

COUNTY COUNCIL: MINUTES

Date: Tuesday, 22nd January 2002

Time: 10.30 a.m. – 11.25 a.m.

Place: Shire Hall, Cambridge

Present: Councillor: P W Silby (Chairman)

Councillors: C M Ballard, I C Bates, Dr T J Bear, B S Bhalla, A J Bowen, S V Brinton, J Broadway, C M Carter, M Y Chapple, R L Clarke, J E Coston, P J Downes, R Driver, J A P Eddy, M Farrar, H J Fitch, J L Gluza, A Hansard, B Hardy, G F Harper, V A Hearne-Casapieri, G J Heathcock, J L Huppert, S F Johnstone, J D Jones, A C Kent, S J Kime, V H Lucas, A R Mair, R B Martlew, L W McGuire, A K Melton, E Meyland-Smith, S B Normington, M K Ogden, L J Oliver, A G Orgee, D R Pegram, J A Powley, P A E Read, J E Reynolds, C E Shaw, R C Speechley, A B Stenner, P L Stroude, J M Tuck, J K Walters and L J Wilson

Apologies: Councillors: P D Bailey, R S G Barnwell, S A Giles, S J E King, M L Leeke, R Wilkinson and F H Yeulett

39. MINUTES: 18th DECEMBER 2001

The minutes of the meeting of the Council held on 18th December 2001 were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

40. CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

The Chairman welcomed Councillor B Hardy to his first Council meeting following his recent illness. She also offered her best wishes to Councillor B S Bhalla.

41. DRAFT COUNTY STRUCTURE PLAN – REVISION TO POLICIES AND TEXT

As agreed at the meeting on 18th December 2001, the Council considered the detailed wording of the draft County Structure Plan. A number of amendments had been set out in the report of the Chief Executive, circulated with the agenda. Five further amendments had been put forward in advance of the meeting and circulated to all members.

Members declared the following non-pecuniary interests:

- Councillor A J Bowen - a member of the Council for the Protection of Rural England, Cambridge University and Jesus College
- Councillor S V Brinton - a member of Cambridge University and Selwyn College

- Councillor H J Fitch - a member of the Council for the Protection of Rural England
- Councillor J L Huppert - a member of Cambridge University and Trinity College
- Councillor S J Kime - owner of land and property at Church End, Cherry Hinton, close to a site to be allocated for development
- Councillor A G Orgee - an employee of an organisation forming part of Cambridge University.

In addition Councillor P L Stroude stated that he had no interest in land affected by the proposals at Longstanton/Oakington.

The Chairman reminded members of Council Procedure Rule 14.1 which states that a motion or amendment to rescind a decision made at a meeting of the Council within the past six months cannot be moved unless the notice of motion is signed by at least fourteen members.

Councillor J K Walters stated his firm view that neither the changes shown in the report to the Council nor amendments numbered 1, 3, 4 and 5 below sought to rescind any decision of the Council made within the past six months; he considered them to be drafting changes in accordance with the decision of Council on 18th December 2001. However, for the avoidance of doubt, he tabled a notice of motion signed by fourteen members, which proposed that both the amendments in the report to Council and amendments numbered 1, 3, 4 and 5 below be agreed.

Councillor J E Reynolds then proposed for adoption the eleven chapters of the draft Structure Plan, as amended. He was seconded by Councillor S F Johnstone. Members considered each of the chapters in turn.

Chapters 1 to 7

No amendments to these chapters were proposed. Members approved the amendments set out in the report of the Chief Executive for each of the chapters. [Voting pattern: agreed without dissent.]

Chapter 8

Amendment 1

Councillor J E Reynolds proposed that paragraph 8.39, Policy P8/11, be amended as follows [deletion struck through]:

‘Land at Alconbury Airfield, identified in Policy P2/3, is suitable for a major rail freight interchange facility.’

This was seconded by Councillor I C Bates and was carried. [Voting pattern: agreed without dissent.]

Members then voted on the amendments to Chapter 8 in the report of the Chief Executive. These were all carried. [Voting pattern: agreed without dissent.]

Chapter 9

Amendment 2

Councillor S J Kime withdrew the following amendment:

- 'a) That a decision regarding Chapter 9 be deferred until the next meeting of Council on 19th February 2002;
- b) That Chapter 9 be re-written to comply fully with the Regional Planning Guidance by removing any reference to land east of Cambridge Airport; and
- c) That Cambridge Airport be safeguarded for development post-2016.'

However, he urged members to vote against Chapter 9, arguing that it was contrary to Regional Planning Guidance and Government guidance on the Green Belt.

Amendment 3

Councillor J E Reynolds proposed that paragraph 9.22, Policy P9/3b, be amended as follows [addition underlined]:

'In determining the boundaries of the areas to be released from the Green Belt the Local Planning Authorities will:

- retain any areas required to maintain the essential purposes of the redefined Green Belt as set out in P9/3a;
- provide green separation between existing villages and any urban expansion of Cambridge;
- ensure the protection of green corridors running from open countryside into the urban area.'

This amendment was seconded by Councillor S F Johnstone and carried. [Voting pattern: agreed without dissent.]

Amendment 4

Councillor J E Reynolds proposed that paragraph 9.22, Policy P9/3c, be amended as follows [additions underlined, deletions struck through]:

- 'Other locations should be reserved for development when required as follows (~~but should not be released until an assessment can be made subject to an assessment~~ of the impact of transport improvements on the A14 corridor and the new settlement):

- Between Madingley Road and Huntingdon Road (predominantly University-related uses)
- Between Huntingdon Road and Histon Road

Land east of Cambridge Airport is to be safeguarded for development after 2016 and only developed following the substantial development of Cambridge Airport and provided that a joint study shows it can be developed whilst maintaining the fundamental purposes of the Green Belt.'

This amendment was seconded by Councillor S F Johnstone and carried.
[Voting pattern: agreed without dissent.]

Amendment 5

Councillor J E Reynolds proposed that paragraph 9.22, Policy P9/3c, be amended as follows [additions underlined, deletions struck through]:

'Master Plans or Design Frameworks will be prepared for all these sites by or ~~subject to the agreement~~ on behalf of the relevant local planning authority (or jointly by both authorities where development areas straddle administrative boundaries) in conjunction with Cambridgeshire County Council. In particular:

1. A Master Plan will be prepared for the southern fringe of the city as a whole which recognises the interdependence of the Addenbrooke's, Clay Farm and Trumpington Sites;
2. A Master Plan will be prepared for the eastern sector as a whole including land to the north of Newmarket Road, the land north of Cherry Hinton, Cambridge Airport and land to its east.'

This amendment was seconded by Councillor S F Johnstone and carried.
[Voting pattern: agreed without dissent.]

Members then voted on the amendments to Chapter 9 set out in the report of the Chief Executive. These were all carried. [Voting pattern: Labour group against.]

Chapters 10 and 11

No amendments to these chapters were proposed. Members approved the amendments set out in the report of the Chief Executive for each of the chapters. [Voting pattern: agreed without dissent.]

In conclusion, it was resolved

That the Policies and text set out in Appendix 2 to the report of the Chief Executive be accepted for inclusion in the draft Structure Plan, to be placed on public deposit in March/April 2002.

[Voting pattern: agreed without dissent.]

42. DISTRICT PERIODIC ELECTORAL REVIEW

Members were informed of proposed changes to local electoral arrangements for District Councils in Cambridgeshire and considered the Council's response to the Local Government Commission.

Members expressed a number of concerns:

- If County and District boundaries were not co-terminous, this would be confusing to the electorate and might adversely affect turnout at elections
- The Local Government Commission's proposals were not consistent across the County - the number of electors per Councillor would be higher in Huntingdonshire than in South Cambridgeshire and East Cambridgeshire
- Proposals to increase the number of multi-member wards in rural areas were not supported, as it was felt that these did not operate effectively.

It was resolved to endorse the recommendation made by Cabinet on 8th January 2002 and:

- (a) submit a response to the Local Government Commission highlighting:
 - Where there is consensus between District and Town/Parish Councils on what should be the outcome of the review, this should be respected by the Commission in accordance with paragraph 6 of its own report, which states, 'Local people are normally in the best position to judge what council size and ward configurations are most likely to secure effective and convenient local government in their areas, whilst also reflecting the identities and interests of local communities';
 - The Council's concern about the Commission's process and timing which separates the District and County electoral reviews by twelve months; and
 - The importance attached to co-terminosity between District wards and County electoral divisions.
- (b) encourage Councillors to submit comments and concerns about their own Divisions direct to the Commission.

[Voting pattern: unanimous.]

Chairman