

**Community Services Scrutiny Committee
Special Meeting**

6 September 2007
2.30pm to 3.40pm

Present: Councillors Slatter (Chair), Blair, Blencowe, Bradnack, James and Shah

For the Information of the Council

07/CS/?? Apologies

Apologies were received from Councillors Kightley, Lynn, Sanders and Ellis-Miller (alternate).

07/CS/?? Declarations of Interest

Slatter: As a Ward Councillor, knows the public speaker

07/CS/?? Public Questions

Mr Andrew Roberts addressed the meeting on behalf of the Trumpington Residents' Association.

The Association welcomed the development of green infrastructure at Trumpington Meadows but asked that the Committee press for the following 4 matters (which they had raised in their responses to the recent revised planning application) to be addressed:

1. That there to be a long-term guarantee that the green space be developed for the benefit of the whole of Trumpington and the Southern Fringe and that a representative of the Trumpington Residents' Association be included on the proposed Management Committee.
2. That the scope of the service building be extended to include rooms for use by community groups and educational groups now that the original plan for a field study centre in the Shepherd's Cottage had been scrapped
3. That two or more areas be designated for allotments and ensure that the sites chosen had suitable soil
4. For the provision of a small car park and cycle parking at the southern boundary of the site (known to be outside the city boundary) and a review of the parking requirements at the northern end where there is already a small car park by Byron's Pool.

The officers responded to the points as follows:

- South Cambridgeshire were the lead authority in relation to the Country Park;
- The location of the allotments was being taken seriously and that at the proposed location on the north of the site, the idea was to completely replace the soil to create top quality soil;
- If the framework for the Management Committee was agreed, then a representative of Trumpington Residents' Association or other suitable body would be on the Management Committee.

07/CS/?? Further Consideration of Options for the Management of Green Infrastructure at the Trumpington Meadows Site

The Chair said that the report was a work in progress report and that events had moved on even since it had been published.

The Head of Active Communities updated members. The Committee noted that since the report had been made publicly available, Grosvenor had submitted a revised open space management framework proposal, which took into account a number of the concerns identified in the report that had been raised in recent discussions between the two authorities and the developer. Given the timetable, it had not been possible to assess the revised proposals in detail. However, the following observations could be made:

Grosvenor now proposed that a number of aspects of open space within the development such as pocket parks, the informal recreation area and leaps, laps and neaps be transferred to the authority on a 125 year long lease together with an annuity to cover the first 12 years of maintenance. In addition, they proposed to refurbish Byron's Pool Local Nature Reserve and car park, and gift land to the City Council to enable the creation of a buffer zone of new woodland and natural fencing between the Reserve and the newly formed country park.

Further details were also set out regarding management arrangements. It was proposed that Trumpington Meadows Management Company (TMMC) would set up a management committee, which had identified representation from a number of local community groups such as residents associations and primary school as well as the two authorities and the housing association.

To date, costings had not been revised, neither had the funding proposal behind the framework involving the housing association.

Members raised the following points:

- A preference for the City Council to manage the Open Space but assurance required about public access particularly for the disabled and about the disposal of rubbish
- Concern about the potential traffic noise from the M11 in relation to some of that open space (pocket parks, LEEAPs etc) because the present structure was erected to protect the Mullard Radio Telescope and reflects a considerable amount of noise to land to the east of the M11.
- Concerns about changes to the boundary of the country park and how public access to green spaces was to be achieved.
- Desirability of creating a "Town Green" and asking officers to assess possible sites from both a practical and a legal perspective
- Concern about the position of Bedfordshire Pilgrims Housing Association (BPHA) in relation to the proposed funding arrangements
- Concern that agricultural land is being included in the management framework when it will be up to the owners to decide how it is used.
- Concern that there are revenue costs allocated to pocket play areas and other play areas but not clear whether there might not be some for what was being described as agricultural land. These should be individually identified in a list to be included in the management framework.
- A statement that the onus was on the City Council to set out the specifications the developer was required to meet

- Need to ensure clarity about the respective accountabilities of the Management Committee and the City Council
- That the accountability of the Management Committee needed to be clearly established in the public interest
- While there was mention of inflation in relation to capital costs no such reference applied to revenue costs

Officers accepted members' concerns many of which would be addressed through the s106 negotiations with the developer. For example, the developer's proposal that the City Council manage the open space and the developer would fund it, needed to be sorted out as the equivalent to a commuted sum. The funding arrangements with BPHA were not equitable and needed reworking. BPHA had only recently been appointed as the Housing Association partner and discussions with them were on-going. The agricultural land would be owned by the TMMC and might be leased out and the costs of doing that were part of the detail that needed to be worked out.

Officers agreed to explore the issue of inflation in relation to revenue costs and to let members have the information.

Debbie Kaye

In response to questions, the officers affirmed that South Cambs DC were adopting the City Council standards with regard to the provision of allotments and that the allotment holders organisation in the city would be included in the consultation if they were not already on the list.

In response to a question, the officers set out the possible timescale. The JSIC and s106 agreements needed to be in place before the application was considered by the Joint Development Control Committee (JDCC). The earliest meeting of the JDCC was scheduled for mid October.

The Chair said that members of the Committee had been alerted by email to the intention to table revised recommendations at the meeting which were then tabled. After the above points had been raised and addressed and some suggested amendments considered, the Committee agreed the following recommendation for the Executive Councillor (amendments to the tabled recommendations highlighted in bold):

“2.1.1 To re-confirm the City Council's preference for self-management of green infrastructure.

2.1.2 To note that the preferred position of SCDC appears to be to support the proposals put forward by Grosvenor in the OSMF

2.1.3 To acknowledge both that SCDC has the majority interest in the Trumpington Meadows development, and that it is desirable to have a coordinated approach to the management of TMCP.

In this context she is further recommended to:

2.2.1 To instruct officers to continue to explore with SCDC whether that authority might be willing to work with Cambridge City Council to support a self-management programme.

2.2.2 ~~If such discussions prove abortive, to support in principle the proposal for the management of green infrastructure put forward by Grosvenor. This support is~~ That

any Cambridge City Council support for the Grosvenor proposals would be conditional upon the following requirements being met within the determination timetable:

- a) That a sustainable, equitable funding model for the management arrangements is established by Grosvenor, which has the agreement of Cambridge City Council and the Bedfordshire Pilgrims Housing Association partner
- b) That concerns identified in this report **and at this committee meeting** about the appropriate use of land, costings, access, standards of maintenance, involvement of local people and accountability are addressed.”

The Executive Councillor agreed these recommendations.

The meeting finished at 3.40pm.

Chair