



**COUNCILLORS' BULLETIN  
8 DECEMBER 2004**

**CONTENTS**



**South  
Cambridgeshire  
District Council**

**INFORMATION ITEMS**

1. Committee Meetings
2. Lunchtime Seminars December 2004 – February 2005
3. Contacting ITNET Staff – **Reminder**
4. Debating Competition for Young People 2004-05
5. Help a Young Person in Care Have a Happy Christmas
6. CASCADE Presentation – 16 December 2004
7. Training Courses:
  - (a) Speed Reading
  - (b) Planning Policy
8. Freedom of Information (Fol) Act Requests Made Directly to Councillors
9. January and February 2005 Travel Expense Claims
10. Call-in Arrangements

**DECISION MADE BY THE COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT PORTFOLIO HOLDER**

1. Community Facility Grant – **Histon and Impington** Parish Council

**DECISION MADE BY THE INFORMATION AND CUSTOMER SERVICES PORTFOLIO HOLDER**

1. A confidential decision was made and has been e-mailed to Members separately

**DECISIONS MADE BY THE PLANNING AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT PORTFOLIO HOLDER**

1. Addenbrooke's Proposed Access Road: Route Options Consultation
2. Cambridge City Local Plan Redeposit Draft 2004 – Representations

**DECISIONS MADE BY OFFICERS AND REPORTED FOR INFORMATION**

1. Community Development Officer: **Coton** Parish Plan Steering Committee

**MINUTES AND AGENDAS**

1. South Cambridgeshire Environment & Transport Area Joint Committee – Agenda for Monday 13 December 2004

**COMMITTEE MEETINGS FROM:  
13 December 2004 to 17 December 2004**

<b>Monday 13 Dec 2004</b>	10 am	Milton Country Park Advisory Group	Milton Country Park
		Chairman's Delegation	Mezzanine
	2.30 pm	Area Joint Committee	Council Chamber
<b>Tuesday 14 Dec 2004</b>	10 am	Land Drainage Advisory Group	Swansley Room*
	2 pm	Housing Portfolio Holder	Mezzanine
<b>Wednesday 15 Dec 2004</b>	9.30 am	Home Improvement Agency Group	Council Chamber
	2.30 pm	Environment & Transport Joint Strategic Forum	Council Chamber
<b>Thursday 16 Dec 2004</b>	10 am	Resources and Staffing Portfolio Holder	Finance Director's Office
	12 pm	Contact Centre Presentation	Council Chamber
	2 pm	Scrutiny and Overview Committee	Council Chamber
<b>Friday 17 Dec 2004</b>	2 pm	Cambridge East Member Reference Group	Swansley Room*

\*Swansley Room – named for Swansley Wood Farm, now the site of Lower Cambourne, thus the Lower (Ground Floor) Meeting Room  
 Monkfield Room – named for Monkfield Farm, now the site of Great and Upper Cambourne, thus the Upper (First Floor) Meeting Room

**LUNCHTIME SEMINARS DECEMBER 2004 – FEBRUARY 2005**

To reserve your seat for any of the following seminars, and to ensure that enough food is ordered, please e-mail [reception@scambs.gov.uk](mailto:reception@scambs.gov.uk).

**December**

**Haven't We Done Well?**

12pm, Wednesday 22 December, Council Chamber

A light-hearted overview of what we have all achieved this year. From moving to Cambourne and a full council election, to winning a national waste and recycling award, it's been a busy and productive year, but sometimes we're so preoccupied we miss out on the best bits! The presentation will finish with an alternative award ceremony!

*Speaker: John Ballantyne, Chief Executive*

**January**

**Conservation and Community Projects – Money Is Out There**

12pm, Tuesday 18 January, Council Chamber

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

*Speakers: Murray Fishlock, Donarbon and Jon Winslow, WREN*

**How Sustainable Are You? And What Does It Really Mean?**

12pm, Friday 28 January, Council Chamber

Everything we do - from shopping and eating to holiday's - impacts on the environment. Are you curious about how the money you spend affects our world? This interactive seminar will help you look at sustainable choices, which affect your life and positively impact on the world.

*Speakers: Mark Smith and Claire Bright, Permaculture Association Members*

**February**

**Licensed To Eat, Drink, Be Merry and Get A Taxi Home**

12pm, Thursday 10 February, Swansley Meeting Room (Ground Floor),

From skin piercing to dangerous wild animals, Environmental Health grants the licenses. From 7 February new legislation affects alcohol and public entertainment – find out how this could affect events in South Cambs villages.

*Speaker: Myles Bebbington, Licensing Officer*

### **modern.gov – Makes Life Easy**

12pm, Tuesday 22 February, Council Chamber

Half an hour designed to make your life simpler! This useful resource, available from our website and intranet is a one-stop-shop to minutes, agendas, councillor details, parish councils, meeting dates and a whole lot more. If you missed out on the training sessions at the end of last year, or would like a refresher, this will be time well spent.

*Speaker: Holly Adams, Democratic Services Officer*

### **CONTACTING ITNET STAFF**

Would all councillors who have an IT issue that needs resolving please ensure that they log a service request with the IT helpdesk? Any councillor who brings in equipment to be repaired or who wants to discuss IT issues will not be seen unless a call has been logged in advance.

ITNET require that this process be followed to track work and to ensure that it is completed fairly in order of urgency. Please phone 0800 783 7237 to log a call with the helpdesk; please do not phone ITNET support staff directly or ask other staff to connect you to them: ITNET support staff cannot help you unless you have logged a call with the helpdesk.

### **DEBATING COMPETITION FOR YOUNG PEOPLE 2004-05**

Many of you will remember the success of last year's Debating Competition for Young People. Schools and youth groups from around the district put forward teams of young people to debate a wide range of issues. In a closely fought final, Sawston Village College won the competition, receiving £500 for the school and £50 for each team member.

The first rounds for this year's competition are now underway and have seen young people debating the introduction of a tax on fatty foods. The debates held so far this year have been of an extremely high standard.

The first rounds this year are again being judged by Council Officers. We would like to ask Members to be involved in the competition by volunteering as judges for the semi-finals and finals of the competition. These will be held on Tuesday 8th February 2005 and Tuesday 1st March 2005 respectively. Both rounds will be held in the Council Chamber at South Cambs Hall. The topic for the semi-finals will be "*I propose that the number of women in parliament should be increased through positive discrimination*". The motion for the final will be "*I propose that voting in elections should be compulsory*". All Councillors will of course be welcome at these matches to view the debate.

To volunteer as a judge, or for more information on the Debating Competition, please contact Geoff Hinkins, Community Projects Officer, on 01954 713354 or [geoff.hinkins@scambs.gov.uk](mailto:geoff.hinkins@scambs.gov.uk), or Susannah Harris, Community Development Officer, on 01954 713355 or [susannah.harris@scambs.gov.uk](mailto:susannah.harris@scambs.gov.uk).

### **HELP A YOUNG PERSON IN CARE HAVE A HAPPY CHRISTMAS**

You have probably noticed the Christmas tree in reception, kindly provided by the Chairman. We hope that Members will help the Council to provide some gifts underneath it, which Cambridgeshire County Council Children's Services will donate to children and young people in care.

The young people in children's homes in Cambridgeshire range from babies right through to 19-year-olds so a range of gifts for all ages will be appreciated.

To help you to decide what gift to buy, gift tag with are available stating either "Boy" or "Girl" and an age range to help you choose a suitable gift. It is up to you how much you spend on the present.

Gifts will be presented to Cambridgeshire County Council on Wednesday 15 December.

For a gift tag or more information about the gift scheme please contact Janet Pentney (01954) 713261 or e-mail [janet.pentney@scambs.gov.uk](mailto:janet.pentney@scambs.gov.uk).

## **CASCADE PRESENTATION – 16 DECEMBER 2004**

Steve Rayment, Assistant Director of Finance and Resources (ICT) invites members to a presentation in the Council Chamber on Thursday 16 December 2004 at 12 o'clock noon. The topic is "CASCADE – Background and overview of the **C**ustomer **A**ccess to **S**outh **C**ambs **D**evelopment project and its relationship with the Contact Centre: an opportunity to refresh your understanding of what, why, where and when". Please contact Democratic Services **by Tuesday 14 December 2004** if you are planning to attend the Scrutiny and Overview Committee meeting at 2 pm and require lunch.

## **TRAINING COURSES**

### **Speed Reading**

There are still a few places left on the speed reading course being held on Thursday 3rd February 2005 from 9 a.m. till 12.30 p.m.

If you would like to improve your reading speeds and learn techniques for handling large amount of written information, this could be just the course for you. The course will be led by Ian Johnson from EERA and was well received the last time it was run.

If you would like to attend, please contact Susan May ([susan.may@scambs.gov.uk](mailto:susan.may@scambs.gov.uk)) before 24 December 2004.

### **Planning Policy Training for Members – why is it important?**

Why should you come to the briefing on planning policy on 13th January at 2.00 p.m.?

Planning policies guide development proposals in all our villages and the countryside. They are the starting point for determining the thousands of planning applications received each year.

Planning policy is one of the few issues reserved for full Council alone to make decisions. Planning policy can have significant implications for the district as a whole as well as in specific localities. Yet plan-making is a lengthy process compared to many of the Council's activities and as a consequence meetings are infrequent, decisions are cumulative and there is a need for Members to have an eye to the 'big picture' when they are making decisions on plans.

Plan-making can also be particularly challenging as Members will often be asked to take a district-wide perspective and to make decisions about accommodating future residents of the District who do not yet have a voice to be heard.

This briefing session should go some way to help Members prepare for this important role and in particular the series of meetings between January and June 2005 on the policies and proposals for South Cambridgeshire's first Local Development Framework.

The present planning challenge facing South Cambridgeshire is enormous – we have been asked to accommodate one of the highest levels of growth in the eastern region over the next 15 years, now prescribed by the Government's Regional Planning Guidance and the County Structure Plan, as well as to protect and enhance the character and environment of the district.

This growth will inevitably impact on all our villages whether they are near to the development areas or not. The Council has the opportunity to steer the way in which it happens through the policies we create in our new Local Development Framework.

In addition to these challenges, there has been a sea change in the legislation on the plan-making system and this training offers Members the opportunity to get to grips with its complexities.

**Be prepared for this most important series of decisions affecting the District for years to come!**

**Please let anyone in Democratic Services (democratic.services@scambs.gov.uk) know if you are able to come along at 2 o'clock on Thursday, 13th January 2005 for this briefing.**  
You do not need to respond if you have already put your name down.

### **FREEDOM OF INFORMATION (FOI) ACT REQUESTS MADE DIRECTLY TO COUNCILLORS**

From 1<sup>st</sup> January 2005, the general public can request information which is held by the Council. Any request which we received must be logged on our FOI request tracker so that it is passed to the appropriate Departmental FOI Champion to take action. Logging requests also enables the Council to monitor performance regarding the 20 working days' timescale. If Members receive a request please pass it on to Janet Pentney (01954 713261) or Pat Wilkinson (01954 713023), or email it to FOI@scambs.gov.uk.

### **JANUARY AND FEBRUARY 2005 TRAVEL EXPENSE CLAIMS**

The Council is currently implementing a new payroll system. Before it can "go live", it has to be thoroughly tested. Part of this testing is to run the new system in parallel with the old system; this will be done during the months of January and February. The only impact this will have on you (sorry, you won't be paid twice!) is that the close date for receipt of information to the payroll section will be earlier than usual for these two months in order to accommodate for the extra volume of work during this time. Therefore, would you please make sure all claims for travel expenses are received by Democratic Services by **Friday 7th January 2005** to ensure processing for January's payroll and **Thursday 10th February 2005** to ensure processing for February's payroll. Claims received after these dates will be processed the following month.

Expense claim forms are available in the Members' Lounge or can be downloaded from the Members' Info section of the SCDC Intranet: click on the Members' Info button from the top of the Intranet home page and the links to expense claims are found at the bottom of the next screen. Right-click on the relevant link and choose "Save Target As", save the file to your computer and enter the necessary information.

### **CALL IN ARRANGEMENTS**

The Chairman of the Scrutiny and Overview 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 15 December 2004 at 5 pm**. All decisions not called in by this date may be implemented on **Thursday 16 December 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 and Overview Committee Procedure Rules', paragraph 12.

### **DECISION MADE BY THE COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT PORTFOLIO HOLDER**

<b>Subject</b>	<b>Decision</b>	<b>Reasons</b>
Community Facility Grant – <b>Histon and Impington</b> Parish Council	Not to offer a grant to construct a parish office at the rear of the new sports pavilion.	Community Facility grants are aimed at funding community buildings not individual parish offices. A grant of £90,000 has been offered towards the construction of the new sports pavilion.

**DECISIONS MADE BY THE PLANNING AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT PORTFOLIO HOLDER**

<b>Subject</b>	<b>Decision</b>	<b>Reasons</b>
<p>Addenbrooke's Proposed Access Road: Route Options Consultation</p>	<p>To submit the comments as set out below and in Appendix 1 to the County Council on the three route options for the proposed Addenbrooke's access road.</p> <p>There is no indication how the increased traffic on Babraham Road, Shelford Road and Hauxton Road (in particular) will be addressed.</p> <p>Problems of increased congestion on Hauxton Road could affect access to the P&amp;R site and the City. Hauxton Road already has a number of junctions along it which impede the flow of traffic; consideration should be given to the potential to link the new access road direct from the M11 interchange and run it as a parallel distributor road parallel with Hauxton Road until the proposed Glebe Farm development.</p> <p>Shelford Road has implications for additional traffic impact on villages to the south.</p> <p>Overall Preference would be for Route A:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• As it doesn't require an additional crossing of the railway line, the impact and mitigation measures can be shared with the proposed crossing for the Guided Bus route.</li> <li>• It doesn't cross as much open countryside and has the least impact on the countryside</li> <li>• It better serves the new development as it is more central to it and could enable a more permeable access road with several access points rather than channelling more traffic into one access point.</li> </ul>	<p>As set out in Appendix A below.</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A very high standard of design and landscaping will be required, particularly for any bridge structure, whichever route is chosen given the sensitivity and importance of this area to the Green Belt setting and approach to Cambridge.</li> </ul>	
--	--	--

### Appendix A – SCDC Response on the Proposed Alternative Routes

<b>IMPACT</b>	<b>Route A Blue</b>	<b>Route B Yellow</b>	<b>Route C Red</b>
<b>Environment</b>	<p>Agree that there would be an impact, but if the Guided bus progresses the potential increase of impact is limited and has the least impact of the 3 alternatives.</p> <p>Although it is suggested in the paper that the road would be visible to more properties, this a matter which should be addressed through design and mitigation measures. Once the development takes place, existing residential properties will be screened by the new development.</p>	<p>With 2 separate crossings of the railway there must inevitably be a greater impact on the landscape setting.</p>	<p>It is very much questioned whether this has the “Least impact on the landscape” as suggested; with 2 crossings of the railway there must inevitably be a greater impact on the landscape setting.</p> <p>Whilst this route may have less impact on the landscape within the City, if the proposed crossing is considered in conjunction with the guided bus this would not be the case. The impact to the wider landscape particularly from Babraham Road and the overall wider Green Belt setting of the approach to Cambridge would be very significant.</p>
<b>Biodiversity</b>	<p>This would not have the largest impact if the guided bus progresses, as these impacts would then happen in any event and therefore there would be no additional impact, apart from the fact that any culvert where the routes cross Hobson’s Brook would need to be of double length which could be less helpful to biodiversity. In terms of the impact of light pollution on wildlife, this option is likely to have the least impact as the route would be shared with the Guided Bus rather than creating</p>	<p>This would result in a second crossing of Hobson’s Brook and therefore the impact would be increased. See comments on light pollution under Option A.</p>	<p>This would result in a second crossing of Hobson’s Brook and also potentially affect the feeder brook from Nine Wells (not shown). Therefore the impact would be significant and not necessarily least. See comments on light pollution under Option A.</p>

	another route. Also this option has the greatest extent of the route within the proposed development, where there would need to be lighting anyway, and thus minimise light pollution in the open countryside.		
<b>Water</b>			The Consultation Paper does not appear to take into account the proximity to Nine Wells and the feeder brook to Hobson's Brook
<b>Air Quality / Noise</b>	There is insufficient information to form a clear judgement between the options in terms of air quality. Consideration will need to be given to the implications of the route and road design of potential congestion and impact on receptors on Hauxton Road and Shelford Road. These impacts will largely dependent upon the design and layout of the road relative to the built development and the speed of traffic. A slower route through the development may have less impact than a faster route away from the development.		
<b>Heritage</b>	There appears to be very little difference between the alternatives on heritage sites.		
<b>Safety</b>	Surely this is dependent upon the design of the road / number of access points etc. Modern engineering can design safer roads (if they get away from the idea that it has to be a 50mph distributor road!) – they shouldn't be considering putting in a straight route that would encourage higher speeds (routes A and B). Route C – further from the development could have more speeding / safety implications than a route through the development.		
<b>Cost</b>	It is difficult to make a clear comparison as the base cost for Route A is not given, so therefore the additional costs of Routes B and C as a proportion of the total cost is not available.		
<b>Accessibility</b>	The Consultation Paper states there will be severance, but again this is an issue for the design / speed of the road – a 30mph road through the heart of the development will improve permeability and be more accessible to more people. It may be better to have the route running through the middle of the development rather than isolating a small portion of it. Route A may therefore be better than B or C.		

<b>Subject</b>	<b>Decision</b>	<b>Reasons</b>
Cambridge City Local Plan Redeposit Draft 2004 – Representations	Make representations to the Cambridge City Local Plan Redeposit Draft 2004 (as set out below).	To seek changes to the Local Plan to ensure it provides an appropriate planning policy framework for planning decisions in the City that affect South Cambridgeshire, particularly in relation to the major urban extensions to the City which adjoin or cross into South Cambridgeshire.

### City Local Plan Redeposit Draft 2004 – Comments by South Cambridgeshire District Council

Fig 1

The schematic diagram is a helpful means of presenting the main spatial components of the strategy, including the urban extensions and how they relate to land outside the City Council's area



and within South Cambridgeshire's area. However, the notations outside the City Council's area should be shown in a different notation to make clear that they are indicative only and not under the City Council's control.

#### Fig 1

The approach at Cambridge Southern Fringe is not consistent with the approach being developed through joint working on this area in 2 respects:

- (a) The Preferred Option in South Cambridgeshire's Preferred Options report proposes that development takes place to the west of the P&R site with an access road and landscaping only to the south. The area south of the P&R should not be shown as an area of major change.
- (b) It does not show the Monsanto area west of Trumpington and in the City as being for development as shown in Figure 9/5.

#### Fig 1

At Cambridge East, the area of major change is shown to extend east of Airport Way to the south of Teversham. This was explicitly rejected in the Panel Report into the Structure Plan and the adopted Structure Plan gives no support to this approach. It is also inconsistent with the Preferred Options report for the Cambridge East AAP that was prepared jointly between South Cambs and the City Council. Airport Way is clearly shown in red on the diagram. The pink area should go up to Airport Way only.

#### Policy 3/13

Whilst some of the Council's concerns made at the 1<sup>st</sup> Deposit stage have been addressed, the point relating to the impact of tall buildings cumulatively with other tall buildings, either clustered together or spread across the city remains. Tall buildings can become valued landmarks and may have a role to play, particularly in major developments, however their impact needs to be carefully assessed, including how they relate to other focal buildings on the skyline when viewed from both within the City and outside to ensure that they complement and enhance those views and do not detract from them. It is suggested that criteria (g) should be deleted and the introductory paragraph of the policy be adapted to read:

"...will only be permitted where they make a positive contribution to key vistas, the skyline and views within, over and from outside the City and if it can be demonstrated that they, both on their own and cumulatively with other tall buildings, will not detract from".

The supporting text could explain this point further.

#### *100 word summary:*

*Whilst some of the Council's concerns made at the 1<sup>st</sup> Deposit stage have been addressed, the point relating to the impact of tall buildings cumulatively with other tall buildings remains. It is suggested that criteria (g) should be deleted and the introductory paragraph of the policy be adapted to read:*

*"...will only be permitted where they make a positive contribution to key vistas, the skyline and views within, over and from outside the City and if it can be demonstrated that they, both on their own and cumulatively with other tall buildings, will not detract from:".*

#### Chp 4: Objectives

A new objective is suggested. The existing objectives focus on the existing character of Cambridge. However, considerable peripheral development is proposed on the edge of the City and the appearance and setting of Cambridge will inevitably change. The challenge is to ensure that the appearance and setting are not harmed and to seek to enhance them through that development. The new objective could be cross referenced to the Areas of Major Change chapter.

#### Para 4.5

In response to the Council's objection to 1<sup>st</sup> deposit plan, it was said that the policy does not need to define "inappropriate development" in the Green Belt because that is done in PPG2. However, the last sentence in paragraph 4.5, which refers to national planning policy guidance, ties back to

the previous sentence relating specifically to proposals that “increase public access, improve amenity and enhance biodiversity”. However, national planning policy guidance should apply to any proposals affecting the Green Belt. The words “such applications” should be deleted and replaced by “any applications in the Green Belt”.

#### Para 5.10

The 2<sup>nd</sup> sentence should be amended to refer to “journey time” rather than “drive time” to reflect the objective of enabling people to use public transport and reflect the objective to provide key worker housing near to where people work. It should also be made clear that this is not intended to imply that affordable housing provision could be made outside of the City Council’s area. A new sentence should be added that it should be located close to public transport nodes. “Key worker housing should be located within a as close to their place of employment as possible and in no instance greater than 30 minutes drive journey time of their place of employment away from it. It should be located close to public transport nodes.”

#### *100 word summary*

*The 2<sup>nd</sup> sentence should be amended to refer to “journey time” to reflect the objective of enabling people to use public transport and reflect the objective to provide key worker housing near to where people work. A new sentence should be added that it should be located close to public transport nodes. “Key worker housing should be located within a as close to their place of employment as possible and in no instance greater than 30 minutes drive journey time of their place of employment away from it. It should be located close to public transport nodes.”*

#### Policy 5/15

The policy should be amended as follows to make clear the scope of uses appropriate at Addenbrooke’s: “associated biomedical and biotechnology activities research, higher education, or research institutes whose work requires access to clinical facilities.”

#### Para 6.6

Last sentence refers to “City wide or regional facilities where appropriate”. The Structure Plan framework is for Cambridge to be a sub-regional centre and the wording should be changed accordingly. It could deal with any proposal for regional uses as an exception to that framework. Suggest rewording as “City wide or sub regional facilities where appropriate. Any proposals for regional facilities would need to demonstrate an exceptional need to be located in Cambridge.”

#### Table 7.2

Footnote 4 to the Future Employment Land Supply referring to Cambridge East, states that some of the 10ha quoted in the City Local Plan could be located in South Cambridgeshire. For completeness, and compatibility with the joint Preferred Options Report for Cambridge East, it would help to say that 20-25 ha or 4-5,000 jobs are proposed in the Preferred Options for the area as a whole, of which 10ha comes from the Structure Plan guidelines for the City. This 10ha could be located in the City or South Cambs determined through masterplanning and the detailed planning application stage.

#### Policy 7/2(a)

The policy allows for regional facilities to be provided as an exception “where there is a proven need”. This should be amplified to make clear that not any regional use will be appropriate in Cambridge, where there are severe constraints on land and where the priority must be to meet the needs of the Cambridge Sub Region. It should clarify the type of uses that might justify as an exception. It should be revised to say that there must be a proven need “for a regional function government agencies and public bodies to be located in Cambridge”.

#### Para 7.14

Should be revised for consistency with representation to Policy 7/2(a) which seeks a refinement of the exception for regional facilities to limit such uses to regional government agencies and public bodies that need to be located in Cambridge”.

#### Para 8.7

The statement that in areas of particularly high traffic congestion, the City Council may require zero increase or reduction in traffic generation through any proposed development is not clear. Is it aimed as all development or just commercial? If it is to apply to residential development, is it aimed at major developments such as Cambridge East where it could effectively be promoting car free developments? It is not appropriate to make policy in the supporting text.

#### Policy 8/12

The policy about aviation development at Cambridge Airport pending its relocation should make clear that any proposals should not prejudice that future relocation. It is suggested that the following is added to the policy: "...or where it would prejudice the future relocation of the activities and the redevelopment of the site for a new urban quarter."

#### Para 8.27

It is not considered that the City Council should advocate in its Local Plan the relocation of an operating airport to another district beyond its jurisdiction. It is requested that the words "and an operating airport" in the 2<sup>nd</sup> sentence be deleted. Similarly, the word "therefore" at the beginning of the 3<sup>rd</sup> sentence should be deleted.

#### Para 8.56

The last sentence which refers to the need for careful design of waste management sites to co-exist with neighbouring uses should be made a separate paragraph to make it clear that it relates to major waste management sites as well as HWRCs. It should also be strengthened to set out some of the key issues that will need to be taken into account in this process eg traffic, dust, noise, odours, etc.

#### Chp 9: Objectives

A new objective is suggested. "The major developments should be of high quality, exemplars of sustainable development and enhance the City and its setting."

#### Para 9.7

The second sentence lists guidance that might be produced for the major developments as: "Masterplans, Supplementary Planning Documents and Local Development Documents". However, SPDs are a form of LDD and if the term LDD was intended to also cover Development Plan Documents, these are policy documents rather than guidance so should be listed separately. Suggest deleting LDDs from the paragraph.

#### Policy 9/2

The policy focuses on phasing of areas of major change in terms of transport infrastructure. However, it should also be about phased provision of services and other infrastructure, managing the development process to minimise the duration of development in any one area so that the impact on existing and new residents is limited, and also to ensure that the development rate is sufficient for developers to recoup on their investments. Wider infrastructure is mentioned in paragraph 9.12 only.

#### Para 9.12

The paragraph refers to sites where land is to be safeguarded for development after 2016 at Addenbrooke's and Huntingdon Road/Madingley Road. However, it does not mention Cambridge Airport in this context and we know that a significant part of the site will not come forward until post 2016 however early the relocation of the Airport were to take place. This should be added for completeness.

#### Phasing Table

All East – Chesterton Sidings should not be included as a destination with a "requirement" for high quality public transport pending more detailed studies into potential routes and environmental

implications, especially for Fen Ditton. There is no commitment from South Cambridgeshire District Council at this stage.

#### Phasing Table

Monsanto – the table requires an access road to Hauxton Road. This is consistent with the Preferred Option CSF4 in South Cambs Preferred Options consultation for its Area Action Plan, but not with the alternative Option CSF5 for a smaller site. The District Council has not yet decided which option to pursue.

#### Phasing Table

Northern Fringe – For consistency with joint working on this site and the County Council's current consultation paper, this should read: "A14 widening. New access road from Junction improvements at the Milton A14 junction. Cambridgeshire Guided Bus and interchange facilities. Access road to Chesterton Sidings from Milton Road. Additional new access road to the remainder of the development from Milton Road. Improved cycle....."

#### Policy 9/3:

(g) this should make clear that the major developments should have higher densities in general, "and particularly" around key transport nodes.

#### Policy 9/3:

(n) this should also require development to be energy efficient though layout, orientation and insulation as well as just incorporating renewable energy technologies.

#### Policy 9/3:

(o) it is not appropriate to make waste policy in this Plan. The waste authority is the County Council. The policy wording should either be amended to make clear that this criteria is "in accordance with the Waste Local Plan", or it should be removed from the policy and put in the supporting text. In either case, it would help clarify the position if the supporting text explained the respective roles of the City and Waste Local Plans and explained that waste issues would be addressed through the masterplan process or a review of the Waste Local Plan.

#### Policy 9/3

A new clause should be added to Policy 9/3 requiring all major developments to be sensitively integrated with existing communities.

#### Policy 9/4

The Proposals Map shows a small area of land at North Works within the City as site 9.19. However, the site should be extended north to include the whole of the area of land that "steps" out into South Cambridgeshire to the east of the Thorpe Way Estate, for consistency with the Cambridge East Area Action Plan Preferred Options Report prepared jointly with South Cambridgeshire District Council.

#### Policy 9/4

(a) The joint Preferred Options report for Cambridge East Area Action Plan prepared by the two Councils assumes total housing provision in this development of up to approximately 12,000 dwellings. The Local Plan identifies 65ha and 4,660 dwellings in the City and suggests a further 5,000 dwellings in South Cambridgeshire, giving a total of 9,660 dwellings. This inconsistency should be addressed with the District Council.

#### Policy 9/4

(b) Delete "all or in part of" in front of 10ha of employment land. The joint Preferred Options Report for Cambridge East says that 20-25 ha or 4-5,000 jobs are proposed in the Preferred Options for the area as a whole. Of this, 10ha therefore comes from the Structure Plan guidelines for the City. The footnote can then make clear that the City contribution could be located in either the City or South Cambs depending on masterplanning. The policy could also include a conversion to jobs for consistency with the Preferred Options report.

#### Policy 9/4

(c) and (h): clause (c) requires a strategic green space which will be Green Belt. For the area within the City it is assumed this refers to the green corridor running through the development from Coldham's Common to the open countryside. However, separate clause (h) specifically requires this green corridor, but does not state that it will be Green Belt. These appear to refer to the same thing and the policy should be clarified accordingly. This could be achieved by adding at the end of (c) "...which would create" and move (h) to follow on, but deleting the word "remove" at the beginning of the clause.

#### Policy 9/4

(e) the land requirements for schools seem to refer to the total educational requirements for the development of Cambridge East as a whole ie. including land in South Cambridgeshire. The supporting text should make clear what is being planned for in this policy. It seems appropriate that it just includes those elements required to serve the amount of development in the City but with a footnote explaining that they could be located in either the City or South Cambs depending on masterplanning. It currently seems to be a mixture of planning for the City part and for the whole.

#### Policy 9/4

(g) it is not appropriate to make waste policy in this Plan. The waste authority is the County Council. The policy wording should either be amended to make clear that this criteria is "in accordance with the Waste Local Plan", or it should be removed from the policy and put in the supporting text. In either case, it would help clarify the position if the supporting text explained the respective roles of the City and Waste Local Plans and explained that waste issues would be addressed through the masterplan process or a review of the Waste Local Plan. The size of site area for major and household waste facilities is not part of the Waste Local Plan and should be in the light type for indicative purposes only.

#### *100 word summary*

*(g) it is not appropriate to make waste policy in this Plan. The waste authority is the County Council. The policy should either be amended to make clear that this criteria is "in accordance with the Waste Local Plan", or put in the supporting text. In either case, the supporting text should explain that waste issues will be addressed through the masterplan process or a review of the Waste Local Plan. The size of site area for major and household waste facilities is not part of the Waste Local Plan and should be in the light type for indicative purposes only.*

#### Policy 9/4

(i) access to the countryside should be to the north as well as the east. This would enable links through to the River Cam and long distance footpaths to be achieved and help facilitate links to Wicken Fen, having regard to the long term proposals of the National Trust to extend this facility towards Cambridge.

#### Policy 9/4

Footnote 1 should make clear what is being planned for in this policy. It seems appropriate that it just includes those elements required to serve the amount of development in the City and the footnote can consistently make clear that they could be located in either the City or South Cambs depending on masterplanning. It currently seems to be a mixture of planning for the City part and for the whole.

#### Para 9.16

The joint Preferred Options report for Cambridge East Area Action Plan prepared by the two Councils assumes total housing provision in this development of up to approximately 12,000 dwellings. The Local Plan identifies 65ha and 4,660 dwellings in the City and suggests a further 5,000 dwellings in South Cambridgeshire, giving a total of 9,660 dwellings. This inconsistency should be addressed with the District Council.

9.16

Last sentence talks of "developing the regional role of the City". The Structure Plan framework is for Cambridge to be a sub-regional centre and the wording should be changed accordingly. It could deal with any proposal for regional uses as an exception to that framework. Suggest adding: Any proposals for regional facilities would need to demonstrate an exceptional need to be located in Cambridge."

Figure 9.4

Whilst recognising that this is illustrative only, in the Cambridge East diagram, the green corridor doesn't give very much protection to the northern end of Teversham. Adequate separation of this major development from adjacent village communities in South Cambridgeshire is a key requirement for this authority and issues such as this will be for the Area Action Plan to take forward.

Policy 9/5:

(i) it is not appropriate to make waste policy in this Plan. The waste authority is the County Council. The policy wording should either be amended to make clear that this criteria is "in accordance with the Waste Local Plan", or it should be removed from the policy and put in the supporting text. In either case, it would help clarify the position if the supporting text explained the respective roles of the City and Waste Local Plans and explained that waste issues would be addressed through the masterplan process or a review of the Waste Local Plan. The size of site area for household waste facilities is not part of the Waste Local Plan and should be in the light type for indicative purposes only.

*100 word summary*

*(i) it is not appropriate to make waste policy in this Plan. The waste authority is the County Council. The policy should either be amended to make clear that this criteria is "in accordance with the Waste Local Plan", or put in the supporting text. In either case, the supporting text should explain that waste issues will be addressed through the masterplan process or a review of the Waste Local Plan. The size of site area for household waste facilities is not part of the Waste Local Plan and should be in the light type for indicative purposes only.*

Policy 9/5

(j) The clause should make clear that the strategic green corridor will also be in the Green Belt.

Fig 9.5

Joint working has suggested that development south of Trumpington would be contained within the alignment of the new Addenbrooke's link road. However, significant landscaping is shown inside the road near the A1309 and development outside the new road near the Shelford Road end. This should be rectified. The extent of development and the alignment of the access road at Monsanto in South Cambridgeshire will be determined through the District Council's Area Action Plan.

Policy 9/6

(g) and (h) it is not appropriate to make waste policy in this Plan. The waste authority is the County Council. The policy wording should either be amended to make clear that this criteria is "in accordance with the Waste Local Plan", or it should be removed from the policy and put in the supporting text. In either case, it would help clarify the position if the supporting text explained the respective roles of the City and Waste Local Plans and explained that waste issues would be addressed through the masterplan process or a review of the Waste Local Plan. The size of site area for major waste management and household waste facilities is not part of the Waste Local Plan and should be in the light type for indicative purposes only.

*100 word summary*

*(g) and (h) it is not appropriate to make waste policy in this Plan. The waste authority is the County Council. The policy should either be amended to make clear that this criteria is "in*

*accordance with the Waste Local Plan”, or put in the supporting text. In either case, the supporting text should explain that waste issues will be addressed through the masterplan process or a review of the Waste Local Plan. The size of site area for major waste management and household waste facilities is not part of the Waste Local Plan and should be in the light type for indicative purposes only.*

**Policy 9/7**

(c) site 9.08 runs up to the City boundary. It does not leave a Green Belt corridor through from Huntingdon Road between Cambridge and Girton as shown indicatively on Fig 1. The allocation should be revised to reflect Fig 1 and in particular ensure the Green Belt extends beyond the frontage of Huntingdon Road through the site, although maximising the amount of development close to the City.

**Policy 9/7**

(i) the “strategic gap” between the City and Girton referred to is actually statutory Green Belt and should be referred to as such.

**Figure 9/7**

Site 9.08 runs up to the City boundary. It does not leave a Green Belt corridor through from Huntingdon Road between Cambridge and Girton as shown indicatively on Fig 1. The allocation should be revised to reflect Fig 1 and in particular ensure the Green Belt extends beyond the frontage of Huntingdon Road through the site.

**Figure 9/7**

The Green Belt north of Huntingdon Road should continue up to Histon Road to clarify the objective of maintaining separation from Girton.

**Policy 9/8**

(d) This needs to make clear that the “open space buffer” is also Green Belt and will include land in South Cambridgeshire. Also that it will provide countryside access for the new community.

**Policy 10/2**

The Local Plan should make clear that in carrying out monitoring and review of the first two stages in the sequence in the Structure Plan in the urban area of Cambridge and through a review of the Green Belt needs to take account of development in both the City and South Cambs because the figures for the two Councils are bracketed together.

**DECISIONS MADE BY OFFICERS AND REPORTED FOR INFORMATION**

**Community Development Officer**

<b>Applicant</b>	<b>Decision and Reasons</b>
<b>Coton</b> Parish Plan Steering Committee	Awarded Community Grant CD09 of £1,000 to create a Parish Plan document for the village that will maintain and improve quality of life in the village, through co-operation and consultation with the Parish Council and residents. The Parish Plan will ensure that future projects meet the community's needs and will therefore be sustainable. Outcomes identified by the plan will also attract external funding to the village.

**SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE ENVIRONMENT AND TRANSPORT AREA JOINT COMMITTEE  
AGENDA**

**Time** – 2.30 pm Monday 13 December 2004

**Venue** – Swansley Room, South Cambridgeshire Hall, Cambourne

## Declarations of Interest

1. Minutes
  - 27 September 2004
  - 8 November 2004
2. Petitions Received
  - (a) Speed Control Measures on Twenty Pence Road, **Cottenham**
  - (b) Objection to One-Way System for Station Road, **Histon**
3. A14 Village Traffic Calming Project - Progress Report
4. Jointly Funded Minor Highway Improvement Schemes
5. A1307 From the A11 to Suffolk County Boundary - Route Safety Study
6. Accident Remedial Scheme: Junction of High Green and High Street, **Great Shelford**
7. **Odsey** Traffic Calming Scheme
8. Area Joint Committee - Agenda Plan