

**Notes from meeting with Cambridgeshire County Council
24th August 2016**

Present: Cllrs Morris, Nicholas, Young and the Clerk, Stephen Conrad (SC) and John Macmillan (JM)

The meeting was held as a follow-up to several outstanding issues with Cambridgeshire County Council's Asset Management team, not least CPC's wish to extend the Recreation Ground, implications of primary school expansion for the third field at the Recreation Ground, and CCC's aspirations to develop land off Rampton Road.

4th Field on Rampton Road (request for additional recreational space near the Sports Pavilion)

SC stated that he hadn't received any instructions from County to dispose of the field in question. Cllr Morris said that our request to purchase/lease the field pre-dated the County plans for development. CPC made the request 12 months ago asking what it would take to buy or lease the field on Rampton Road, which would afford us a second access to the Recreation Ground. JM said it was not for sale in isolation and that he was not aware of any such request by the Parish Council. SC said that he had briefed Roger Moore, Head of Strategic Assets, about the request but only more recently. It would therefore appear that our original requests had been ignored. JM said they had been working for quite some time with their members on the development and the field requested would be part of that development plan.

There is a meeting of the Assets & Investment (A&I) Committee coming up at County on 16th September and JM will put forward our request to purchase/lease the field for recreational purposes. Cllr Young was concerned that there was a breakdown in process by County in relation to our request. Clerk to forward all emails from CPC in relation to our requests for the field.

CCC David Jenkins (Cottenham representative) is on the A&I Committee and it is in the main a public meeting; Cllr Morris to attend. For info the remit of the Committee is to look at developing schemes for County plus property related matters. The group was set up with full powers as a break out from the General Purposes Committee.

Primary School expansion (subject to approval of any of the major speculative applications)

SC stated that we were in a period of doubt that would affect pupil numbers plus the Neighbourhood Plan may also have implications. The understanding from Education is that some land to the rear of the Primary School had already been allocated. There are no final decisions but the thinking is that it is desirable to have just one school and not two separate ones. If there was a decision then the land immediately adjacent to the school (third field) could be the best option for expansion. If any of the speculative developments are given the go ahead then the site would be needed. SC said he was aware that in the lease document it states that if the land is needed for educational use then they have to give us 6 months notice and provide replacement land of equivalent standard. They have sought, in their proposed planning application, to provide an identical area adjacent to the site. SC also believes that the existing third field isn't ideal for CPC's purposes – it's elongated, drainage is poor and we have the education issue hanging over us. SC believed that the new proposals would give better pitch configuration. Cllr Morris said this assumption was wrong, for example the proposed pitch configuration shows no understanding that the cricket pitches would cost £20k alone to re-site, in addition to the time involved to bring them into use. Cllr Morris also commented that the 3rd field lease was vague and the assumption was that the 3rd field could be needed for a road not a school; this had been confirmed in an email from SC dated 2002.

SC wanted to have a dialogue and he is advising County as a whole however the best solution for County may not be the best solution for Cottenham. We may want to consider their suggestion as part of our Neighbourhood Plan. Other land configurations may be possible. Currently SC and JM have no knowledge of any designs for a new school but Cllr Morris mentioned that he had already seen something from

Education. Cllr Young said that the land swap didn't address our deficit of open space, which was the original reason for our request to purchase/lease the field on Rampton Road.

Planning proposal (CCC's aspiration to build 154 homes on their land next to the Recreation ground)

County has an expectation that they will act in the same way as the other developers. Cllr Morris thought that it was questionable as to whether Les King Wood could be included as part of the open space allocation for the proposed development. SC said that the site obviously wasn't a flood risk. Cllr Morris said that 'obviously' was incorrect as we have already pointed out in our defence against other developers. It was also pointed out that we have money available now to purchase the '4th field' on Rampton Road.

SC explained that as part of the design for developing 154 houses on the site on Rampton Road there are 2 roads which could give access close to the pavilion and recreational space. There would be 40% affordable housing. Of the remaining 60%, this would be a mix of sale and rental properties since they feel there is a demand for this mix. Cllr Nicholas pointed out that there was a demand for houses for local people. There was then discussion about affordable housing. SCDC use exception sites, although SC speculated that SCDC were concerned by the number of sites coming forward and if the schemes only satisfied local need there may need be a change of policy regarding this. East Cambs use the CLT (Community Land Trust) model. Cllr Morris suggested that County sell the whole site for a CLT. Cllr Young asked how far the CLT model could be stretched. The income would only be the same as an exception site and the last time SC was involved in a similar case, approx. 5 years ago, it was much more than twice agricultural land value at £20k per plot. JM said that County were desperate to maximise their assets due to cuts in funding. Cllr Morris said that we are developing the Neighbourhood Plan using a sustainable model of 800m radius from the centre of the village for any development; the proposed site falls outside this radius. FM clarified the radius area. JM mentioned that County may be interested in providing some care homes. Cllr Nicholas commented that the proposed care homes from Gladman aren't truly care homes as there are additional costs involved for nursing etc. Cllr Young pointed out that any provision would need to be more central otherwise people would be isolated/trapped due to the distance from services etc.

Consultation document (about the planning proposal)

Cllr Morris stated that we took exception to wording in the proposed consultation document to be sent to residents. Clerk expressed the need to remove reference to CPC, particularly questions 7 and 8 and the 'opportunities' section which inferred that the additional recreational space/access was a County idea.

SC indicated that the outline application would be submitted late September/early October. There is no date for sending out the consultation document. They will work to what they believe is the right timeframe. County want to maximise and discuss as much as possible with communities about their development plans. Cllr Young pointed out that there was no room for negotiation due to County needing to maximise their profits. JM said that they were different from other developers; they want to maximise but also taking the village along with them. He also recognised that there is opposition from residents to development. It is very hard for them to assist with the needs of Cottenham until they know what our Neighbourhood Plan is.

Cllr Morris asked what happened to the Savills survey from December 2015. JM stated that it had got wrapped up in something else. Cllr Morris pointed out that the survey didn't mention speculative developments.