

## COUNCILLORS' BULLETIN

ISSUE DATE 28<sup>TH</sup> APRIL 2004

### CONTENTS



South  
Cambridgeshire  
District Council

1. Committee Meetings
2. Information on attendance at Housing Portfolio Holder meetings
3. Information on the Environment Fayre at **Papworth Everard** – 22<sup>nd</sup> May 2004
4. Information from Legal Services regarding the Deputy Monitoring Officer
5. Planning Performance Criteria
6. Call-in Arrangements

### MINUTES

1. Milton Country Park Advisory Group Minutes from 19<sup>th</sup> January 2004
  - Use of the Park by dogs and their walkers
  - The future of fishing at the Park
  - Tree inspection Policy
  - Swallows Refreshment Kiosk
2. Northstowe Member Steering Group Minutes from 25<sup>th</sup> February 2004
  - Remit of the Steering Group
  - Public Exclusion from Steering Group Meetings
  - Steering Group Membership
  - LDF and Action Plan Area timetables
  - Scope of Area Action Plan for Northstowe
  - Summary of work to date
  - Developer Proposals
  - Infrastructure Partnership
3. Northstowe Member Steering Group Minutes from 31<sup>st</sup> March 2004
  - Gallagher Estates and Fairfield Partnerships presentations to Members
4. Cabinet Minutes from 22<sup>nd</sup> April 2004
  - South Cambridgeshire Community Strategy
  - **Melbourn** Dual Use Capital Grant
  - Strategic Risk Management
  - **Comberton** – Community Facility Grant
  - CPA – Benefits Service

## IMPORTANT INFORMATION FOR COUNCILLORS

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FROM 3 <sup>rd</sup> May 2004 – 7 <sup>th</sup> May 2004			
MONDAY 3 <sup>rd</sup> May 2004	OFFICE CLOSED – BANK HOLIDAY		
TUESDAY 4 <sup>th</sup> May 2004			
WEDNESDAY 5 <sup>th</sup> May 2004			
THURSDAY 6 <sup>th</sup> May 2004	2 pm	*Housing Portfolio Holder Meeting	Committee Room 1
FRIDAY 7 <sup>th</sup> May 2004			

### \*REMINDER: INVITE TO HOUSING PORFOLIO HOLDER MEETINGS

At the December 2003 meeting of the Housing Portfolio Holder, it was agreed to invite non-executive Members to the portfolio meetings. The allocation will be done on a first come, first served basis and will be restricted to two members only. If you would like to attend the next Housing Portfolio Holder meeting, it will be taking place in Committee room 1 between 2 pm and 4 pm on Thursday 6<sup>th</sup> May 2004. The first two members to contact Democratic Services will be able to attend. Members who wish to attend must note that some items may be confidential. Contact Lucie Edginton on ext 3026 or by email [lucie.edginton@scams.gov.uk](mailto:lucie.edginton@scams.gov.uk)

### INFORMATION ITEM – ENVIRONMENT FAYRE AT PAPWORTH EVERARD

Environment Fayre at Papworth Everard Village Centre - Saturday 22nd May 10 am-3 pm

The Environment Fayre is coming to Papworth Everard, with lots of interesting things to see and do, including:

- How to attract more wildlife (butterflies, birds -- and bats!) to your garden
- Master Composters to give advice on slimming your bin
- English Nature advisors to discuss trees, wild flowers, dragonflies and badgers
- Advice on water saving, energy saving and solar lighting -- plus free low energy light bulbs
- Local groups selling recycled toys and clothing and the Papworth Youth Club displaying crafts made from recycled materials
- Bring along your old mobile phones and printer cartridges as recycling facilities will be available; also any old spectacles and sunglasses as Vision Aid Overseas will be happy to take them

Food and drink is available. Entrance is free.

## **INFORMATION FROM THE LEGAL DEPARTMENT**

The Monitoring Officer, Christopher Taylor, has re-appointed Fiona McMillan as deputy Monitoring Officer as from 1st May 2004 on her return from maternity leave. David Lord shall then cease to be deputy Monitoring Officer but will continue to assist with the training of District and Parish Councillors on ethical issues and will be able to advise and clerk Standards Committee hearings panels as necessary.

## **INFORMATION REGARDING PLANNING PERFORMANCE CRITERIA**

### **PERFORMANCE CRITERIA - QUARTERLY STATISTICS**

In the fourth quarter of 2003 the number of applications received by South Cambridgeshire increased by 1% over the corresponding period in 2002. In England there was a 4% increase.

The percentage of all decisions taken within the eight-week period in the District was 69% compared with 73% in England. The equivalent figure for householder development was 83% compared with the national figure of 83%.

The percentage of decisions delegated to officers in this quarter was 86%. There is no equivalent national figure but in Cambridgeshire the average figure was 88%. The Government has set a target of 90%.

The new Government targets are included in the Statistical Release. On the "excluding major and minor applications" where the Government target is 80% in eight weeks the Council achieved 77% whilst on the "minor" category where we are urged to decide 65% in eight weeks the Council achieved 54%. The more difficult target is the Government's 60% in thirteen weeks for major applications i.e. things like the Wellcome Trust or the Northern Fringe! Here the Council achieved 29%. These last two figures represent improvements on the third quarter.

The graphs, which accompany this report, illustrate the picture in Cambridgeshire for each of these development types during the year ending 31<sup>st</sup> December 2003 and the quarter October to December 2003.

### **RETROSPECTIVE APPLICATIONS**

In response to a recommendation from Scrutiny Committee (17<sup>th</sup> April 2003), the number of retrospective applications are to be recorded.

Thus in the fourth quarter of 2003, the number of retrospective applications submitted was 18. This represented 3.2% of all applications submitted during that quarter, a very similar proportion to the number submitted during the third quarter. Of the 16 retrospective applications which have been determined, 75% have been approved and 25% refused. During the quarter 84% of all applications were approved.

### **Informal officers**

Since October 2003, the Council has employed two officers out of the first years Planning Delivery Grant to answer written and verbal enquiries from the public and potential applicants.

In the period 13<sup>th</sup> October 2003 to 21<sup>st</sup> April 2004 the two officers have responded to some 581 of 642 (90%) written enquiries. More than 60% have been responded to within 2 weeks and 80% within 3 weeks.

This has represented an improvement to the service to the public by affording some priority to these enquiries and by the introduction of a computer system to monitor progress on each such enquiry.

#### ENFORCEMENT STATISTICS (Quarter ending December 2003)

Statistics for the previous quarter are in brackets.

Enforcement Notices	5	(1)
Stop Notices	2	(1)
Planning Contravention Notices	6	(0)
Breach of Condition Notices	0	(0)
Amenity Notices	0	(0)
Number of Complaints	75	(111)
Prosecutions	3	(2)
Injunctions	1	(0)

#### LANDSCAPING STATISTICS (Quarter ending December 2003)

Statistics for the previous quarter are in brackets.

##### Applications for work on Statutorily Protected Trees

(Tree Preservation Orders and Conservation Areas)

Number of applications – Received	137	(170)
-----------------------------------	-----	-------

##### Landscaping

Number of landscaping conditions received from D.C.	66	(81)
Number of weekly actions	333	(669)
Number of schemes submitted	64	(68)
Number of schemes finalised and approved	21	(28)
Number of landscaping conditions currently active (excluding Cambourne work)	872	(958)
Number of breach of condition notices served	3	(0)

#### LOCAL GOVERNMENT (ACCESS TO INFORMATION) ACT 1986

Background papers in respect of this report for the purposes of the above Act are available for inspections in accordance with the provision of that Act:

- a) Any planning application, including plans and any accompanying letter or document from the applicant.
- b) Any letter or representation received in connection with a matter reported.
- c) Any Structure Plan, Local Plan or Policy Document referred to in a report.
- d) Any agenda, report or minutes of a meeting of the Council referred to in a report.
- e) Any other publication, document or report referred to in the report.

Files on individual items on the agenda are available as required from the following individuals:

Mr J Belcham	(01223) 443252
Mr A Moffat	(01223) 443169
Mr K Miles	(01223) 443181
Mr R Morgan	(01223) 443165
Mr D Rush	(01223) 443153
Mr P Sexton	(01223) 443255

D B HUSSELL  
Development Services Director

### **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 **Thursday 6<sup>th</sup> May 2004 at 5pm**. All decisions not called in by this date may be implemented on **Friday 7<sup>th</sup> May 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.

**SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL  
MILTON COUNTRY PARK ADVISORY GROUP**

At a meeting of the Advisory Group  
held on 19<sup>th</sup> January 2004

PRESENT: Councillors; PL Stroude (Chairman), Mrs MP Course (Vice Chairman), DP Roberts (Community Development Portfolio Holder), TJ Flanagan, R Hall and RT Summerfield

In attendance: Mr S Bennett (Friends of MCP) and Mr P Oldham (Milton Parish Council)

**1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

1.1 An apology for absence was received from Councillor Mrs JA Muncey.

**2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

2.1 Mr P Oldham declared an interest in item 5 as a dog owner who uses MCP and Councillor RT Summerfield advised the Group that as he was no longer a Member of the Board of Governors of Edmund House, he would not be declaring an interest in item 9.

**3. MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING**

3.1 The Advisory Group authorised the Chairman to sign, as a correct record, the Minutes of the meeting held on 14<sup>th</sup> July 2003.

**4. MATTERS ARISING**

4.1 Minute 5.1 The Chairman requested that a letter be sent to Roger Day, the representative from Milton Parish Council, thanking him for his valued contribution to meetings of the Advisory Group. SM to action

4.2 Minute 8.5 A one off payment had been discussed with regard to clearing the additional rubbish at the Community Centre. A formal offer was to be made shortly. SM to action

**5. USE OF THE PARK BY DOGS AND THEIR WALKERS**

5.1 The Head of Community Services introduced the report and provided a summary to the Group. The report included the existing by-laws already in existence and made recommendations on how the by-laws could be enforced. The Head of Legal Services had made the following comments:

- The cost of pursuing a prosecution would be disproportionate to any fine given to an offender
- Third party evidence was not a strong enough basis for prosecution
- In order to bar offenders instead of prosecuting them, the Legal Department would still need to be involved in the process.

5.2 The Group discussed the issue at length and made the following observations:

- Rangers were easily identifiable and repeat offenders were known to obey byelaws whilst in their sight and to change the times they walk their dogs in order to avoid future detection

- MCP was for the enjoyment of all visitors and small children may feel intimidated and could be injured by dogs that are out of control when off their leads
- Explore the possibility of requesting that dogs be kept on leads at all times in the Park; however this would significantly detract from the amenity of the Park for those with dogs
- The Dog Warden could be asked to make additional patrols of MCP. It was confirmed that the Dog Warden was Lynette Gilbert.
- Improved clarity of the Notices advising people where dogs can and cannot be let off the lead and highlighting the penalties for non-compliance may help; this could be achieved as part of an ongoing interpretation improvement plan if finances permit
- All breaches of the existing by-laws, including failure to clear up after dogs should form part of the policy to pursue offenders through the courts
- The advice of the Head of Legal Services should be sought on:
  - What powers the Council had to ban people from MCP if their behaviour or the behaviour of their dogs warrants it?
  - Advice and action points as to how best to secure a prosecution (the use of cameras for example)

5.3. The Advisory Group **AGREED** to:

- a) Endorse the maintenance of the existing dog bylaws, and that prosecutions be pursued, where sufficient evidence had been secured against persons breaching a dog bylaw.
- b) Explore the powers of banning people from the park if their behaviour or the behaviour of their dog(s) warranted it.

5.4. In addition, the Ranger and his staff undertook to generate publicity to encourage people to report offenders, and seek the support of the local press to shame people who do not comply with the bylaws. Mr Oldham stated that he would publicise known offenders on the village website.

## 6. **FISHING – THE CURRENT SITUATION AND THE FUTURE**

6.1 The Head of Community Services introduced the report on Fishing at the Park. Since MCP opened to the public in 1993, fishing had been an accepted activity for visitors. Fishing had been taken place via an agreement with Histon and District Angling Society, to whom the fishing rights were let on an annual basis for the sum of £3310.00 for this financial year. The current agreement was due to expire in 2004 and would require renegotiation.

6.2 The Pond and Lake consultants had conducted two surveys of the fishing at MCP and had made the following observations:

- A more active management of the fishing environment was recommended
- More shelter for fish should be provided to protect them from predators, including cormorants
- The rent charged was reasonable for the facilities but did not take into account the quality of the fish
- The current fish stock was aging and in general not replacing themselves. This would lead to a decline in fish and fishing over the next 5 years
- Fishermen were tending to be more individual and not club orientated. The growth of “Carp puddles” where a catch was guaranteed was increasing.

6.3 The Group discussed the report at length:

- The Council was duty bound to speak to the current society first if any change to the fishing policy was to occur, but this did not preclude involving other angling societies if the current society were not interested.
- The Society currently sells approximately 250 season tickets and 250-day tickets for all their angling waters. Of the people who fish the park, 90% of all angling occurs on Todd's pit
- It was noted that the type of fishing differed between Todd's that contains mainly carp, and Dickerson's that contains silver fish and pike with a limited number of carp
- Fishing platforms were used for other purposes such as feeding the ducks and swans and should be retained even if fishing did not continue
- Young children come to MCP to "learn" the art of fishing and were not so concerned about having a vast volume of fish to catch.
- Fishing was part of the cultural heritage of the park
- The Community Support Beat Officer for Milton should be requested to visit the park although this might not be within his remit
- It was acknowledged that if restocking took place, the nature of the fishing experience would slowly change to a more mixed variety of fish.
- That the fishing season should continue to be observed
- The MCP Ranger had received an email from the Histon and District Angling Society summarising their main views:
  - The contents of the Pond and Lake report could be detrimental to the Society if it was available in the public domain
  - If the Society can break even this year (AGM March 2004), it would be willing to pay the rent at the current rate (£3,310 pa) but would want to see an increase in the fish stock in Todd's pit
  - The Society would wish to continue fishing in Dickerson's pit

#### 6.4 Financial Implications

- The Angling Society should contribute to any increase in financial costs incurred through a restocking programme
- If fishing was prohibited, the financial loss to MCP would be £3,310 pa
- If Members agree to a restocking programme then the Council should not bear the whole cost but ask for a contribution from the Society.
- As an example, a 3lb in weight carp would cost approximately £10, there was no pricing available for silver fish or pike

#### 6.5 The Advisory Group **RECOMMENDED** that:

- (a) Todd's Pit should have a limited programme of restocking with small carp, and Dickerson's should be allowed to regenerate naturally with a mixture of silver fish, e.g. roach and rudd.
- (b) Both pits should contain increased shelters for fish as this had Conservation benefits for both fish and other wildlife.
- (c) Discussion should take place with fishermen on the basis on continued fishing at both Todd's and Dickerson's pits
- (d) A new lease agreement to be prepared for the Society, following these discussions to include investment in restocking, a commitment to continue Bailiff management and a reduction in anti-social behaviour. The Terms and Conditions agreed with the Society are subject to decision by the Portfolio Holder and will be reported to the next meeting with the financial implications.



## **7. TREE INSPECTIONS AND WORK AT THE PARK**

7.1 The Head of Community Services introduced the report on Tree inspection to the Group and that the Council was working towards a full policy on Tree management. It was essential that the Council carry out tree inspections on a routine basis in the park to ensure that its duty of care was maintained. The production of an inspection policy and its associated practice notes would allow staff to manage access to the park more effectively in severe weather conditions. A programme of tree inspections had been shown to reduce the amount of negligence that courts have attached to councils in regard to death or injury caused by trees.

7.2 The Group queried:

a) If it was necessary to inspect every tree, every year?

The MCP Ranger commented that a useful methodology for this process had been designed by the National Trust to categorise trees to enable more effective assessment. This would include for example a more stringent assessment of trees near paths and access routes.

b) To what criteria would the Rangers decide to close the Park?

The MCP Ranger advised the Group that an Anemometer had been installed to measure wind speed and several local web sites were being used to check "actual wind speed" against "forecast wind speed". The National Trust and Corporation of London had advised closure of parklands once a speed of 47mph (40 knots) had been reached. In response it was suggested that the Park be closed once gusting wind speeds of 35 mph had been reached and forecasts suggested that the wind might exceed 47 mph were in existence, to safeguard both the public and staff.

7.3 The Advisory Group AGREED (subject to a draft policy being presented to the next meeting of the Group) to:

Endorse the work carried out so far on completing a tree inspection policy and practice guide and the need for professional indemnity insurance cover for the staff plus ongoing training.

## **8. VISITOR CENTRE VOIDS CONVERSION**

8.1 The Advisory Group noted the report on the conversion of void areas

## **9. EXCLUSION OF PRESS AND PUBLIC**

**RESOLVED** that under Section 100(A)(4) of the Local Government Act 1972, the public be excluded from the meeting for the following items on the grounds that they involve the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in paragraph 7 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Act.

## **10. SWALLOWS REFRESHMENT KIOSK DEVELOPMENT**

10.1 The Group made the following observations:

- Availability of refreshments was a boost to park facilities
- Events at MCP last year showed the inadequacy of the current facilities
- The relocation would free up space in the Visitor Centre
- The lease should contain a "buy back" clause
- The building should be a good quality build and similar in style to the Visitor centre

- The quality of food and opening hours should be agreed and adhered to
- A financial contribution would not be required from the Council

10.2 The Group noted the report.

**11. DATE OF NEXT MEETING**

The next meeting will be held on Monday, 19<sup>th</sup> April 2004 at 10am, finishing with a walk in the Park.

The meeting closed at 12.15pm

**SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL  
NORTHSTOWE MEMBERS STEERING GROUP**

At a meeting held at South Cambridgeshire Hall, Cambridge on  
Wednesday 25<sup>th</sup> February 2004 at 2pm

**PRESENT:**

Cllr David Bard	Planning & Economic Development Portfolio Holder (SCDC)
Cllr Rex Collinson	Sustainability & Community Planning Portfolio Holder (SCDC)
Cllr Tom Flanagan	South Cambridgeshire District Council
Cllr Roger Hall	South Cambridgeshire District Council
Cllr Jane Healey	South Cambridgeshire District Council
Cllr Shona Johnstone	Cambridgeshire County Council
Cllr Tony Manning	South Cambridgeshire District Council
Cllr Tony Nicholas	South Cambridgeshire District Council
Cllr Daphne Spink	Leader and Conservation Portfolio Holder (SCDC)
Cllr Peter Stroude	South Cambridgeshire District Council

**APOLOGIES:**

Cllr Nichola Harrison	Cambridge City Council
Cllr John Reynolds	Cambridgeshire County Council
Kathy Baldwin	Cambridgeshire County Council
Brian Human	Cambridge City Council

**1. ELECTION OF CHAIRMAN AND VICE CHAIRMAN**

**1.1** On the nomination of Councillor Tom Flanagan seconded by Councillor Rex Collinson and there being no further nominations, it was

**RESOLVED** that Councillor David Bard be elected Chairman of the Northstowe Member Steering Group for the coming year.

**2. ELECTION OF VICE CHAIRMAN**

**2.1** On the nomination of Councillor Peter Stroude seconded by Councillor Flanagan and there being no further nominations, it was

**RESOLVED** that the position of Chairman of the Development and Conservation Control Committee be elected Vice Chairman of Northstowe Members Steering Group for the coming year. This year it would be Councillor Jane Healey

**3. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

**3.1** Councillor Stroude (local member for Longstanton) declared an interest as a property and landowner within Oakington.

**3.2** Councillor Stroude asked the Chief Executive for clarification if an interest such as this would disqualify an elected member from voting or participating at the Northstowe Member Steering Group. The Chief Executive confirmed that it would not disqualify Members as the Steering Group was not a decision making body, the Chief Executive additionally advised any member who had any concerns to seek legal advice.

#### 4. CONFIRMATION OF REMIT OF THE GROUP

##### 4.1 The Group **AGREED** that the purpose of the group was:

To provide a steer to officers and the Planning and Economic Development Portfolio Holder on Northstowe and to take the place of the Planning Policy Advisory Group (PPAG) on this matter. The role of the Group would evolve as Northstowe proceeds through the Planning and Development processes. Initially, the role of the Group would be to provide a steer on policy development for Northstowe. Plan making should take approximately 3 years. Once planning applications begin to be submitted for the development of Northstowe, the role of the group would begin to change to that of providing a steer on implementation.

##### 4.2 As the Group was not a decision making body, planning policy decisions could only be made by the Planning and Economic Development Portfolio Holder, Cabinet and Council.

##### 4.3 The Group **AGREED** that Cabinet should only make recommendations to Council on key issues.

#### 5. PUBLIC EXCLUSION FROM GROUP MEETINGS

##### 5.1 The Steering Group discussed attendance of members of the public and the press. It was **AGREED** that meetings of the Northstowe Member Steering Group would not be open to the public and press. The Group could retain the authority to exclude members of the public and press from discussion as provided in the Access to Information Rules. It was acknowledged that specific meetings could be held in public if appropriate.

##### 5.2 Councillor Daphne Spink advised that the meetings would not be closed to any member of South Cambridgeshire District Council who wished to attend providing they gave advance notice to the Chairman of the Group.

#### 6. NORTHSTOWE MEMBER STEERING GROUP MEMBERSHIP

##### 6.1 The Cabinet meeting of 31<sup>st</sup> July 2003 had agreed the membership of the Group:

*Leader of the Council  
Chairman of the Development and Conservation Control Committee  
Planning and Economic Development Portfolio Holder  
Sustainability and Community Planning Portfolio Holder  
1 County Council Member and 1 City Council Member*

##### 6.2 The County Council Member asked the Group to consider increasing County representation to two Members. At present, Councillor John Reynolds was invited to attend the meeting as the local member not as the County's Portfolio Holder for Strategic Planning. Councillor Shona Johnstone wished to attend as a local member. It was suggested that the portfolio holder role of the County members was also beneficial to the Steering Group.

##### 6.3 The Chairman **AGREED** to refer the request to increase the County's membership from one to two Members on the Northstowe Members Steering Group to Cabinet for decision. **LKE**

## 7. LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK AND ACTION PLAN AREA TIMETABLES

7.1	AREA ACTION PLAN STAGES	DATE
	Commence survey and analysis	Mar 2003
	Workshop on Development & Design Principles	Sep 2003
	Workshop of Site Options	Nov 2003
	<b>Inaugural Member Reference Group</b>	<b>Feb 2004</b>
	Informal Pre-Submission consultation (Statutory Bodies)	Feb – Mar 2004
	<b>Options development including Member Steering</b>	<b>Mar – Jun 2004</b>
	<b>Preferred site selection including Member Steering</b>	<b>Apr 2004</b>
	Formal Pre-Submission consultation (statutory bodies)	Jun – July 2004
	<b>Member Reference Group (options)</b>	<b>Jul 2004</b>
	Portfolio Holder agrees options	Aug 2004
	Preferred Options public participation	Sep – Oct 2004
	<b>Policy drafting including Member Steering</b>	<b>Sep - Dec 2004</b>
	<b>Member Steering Group (draft Area Action Plan)</b>	<b>Dec 2004 (start)</b>
	Council (draft Area Action Plan)	Dec 2004 (end)
	Submit to Secretary of State	Jan 2005

7.2 The Planning Policy Manager introduced the report, advising Members of the timetable for preparing the new style Local Development Framework for South Cambridgeshire including the Area Action Plan for Northstowe. The report seeks to show key milestones for Northstowe within the overall timetable. Members were asked to note the following table:

7.3 The Group **NOTED** the report

## 8. SCOPE OF AREA ACTION PLAN FOR NORTHSTOWE

8.1 The Planning Policy Manager introduced the report, advising Members of the scope of the Area Action Plan for Northstowe and invited Members to comment on the scoping document. The Area Action Plan for Northstowe would identify the site boundary for the new town, associated off-site infrastructure, establish an overall vision and set out the principles to guide all phases of development.

8.2 The Sustainability and Community Planning Portfolio Holder commented that in “Development Principles”, there did not appear to be any reference to Sustainability issues. The Planning Policy Manager advised that Sustainability issues were specifically referred to in the Vision, but sustainability objectives underpin all sections of the scoping document  
Councillor Daphne Spink asked how 600 dwellings per annum could be achieved especially with regard to recent experiences at Cambourne. The Planning Policy Manager advised that it was an objective at this stage and that a master plan and phasing strategy would contribute to this being an achievable target.

8.3 Councillor Flanagan asked what provisions had been made to safeguard against flooding, as this was an issue for this area. The Planning Policy Manager advised the Group that the Structure Plan flagged this issue up and that it was a matter of strategic importance. The Land Drainage Sub Group and Gallagher’s had a Water Specialist providing technical guidance and advice to them. Once detailed proposals had been received, they would be made available to the Steering Group. There would also be a cross check to any drainage proposals by the Development Control Quality Manager who also sits on the Land Drainage Topic Sub group.

**8.4** Councillor Tony Nicholas asked if the site boundaries and definition was finalised. The Planning Policy Manager advised the Group that a range of site boundary options would be brought to the next meeting for consideration and comment. The final site area was not yet agreed but would have to be decided before the Area Action Plan was submitted to the Secretary of State in January 2005. **KM**

**8.5** Councillor Johnstone asked with regard to the scoping document that any strategy for vehicular movements be designed to integrate walking and cycling. It was noted that it was difficult to resolve the need for access from Longstanton and Oakington to Northstowe and any route being used as a “rat run”.

**8.6** Councillor Stroude commented that it was worth considering re-opening the back road from Longstanton to Oakington that was for access only at present. The Chairman advised the Group that traffic and transport issues were important but discussion should be reserved for later meetings when draft policy was available for comment.

**8.7** Councillor Johnstone asked that the issue of odour problems at Uttons Drove be addressed even if capacity is not a problem and to also consider scope for links with the Over Fen proposed wetland reserve to assist with surface water run off.

**8.8** Councillor Nicholas asked what additional provisions would be included in the Section 106 Agreements for Northstowe to ensure facilities were delivered to agreed timescales. Councillor Spink advised the Group that many changes will be made to Section 106 including:

- Trigger point phraseology to be tightened up
- The Head of Legal Services has advised an increase in the number of checks and stages to go through before each trigger point so potential problems would be identified earlier
- More inspections of site would take place
- Moratoriums will be used to prevent further occupation of housing developments if facilities were not in place at the appropriate trigger points
- The legal wording of the agreements would be tightened up.

**8.9** The Group **NOTED** the report

## **9 WORKING ARRANGEMENTS AND SUMMARY OF WORK TO DATE**

**9.1** The Development Services Director introduced the report, updating Members of the working arrangements and summary of work carried out to date.

### Task Groups

- Town Centre
- Community Services
- Transport
- Biodiversity and Landscape
- Waste and Energy
- Land Drainage

### The Steering Group

- Overall Vision
- Master planning
- Development Principles
- Quantities of development (housing, employment etc)
- Housing mix and density
- Employment mix
- Planning obligations

## 9.2 Stakeholder Involvement

To date, two workshops had been held in advance of formal steps of public involvement to gain a preliminary idea of what local people felt. Copies of the reports that were produced would be distributed before the next meeting. **KM**

The main involvement of the public in the planning of Northstowe would take place in:

- Sep 2004 Pre-Submission options public participation
- Jan – Mar 2005 Submission public consultation
- Apr – May 2005 Consultation on objection sites

9.3 Councillor Tony Manning asked the Planning Policy Manager to confirm if SCDC was planning to have 8,000 or 10,00 houses in Northstowe and what impact this had on the respective Land Use budget for each size development.

9.4 The Planning Policy Manager informed the Group that Land Use budgets had been produced for both sizes of development including factors like how many primary schools each size would require. It had been identified that if 10,000 homes were agreed upon then an extra 70 hectares of land would be required. The decision on the actual size had not been finalised, and could be somewhere in the range between 8,000 and 10,000 homes.

9.5 Councillor Johnstone asked if the decision would take account of the natural boundaries that the B1050 and the railway line formed. The Planning Policy Manager advised that a range of development options would be produced highlighting the relative advantages and disadvantages of each option to be presented to the Group at the next meeting. **KM**

9.6 The Group **NOTED** the report

## 10 DEVELOPER PROPOSALS AND LIKELY SUBMISSIONS

10.1 The Planning Policy Manager drew Members' attention to the report advising of various developer proposals and identified that it was highly likely that competing planning applications would be submitted for a new town at Longstanton/Oakington. Mark Vigor of the County Council asked Members to note the High Court Challenge relating to the promoter of a new town site at Wilburton. The substance of the challenge was that the development of Northstowe would not commence in 2006 as required by RPG6 and the Structure Plan. To date, over 600 witness statements had been received. The outcome of the challenge was likely to be available in July 04. The Structure Plan currently stays in place including Northstowe development to commence in 2006.

10.2 The Group **NOTED** the report

## 11 RELATIONSHIP WITH INFRASTRUCTURE PARTNERSHIP

- 11.1 The Partnership was in the process of evolving from an informal working arrangement amongst the Councils to a formal partnership that involves other providers as well as the development industry and organisations such as English Partnerships, which can play a role in assisting delivery. A Chairman has been appointed (Sir David Trippier) who would now have a role in the appointment of a Chief Executive and staff. Cabinet had agreed the Partnership structure at the Cabinet meeting of the 18<sup>th</sup> December 2003. The Partnership's remit was to play a co-ordinating role to help ensure service and utility providers were project planning for future developments such as Northstowe.
- 11.2 Councillor Roger Hall enquired if there was an update on Chesterton sidings and the associated railway station. The Planning Policy Manager advised that Chesterton formed a key part of the Cambridgeshire Local Transport Plan and the delivery of a railway station formed an integral part of any redevelopment of the sewage works and the sidings. The County Council had asked an external contractor to examine what road access would be required if there was to be a station at Chesterton.
- 11.3 Councillor Spink advised the Group that Anglian Water had made no comment after the last Partnership meeting. A meeting between SCDC and Anglian Water had been arranged to see how serious they were about relocating the sewage works. This site had been under review for the last nine months. External consultants had advised that the cost of moving was greater than that of redevelopment, Anglian Water had approached the Infrastructure Partnership to pay for a relocation feasibility study. This would be discussed at the next Partnership meeting.
- 11.4 The Development Services Director advised the Group that Anglian Water had indicated they would only move if it were commercially viable. They had also commented that they could not guarantee an odour free sewage process even in a new plant. The current location was ideally located, as the natural water flow does not require additional energy to pump it through the processing plant. Anglian Water had also looked at a smaller footprint plant but it would only free up 50 % of the land and the remaining 50% would not be suitable for development.

## 12 ANY OTHER BUSINESS

- 12.1 The Development Services Director commented that South Cambridgeshire District Council was committed to produce a high quality new town, but this could only be achieved with the right levels of staffing. A new team was required and the recruitment process was starting in April/May 2004. A meeting had been arranged with Go-East to discuss the requirement for new staff in planning and to apply for funding from the Growth Area Fund.
- 12.2 The Planning Policy Manager asked if the Group would be happy for the papers and minutes of the Steering Group meetings to be made available to the Local Strategic Partnership (LSP).

KM

The Group **AGREED** to make the papers available to the LSP providing they were stamped as **DRAFT** documents.



**13 DATE OF THE NEXT MEETING**

**13.1** The Group asked for meeting dates to be scheduled at 4-5 week intervals and to be planned for the rest of the year in order to assist Members with diary scheduling. The Democratic Services Officer will circulate a proposed list of dates for comment.

**LKE**

**13.2 Proposed Schedule for comment/agreement**

Wednesday 31<sup>st</sup> March at 10 am in the Council Chamber, South Cambridgeshire Hall

Friday 23<sup>rd</sup> April at 10 am in the Council Chamber, South Cambridgeshire Hall

Monday 24<sup>th</sup> May at 2 pm at Cambourne Offices

Monday 5<sup>th</sup> July at 10 am at Cambourne Offices

Monday 6<sup>th</sup> September at 10 am at Cambourne Offices

Monday 8<sup>th</sup> November at 10 am at Cambourne Offices

Monday 6<sup>th</sup> December at 10 am at Cambourne Offices

---

The meeting closed at 3.45pm

---

**SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL  
NORTHSTOWE MEMBERS STEERING GROUP**

At a meeting held at South Cambridgeshire Hall, Cambridge on  
Wednesday 31<sup>st</sup> March 2004 at 10 am

<b>PRESENT:</b>	Cllr Jenny Bailey	Cambridge City Council (For Cllr Nichola Harrison)
	Cllr David Bard	Planning & Economic Development Portfolio Holder
	Cllr Rex Collinson	Sustainability & Community Planning Portfolio Holder
	Cllr Tom Flanagan	South Cambridgeshire District Council
	Cllr Roger Hall	South Cambridgeshire District Council
	Cllr Jane Healey	South Cambridgeshire District Council
	Cllr Shona Johnstone	Cambridgeshire County Council (For Cllr John Reynolds)
	Cllr Tony Manning	South Cambridgeshire District Council
	Cllr Alex Riley	Chairman of Longstanton Parish Council
	Cllr Deborah Roberts	Community Development Portfolio Holder
	Cllr Daphne Spink	Leader and Conservation Portfolio Holder
	Cllr Peter Stroude	South Cambridgeshire District Council
	Alan Joyner	Gallagher Estates

**BY INVITATION:**

(Attended meeting only whilst making presentation and answering questions)

Andy Lawson	Gallagher Estates
David Hunt	Gallagher Estates
Ian Hay	Defence Estates
Nick Freer	David Lock Associates
Steve Biart	The Fairfield Partnership
Richard Lewis	Vincent and Goring
Joe Ellis	Boreham Consulting
Roger Griffiths	Roger Griffiths Associates
Phil Brogan	Camargue

<b>APOLOGIES:</b>	Cllr Nichola Harrison	Cambridge City Council
	Cllr Tony Nicholas	South Cambridgeshire District Council
	Cllr John Reynolds	Cambridgeshire County Council

**1. MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING**

1.1 Those present authorised the Chairman to sign, as a correct record, the Minutes of the meeting held on 25<sup>th</sup> February 2004 subject to the following amendments:

**Minute 10.1.** Should read "...to date over 600 witness statements..." and "The outcome of the challenge was likely to be available in July 2004"

**LKE**

**2. MATTERS ARISING**

**2.1 Minute 3 – Declarations of Interest**

The Planning Policy Manager had confirmed with the Head of Legal Services that as the Steering Group was not a decision-making body, declarations of interest did not need to be made but he advised that in the interest of transparency, it would be advisable to declare interests for the minutes.

**2.2 Minute 5 - Public access to Steering Group Minutes and Reports**

Councillor Shona Johnstone queried the status of minutes & reports from the Steering Group and if they would be made available to the public? The Planning Policy Manager advised the Steering Group that if it wished reports & minutes to be made public, they could be made available after the meeting. Minutes would only be made available to the public once approved by the Steering Group.

**LKE**

### **2.3 Minute 6 - Steering Group Attendance**

Councillor RF Collinson queried if Councillor Alex Riley was a standing member of the Steering Group. Councillor Mrs DSK Spink confirmed that Cabinet had agreed Councillor Riley was entitled to attend and apologised for the oversight in not including Councillor Riley in the distribution list. The Democratic Services Officer would ensure there was no repeat of this.

LKE

### **2.4 Minute 13.2 – Proposed Meeting Schedule**

The Group agreed the proposed schedule of dates.

## **3. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

- 3.1 Councillor Stroude (local member for Longstanton) declared an interest as a property and landowner within Oakington.

## **4. INTRODUCTION TO THE NORTHSTOWE DEVELOPER PRESENTATIONS**

- 4.1 The Planning Policy Manager advised members of the two Developers who were to make presentations and explained to Members that they are not deciding at this meeting (31<sup>st</sup> March 2004) which area they favour for the Northstowe development but simply receiving presentations on two of the options available. A scoring sheet for each presentation had been provided and was available within report one, appendix one.

- 4.2 It would be important at subsequent meetings for Members to form a preference for which site or sites should be selected for when South Cambridgeshire District Council carries out public participation of Preferred Options.

- 4.3 Policy P9/3 New Settlement, the text should read "This is the policy which specifically relates to the new settlement and has a set of 7 requirements".

- 4.4 Councillor Riley enquired if there would be a chance to discuss the officer reports tabled at this meeting as Longstanton Parish Council had a written response to submit. The Chairman suggested that this could be done at the next Steering Group meeting.

## **5. GALLAGHER ESTATES AND FAIRFIELD PRESENTATIONS**

- 5.1 Both developers gave presentations to the Member Steering Group. During the course of the meeting, it had been agreed that the minutes once authorised, would be made available to the public. Due to the potentially confidential nature of material contained within the presentations and resulting from the subsequent question and answer session, this had not yet been added to the minutes.

Note: Members agreement to consult with the developers on the content of minutes that contain potentially confidential material will be sought at the meeting on the 23<sup>rd</sup> April 2004.

## **6. NORTHSTOWE SITE DEFINITION WORKSHOP – 15<sup>th</sup> November 2003**

- 6.1 Members **NOTED** the report and thanked the Planning Policy Manager for providing copies to the Steering Group

## 7. ANY OTHER BUSINESS

7.1 Councillor Dr Bard commented that the presentations whilst informative had not added that much detail and that he felt more detailed plans and maps were required by the Steering Group before a decision on the site selection could be made in a fully informed way.

7.2 Councillor Spink commented that for the Cambourne Development the developers had been far more able to produce detailed material for consideration at a similar stage in the planning process.

7.3 Councillor Shona Johnstone asked about the tight timescales and when did SCDC need to define the site exactly in order to develop the Local Development Framework (LDF) and grant planning permissions.

7.4 The Planning Policy Manager was still waiting for the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Bill to be agreed by Parliament that was due to be enacted in June/July 2004. A programme of work had been prepared to work towards this that he would circulate to all members. In order that the Local Development Framework could be adopted by 2006, a draft plan is required to be submitted to the Secretary of State by January 2005. **KM**

7.5 As the first formal stage in the LDF process, letters would be sent to the statutory consultees as soon as possible seeking issues that those consultees think the Council should take into account in preparing its Preferred Options for public participation. This would be with a view to bringing site options back to the May meeting of the Steering Group.

7.6 The Planning Policy Manager advised the Group that he could bring an initial report on a recommendation for site options (a site evaluation) to the April meeting but that this would exclude statutory bodies consultation comments. **KM**

7.7 Councillor Bard commented that it would be useful to see more detail on each of the Developers' proposals at the May meeting of the Steering Group.

7.8 Councillor Riley commented that it might be a good idea for the Developers to prepare a joint proposal once the site area had been decided.

7.9 The Group **AGREED** to receive a preliminary report on options at the April meeting **KM**

## 8 DATE OF NEXT MEETING

8.1 23<sup>rd</sup> of April 2004 at 10 am in the Council Chamber

Monday 24<sup>th</sup> May at 2 pm at Cambourne Offices

Monday 5<sup>th</sup> July at 10 am at Cambourne Offices

Monday 6<sup>th</sup> September at 10 am at Cambourne Offices

Monday 8<sup>th</sup> November at 10 am at Cambourne Offices

Monday 6<sup>th</sup> December at 10 am at Cambourne Offices

---

The meeting closed at 1.25 pm

---

## CABINET

At a meeting of Cabinet held on  
22<sup>nd</sup> April 2004

PRESENT: Mrs DSK Spink	Leader and Conservation Portfolio Holder
RT Summerfield	Deputy Leader and Finance and Staffing Portfolio Holder
Councillors: Dr DR Bard	Planning and Economic Development Portfolio Holder
CC Barker	Environmental Health Portfolio Holder
JD Batchelor	Information and Customer Services 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 MP Course, Dr SA Harangozo and Dr JA Heap were also in attendance, by invitation.

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors SGM Kindersley, Mrs JE Lockwood and DL Porter, and from the Development Services Director.

---

### Procedural Items

---

#### 1. MINUTES

The Leader was authorised to sign the minutes of the meetings held on 25<sup>th</sup> March and 1<sup>st</sup> April 2004 as a correct record, subject to the following amendments:

Cambridgeshire Guided Busway Order (25 March, Minute 7), under Heavy/Light Rail Alternatives

“Councillor JD Batchelor...the rail industry had confirmed that it was uninterested...”

Travellers (25 March, Minute 9b)

“Cabinet agreed...(a) to undertake a quantitative needs assessment...”

Declarations of Interest (1 April, Minute 2)

“...although she did not produce cooked food for the market.”

#### 2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

None.

---

### Recommendation to Council

---

#### 3. SOUTH CAMBS COMMUNITY STRATEGY

Council had approved the draft Community Strategy on 12<sup>th</sup> December 2003 and the finalised Strategy was to be reviewed and publicly launched in autumn 2004 to tie in with the county's new Local Public Service Agreement with the government. The

Sustainability and Community Planning Portfolio Holder commended the Community Strategy to Cabinet and cautioned that there could be a need for additional staff to ensure that all aspects were delivered and monitored.

The following points were raised:

- Further priority action areas for lifelong learning had been added and two priority action areas had been added in relation to travellers: the travellers' needs survey and enforcement action to tackle unauthorised and illegal development;
- It was hoped that the provision of broadband would reach 90% of settlements by the end of 2004, two years ahead of the target date in the Strategy;
- There was a danger of small community-specific voluntary organisations being overshadowed by larger groups at the new Voluntary Sector Forum;
- The Strategy incorporated a youth element throughout by identifying children and young people as priority groups, although there were some queries as to whether this was sufficiently emphasised; and
- All partners would monitor progress throughout the lifetime of the Strategy.

Reservations were expressed about the staffing and resource implications, and it would be necessary to prioritise those aspects for which the District Council was primarily responsible. It was emphasised that the Strategy was the responsibility of all partners, with different partners taking the lead on different actions. Central government was the main partner on new settlements.

Cabinet commended the Head of Community Services for his considerable work on the Community Strategy, especially after Cambridgeshire County Council withdrew policy officer support.

Cabinet **RECOMMEND TO COUNCIL** that the South Cambs Community Strategy be approved.

---

### Decisions made by Cabinet

---

#### **4. MELBOURN - DUAL USE CAPITAL GRANT FOR COMMUNITY SPORTS LIMITED**

Cabinet received a presentation from Mr Ron Berry, Warden of Melbourn Village College, and Ms Jo Green of Melbourn Community Sports Limited, outlining their community sports provision project and the 'not for profit limited company' established to bring the project into operation.

Councillors Mrs MP Course and Dr JA Heap, local members for villages within the catchment area, voiced their strong support and a letter of support from Councillor Mrs JE Lockwood was read.

The Community Development Portfolio Holder complimented the project as a great asset to the village and surrounding area and explained that two sizes of fitness suite had been considered; the requested grant of £275,000 would allow the larger one to be provided. She commended the grant to Cabinet and confirmed that the facility would be open fully to the community, including casual users who did not belong to a sports organisation. Members acknowledged the continuing success of the Dual Use Programme and noted that facilities for arts were provided.

Cabinet

**AGREED** to award a grant of £275,000 to Melbourn Community Sports Limited towards their Dual Use Sports Capital Project at Melbourn Village College on the condition that a detailed Service Level Agreement guaranteeing community access be agreed and signed by all parties.

## 5. STRATEGIC RISK MANAGEMENT

Cabinet, at its meeting of 22<sup>nd</sup> January 2004, had approved a Risk Management Strategy, following which a Risk Management Group had been established to ensure that risk management was properly co-ordinated across the Council and to keep Management Team and Cabinet informed of any significant risks and any associated developments or issues. A list of identified strategic risks had been produced and prioritised, and associated Management Action Plans prepared. Risk Management had been applied to major projects and it was now necessary to ensure it featured in all operational aspects of Council work. The Chief Executive confirmed that it could be necessary to amend existing or add new annual priorities if situations arose which presented significant risks to the Council.

It was agreed that the final column of the Risk Scenarios should be labelled 'possible consequences'.

Cabinet **AGREED**:

- (a) to approve the Risk Scenarios as provided in Appendix A of the report;
- (b) to approve the Prioritisation Matrix in provided at Appendix B of the report;
- (c) to approve the Management Action Plans as provided in Appendix C of the report; and
- (d) to instruct the Risk Management Group:
  - (i) at their April 2004 meeting, to cascade the process down the departmental, operational risk management levels to embed it throughout the Council; and
  - (ii) at their June 2004 meeting, to review the Management Action Plans for the four strategic risks 'above the line' in the Prioritisation Matrix and to prepare Management Action Plans for the other strategic risks.

## 6. COMBERTON - COMMUNITY FACILITY GRANT

The Comberton Village Institute Trustees had applied for a Community Facilities Grant of £75,000 towards the cost of a new village hall and the Leader circulated a letter from the local Steering Group for a New Village Hall, urging Cabinet to approve the maximum grant. The Community Development Portfolio Holder clarified that she had not withdrawn her support for the project, as stated in the letter, but had been unable to support it initially due to the implications of awarding 44% of the Village Facilities budget to one village at the start of the financial year. She agreed that a new village hall was a needed facility in Comberton, but advised members of forthcoming applications for similar grants.

Officers had invited several local groups to submit grant applications by February 2004 to take advantage of that year's remaining budget, but this had been awarded to another applicant and the Comberton application deferred to the current financial year. Officers were able to indicate to applicants if they met the criteria for grants up to a specific level, but applicants were advised that the final decision rested with Cabinet; officers did not promise that grants were forthcoming.

Councillor Dr SA Harangozo, local member, spoke in support of the project and highlighted the deficiencies of the current building, a 57-year old structure which did not meet current food hygiene, safety or disabled access requirements. An independent advisor had determined that the costs of refurbishment were equivalent to those of constructing a new building. Village consultation indicated that a new village hall would benefit all residents, including young people. Local fund-raising efforts had already resulted in £117,900 towards the project and lottery funding was sought.

Members discussed the matter at length:

- Local fundraising in Comberton had been successful and a new village hall would be a sustainable project and provide accommodation for smaller groups for whom the Village College was too large;
- Lottery funding usually depended on support from the local authority;
- Maintaining the current level of Council Tax resulted in more limited budgets and resources did not meet the demands on the Village Facilities budget;
- The current maximum grant could be reviewed to avoid similar situations in the future; however, grants had to be of a level high enough to be effective; and
- Applying a deadline to grants for capital schemes could force some projects to be rushed or held back.

Members agreed that the application must be considered under the existing rules, but that the criteria, application procedure and upper limits of grants needed further consideration in light of limited budgets and increased demands. The Community Development Portfolio Holder agreed to discuss the Village Facilities Grants budget with officers and circulate the outcome to Members for comment.

Cabinet

- AGREED**
- (a) to approve a maximum grant of £75,000 to the Comberton Village Institute Trustees towards building a replacement village hall, contingent upon successful receipt of lottery funding; and
  - (b) that the grant money be returned to the 2004/05 budget and the Comberton Village Institute Trustees be invited to re-apply in the next financial year if, after six months or a date on which the Lottery Community Fund indicates its funding decision will be made, whichever is the sooner, no further progress has been made.

---

**Information Item**

---

**7. COMPREHENSIVE PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT - BENEFITS SERVICE**

The Benefit Fraud Inspectorate had inspected the Council's Benefits service and the Inspector's final report was presented to Cabinet. The Resources and Staffing Portfolio Holder explained that officers had had to answer 857 questions as part of the inspection. The results of the inspection, that the Council delivered a Fair service with a Fair to Good chance of improvement, would contribute to the overall



Comprehensive Performance Assessment (CPA) score. The report highlighted areas for further development and was accompanied by action plans. Cabinet would receive the full implementation plans in August 2004 and a follow up inspection would be held in 2005.

Members expressed disappointment with the score, which was lower than expected following the successful internal review.

Cabinet **NOTED** the content of the Benefit Fraud Inspectorate report and the actions officers planned to take to bring the service to Standard.

---

**Standing Items**

---

**8. MATTERS REFERRED BY SCRUTINY AND OVERVIEW COMMITTEE**

The 13<sup>th</sup> May Scrutiny and Overview Committee meeting had been cancelled.

**9. RE-LOCATION OF OFFICES TO CAMBOURNE**

This would be the last Cabinet meeting in Cambridge.

The Information and Customer Services Portfolio Holder confirmed that BT was working on the telephone system and that most internal phone numbers would retain their existing extension with a new prefix.

---

**The meeting ended at 11.45**

---