

<b>North West Fringe Member Reference Group</b>	23 June 2006 10.00am-11.17am
---	---------------------------------

**Councillors Present:**

County Councillors Reynolds (Chair) and White  
City Councillors Durrant, Holland, and Ward;  
South Cambridgeshire District Councillors Heazell, Mason, Spink and Wright

**Also Present:**

City Council Officers: Sara Cass (Urban Extensions Project Manager); David Roberts (Planning Policy Manager);  
County Council Officers: Paul Cook (Head of Transport Policy and Strategy); Craig Drury (Principal Transport Officer); Kathy Baldwin (Sustainable Communities Manager)  
South Cambridgeshire District Council Officers: Michael Monk (Planning Consultant working for South Cambridgeshire District Council)

**And**

Jemma Little and Peter Studdert (Cambridgeshire Horizons)

Apologies had been received from Caroline Hunt (Principal Planning Officer) South Cambridgeshire District Council

**06/NWF/07 Election of Chair**

South Cambridgeshire District Councillor Spink was appointed as Chair for the meeting.

**06/NWF/08 Apologies**

Apologies had been received from City Councillor Reid and County Councillor Hughes.

**06/NWF/09 Declarations Of Interest**

None.

**06/NWF/10 Minutes**

The minutes of the meeting held on 14 June 2006 were agreed as a correct record.

**06/NWF/11 Matters Arising**

Re: Minute number 06/NWF/05

In response to comments from a councillor expressing concerns about the consultants making assumptions and not taking known issues into account, the County Council officers assured members that the Highways Agency had been included in the project from the beginning and that this was still work in progress which would be reported further to the Reference Group in the autumn.

Re: Action on minute number 06/NWF/05

Action Head of Transport Policy
--

The Head of Transport Policy undertook to email the information to members within the next few days.

### **06/NWF/12 North West Cambridge Landscape Strategy**

Members made the following points to which officers responded (A):

- Noted particularly the use of the contour line as the building line which keeps the landscape view.
- Noted the importance of the Park & Ride site on Madingley Road and its environs and expressed disappointment that the Inspector had excluded them from the Green Belt. Would prefer them to be located within the Green Belt.
- Important when going out to public consultation to have documents which are accessible to those with particular sight problems such as red/green colour blindness which affects 15% of men and to have text a size that is legible.
- Photographs linked to maps to show how proposals would look because difficult to picture for the general public.
- There is knowledge in local areas and it will be important to capture that.

The officers agreed to action the points raised where possible.

- How would the two sites (West Cambridge and NIAB) be integrated especially in relation to the Long Term Transport Plan (LTTP) when the NIAB planning application is expected later in the summer?

The officers acknowledged that it was not an easy situation with the different processes and timescales for the two sites. The landscape study did apply to both sides of the Huntingdon Road and there would be consultation in September on the Area Action Plan (AAP). There was to be a draft LTTP available on 4 September which would sit alongside the Issues & Options Report during the consultation on the AAP. The outcome of the Examination in Public on the South Cambridgeshire Local Development Framework would determine whether or not any more land would be released from the Green Belt north of Huntingdon Road. There were three forums to help ensure adequate co-ordination - this Reference Group, a joint officer working group and a group where the officers worked directly with the developers.

The Reference Group noted the North West Cambridge Landscape Study.

### **06/NWF/06 Issues and Options Report**

The Planning Policy Manager highlighted key elements of the Issues & Options Report:

- a) It was not a draft Area Action Plan (AAP) but a document to be used for consultation.
- b) The results of the consultation would inform the draft AAP which in turn would be consulted on from April - June 2007.
- c) A report was due about the sustainability assessment.
- d) Feedback was looked for in relation to:
  - the balance between aspirations and impact on the environment
  - where to locate shops and services
  - where to locate a new secondary school

Draft until the next meeting

- How the footprint of the development is viewed
- Housing issues such as affordability, density, mix of affordable and other
- Employment
- North facing slip roads on the M11
- Energy provision including renewable sources

Members raised the following to which officers responded (A):

- Important to separate out community facilities and education
- For Girton, important to gain views on the relationship between the existing shops and any new provision

The officers agreed to action these points.

1. Re Option 10.1 (Map 2) which referred to “the sweep of open rising ground that is so important to the setting of Cambridge is effectively lost”. This was difficult to visualise and photographs could be helpful for the public consultation phase.

A: It would be difficult to provide photographs to show the impact because the kind of development that will be there was not known at this point in time.

2. Re 12.1 which related to land requirements for employment uses in the City but much of the development was in South Cambridgeshire so information needed to be included about what was in the South Cambridgeshire Local Development Framework. The type of employment also needed to be spelled out. On the new Arbury Camp development there was no sign of B1 class of employment although several hotels were being built which were not in the Master Plan. Sustainability was important so need other forms of employment in this area than the university in order to reduce the need for travel.

A: South Cambridgeshire DC and the City Council had agreed to set a level for employment uses whether the land was in the City or South Cambridgeshire. The close link to the university would help the establishment of B1 forms of employment; this was a different context to the Arbury development.

3. Re: infrastructure eg energy. As the Electricity Board stated 18 months ago that they were near to capacity for supplying the energy needs of the existing city, how could all the additional energy be provided? This might also apply to gas, water, drainage and sewage. Public buildings were now required to have dual flush toilets so should this be a requirement for the private sector? The public also needed to know what kinds of renewable energy sources there were (biomass, water etc) so that they could express their view.

A: A new electricity substation was being built in Kings Hedges which would come into operation in 2008 and which was designed to supply all the electricity needs for the foreseeable future. The key infrastructure providers had been included in consultations from the beginning. They had a statutory duty to provide what was required and the public could not be asked for options on this. Building Control regulations now required all new dwellings to have dual flush toilets. Agreed to identify what renewables could be considered and also to flag up that more efficient use of gas might be an alternative to renewable sources. There was an important government decision due in October. The paper would encourage service providers to engage with the consultation and participation process.

### Draft until the next meeting

This last point was understood and a member requested that, as the consultation is about issues as well as options, information such as that contained in the officer's answer be included in the paper as the public did have concerns about energy and drainage provision and should have the opportunity to express their views.

4. There was no provision for sites for travellers and this was a good opportunity for such a site with perhaps 5-6 pitches to be part of the new development and for this to be under consideration by the traveller community and the general public from the beginning.

A: The land released from the Green Belt was specifically for the university and so we were required to meet their needs. The City Council was looking for a temporary site for travellers.

5. Re page 19 Phasing and implementation and Transport and other infrastructure: In the past, infrastructure had been delivered after construction so phasing and implementation were key elements.

The Chair pointed to paragraph 22.9 which addressed this issue and some of the others being raised.

6. Re page 39 Drainage: Paragraph 20.1 ignored an important surface water outfall which runs through Impington and Histon which experienced flooding at times now. Important to get the surface drainage right at a very early stage. The A14 improvements would affect this outfall as well. There was a similar problem in Girton which also experienced flooding. The Issues & Options paper needed to say that the consultation was going on at the same time as a planning application would be received. Two catchment streams served the NIAB land and officers were recommended to read the submission of the parish councils to the Local Development Framework Examination.

A: Agreed to put additional text in to the paper to emphasise that downstream flooding should not be worsened.

7. Re: options 18.1 and 18.2 What would encourage developers to go for more than 10% renewable energy? Should we not be seeking 20% here given the single land ownership and given that much of it would be developed by and for the University?

A: 10% was a new government policy and no other authority had yet managed more than this although London was aiming for 20%. Officers agreed to include a further option for 20% renewables.

8. At the new Arbury development there were only trees and the A14 barrier in existence. Was there a risk for the new development that the aspiration of keeping the landscape view would be overtaken by other considerations?

A: the sensitivity of the urban edge was all-important and the focus was on providing very real options for the public and key stakeholders to comment on.

9. Members needed to have their issues registered too and one was about the consistency of the Cambridge Local Plan and the South Cambridgeshire Local Development Framework especially in implementation and applying common standards.

A: The AAP would be a unit on its own to be adopted jointly by the two authorities.

The officers said that they were planning a leaflet that would describe the relationship between the two sites and this would also be a feature of the planned exhibitions.

Draft until the next meeting

The NIAB site would not be part of the AAP and this needed to be clarified and the issues it raised identified.

### **06/NWF/06 Issues and Options Consultations Process**

The Urban Extensions Project Manager said that while the government's consultation requirements were for stakeholders which were listed in Appendix 1, the public were also going to be included.

Members raised the following and the officers responded (A):

- Alerted officers to some typing errors in the list of stakeholder names and that the South Cambs LSP was not identified as a consultee.
- Concern re the 6 week consultation period which was relatively short for adequate consultation with parish councils and the public.

A: The 6 week period was set by the regulations and could not be more or less. Spelling errors would be corrected, the South Cambs LSP would be added as a consultee.

Members suggested and officers agreed that parish councils should be offered presentations and that a stakeholder day be held in addition so that they worked together on the issues and options and build a common interest which was important.

### **06/NWF/06 Date of Next Meeting**

The next meeting is likely to be in September to consider the draft AAP. Members agreed

1. to a 5.30pm start time to allow members of the public more opportunity to attend
2. to finding a venue in the local community of North West Cambridge
3. that a date in September be set soon.

The meeting closed at 11.17am.

**Chair**