

A meeting of the **OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY PANEL (ENVIRONMENTAL WELL-BEING)** will be held in **CIVIC SUITE 1A, PATHFINDER HOUSE, ST MARY'S STREET, HUNTINGDON, CAMBS PE29 3TN** on **MONDAY, 5 DECEMBER 2011** at **7:00 PM** and you are requested to attend for the transaction of the following business:-

**Contact
(01480)**

APOLOGIES

1. MINUTES (Pages 1 - 8)

To approve as a correct record the Minutes of the meeting held on 8th November 2011.

**Mrs A Jerrom
388009**

2. MEMBERS' INTERESTS

To receive from Members, declarations as to personal and/or prejudicial interests and the nature of those interests in relation to any Agenda item. Please see notes 1 and 2 overleaf.

3. LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT 2000: FORWARD PLAN (Pages 9 - 12)

A copy of the current Forward Plan, which was published on 10th November 2011, is attached. Members are invited to note the Plan and to comment as appropriate on any items contained therein.

**Mrs H Taylor
388008**

4. ROLL FORWARD OF THE COUNCIL'S CORE STRATEGY - ITS LOCAL PLAN (Pages 13 - 16)

To receive a report by the Head of Planning Services outlining the requirement for a review of the Council's planning policy.

**S Ingram
388400**

5. RAF BRAMPTON URBAN DESIGN FRAMEWORK (Pages 17 - 36)

To consider a report by the Head of Planning regarding the recent consultation on the draft RAF Brampton Urban Design Framework.

**P Bland
388430**

6. DRAINAGE ISSUES

To consider a petition presented by Parish Councillor Mrs A Rees containing 257 signatures in respect of sewage overflow at Windsor Road and Main Street, Yaxley, a matter which is considered to be of general concern affecting the District.

The Petition has been referred to the Panel from the Council meeting on Wednesday 2nd November 2011.

The petitioners have made the following statement –

“Yaxley Village has for many years had problems with the overflowing of sewage into the surface water when flooding occurs at the bottom of Windsor Road and Main Street. On 23rd September 2011 sewage overflowed into Yaxley Lode and caused pollution of the Lode this affected fish, wildlife and the environment. Anglian Water is responsible for this pollution and should correct the cause for the future and health of Yaxley residents, businesses and homes’.

7. WORKPLAN STUDIES

To consider, with the aid of a report by the Head of Legal and Democratic Services, the current programme of Overview and Scrutiny studies.

**Mrs A Jerrom
388009**

8. OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY PANEL PROGRESS (Pages 37 - 42)

To consider a report by the Head of Legal and Democratic Services on decisions taken by the Panel.

9. SCRUTINY

To scrutinise decisions as set out in the Decision Digest and to raise any other matters for scrutiny that fall within the remit of the Panel. (To follow).

Dated this 25 day of November
2011



Head of Paid Service

Notes

1. *A personal interest exists where a decision on a matter would affect to a greater extent than other people in the District –*
 - (a) *the well-being, financial position, employment or business of the Councillor, their family or any person with whom they had a close association;*
 - (b) *a body employing those persons, any firm in which they are a partner and any company of which they are directors;*
 - (c) *any corporate body in which those persons have a beneficial interest in a class of securities exceeding the nominal value of £25,000; or*

(d) *the Councillor's registerable financial and other interests.*

2. *A personal interest becomes a prejudicial interest where a member of the public (who has knowledge of the circumstances) would reasonably regard the Member's personal interest as being so significant that it is likely to prejudice the Councillor's judgement of the public interest.*

Please contact Mrs A Jerrom, Democratic Services, Telephone: 01480 388009, email: amanda.jerrom@huntingdonshire.gov.uk if you have a general query on any Agenda Item, wish to tender your apologies for absence from the meeting, or would like information on any decision taken by the Committee/Panel.

Specific enquiries with regard to items on the Agenda should be directed towards the Contact Officer.

Members of the public are welcome to attend this meeting as observers except during consideration of confidential or exempt items of business.

Agenda and enclosures can be viewed on the District Council's website – www.huntingdonshire.gov.uk (*under Councils and Democracy*).

If you would like a translation of Agenda/Minutes/Reports or would like a large text version or an audio version please contact the Democratic Services Manager and we will try to accommodate your needs.

Emergency Procedure

In the event of the fire alarm being sounded and on the instruction of the Meeting Administrator, all attendees are requested to vacate the building via the closest emergency exit.

This page is intentionally left blank

Agenda Item 1

HUNTINGDONSHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

MINUTES of the meeting of the OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY PANEL (ENVIRONMENTAL WELL-BEING) held in Civic Suite 1a, Pathfinder House, St Mary's Street, Huntingdon, Cambs PE29 3TN on Tuesday, 8 November 2011.

- PRESENT: Councillor P M D Godfrey – Chairman.
- Councillors M G Baker, Mrs M Banerjee, I J Curtis, J W Davies, P Godley, G J Harlock and J S Watt.
- Co-opted Members Messrs D Hopkins and M Phillips.
- APOLOGIES: Apologies for absence from the meeting were submitted on behalf of Councillors D Harty and C R Hyams.
- IN ATTENDANCE: Councillors Mrs B E Boddington, B S Chapman, D B Dew, N J Guyatt and D M Tysoe.

44. MINUTES

The Minutes of the meeting of the Panel held on 12th October 2011 were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

45. MEMBERS' INTERESTS

No declarations were received.

46. GREAT FEN PROJECT PRESENTATION

(Councillor D B Dew, the Council's representative on the Great Fen Project Board, was in attendance for consideration of this item.)

Following an introduction by Councillor Dew, the Panel received a presentation giving an overview and update on the Great Fen project by the Great Fen Project Manager, Ms Kate Carver, with assistance from Mr John Orr, of the Environment Agency who was also the Chairman of the Great Fen Project Board. Ms Carver had been invited to the meeting by the Chairman following his attendance at the Great Fen Community Forum meeting in October 2011, where the presentation had been well received.

Ms Carver explained that the long term vision for the Project was to create 3,700 hectares of wetland between Huntingdon and Peterborough on land adjacent to the existing national nature reserves of Holme Fen and Woodwalton Fen. The Project was managed through a partnership between the Environment Agency, the District Council, the Middle Level Commissioners, Natural England and the Wildlife Trust for Bedfordshire, Cambridgeshire,

Northamptonshire and Peterborough. It aimed to restore the habitat and promote the biodiversity of the area. Financial assistance had been received from the heritage lottery fund, which had helped the partnership to acquire 55% of the total Project land.

Ms Carver advised that the partnership had now been established on a more formal basis. This would put the partners in a better position to achieve the aims of the Project in relation to the natural and historic environment and achieving social, economic and climate benefits. Furthermore, planning permission had recently been granted for a visitor and information centre at New Decoy Farm, which would enhance public access to wildlife areas and a circular walking route.

Mr Orr explained the importance of the Project in terms of conservation and climate change and highlighted the potential for water storage on the land to help the area to cope with fluctuations in rainfall. He also stressed the importance of reversing the process of peat loss.

The Council's Corporate Team Manager with responsibility for Economic Development gave details of the economic benefits that were expected to be created in the area. Ms Donnellan explained that over the next 4 to 6 months her team would be looking at maximising opportunities for tourism and visitor spending. It was also expected that there would be an added benefit through the creation of volunteering opportunities in connection with the Council's job clubs for the unemployed. In answer to questions from the Panel, Members were informed that real benefits could be secured for the surrounding villages by attracting bird watchers to the area and that such tourism initiatives already had been developed and proved to be viable.

The Chairman thanked both Ms Carver and Mr Orr for their presentation.

47. GREAT FEN SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING DOCUMENT

(Councillor N J Guyatt, Executive Councillor for Strategic Planning and Housing, was in attendance for consideration of this item.)

Councillor Guyatt introduced a report by the Head of Planning Services (a copy of which is appended in the Minute Book) updating the Panel on the consultation that had been undertaken in respect of the Great Fen Masterplan. If adopted and following the addition of a preface to the document, the Masterplan would provide planning guidance to inform Council policy and decisions on any planning proposals for the area.

The Masterplan had been prepared in conjunction with the Great Fen partners. It referred to the aims and objectives of the Project as set out under the previous item by the Great Fen Project Manager, and to the themes of the Project, namely: habitats, landscape character and structure, land and water management, visitor gateways and access.

Having questioned how the two existing nature reserves would be joined together to form the Great Fen, Members were advised that this would be achieved by converting existing intensively farmed land to arable use and wetland. Although some development would be

possible via permitted rights, other development would be required to follow due process. In response to a further question by Councillor Watt, Members were assured that responses recorded in the consultation document would have been taken from formal written responses.

The Chairman expressed his support for the decision to carry out a new socioeconomic study, which he thought was important given the unexpected speed at which the Project had progressed. He also supported the implementation of the business development study led by Ms Donnellan's team. Having commented that the number of expected visitors to the Project was likely to have been underestimated, the Panel

RESOLVED

that the Cabinet be recommended to approve the Preface text attached at Appendix A to the report now submitted and adopt the Great Fen Masterplan as Huntingdonshire District Council Planning Guidance to inform Council policy and guide Development Management decisions.

48. LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT 2000: FORWARD PLAN

The Panel considered and noted the current Forward Plan of Key Decisions (a copy of which is appended in the Minute Book) which had been prepared by the Executive Leader of the Council for the period 1st November 2011 to 29th February 2012. Having commented on the high number of items in the Plan that fell within the Panel's remit, Members were advised that the item on Gypsies and Travellers had been withdrawn. The item on the Roll Forward of the Core Strategy would be submitted to the Panel's December meeting.

49. CARBON MANAGEMENT PLAN

(Councillor DM Tysoe, Executive Councillor for the Environment, was in attendance for this item).

The Panel considered a report by the Head of Environmental Management (a copy of which is appended in the Minute Book) providing an update on progress against the targets contained in the Council's Carbon Management Plan (CMP). Members noted that achievement of a 15% reduction in its carbon emissions meant that the Council was on course to meet the target to reduce CO₂e by 30% in the period to 2013. A 7% reduction in energy costs had also been achieved over the previous 2 year period.

Members were advised of ongoing works to determine which efficiency saving measures would be most appropriate for each of the Council's 10 main sites and noted that over 70% of the Council's total energy spending had been on the five main sites, which included three leisure centres.

The Panel was informed that the terms of a three year programme to install solar photovoltaic (PV) panels at the Council's main sites had been based on pay back figures using the Government's feed-in tariff. The cut off date before which PV schemes would qualify for income at

the current rate had recently changed and, therefore, figures shown at Annex C of the report would need to be revised. In addition, the recommendation relating to the installation of PV systems would be subject to a reassessment of their viability. The Panel was advised that owing to the change and the resulting decrease in the return on investment which was now expected to be around 6.2%, it was still considered to be advantageous to install PV panels up until 31 March 2012, when the return would be further reduced. However, it might be necessary to reduce the number of site installations.

In response to questions, the Panel was advised that the Council would be looking at reducing carbon emissions as well as saving energy and the Salix Energy Fund would be utilised in this respect. Research continued to be undertaken in conjunction with the leisure centres and other departments in order to identify the most suitable measures with the shortest payback times. Owing to the fact that the market in PV systems was fluctuating, the Panel recommended that the payback calculations should be updated to reflect current market rates.

The Panel was informed that although the Council would not benefit directly from the Government's Green Deal, it would, in conjunction with other local authorities, have a part to play in promoting such energy saving schemes to residents and businesses.

RESOLVED

that on the understanding that that the payback calculations are updated and further analysis of the viability of the project is undertaken in light of government policy changes, the Cabinet be recommended to

- (a) note the good progress that has been made towards the implementation of the Council's Carbon Management Plan and the positive impact this has had on energy use and energy bills at the Council's main sites;
- (b) support ongoing cross-functional energy reviews to maximise cost savings and the continued use of the Salix ring-fenced funding and Environment Strategy Capital funding to implement further energy saving projects, and
- (c) support the installation of Solar PV panels at the Council's main sites which will generate a significant ongoing revenue stream for the Council.

50. LOVES FARM, ST NEOTS

(Councillors Mrs B E Boddington and R J West, Ward Councillors for Gransden and the Offords, Councillor B S Chapman Ward Councillor for Priory Park and Executive Councillor for Customer Services and Councillor N J Guyatt, Executive Councillor for Strategic Planning and Housing, were in attendance for this item.)

Councillor Mrs Boddington addressed the Panel on her concerns over

the appearance of the Loves Farm development in St Neots. Councillors Mrs Boddington and West had been approached by residents of the development because of their membership of the Development Management Panel and the close proximity of their Ward to the area.

Councillor Mrs Boddington highlighted the density of housing within the development and problems associated with it. Residents had complained about the poor appearance of the extremities of the development, which they felt was caused by its design. Attention was drawn to wood cladding that had started to deteriorate and a lack of utility space. Residents also had complained at the narrowness of roads, the lack of footpaths and the absence of street names, all of which caused problems for emergency vehicles. Whilst residents appreciated the excellent work done by the Community Development Officer they were disappointed at delays in the provision of a community centre.

In concurring with Councillor Boddington and residents' views, Councillor West commented on the closure of the rail bridge. He also identified a need for developers to bring roads swiftly up to an acceptable standard in order that they could be adopted without delay.

It was acknowledged that there could often be tensions and differences in priorities between developers and the planning authority but it was stressed that there was a need not only to address the current problems but also to learn from them and to inform the design stages of future developments.

In response, the Head of Planning explained that as with all developments, the planning authority had given due regard to Government policy which at the time Loves Farm was developed, had dictated the housing density levels. Mr Ingram reported that among the positive outcomes from the development had been the provision of a new primary school, which had been completed at an early stage. He also stated that the wood cladding was intended to show signs of weathering and that other issues could be referred to registered social landlords.

The Chairman thanked the Councillors for their comments. The Panel requested a synopsis of the matters that had been discussed and decided that a working group should be convened in the New Year to examine them and make recommendations to inform future developments.

RESOLVED

that Councillors Curtis, Godfrey and Harlock be appointed to a working group to meet with Councillors Mrs Boddington and West to examine the matters raised at the meeting and to make recommendations to inform future developments.

51. HUNTINGDONSHIRE COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE LEVY - DRAFT CHARGING SCHEDULE AND DEVELOPER CONTRIBUTIONS SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING DOCUMENT.

(Councillor N Guyatt, Executive Councillor for Strategic Planning and Housing, was in attendance for consideration of this item.)

Councillor Guyatt introduced two reports by the Head of Planning Services (copies of which are appended in the Minute Book) updating the Panel on the outcomes of the recent consultations on the Huntingdon Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) draft charging schedule and the draft Developer Contributions Supplementary Planning Document (SPD). The CIL draft charging schedule, which had been amended following the consultation, would be submitted for Cabinet approval prior to a final statutory four week consultation period in November/December 2011.

The Panel was informed that the documents represented the Council's framework for charging in relation to the majority of new developments across the District. The CIL had been introduced by the Government in 2010 to allow local planning authorities to raise funds to pay for the infrastructure required as a result of development. It would be based on identified community infrastructure needs and, subject to some exemptions, would be payable per net square metre of floor space. The charges had been calculated following viability testing and would be complementary to the Developer Contributions Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) which would be subject to consultation at the same time.

It was explained that, following the consultation, the SPD would be considered for adoption by Cabinet in December 2011. Once adopted, it would operate alongside the CIL. Following public examination, it was expected that the draft charging schedule would be adopted in Spring 2012.

The Panel was informed that the SPD would provide policy guidance for securing Section 106 planning obligations for a range of site related infrastructure. In response to a question, Members were advised that CIL contributions would be fixed whilst Section 106 contributions, which would run in association with the CIL for larger developments, could be negotiated. Members were informed that the CIL would introduce a charge for smaller developments but that larger developers were likely to pay less than at present. Having questioned the level of charge associated with health related projects, the Panel was advised that the levy had been rigorously tested and it had, in fact, been set at a lower rate than had been deemed viable.

RESOLVED

that the reports by the Head of Planning Services on the Huntingdonshire Community Infrastructure Levy - Draft Charging Schedule and Developer Contributions Supplementary Planning Document and on Developer Contributions Supplementary Planning Document be endorsed for submission to Cabinet.

52. WORKPLAN STUDIES

The Panel considered and noted a report by the Head of Legal and Democratic Services (a copy of which is appended in the Minute Book) informing them of studies that were being undertaken by the other Overview and Scrutiny Panels.

53. OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY PANEL PROGRESS

With the aid of a report by the Head of Legal and Democratic Services (a copy of which is appended in the Minute Book) the Panel was advised of progress on issues that had been previously discussed. With regard to CCTV, Members were informed that a report was to be submitted to the Cabinet on developments that could enable the service to be maintained.

The Panel was advised that a petition regarding drainage issues in Yaxley had been submitted to full Council in November by a member of the public. Councillor Godfrey had agreed that the petition should be considered by the Panel at their December meeting. Having discussed writing to the Chief Executive of Anglian Water on the matter, it was suggested that the Panel might also make contact with representatives of Anglian Water.

54. SCRUTINY

The Panel considered and noted the latest edition of the Council's Decision Digest summarising the Council's decisions since the previous meeting. Having commented on the success of the Council's food hygiene rating scheme, Councillor J W Davies advised Members of the impending migration of it to the Food Services Agency's own scheme.

Chairman

This page is intentionally left blank

FORWARD PLAN OF KEY DECISIONS

Prepared by
Date of Publication:
For Period:

Councillor J D Ablewhite
10 November 2011
1 December 2011 to 31 March 2012

Membership of the Cabinet is as follows:-

Councillor J D Ablewhite	- Leader of the Council, with responsibility for Strategic Economic Development	3 Pettis Road St. Ives Huntingdon PE27 6SR Tel: 01480 466941 E-mail: Jason.Ablewhite@huntingdonshire.gov.uk
Councillor N J Guyatt	- Deputy Leader of the Council with responsibility for Strategic Planning and Housing	6 Church Lane Stibbington Cambs PE8 6LP Tel: 01780 782827 E-mail: Nick.Guyatt@huntingdonshire.gov.uk
Councillor B S Chapman	- Executive Councillor for Organisational Development	6 Kipling Place St. Neots Huntingdon PE19 7RG Tel: 01480 212540 E-mail: Barry.Chapman@huntingdonshire.gov.uk
Councillor J A Gray	- Executive Councillor for Resources	Shufflewick Cottage Station Row Tilbrook PE28 OJY Tel: 01480 861941 E-mail: Jonathan.Gray@huntingdonshire.gov.uk
Councillor D M Tysoe	- Executive Councillor for Environment	Grove Cottage Maltings Lane Ellington Huntingdon PE28 OAA Tel: 01480 388310 E-mail: Darren.Tysoe@huntingdonshire.gov.uk
Councillor T D Sanderson	- Executive Councillor for Healthy and Active Communities	29 Burmoor Close Stukeley Meadows Huntingdon PE29 6GE Tel: 01480 412135 E-mail: Tom.Sanderson@huntingdonshire.gov.uk

Any person who wishes to make representations to the decision maker about a decision which is to be made may do so by contacting Mrs Helen Taylor, Senior Democratic Services Officer on 01480 388008 or E-mail: Helen.Taylor@huntsdc.gov.uk not less than 14 days prior to the date when the decision is to be made.

The documents available may be obtained by contacting the relevant officer shown in this plan who will be responsible for preparing the final report to be submitted to the decision maker on the matter in relation to which the decision is to be made. Similarly any enquiries as to the subject or matter to be tabled for decision or on the availability of supporting information or documentation should be directed to the relevant officer.

Colin Meadowcroft
Head of Legal and Democratic Services

Notes:- (i) Additions/significant changes from the previous Forward are annotated ***
(ii) For information about how representations about the above decisions may be made please see the Council's Petitions Procedure at <http://www.huntsdc.gov.uk/NR/rdonlyres/3F6CFE28-C5F0-4BA0-9BF2-76EBAE06C89D/0/Petitionsleaflet.pdf> or telephone 01480 388006

Subject/Matter for Decision	Decision/ recommendation to be made by	Date decision to be taken	Documents Available	How relevant Officer can be contacted	Consultation	Relevant Executive Councillor	Relevant Overview & Scrutiny Panel
10 Council Tax Base***	Chairman of Corporate Governance and Section 151 Officer	5 Dec 2011	None.	Julia Barber, Head of Customer Services Tel No. 01480 388105 or email Julia.Barber@huntingdonshire.gov.uk		J A Gray	All
Roll Forward of the Council's Core Strategy -Its Local Development Plan	Cabinet	8 Dec 2011	None.	Steve Ingram, Head of Planning Services Tel No 01480 388400 or email Steve.Ingram@huntingdonshire.gov.uk	Update.	N J Guyatt	Environmental Well-Being
Developer Contributions Supplementary Planning Document	Cabinet	8 Dec 2011	Local Infrastructure Framework	Paul Bland, Planning Service Manager (Policy) Tel No. 01480 388430 or email Paul.Bland@huntingdonshire.gov.uk	Endorse as Council policy.	N J Guyatt	Environmental Well-Being
Waste Collection Policies	Cabinet	8 Dec 2011	None.	Eric Kendall, Head of Operations Tel No. 01480 388635 or email Eric.Kendall@huntingdonshire.gov.uk		D Tysoe	Environmental Well-Being

Subject/Matter for Decision	Decision/recommendation to be made by	Date decision to be taken	Documents Available	How relevant Officer can be contacted	Consultation	Relevant Executive Councillor	Relevant Overview & Scrutiny Panel
Great Fen Supplementary Planning Document	Cabinet	8 Dec 2011	Great Fen SPD	Paul Bland, Planning Service Manager (Policy) Tel No. 01480 388340 or email Paul.Bland@huntsdc.gov.uk	Endorse as Council policy (further details required)	N J Guyatt	Environmental Well-Being
RAF Brampton Urban Design Framework	Cabinet	8 Dec 2011	Agreed Urban Design Framework	Paul Bland, Planning Service Manager (Policy) Tel No. 01480 388430 or email Paul.Bland@huntingdonshire.gov.uk	Adopt as Council Policy.	N J Guyatt	Environmental Well-Being
Draft MTP	Cabinet	8 Dec 2011	None.	Steve Couper, Head of Financial Services Tel No. 01480 388103 or email Steve.Couper@huntingdonshire.gov.uk		J A Gray	Economic Well-Being
CIL Charging Schedule***	Cabinet	19 Jan 2012	Local Investment Framework Viability Reports	Steve Ingram, Head of Planning Services Tel No. 01480 388400 or email Steve.Ingram@huntingdonshire.gov.uk		N J Guyatt	Environmental Well-Being
Budget and MTP***	Cabinet	16 Feb 2012	Draft MTP, Previous Year's budget report, Various Annexes	Steve Couper, Head of Financial Services Tel No. 01480 388103 or email Steve.Couper@huntingdonshire.gov.uk	Overview and Scrutiny (Economic Well-Being). 2nd February 2012.	J A Gray	Overview and Scrutiny (Economic Well-Being)
Cambridgeshire Green Infrastructure Strategy	Cabinet	19 Jan 2012	Cambs County Council-Led Project	Paul Bland, Planning Service Manager (Policy) Tel No. 01480 388340 or email Paul.Bland@huntsdc.gov.uk	Endorse as Council Policy (subject to County Council progress).	N J Guyatt	Environmental Well-Being
Cambridgeshire Future Transport - Transport for Cambridgeshire	Cabinet	19 Jan 2012	None.	Paul Bland, Planning Service Manager (Policy) Tel No. 01480 388430 or email Paul.Bland@huntingdonshire.gov.uk	Update on emerging options and recommendations.	N J Guyatt	Environmental Well-Being

Subject/Matter for Decision	Decision/ recommendation to be made by	Date decision to be taken	Documents Available	How relevant Officer can be contacted	Consultation	Relevant Executive Councillor	Relevant Overview & Scrutiny Panel
Huntingdon West Master Plan	Cabinet	19 Jan 2012	Huntingdon West Action Plan	Paul Bland, Planning Service Manager (Policy) Tel No 01480 388430 or email Paul.Bland@huntingdonshire.gov.uk		N J Guyatt	Environmental Well-Being
Voluntary Sector Support	Cabinet	19 Jan 2012	None.	Dan Smith, Community Health Manager Tel No 01480 388377 or email Dan.Smith@huntingdonshire.gov.uk		T D Sanderson	Social Well-Being
Location of the Call Centre	Cabinet	19 Jan 2012	Previous Cabinet Papers	Julia Barber, Head of Customer Services Tel No 01480 388105 or email Julia.Barber@huntingdonshire.gov.uk		J A Gray	Economic Well-Being
Planning for Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDs)	Cabinet	19 Jan 2012	CCC SuDs Options Paper	Paul Bland, Planning Service Manager (Policy) Tel No 01480 388430 or email Paul.Bland@huntingdonshire.gov.uk	Consider options.	N J Guyatt	Environmental Well-Being
Treasury Management Strategy and Prudential Indicators***	Cabinet	16 Feb 2012	Previous year's Strategy	Steve Couper, Head of Financial Services Tel No. 01480 388103 or email Steve.Couper@huntingdonshire.gov.uk	Overview and Scrutiny (Economic Well-Being). 2nd February 2012.	J A Gray	Overview and Scrutiny (Economic Well-Being)
St. Neots Town Centre Urban Design Framework***	Cabinet	22 Mar 2012	Options Paper	Paul Bland, Planning Service Manager (Policy) Tel No. 01480 388430 or email Paul.Bland@huntingdonshire.gov.uk	Approve for public consultation.	N J Guyatt	Environmental Well-Being

**COMT
OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY
CABINET**

**14th November 2011
5th December 2011
8th December 2011**

**UPDATE OF THE COUNCIL'S CORE STRATEGY –
ITS LOCAL PLAN
(Report by Head of Planning Services)**

1. INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 The purpose of this report is to inform Cabinet about the need for the Council to consider updating its Core Strategy - in order to provide Huntingdonshire with a suitably robust on-going local planning policy and development framework. Current emerging changes in the national planning policy position and within our local circumstances have effectively accelerated the need for the Council to pro-actively reconsider our local planning policy position.
- 1.2 The designation of the Alconbury Airfield Enterprise Zone triggers the requirement for the Council to consider undertaking a review of the District's Development Plan Documents. A review of our local planning policy position is therefore now considered to be necessary. It is anticipated that the undertaking of such an exercise, although potentially initially resource hungry, will leave the Council more appropriately placed to guide and accommodate the district's future sustainable growth needs.

2. BACKGROUND

- 2.1 The Adopted Core Strategy 2009 sets out the Council's strategic planning and sustainable development strategies for the period up to 2026. The Core Strategy is the spatial expression of the Council's aspirations for the growth, conservation and environmental enhancement of the district. It is the primary planning policy document within the Local Development Framework - and as such it effectively constitutes the approved 'local plan' for our area.
- 2.2 Huntingdonshire is one of a minority of local planning authorities that have successfully managed to adopt a Core Strategy. In September 2010, in considering the potential implications of the then intended revocation of the Regional Spatial Strategy, the Council also specifically reinforced its on-going commitment to the Core Strategy as the Council's primary planning policy document.
- 2.3 The emerging new National Planning Policy Framework, which will replace all existing national planning policy guidance, is likely to require all local planning authorities to look to revise their local planning policies and to update their local growth requirements. This revision will be required in order to address the fundamental changes in the local policy position which will be brought about by the significant reduction in national planning policy guidance.
- 2.4 The designation of the Alconbury Airfield Enterprise Zone also automatically triggers the need for the Council to consider revising and updating the Huntingdonshire Core Strategy. As Members will be aware Urban&Civic, the owners and potential developers of Alconbury airfield,

have also already commenced a consultation exercise regarding their intended development of the whole area within their ownership. This anticipates a substantial investment giving rise to the proposed creation of 8,000 new jobs, the building of up to 5,000 associated new dwellings, the potential provision of a new railway station (and other local transport improvements) and the delivery of a range of new educational and other community facilities. It is their stated intention to submit an outline planning application in the spring of 2012.

- 2.5 The Council would have had to consider updating the Core Strategy within relatively short timescales anyway - as additional housing and other sustainable growth requirements emerged – but this requirement has now been effectively accelerated by the committed and emerging proposals for the redevelopment of Alconbury airfield.

3. UPDATING THE EXISTING CORE STRATEGY

- 3.1 The Adopted Core Strategy was developed having regard to an extensive local and sub-regional evidence base. It remains an appropriately robust mechanism both to assess current planning and development proposals and to promote the positive sustainable growth of the District. Given this evidence base and the recent consideration and adoption of the Core Strategy this process of updating is not anticipated to materially alter the overall approach of the existing Core Strategy as there is no identified or justified basis for doing so. Instead it is presently contemplated that the existing Core Strategy will continue to be used as a sound basis for meeting our currently defined sustainable development needs.

- 3.2 Looking forward it is considered that the emerging National Planning Policy Framework will provide a streamlined context for developing a new local planning position. The Adopted Core Strategy is based on sound evidence of need for its scale and directions of growth. Therefore it is proposed that the Council should effectively maintain its support for them. The proposed local plan would need to develop a local strategy to incorporate the scale of new development envisaged for the extended period up to 2036. It is intended that this would be a comprehensive local plan that would incorporate both new local planning policies and identify development allocations.

- 3.3 It is considered that this approach of ‘retaining’ the development proposals contained within the Adopted Core Strategy would remove any uncertainty regarding the weight that could continue to be attached to the Council’s adopted ‘plan’. Any such uncertainty would have the clear potential to undermine prospective investment within the area, be challenged by interested parties and give rise to the promotion of a number of inappropriate and speculative alternative development proposals.

4. UPDATING THE LOCAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN

- 4.1 Planning for the district’s future needs would require an updating of the Council’s development strategy, for the period up to 2036, in order to be able to incorporate in a satisfactory and sustainable way the scale of additional new development that it is considered will need to be delivered.

- 4.2 That updated strategy for future growth would need to be based on sound evidence of the local need for additional economic growth, associated housing development and related infrastructure delivery; have regard to

the existing and potential environmental capacity of Huntingdonshire's market towns (to be able to sustainably accommodate any additional growth); and require the development of an associated local infrastructure strategy which could demonstrate how that growth could be satisfactorily accommodated. This updated local evidence base, sections of which will be produced in partnership with colleagues across Cambridgeshire and the LEP area, will effectively shape the plan going forward.

4.3 To ensure a robust strategy is in place to meet the current and future development needs of Huntingdonshire, and to ensure that a sound policy and delivery framework is in place to shape emerging major development proposals, the roll forward of the Core Strategy would need to be completed as early as possible in line with the applicable legislative and process requirements.

5. RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Therefore it is recommended that the Cabinet;

- a. Formally confirms the Council's intentions to review and update its Core Strategy in the manner set out in this report - and endorses the proposal for the Council to produce a new Local Plan in order to achieve this.
- b. In the interim, giving the on-going discernable growth demands on the area, maintains its support for the Adopted Core Strategy as a sound basis for making relevant planning decisions.
- c. Endorses the commencement of work, with partners as may be applicable, on compiling an updated local evidence base. That evidence base will identify what growth will be needed and how that additional growth could be appropriately and sustainably accommodated.
- d. Requires the Head of Planning Services to readily bring forward an updated Local Development Scheme (which will outline the timetable for preparing and delivering this new local plan).

Background Papers:

The Adopted Huntingdonshire Core Strategy 2009

The Draft National Planning Policy Framework CLG 2011

CONTACT OFFICER - enquiries about this report to Steve Ingram, Head of Planning Services, on 01480 388400.

This page is intentionally left blank

1. COMT	14 TH NOVEMBER 2011
2. DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT PANEL	21 ST NOVEMBER 2011
3. OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY (ENVIRONMENTAL WELLBEING)	5 TH DECEMBER 2011
4. CABINET	8 TH DECEMBER 2011

RAF BRAMPTON URBAN DESIGN FRAMEWORK (Report by Head of Planning Services)

1. INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 The purpose of this report is to update Cabinet regarding the recent consultation about the draft RAF Brampton Urban Design Framework (Draft UDF) and, taking account of any appropriate additional comments from the Overview and Scrutiny (Environmental Wellbeing) Panel and the Development Management Panel, to recommend the approval of the Draft UDF (incorporating minor adjustments) as planning guidance to inform the development of Council policy and the consideration of potential planning applications.

2. BACKGROUND INFORMATION

- 2.1 The Draft UDF seeks to establish positive planning, urban design, and development principles for the potential development at RAF Brampton in line with the principles established in the adopted Huntingdonshire Core Strategy (2009). In particular, the Draft UDF provides a framework to enable the delivery of a high quality, sustainable, mixed-use development.
- 2.2 At the Core Strategy Examination in Public, an independent Planning Inspector examined the principle of development in this area and found it to be sound. The following extracts from Planning Inspector's report, dated 29th July 2009, confirm the basis on which RAF Brampton was selected.

3.43 In the case of the Huntingdon Spatial Planning Area this includes Godmanchester and Brampton. Godmanchester is virtually contiguous to Huntingdon and relies on the market town for most of its needs, and at RAF Brampton there is an extensive area of previously developed land which can be used for large scale mixed development, avoiding the need to take further greenfield land around Huntingdon. I find this to be a sound and realistic approach which would recognise the close relationship between the Market Town and the Key Service Centres nearby. These developments with their improved public transport will be served by Huntingdon railway station and extensive bus services, including the new priority bus and guided bus route linking Huntingdon / St Ives with Cambridge.

3.46 With its grouping of settlements within the Spatial Planning Area Huntingdon has ample opportunity for sustainable growth. There is previously developed land at Huntingdon West which is the subject of a forthcoming Area Action Plan. Brampton and Godmanchester are closely linked to Huntingdon and RAF Brampton, a previously developed site, has

potential for mixed use after 2012. Although the Godmanchester and Fenstanton developments may have to wait for road improvements, the development at Huntingdon West and RAF Brampton is not similarly constrained.

- 2.3 The Draft UDF was subject to extensive public consultation between 12th September and 21st October 2011. The consultation was well publicised in 'Brampton Matters' (the village magazine), the local press, on posters and flyers, and through the Parish and District Council websites. A pre-consultation event staffed by Planning Services officers was held on 5th September 2011. Consultation exhibitions were staged at Brampton Memorial Centre during the consultation period and again these were staffed by Planning Services officers on 22nd September and 3rd October 2011. An evening village meeting was held on 12th September 2011 where Planning Services officers presented the Draft UDF and answered questions. Some 80 members of the public attended. A substantial and detailed response was received from the Parish Council along with comments from statutory consultees. In total, 166 written responses were received from 52 respondents.
- 2.4 For planning purposes, within the adopted Core Strategy, RAF Brampton is identified as a strategic area of mixed-use development within the built up area.
- 2.5 The Draft UDF preferred option sets out urban design principles, places significant emphasis on providing enhanced public open space, ensures integration with Brampton village, and reflects the historic form in particular through protecting and enhancing the setting of Brampton Park House and referencing the existing structure of the site.
- 2.6 With regard to the capacity of development at RAF Brampton, as identified in the Draft UDF, the site has capacity for 400 dwellings, 3.2ha of employment land, provision for one or two neighbourhood shops, community facilities, and publically accessible open space. A plan showing the proposed disposition of land uses (taken from the Draft UDF) is at Appendix A.

3. CONSULTATION THEMES

- 3.1 A summary of the consultation comments and the District Council responses can be found at Appendix B. The main consultation themes that emerged were as follows:
- Retention of Brampton Park Theatre
 - Traffic and transport
 - Footpaths and cycle paths
 - Flooding
 - Housing
 - Trees and open space
 - Social infrastructure
 - Environmental infrastructure
 - Proposed shop
 - Process issues

4. CONCLUSIONS

- 4.1 A range of comments was received on the proposals set out in the Draft UDF. There is little evidence of challenge to the principles of a significant mixed-use development on this site. There is both support for and objection in parts to the detail within the Draft UDF. The main objections derive from users and supporters of the Brampton Park Theatre, many of whom live in Brampton itself. Following a request from some of these objectors, members of the Parish Council and recommendations of the RAF Brampton Working Group, alternative plans will be incorporated into the final document to show the potential retention of the theatre building or the theatre plus the attached junior ranks mess respectively.
- 4.2 It is considered that the principles set out in the Draft UDF establish a robust framework for the delivery of the District Council's adopted Core Strategy policies for mixed-use development in this area. The Draft UDF secures the opportunity to create a high quality, mixed-use development set within a mature landscaped framework with important integration with Brampton village
- 4.3 It is intended that the UDF will be used as planning guidance to inform emerging Council planning policies and to provide a robust framework for the consideration of any planning applications received in the interim.

5. RECOMMENDATION

- 5.1 It is recommended that Cabinet authorises the Executive Councillor for Strategic Planning and Housing, in conjunction with the Chairman of the Development Management Panel and the Head of Planning Services, to finalise and approve the RAF Brampton Urban Design Framework as planning guidance to inform Council policy and Development Management decisions on potential planning applications.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

Draft RAF Brampton Urban Design Framework September 2011

(This document can be found on the HDC website at the following link:

[http://www.huntingdonshire.gov.uk/Planning/Urban%20Design/Brampton/Pages/RAF BramptonUrbanDesignFramework.aspx](http://www.huntingdonshire.gov.uk/Planning/Urban%20Design/Brampton/Pages/RAF%20BramptonUrbanDesignFramework.aspx))

Adopted Huntingdonshire Core Strategy 2009

Contact Officer: Paul Bland – Planning Services Manager (Policy)
☎ 01480 388430
Alison Wood – Urban Design Officer
☎ 01480 388476

APPENDIX A

PLAN OF RAF BRAMPTON – PROPOSED DISPOSITION OF LAND USES

APPENDIX B

**SUMMARY OF DRAFT RAF BRAMPTON URBAN DESIGN FRAMEWORK
CONSULTATION COMMENTS AND DISTRICT COUNCIL RESPONSES**

This page is intentionally left blank

Drawing: RAF Brampton Urban Design Framework - Map 15 Land Uses

Application Ref: N/A



Location: Brampton

Item:

This page is intentionally left blank

APPENDIX B

RAF Brampton Urban Design Framework Summary of Consultation Comments and District Council Responses

Principle, scale and location of proposed development	
Summary of Consultation Comments	District Council Responses
<p>There is general support from respondents from Brampton relating to the proposed development, safeguarding significant trees and providing open space and linking the development to Brampton village.</p> <p>One consultee noted that it is not necessary to build new homes on a site that is a very short distance from a major Waste Management Site (with a 24 hour usage capability)</p> <p>Reference to the site's military heritage and archaeological potential should be further referenced</p> <p>Concern over parking and full capacity of village Doctors surgery.</p>	<p>The District Council must deliver its adopted Core Strategy, which seeks to provide a mixed use development at RAF Brampton. The principle, scale and location are set out in the Core Strategy. This Draft UDF has no policy making role in relation to principle, scale and location of development.</p> <p>Noted as above. The adjacent Waste Management site does not yet have a 24 hour licence.</p> <p>To be incorporated into the final UDF.</p> <p>Car parking capacity within the proposed RAF Brampton development area is considered to be satisfactory. Car parking capacity for existing facilities in Brampton village may need to be reviewed and this will be taken forward in conjunction with the Parish Council, Cambridgeshire County Council and relevant interested parties.</p>
Retention of Brampton Park Theatre	
Summary of Consultation Comments	District Council Responses
<p>Users and friends of Brampton Little Theatre have expressed that they would like to see the 'theatre' building retained. The theatre together with the attached Airmen's Mess building could be redeveloped into an Arts Centre, providing cultural facilities for Brampton; it could also provide changing rooms for the sports pitches.</p>	<p>Save the Theatre Action Group have been advised that a 'theatre' in itself does not provide a multi-use community building as required by the development to meet community needs of the residents. However alternative options Plan B and Plan C will be included within the final UDF which leave the way open for the action group to purchase the building. It is however doubtful if changing rooms at this location would meet Football Foundation criteria.</p>

<p>The building has been registered on the Theatres Trust's Building's At Risk register. The Parish Council, Theatres Trust, Brampton Park Theatre Company and Brampton Choral Society should be consulted on Plan B.</p> <p>S106 / Community Infrastructure Levy funding could be used to refurbish the building, this being more pragmatic use of the funding than any new-build community building. A business case shows that an Arts Centre can survive without ongoing subsidy, and there is local support for it.</p>	<p>Noted. Appropriate contact with The Theatre's Trust will be maintained.</p> <p>Whilst there is an active support group, some of whom are Brampton based, the support is, as yet, unquantified. The parties interested in the retention of the building will need to provide appropriate evidence of viability and refurbishment within their business plans costs if they intend to seek developer contributions for refurbishment. Other sources of capital and revenue funding may also need to be investigated.</p>
Traffic and Transport	
Summary of Consultation Comments	District Council Responses
<p>The roads into Huntingdon are barely managing to carry traffic in the morning; additional 500 vehicles coming off the site will only make matters worse. Concern of additional congestion along the High Street and Church Road at peak times.</p> <p>Parish Council welcomes the proposed mini roundabout on the High Street, Church Road and Buckden Road junction and also the reopening of the Park Lane exit onto Buckden Road.</p> <p>Parking along the High Street outside the shops is problematic; there is an opportunity to remodel this area to provide a lay-by, which this development could fund.</p> <p>The road / track to Park Road from the site should be reconnected – access will be required by emergency services.</p> <p>Sustainable transport methods could be augmented by frequent and affordable</p>	<p>Cambridgeshire County Council as local highways authority raised no objections in terms of highways capacity and congestion when RAF Brampton was considered at Core Strategy stage. New development proposals will require detailed travel and transport assessments.</p> <p>This issue will be investigated with the CCC as highway authority as proposals for the development of RAF Brampton are brought forward.</p> <p>Car parking capacity for existing facilities in Brampton village may need to be reviewed and this will be taken forward in conjunction with the Parish Council, Cambridgeshire County Council and relevant interested parties.</p> <p>This would be welcomed, however Park Road from the Grafham Road junction to the site is a private road in 3rd party ownership. Any increase in vehicular traffic could increase the usage of the substandard junction onto the A1 northbound from Grafham Road which is dangerous.</p> <p>This issue will be investigated with CCC as highway authority and with bus providers,</p>

<p>community shuttle buses – preferably electric powered to reduce noise and air pollution – to connect to key points within the village and RAF site. A morning and evening peak hour shuttle service could connect the site with Huntingdon railway station, Hinchingsbrooke, and Huntingdon Town Centre.</p> <p>Frequency of bus services needs to increase.</p> <p>Parish Council would like to see each person moving into the site provided with a one year free buss pass by the developers.</p> <p>DIO has no control over any land outside the surplus estate and no control over Annington Homes roads which are proposed for upgrading to adoptable standards.</p> <p>Bus stops should have shelters.</p> <p>Roads within the site must be wide enough for vehicles to park and maintain free flowing traffic including buses.</p> <p>There may be instances where cul-de-sacs are appropriate in the masterplan.</p> <p>The 30mph sign along Buckden Road must be moved south past the Park Lane junction and car garage.</p>	<p>including potential funding sources.</p> <p>This will be investigated with CCC as highway authority and with bus providers.</p> <p>This will be investigated with CCC as highway authority and with bus providers.</p> <p>To be investigated with CCC as highway authority and Annington Homes.</p> <p>Agree - to be investigated with CCC as highway authority, to be included within the final UDF.</p> <p>Agree - to be investigated with CCC as highway authority, to be included within the final UDF.</p> <p>Generally disagree - cul-de-sacs do not allow for permeability throughout the site.</p> <p>To be investigated with CCC as highway authority.</p>
Footpaths and cyclepaths	
Summary of Consultation Comments	District Council Responses
<p>Natural England, the Parish Council and CCC welcomes proposal to enhance pedestrian and cycle connections to existing public rights of way and to the wider countryside such as Brampton Wood SSSI and the Ouse Valley Way. Request that this be a bridleway.</p> <p>Development should contribute to the wider pedestrian / cycle routes to be upgraded to Paxton Pitts.</p> <p>The route to school for secondary school children needs to be carefully considered.</p>	<p>Noted. To be discussed with CCC and the landowner.</p> <p>This matter will be considered in conjunction with CCC.</p> <p>Pavement widths are constrained by existing boundary walls; however this will</p>

<p>Buckden Road and Church Road are narrow and the crossing to the north side of Thrapston Road / Huntingdon Road at the roundabout is dangerous. Use of the east side requires a better crossing of Huntingdon Road.</p> <p>The upgraded footpath across the field to the school must be out of bounds from horse riders. The trees along this route should be retained.</p> <p>The existing rights of way network is fragmented. Wherever possible rights of way need to be bridleways which can be used by walkers, cyclists and horse riders.</p> <p>Requirement for more dog walking routes.</p> <p>The south west part of FP3 around the current perimeter fence leading to Buckden Road should be retained as it is a countryside route and an important link to the Ouse Valley Way and access to the waste tip when it is eventually restored.</p> <p>Stopping up FP3 to the west of the camp is a pity because it is an informal countryside route across fields. Rather than being stopped up it could be linked with the changed route of FP4 to the school and diverted through the tree belt on the western edge of the site.</p> <p>FP2 should not be stopped up, but diverted to the inside of the hedge along the road to the fishing lakes.</p> <p>Brampton is a popular village for horse riders but this activity has no mention.</p> <p>Pedestrian and cycle routes through the development need to have public highway status.</p>	<p>be investigated with CCC as highway authority.</p> <p>Noted. To be discussed with CCC and the landowner and amended in the final UDF as necessary.</p> <p>Noted. To be discussed with CCC and the landowner and amended in the final UDF as necessary.</p> <p>Consideration is to be given to the rationalisation and improvement of the footpath network in the area.</p> <p>Noted. To be discussed with CCC and the landowner and amended in the final UDF as necessary.</p> <p>Noted. To be discussed with CCC and the landowner and amended in the final UDF as necessary.</p> <p>Noted. To be discussed with CCC and the landowner and amended in the final UDF as necessary.</p> <p>Noted. The Draft UDF does not indicate any space or facilities specifically for equestrian uses.</p> <p>Noted. To be discussed with CCC and amended in the final UDF as necessary.</p>
Flooding	
Summary of Consultation Comments	District Council Responses
<p>The site is part of and is adjacent to a very large flood plain. Serious consideration has to be given to the impact of</p>	<p>This has been carefully considered as the Draft UDF has been prepared. Detailed flood management measures will need to</p>

<p>development on the base upon the flood plain.</p> <p>Concern that DIO and Annington Homes should have consideration of the Pitt Report and the Cambridgeshire Flood Memories Project.</p> <p>The Parish Council wishes to see measures incorporated to protect the housing and employment areas from high flows in the River Great Ouse.</p> <p>The Parish Council would like to see figures related to the net additional run-off created by development on the site. Any increase in run-off would be considered a major concern given the flooding of residential areas adjacent to the site.</p> <p>The Parish Council wishes to have sight of the Surface Water Drainage and Flood Risk Strategy.</p> <p>This section should be referencing Hydrology and Flood Risk or there should be a separate section on flood risk.</p> <p>The employment areas north of Central Avenue will need careful consideration with only footprint redevelopment allowed without suitable mitigation / compensation.</p> <p>Design issues relating to flood risk and its mitigation where appropriate must be included within the UDF for the site. Surface water management methods need to be incorporated in master planning at an early stage as it can impact on the layout.</p> <p>A “drainage and flood risk strategy” will need to be agreed which must include any phased development proposals and future maintenance responsibilities.</p>	<p>be discussed as developers prepare appropriate planning applications for the area.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted – these will be considered as proposals are developed.</p> <p>Noted – these will be considered as proposals are developed.</p> <p>Noted as above.</p> <p>Noted as above.</p> <p>The Draft UDF has taken careful consideration of the potential flood risk issues and this is reflected in the proposed disposition of land uses. Further detailed work on flood risk issues will need to be undertaken as proposals are developed.</p> <p>This will be undertaken as proposals are developed.</p>
Housing	
Summary of Consultation Comments	District Council Responses
<p>Questions regarding why 400 homes are needed in this location.</p>	<p>The District Council must deliver its adopted Core Strategy, which seeks to provide a mixed-use development at RAF Brampton.</p>

<p>The Parish Council accepts modest infill development within the Annington Homes sector.</p> <p>The Parish Council considered that 400 homes located in a mix of high and low density areas is acceptable.</p> <p>The Parish Council has highlighted concern that there are no proposed bungalows, a number which will be necessary to create an all-age development.</p> <p>Concern regarding 2 and a half and 3 storey housing close to Buckden Road unless they are hidden by the tree screen.</p> <p>Clarification is needed as to whether affordable housing is to be 40% or up to 40%.</p> <p>The Parish Council have recommended that some of the new houses be reserved for the children and grandchildren of local residents, thereby reinforcing the sense of community.</p> <p>The document states that there is an opportunity for small local builders and self-builders and their architects to be involved in the provision of a variety of homes to add interest to the site. There is no indication as to how this process is to be undertaken. How can we register our interest in making use of the opportunity to undertake a self-build on the site?</p> <p>This must not be a repeat of boring traditional housing estates, modern and eco friendly designs should be used.</p> <p>Photovoltaics would be appropriate on new build roof surfaces.</p>	<p>Noted, as reflected within the UDF.</p> <p>Noted, as reflected within the UDF.</p> <p>Bungalows have not been specifically included within the Draft UDF. However, should a need or market demand require bungalows these can be considered as part of any planning application.</p> <p>The existing woodland edge along Buckden Road will obscure views into the site. The majority of development adjacent to this treed edge will be 2 storey with only limited 2 and a half storey development.</p> <p>Core Strategy Policy CS4 states that developments of this kind should seek to achieve a target of 40% affordable housing.</p> <p>Noted. There is no formal mechanism for securing this but it can be investigated at the appropriate time as development proposals are brought forward.</p> <p>The District Council will work with any potential developer of the area to seek to develop an appropriate mechanism through which small local builders can get involved in the development.</p> <p>The UDF has been produced to ensure that the development on the site is of high quality.</p> <p>Sustainability measures will be required on the development. There is no objection per-se to the principle of photovoltaics.</p>
Employment	
Summary of Consultation Comments	District Council Responses
<p>The location of the employment area further separates the site from the village by blocking views and occupying an area</p>	<p>Disagree; the employment area helps to integrate the site with the village by being in a location accessible to existing</p>

<p>where south facing homes can be provided.</p> <p>The location for employment is close to and benefits from good access from the B1514.</p> <p>There is potential for the Officers' Mess to provide catering and housekeeping jobs that could be attractive to local residents.</p> <p>Concern about the types of employment that would be permitted. The Parish Council would like strict control to be maintained and would wish this to be agreed now.</p> <p>The Parish Council would like the District Council to consider how the alternative use to which the 'employment area' could be put should there be insufficient take up by new employers, reference competition from Alconbury.</p>	<p>residents. Views to the village / site will not be blocked; many existing trees in this location will be retained. Employment buildings occupy a similar footprint to buildings currently in this location. The majority of the dwellings proposed have south, west and east facing gardens through the layout of the site.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>The employment uses are envisaged to be class B1 uses that encompass, offices, research and development or products or process, or for light industrial processes as stated within the UDF. The proposals put forward by the landowner / developer will be considered at planning application.</p> <p>The take-up of employment land is monitored on an annual basis by HDC. However, the Draft UDF employment land areas relate to land supply requirements over the life of the Core Strategy (to 2026).</p>
--	--

Trees and Open Space

Summary of Consultation Comments	District Council Responses
<p>Retention of feature trees and tree belts is welcomed.</p> <p>The Parish Council assumes responsibility (safeguarded by an appropriate commuted sum) for the many fine specimens on the site.</p> <p>A community orchard in the walled garden would complement the allotments.</p> <p>Brampton needs playing fields, allotments, and the historic house to enhance the present village amenities.</p> <p>Biodiversity and wildlife should be</p>	<p>Noted, these are a unique quality to the character of the site.</p> <p>These issues will be addressed at a later stage.</p> <p>The development generates a requirement for an allotment. The possibility of a community orchard will be investigated and incorporated into the final UDF. Parts of public open space could contain fruit trees.</p> <p>These are proposed within the UDF.</p> <p>The Draft UDF seeks to achieve this by</p>

<p>encouraged through a network of green spaces and SUDs and for trees and planting to provide shading and cooling in summer. Green corridors should be as wide as possible and incorporate structural and habitat diversity.</p> <p>It will be important to consult young people including the Youth Forum regarding the contents of the new LEAPs, NEAP and woodland trim trail.</p> <p>Loss of existing cricket pitch on the site is regrettable. The availability of tennis courts is seen as an asset and the Parish Council would see merit in retaining three courts. The playing fields will require changing facilities to Football Foundation standards. It is important that cycle racks be provided.</p> <p>Open space will need to be high quality so residents can meet many of their recreational needs within the development.</p>	<p>securing the retention of a high quality landscape, with substantial wooded areas and green corridors throughout the development area.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted. The tennis courts are shown in the Draft UDF as being retained, and it is envisaged that changing facilities could be provided as part of a multi-use community facility.</p> <p>Noted. The Draft UDF seeks to achieve this.</p>
Listed buildings	
Summary of Consultation Responses	District Council Response
<p>The retention of listed buildings and a sense of the history of the site will be particularly welcome.</p> <p>The Gate House could be changed back into a one bed house.</p> <p>The Parish Council is concerned that Brampton Park House should have a viable and productive future. If no future can be found MoD might consider retaining for training and conference purposes.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted. The best way of preserving a listed building is to ensure that it has an active an viable use.</p>
Social Infrastructure	
Summary of Consultation Responses	District Council Response
<p>The Parish Council welcomes the proposal that the existing village school be expanded, as this will serve to bind the enlarged village together.</p> <p>Retaining the theatre / mess building is highly suitable for development into an Arts Centre. This has to be more sensible and cost effective option for S106 money to be invested.</p>	<p>This is the aspiration and discussions are in place with CCC as education authority.</p> <p>Noted (see previous comments relating to the Brampton Park Theatre).</p>

<p>Brampton has no provision for the Arts other than the theatre and already huge facilities for sports.</p> <p>The Parish Council welcomes the consideration given to the visual and physical integration of the Annington properties in the proposal. It should avoid the creation of two separate enclaves.</p> <p>There is little information with in the UDF regarding benches street lights, pillar boxes and other street furniture. The Parish Council would like to be consulted before the frequency and positioning of these items is finalised.</p> <p>The number of potential new residents will require provision of additional community facilities. These are shown most conveniently co-located with the changing rooms. The location indicated has good parking and open space / sports provision adjacent.</p> <p>The Parish Council has requested that the integral tool store be large enough to accommodate a tractor and other grounds maintenance equipment.</p> <p>The community building could house pre-school educational facilities. On site pre-school provision should be made.</p> <p>An opportunity is being missed for a sports centre. There is plenty of accommodation for visiting competitors. The Officers Mess is already a small hotel with annexes.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>It is important for the long term sustainability of the site as a whole that Annington Homes and new development are integrated.</p> <p>The Parish Council will be consulted as development proposals are brought forward.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>This has potential to be provided with a multi-use community building. To be further investigated.</p> <p>A development of this size is unable to deliver a sports centre through S106 or CIL. There could be potential for the Officers Mess to be converted to a hotel, subject to planning requirements.</p>
Environmental Infrastructure	
Summary of Consultation Responses	District Council Response
<p>Buckden Road should not be allowed to become a 'highway' into Huntingdon with buildings turning their backs on it.</p>	<p>Agree - the UDF illustrates dwellings fronting outwards on the site.</p>
<p>Key views within the development have been carefully considered.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
<p>The tree belts within the site will be heavily used by village people. A quieter area should be provided.</p>	<p>A range and size of different types of open space will be provided on site to cater for different users.</p>

<p>Access to formal and informal green space should be considered with regard to Natural England's Access to Natural Greenspace Standards.</p> <p>The developers should make reference to the Cambridgeshire Green Infrastructure Strategy in linking areas of open space with the surrounding countryside and green infrastructure network.</p> <p>A map should be included with the UDF demonstrating how the development will link into the surrounding green infrastructure network.</p> <p>Allotments will provide multi-functional benefits. Inclusion of green walls, bat and bird boxes would also provide biodiversity enhancement. Provision must be made for animal habitats, bird boxes, etc.</p> <p>Development of the site will require a detailed ecological assessment and mitigation and enhancement strategy.</p> <p>CIL money should be allocated for enhancement to nearby strategic green infrastructure that might suffer from increased usage.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>The Cambridgeshire Green Infrastructure Strategy will be a material consideration as development proposals are brought forward.</p> <p>Noted. This will be considered.</p> <p>Noted. This will be considered as development proposals are brought forward.</p> <p>This will be a requirement of any planning application.</p> <p>The CIL is not yet in place. The prioritisation of use of potential CIL funds will need to be considered against a range of community infrastructure measures.</p>
Proposed Shop	
Summary of Consultation Responses	District Council Response
<p>Some concern that a potential shop within the site will have an adverse impact on the viability of the existing village shops. A few small shops on the site rather than one convenience store would help reduce car journeys and congestion on the High Street. Need to encourage early provision.</p>	<p>A limited retail provision will help to serve residents of the development and this part of Buckden Road and environs without having an adverse impact on the existing shops.</p>
Process Issues	
Summary of Consultation Responses	District Council Response
<p>Concern that it is unrealistic and environmentally unsustainable for residents of Annington Homes to have to travel to RAF Wyton for social facilities, particularly when the proposed Arts Centre is on base.</p> <p>The Parish Council is concerned that</p>	<p>Disagree; there are a number of social facilities currently within Brampton village that Annington residents can use. A multi-use community centre is proposed as part of the development.</p> <p>The District Council will work with the DIO</p>

<p>maintenance be put in place to coincide with the departure of MOD. Otherwise assets, such as the listed buildings and the open space to be used as football pitches will quickly deteriorate and become devalued.</p> <p>Open space will be owned and managed by a variety of public bodies. Long term management will be essential in ensuring these areas provide maximum long-term benefits for people and wildlife.</p> <p>It is important that access be made available from the north western corner of the site to the footpath to school from the first day of withdrawal of security.</p> <p>Residents of the village should have access to the open spaces at the earliest opportunity.</p> <p>The Parish Council wishes to be closely involved with the determination of the level of S106 payments required and consulted on the proportion of CIL money to be allocated.</p> <p>The Parish Council would like to see a schedule that ties provision of infrastructure to the completion of specific numbers of houses.</p> <p>Responsibility for removing the security fence around the perimeter of the site should be made explicit and when this will occur.</p> <p>Security of the site needs to be put in place after MoD leave the site to reduce vandalism of empty buildings.</p> <p>The demolition of existing structures should not take place until a proper survey and assessment of their significance has been carried out in accordance with PPS5.</p> <p>Contaminated land will require remediation.</p> <p>The Parish Council would like the development to be called Brampton Park and have an input into the naming of roads.</p>	<p>and the Parish Council to develop an appropriate management and maintenance strategy when HM Forces vacate the site.</p> <p>These issues will be addressed at a later stage, and potential partners have already been identified.</p> <p>Agree. To be investigated further as development proposals are brought forward.</p> <p>Agree. To be investigated further as development proposals are brought forward.</p> <p>Noted. The Parish Council will be consulted on these matters at the appropriate time.</p> <p>Noted. The Parish Council will be consulted on these matters at the appropriate time.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted. Heritage assets have been considered carefully within the Draft UDF and impacts will be considered as development proposals are brought forward.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p>
--	---

This page is intentionally left blank

Panel Date	Decision	Action	Response	Date
------------	----------	--------	----------	------

19/05/10	Corporate Plan – Growing Success Councillors P M D Godfrey and D Harty appointed to the Corporate Plan Working Group.	Quarterly reports submitted to all Overview & Scrutiny Panels.		
----------	---	--	--	--

13/07/2010	Great Fen Project The Panel attended a tour of the Great Fen.		The Director of Environmental and Community Services advised Members that updates on the progress of the project would be presented to the Panel at 6 monthly intervals.	
7/12/10	The Panel requested an update from the Director of Environmental and Community Services.	Email requesting update sent.	An update on the Great Fen Project will be presented at the March meeting of the Panel.	00/10/11 08/03/11
08/03/11	Report sent to Cabinet Middle Level Commissioners to be invited to meeting on completion of Hydrology report by Atkins			TBC
08/4/11	Cabinet response received, Cllr Dew to take Panel's views to next meeting of Great Fen Partners		Supplementary Planning Document expected at November meeting. (see Forward Plan)	08/11/11
13/9/11	Councillor Godfrey requested that the Great Fen appear on the Panel's October agenda.			12/10/11
12/10/11	Councillor Godfrey reported on GF Community Forum. GF Project Manager to be invited to present to November meeting		Presentation received	08/11/11

Panel Date	Decision	Action	Response	Date
------------	----------	--------	----------	------

08/11/11	Presentatation received and the Panel requested further regular updates.			TBA
----------	--	--	--	-----

7/12/10	<u>Environment Strategy</u> The Panel received a review of the Environment Strategy.	Members requested a further review in 12 months time.	The Panel received an update at their November meeting when the Carbon Management Report was received. Further updates will be presented to the Panel when they become available.	TBA
---------	---	---	---	-----

	<u>Forward Plan</u>			
07/12/10	Cambridgeshire Green Infrastructure Strategy			10/01/12
14/06/11	Cambridgeshire Future Transport			10/01/12
14/06/11	Waste Collection and Recycling Policies			TBC
12/10/11	RAF Brampton Urban Design Framework			08/12/11
12/10/11	Huntingdon West Master Plan			10/01/11
12/10/11	Planning for Sustainable Drainage Systems (SUDs)			10/01/11
12/10/11	Roll forward of the Council's Core Strategy – Its Local Development Plan			08/12/11

	<u>Provision of Play Facilities for Young People</u>			
--	--	--	--	--

Panel Date	Decision	Action	Response	Date
<p>13/05/09</p> <p>2/02/10</p> <p>2/11/10</p> <p>7/12/10</p>	<p>This item was transferred over from the former Overview and Scrutiny Panel (Service Delivery) who had identified this subject as a potential area for study. Particular interest expressed on how these facilities are managed and insured and if they were maintained by the District Council. The study sought to make recommendations on achieving an even distribution of facilities across the District and on meeting the ongoing revenue costs associated with such facilities.</p> <p>Final report of Working Group considered by Panel. Report presented to Cabinet on 22nd April 2010 by Councillors P G Mitchell and R J West.</p> <p>The Panel considered a progress report on the two recommendations that were endorsed by the Cabinet. The Panel has discussed whether to revisit its previous recommendations regarding the maintenance of outdoor youth facilities. Further financial details awaited before proceeding further.</p> <p>In light of recent developments, the Panel has agreed to pursue this matter further at a later date.</p>			<p>TBC</p>
<p>3/11/09</p>	<p><u>Monitoring of Section 106 Agreements (Item transferred over from O&S Social Wellbeing Panel)</u></p> <p>Panel agreed to include the Monitoring of Section 106 agreements in its work plan.</p>	<p>Monitoring reports to be submitted to Panel on a quarterly basis.</p>	<p>Quarterly monitoring report received at Oct 2011 meeting.</p>	<p>10/01/11</p>

Panel Date	Decision	Action	Response	Date
14/06/11	<p><u>Maintenance of Water Courses</u></p> <p>The Panel has requested a presentation on the maintenance arrangements in place for water courses within the District.</p>	<p>Presentation requested from the Projects and Assets Manager.</p>	<p>C Allen attended Oct meeting and suggested that CCC be invited to a future meeting to advise of their growing responsibilities.</p>	TBC
13/09/11	<p><u>Planning Implications of the Enterprize Zone</u></p> <p>The Panel has requested further information to be circulated on the planning implication following the successful bid for an Enterprise Zone in the District.</p>	<p>Information to be circulated once available. Members invited to attend a presentation to the Social Wellbeing Panel.</p>		
13/9/11	<p><u>Tree Strategy Working Group</u></p> <p>To form a strategy in conjunction with the Tree Officers for the retention and planting of trees.</p>	<p>Meetings held 5/11/10, 24/11/10 and 27/7/11. Draft policy being drawn up by Brian Ogden for submission to the group for comment.</p>		
13/9/11	<p><u>Waste Collection Working Group</u></p> <p>The Panel formed a working group to look into waste collection policies. Cllrs M Baker, Godfrey, Harlock, Mr M Phillips.</p>	<p>First meeting took place on 6/10/11 attended by E Kendall – Head of Operations. Mr Kendall would continue to formulate the Council's waste collection policies and bring them to the working group for comment prior to their submission to Panel.</p>		TBA
12/10/11	<p>Councillor Hyams joined the working group.</p>			

Panel Date	Decision	Action	Response	Date

This page is intentionally left blank