

## **SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL**

Minutes of the New Communities Portfolio Holder's Meeting held on  
Tuesday, 14 December 2010 at 11.15 a.m.

Portfolio Holder: David Bard

### **Councillors in attendance:**

Scrutiny and Overview Committee monitors:

Scrutiny and Overview Committee monitors  
and Opposition spokesmen: Bridget Smith

Opposition spokesmen: Lynda Harford

Also in attendance: Nigel Cathcart, Douglas de Lacey, Sue Ellington,  
Mike Mason, David McCraith, Hazel Smith,  
John F Williams and Nick Wright

### **Officers:**

Jonathan Dixon	Principal Planning Policy Officer (Transport)
Jane Green	Head of New Communities
Keith Miles	Planning Policy Manager
Jo Mills	Corporate Manager, Planning and New Communities
Jennifer Nuttycombe	Planning Policy Officer
Andy O'Hanlon	Development Officer
Ian Senior	Democratic Services Officer

## **19. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Councillor Nigel Cathcart declared a personal interest as living close to one of the sites, in Bassingbourn, identified as a site Option in the Gypsy and Traveller Development Plan Document.

Councillor Lynda Harford declared a personal interest as a member of Cottenham Parish Council.

Councillor Bridget Smith declared a personal interest as a trustee of stART.

Councillor Hazel Smith declared a personal interest as a member of Milton Parish Council.

## **20. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING**

The New Communities Portfolio Holder agreed that the Minutes of the New Communities Portfolio Holder's meeting held on 7 October 2010 were a correct record.

## **21. GYPSY AND TRAVELLER DEVELOPMENT PLAN DOCUMENT (GTDPD) - UPDATE**

The New Communities Portfolio Holder considered a report and appendices analysing the results of consultation on the Gypsy and Traveller Development Plan Document Issues and Options 2 - Site Options and Policies. .

The Planning Policy Manager said that officers had expected that, by now, they would have had sufficient time to consider the draft Localism Bill, and would have received the

new guidance proposed by the Government regarding planning for Gypsy and Traveller accommodation. In the event, the Bill had only been published the day before the Portfolio Holder meeting, and the Guidance Note was still awaited. The report therefore focused on identifying which sites were no longer site options as a result of issues raised during the consultation period, and outlined the next steps in the plan making process.

The New Communities Portfolio Holder referred to a letter received on 13<sup>th</sup> December from solicitors acting on behalf of the Northwest Cambridge Consortium of Landowners and Barratt Strategic calling into doubt the legality of the process being followed. He said that that process was fully compliant with the Constitution, and pointed out that he would not actually be finalising the Plan at the current meeting in any event. The Portfolio Holder noted that Site 5 (land between Madingley Road and Huntingdon Road, Cambridge) had different policy considerations applying to that site. On a separate issue, Site 7 (Cambourne) was no longer a Site Option for delivery through the major development proposal for the remaining 950 dwellings, but other sites might yet be identified elsewhere in Cambourne.

Those present made the following points:

- The methodology adopted for conducting needs assessments should be robust enough to avoid double-counting.
- There was support for Site 18 (Spring Lane, Bassingbourne) no longer being a Site Option, but concern that the Site Option near to the A1198 needed further consideration.
- The existing Travellers site at Smithy Fen, Cottenham should not be expanded.
- The assessment of noise issues in relation to the railway station and sidings at Chesterton Fen Road was welcomed.
- Appropriate drainage was essential.

The New Communities Portfolio Holder

- (a) **noted** the representations received during the Issues and Options 2 consultation, set out in Appendix 1
- (b) **agreed** the responses and recommendations in Appendix 2:
  - review the approach to the Gypsy and Traveller Development Plan Document (DPD) in 2011 when the new Needs Assessment has been completed and further information regarding government policy, in particular the Localism Bill and the new guidance regarding planning for Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation, is available.
  - review the Vision and Objectives in light of the approach to the development plan following changes to government policy having regard to relevant issues raised during the consultation.
  - provision at major developments could be either public or private, determined at the time of delivery and taking account of needs at the time. A Site Delivery Strategy will be prepared to explore innovative methods of site delivery, funding and management.
  - review the criteria based policy on major developments following changes to government policy having regard to relevant issues raised during the consultation.

- major developments should be required to provide a specific number of pitches through the GTDPD, with flexibility on how that number is provided left to masterplanning of the development.
  - the delivery of sites should be phased so that key services and facilities at the major development are available before Gypsy and Traveller pitches are occupied.
  - prepare local guidance on design of Gypsy and Traveller sites, including site size, and consult on it at the next opportunity, including consultation with Gypsies and Travellers.
  - the following sites are no longer site options:
    - Site 5: University site - Land between Madingley Road and Huntingdon Road Cambridge)
    - Site 7: Cambourne (in association with a major development proposal)
    - Site 18: Land at Spring Lane, Bassingbourn
    - Site 21: Blackwell (Transit Site)
  - commission further assessment of the potential noise impacts of train stabling and the proposed new railway station at Chesterton Sidings on the Chesterton Fen Road area.
  - sites suggested through the consultation by, or with the support of, landowners, are subject to public consultation at the next stage of the plan making process, identifying whether or not they should be proposed as site options or rejected.
  - if sites are allocated in the Green Belt under exceptional circumstances, they should remain in the Green Belt, including the area west of Chesterton Fen Road if sites are allocated in this area.
  - Policy CNF6 from the Local Plan 2004 should not be included within the Gypsy and Traveller Development Plan Document and will be superseded by it.
  - review the draft policies for windfall development and site design in light of anticipated new government guidance.
  - utilise the monitoring indicators currently included in the Annual Monitoring Report to monitor the performance of the Gypsy and Traveller DPD. Add information regarding unauthorised encampments in the district during the year as a whole rather than purely on the two specific dates of the caravan count.
- (c) **agreed** that a further report being brought to him on the next steps once changes in the national planning policy framework for plan making and for Gypsies and Travellers are known.

## 22. CAMBRIDGE WATER CYCLE STRATEGY

The New Communities Portfolio Holder considered a report about the emerging Phase 2 Water Cycle Strategy, commissioned by Cambridgeshire Horizons, for the major growth

areas in and around Cambridge.

Those present made the following points:

- South Cambridgeshire District Council should lead by example and make sure that its rainwater harvesting facility was fully functional.
- A list should be maintained of tradesmen suitably qualified to maintain specialist and complex water recycling and drainage systems.
- Education was important in achieving new standards in water conservation.
- The Water Cycle Strategy should form an integral part of the District Council's overall approach to drainage and flooding issues.
- Water quality should be a priority.
- Measures were needed to minimise the impact of future development at Northstowe by providing water recycling facilities for the new town.

The New Communities Portfolio Holder

1. **noted** the content of the Draft Phase 2 Detailed Water Cycle Strategy for the Major Growth Areas in and around Cambridge
2. **agreed** that the following issues be addressed further
  - Clarification regarding the timescales of implementing water efficiency standards and the impact on water neutrality and wastewater calculations.
  - Provide more details and examples of water efficiency measures such as grey water and rainwater recycling, and explore practicalities, in particular in small development schemes.
  - Provide more details and examples regarding the relationship between 100% above ground drainage SUDS and housing density.
3. **agreed** that the final study should subsequently be brought back to the portfolio holder for endorsement for use as an evidence base for the Local Development Framework and as a material consideration in planning decisions.

## 23. SERVICE PLANS 2011/12 - NEW COMMUNITIES PORTFOLIO

The New Communities Portfolio Holder considered a report updating him on the revised Planning and New Communities Service Plan for 2011/12.

The Corporate Manager (Planning and New Communities) highlighted the corporate actions relevant to the New Communities Portfolio.

Those present made the following points:

- Action A2 (Community benefit from development) would be influenced by elements of the Localism Bill.
- Actions D1 to D4 relating to business and enterprise could easily be hindered by planning and conservation considerations, and the Council should ensure suitable flexibility.

The New Communities Portfolio Holder **endorsed** the proposed actions.

## 24. COTTENHAM: ARTS CAPITAL GRANT FOR THE VILLAGE COLLEGE

The New Communities Portfolio Holder considered a report relating to a grant application relating to a community-based public art project costing £25,000 as part of a major capital development at Cottenham Village College.

The application originally had formed part of a comprehensive grants report presented to the New Communities Portfolio Holder meeting on 7 October 2010, but had been withdrawn from the agenda at that time to allow additional preparatory work to be carried out. The report had not been published as part of the agenda for the current meeting, but the New Communities Portfolio Holder had agreed to admit it as a late item on the grounds of its urgency, the applicants needing a decision ahead of the next New Communities Portfolio Holder meeting in January 2011.

The Development Officer distributed a table setting out a timeline and the key actions and opportunities for community involvement.

The New Communities Portfolio Holder said that the reduced availability of resources, and a worse-than-expected financial settlement from central Government, made this a difficult application for the Council to meet in full. He engaged in discussion with the Arts Development Manager in an effort to establish whether or not part of the proposal could be waived (or funded in some other way) to enable the Council to make a smaller grant than that applied for.

Those present discussed the application in general. The New Communities Portfolio Holder noted that the workshops envisaged appeared to be intended as an opportunity for providing ongoing and transferrable skills. He suggested that charging for attendance at these might be a helpful step forward. However, the opposing view was that local people simply wanted to attend the workshops as a means for becoming involved in the project under consideration.

With reluctance, the New Communities Portfolio Holder **refused** the grant application in respect of a community-based public art project costing £25,000 as part of a major capital development at Cottenham Village College.

## 25. ANNUAL MONITORING REPORT 2009-10

The New Communities Portfolio Holder considered the Local Development Framework Annual Monitoring Report prior to its submission to the Department for Communities & Local Government (CLG). The Planning Policy Manager said that, although the Council would continue to produce an AMR in future years, the present one was the last that the Government wanted to receive.

The Planning Policy Officer provided a verbal update on the data missing from the draft Annual Monitoring Report (Appendix 1). The Annual Monitoring Report would be amended to include this additional information before being submitted to the Government.

The New Communities Portfolio Holder

- (a) **agreed** the contents of the Annual Monitoring Report for submission to the Department for Communities and Local Government; and

- (b) **delegated** further minor editing changes to the Annual Monitoring Report to the Corporate Manager (Planning and New Communities) where they are technical matters.

**26. SERVICE IMPROVEMENTS & PERFORMANCE INDICATORS 2010/11: SECOND QUARTER**

The New Communities Portfolio Holder **received and noted** a report outlining the progress made by the New Communities and Policy teams for the second quarter.

The Head of New Communities referred those present to the Council's Aims and Actions detailed in the report.

The New Communities Portfolio Holder paid tribute to officers for achieving such high standards of service at a time of such stringent financial conditions.

**27. FORWARD PLAN**

Those present noted the Forward Plan for the New Communities Portfolio included in the agenda.

The Head of New Communities said that the Orchard Park Design Guidance Supplementary Planning Document, due to be presented to the New Communities Portfolio Holder meeting on 25 January 2011 might have to be postponed until the meeting on 8 March 2011.

**28. DATE OF NEXT MEETING**

Those present noted that the next New Communities Portfolio Holder meeting would be on Tuesday 25 January 2011 starting at 11.15am or upon completion of the Planning Portfolio Holder meeting, whichever was the later.

---

**The Meeting ended at 1.10 p.m.**

---