

Cross Boundary Coordination in Planning Matters

10.00 - 11.30 am THURSDAY 16 APRIL 2020

Meeting Summary

ATTENDEES:

UDC

(SP) Simon Payne – Garden Communities Project Manager

(SM) Stephen Miles – Planning Policy Team Leader

(HR) Hayley Richardson – Garden Communities Support Officer

Cambridge Authorities (GCC)

(CH) Caroline Hunt - Local Development Framework Team Leader

(ND) Nadeem Din - Local Plan Project Manager

(TW) Toby Williams – Principal Planner

(JD) Jonathan Dixon – Greater Cambridge Planning

APOLOGIES:

UDC

Roger Harborough - Director of Public Services

Gordon Glenday – Assistant Director Planning and Building Control

Cambs Authorities

Stephen Kelly - Joint Director of Planning and Economic Development

Paul Frainer - Assistant Director Strategy and Economy

1. Introductions/purpose of meeting

The meeting was an informal discussion between Greater Cambridge Councils (GCC) and Uttlesford District Council (UDC) to discuss their positions in the Local Plan and other cross boundary issues and not a formal DtC meeting, which would take place at the appropriate times.

2. Progress of Local Plans

JD recently been appointed Planning Policy Manager and would likely be taking lead on aspects of the Local Plan while CH concentrates on the strategic side, and Duty to Cooperate.

CH said GCC were still processing the responses from the Options and Issues Consultation and taking stock of the way forward while being mindful of the timetable set out by Secretary of State (Robert Jenrick) for delivering the Local Plan by December 2023 and delivery a sound plan for the area.

SM - Uttlesford responded to both Cambridge consultations and was supportive of these.

SM – said since receiving the Inspectors’ letter in January UDC was considering the letter and its options. UDC had appointed Malcolm Sharp and Simon Smith from the East of England Peer Review Group to produce a report on the recommendations for the Local Plan. The report was received in early March and the recommendation was to withdraw and start again, the report will be published on April 22nd. The Council will be holding a virtual Full Council meeting on 30th April to reach a decision.

SP and SM said although UDC are now slightly behind the Greater Cambridge timescale they were hopeful that work each local plan could parallel between the authorities. It was agreed that cross boundary collaboration would be beneficial to both authorities and GCC are preparing on ‘Duty to Cooperate’ paper setting out its approach to include neighbouring authorities, including UDC. This work would hopefully have more formed thought in the next 2 – 3 months.

3. Cross Boundary Issues

i) Call for Sites Issues (including potential Chrishall interest)

From a GCC perspective JD said the volume of sites was bigger than any other SHLAA before. ND, the appointed interim project manager of the Local Plan, commented there were, so far, over 100 sites in addition to the previous sites from last year.

SM – said that UDC were considering their need for CfS but were still in too early a stage to consider the approach on call for sites.

ii) Development in the North Uttlesford Area

SP – said there was a very clear response from the Inspectors on North Uttlesford but Grosvenor still want to pursue development in this locality providing needed homes that are well connected to the surrounding sites (genome campus etc.). It was agreed that UDC and GCC should liaise about any proposals in this locality on both sides of the county boundary as part of their plan making.

iii) Liaison on Wellcome Trust Proposals

TW- said S106 process has been stretched out longer than expected with regards to housing and transport schedules as the work had been put on hold until Agripark decision was made. It makes drafting for mitigation of MacDonald's roundabout much easier in legal terms - 3 to 4 weeks away from agreeing S106 however may take longer with regards to mitigation for Hinxton village which is still a matter for debate. A timetable for reserved matters hadn't been provided but it's likely to move quickly for this 3 -2 months of any decision being made. GC will consult UDC on the RM work.

iv) Reflections on Agripark Decision

TW said the Agripark decision was very welcome news from inspector in reasoning and decision. GCC didn't win on green belt point, but inspector clear on other points. Landscape and heritage harm. Interesting take on means of control of Agripark planning condition. Nature of proposal too broad.

SmithsonHill won't give up on this site. However GCC in strong position moving forward.

v) Transportation Issues (Inc. A505 and CAM Metro)

SP - UDC involved in A505 work and made representations on CAM metro proposals - supportive.

CH - still an important consideration, potentially the alignment in our local plans will allow us to discuss this in a more joined up way. Multimodal study not just about road capacity - movement capacity.

4. Next Steps:

The informal meetings are welcome.

The conclusion of the meeting was the importance of both informal and formal engagement between authorities **to** collaborate on issues and explore sharing of resources.

CH to review their current work timeline and arrange another collaborative discussion. (Approx. 4-6 week time) SP and SM agreed that this would match with Uttlesford timeline of work.

DONM: end of May/early June