

**Councillors Present:** Reid (Chair), Bailey, Blencowe, Durrant, Holland and Ward

Also Present: Dave Roberts (Planning Policy Manager), Barry Louth (Transport Planning Manager).

**1 Minutes**

The Minutes of the meeting held on the 29 March 2006 were approved as a correct record.

**2 Apologies**

Apologies for absence had been received from Councillor Baker.

**3 Declarations of Interest**

None.

**4 Public Questions**

None.

**5 Gypsy & Traveller Pitch Provision**

The Planning Policy Manager introduced the report highlighting those representations where the City Council was objecting to issues raised in the Issues & Options 1 Report on which they had been consulted by South Cambridgeshire District Council.

Members raised the following:

- What was the definition of a pitch (was it a dwelling and vehicles) and was there a standard size for a pitch? (Councillor Holland)
- How would the City Council ensure that it was not too late to seek provision for Gypsy and Traveller pitches on other new fringe development sites, learning from what has happened with the Southern Fringe and the NIAB sites? (Councillor Ward)
- Maybe even with the Southern Fringe and the NIAB sites the City Council should reserve judgement and use parts of the green belt adjacent to these sites for Gypsy and Traveller pitches. (Councillor Durrant)
- As a general principle, the provision should not be site specific. When all the sites were analysed against the supporting policies cited, this ruled more sites out than in. There is no specific policy which would encourage the City Council to take a view on a Gypsy and Traveller

pitch on the two sites identified, so nothing is ruled out. (Councillor Blencowe)

The Planning Policy Manager said there was a typical pitch size and he could confirm what it consisted of if required. He said that both the Cambridge East and the North West Fringe sites could be considered for Gypsy and Traveller Sites. A recent East of England Regional Assembly conference had considered the issue of locations of sites and the outcome could be that the city would be asked to provide 15 pitches. With regard to the Southern Fringe and NIAB sites, the time was past for considering them. The relevant general policy was in the Local Plan.

The Chair said that locations of Gypsy and Traveller sites for the Southern Fringe and NIAB sites should have been in the Master Plan. A decision was needed now before the planning applications for those sites were received. Possible locations in the other urban extensions would be considered. Land was being taken out of the Green Belt as indicated on page 14 of the agenda under GT21 Green Belt – Proposed Approach.

Members then made the following points:

- The hope that officers were actively looking for a site somewhere in the city as full Council had agreed that there should be one. It was also part of a sub-regional policy. ( Councillor Blencowe)
- The need for a **transit** site had been known for some considerable time. (Councillor Ward)
- The views expressed by officers in paragraphs 3.6 and 3.7 of the officer report are unusually strong against including provision of Gypsy and Traveller sites in the Southern Fringe and the NIAB sites. What was the definition of the Southern Fringe and why could there not be provision from part of the Green Belt in that location? (Councillor Durrant)

The Chair proposed that the recommendations be amended as follows:

2.1 Delete

2.2 Then becomes 2.1

2.4 then becomes 2.2 and is amended such that the sites identified in the Development Plan be added so that the recommendation reads (amendments shown in bold):

The Executive Councillor is recommended to agree that it would not be appropriate to seek the provision of sites for Gypsy and Traveller pitches in the Southern Fringe or on the NIAB site (**Local Plan sites 9.02, 9.03, 9.05, 9.06, 9.08, 9.09, 9.12, and 9.13**) in respect of the current and imminent planning applications for those sites.”

The Steering Group agreed the amended recommendations 2.1 (by 4 votes to 0) and 2.2 (by 4 votes to 2).

The Executive Councillor agreed the amended recommendations.

## **6 Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Local Development Framework- Core Strategy and Site Specific Allocations Preferred Options**

The Steering Group considered the City Council's draft response to the consultation from the County Council. It was agreed that the second paragraph on page 31 of the agenda be omitted. The Labour councillors said they could not support SSP15 Land at Honey Hill, Fen Ditton.

The Steering Group approved amended recommendation 2.2 by 3 votes to 2. The Executive Councillor agreed the amended recommendation.

## **7 City Council Objectives for Demand Management - Cambridgeshire Long Term Transport Strategy**

The Discussion Note was considered, in particular paragraph 4.1, in order to begin to establish the objectives which the City Council would like to be met by any demand management measures (including road user charging) proposed by the County Council as part of proposals arising from their Long Term Transport Strategy.

In response to questions from members, the Transport Planning Manager explained the government's thinking about local and national initiatives in relation to demand management schemes. He said that local schemes were to be introduced first for a limited time period (from 5 –15 years) and that revenues were to be available locally. If a national scheme were implemented within 5 years, the local schemes would be absorbed into the national one. He advised the members to take the lead in making proposals rather than wait for the County Council to make their recommendations.

The Chair emphasised that all objectives should also be a tool for targeting carbon emissions.

The following refinements were suggested to the draft proposals:

- To include where appropriate the suggestion of elimination of congestion on bus routes.
- That 4.1.4 include incentives to drive low emission cars.
- That the measures in 4.1.6 should not be restricted to city residents and therefore thought needed to be given to where the demand management measure would begin.
- That traffic lights be used to regulate the flow of cars to x per hour on Histon Road.

The Transport Planning Manager said that early in the new financial year the County Council would be making proposals that could include mileage charges, and area scheme like London has which would cause most problems for the City Council. He suggested that the measures the City Council wanted be used to benchmark those of the County Council.

The meeting closed at 10.07am

**Chair**