

STAPLEFORD PARISH COUNCIL

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF STAPLEFORD PARISH COUNCIL held on THURSDAY 7TH July 2022 at 7.00pm In the Jubilee Pavilion, Gog Magog Way, Stapleford

PRESENT: Cllr G Pett (Chairman), Cllr Jenny Flynn, Cllr Michael Gatward, Cllr B Kettel Cllr H Kettel, Cllr David Pepperell.

Stapleford Parish Council Clerk: Belinda Irons – Minutes

South Cambs District Council: Cllr Peter Fane, Cllr Will Jackson-Wood

Cambridgeshire County Council: Apologies: Cllr Brian Milne

MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC: There was 1 member of the public present

137.2022 Apologies: Cllr Shelton

138.2022 Declaration of Members Interest:
a) To receive declarations of interest from councillors on items on the agenda
Cllr Pett: Planning: 26 Priams Way: neighbour: personal declaration
b) To receive written requests for dispensations for declarable interests
c) To grant any requests for dispensation as appropriate

139.2022 Minutes of the previous meeting:
PROPOSAL: That Stapleford Parish Council herewith agree the minutes of the Parish Council meeting held on the 9th June 2022
Cllr Pepperell disagreed with the amendment to the May minutes. The minutes will be reviewed and presented to the September meeting.

140.2022 SCDC Councillors reports

Planning: The Greater Cambridge Shared Planning Service has published its report on the outcome of the consultation on the First Proposals (published last August)

CLP First Proposals Consultation Report 2022 Accessible (greatercambridgeplanning.org)

And a spreadsheet summarising the response on individual sites, including additional sites now proposed by developers.

gclp-first-proposals-questionnaire-responses-redacted.xlsx (live.com)

(Search “Shelford” or “Stapleford” in the spreadsheet for the various responses to proposals in these villages).

In addition to the sites considered suitable, developers have submitted new proposals (or additional houses) for sites in Trumpington (additional 50 houses West of Hauxton Road) and 800 homes at

Chairman’s signature..... 1st September 2022

Duxford, as well as a site at Knapwell / Cambourne and a garden village of 8000 houses and 20,000sq m of employment space in Dry Drayton / Madingley.

Response from local councillors:

Peter Fane and former councillor Nick Sample submitted a response suggesting in relation to the 10 ha proposed site off Mingle Lane / Hinton Way that any development on this site be focused on the East next to the cemetery, the remaining 6 ha being a country park should remain in the green belt; and alternatively that the 4 ha of development for the retirement village, not in the plan but consented anyway by the inspector, should replace the 4 ha of land proposed to be taken out of the green belt at Mingle Lane / Hinton Way.

These suggestions have not been dismissed as yet by the GCSPS, who have been reminded to include them in the list of consultation responses. and Will and Peter will continue to press the case in the next stage.

GCP CSET bus road proposals:

As to the **Retirement Care Village**, Peter Fane attended the GCP Board meeting on 30th June to point out that neither of the two routes through on which GCP proposes to consult would be compatible with the Inspector's findings. One route cuts the village off from the associated country park, the other cuts through the RCV, whereas the Inspector made clear that the village and the country park could only be considered as a single development, with the country park intended also for the benefit of the village. No proposals have yet been made for safe crossing points, although some retirement village residents are likely to be of limited mobility. This was rejected by the GCP Director of Transport at the meeting, and that appears to have been accepted by the Board. This interpretation is also being tested with the GCSPS and with the Inspector.

Neighbourhood Plans:

On 30 June, DLUHC provided an update on the financial support for neighbourhood planning in 2022/23, confirming that "neighbourhood planning remains an essential part of the government's reforms to help local communities play a much stronger role in shaping the areas in which they live and work and in supporting new development proposals". Additional funding has been made available to support the role of councils in the neighbourhood planning process.

<https://www.gov.uk/guidance/planning-guidance-letters-to-chief-planning-officers>

Cycling support:

On 6 July, DfT published its revised cycling and walking investment strategy for the period to 2025. It includes new and updated objectives including doubling cycling, increasing levels of walking across the community, and walking to school, with funding in place to achieve these. It is planned that nearly £4 billion will be invested in walking and cycling over the period – delivering new and improved walking and cycling routes in England.

[Cycling and walking investment strategy report to Parliament 2022 - GOV.UK \(www.gov.uk\)](#)

Decisions to be taken by SCDC Cabinet in July:

Chairman's signature..... 1st September 2022

On 11th July, cabinet is due to agree its response to the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Local Transport and Connectivity Plan consultation, to endorse the Council's interim approach to Biodiversity Net Gain, and to note two case studies for emerging habitat banks including at Wandlebury Country Park.

[South Cambs Zero Carbon Communities | Facebook.](#)

The Queen's Baton Relay will be at the Wellcome Genome Campus on Saturday 9th July open from 12:30pm, ahead of the 2022 Commonwealth Games in Birmingham. The Science and Sport Fun Day will [welcome the Queen's Baton Relay at around 3pm](#), Tickets are free but limited so [please book in advance before the event.](#)

South Cambs District Council has just launched our summer visitor campaign including at bus stops, Cambridge station and the P&Rs.

Supplement: [South Cambs District Council action on climate change:](#)

Two of the parish councils in Shelford ward have declared a climate emergency, and parish councils and other bodies have taken up SCDC zero carbon grants for tree planting and related activity in the ward¹. South Cambs' role in tackling climate change, part of our "Green to the Core" commitment in the business plan, has been recognised nationally. Will and I thought it would be useful to highlight some of the measures the District Council is taking, on which it welcomes the collaboration with parishes.

As a Council, we declared [climate](#) and [ecological](#) emergencies in 2019. Since 2018, being Green to our Core has been a top Business Plan Priority. The Council has established a dedicated Climate and Environment team, which now consists of five members of staff.

The SCDC Climate and Environment Advisory Committee is chaired by Cllr Pippa Heylings, who is also a Board Member on the Local Nature Partnership, and the lead member of the LGA's national cross-party Climate Change Task Group.

We adopted our first [Zero Carbon Strategy](#) in May 2020. This sets out the need to halve net carbon emissions in the district by at least 2030 and our plans to support this. In February 2021 we created our ['Doubling Nature' strategy \[PDF\]](#), sister document to our Zero Carbon Strategy, setting out our approach to increasing wildlife-rich habitats, tree canopy, and access to green spaces in South Cambridgeshire.

These strategies recognise that our influence is greatest in terms of planning. We have changed our approach to developing our new Local Plan, putting climate and biodiversity at the forefront and examining the likely impact of carbon emissions from different spatial strategies. This informed the preferred development strategy set out in the [Greater Cambridge Local Plan First Proposals](#) which will require all new homes and non-residential buildings to be Net Zero for the energy used, location and design to promote sustainable travel.

¹ [Zero Carbon Communities Grant funded projects - South Cambs District Council \(scambs.gov.uk\)](#)

We are now finalising a new Biodiversity Supplementary Planning Document, with clear guidance to developers on what they must do to better protect and enhance any local biodiversity affected by development.

Actions on our own housing estate?

SCDC has a rolling plan to make existing Council houses more energy efficient and bringing down energy bills for tenants. This also helps to tackle fuel poverty in the face of rising energy prices.

2,200 solar panel systems have been set up, approximately 270 air source heat pumps have been installed and 850 homes have been improved with external wall insulation

Our project to upgrade our 1,800 streetlights across South Cambridgeshire is almost complete, replacing bulbs with low energy ones to reduce light pollution, improve lighting and cut energy bills.

Nearly two thirds of our emissions come from our fleet, so in the longer-term we plan involves to change all our diesel vehicles to electric or to alternative fuel. We now have the county's first electric bin lorry and two more have been ordered and will be in service within the next few months. With £2.7 million funding from the Combined Authority, SCDC is developing a solar farm to power electric bin lorries used by Greater Cambridge Shared Waste, and the shared waste depot in Waterbeach is already partly powered by solar panels.

- Our project to retrofit the Council's main Cambourne Office, funded through our renewables reserve, is on track to be completed this month. This involves the installation of a Ground Source Heat Pump, upgrading our lighting to LEDs, and putting in electric vehicle chargers and a solar carport system to reduce our emissions and generate renewable energy. By 2030 the building's emissions should drop to a quarter of current levels. In 2021 we offered Six Free Trees to every Parish Council he district

Since launching the Zero Carbon Communities grant scheme in 2019, £310,000 has been allocated to 51 different community groups, supporting them with the cost of cycling, tree planting, energy efficient lighting, food production, distribution, and waste reduction. Cambridge Carbon Footprint has received funds to run a training programme called Net Zero Now to empower community leaders to take climate action, resulting in a number of parish councils declaring a climate emergency.

The District Council is involved in several schemes to help reduce both emissions and costs for householders. The ECOFlex scheme has helped over 200 homeowners with energy efficiency measures, and we have worked with neighbouring local authorities to develop a home retrofit service, Action on Energy Cambridgeshire. As well as installing free insulation and other energy improvements for lower income households. In partnership with Cambridgeshire County Council, we delivered the Solar Together Cambridgeshire scheme, which has installed 1.93 MW of Solar PV panels in homes across the district. In 2022, over 850 residents have accepted the offer of Solar PV panels, over 80 of these including battery storage.

Our quarterly newsletter reaches over 600 individuals, with advice on what people can do in response to the climate emergency and sharing news of environmental schemes available. Our website provides a Climate emergency toolkit to residents to give them ideas on what they can do to reduce their emissions. We run monthly community networking sessions to share inspiration and ideas, and an annual fortnight of Climate and Environment events to celebrate climate action taking place in the district.

The SCDC actions on climate change have now been recognised by the Local Government Association for our work on Climate, Environment and Waste, in particular the Zero Carbon Strategy, Zero Carbon Communities Grant Scheme and our Greening of South Cambridgeshire Hall project.

Cllr Fane and Parish Councillors discussed the following topics and areas of concern:

Local Plan consultation and the proposed Mingle Lane/ Hinton Way site: the development is proposed for four hectares of the 10 hectare site. Cllr Fane has suggested the proposed development go near the cemetery, with the tree belt to shield the cemetery from development to be planted. This would enable the rest of the site to be a countryside park which has potential to join with the Rangeford countryside park. Further, that the Rangeford development should be accepted as fulfilling the Stapleford & Shelford development allocation. Cllr Fane has questioned why his and former Cllr Sample's responses have not been included. Some responses supported affordable housing near sustainable transport. Some responses want Stapleford and Shelford to remain separated by green space. Cllr Fane expressed his opinion that it was more important for the villages to remain separate to Cambridge City.

Cllr B Kettel commented that the latest Call for Sties included four additional sites within the same tract of land which virtually infill between Haverhill Road and Hinton Way, with another retirement village and medical centre proposed. Cllr Flynn commented that the 2022 housing needs assessment data demonstrated affordable homes for local people are needed. Cllr B Kettel further commented that many of the nearby retirement homes were empty because local people can't afford them.

(The Chairman allowed the member of public to speak). The member of public commented on lack of affordable homes for local young people and that the majority of properties in the village were too expensive. Many youngsters are living with parents, which means the parents can't sell and downsize to retirement properties. More retirement properties are not needed. We need to provide for our young people.

Busway: Cllr Fane commented that the GCP is in discussion with Rangeford to reroute the CSET busway through the development. Cllr B Kettel commented that Rangeford had stated at the site meeting, it did not want the busway going through the development.

The member of public commented that the GCP was an unelected, non-representative organisation

Cllr Fane commented that the Planning Inspector, when overruling the SCDC refusal decision and granting the retirement home appeal, stated the countryside park and the retirement village were one development. SCDC had failed to provide adequate retirement accommodation. The GCP is working on the basis the countryside park and the retirement village are separate. Cllr Fane's opinion was that the development cannot be split, and that the Inspectorate may provide some support for this position. The District Councillors are working hard to try to minimise the damage which developers are creating. Cllr Fane has spoken with many residents in Mingle Lane.

Cllr Pepperell commented that the GCP dismiss Councillors comments and concerns, and the busway will result in infill development. Cllr B Kettel commented this unelected body is destroying our neighbourhood and environment and wasting public money.

Cllr Pett commented that there is no point in Local Government if it's opinion is not considered.

141.2022 Public Issues:

Members of the public and Councillors can raise matters of concern

Development:

Many people are concerned at the level of development proposed for Stapleford and Shelford as there is insufficient infrastructure to cope with demand, and it will mean the loss of green open spaces. There are retirement villages within 4 to 5 miles, with many units empty due to the price. The Rangeford development will be out of reach for many local people. Two further complexes are being built in Shelford. Residents Council Tax bills should be reduced due to the impact of development and loss of intrinsic amenities. Someone should be held to account.

GCP: unelected, undemocratic and forging ahead with no regard for local opinion and wasting public money.

142.2022 Planning: Cllr B Kettel

Planning applications:

Reference: 22/02435/HFUL Proposal: Single storey side extension, minor amendments to rear openings, internal alterations. Site address: 3 Dukes Meadow Stapleford Cambridgeshire CB22 5BH: response by 13.7.2022

No objection

Reference: 22/02416/HFUL

Proposal: Construction of timber garden studio

Site address: 146 Hinton Way Great Shelford Cambridgeshire CB22 5AL

Response by 13.7.2022 *No objection*

Reference: 22/02535/HFUL Proposal: Garage conversion, Insulated render system to external walls. Replacement windows and doors. Site address: 14 Joscelynes Stapleford Cambridgeshire CB22 5EA *No objection*

Reference: 22/02542/HFUL Proposal: External alterations of barn as part of creating ancillary domestic annex to main dwelling. (Retrospective) Site address: The House On The Hill Hinton Way Great Shelford Cambridgeshire: *SPC expressed concern at this development but did not believe there were planning grounds for objection. Request CONDITION: The annexe must remain ancillary to the main dwelling house in perpetuity; removal of permitted development rights*

Reference: 22/02627/HFUL Proposal: Two storey side and rear extension. Site address: 26 Priams Way Stapleford Cambridgeshire CB22 5DT: *No objection*

Rangeford Village proposals re Retirement Development, Haverhill Road:
Parish Council site meeting: update.

Public meeting Wednesday 13th July commencing 12.30 to 5.30pm in the
Johnson Hall.

Councillors met with representatives of Rangeford and Carter Jonas to
discuss the reserved matters application and the impact of the busway.

In summary, the GCP are seeking discussions with Rangeford to obtain
access either across the countryside park or through the development itself.

The units will be constructed to a carbon neutral standard. Infrastructure will
be installed first, including access into the countryside park. There is no
parking for the countryside park – it will be pedestrian and cycle access only.

The principle of development was granted at appeal. The Reserved Matters
application details the layout and design of the development.

Prices may start at £399,000 for a one bedroom apartment, with two
bedrooms likely to cost £600,000 to £650,000. The price is calculated on the
average price in the village.

Cllr Gatward expressed concern at the price, as it was stated that release of
Green Belt land would, of necessity, be one fifth to one quarter the land price
of development land which is the major expenditure in any development. A
significant profit is being reaped at some stage in this development, and the
lower land price is not reflected in the sale prices quoted.

143.2022 Neighbourhood Plan: Cllr Flynn

Cllr Flynn discussed with Rachel Hogger of Cambs ACRE the previous
proposal that she submitted on behalf of the Parish Council to support our NP
and more generally about work that she did for our NP work prior to 2019,
and moving forward, what the NP should do over the summer holiday period
to ensure that we're ready to move forwards from Sept with the support of a
consultant.

Rachel could not emphasise enough how crucial it is that we apply for our
Locality funding now. The scheme is in an extended 5th year of what was
intended to be a 4 year grant programme and there is no guarantee that it will
continue beyond April 2023 or, if it does, what form it will take. If we don't
secure funding now and the scheme closes, then the onus may well be on the
PCs to fund the NP to completion. We would still need external consultant
support, so we could be looking at something exceeding £25k to complete
everything. It could be considerably more than this because everything
currently fundable through grants (which includes highly technical stuff) would
need to be outsourced.

Grant applications

There are 2 things that we need as a matter of urgency:

1. How much of the £10k that we are entitled to remains in our Locality account. We won't just be given the money and it can't be spent retrospectively - we need to show what we will spend it on and it is perfectly acceptable to supply a consultant's brief to illustrate this, even if we haven't accepted the brief. Whatever money we get needs to be spent by March 2023 or we will have to return it. The suggested way we get the money is

- (a) we complete a draft application
- (b) we then complete a more detailed application
- (c) we arrange a virtual appointment to speak to Locality (LW and JF)
- (d) they might suggest additional financial support we can apply for.

If we don't have the Locality money in place before September, then the PCs will be paying for consultant from public funds.

2. Apply for a Design Statement and find out how much additional funding we would in theory be entitled to if we apply for Design Codes via Technical Support. We need to know this for project planning purposes. Again, such technical support money would need to be capable of spending by 31 March 2023. The grant programme might be extended beyond this date, but nobody knows.

Given the urgency of the situation, Stapleford Parish Council instructed it's Clerk to progress what she can with immediate effect. **ACTION: CLERK**

External consultant support

Three proposals from external consultants have been received to support the NP steering group. This is vital technical specialist advice. Our villages are in a particularly complex position of not having any development sites within the existing built area which means our available policy options for addressing affordable housing needs are seemingly nil because NPs are not permitted to propose greenbelt sites. The costs of external support are in the range of £500-560/day. Current recommendation is to use Cambridgeshire ACRE (£500/day) because they understand our situation, having worked with us before. They would also be in a good position to apply for rural exception sites for us if we wanted to go down this route. Anticipated cost is approximately £10k with them in the first instance, half of which could be funded through the Locality grant if we secure it now. The consultant options will be presented to the steering group over the next few days, with a view to retaining one of the consultants before the end of next week.

Cllr Flynn stated in the meeting that she cannot continue to Chair the NP without external consultant support. Unless someone else comes forward to take it on (and it would have to be someone from within one of the PCs), it will

Please see below the responses the Officer gave to various questions. Particularly disappointing that Cllr Brian Milne who was the SCDC substitute offered no opinion of his own.

3. A meeting of 4 of us from BWTB with the GCP Exec (first requested at the beginning of February) is now being held on 22nd July. Cllr Bridget Smith will again be absent and we are asking if Cllr Brian Milne will attend in her place.

4. A lot of work has gone into a BWTB website which will be ready to launch shortly. This will hold all the relevant reports and images as well as being the focus of fundraising with a direct link to CPPF's site who have the e responsibility for holding the finances for the campaign. It will link with Twitter and be able to generate GDPR compliant information emails to all consenting individuals.

5. A poster and leaflet campaign similar to the East West Rail campaign is being planned to link people to the website.

6. Very important that we get responses into the Mayor CA consultation (closing 4th August) and also the Retirement Village alignment. I will email separately.

Questions to the GCP Board

Howard's question

Following a consultation on two on-road and one off-road route conducted February to April 2018, a decision to go ahead with the off-road route was made at the GCP Exec meeting 11th October 2018, with the Transport Director highlighting that 'the proposals were closely aligned with the development of the CAM' (item 7 in the Minutes). Indeed the submitted Paper at Appendix B-Business Case (B.39) states: 'The CAM proposals which form part of Strategy 1 contribute towards delivering the extended network envisaged within the LTTS' and furthermore at B.109: 'The proposed mass transit route is currently envisaged to form part of a wide CAM network'. However the Officer's report to GCP Exec Board 30th June 2022 (agenda item 9) at 1.32 suggests that the CAM requirement was introduced after the Executive Board decision to adopt the off-road route which appears to be inconsistent with the facts.

Given that CSET has been designed to be CAM compliant and this has now been dropped, will the GCP review the scheme against an optimal scheme in the A1307 corridor?

Response to HK question: CSET is a standalone scheme. Route decision predated CAM.

Howard's second Question

The Officer's report to the GCP Executive Board meeting to be held on 30th June 2022 (agenda item 9) at 1.30 states: "Route options were consulted upon in 2017. The entirely off-road option was the public's preferred solution."

Noting that the vote for the alternative A1307 was split by offering two options compared to only one off road option (1702 people voted for the A1307 as opposed to 1064 for the off-road route) and you could in any event vote for all options, and the more recent Anthony Browne survey, with a considerably higher number of respondents, showed that 81% would definitely not, or probably not, support the GCP busway.

In the light of this, will the GCP have regard to overwhelming public opinion and review their route?

Chairman's signature..... 1st September 2022

Response to HK question: GCP followed guidance on consultations. [He didn't address the vote-splitting point].

James Littlewood's Questions

Q1.

There have been some significant changes in relation to CSET scheme:

1. The Preferred Option for Local Plan is to extend the Cambridge Biomedical Campus next to the A1307. This won't be directly served by the CSET route, whereas it could be served by a route that was discounted in 2018. This will significantly increase the Benefit Cost Ratio of that option compared with the longer route across open countryside.
2. A factor in the GCPs' 2018 decision to discount a route in the A1307 corridor was that it could not form part of the Cambridgeshire Autonomous Metro (CAM). The CAM has been dropped. Given that CAM was a factor in reaching a decision on preferred routes, there is a requirement to review that decision.
3. Now that the detailed route alignment is known, it will poorly serve the villages of Sawston, Stapleford and Shelford and in some cases could undermine bus services that serve village centres. One of the arguments for building across the countryside was that it would serve these villages.
4. A planning inspector recently granted permission for a development, including creating a new country park. The Busway would run adjacent to this park and have a negative impact on the park. In other words, the negative impact of the Busway has increased.
5. Permission for Cambridge South Station will be granted ahead of the busway. The rail scheme will proceed first and therefore the busway construction works will have to fit around or be delayed by Network Rail. This creates a risk of further delay, compared to alternative options.

An alternative busway within the A1307 corridor would deliver similar journey times and reliability at significantly less cost, more quickly and with less damage to the countryside. Due to the expansion plans of the Campus it would deliver better economic and transport benefits compared to the costs.

Please will the GCP review the decisions made in 2018 and 2021 against an optimal scheme in the A1307 corridor?

Q2.

Option 2 of the proposed alignments around the retirement village would leave an area of land between the busway and Haverhill Road which was no longer viable for agriculture. The landowner has already indicated that they will not allow this land to be used for environmental mitigation because they would like to build on it. It is therefore almost certain that if Option 2 went ahead that there would be a planning application submitted for housing on that land. Whilst the outcome of such an application cannot be known, there is clearly a risk that development could be granted in future. Especially as approval has been given for the retirement village across the road. Therefore, the Officers Report is misleading to say that the impact on landscape, environment and green belt would be similar for both options; Option 2 carries a high risk of future harm whereas Option 1 does not. It is important that the consultation highlights the risk of future development associated with Option 2, so that people are fully aware of the implications when they respond.

Please will you commit to providing information about this risk as part of the public consultation?

Q3.

The Officers Report (para 1.30) implies that there is public support for the preferred option. However the report does not mention a survey carried out in March by the local MP which found that 72% of respondents definitely do not support the preferred option and only 9% definitely did. 58% of respondents definitely or probably supported an alternative in the A1307 corridor and only 28% definitely or probably didn't. The number of respondents to this survey was higher than to the GCP consultation. This survey has been made available to the GCP. Will officers include information in their reports from sources other than their own?

Response to JL question: CSET meets local plan. JL's assertions about BCRs are inaccurate. Route serves villages as well after LLF feedback.

Jim Rickard's Question

Tracing the history of the CSET project through the WSP Parsons Brinckerhoff Haverhill Corridor Study carried out for Cambridgeshire County Council, and your own agenda packs for October 2018 and June 2020, it's clear that the benefit to cost ratios of the different options have evolved. This is quite natural as more work is done on a project.

However, the two strategies following the A1307 alignment have consistently shown better BCRs than the GCP's preferred route. Recent developments involving speed restrictions, an additional pedestrian crossing for the retirement village and the need to reposition the Haverhill Road stop and slew the route around the retirement village would appear to penalise your currently preferred route still further.

Conversely the projected south-eastern expansion of the Biomedical Campus would appear to improve the business case for the two routes along the A1307, and strategy 2 in particular.

Will the GCP therefore reassess the BCRs for all three strategies, and make public the outcome of that reassessment?

Response to JR question: GCP complies with statutory requirements. Full business case including BCRs will come back to the Board.

Peter Fane's Question

As the ward councillor for Shelford on South Cambs District Council, I am keen to establish the compatibility or otherwise of the GCP's route options with the Inspector's finding in granting the planning appeal for the retirement village and associated country park.

As I understand it, GCP is planning two options for a revised route for the proposed new road for buses (busway), one through the edge of the proposed retirement care village, one between the village and the country park. **What consideration has GCP given to how residents would be expected to cross the bus road safely, so as to enjoy the country park, bearing in mind some may be of limited mobility?**

The Inspector made clear that the retirement village and the "public access country park" were two elements of a single development, that without the publicly accessible country park the retirement village would have been 'inappropriate development' (para 6). He also referred to the recreation benefits of the country park to the existing village (paras 40 and 53), which would presumably be somewhat limited if the park is largely separated from the villages by the new bus road?

He referred (para 63) to a different alignment for the busway "avoiding the part of the site to be developed as a retirement care village", which only one of the options under consideration by GCP might do.

I wonder whether the board has considered this issue in relation to item 9 of the agenda, and is satisfied that the current proposals are indeed compatible with the Inspector's findings when granting planning consent for the retirement village and associated country park?

Response to P Fane question: Busway was included in the planning inspector's decision and they have had dialogue since.

GCP

T Bick, feedback from Joint Assembly: agreed to consider only the two retirement village route options and not to widen the debate to go back over other route strategies. Disappointment at the delay caused by the retirement village decision.

B Milnes: as the 'brown' and 'pink' route options around Babraham are similar in cost, request to choose the one less damaging to the village [I didn't note which one that was]. There have been "shifting sands" over the presentation of the routes: having originally been told the route was not there to serve the villages, serving the villages is now part of how the route is presented: is it an objective or not?

A Williams: has been with the project a long time: in the early days they didn't know what CAM would look like. Preferred route was what the LLF wanted. Interaction with Cambridge South Station will be important. Need to take advantage of the retirement village refinement to the route to minimise the environmental impact.

Agreement to proceed to consultation on the two retirement village route options as recommended.

Subject BWTB

From [Hkettel Stapleford PC](#)

To

Date 2022-06-27 20:35

I attended the SCDC Cabinet & Parish Council Liaison Meeting tonight (Coton also represented).

I asked the question on protecting the environment and the carbon cost of the new road (and the implications for the route deviation around the retirement village). Inevitably Bridget spoke at length about providing homes and decent transport for working families. Interestingly I had full opportunity to double-down on some of the arguments but she then went on to talk about demolishing houses!

She didn't seem to have an answer to the point about the poor economic benefit and the fact that CBC is expanding towards the alternative route.

I mentioned Peter's point about developers already looking at developing sections of land that will become uneconomic for farming and Tumi came over to speak to me at the end to ask me for the details. She had said in the public discussion that the GCP should use this sort of land as tree shelter et cetera.

What was also interesting was that I spoke to Peter McDonald at the end, mentioning in particular that it only needs a 10% reduction in traffic to avoid the congestion and this can be achieved through the City Access Strategy, and also that the busway will reduce the viability of the local bus service. He reminded me that the scheme will have to go to the County Council and he for one will be looking carefully at the business case and bearing in mind that the GCP is running out of money!

Coton questions focused on the outline business case for C2C.

Discussion undertaken at the meeting resulted in comments that the tax payer is paying for growth. There is no evidence of countryside protection by SCDC. Inflation is eroding the capital sum. There is a 3 minute time saving between Babraham and Addenbrookes. There is a constant turnover of membership of the GCP which Councillors believe results in a lack of cohesive and informed decision making. The process which the GCP has undertaken was suggested as basically skewed, with information and data included or excluded from the process to fit the results the GCP is seeking, and thus seriously flawed in purportedly data supported outcomes.

Cllr Pepperell asked where the audited accounts can be found. This was not known.

A formal vote of thanks was extended to Cllr H Kettel for his dogged commitment and diligence in dealing with this complex issue, and his pursuit of the truth from the GCP.

151.2022 Governance

Prioritising Projects Template: Cllr Flynn progressing as time allows.

Minutes of Meeting: binding: costs: historical documents to be archived: The Parish Council agreed that the minutes need to be professionally bound. Each book, which may take up to three years minutes depending on the number of pages involved, will cost £75.00 (seventy five pounds) plus VAT. Cllr Pett will liaise with Brignells Bookbinders regarding the colour of the cover. **ACTION: GP**

Recording meetings: extensive discussion around transparency and public involvement was undertaken. Cllr Gatward was very clear that inclusivity and transparency should be key drivers for the initiative. The Clerk advised that presentation to Central Government is being made by the Local Government Association and NALC to change legislation to enable hybrid meetings to take place legally, which has the potential to completely change the format of meetings as they would be held on a virtual platform and can be recorded by anyone. This initiative, if accepted in law, may result in grant funding being available to provide equipment and expertise in this complex area.

Risk Assessment: routine inspections and reporting: process: Options: The Clerk will seek quotes from Risk Assessors. **ACTION: CLERK**

Contractors schedule of works: discussion/ decision: ongoing.

152.2022 Finance

Provision of Broadband to the Pavilion:

PROPOSAL: That Stapleford Parish Council herewith agrees to enter into a 24 month contract with National Broadband which has an installation cost of £249.17 and a monthly charge of £35.00 all plus VAT

AMENDED:

PROPOSAL: That Stapleford Parish Council herewith agrees to enter into a 24 month contract with National Broadband which has an installation cost of £249.17 and a monthly charge of £35.00 all plus VAT, subject to verification by National Broadband its system will work at Stapleford Pavilion. PROPOSED: Cllr Flynn, seconded Cllr H Kettel.
AGREED AND RESOLVED UNANIMOUSLY. ACTION: CLERK

Accounts summary: July Meeting

Income June: £8,074.66

Expenditure June: £12,072.52

Less S106 Ring-fenced: £53,904.31

Carried forward: £159,136.33

Bank Reconciliation:

Brought Forward: £183,906.47

Add receipts £61,094.19

Less payments £31,941.77

Cash in hand £213,058.89

Bank:

Lloyds 2 £1.45

Lloyds £11,519.76

Sapphire £14,075.28

Hallmark £53,904.31

Current £133,243.45

Less unrepresented chq - £466.43

Plus unrepresented receipt + £781.07

TOTAL £213,058.89

Total expenditure paid in June with additional payments authorised by Councillors by email dated post 15.6.2022:

Description	Reference	Value	
Salary	June	£886.48	15.6.2022
Salary	June	£45.00	15.6.2022
PAYE & NICS	June	£347.75	15.6.2022
Payroll		£31.20	15.6.2022
Pavilion: doors/ key pad/cores	2292	£198.00	15.6.2022
Pavilion deposit reimbursement		£200.00	27.6.2022
pavilion cleaning	3111	£350.00	15.6.2022
completion retainer	383	£937.88	15.6.2022
Scribe accounting system	2930	£777.60	15.6.2022
Verges	SI-1625	£408.00	15.6.2022
Rec & Slaughterhouse	SI-1652	£120.00	15.6.2022
Village Weekend: reimbursement		£33.20	27.6.2022

Chairman's signature..... 1st September 2022

			p. 2022.81
Clerks mobile phones	July	£16.80	
Street lighting electricity	July	£0.00	
B Irons	July	£46.34	
			-£63.14

TOTAL DEBITS

-£4,358.97

PROPOSAL: That Stapleford Parish Council herewith agrees the payments presented on the schedule, plus urgent payments authorised by email for June 2022 also shown above. PROPOSED: Cllr Pett, seconded Cllr Gatward. AGREED AND RESOLVED UNANIMOUSLY

The Clerk will seek dates to be included on invoices when grounds maintenance work is completed to ensure there is no duplication and also provide verification should a member of the public request such information.

ACTION: CLERK

153.2022

Audit:

Documents emailed to PKF Littlejohn and loaded to website 13.6.2022

154.2022

Section 106 Reports

Pavilion renovation incorporating a public access toilet: Cllr Pett & Cllr H Kettel: The Parish Council is not in a position to progress due to a lack of Councillors. The Clerk will investigate grant funding **ACTION: CLERK**
Pavilion renovation: solar array installation: discussion: Subject to grant funding.

Art fund: Cllr G Pett: ongoing

Jubilee Pavilion & Recreation Ground entrance illuminated signage update: ongoing

155.2022

Cemetery:

Headstone stabilisation update: completed

Removal of Box plants due to Box Blight: update: the contractor has been reminded to remove and correctly dispose of the arisings.

156.2022

Slaughterhouse & Gardens:

Gardens: renovation: update: Cllrs Flynn and Gatward to liaise with 2G3S to progress. **ACTION: JF / MG**

Clearing building: update: Cllr Gatward with the Clerk and volunteers will progress. **ACTION: MG / CLERK/ VOLUNTEERS**

Proposal for use: 'Bike Shed': To be progressed once the building is cleared. The bier will remain.

157.2022

Clerk's updates: no further updates.

Chairman's signature..... 1st September 2022

158.2022

Correspondence :

Mr B Sutcliffe: dangerous driving on Mingle Lane: request for PC assistance: Volunteers are need to run a 'Speed Watch' campaign as part of the Police initiative.

<https://www.cambs.police.uk/advice/advice-and-information/wsi/watch-schemes-initiatives/community-speedwatch/swgc/csw-guide/>

Mrs W Elsbury: gate between Vicarage Lane and Collier Field: needs repair/ replacement: The Parish Council has established this is the responsibility of the school as there is no public access to the Collier Field land which is in the ownership of the school. The post needs to be replaced.

Age Uk: request for PC to reconsider funding: The Parish Council has not committed to funding as the numbers of residents using the service is below the minimum requirement and the Parish Council has been advised that provision of this service is not in it's remit at the cost stated.

Mrs L Warth Ragwort removal from highway verge: the Clerk will liaise with CCC for best practice advice and action. **ACTION: CLERK**

Mrs M Fyfe Ragwort removal from highway verge. As above.

159.2022

Dates of Meetings:

1st September, 6th October, 3rd November, 1st December

Meeting closed at 10.03pm