

<b>Southern Fringe Member Reference Group</b>	7 March 2006 5.30pm –7.05pm
---	--------------------------------

**Councillors Present:**

County Councillors Kent (Chair); Kenney  
City Councillors Adigun-Harris, Durrant and Slatter; Councillor Bailey, Executive Councillor for Planning & Transport (ex officio)  
South Cambridgeshire District Councillors Bard, Kember, Nightingale and Orme

**Also Present:**

City Council Officers: Brian Human (Head of Policy & Projects)  
County Council Officers: Mark Vigor (Head of Strategic Planning); Stewart Patience (Policy Officer, Development Strategy); Joseph Whelan (Head of New Communities); John Clough (Senior Projects Manager)  
South Cambridgeshire District Council officers: Frances Fry (Principal Planning Officer); Keith Miles (Planning Policy Manager)

**And**

Peter Studdert (Cambridgeshire Horizons); Roger Cutting (Planning Manager, Cambridge University Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust; Steve Sillery (Bidwells advising the Trust); Angela Dove (Faber Maunsell, Consultants to the Trust)

**06/SF/01 Apologies**

Apologies had been received from City Councillors Baker and Stuart (alt).

**06/SF/02 Petition**

The Chair received a petition from a representative of the Trumpington Residents' Association which contained 352 signatures. She read out the text of the petition:

"We the undersigned object strongly to the proposal to use land on Glebe Farm near Exeter Close, adjacent to Bishop's Road, Trumpington for a Household Waste Recycling Centre (HWRC).

We believe that this area is very suitable for the building of new homes and the construction of a HWRC with its access roads and buffer zones would squander much of this precious resource. We suggest that the HWRC would be better located close to the M11 and suggest that the contaminated land on the Aventis site (previously known as the 'Fisons Site') is explored.

We urge the County Council to exclude the Glebe Farm site from its list of proposed sites."

(Note: After the meeting, the officers at the County Council confirmed that the petition had been logged as a representation for the Issues and Options consultation.)

**06/SF/03 Minutes**

The minutes of the meeting on 5 December 2005 were agreed as a correct record.

**06/SF/04 Matters Arising**

Re: Household Waste Recycling Centre

The Head of Strategic Planning at the County Council clarified that there were 2 different planning processes:

1. South Cambridgeshire District Council's Local Development Framework and the City Council's Local Plan.
2. In parallel with those was the Cambridgeshire & Peterborough Minerals & Waste Development Plan which was to provide sites for waste and minerals.

He acknowledged that it was not easy to keep people informed.

Members asked raised the following:

- Local residents and councillors had been taken by surprise by the consultation on this site
- The Reference Group had suggested several possible sites – round the M11, near the Park & Ride site and the old Fisons Juventus site – so they were surprised that only one site had been identified. Was this because the site was owned by the County Council?
- Concerns about using an area earmarked in the Area Development Framework for housing
- What is the difference between a reserved site and a preferred site?
- The visual and traffic impact of a HWRC on this site
- Had a traffic survey been done in relation to the Glebe Farm site?
- Did the Addenbrookes Access Road include access to the facility if it were located at the Glebe Farm site.

In reply the Head of Strategic Planning said:

- A major problem was finding landowners who were willing to offer identified sites. There was still opportunity to suggest other sites.
- The Glebe Farm site was described as the reserved site because it might have to be used; it was not the preferred site if a more suitable one became available.
- Because of the scale of the Glebe Farm site, he doubted that there would be much impact from additional traffic.
- The Addenbrookes' Access Road planning application did not include provision for access to the Glebe Farm site.

Members then raised further points:

- How would the Reference Group be able to contribute further to the process of selecting a suitable site and might Cambridgeshire Horizons be able to support the process?
- Was it possible to have the selection criteria in the public domain so not only this site could be adequately considered but also other sites.
- The relationship between the size of any site and the traffic assessment was critical. Could members be given the pros and cons of different site sizes at the various locations and the impact on the traffic assessment.

The Chair asked the Head of Strategic Planning to sum up.

He stressed that no alternatives had been rejected and summarised what would happen in the next few months:

Draft until the next meeting

1. Sites proposed by the industry would be considered
2. The Reference Group on Waste would work on alternatives
3. What was required would be narrowed down
4. Consultation on realistic alternatives would take place in the summer and early autumn
5. The officers would then attend a Steering Group meeting and present the options.

Peter Studdert agreed that Cambridgeshire Horizons would provide support to the process of identifying sites in the area. He also suggested that the powers allowed under compulsory purchase legislation be investigated and this was agreed.

Action: MV PS
---------------------

There were no other matters arising.

### **06/SF/05     Declarations Of Interest**

Code of Conduct personal interests were declared as follows:

<b>Councillor</b>	<b>Minute Number</b>	<b>Nature of Interest</b>
Adigun-Harris	06/SF/04	He lives close to the proposed recycling site
Adigun-Harris	06/SF/07	His wife works for the Trust
Slatter	06/SF/04	She lives close to the proposed recycling site
Orme	06/SF/07	Pension provided by University Superannuation Scheme
Bard	06/SF/04	Pension provided by Bayer CropScience
Bard	06/SF/07	His wife works for the Trust

### **06/SF/06     Oral Update on the Area Development Framework, the landscape study, and the community facilities study**

The City Council's Head of Policy & Projects summarised as follows:

#### The Area Development Framework:

This had been approved by the Executive Councillor, Councillor Bailey, on 10 January with 2 minor amendments to the published document. Hard copies of the final document would be circulated.

#### Landscape Study:

The Consultants were currently working on ways to enhance biodiversity, access and ownership & management arrangements. They were due to complete the work by 31 March and the local community would be given an update in April.

#### Community Facilities:

The City Council's Head of Community Development, Ken Hay, was working with consultants on a number of aspects:

- The requirement for a Community Centre and its location
- The co-location of services and how these would be managed overall

Draft until the next meeting

- Links with both secondary and primary education provision
- The Trumpington Meadows development
- Cycle Routes
- Information and communications technology

A workshop was planned at which officers would work with residents on the outcome of his researches.

Members emphasised the importance of the following considerations:

- Facilities for a community orchard and for allotments
- Provision of public footpaths and bridleways including new ones as necessary
- The importance of linking the schools with community provision, possibly by the co-location of the secondary school, Fawcett School and the community centre to create a community corridor, a proposal being promoted by the Children's Services Office of the County Council
- Ensuring that there was adequate provision and enough space for the needs of teenagers and that they were consulted

The Head of Policy & Projects noted these for further consideration.

Action: BH
---------------

**06/SF/07      Controlling through traffic on the Cambridge Biomedical Campus when the Addenbrookes Access Road and on-site connecting roads are operational**

The Planning Manager, Cambridge University Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust spoke to the report.

The Southern Fringe Area Development Framework stated that there should be no direct link from the new Addenbrookes Access road to Babraham Road to stop "rat-running" through the site. Any barrier/permit system at entry or leaving the site, was impractical as this would cause delays in accessing the hospital facilities and cause traffic congestion both on and off the site. It was not possible to design a solution to provide barriers at the Hills Road entrance/exit because of lack of space available. Having taken legal advice as well as that of the consultants, the only practical solution was to utilise a number plate recognition system combined with fines (of the order of £60) for drivers shown to be "rat-running". The technology allowed "rat-running" drivers to be distinguished from those dropping off relatives or friends with hospital appointments. The Trust would operate the system and detailed practical arrangements and costings were currently being worked up.

Members made the following comments:

- Several members were not convinced that a barrier system would not work
- Concerns about the legality of access to the DVLA and about the accuracy of the numberplate recognition system
- How would non-payers be dealt with
- It was a system with considerable potential
- Was this proposal part of the planning process

The Planning Manager emphasised the practical problems of any barrier/permit system. He confirmed that the DVLA was agreeable to extend the existing licence the Trust had with them for the enforcement of civil penalty notices arising from parking

Draft until the next meeting

infringements on the site. The proposed system would form part of the planning application.

Steve Sillery (Bidwells) referred to the effectiveness of such a system being currently used on one particular stretch of the M11 to track drivers not keeping to the 40mph limit. Drivers were obeying the limit.

### **06/SF/08 Report from the Project Board**

The City Council's Head of Policy & Projects spoke to the minutes of the Board meeting on 24 January.

He highlighted key areas discussed including the Extended Schools work for Northstowe being broadened to include extended schools issues for the Southern Fringe, the strategy for delivering community facilities which needed to be in place before mid-July and the decision on the % of affordable housing to be provided which depended on the outcome of the inquiry into the Local Plan/Local Development Framework.

The Board would be reporting to the Joint Strategic Forum on 22 March. Consideration would be given to expanding the composition of the Board to include developers and land owners.

In response to questions from members, the officers clarified the following:

- There are 3 sections to the development – Trumpington Meadows, Clay Farm and Addenbrookes.
- The barrier that already existed on the M11 was to screen residents from microwave radiation; the proposed acoustic barrier would be placed on the other side of the motorway.

### **06/SF/09 Cambridge Southern Fringe Member Reference Group Future Role**

The City Council's Head of Policy & Projects introduced the report. He said that sustainable urban drainage should be added to the list of matters of principle and strategy that were not fully resolved and were listed under paragraph 2.3 of the report.

#### **Resolved**

- 1) that the Reference Group continue for a limited period to deal with the following outstanding issues:
  - the provision and location of community facilities;
  - the future of secondary school provision;
  - the possible provision of a household recycling centre;
  - strategic landscape issues associated with the work currently commissioned with Cambridgeshire Horizons;
  - possibly any outstanding transport issues;
  - priorities for S106 funding;
  - sustainable urban drainage.
- 2) That it was not appropriate for the Reference Group to be involved in discussions about planning applications.

Draft until the next meeting

**06/SF/10    Date of Next Meeting**

Members will be contacted about the date of the next meeting when there is business to be done.

The meeting closed at 7.05pm.

**Chair**