

100
41
"In view of the unique service offered by Papworth Hospital, its status in the world of medicine and the possibly deleterious effect its closure might have on the future service offered to patients and on the village of Papworth Everard, his Council urges the East Anglian Regional Health Authority to make every effort to retain Papworth Hospital on its present site."

Notice of Motion

NOTICE of MOTION

from COUNCILLOR R. COLLINSON

to the

HOUSING COMMITTEE OF SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL, meeting on
28th. JULY, 1988.

That this Council, through its Housing Committee should, as a matter of urgency, seek additional ways of alleviating the growing housing crisis in South Cambridgeshire highlighted in the recent Housing Investment Programme Strategy Statement 1989/90.

In particular that it should:

- a) seek to expand as rapidly as possible the number of Build-for-Sale schemes available to local young people on the lines of that currently under construction at Stapleford;
- b) examine ways in which it can increase housing help to the elderly, the disabled and young people both married and single;
- c) urge the government, through the Association of District Councils and all other appropriate channels, to relax the current curbs on Housing spending, particularly those applying to revenues from 'Right to Buy' Council House sales.

SCM

Motion to Council. 22nd September 1988.

Bearing in mind that several Parishes on the A.45 west of Cambridge are deeply concerned with South Cambs D.C's recommendation to the development of a settlement on that road, and bearing in mind that the Secretary of State has indicated his acceptance of that recommendation, it is of major importance that the Council indicate to the public and to the Secretary of State in it's response by 30th September, both the general area for such a settlement and the reasons therefore.

In moving the Motion to direct Officers of the Council to identify an area beyond the Bourn/Knapwell Turn in conjunction with Highway Officers of the County Council in order to provide a bypass for the Village of Caxton in conjunction with the development, it is with the objective of a minimal affect on that Village consistent with the need to provide more homes, especially for young families in our District, (the first time buyers) so that supply is increased to reduce the price for them, and to avoid forcing them to areas where they would not wish to live, for economic reasons, alone.

but are forced to

Any examination of a location in our District closer to Cambridge would manifest on the A.45 west of Cambridge that with the existing proposals to build, and houses already constructed in the Parishes of Caldecote/Hardwick/ Dry Drayton/Bar Hill and with Oakington and Longstanton on the other side of the A.604 would in early course lead to coalescence on a massive scale, and would, if sited nearer to Cambridge than the Bourn/Knapwell Turn would deflect south moving traffic through Bourn Village to join the A14 at Longstowe.

The creation of a bypass at Caxton will cater for traffic from the already approved expansion at Papworth Everard, and bearing in mind that development at Chittering will be more likely to meet the demand of rail commuters from Stansted, this Motion includes a request to the Secretary of State that he concurrently approve development on the general line of the A.45 east of Cambridge so that East Cambs D.C. can share in meeting, or attempting to meet, the demand for housing in the Cambridge area.

I beg to move:-

Donald Allen (Signature)

12 September 1988

(A paper indicating further reasons for the selection of the area indicated is attached.)

Dear Mrs Letley, *taking*

I am sending a copy to Cllr Tulitt today with a covering letter and I am enclosing a personal letter to the Chief Executive which I would be glad if you would kindly pass to him. Unless I give instructions to the contrary I should be glad if you would kindly discuss with Mr Hancock whether this should go as a separate Motion to Council on 22nd Sept or whether it can be circulated as a separate item to be dealt with when the Planning Cttee Item arises.

My envelope to Mr Hancock encloses both the Motion and a copy of my letter to the Chairman of the Planning Cttee who will, I feel sure, acquaint Mr Hussell of my views.

Donald Allen (Signature)

Supplementary Paper on
Motion to Council. 22nd September 1988.

Whilst the Motion itself is more than sufficient for South Cambs D.C. Officers to identify more closely the area of search for the settlement of Housing on the A.45 west of Cambridge, areas both of Shopping and Commerce need separate consideration on the acceptance by the Secretary of State of a concurrent development on the A.45 but east of the City of Cambridge, to provide housing in the Cambridge area.

The vacillation of the County Council, probably due to the party imbalance there and failure to agree on more suitable locations, introduced the suggestion of Swavesey and Chittering based on the appreciation in the Structure Plan Review of August 1986 that, in the opinion of the Officers of the County Council that greater provision was necessary than Members of the County Council agreed on, in the May 1987 submission.

There was in the Chittering proposal the concept that those who would be looking for houses there would reduce the park and ride problem by rail commuting from there to Cambridge for employment. The sudden realisation that, in the national context the Govt were installing at considerable cost a rail link into Stansted, suddenly caused a change of heart, the house purchasers at Chittering would be commuters between Stansted and Chittering and that was not one of the County's objectives. The fact that East Cambs D.C. stepped into the picture and volunteered Stretham/Wilburton is now history but is indicative of expediency rather than thought.

In terms of distance I could see little objection to Wilburton/Stretham because so many young families are being forced by economic reasons to commute from even further afield, moreover other suggestions including "The Fens" whilst having plenty of space both for housing and industry have never been attractive home areas for those who have enjoyed our South Cambridgeshire countryside. Surely it is our duty to try and provide homes for the young in our District, and not force them to areas where they will not settle happily.

The only hope of reducing house prices which have accelerated phenomenally in the last two years is supply, and it should be the duty of the District Council to try at least to make some provision in it's District and not resort to a NIMBY position. For this reason we need once again to look at the national context and ignore the County's view that a convenient area for them was Swavesey because by choosing that location it seemed that the County Planners had overlooked their concurrent Highway duties.

To anyone like myself involved in the 1972 Public Inquiries on the Cambridge Western and Northern bypasses and who asked that Inspector why a feasibility study on the east west link between the A.1 at Alconbury to the M.1 in the area of Northampton should not be considered in the context of the lines of our bypasses I was informed then that it was outside the remit of our Inquiry. The fact that the A.1 on the general line of the A.604 was to link in with the M.6 where it meets the M.1 at Junction 19 on that Motorway to provide a strategic route from Birmingham and the Midlands to the East Coast Ports of Felixstowe and Harwich should have been enough to suggest that a settlement at Swavesey coming onto the A.604 was manifestly a nonsense. Since the line of that route now, not only provides a major route between the Midlands and Felixstowe but the massive developments at Dartford and thus on to the Channel Tunnel, apart from Stansted, will make the A.604/M.11 route probably the busiest in the Country. Any idea that we should provide any settlement closer to Cambridge on the A.45 west, bringing more traffic onto the A.604/M.11 has to be considered as mental derangement on the proposers and to suggest north facing slip roads from the A.1303 on to the M.11 only half a mile from the Northern Bypass Interchange has to be viewed in the same way.

We have to recognise that Commuters will move between a variety of points, many South and those who know the route to the A.1 from the A.14 via Dunton and Edworth from Arrington will realise that the A.14 is now grossly underused since being detrunked from the major route it used to be. The linking of a settlement where indicated to both the A.14 and the A.45 without bringing more traffic onto the M.11 is of major importance. The construction of the Royston bypass adds favour to the concept.

Donald Allen (Signature) →

12 September 1988

To. The Chairman.
Planning Cttee.
South Cambs D.C.

12th Sept 1988.

Re. The Structure Plan.

From. Donald Allen.

Dear Chairman,

I felt that I should alert you to concern being expressed in various quarters as to South Cambs D.C. support for a settlement on the A.45 west of Cambridge. Even both our M.P's believe that we have left our senses behind, largely because we won't identify a more detailed area of search, and I believe also, as evidenced at the Planning Cttee last week that we are weakening our case and may lose that recommendation at Council, unless some action is taken to clarify the situation. There is a fear that instead of us giving a positive indication to the Secretary of State, he will indicate himself where it has to go, largely because of our indecision.

From conversations I have had there is a body of opinion criticising us for not now opposing any development and suggesting that it should go "On the Fens". I believe some County Councillors favour this and in response to their criticism of my response was pretty much to the point—Why instead of mucking about with Swavesey and Chittering only to discover the former was coming out onto the future busiest road in the Country and the latter was only two rail stops from a rail link into Stansted didn't they think this up months ago.? They thought Stretham/Wilburton would be acceptable.

Quite obviously because of the political imbalance at the County they are now acting like hens with their heads cut off, and the latest "The Fens" could mean a place like Chatteris or anywhere else where they think there is cheap land, the most relevant to all appears to be the central theme that there should be no change in the Party strengths wherever it goes. My response to this criticism has been that since we had to deal with numbers which they had wrong anyway, in a District where their stated policy was "Not south of the A.45 for major additions" gave our District little room for manoeuvre.

Following these discoveries I tackled Cllr Hay on the Lobby known to be in opposition to the A.45 settlement and it is obvious that there is a feeling that unless the District comes out with a proposal which eliminates his patch, as with others he will Vote against any A.45 proposal. I have indicated to you in my letter of 10th Aug my own view as to where it should go and for reasons I explained, and, having explained these views to Cllr Hay he would support us at Council provided we make that position clear. You may have witnessed at the Planning Cttee that he made quite a contribution on the lines "We find we've changed our minds and we are opting for the NIMBY position," and as I have pointed out to him that makes us look stupid, to which I have the feeling he thought "So you made a mistake"??

In the circumstances since we have not had the private Meeting I felt we should have to debate a general area, as I indicated, with Cllr Hay's support, we will identify an area to the east of Caxton so that that underused road the A.14 can come back and help in any south commuting problem. Both Cllr Hay and I feel that if we don't do more than suggest the A.45 west we could find Scotland Farm being thrown at us by the Minister all because by Sept 30th we hadn't indicated our preferred location.

The Motion will read as per attached.

yours sincerely

Donald Allen (Signature)

Personal

*Copy to C.E.O.
Please see note at
foot of motion.*

Motion to Council. 22nd September 1988.

Bearing in mind that several Parishes on the A.45 west of Cambridge are deeply concerned with South Cambs D.C.'s recommendation to the development of a settlement on that road, and bearing in mind that the Secretary of State has indicated his acceptance of that recommendation, it is of major importance that the Council indicate to the public and to the Secretary of State in its response by 30th September, both the general area for such a settlement and the reasons therefore.

In moving the Motion to direct Officers of the Council to identify an area beyond the Bourn/Knapwell Turn in conjunction with Highway Officers of the County Council in order to provide a bypass for the Village of Caxton in conjunction with the development, it is with the objective of a minimal affect on that Village consistent with the need to provide more homes, especially for young families in our District (the first time buyers) so that supply is increased to reduce the price for them, and to avoid forcing them to areas where they would not wish to live, for economic reasons, alone.

Any examination of a location in our District closer to Cambridge would manifest on the A.45 west of Cambridge that with the existing proposals to build, and houses already constructed in the Parishes of Caldecote/Hardwick/ Dry Drayton/Bar Hill and with Oakington and Longstanton on the other side of the A.604 would in early course lead to coalescence on a massive scale, and would, if sited nearer to Cambridge than the Bourn/Knapwell Turn would deflect south moving traffic through Bourn Village to join the A14 at Longstowe.

The creation of a bypass at Caxton will cater for traffic from the already approved expansion at Papworth Everard, and bearing in mind that development at Chittering will be more likely to meet the demand of rail commuters from Stansted, this Motion includes a request to the Secretary of State that he concurrently approves development on the general line of the A.45 east of Cambridge so that East Cambs D.C. can share in meeting, or attempting to meet, the demand for housing in the Cambridge area.

I beg to move:-

Donald Allen (Signature)

September 1988

(A paper indicating further reasons for the selection of the area indicated is attached.)

Personal
Dear Mr Hancock,

I hope Mrs Letley will appreciate that in passing a copy of a letter to you it is not to prevent you passing information to her.

However I do feel from the Vote at Planning that we are in peril of our former policy being reversed at Council.

For this reason I am enclosing a copy of a letter to Mr Subitt because I believe it to be important, he and you are made aware well in advance of my thoughts and contemplated action.

Yours sincerely

Donald Allen (Signature)

Draft Motion to Council. 23/2/89

Bearing in mind that Councils^s were advised on reorganisation to have a review of its functions and its corporate plan of objectives and priorities, and bearing in mind that this Council is entering the uncharted waters of the Community Charge, when urgent and important matters may need such attention:-

" I beg to Move that the Chairman of the Council be invited to convene a Working Party to consider the effectiveness of its, The Council's, procedures and having regard ~~to the fact that only 17 Members of the Council have 10 years experience of the working operations of the Council,~~ such Working Party should include former Chairmen of the Council whose experience will be valuable in such discussions."

Donald Allen (Signature)

To, Cllr Mrs D.S.K. Spink.
Chairman, South Cambs D.C.

9th Feb 1989.

From, Donald Allen.

Dear Chairman,

You will recall our discussion prior to the Finance Cttee on the 7th inst on the subject of Cttee decisions, and of my intervention at the end of the Estimate explanations drawing the Cttee's attention to the fact that there were indications that the prudence we exercised in our early years was disappearing as new Members joined primarily it seemed to me to get the District to pick up their Parish responsibilities.

My comment that our actual expenditure in 1982/3 for G.P. was £189,830 that our commitment in 1989/90 estimates was for £634,840 and that obviously did not include the £2 Million figure for the Country Park, nor the pressures we should receive from Village Colleges who had failed to get into the initial "trough", nor the proportionate amounts for those that had.

Your Vice Chairman will know much about the functions of the former Policy Advisory Cttee, what he may not know is the responsibility for its failure was the simple duplication of duties in the Blue Book, and a clever prong by Members of the Planning Cttee wanting a separate Conservation Cttee and the G.P. Cttee who felt that the Policy Advisory body was interfering with matters which the error in the Blue Book made them believe was their function.

I have little doubt that the Chief Executive will confirm these points but I think it is better for him to stay clear, I will provide the proof since I have no thought of personal advancement, yet, in view of the reducing size of the G.P. Cttee compared with the massive increase in Estimate, and because we are moving into a sphere when we know we can only depend on our Domestic Community Charge, we are reliant on others not only for the equivalent of our Grants, but also for the element to be raised by Govt from the Business element, and our future commitments will need very careful and perhaps urgent attention.

For these reasons I determined that Council between now and May should reconsider the Cttee structure with a view to combining the Finance and G.P. Cttees so that better control in major Cttee responsibilities can be made effective. It can hardly be termed a short period of consideration since the last review took place with the formation of a separate Conservation Cttee. I do not propose to comment on the latter but the rapid increase of "listings" and other issues which could force the Council into costly exercises needs a review by the appropriate Cttee responsible for our future financial commitments.

I am sending a copy of this to your V. Chairman, Cllrs Holt and Mrs Cannon in the first instance because whilst I would not wish to leave out Cttee Chairmen (of both sexes) there are problems of procedure which need consideration in the first instance.

yours sincerely.

Donald Allen (Signature)

Standing in the name of C.A.S.

R. Page (Signature)

Arising out of the public protests against the review of the Structure Plan, and after fully considering the presentation of all the applications for new settlements within the Cambridge Sub-region and the consultants' report on the feasibility of an out-of-town shopping centre; this Council is firmly of the view :-

- a) That the projected population/housing increase in the Secretary of State's modifications to the revised Structure Plan is unnecessary and unnecessarily high;
- b) That no new settlement should be contemplated on the A.45 corridor;
- c) That attempts to provide an out-of-town shopping centre within our area should be firmly resisted; and
- d) H.M. Government be urged to encourage growth in the North of the country where the population and infrastructure already exist.