

**Committee:** LDF Member Working Group

**Agenda Item**

**Date:** 8 February 2013

**5**

**Title:** Duty to Co-operate – Plan Proposals from Neighbouring Authorities

**Report Author:** Melanie Jones

**Key decision:** No

---

---

### Summary

1. Two adjoining local authorities are currently out on consultation with Local Plan documents. Braintree District Council are consulting on a Site Allocations and Development Management Plan and a draft revised Statement of Community Involvement. Their consultation runs from 10 January 2013 until 22 February 2013. South Cambridgeshire District Council and Cambridge City Council are carrying out joint Issues and Options consultations for their Local Plans between 7 January 2013 and 18 February 2013. Under the Duty to Co-operate it is important that these plans and proposals are considered. The key issues are set out in this report.

### Recommendations

2. There are no direct implications for Uttlesford arising from these consultations but this will be kept under review and further comments made as necessary at future stages of consultation.

### Financial Implications

3. There are no financial implications arising from the report.

### Background Papers

4. None

### Impact

- 5.

Communication/Consultation	The plans are subject to consultation in accordance with the relevant Statement of Community Involvement
Community Safety	No issues
Equalities	The plans will be subject to Equalities Impact Assessment in accordance with the relevant authority's normal practise.
Health and Safety	No issues
Human Rights/Legal Implications	No issues

Sustainability	The plans are subject to a Sustainability Appraisal
Ward-specific impacts	No issues
Workforce/Workplace	No issues

## Situation

### **Braintree**

6. Braintree DC has reviewed its Statement of Community Involvement to take account of changes in legislation, changes in corporate priorities and the structure of committee meetings within the Council and technological changes which have led to increased use of electronic communication and websites. Uttlesford is identified as an adjoining District Council as specified in the Town and Country Planning (2012) Regulations.
7. Braintree's Core Strategy was adopted in September 2011. The strategic growth areas are identified in the Core Strategy and are not part of the current consultation. The purpose of the current consultation is to allocate sites to meet the development needs of Braintree and to provide policies to manage change which will be used to assess and determine planning applications in conjunction with the strategic policies in the Core Strategy. The Development Management Policies will replace the saved policies in the Braintree Local Plan Review.
8. Housing supply is not considered to be a cross border issue for Uttlesford as Braintree is meeting it's own identified needs with a potential 693 additional supply over its requirements.
9. In relation to Gypsies and Travellers the Core Strategy sets out the requirement for 67 residential pitches up to 2021. In July 2012 there were 38 authorised pitches in the District leaving a requirement for an additional 29 pitches plus 6 transit pitches and 1 additional plot for travelling show people. 21 new pitches are allocated in this plan at Stisted and the remaining 7 pitches along with the transit pitches and pitches for travelling show people will be provided through the determination of planning applications. There is no suggestion in the plan that any unmet need should be met in adjoining Districts but Members may feel that that they would prefer that sites are allocated in the plan for these outstanding pitches. This is one of the alternative options listed as having been considered but it is not clear in the plan why it was dismissed.
10. A Development Management Policy is included in the plan which prevents development which would prejudice the use of disused railway lines for recreational purposes including the Flich Way.

### **South Cambridgeshire District Council and Cambridge City Council**

11. This consultation is split into 2 parts. Part 1 is a joint consultation on the development strategy for the wider Cambridge Area and site options for housing or employment development on the edge of Cambridge on land currently in the Green Belt, options for sub-regional sporting, cultural and communities and site options for a community stadium. Part 2 includes more detailed matters for each of the Authorities. The City Council is looking at space standards and car and cycle parking standards and South Cambridgeshire are looking at new issues arising from the previous consultation last summer that would be reasonable additional options for the new local plan including possible new site options for development as well as matters such as possible changes to village frameworks and local designations to protect village character.
12. Part of the evidence base for the work includes a Green Belt Review looking at the inner boundary and sites around the edge of Cambridge. The outcome of that review is that even though there might be other sustainability benefits from locating close to the edge of the city there would be clear harm to the purposes of the Green Belt if significant areas of Green Belt were to be released for housing. The strategy is therefore likely to involve only limited greenbelt releases. Sites have been identified with a potential capacity of 680 dwellings. The alternative strategy would be to look lower down the settlement hierarchy.
13. Sites are proposed at Cambourne, Histon and Impington, Melbourne, Waterbeach, Comberton and Sawston, which is the nearest settlement to Uttlesford and most likely to be of interest. The sites in Sawston have a total capacity of 520 homes and include some sites currently in employment use.
14. The Councils have not yet formed a view on whether there is a need but in the consultation they are exploring views on site options for a new community stadium which could include a mix of uses including health, leisure, education etc and other facilities such as an Ice Rink and Music Venue.

## Risk Analysis

15.

Risk	Likelihood	Impact	Mitigating actions
That the Council's views are not taken into account in relation to some issue which has cross border implications	1. Low providing comments are made in relation to material planning issues	3. Failure in Duty to Co-operate.	Respond to consultations in a timely manner and in the format etc requested.

1 = Little or no risk or impact

2 = Some risk or impact – action may be necessary.

3 = Significant risk or impact – action required

4 = Near certainty of risk occurring, catastrophic effect or failure of project.