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|  | **Minutes of the Parish Council meeting held on Wednesday 29th March 2017 at Horningsea Village Hall** | Action |
|  | **Present**: Margaret Starkie, Jessica Kitt, Andy Neely (7.35pm), Tessa Pleasants, Andy Greed, Michael Gingell  District councilor Robert Turner  20:30 Paul Mumford, case officer & Andrew Winter from New Communities team, SCDC & Dave Allatt from CCC  15 members of the public |  |
|  | **Open Forum:**  Fifteen members of the public attended the meeting. One asked for a zebra crossing on High Street as traffic had increased and was likely to increase more with Waterbeach development. The chair explained that CCC Highways had said the conditions were wrong for a crossing. However, she will contact Highways again regarding this.  All members of the public wished to speak at item 147. The agenda order was changed to allow attendance of SCDC officers but is reported in the order of the agenda. |  |
| 143/16-17 | **Apologies** were received from the clerk Hayley Livermore. The meeting was declared quorate.  Cllr Balm was absent |  |
| 144/16-17 | **Declarations of disclosable pecuniary & other interests** –Cllrs Starkie and Pleasants for item 157b |  |
| 145/16-17 | **To approve the minutes of the meeting 25th January 17-** The minutes of the meeting 25th January were approved and signed. |  |
| 146/16-17 | **Matters arising from the minutes of 25th January 17**  None |  |
| 147/16-17 | **To consider planning application S/0559/17/OL. Waterbeach Barracks and Airfield Site, Waterbeach, Cambridgeshire**  MS had attended Waterbeach section of Local Plan examination  on 28/3/17 **–** notes appended  She met Chris Goldsmith of Turnstone, developers for RLW estates,  and invited him to meet residents and PC on how they fit in and work together  Residents raised the following:  Positives - provision of secondary school Concerns - infrastructure, especially A10 corridor, being not sufficiently forward to support this density of development.  Other concerns included:   * height of buildings and effect on flat landscape * staffing 4 new schools when current school struggles * construction traffic travelling through Horningsea * 2 halves of the development are on different timescales and   therefore aren’t linked in to maximise the potential   * transport infrastructure, especially A10   + Highways position: up to 1600 houses: A10 is fine   + City Deal phase I must be proven successful before   Phase II is released which if it doesn’t happen will cause problems   * + There are other upcoming developments on A10 which   will further impact the volumes of traffic and exacerbate the problem   * + Rat-run through Horningsea * Baits Bite cycle crossing – must have a new bridge as currently difficult or impossible for some cycle traffic * S106: with groups all working separately it means it is difficult to maximize the s106 opportunity (U&C, RLW, Wing etc); S106 can only be used for mitigation related to that specific development;   CIL, which can be used widely, does not apply to this development   * Flood plain (most of the site isn’t in flood plain) * Recently formed Horningsea Planning group has also given a response   Paul Mumford and colleagues reported   * U&C highlights that it has been brought in to develop the   barracks site by Secretary of State for Defence   * Can extend 10 April deadline for PC response if needed   (agreed extend to 10 May)   * SCDC & CCC need as many views and comments as possible   to help inform their decision   * Bourne & Waterbeach sites are identified as sites for development (some would rather see development immediately around Cambridge but that is greenbelt) * Strategic site: RLW land, U&C land is c60-65% and all the   barracks is considered as ‘previously developed land’. 35% is agricultural land.   * Need a supplementary planning document before a decision is   made: provide more detail on infrastructure: transport, water (drinking and foul) etc. and when they come online.   * Need to consider the site as a whole (U&C AND RLW) to look   at the infrastructure; e.g. if think the secondary school is in the wrong place then they will trigger U&C to review it (this is why the U&C OPA is not detailed and currently designed to be flexible)   * RLW planning application expected end 2017 * U&C to planning committee for decision by early 2018 * SCDC has proposed LP as whole site having capacity for approx. 8-9000 dwellings; RLW think 11,000, U&C think c10,000.   + Council calculation is based upon the assumption that within a plot 60% will be built on, 40% will be left as green space and that there will be 30-40 dwellings per hectare * A10 study due to conclude in summer 2017, provide strategic solution taking into account the upcoming developments;mechanisms exist to allow a funding package that will deliver * A10 strategic solution has to be agreed BEFORE U&C OPA considered by SCDC planning committee   Local Plan   * Q: if plan is dismissed by LP inspector or she wants   changes   * what will be the implications? * A: if she says no, it isn’t impossible but makes the plan more   difficult and the plan detail needs to be looked at to  understand their mitigation  Traffic during construction  Traffic from 1600 dwellings  Traffic as a result of A14 roadworks (M Gingell guesstimate 20%  increase last year and expect 20% next year)  Need a transport assessment conducted now (should be in the application)  Highways surface study before and after would be  interesting, if they make existing surfaces worse  Damage to listed walls and houses  Q: Where does SCDC stand on Horningsea Conservation Policy?  A: Existing policies should be reflected in any decision made.  Northstowe has 5-6 story high buildings in town centre  It will be a new town and need to therefore think how high  buildings should be. 30m = 10 stories  Concerns about building on Fen Land, especially if high  (sinking/ subsidence)  Concern that public only has until 10 April to respond  Advice to keep focused on key things!  Require a follow-up meeting for PC to ratify response | Draft response to be amended, circulated to members and ratified before APM on 3rd May |
| 148/16-17 | **District Councillor report**  Cllr Tuner will take key points to R Britton of U&C re. Infrastructure, cycle routes & buses; A10: all developers along A10 will have to contribute to the upgrade, notjust U&C. |  |
| 149/16-17 | **County Councillor report**  Cllr Williams was not present and no report was sent |  |
| 150/16-17 | **Publication policy**  Publication policy had been circulated prior to the meeting. Adoption proposed by Cllr. Kitt, seconded by Cllr. Greed and agreed unanimously. |  |
| 151/16-17 | **Financial regulations update**  Financial regulations updated in line with NALC guidance. Adoption proposed by Cllr. Greed, seconded by Cllr. Pleasants and agreed unanimously |  |
| 152/16-17 | **Lights outside Village Hall**  Young resident had requested that more lights were added outside the village hall so that green could be used more during the hours of darkness especially in winter.  HVHT chairman reported that the Trust had also been approached and will discuss and report back but there is a cost implication. There are concerns about vandalism and that lights would affect night life such as insects/bats. CCTV was suggested but there are legal implications for monitoring. Chair suggested contacting Chair of Fen Ditton who could advise on regulations regarding CCTV as they’ve been through the process e.g. data protection & filming children. | MS – contact details to MH |
| 153/16-17 | **Report on SE Parish Patch Meeting Older People's Services & proposal to consult with HRA and Waterbeach**  MS reported on SE Parish Patch Meeting Older People's Services & proposal to consult with HRA and Waterbeach as CCC services are experiencing financial cuts.  MS proposed consider time sharing with Waterbeach. Defer until next meeting & MS to contact other PCs. | MS to FDPC and WBPC |
| 154/16-17 | **Preparation for Annual Meeting of the Parish Council and Annual Assembly of the Parish - APM**  Clerk has started to invite speakers to APM on 3rd May. List to be circulated for additions/amendments.  AGM: Councillors will need to update declarations of interest and give to the clerk; meeting will include election of Chair and Vice Chair and review of responsibilities. | MS to circulate responsibilities list |
| 155/16-17 | **A14C2H - mobile visitor centre now available for booking**  No interest at present |  |
| 156/16-17 | **LHI funding for Mobile VAS**  The chair congratulated Cllr. Kitt and the Clerk on securing this funding and thanked them for the work involved.  The clerk should hear from CCC soon and a site visit will be arranged & exact specification of equipment agreed. |  |
| 157/16-17 | **Finance**   1. Payments since last meeting 2. 1) HRA Grant 1000.00 Chq 650 3. SLCC- Clerk Membership 60.50 Chq 651 4. Cambs ACRE-Payroll 36.00 Chq 652 5. The following payments were approved and signed   1) H Livermore-Expenses 79.28 Chq 653  2) CAPALC- Chairman training 105.00 Chq 654  3) M Starkie-Expenses 82.96 Chq 656   1. Budget update-16-17   Budget update given. Spending is in line with budget.   1. Bank reconciliation   Circulated before the meeting. As of 17/2/17 there is £22,907 across the 2 accounts.   1. HRA Grant application- The HRA application had been discussed and agreed at a previous meeting and the full application had been circulated before the meeting. Approval of grant for £400 towards village day was proposed by J Kitt, seconded by A Nealy and agreed unanimously. |  |
| 158/16-17 | Clerks report  None |  |
| 159/16-17 | **Correspondence**   1. Michael Hellowell re Insurance for trusts 2. PCSO Leanne Fisher re village parking problems 3. Capalc re S137 allowance for 2017-18 4. Cambridgeshire County Council- Surfacing works 5. SCDC- Application for law development certificate- 3 Kings Cottage, Clayhithe Road, Horningsea, Cambridge 6. SCDC- Application for law development certificate- Kings Barn, High Street, Horningsea, Cambridge | Noted  Noted  Noted  On website  Noted  Noted |
| 160/16-17 | **Local recognition of volunteers**  Agreed at previous meeting that this is done at every APM. Recipient and form of award proposed for May meeting by M. Starkie; seconded by J. Kitt and agreed unanimously | Confidential note |
| 161/16-17 | **Village signs**  Due to several deer deaths and this being a potential accident hazard, Cllrs agreed to ask CCC for deer warning sign. | MS to Nicola Burdon |
| 162/16-17 | **Village website**  Deferred to next meeting | Clerk and RB |
| 163/16-17 | **Safety and Security in Horningsea**  Horningsea MS had talked to PCSO about assault on resident; victim support had been offered and enquiries ongoing.  Three shed break-ins on the night of 28 March. MS had attended Safety meeting at SCDC led by police – information circulated. |  |
| 164/16-17 | **To Accept notices & Matters for the next Agenda**  PC representative to attend Licencing service of new vicar  Meeting closed at 22:15 | Inform Lindsay Davies of representative |

Appendix 1

|  |
| --- |
| **Appendix 1 – Report of Local Plan Waterbeach Session 28th March 2017**  The Inspector, Laura Graham, explained that she would allow only comments raised in representations. She was aware of OPA but would not be discussing it as it was not in her jurisdiction and the consultation was still open.  Her approach to SCDC modification to proposals was that there would be no discussion but she had some questions as to why the council thinks modification necessary to improve soundness. She will then come to a view as to whether they are necessary for soundness and then they will have to be advertised and she will consider any comments.  Representations had been received from County Councillor for division and four reseidents.  Two late submissions had been made but the inspector declined to accept them (one was Network Rail; the other was a statement by an MP and could be construed as libellous).  Quantum and timing of development - from representations tied in with transport viability  Representatives questioned the infrastructure as sufficient to cope with current traffic and increased would result because of development causing rat runs on roads with poor condition roads. A10 serves south and east Cambridgeshire and existing developments in Ely so needs a clear policy on A10 before WB.  SCDC responded that it was not sound to hold back development of new town. Does not remove need for development to be supported by infrastructure for all stages and draws on Transport strategy 2015. They also questioned whether Northstowe and WB could be delivered at same time. SCDC responded that there are challenges to targets for growth so working on early delivery although Northstowe has lagged behind.  SCDC plan was prepared in tandem with Transport strategy. A10 corridor future prioritisation of city deal funding, east fringe and WB planning. SCDC plan was submitted with evidence base on transport and that infrastructure can be delivered on time for need. Fourth strand wider context of beyond Ely demand. Not for WB developers to pick up the issues of A 10 to solve problems.  The examiner clarified that she understand that the concern is that the WB development will add to the issues on the A10 and that there are other partners. SCDC recognises these issues but look at wider issue highways - e.g. Cycle & walking, rail station and public transport  Any requirement to enhance A10 is in policy and the timing of these phase of development.  Another concern was the quantum of develoment and how the site has been designated brownfield when a large part is farmland  SCDV responded that the national definition includes curtelage of airfields which can also be built on. This is an area of growth so council must take into account availability of brownfield.  Another concer was the height of buildings to make viable density. 6 to 8 storeys were not suitable for a fenland site. SCDC responded that there were no requirements in LP for high buildings to meet density.They are proposing WB as an urban town so this quantum of development reasonable with high quality development as in policy direction.  Concerns were raised on financial viability and funding reliance on city deal as not in first tranche and possibly on third. SCDC rspondednthat it was not in tranche one of City Deal commitment to A10 but City Deal will give prioritisation to take account of LP  LG commented that she had looked at City Deal in relation to A428 but had not picked up on A10. What funding is available at an early stage and will it not be there at beginning of the development so that infrastructure is in place right from the beginning? Transport strategy identified £20 million required for the complete A10 corridor. Some from this development and other i.e. 1 and 2 tranche of City Deal. Investment must support strategy of local plan with second tranche 2019. LG agreed that Treasury will only release tranche 2 when tranche one performance good, i.e. meets triggers  A10 study looked at planned growth both in greater Cambs and outside, range of partners fund that study to look at that corridor development. Will test the various mitigation measures and if more mitigation needed and the phasing and if more funding needed.will help council to understand the needs and mitigation for early stages of development and what needed when the major part started  Infrastructure delivery doc gives more information but does not include the devolution deal  LG asked how the council wants to deal with this devolution issue. If they want it brought into the LP it will have implications.  SCDC QC responded that he would take instructions as he could not answer now.  LG asked who was responsible for the A0 - not a trunk so responsibility of CCC not Highways England.  SCDC recognises the need for 40% affordable housing and this has not been achieved in other developments. Recognise the price differentials across housing areas. Their starting point is 40% affordable housing on this site but will depend on viability in the planning applications. National policy changing on affordable housing which could potentially impact  Concern was expressed because originally 900 to 1500 houses planned and so infrastructure could be in place in time but now that the development is much larger and the infrastructure will not be in place. Quantum and timing in original plan gave green space between WB but now much bigger and so green space needed more. When A10 blocked WB becomes gridlocked and pressure on Station Road level crossing and Clayhithe bridge. So A10 improvements are needed to prevent exacerbation of issues within the village accidents etc. Not just A10 corridor but the ancillary roads  SCDC responded that new station will give improved transport and there is access to the new station at Chesterton. In submitted plan and modification there is recognition that the development coming forward will have to take into account the pressure on A10 and ancillary roads |