

**Councillors Present:**

County Councillor Kent (Chair)  
City Councillors Baker, Durrant and Slatter;  
South Cambridgeshire District Councillors Nightingale and Orme

**Also Present:**

City Council Officers: Glen Richardson (Urban Design Manager); Brian Human (Head of Policy & Projects); Ken Hay (Head of Community Development)  
County Council Officers: Joseph Whelan (Head of New Communities);  
South Cambridgeshire District Council officers: Frances Fry (Principal Planning Officer)

**And**

Peter Studdert (Cambridgeshire Horizons)

**06/SF/11 Apologies**

Apologies had been received from City Councillors Adigun-Harris and South Cambridgeshire District Councillor Kember.

**06/SF/12 Declarations Of Interest**

Code of Conduct personal interests were declared as follows:

<b>Councillor</b>	<b>Minute Number</b>	<b>Nature of Interest</b>
Slatter	06/SF/14	She lives close to the proposed recycling site

**06/SF/13 Minutes**

With one amendment (on page 2 minute no 06/SF/04 second bullet point replace "Fisons Juventus site" with "Fisons Aventis site"), the minutes of the meeting on 7 March 2006 were agreed as a correct record.

**06/SF/14 Matters Arising**

Re: Household Waste Recycling Centre

The Head of New Communities said that the Cambridgeshire & Peterborough Minerals & Waste Development Plan would not be adopted until 2009 and was still at an early stage.

The Chair informed the committee that County Council officers had arranged a meeting on 20 June 2006 with the local Residents' Association about this matter. She also said that the County Council Cabinet had decided not to renew the option of offering 2 hectares they own to Countrywide for residential development.

Councillor Slatter asked for a progress report about the involvement of Cambridgeshire Horizons in helping to identify sites in the area and the possibility of using compulsory purchase legislation.

Peter Studdert said that help had been offered and that the legislation for compulsory purchase had to be anchored to the individual circumstances.

The Chair expressed the Reference Group's concerns about the coherence of the planning process in the light of the County Council Cabinet's decision and asked Cambridgeshire Horizons to continue to actively offer their help and support in this matter.

The Head of Policy & Projects reported that a meeting of the City Council's Development Plan Steering Group had agreed a response to the second Issues and Options paper about the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Development Plan. The response gave the grounds for objecting to the proposed site in relation to adverse impact on amenity and traffic levels. They had suggested that the area of search be broadened.

The Chair asked what the implications were on the Area Development Framework of the County Council Cabinet decision not to release 2 hectares rather than 1 hectare.

The Head of Policy & Projects said that the land to the south of Glebe Farm was designated for residential use. The implication was unclear but would be part of the process of adopting the Waste Development Plan.

The Head of New Communities said that the preferred options for the siting of waste recycling facilities would be published in November/December 2006 for further consultation.

#### Re: Addenbrookes Access Road

Councillor Nightingale said he understood that the Reference Group had asked that an independent opinion be obtained concerning the volume of traffic movements that might be expected on the access road.

The Head of New Communities advised that traffic movements would be considered as part of the planning application. South Cambridgeshire District Council would be a consultee in relation to the planning application for the road and could make this request.

#### Re: Planning Applications

The Chair asked for an update on when planning applications might be expected.

The Head of Policy & Projects said that the first applications (from Addenbrookes and Clay Farm) were expected in July. The Bell School site was also due in the summer. The Planning Officers at both the City Council and South Cambridgeshire DC were working with developers to ensure that the planning applications did not all arrive at the same time.

### **06/SF/15 Draft Landscape and Open Space Strategy for Cambridge Southern Fringe**

The Urban Design Manager spoke to the two maps which outlined the two proposed principal landscape and open space areas. These related to the lands to the south

and west of the “Trumpington Meadows” site west of Hauxton Road, and the “green corridor” between Hobson’s Brook and the London-Cambridge rail line.

He said that he would be presenting the draft proposals at a meeting of the Trumpington Residents’ Association in the following week, to which representatives of the Hobson’s Conduit Trust and Trumpington Environmental Action Group (TEAG) had also been invited. He would then be presenting a report at the 27 June meeting of Environment Scrutiny Committee for comment by the Committee and decision by the Executive Councillor for Planning & Transport. The decision would provide detailed guidance to prospective developers.

He used the draft report from the consultants who had consulted key stakeholders such as English Nature, Hobson’s Conduit Trust, to highlight the key features proposed:

General:

- A network of Open Spaces within the existing landscape
- Links to the neighbouring countryside such as the Gog Magog hills
- Provision of paths for horse riding and cycling as well as footpaths for pedestrians

**Trumpington Meadows site** (two thirds located in South Cambridgeshire; one third in the City)

General:

- Informal recreation areas
- Creating an attractive edge to the built environment
- Use of public art

The Area to the North of the M11 (in the City)

- Informal recreation areas
- Green fingers
- Long distance cycle path
- Pasture land

The Area to the South of the M11

- More informal recreation areas
- Shrub planting and sheltered woodlands
- Circular Walks
- Keep the agricultural land

The Area to the North of the M11

- Parkland and farm land with a pond

Members raised the following points to which the officers replied (A):

1. The residents’ request for provision of allotments in this area with suitable access was missing (Slatter)  
A: Acknowledged this and the need to find a site with both good soils and accessibility.
2. The Disability Consultative Panel had early on flagged up the need to stop the reflection of sound from the existing protective barrier against microwave radiation placed on the north side of the M11 and had this been taken into account? (Slatter)

A: The plan to create an earth mound would help. The full details had yet to be worked out.

3. Was there to be a barrier on the south side of the M11 as well? (Baker)

A: The metal barrier was to be removed and the use of earth mounding and landscape enhancement would have an acoustical muffling effect. This proposal would have to be approved by the Highways Agency. Councillor Durrant commented that barriers could be made of different materials and it could be possible to create one that was striking.

4. Would there be lighting on the cycle path through the Addenbrookes site, otherwise people would be discouraged from using it in the dark? (Nightingale)

A: There were no plans for lighting this path.

5. Would it be possible to meet the recommendations from the Disability Consultative Panel that some of the footpaths not be for use by cyclists; that the surface be suitable for wheelchairs and those with joint problems; that there be circular walks of different lengths; that new paths be created parallel to Grantchester Road. (Slatter)

A: A balance needed to be found in providing segregated paths because there was a serious cost implication. The principal routes would be surfaced in tarmac.

6. Which areas were to be open to the public? (Kent)

A: The whole of the site to the west of the cycle path in the part of the site to the south of the M11 and the whole area of the site to the north of the M11 were to be open to the public.

7. What consideration was being given to biodiversity, specifically what sort of animals would be encouraged by the plans? (Durrant)

A: The pond which would also have wet meadowland and the other areas where there were meadows parts of which would not be mown would all attract birds and insect life as well as a variety of wild flowers.

## **Green Corridor**

The key points from the Area Development Framework which have been addressed:

- Protection and promotion of biodiversity
- Accessibility
- A more formal, active recreation area – tree lined paths, footpath, pitches, pavilion
- Allotments – a car park which will serve them and the pitches
- Picnic area
- Protect Hobson's Brook
- Possible BMX track

Members raised the following to which the officer replied:

1. Was it possible for the public to access the whole area from north to south? (Nightingale)

2. The site was cut in half by the Addenbrookes Access road. How was that being addressed? (Orme)

A: There was access across the whole site at two main access points – at the Park Gateway point to the east of Hobson's Brook and underneath the point where the guided bus bridge crosses the railway line.

3. Before presenting the proposals to the residents for consultation, it would be important to show clearly on the maps where the various paths went, especially the long-distance path to Ninewells. (Kent)

A: The access to Ninewells would be via the Addenbrookes bridge.

4. Were the playing fields public playing fields or for use exclusively by the new secondary school? (Kent)

A: The playing fields were planned to be dual purpose for use by the school if it were nearby and for the public also.

5. Was the cycle route in the right place to retain the wildlife corridor or Hobson's Brook? (Kent)

A: Considerable distance (9 metres) was planned between the cycle route and the margins of Hobson's Brook.

6. Why was the NEAP area not more integrated with the actual residential development? (Orme)

A: Connection to the planned development was critical and there were planned access points across Hobson's Brook at two sites, one close to the sports pitches and one at the Park Gateway.

The Urban Design Manager gave details of a controversial proposal for an electricity sub-station 4-5 metres high to be sited north of the guided bus route and well landscaped to obscure it from view. The developer had asked for this so as not to use land earmarked for Addenbrookes development for the substation.

The Steering Group expressed great concern about the proposal to site the electricity substation in the green corridor and asked that it be removed as not in keeping with the ADF.

**Resolved** that the officers go back to the developers to find other options than putting the substation in the green wedge.

Action  
GR

The Urban Design Manager addressed the issues of how the sites would be managed and who would own them. They could be managed by establishing a local Trust or by one set up by the developer. Money would be contributed via the S106 agreement to fund the Trust and the on-going maintenance of the areas. The ownership could be in private hands, leased or leased back to the city.

Costs of establishing the Trumpington Meadows and Green Corridor proposals are preliminary only and subject to change and are necessary in order to gain a general idea of overall cost. Trumpington Meadows figures are £2.8m with annual maintenance costs of £220,000 and for the Green Corridor, £2.7m and £240,000 respectively.

**Resolved** that the Consultants' draft report be made available to the Steering Group members and the final version be accessible on the website.

Action  
GR/  
LW

Councillor Durrant suggested that a model of the proposals might be more informative than the two-dimensional maps though he recognised that there was a cost implication of doing this.

## **06/SF/16 Southern Fringe Draft Community Facilities Strategy**

The City Council's Head of Community Development spoke to the progress report on the development of a draft Community Facilities Strategy for the Southern Fringe.

The proposals would be taken forward by:

- A presentation for members and key stakeholders on 5 June 2006

- Consultation with the Primary Care Trust at their board meeting at the end of June
- A decision by the County Council Cabinet on the secondary school before the summer recess
- Options would then be firmed up including the issue of financial viability

The draft Strategy would be considered at the meeting of the City Council's Environment Scrutiny Committee on 27 June and agreed by the Executive Councillor for Planning & Transport at that meeting.

Members questioned why the draft Strategy was going to that particular meeting and the Head of Community Development said that it was important to connect the Community Facilities Strategy to the Landscape and Open Space Strategy and to get a steer on the location of the facility. He agreed that the location of the secondary school was critical to the location of the community facility.

The Head of Policy & Projects said that the Education Authority was departing from the Area Development Framework in their thoughts about where to locate the school. The Chair expressed concern at this having understood that the site in the ADF was indicative as were those for the other community facilities.

The Chair expressed concern that there seemed to be different interpretations of the County's view about the preferred site.

#### **06/SF/17     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 7.14pm.

**Chair**