



# SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL COUNCILLORS' BULLETIN ISSUE DATE 7<sup>th</sup> JANUARY 2004

## CONTENTS

### IMPORTANT INFORMATION FOR COUNCILLORS

1. Forthcoming Committee Meetings
2. Information on **Alconbury** Airfield and **Stansted** Airport, a members briefing paper
3. Training Courses/Seminars/Conferences
  - LGA Conference "Decentralising for Rural Delivery, Seizing the opportunity"
  - EERA/EO seminar "Value Management. Delivering Service improvement"
4. Call-in Arrangements

### ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH PORTFOLIO HOLDER DECISIONS REPORTED FOR INFORMATION

1. Agreement of information included within the PFI outline business case for submission to DEFRA

### COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT PORTFOLIO HOLDER DECISIONS REPORTED FOR INFORMATION

1. To reduce the grant of £50,000 awarded to **Coton** Parish Council to replace the cricket and football pavilion to £40,000

### PLANNING AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT PORTFOLIO HOLDER DECISIONS REPORTED FOR INFORMATION

1. To agree a street name (Covent Garden) for new development off High Street, **Willingham**

### OFFICER DECISIONS REPORTED FOR INFORMATION

1. Community Development  
Award of £650 to the "Most Wanted" Youth Group, **Gamlingay**

### CONSERVATION ADVISORY GROUP MINUTES 10<sup>TH</sup> DECEMBER 2003

1. The minutes are subject to formal adoption by the Conservation Advisory Group on 21<sup>st</sup> January 2004
  - 3) Cambridgeshire Historic Churches Trust
  - 4) Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Biological Records Office
  - 5) Parish Paths Partnership ("P3") on rights of way in South Cambridgeshire
  - 6) St Denis Church, **East Hatley**

## IMPORTANT INFORMATION FOR COUNCILLORS



### COMMITTEE MEETINGS

FROM 12<sup>th</sup> JANUARY to 16<sup>th</sup> JANUARY 2004



|   |       |   |  |
|---|-------|---|--|
| <b>MONDAY 12<sup>th</sup> JANUARY 2004</b>    |       |   |  |
| <b>TUESDAY 13<sup>th</sup> JANUARY 2004</b>   |       |   |  |
|   | 10 am | Information and Customer Services Portfolio Holders meeting     | Finance and Resources Directors office   |
|   | 2 pm  | Cambourne NOW Group   | COMMITTEE ROOM 1                         |
|   | 5 pm  | Constitution Review Working Party                               | COUNCILCHAMBER                           |
| <b>WEDNESDAY 14<sup>th</sup> JANUARY 2004</b> |       |   |  |
|   | 10 am | Sustainability and Community Planning Portfolio Holders meeting | COMMITTEE ROOM 2                         |
|   | 11 am | Housing Portfolio Holders meeting                               | Housing and Environment Directors office |
| <b>THURSDAY 15<sup>th</sup> JANUARY 2004</b>  |       |   |  |
| <b>FRIDAY 16<sup>th</sup> JANUARY 2004</b>    |       |   |  |

## **Information on Alconbury Airfield and Stansted Airport**

### **Members' Briefing Paper:**

Members will have noted in the media two decisions released just before Christmas by the Government:

- The appeal by Alconbury Developments Ltd (ADL) on the use of Alconbury Airfield
- The White Paper on "The Future of Air Transport" which states Government policy for the expansion of airports in the UK.

These decisions are of the utmost importance to South Cambridgeshire. The **Alconbury decision** is relevant to the relocation of Marshall's and Cambridge Airport which in turn is critical to the delivery of housing close to Cambridge. Without the Airport being available for development there would be real difficulties in meeting the Regional Planning Guidance and Structure Plan targets with the consequence that development pressures would have to be accommodated elsewhere in South Cambridgeshire. The White Paper proposes the **expansion of Stansted** by an additional runway which has implications for travel through South Cambridgeshire, air movements which may affect South Cambridgeshire, and urbanisation requirements which the District Council will need to ensure are met close to the Airport and do not add to the development pressures in the Cambridge Sub-Region.

### **Alconbury**

The Deputy Prime Minister (DPM) has allowed the appeal by Alconbury Developments Limited (ADL) to develop warehousing for a road/rail freight interchange. He has, however, imposed a no-flying condition whilst at the same time agreeing to the safeguarding of the runway for potential future aviation. It would appear that this is primarily to make it clear that any future flying use would have to be taken through the planning system and not depend on existing flying rights (which have been contested).

Whilst Alconbury has been ruled out by the White Paper as an airport to meet the needs of the South East for commercial air freight and a budget airline airport, the decision would not appear to preclude the opportunity to develop a small regional airport (should that prove viable) and accommodate Marshall's aerospace facility.

At the same time, the DPM has imposed a condition requiring the new rail link to the East Coast Main Line to be in place before any of the development is in operation. This is in contrast to ADL's plans which saw a proportion of the development taking place based purely on road access before the rail link was established. This may affect the viability of the scheme and may lead ADL to reconsider their plans, but this remains to be seen. South Cambridgeshire has consistently argued that this large brownfield site should be used for the greatest benefit of the Sub-Region rather than a national freight distribution centre which could be accommodated elsewhere.

The Arup report into the potential relocation of Marshall/Cambridge Airport (jointly commissioned by EEDA, the local authorities and Marshall) identified a number of alternative locations. Of these, Alconbury, Wyton and Mildenhall would seem to offer the greatest potential. Marshall and the local authorities are working together on a preparatory work for masterplanning the east of Cambridge. It is important that Marshall be encouraged to explore further the opportunities to relocate to give certainty at the earliest opportunity. Certainly, the appeal decision by the DPM does not appear to rule out Alconbury from being a potential location for Marshall, should ADL resolve to submit a new planning application. Such a revised proposal would be consistent with the approach urged by this Council. It will be for Huntingdonshire District Council to determine whether Alconbury or Wyton would be their preferred location. Forest Heath District Council is likely to welcome any suggestion of Mildenhall because of the gain in skilled jobs, although the Ministry of Defence, conscious of the need for security of the USAF may be more reticent.

## The White Paper and Stansted

The Secretary of State's publication of the White Paper follows one of the biggest consultation exercises undertaken by Government on a planning issue; over 500,000 responses were received. It looks to establish a strategy for the next 30 years.

It suggests making full use of the capacity at existing airports and growth at a number of regional airports (as commended in South Cambridgeshire's response to the consultation). However, it does not bring forward any proposals to address further the environmental costs of air travel, particularly the impact on climate change through the burning of fossil fuels.

It recognises the need for additional runway capacity in the South East and concludes:

- No second hub airport
- **Make best use of existing runways at Stansted and Luton**
- **A new runway at Stansted by 2011/12**
- A new runway at Heathrow within the period 2015/20, if stringent environmental limits can be met.
- Safeguarding a new runway at Gatwick for post 2019
- Alconbury for passenger or freight services is not supported although "the potential for relocation there of aircraft maintenance operations from Cambridge is recognised".
- No other new runways, including any at Stansted.

At **Stansted**, therefore there is now clarity that the airport will expand beyond the current planning permission of 25mppa to the maximum capacity of the existing runway – 35mppa. This needs to be compared with the existing figures of around 19mppa in 2003. Stansted will become much busier than now, with resultant increases in surface and air traffic even within this constraint.

The second runway would add another 46mppa. The White Paper suggests that if this were provided in 2011/12, traffic would grow rapidly because at that time there would be little remaining additional capacity elsewhere in the South East.

The Paper also links the expansion of the airport to the "regional and sub-regional growth objectives reflecting employment led growth in the service and high-technology economies of London, east Hertfordshire, west Essex and Cambridge." It will be important for South Cambridgeshire to ensure that the special needs of the Cambridge Sub-Region, its specialist economy and environmental qualities are not lost in this apparent amalgam by Government and that any resultant urbanisation takes place close to the Airport. The White Paper recognises the concerns about the rural heritage of the area around Stansted but wishes at the same time to "consider the potential growth of the airport and its associated development within the wider planning context". South Cambridgeshire will need to continue to press its case that urbanisation associated with Stansted will need to be located a short distance from the airport in order to reduce travel distances, consistent with Government policy.

In addressing the surface transport links that this proposal would need, the White Paper notes the commitment to widen the M25 and M11 and suggests consideration of:

- Increased capacity on the West Anglia line
- Peak capacity at Liverpool Street and Tottenham Hale
- Increased capacity of the M11 between Stansted and the M25
- Enhanced local access.

Worryingly, the White Paper is silent on the A14. Your officers will need to consider whether the implications of such a major expansion at Stansted has been taken into account in the CHUMMS proposals. This is particularly relevant given the statement in the White Paper of the "need to encourage growth in the north of the South East region and build stronger links between the Midlands and the South East".

The potential additional impact of air traffic noise on South Cambridgeshire is difficult to predict. The White Paper refers only to the number affected within the 57dBA noise contour (rising to 8,000 people at 2015 and 14,000 by 2030). It suggests airlines be "incentivised" to introduce the quietest aircraft available. It is not possible from the White Paper to assess the long-term flight patterns and stacking requirements: Members may wish to use the informal Stansted Airport/South Cambridgeshire meetings to explore this issue in particular.

Contact Officer: Michael Monk, Principal Planning Policy Officer 01223 443181.

**Background Papers:**

The Future of Air Transport, Dept for Transport, December 2003,  
Letter from the Deputy Prime Minister's Office, 10<sup>th</sup> December 2003, on appeals by ADL,  
Huntingdon planning application numbers 97/1500 and 97/1507.

## Training Courses/Seminars/Conferences

| Name of Course   | Description   | Date and Venue   |
|--|---|--|
| <p><u>“Decentralising for Rural Delivery? Seizing the opportunity”</u></p> <p>LGA Conference</p>   | <p>Key Themes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The government's development of rural strategy and review of rural white paper</li> <li>• The implications of the role for local authorities following Lord Haskin's report</li> <li>• The Regional role in delivery</li> <li>• Where can Local Authorities make a difference in the future delivery of rural economic and social well being</li> <li>• What are the implications for environmental well-being of Lord Haskins report?</li> </ul> | <p>Monday 9<sup>th</sup> February 2004</p> <p>Cavendish Conference Centre, London</p> <p>9.30am – 3.30pm</p>       |
| <p><u>“Value Management. Delivering Service Improvement”</u></p> <p>This conference is jointly provided by the East of England Regional Assembly (EERA), The Employers' Organisation for local government and the Institute for Value Management</p> | <p>Key Topics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Overview of Value Management</li> <li>• Determining, Measuring and Evaluating Value</li> <li>• Applying Function Analysis and Identifying Value</li> <li>• Developing and Appraising Improvement Options</li> <li>• Review and Implications of Applying Value Management</li> </ul>   | <p>Wednesday 3<sup>rd</sup> March 2003</p> <p>Flempton House, Flempton, Bury St Edmunds</p> <p>9.15am – 4.14pm</p> |

More details on the above courses can be found by contacting Lucie Edginton, on (01223) 443026 or [lucie.edginton@scambs.gov.uk](mailto:lucie.edginton@scambs.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 14<sup>th</sup> January 2004 at 5pm**. All decisions not called in by this date may be implemented on **Thursday 15<sup>th</sup> January 2004**.

*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.

## **DECISIONS MADE BY PORTFOLIO HOLDERS**

### **ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH PORTFOLIO HOLDER DECISIONS**

| Subject   | Action Taken  |
|---|---|
| <p><u>Information to be included in the PFI Bid Outline Business Case for Integrated Waste Management Project</u></p> <p>The information included in respect of SCDC was in line with previous discussions and agreements and did not commit this Council to involvement in any future procurement. This decision was in accordance with the decision of Cabinet on the 27<sup>th</sup> of November 2003 to join as a partner in the submission of the outline business case to DEFRA for PI credits.</p> | <p>To agree to the information included within the PFI outline business case for submission to DEFRA.</p> |

### **COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT PORTFOLIO HOLDER DECISIONS**

| Subject  | Action Taken   |
|--|--|
| <p><u>Grant to Coton Parish Council</u></p> <p>The previous project did not progress, as the applicant was unable to raise the required level of funding. The club has now formed a working party and is keen to move forward. The total project cost has now been reduced as the existing footings can be used.</p> | <p>Agreed to reduce the grant of £50,000 awarded to Coton Parish Council in 2001 to replace the cricket and football pavilion to £40,000</p> |

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

| Subject   | Action Taken  |
|---|---|
| <p><u>Street Naming</u></p> <p>To decide the street name of new development off High Street, Willingham</p> | <p>From the two names put out for consultation, Covent Garden was agreed.</p> |

## **DECISIONS MADE BY OFFICERS**

| Subject   | Action Taken   |
|---|--|
| <p><u>Community Development</u></p> <p>Youth Consultation through video project. Working with community education and professional film makers to provide a way for young people in Gamlingay to make their views known to the Parish Council and other community groups. The benefits will be the development of new skills and self confidence and the acknowledgement of how young people feel they are perceived in Gamlingay</p> | <p>Agreed to award £650 to the "Most Wanted" Youth Group, Gamlingay.</p> |

## **CONSERVATION ADVISORY GROUP**

At a meeting of the Committee  
held on 10<sup>th</sup> December 2003 at 2.00pm

PRESENT: Councillor SJ Agnew - Chairman  
Councillor NN Cathcart – Vice-Chairman  
Councillor Mrs MP Course  
Councillor Dr JA Heap  
Councillor RGR Smith  
Councillor RJ Turner  
Councillor AW Wyatt

Councillor RF Collinson attended the meeting by invitation.

Councillors Mrs JM Healey (Chairman, Development and Conservation Control Committee) and Mrs DSK Spink (Portfolio Holder for Conservation) sent apologies for absence.

### **1. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Councillor SA Agnew and Councillor Mrs MP Course declared personal interests in Minute no. 5 (Parish Path Partnership). Councillor Agnew was currently a member of a Parish Council involved in the scheme, and Councillor Mrs Course announced that Meldreth Parish Council was considering whether or not to become a partner.

### **2. MINUTES**

The Advisory Group authorised the Chairman to sign, as a correct record, the Minutes of the meeting held on 22<sup>nd</sup> October 2003.

In relation to Minute no. 3 (Archaeological Training Excavation in Fulbourn), the Conservation Manager updated Members about developments following the excavation and, in particular, the steps taken to identify the number of people from South Cambridgeshire taking part, and support for village initiatives.

### **3. CAMBRIDGESHIRE HISTORIC CHURCHES TRUST**

Nick Cleaver, Secretary of the Cambridgeshire Historic Churches Trust (CHCT), made a PowerPoint presentation to the Advisory Group.

Councillor RF Collinson was currently the Council's representative on the CHCT but, since becoming a member of the Cabinet and ceasing to be a member of the Conservation Advisory Group, would now be relinquishing that particular responsibility. The Head of Legal Services had confirmed that Councillor Collinson had no interest in this item that needed to be declared.

Members made the following points:

- should the Council decide to support the CHCT, it should do so regardless of denomination
- the CHCT could only function fully if it was funded from a wide range of sources. The Council's primary role would be to endorse the principles, for which the CHCT stood, and to help procure grants from elsewhere.
- church buildings should be recognised, not just as places of worship but, in many cases, as important community facilities as well
- the availability of adequate resources was an important consideration
- changes to church buildings should be consistent with their historic fabric and interiors



The Conservation Manager confirmed that:

- the Council remained responsible for redundant churchyard walls
- the CHCT would be expected to consider each application on its merits. Although the majority of churches in the District were listed buildings, applications in respect of those not listed would be given equal consideration.
- appropriate funding was available from within existing resources. This money might be funnelled into those projects that might not proceed without some indication of support from the District Council.

The Chairman suggested that the Council should reconsider its stance in two years' time.

The Conservation Advisory Group **RECOMMENDED** that the Portfolio Holder for Conservation

- (1) authorises the amendment of the existing Historic Buildings Grant policy to enable grant offers to be made toward partnership funding packages, subject to the criteria outlines in paragraph 22 of the report from the Conservation Manager, aimed at repairing the external fabric of church buildings;
- (2) requests that full Council appoints Councillor Mrs MP Course as its representative on the Cambridge Historic Churches Trust to assist with the targeting and direction of the grant schemes by whatever means seem most appropriate;
- (3) authorises an initial grant subsidy of £4,000 to the CHCT from the Heritage Initiatives Fund in 2004-05, as a way of endorsing and assisting with the Trust's work.

Members requested that the Conservation Manager prepare a report on the effectiveness of the grant subsidy identified in Recommendation no. (3) above, prior to the Conservation Advisory Group making any commitment of subsequent future grant support beyond 2004-05.

#### **4. CAMBRIDGE AND PETERBOROUGH BIOLOGICAL RECORDS OFFICE**

Catherine Weightman (Biodiversity Partnership Co-ordinator), Brian Eversham (Conservation Director for the Wildlife Trust) and Rob Mungovan (Ecology Officer, South Cambridgeshire District Council) gave a verbal presentation to the Advisory Group.

Members considered a report outlining the role of the proposed Biological Records Centre ("BRC") and exploring funding options.

It was noted that the proposed Centre could help to reduce the duplication of effort in organising surveys and storage of data in a number of areas, would be beneficial to the planning system with respect to supplying up-to-date species distribution data, and would enable consultants to obtain information direct from a central source.

Councillor Dr JA Heap declared a personal interest in this item, but did not consider it sufficient to warrant him not contributing to the debate. While welcoming the proposal in principle, he expressed caution about the ability of the BRC to become self-funding after three years. He requested that a future presentation be given to the Group at which time the funding of the Service Level Agreement should be discussed.

The Conservation Advisory Group expressed its continued support for the establishment of the Biological Records Centre, and **RECOMMENDED** that the Portfolio Holder for Conservation

- (1) confirms South Cambridgeshire District Council's commitment to supporting the establishment of the BRC, subject to approval of the proposed lottery bid.;
- (2) authorises capital grant funding of £13,000 from the Heritage Initiatives Fund to support the lottery bid, as outlined in the report from the Conservation Manager; and
- (3) explores, subject to the successful establishment of the BRC, appropriate levels of revenue funding from an appropriate budget for the period after 2006-07, and asks the Conservation Manager to report the conclusions back to the Group in due course.

## **5. PARISH PATHS PARTNERSHIP ("P3") ON RIGHTS OF WAY IN SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE**

John Cooper (Senior Access and Parish Paths Liaison Officer with the Countryside Services Team of Cambridgeshire County Council) made a PowerPoint presentation to the Advisory Group. Members considered a report on the effectiveness, impact and the Council's continued financial support of the P3 initiative.

Mr Cooper informed Members that he and his Team were willing to address individual parish councils about how the partnership operated in practice, and how it could benefit those parishes not yet participating in the scheme.

The Conservation Advisory Group **RECOMMENDED** that the Portfolio Holder for Conservation

- (1) Confirms the Council's continued support for the development of the Parish Paths Partnership (P3) Scheme, and seeks funding for 2004-05 at the level established in the current financial year; and
- (2) Identifies additional potential enhancement schemes for future development in 2004-05 and 2005-06.

## **6. ST. DENIS CHURCH, EAST HATLEY**

Members considered a report setting out the results of the recent tender process, and seeking support for letting a contract for conducting 'holding' repairs to arrest the deterioration of the former church, thereby enabling further investigation of the viability of options for the re-use of the building. Such options included a potential scheme to be developed with the Wildlife Trust for environmental education and study.

Members discussed the financial implications relating to proposals for carrying out short-term and longer-term repairs. In essence, the approximate figures ranged from £50,000 to £75,000, but Members expressed fears that this might only be the beginning of the Council's financial commitment. The least expensive option would be to "stitch" the gable ends together, and replace the original, tiled roof with one of a lightweight, corrugated composite material.

Members made the following comments:

- that serious account should be taken of the adverse effect such expenditure could have on the level of Council Tax charged in the coming year
- that an alternative option was to allow the church to deteriorate gracefully
- that the Council might not recoup any money it spent at this stage, such as by disposing of the church as a commercial or community property

- that the Advisory Group needed to know what the entire costs were likely to be before it should consider making a recommendation
- there were Health and Safety issues to be addressed

The Advisory Group concluded that it was unable to make a recommendation based on the facts before it. It therefore requested that the Conservation Manager engage consultants to assess the potential costs further, and present an updated report to the Conservation Advisory Group meeting on 21st January 2004.

## **7. AWARD FOR ACHIEVEMENT IN HISTORIC BUILDING CONSERVATION: CONFIRMATION OF AWARDS AND PRESENTATION OF AWARDS**

Members considered a report on the winners of the various categories in the Conservation Award Scheme.

Presentations would be made during the evening of 21<sup>st</sup> January 2004 to the following Groups:

- ***Award for achievement in Historic Building Conservation - Large Scheme.***
  - A Sheepshead Row in Melbourn
- ***Award for achievement in Historic Building Conservation - Small Scheme.***
  - 27 High Street, Willingham
  - Highly commended – 17 South End, Bassingbourn
- ***Award for achievement in Historic Building Conservation - Craft Skills.***
  - Bourn Hall
- ***Award for Innovative Conversion and Use of a Historic Building.***
  - Stables at Wandlebury Country Park

---

The meeting closed at 5.15pm

---