

**ENVIRONMENT
SCRUTINY COMMITTEE**20 September 2002
(10.00 – 1.00pm)

PRESENT: Councillors Dixon (Chair), Bailey, Baker, Blencowe, Bradnack, Durrant, Pinnington, Stuart and Ward.

ALSO PRESENT: Councillor Nichola Harrison, Executive Councillor for Environment. Councillor Liddle for Councillor Hipkin.

FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE COUNCIL

02/ENV/21 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence had been received from Councillor Hipkin.

02/ENV/22 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

The following personal interests were declared (which covered the issues on ENV /24,25 and 26).

Councillor Durrant as Co Chair of Cambridge Futures and supporter of Residents Against Village Extinction (RAVE)

Councillor Stuart as a member of the Council for the Protection of Rural England and RAVE

02/ENV/23 PUBLIC QUESTION TIME

No members of the public wished to address the Scrutiny Committee.

02/ENV/24 CAMBRIDGE CITY (MARSHALL OF CAMBRIDGE) AIRPORT (See also Record of Decision 02/ENV /21)

In introducing the report, the Director of Environment & Planning advised the Committee that the Arup report was helpful in moving the debate further on the issue of relocating the airport. Councillor Bradnack stated that Labour Group were against the recommendations in 2.2 and 2.3 of the report. He stated that the Arup report did not properly acknowledge the difficulties of a relocation. He stated that the current debate was destabilising Marshall's as a business. He also questioned the conclusions of the Eastern Cambridge Study (September 2002), particularly regarding the capacity of future transport infrastructure.

Councillor Stuart stated that the Arup Study did not consider whether relocation of Marshalls would be commercially viable, which was a proper matter for the Council to consider. He stated that from the information he had gathered it would not be viable for the business to relocate, and if that was not the case Marshalls needed to provide information to counter that view. He stated that it was irresponsible to promote the removal of the aerospace industry from the airport site.

The Director of Environment & Planning informed the Committee that the Arup report (which had been commissioned by a range of partners including Marshalls) illustrated that Cambridge Airport was not environmentally sustainable if the long term strategic aim for the growth in air travel (as discussed in the Government's consultation report SERAS) was to be achieved. He reminded members how the current application for limited expansion of the Airport had resulted in considerable local opposition. Councillor Stuart stated that Cherry Hinton residents supported the Airport staying put, with modest growth in the longer term. The Director of Environment & Planning stated that the 'steady-state' was not an option for the medium to long term. He confirmed that the Marshalls workforce was as dispersed as any average Cambridge company with 87% driving to work with an average commute of 53 minutes both ways. The Arup report stated that 683 employees would have to move if the business was relocated.

Councillor Blencowe questioned if there were 'risks and complexities' (paragraph 4.6) associated with a move of the airport and the aerospace industry, why the Council was keen to reaffirm its commitment to relocation.

In responding to the debate, Councillor Harrison advised that it would be wrong to favour the expansion of the airport on-site, before knowing the outcome of the Environmental Impact Assessment being undertaken as part of the current planning application. It was also important to ask the question where had Marshalls got a better chance of surviving. The Arup Study and other on-going work would afford Marshalls the opportunity to look at the long term prospects. Councillor Stuart stated that the new terminal would make the Airport viable. Councillor Bradnack queried why the recommendations could not await the decision by South Cambridgeshire DC on the application for a new terminal.

Councillor Durrant maintained the city needed economic diversity, which Marshalls provided and there were real risks regarding the strategy being proposed. He stated that the recommendation should refer to the closure of Cambridge Airport, which was what the decision really was about.

Councillor Pinnington asked about the assumptions concerning Alconbury in the SERAS report and the required transport infrastructure. The Director of Environment & Planning stated that the City Council's response to the Government's consultation paper would be considered at Environment Scrutiny Committee on 5 November. However, the proposals to upgrade the A14 and provide a busway within the next ten years were points in favour of siting at Alconbury and it would be logical to extend any guided bus to that site.

The Committee agreed with the recommendations for the Executive Councillor as stated in the report as follows:

Recommendation 2.1 (by 10 votes to 0)

Recommendations 2.2 and 2.3 (by 6 votes to 4)

The Executive Councillor agreed to the recommendations.

02/ENV/25 CAMBRIDGE GREEN BELT STUDY – LANDSCAPE DESIGN ASSOCIATES FOR SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL *(See also Record of Decision 02/ENV/22)*

The Chair ruled that under 100B(4)(b) of the Local Government Act 1972 the late agenda item of the Director of Environment & Planning on South Cambridgeshire DC's report on the Green Belt despatched and placed on deposit on 19 September be considered despite not being made publicly available three clear days prior to the meeting. The reason why the Director's report had not been available beforehand was because the SCDC report only became publicly available on 17 September (after the agenda despatch). The Chair's view was that despite only being available at very short notice, the Director's report should be considered by the Committee to clarify the position of the City Council in respect of the main findings of the Cambridge Green Belt Study.

The discussion on this report was taken as part of the debate on the next item.

The Committee agreed with the recommendations for the Executive Councillor as stated in the report as follows:

Recommendation 2.1 a (by 10 votes to 0)
Recommendation 2.1 b (by 6 votes to 4)
Recommendation 2.1 c (by 6 votes to 0)
Recommendation 2.1 d (by 9 votes to 0)
Recommendation 2.1 e (by 7 votes to 3)
Recommendation 2.1 f (by 6 votes to 3)
Recommendation 2.1 g (by 9 votes to 0)
Recommendation 2.1 h (by 10 votes to 0)

Recommendation 2.2 i (by 9 votes to 0)
Recommendation 2.2 j (by 6 votes to 4)
Recommendation 2.2 k (by 10 votes to 0)

The Executive Councillor agreed to the recommendations.

02/ENV/26 CAMBRIDGESHIRE & PETERBOROUGH DEPOSIT DRAFT STRUCTURE PLAN: EXAMINATION IN PUBLIC *(See also Record of Decision 02/ENV/23)*

The Planning Policy Manager in introducing the report advised members that a meeting had taken place with the Waterbeach consortia which had provided some further information regarding rail links and discussions with the Strategic Rail Authority. The Scrutiny Committee agreed that the Director of Environment & Planning should invite both the Longstanton/Oakington and Waterbeach consortia to present their proposals after final submissions to the EIP (3 October). It was also agreed that a special meeting of Environment Scrutiny Committee would be called if the Council was in a position to recommend a preference between the proposed new settlements. In discussing the South Cambridgeshire DC Green Belt Study, the

Committee was advised that the officers did not believe the views and recommendations included in the City Council report on the Structure Plan Examination in Public should be amended.

Councillor Stuart argued for the preservation of the Green Belt and not undermine the scale and setting of the city. He did not agree with the conclusions of the Eastern Cambridge Study (the report by consultants Llewelyn Davies) and stated that major transport improvements would be required before any large scale developments were proposed in the east and this issue had not been adequately addressed. He stated that urban expansion would not increase the availability of affordable housing in Cambridge and would starve outlying areas of critical mass as employers continued to choose city locations.

Councillor Bradnack proposed an amendment (see below) to the recommendations which removed all references to the eastward expansion proposals. He was also concerned about the transport implications of such expansion. Both he and Councillor Durrant asked for the wording in 3D.8 (page 21) to reflect the adopted Council Motion on affordable housing (later established by officers to have been 25 April 2002). The Executive Councillor agreed to the change. *This was amended by the officers on 23 September to read "...within Cambridge the range will be between 30-50%, and that on sites released from the Green Belt this proportion should be at or towards the top end of this range..."*

Councillor Durrant supported peripheral development but not to the scale proposed and questioned the thinking behind excluding from future development the land north of Barton Road on environmental grounds. He maintained that future growth should be focused on the west rather than the east. The Planning Policy Manager advised Committee that matters concerning environmental issues and the inner Green Belt would be the subject of a report to Committee on 5 November, although some of the work had already been used, as for north of Barton Road, to inform the case for the EIP.

In response to points made, the Director of Environment & Planning stated that the Eastern Cambridge Study had produced enough of a strategic transport perspective to 2031 to make the report viable for the current debate. Members were advised that there was a large degree of consensus on where growth should take place over the next ten years between the City, South Cambridgeshire and County Councils and between City and County about the broad direction of a long term strategy. By adopting the City Council approach to growth and development, there would be no need for further change to the Green Belt for 20-25 years, whereas in other scenarios the debates would be revisited within the next 10 years.

In response to a question from Councillor Stuart, the Executive Councillor stated that the eastward expansion would not be viable unless supported by public transport and referred to page 3 (1B.1) of the Council's response to the EIP.

The Chair put Councillor Bradnack's amendment as recorded below to the vote:

'Remove:

Pg 2 para 1A4 after first sentence

Pgs 7-8 all 2.3, 2.4, 2.5 and 2.6

Pgs 11-12 3A3 from 'However...', 3A4, 3A5, 3A6

Pgs 16-17 3B11, 3B13

Pgs 28-29 4B2

Pgs 31-32 Amend 5A2 to limit the objections to the first one, remove the second, and 5A3, 5A4, 5A5

Pg 34 para 5B2 remove last two sentences

Pg 48 do not accept County Council approach or conclusions in 5Di) 1

Amendments may also have to be made to tables to reflect these amendments'

The amendment was lost by 6 votes to 3.

The Committee agreed with the recommendations for the Executive Councillor as stated in the report as follows:

Recommendation 2.1 (by 6 votes to 4)

Recommendation 2.2 (by 6 votes to 4)

Recommendation 2.3 (by 6 votes to 4)

Recommendation 2.4 *amended to include reference to consulting Chair and spokes*
(by 9 votes to 0)

Recommendation 2.5 (by 6 votes to 1)

The Executive Councillor agreed to the recommendations.

02/ENV/27 **NOMINATIONS TO THE COUNTY BUS STRATEGY REFERENCE GROUP** *(See also Record of Decision 02/ENV /24)*

Councillor Baker nominated Councillor Pinnington, Councillors Bradnack and Stuart were also nominated.

Resolved

That Councillors Bradnack, Pinnington and Stuart along with the Council's relevant officer make up the City Council contingent on the County Bus Strategy Reference Group.

The meeting ended at 1.00pm

CHAIR