

16 January 2003  
(6.00 pm – 7.10 pm)

## **DEVELOPMENT PLANS STEERING GROUP**

Present: Councillors Harrison (Chair), Dixon, Durrant, Stuart and Ward

Also present: Director of Environment and Planning and the Head of Policy and Projects.

### **1. Minutes**

The minutes of the meeting held on 2 December 2002 were signed as a correct record.

### **2. Apologies**

Apologies were received from Councillor Bradnack, Currie and Howarth.

### **3. Declarations of Interest**

Councillor Durrant declared a personal interest as Co-Chair of Cambridge Futures.

### **4. Public Question Time**

No members of the public wished to address the Steering Group.

### **5. Planning and compulsory Purchase Bill 2002: Implications for the Review of the Local Plan**

The Planning Policy Manager summarised the major phases of plan preparation as detailed in paragraph 3.4. Recent advice received from Government (5 Dec 2002) is to proceed with the Local Plan. This work will form part of the Local Development Frameworks (the new Local Plan). The main changes under the new system would be that the whole plan would be re-deposited for comments, not just the changes, and the inspectors report would be binding and so there would be no consultation on proposed modifications. Thus savings in time and costs would be made.

The plan format is detailed in paragraph 5.3 of the report. The plan currently being prepared is compatible with the current planning act and with the new local development framework format. The implications are detailed in table 5.6. The plan is to continue to produce a local development framework comparable plan and not to publish the 2<sup>nd</sup> deposit until the Act is in force.

General discussion took place regarding the speed the plan would take to progress as well as the fact that the inspector's report will be binding. The Director reminded Members that the loose leaf format will enable updates to more easily produced at a later stage. The Action Area Plans would have the

detail defined in them, eg for the Eastern Expansion Area. Clarification of Business Planning Zones would be sought from the regional office. The LGA is currently lobbying hard to have this zoning clearly defined, who would use it and what powers would Councils have in objecting to such a designation.

The Action Plans would be designated by the Council as part of the Local Plan. A developer could ask for one but if the Council disagreed we would not have to include one unless the objector persuaded the Local Plan Inquiry of the merits of such a proposal. The Area Action approach allows flexibility.

Councillor Dixon asked for clarification that there would be only one deposit. The Planning Policy Manager confirmed that members of the public would be consulted once on the first deposit and then the plan would be amended and the whole plan re-deposited.

Councillor Harrison questioned the life expectancy of the plan and the Planning Policy Manager agreed to check with the regional office.

The Steering Group agreed to the new timetable avoiding the 3<sup>rd</sup> deposit, the end column of the table 5.6.

## **6 Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Waste Local Plan (Revised Deposit): Inspectors Report into Objections**

The Deposit Waste Local Plan (WLP) was published for consultation in August 2000. The City Council made a number of objections which were considered by the Waste Local Plan Public Inquiry Inspector. The inspectors findings on our objections are set out in the report to DPSG in Table 5.1 and are summarised in Conclusion paragraph 6.1.

The four main implications of the Waste Local Plan Inspectors Report for the new Cambridge Local Plan are:

- a) *The need to allocate a 2ha site for a major waste management facility (not Energy from Waste) as part of the masterplanning process for Cambridge Northern Fringe East. Improvement of highway infrastructure would be a major pre-requisite;*
- b) *The need to consider the potential for a major waste management facility as part of any masterplanning process for any expansion to the East of Cambridge;*
- c) *The need to regard the Cambridge area as a whole as an area of search for a major waste management facility under policy WLP17.*
- d) *The need to continue discussions with the County Council regarding the selection of sites for Household Waste Sites (HWRCs) to the north and south of the City, with a view to allocating land in the Local Plan for such purposes.*

The steering Group discussed the conclusions of the report and made the following points:

The County Council and Peterborough City will now modify the WLP and there will be a formal period for objections to be made to the those later this year.

Councillor Harrison suggested that the Head of Environmental Health and Waste Strategy be consulted on the draft local plan.

In discussing the conclusions in 6.1 a), members of the steering group expressed concern about: Chesterton Sidings not being a suitable site for a major waste management facility.

Whether the development of major waste management facilities would jeopardise the development of the Airport site and of the Cambridge Northern Fringe.

DPSG noted that any such development would be subject to all other policies in the Development Plan (the Structure Plan, the WLP and our local plan) any application would be determined by the County Council not by the City Council.

In respect of paragraph 6.1 b), members of the DPSG expressed support for the principle of waste being processed as close to its point of origin as practicable.

In respect of paragraph 6.1c), members of the DPSG commented that: with regard to the location of WLP17 it is unclear whether it refers to a site in South Cambridgeshire or the City. This point needs clarification.

It was noted that the population outside of Cambridge City is larger than within and it may be necessary to have more than one site. Site locations which have been proposed as possible locations for such a facility are Landbeach, Whittlesey and Peterborough.

Councillor Durrant did not agree with the Inspector in regard to paragraph 8.17.9 of the WLP (page 4 of report, 4<sup>th</sup> row). Councillor Durrant wished his objection be noted to the conclusion 6.1 c) of the report.

In respect of paragraph 6.1 d), members of DPSG agreed that discussions should be continued with the County Council regarding the selection of site for HWRCs to the north and south of the City, with a view to allocating land in the Local Plan for such purposes.

Councillor Harrison thanked Debbie Mack for her work and wished her well during her maternity leave.

The meeting finished at 7.10 pm.

**Chair**