillors: J Healey C Shaw J Stewart and D Spink,

**16. MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 24<sup>th</sup> SEPTEMBER**

Agreed as correct record.

**Matters Arising**

**Minute 12 (Matters Arising Minute 6 of 18<sup>th</sup> June) Cambridge Development Areas – Update – Resolution a)**

The issue of this still being outstanding was raised and was the subject of discussion during the report at Minute 18.

**17. PRESENTATION INFRASTRUCTURE PARTNERSHIP PROGRESS**

The slides to this presentation are included as an appendix to these Minutes.

It was noted that the Infrastructure Partnership Group were due to meet the following week to recommend the way forward to the appropriate decision making bodies within each Council.

It was noted that it was vital that there should be member representation from all three authorities on the board of the Infrastructure Partnership. In respect of third tier representation e.g. parishes or through a County wide body this would be the subject of further discussions, but attention was drawn to the fact that the Government only wished to see limited local government representation and that their preferred model was only likely to include a minority of the board seats being taken up by local government representation. There was an expectation to include a mix of other public and private sector representation.



It was noted that wider membership would also increase the compulsory purchase powers (CPO) available to the partnership through the active participation of organisations such as EEDA and English Partnerships.

There was a request that there should be joint briefings to local members to ensure that they understood what the details of the partnership would be.

Confirmation was provided that project priorities would still be the responsibility of the appropriate local authorities e.g. County Council for Transport and districts for housing - Section 106 priorities. The Partnership will be responsible for ensuring delivery of the Structure Plan outputs within an already agreed policy framework. The major challenge was around the targets set for new housing and these were still currently falling short of government targets.

In answer to a question raised regarding whether the shortfall in house building provision was a result of planning restrictions processes in local development frameworks or developer inability to deliver, the answer was seen as being more complex. While planning decisions were not necessarily a barrier and planning consents existed in each district to meet the targets, currently the building industry did not have the necessary capacity to meet the set targets. It was not necessarily in the interests of companies to build more houses as an increased supply could reduce their profits. An area that required urgent attention from the government was the issue of separating land ownership from construction companies.

Concerns were expressed regarding any pressures to deliver specific targets leading to an erosion of minimum quality standards. The vital link between the provision of appropriate infrastructure with housing development was seen as critical. Officers would continue to press the government to provide the appropriate level of resources necessary.

It was requested that the officer reports to the various councils should set out the advantages that were expected to accrue through setting up a formal partnership board.

**NOTED - The update report.**

## **18. CAMBRIDGESHIRE AND SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DEVELOPMENT AREAS UPDATE**

Councillor Johnstone declared a personal non-prejudicial interest in this item as a non-Executive Director of Addenbrookes' Hospital.

The purpose of this report was to bring members up to date with progress since the report on the 18<sup>th</sup> June 2003 and look ahead to the next steps.

It was reported that new Government guidance on Local Planning Frameworks received the previous day, would have implications for timetables set out in the report.

Significant progress was being made in establishing a good policy framework for development in the six key areas in and adjacent to Cambridge. Work on East Cambridge had started at a slower pace and might require to be accelerated, if resources allowed. It was important to continue making progress on the preparation of the frameworks in order that land could come forward for development at the earliest possible stage, consistent with completing statutory stages in the planning process. It was also vital to establish the appropriate inter-authority structure for future planning and decision-making and structures to ensure the delivery of development as soon as possible.

Officers went through the details of progress in each of the Areas highlighting the main issues and receiving comments from the Forum.

## **THE CAMBRIDGE STATION AREA**

The key activities reported were as follows:

a) The main points emerging from responses to the Station Area Action Plan in the Deposit Draft Cambridge Local Plan included:

- (i) That parking should not be restricted at the station and the same level should be provided as at present,
- (ii) Pedestrian access links should be provided between the Cattle Market and the Station;
- (iii) The boundary of the Area Action Plan should be extended to include nearby commercial properties in Hill Road,
- (iv) The commercial character of the area had not been acknowledged,
- (v) The 'triangle site' should be treated as a separate site, excluded from the Area Action Plan.

b) Public transport access for both conventional bus and rapid transit vehicles was a key consideration for the Station Area.

c) The Consultants report on buses in Cambridge had concluded that Cambridge city centre remained the focal point for terminating and stopping bus services and that Cambridge Station would continue to play an ancillary role.

(d) Council officers were continuing discussions with developers with major interests in the area.

### **Next Steps**

To prepare the Strategic Development Framework and Design Code as a draft SPG and undertake public consultation with the results to be reported to the January meeting of the City Council's Environment Scrutiny Committee.

### **Forum Comments**

In response to questions raised, it was confirmed that the Railway bodies did not see the proposed station at Chesterton Sidings as having the effect of reducing parking provision at the station. As the northern station was expected to have parking provision of 1000 spaces, there had to be some doubt that this would in fact turn out to be the final position.

The report did not refer to cycle parking provision – officers confirmed that plans were being looked at to increase this from the current 800-900 spaces to 2-3,000 spaces.

Some members expressed doubts that more buses could be accommodated in the city centre. It was indicated that improvements to Drummer Street/ Emmanuel Street would aid through flow. There was a discussion regarding CPO powers that would be available to provide the appropriate access points to the station, particularly through the Rapid Transit Transport and Works Act process.

It was noted that the briefing that had been requested in relation to City Centre bus issues had been arranged at very short notice and therefore many Members had been unable to attend. Officers were asked to expedite a further briefing as soon as possible.

## **AGREED**

**Graham Hughes to set up a further briefing on Bus Study as soon as possible as this was now an urgent priority for many members.**

## **CAMBRIDGE SOUTHERN FRINGE**

The key activities reported were as follows:

- (a) Key points emerging from responses to the Southern Fringe Area Action Plan included:
  - (i) That Monsanto should be included in the Southern Fringe Area Action Plan as an urban extension;
  - (ii) Netherhall Farm should also be included in the Southern Fringe as an Urban Extension;
  - (iii) The Bell School site should not be released from the Green Belt for residential development; and
  - (iv) Concern regarding loss of landscape, wildlife, biodiversity and other issues, such as the possible impact on the water table.
- (b) Monsanto had prepared a Masterplan for its land south of Trumpington and this had been the subject of selective consultation by the consultants. Reservations had been expressed regarding the proposed development in the Green Belt south of the currently developed land.
- (c) Work was continuing to define access routes including links to Rapid Transit.
- (d) The successful bid for Growth Area Delivery Grant, submitted by the Sub-regional Infrastructure Partnership included an element that might be used to assist in providing the necessary access into the Southern Fringe.
- (e) The Steering Group had developed plans for a Stakeholder Workshop to be held on 25<sup>th</sup> October 2004.

## **Next Steps**

To hold a stakeholder partnership workshop on development issues followed by wider consultation and to work with developers on their master plans and to assess the public consultation with the aim of drawing together a strategic framework that could be adopted as supplementary planning guidance

## **Forum Comments**

Concerns were expressed at the timing and short notice given in terms of the briefing by Monsanto on their Master Plan which had taken place during August. It was noted that more detailed information on Monsanto's Master Plan would be available at the forthcoming stakeholder meeting.

Other issue raised on the Southern Fringe Area Action Plan related to infrastructure concerns around Education and Early Years Provision and the need to integrate the whole development with the surrounding area. There was a need to ensure widespread consultation with local Members.

## **AGREED**

**That the results of the consultation, including that to be undertaken with local members, should be reported to the next Joint Forum meeting before being taken for decision by the appropriate formal Council committee which it was agreed should be to the April rather than the January meeting.**

## **CAMBRIDGE NORTHERN FRINGE**

### **CNF East - Recent Developments**

Progress since the last meeting included:

- (a) The consultancy team producing a Stage 1 report providing a survey and analysis of the area. Key issues that had emerged included:
  - (i) Whether the Anglian Water sewage works could be downsized or relocated off-site.
  - (ii) The need to find a suitable site to relocate the aggregates batching plant.
  - (iii) The short window of opportunity available in the Strategic Rail Authority bidding process for the development of a parkway station on the site.
  - (iv) Development on the site would need to be predominantly residential if best development values were to be achieved.
  - (v) The need to consider how a phased approach to bringing forward development and the necessary supporting infrastructure on the site could work.

Work was on going to explore these issues and establish the infrastructure costs likely to be required to bring forward development on the site. The second stage consultants report was expected by the end of the week.

- (b) The key points from responses to the Northern Fringe East Area Action Plan included in the Deposit Draft Cambridge Local Plan included support for the proposed station and for new development around the station to ensure that people could easily access public transport.
- (c) Details were provided on the allocation of the delivery grant of £7.0m, which required to be spent within three years.

### **Forum Comments**

It was noted with concern that the Highways Agency did not wish the development to proceed before improvements were made to the A14. As the rail station was essential to the transport vision for Cambridge it was suggested that a strong case needed to be made to the Strategic Rail Authority to apply pressure as appropriate and that further urgent talks should be undertaken with the Highways Agency.

Officers indicated that at this stage, the views expressed by the Highways Agency most likely represented a holding position which was normal practice. Members requested that discussions with them to elicit their true views should take place urgently.

It was noted that the results of the consultants study concerning the future of the Sewage treatment works was due by the 17<sup>th</sup> October and this would lead to a public consultation exercise to be reported back to the Joint Forum.

## **AGREED**

**A) That while the officers should hold further talk with the Highways Agency.**

**B) If these did not prove satisfactory within 4 to 6 weeks, then this should be followed up with a joint letter from the Joint Forum to the Highways Agency copied to Lord Rooker and signed by all three authorities.**

### **CNF East - Next Steps**

The principal area of work over the next few months would involve continuing to co-ordinate the work of the consultants. Further work on implementation through the Delivery Grant was also required and the next steps were outlined in the report.

### **CNF West - Recent Developments**

The development strategy for the Cambridge Northern Fringe West was being incorporated into the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan and this was progressing towards adoption. The strategy had been consulted upon as a Proposed Modification following consideration at the Public Local Inquiry. It was anticipated that this Local Plan would be adopted towards the end of the year.

**Negotiations were continuing on the detailed content of a Section 106 and the final list of matters to be covered had still to be agreed. The main components were set out in the officer's report. Once outline planning permission was issued, reserved matters applications would follow and development was expected to commence during 2004.**

## **EAST CAMBRIDGE**

It was reported that Marshall of Cambridge were actively exploring ways to bring land at the Airport forward for development through the appointment of consultants looking strategically at development options and transport. The work was not sufficiently advanced to be able to report any results. It was confirmed that Marshall were continuing to consider alternative sites for the relocation of the Airport, but no conclusions have yet been reached.

Key points emerging from the responses to the East Area Action Plan (for the City part of the area) included:

- (a) A majority of representations wished to reinstate an earlier policy into the Plan, which restricted any further aviation development at Cambridge Airport;
- (b) The site should not be included as an urban extension due to the uncertainty of the site coming forward before 2016; and
- (c) Support for open space, green wedges/ fingers to be maintained.

The necessary steps for moving the proposals for the development of East Cambridge were less well developed than for the other development areas. Further work required to be undertaken to define the steps and agree an appropriate timetable with provisional work being as set out in the officers' report.

### **Forum Comments**

It was noted that the range of options for re-location of Marshall's was in part dependent on the results of the Alconbury distribution depot appeal, the current

SERAS work and the subsequent Air Transport White Paper. It was suggested that a member reference group should be set up, as this was a cross boundary issue.

It was noted that even if a site was confirmed in the near future, it would be at least 4 to 5 years before any re-location would take place and that even following this, there would still be a substantial Marshall employment presence in Cambridge.

### **NORTHSTOWE NEW TOWN**

South Cambridgeshire District Council had established a member Steering Group whose initial task was to oversee the planning stage of the new town and details were provided on the two-day September workshops. It was reported that the provisional further two-day workshop in November would be based on the need for close joint working to ensure a fast track approach to the new town with the early commencement of development required by RPG6, posing a particular challenge. One of the lessons from the first workshop was the need to make early (if preliminary) decisions on the extent of the new town site.

A timetable was provided for the completion of the Action Area Plan.

### **Forum Comments**

Due to the size of the development it was suggested that a member Reference Group needed to be constituted as well as ensuring that both local members and next-door members were consulted on proposals. It was noted that local members, including those from parishes, would be invited to the next round of workshops.

In answer to queries raised, it was noted that the exact site had not yet been agreed with the location having been the first stage requirement of the Structure Plan. It would be for local plans to agree exact boundaries. This issue would be looked at as part of the forthcoming seminar.

There was a discussion regarding the timetable for building the first houses and whether this had slipped. It was noted that a great deal of infrastructure required to be put in place in advance but that the developers were keen to see an early start. The original target of 2006 had been devised by Civil Servants to appease Ministers and was never considered to be an achievable date by the local authorities.

### **JOINT PLANNING AND DELIVERY**

Good progress has been made on the on the early stages of planning the development areas in Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire largely due to the good working relationships between the three local authorities and the establishment of informal partnerships with developers and landowners. The latter has been particularly important in trying to ensure that development plans were realistic. The next stages of the work would require these arrangements to be reviewed to achieve joined up planning and effective implementation.

The Cambridge Northern Fringe East and East Cambridge planning areas all straddled the boundary between the City and South Cambridgeshire, and for effective planning they would need to be covered by one plan. It was proposed that this should be through Development Plan Documents proposed in the new legislation. This would need consistent decision-making and would need to be examined by the appropriate Development Control officers.

As already indicated in a previous report, the government had requested local authorities in growth areas to create effective delivery vehicles to deliver the necessary homes and infrastructure. The local authorities of the Cambridge Sub-

Region had agreed to establish a formal Infrastructure partnership to co-ordinate growth, bring in additional skills and capacity and lobby for resources.

In terms of implementing the current planning work, this had up to now been carried out by the thinly spread resources of the three Local Authorities and to ensure timely delivery of development, additional resources would be required. Subject to successful recruiting, this could be addressed through Growth Area Delivery Grant to bring skills and capacity through the Infrastructure Partnership.

#### **AGREED**

- a) **To note the progress and endorse the next steps in the planning process.**
- b) **To endorse the need to continue appropriate inter authority planning processes; and**
- c) **To endorse the need to consider the next steps towards delivery of development with options to be provided by officers for appropriate member approval.**

#### **19. RAPID TRANSIT UPDATE**

Councillor Johnstone declared a prejudicial interest and left the room during discussion of the section of the report on the link to Addenbrookes' Hospital.

The report provided details on progressing the project in the three key areas of undertaking a preliminary consultation on the scheme's proposals, moving towards Transport and Works Act (TWA) submission and working with the Department of Transport to firm up the funding allocation. All of these elements had now either been completed or were nearing completion.

The updated the position on the key details as follows:

Histon Stop – There were now clear proposals as detailed in the report.

Addenbrookes' Hospital Link – There was a case for a separate crossing of the rail line to the link road.

Hills Road – There were still more detail needed and this was still at a delicate stage with consultants carrying out further consultation.

#### **Forum Comments**

It was noted that the environmental impact of the development was causing concern as further details emerged.

Concerns were expressed regarding the stops at Longstanton/Northstowe and Swavesey. For the latter there was concern of whether the stop was in the right place as a result of having to take into account the scheduled ancient monument at Swavesey Priory.

There was discussion regarding the amount of the LTP bid and whether this was expected to be a projected budget overspend. Officers confirmed that the project was re-costed on a monthly basis and that the cost was still estimated at around £75 Million. The Cambridge north to St Ives section was to be financed from the main bid through the Annexe E specific funding block while the Cambridge City and St Ives to Huntingdon section was to be paid from the LTP Integrated block fund. Over 75% of the capital was expected to be met from the Department of Transport if the scheme was successful.

Concerns were raised regarding:

- The possible option of a link over Hills Road Bridge as the tunnel might now not be viable and
- The lack of access from Trumpington in the proposals in the current report.

These would be addressed in a future report.

## **NOTED**

**1) That work was on target to apply for a TWA order in January.**

**2) A further report would be presented to the next meeting of the Joint Forum on the final details of the scheme.**

### **20. AGENDA PLAN**

The Forum noted the agenda plan.

### **21. DATES AND VENUE OF FUTURE MEETINGS**

It was noted that the remaining Forum meeting for the 2003/04 municipal year was as follows:

- 28<sup>th</sup> January – Guild Hall Cambridge

The following future dates were recommended for approval with an update on the list on the agenda recommending the 21<sup>st</sup> July rather than the 14<sup>th</sup> July 2004.

| <b>Dates 2004/05</b>            | <b>Venue</b>  |
|---------------------------------|---------------|
| Wednesday 28th April            | South Cambs   |
| Wednesday 21 <sup>st</sup> July | Shire Hall    |
| Wednesday 20th October          | The Guildhall |
| Wednesday 15th December         | South Cambs   |
| Wednesday 30th March 2005       | Shire Hall    |

All meetings would commence at 2.30 pm.

## **AGREED**

**All dates set out above were agreed with the exception of the 21<sup>st</sup> July as the school summer holidays commenced on 20<sup>th</sup> July. It was recommended that officers look for an earlier date, possibly Monday 19<sup>th</sup> July and preferably in the morning.**

## **Note**

*Since the meeting and in consultation with Democratic Services Officers in each authority it has been confirmed that **10 am Monday 19<sup>th</sup> July will be the date for the July 2004 meeting.***



## **OFFICER DECISIONS REPORTED FOR INFORMATION**

### **Decisions by Conservation Manager**

| Applicant   | Decision   | Reason   |
|---|--|--|
| Mr S.Parr, High Street, Cottenham                                       | £5200 (50%) awarded  | For replacing the corrugated iron roof with long straw thatch  |
| Mr. & Mrs. J Edridge, High Street, Hauxton                              | £3203 (50%) awarded  | For re-roofing the rear and side elevations of the house using Cambridgeshire Gault clay peg tiles from Burwell. |
| Mr. J G Hall, Linton  | £1850 (10%) awarded  | For rethatching, ridding and rewiring the long straw thatched roof   |
| The Barn, High Street, Great Eversden                                   | £4100 (25%) awarded  | For rethatching, ridding and rewiring the long straw thatched roof   |
| School Room, All Saints Church, Castle Camps - Parochial Church Council | Extended by 10 months until the end of March 2005 to allow for further local and national fundraising to take place. | Grant Time Extension   |
| Mr. and Mrs. J Mol, Common Road, Weston Colville                        | £119 (balance following payment of grant).   | Grant Monies returned to the Fund  |

Further information is available from Shona Smith, Conservation Assistant who can be contacted on (01223) 443217 or e-mail: [shona.smith@scambs.gov.uk](mailto:shona.smith@scambs.gov.uk)

## DECISIONS MADE BY PORTFOLIO HOLDERS

### JOINT PORTFOLIO HOLDER DECISION BETWEEN PLANNING AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT AND HOUSING

| Subject  | Action Taken   |
|--|--|
| <p data-bbox="177 394 571 488">ODPM sought comments on draft changes to PPG3 Housing:</p> <ul data-bbox="236 524 552 757" style="list-style-type: none"><li data-bbox="236 524 552 618">• Supporting the delivery of new housing</li><li data-bbox="236 622 552 757">• Influencing the size, type and affordability of housing</li></ul> <p data-bbox="177 792 571 1025">Officer level comments were sent on 30 October to meet the deadline of 31 October 2003 and were subsequently agreed by the Portfolio Holders and confirmed to ODPM.</p> | <p data-bbox="579 394 1417 488">Whilst supporting much of the generally thrust of the consultation documents, the responses raised some concerns:</p> <ul data-bbox="635 524 1417 1473" style="list-style-type: none"><li data-bbox="635 524 1417 689">• Proposed changes with respect to redeveloping “redundant” employment buildings for housing could undermine the sustainability objective of achieving a close balance between homes and jobs, particularly in villages.</li><li data-bbox="635 725 1417 819">• Current guidance is too vague on the definition of affordability in terms of the relationship between local income and house prices or rents.</li><li data-bbox="635 855 1417 949">• Key workers should be defined on the basis of both their job and their income in relation to local house prices, not one or the other.</li><li data-bbox="635 985 1417 1079">• Authorities should be able to define appropriate tenures for affordable housing if it is to meet identified local needs.</li><li data-bbox="635 1115 1417 1209">• There is a need for more detailed guidance on how development viability is to be assessed.</li><li data-bbox="635 1245 1417 1339">• Affordable housing should be provided even where public subsidy is not available though grant-free alternatives.</li><li data-bbox="635 1375 1417 1469">• The preference should always be for on-site delivery of affordable housing, to help provide balanced and sustainable communities.</li></ul> <p data-bbox="579 1505 1417 1536">The following proposals were specifically supported:</p> <ul data-bbox="635 1572 1417 1886" style="list-style-type: none"><li data-bbox="635 1572 1417 1644">• Reducing the threshold in site size for securing affordable housing.</li><li data-bbox="635 1680 1417 1774">• Proposals that local planning authorities can plan for a mix of housing types and sizes that reflect identified local needs.</li><li data-bbox="635 1809 1417 1886">• The introduction of a land use category of “affordable housing”.</li></ul> |

## **DECISIONS MADE BY PORTFOLIO HOLDERS**

### **PLANNING AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT PORTFOLIO HOLDER DECISION**

| Subject  | Action Taken  |
|--|---|
| (1) Remove Pay and Display bay on southwest side of St Peters Street.<br>(2) Introduce dual use footways on Huntingdon Road/Sherlock Road/Storeys Way.<br>(3) Install a toucan crossing in Huntingdon Road | No objection to the proposals.  |
| Subject  | Action Taken  |
| Prohibition of waiting in Brook Road, Bassingbourn   | Support the proposal as it should help safety outside the school  |
| Subject  | Action Taken  |
| To meet statutory rules for building regulation self financing*  | To amend the South Cambridgeshire Scheme of Charges for building regulation applications to bring it more in line with the LGA model scheme of charges. |

\*For further details on this decision, please contact Stephen Rizzo on (01223) 443201 or e-mail him on [Stephen.rizzo@scambs.gov.uk](mailto:Stephen.rizzo@scambs.gov.uk)

### **ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH PORTFOLIO HOLDER DECISION**

| Subject   | Action Taken   |
|---|--|
| Contribution was requested from the Parish for flood study to identify possible improvements along the Elsworth brook following serious flooding in October 2001. The Parish has also applied for similar contributions from the Cambridgeshire County Council and the Env. Agency.         | To approve expenditure of approximately £1600 as SCDC contribution (25% of total) towards flood study within the Parish of Elsworth. The contribution is conditional in that a similar amount will be made available from both the Cambridgeshire County Council and the Env. Agency. Contribution agreed. |
| Subject   | Action Taken   |
| Study is being undertaken by the Environmental Agency as part of a joint approach to finding a solution to the flooding problems in Bourn Second phase study is expected to recommend whether the improvement works are feasible and if the works are likely to attract Government funding. | To approve expenditure for second phase of study on Bourn Brook (Pre-feasibility). Cost of works estimated up to £20,000   |

## **RESOURCES AND STAFFING PORTFOLIO HOLDER DECISION**

| Subject   | Action Taken  |
|---|---|
| All efforts to recover the outstanding debts have failed, or because of the circumstances of the debtor, there appears to be no realistic chance of recovery.   | Authority is given for £16,051.33 in respect of Non-Domestic Rates, and £3268.00 in respect of Sundry Debtors to be written off as irrecoverable  |
| Subject   | Action Taken  |
| Following a full tender exercise, these two companies (Rundle and Co and Newlynn) are adjudged to be capable of providing the level of service required by the authority and by appointing two companies it introduces an element of competition. This approach also enables a degree of joint working with a neighbouring authority. | Rundle and Co and Newlynn collection services are to be contracted to provide a bailiff service for the collection of Non Domestic Rates and Council Tax with effect from 1 <sup>st</sup> November 2003 on a no commission basis. |