

**Local Plan Examinations
Cambridge City and South Cambridgeshire**

Note of the pre-hearing meeting (PHM) on 11th September 2014

These Notes are not intended to be a full record of the meeting, they are a summary of the main points made.

1. Inspector Laura Graham opened the meeting, explaining that she had been appointed by the Secretary of State to hold the examination into the soundness of the submitted plans. The Inspector then introduced Inspector Alan Wood who will be assisting and Planning Officer Laura O'Brien. The Inspector also introduced Ms Gloria Alexander, the Programme Officer (PO).
2. The representatives from both Councils then introduced themselves– Mrs Caroline Hunt the planning policy manager for South Cambridgeshire and Mrs Sara Saunders the planning policy manager for Cambridge City. A full list of the witnesses which both Councils intend to call upon throughout the examination can be found appended to this note.
3. The Inspector stressed that no evidence would be heard and no discussion of the merits of the plan would take place at the PHM. The purpose of the meeting was to clarify the administrative and procedural matters which govern the hearings to be heard from November onwards. The Inspector then explained that these are Examinations into the soundness of the Local Plans, and she will have regard to the representations made, but her report will not include an individual response to each representation.
4. The Examinations started with the submission of the Plans and will end with the submission of the Inspector's report to the Councils. There will be a separate report to each Council but as the Plans are highly interdependent in many respects, the Inspector is carrying out the Examinations concurrently and there will be a number of joint hearings sessions.
5. The Inspector then opened the floor to any attendees with particular questions about the Guidance Notes, which had been circulated previously:

- **Question 1 - A question was asked as to how it would be made clear which items would be covered in which sessions?**

The Inspector explained that the sessions will cover the published Matter, Issues and Questions (MIQ) which she has compiled for the first block of hearings. Those who have made representations relevant to each session (and have asked to be heard) will be invited to attend. If any representations have been made which do not fit within one of the timetabled sessions they will be included in a session towards the end of the examination. The same weight is given to written representations as oral representations and some parties may wish to reconsider whether they will appear. Detailed MIQ will be provided for the subsequent hearings at a later date and participants will be able to comment on these if they wish through the PO.

- **Question 2 – A question was raised regarding paragraph 13 of the Inspector's Guidance Note. It was asked whether the assumption is that the plan is sound and it must be proved otherwise, or, is the**

Inspector working from an open minded point of view and evidence must be provided either way?

The Inspector explained that the Councils considers that they have submitted sound plans. Those who disagree must explain why referring to the soundness criteria. The Inspector has an open mind. For those wishing to be heard, a knowledge of the soundness criteria is important and statements should be framed in those terms.

- **Question 3 – A question as to whether only those who made representations were allowed to speak, as stated in paragraph 12 of the Guidance Note, was asked?**

The Inspector explained that this was indeed the case and would remain so. A number of requests to speak from individuals who did not make representations have been received and if one were to be allowed it could set a precedent for others, so nobody without a right will be heard.

- **Question 4 – The Inspector was asked to define a representation – i.e who has a right to speak.**

The Inspector explained that the period for making written representations was towards the end of 2013. Those who made a representation, indicating that they thought the plan needed to be changed and ticked a box regarding speaking at the hearing would be allowed to speak. Those who want to speak but did not tick the relevant box can still request to do so through the PO. The deadline for making this request is the 19th September to allow the programme to be finalised.

- **Question 5 – A question was asked as to how the participants listed in the draft programme were compiled.**

The Inspector explained that the draft programme only relates to the first block of hearing sessions and identifies those who made representations on those issues. Later sessions will cover other issues and will give others the opportunity to appear. If anyone is not on the list so far but feels they should be they should contact the PO and give relevant representation numbers. The lists came from the Councils' representation databases but were not sifted by the Councils in any way. The PO requested the information from the software company who administer the databases and the Inspector made the decision regarding who would appear. Anyone who made a representation and indicated that they felt the plan needed to be changed can request to be heard but it is the Inspector's decision. The Inspector confirmed that she has read all of the representations made.

- **Question 6 – A participant expressed concern that he submitted a representation last year but was then told by the City Council that it was too long. The edited version did not represent his views.**

Cambridge City Council confirmed that they asked for a summary of representations for the database. The full representations are also on the database and available to view. They have been passed to the Inspector. Representors were asked to check the summary prepared by the Council and

were given the opportunity to alter it prior to its publication. If anyone has any concerns then they are invited to check and get in touch with the PO.

- **Question 7 – A question was asked that if new information has come to light can it be added into representations?**

The Inspector stated that information can't be added to existing representations. If their representation falls under the MIQ identified by the Inspector, they will have the opportunity to submit a reasonably short statement (with appendices, including photographs, if required) addressing the MIQ which can include any new information.

- **Question 8 – Concern was raised regarding the listed participants for matter 5 *Infrastructure/Monitoring/Viability* do not include any local people who certainly made representations around this area, particularly regarding Waterbeach.**

The Inspector confirmed that there will be a specific session on Waterbeach and those who had made relevant representations will be invited to attend.

- **Question 9 – The Inspector was asked whether she was aware of the appeal decisions at Waterbeach which will have an impact on the South Cambridgeshire Plan. It was asked whether the plan was still sound when major changes will now be needed.**

The Inspector confirmed that she was aware of the appeal decisions and that the issue has already been raised by the Council. South Cambridgeshire District Council advised that modifications will probably be needed. These modifications would need to be advertised and representations will be able to be made. Further hearing sessions may also be required on this issue. In making the decision regarding extra sessions issues of natural justice will be considered.

The Council agreed that they were aware of the decisions and the implications on the Green Belt. They consider that the issue can be appropriately addressed through advertised modifications and relevant hearing sessions.

- **Question 10 – It was asked whether additional documents can be submitted if there are developments within an issue?**

The Inspector confirmed that if relevant to specific MIQ additional evidence can be included in their statement, provided it is in accordance with the requirements set out in the Guidance Note.

- **Question 11 – It was asked whether there will be a hearing session on the Mill Road area?**

The Inspector stated that it was not yet possible to confirm whether there will be hearings on specific sites.

- **Question 12 – It was asked whether the Inspector has seen the full representations?**

The Inspector stated that she has seen all of the representations in full.

- **Question 13 – The subject of the recent Waterbeach appeal decisions was raised again. Concern was expressed and it was asked whether this will be a specific issue in the context of five year housing land supply and it was asked whether this can be addressed at an early stage?**

The Inspector stated that the detail of this matter was not open for discussion at the PHM, but that she expects the Council to address these matters in their statement. She understands that people who did not originally make representations may wish to do so if main modifications are advertised.

- **Question 14 – The Inspector was asked whether she intended to issue an interim note after the first session regarding housing numbers?**

The Inspector stated that she is uncertain at present. If there are soundness concerns then she will identify them to allow them to be addressed before any further sessions. The Inspector will consider issuing a note and will also seek advice from colleagues in the Inspectorate.

- **Question 15 – It was stated that no Parish Council representatives are listed as participants for any issues. It was asked whether the Inspector has access to old information and representations made at earlier stages?**

The Inspector stated that this evidence does not form part of the examination into the plans at this stage and is not before her.

- **Question 16 – The previous question was followed up with a further question – it was asked how the Parish Council will be able to involved in the hearings as they worked closely with the Council on proposals which were included in the plan and would like the opportunity to defend their proposals against those making representations against them.**

The Council confirmed that they worked closely with the Parish Council and asked them to submit their proposals. As such the Parish Council did not make representations on those parts of the plan. The Inspector stated that if the Parish Council are supporting the Council and their proposals then they should liaise with the Council and help them to make the points.

6. The Councils took the opportunity to clarify their position regarding legal representation as set out in paragraph 14 of the Inspector's guidance note. They do have legal representation, a barrister, who will form part of their team at the hearings as and when required.
7. The Inspector added that the hearings are not like a public inquiry and the barristers present will be a part of the teams; they won't be making the cases or presenting any submissions. The hearings will not become more formal as a result.

- **Question 17 – Concern was raised that an individual put in representations and has been invited to speak on one matter but not another. It was asked whether she could put in a request to speak under an additional matter.**

The Inspector advised that they should contact the PO to make a request and include the reference number of the relevant representation.

- **Question 18 – Clarification was sought regarding the purpose of the additional statements and whether they were the same as statements of common ground.**

The Inspector explained that these statements relate to the MIQ raised by the Inspector. They are optional but often prove useful in focussing representations at the sessions.

They are not the same as statements of common ground which are designed to prevent discussion into technical matters at the sessions. Instead, parties are asked to get together with others and the Councils to refine areas where they agree and disagree. This helps the sessions to run smoothly. These statements do not have to be long and can simply be bullet points. The obligation to write the statements is shared and any individual who thinks a statement of common ground would be useful is encouraged to approach the Councils and others.

The Councils confirmed that they are looking to prepare a number of statements of common ground and have already made some approaches. Matter 3 b refers to this and the Councils are willing to work with anyone who would like to do so.

- **Question 19 – A participant stated that they have not seen the MIQ.**

The Inspector stated that the first block has been published and copies are available online and added that further MIQ for later sessions would follow.

- **Question 20 – It was asked whether the Site Visits will be timetabled?**

The Inspector explained that site visits on plan examinations are rarely accompanied and they would most likely be undertaken by the Inspector alone. The examinations deal with principles and not details of proposals. If access to private land is required it may sometimes be necessary for the PO to arrange this with any landowner; in these cases the Inspector will be accompanied by a representative from each party. No discussion will take place on site, this will all occur during the hearing sessions.

8. The Inspector then took the time to reiterate that she has set out the matter, issues and questions (MIQ) for the first block of hearings sessions and hopes to be able to circulate those relating to the remaining sessions shortly. The next block will be in early 2015 and there will be sessions on the Green Belt (including the issue of exceptional circumstances), transport, housing delivery (including whether the Objectively Assessed Need will be met, five year housing land supply, the appropriate buffer and housing for specific groups, such as older people, students and Gypsy and Travellers). Sessions will move on to cover Areas of Major Change/Major Development Areas, site specific matters, the built and natural environment and omission sites. The examination will be a long process and the sessions will be very substantial. There have been a lot of representations and, whilst the Inspector understands that parties wish to progress quickly, the examination is a major task and cutting corners would not assist the overall process.

- **Question 21 – It was asked whether a list of future topics could be released in draft so that interested parties know which topics are to be covered.**

The Inspector agreed and is currently working on this.

- **Question 22 – A question was asked regarding omission sites. It was asked whether the list of sites is closed or whether new sites can be added?**

The Inspector explained that there is no 'list' of omission sites; they come from representations made which seek the inclusion of alternative sites in the plan. No further sites can now be suggested, those to be discussed must have been raised in representations.

- **Question 23 – A follow up question was asked as to who can appear at the sessions discussing the omission sites. A group made representations about a specific site and would like to speak.**

Anyone wishing to speak against specific sites should rely on the Council to present their case and if they feel they can add anything they should speak to the Council.

- **Question 24 – A question was asked regarding the political context of the plans. There has been a seismic change in the planning landscape (City Deal, National Planning Practice Guidance, etc), the participant asked whether it was necessary to examine the entire plan with such a high level of scrutiny when a new plan is intended to start in 2019.**

The Inspector explained that the plan as submitted has to be examined so the examination will include the full plan period. This is not an entirely unusual situation as it is expected that any plan will be refreshed throughout its life.

- **Question 25 – The Inspector's views were sought on applications submitted before the adoption of the plan.**

The Inspector stated that she was unable to comment on this and is only in a position to examine the plan before her. Planning applications are a matter for the Councils.

- **Question 26 – The Inspector was asked if anyone can attend the hearing sessions to observe?**

The Inspector confirmed that this was the case but people will not be able to participate unless they are on the list of speakers.

- **Question 27 – A question was asked regarding the suitability of the venues to allow people to attend and hear the proceedings.**

The Inspector and the PO confirmed that the first block of hearings will be at the South Cambridgeshire District Council offices in Cambourne. The PO confirmed that she has assessed the venue and it is suitable.

- **Question 28 – The Inspector was asked whether video evidence could be submitted along with the MIQ statements.**

The Inspector advised that this would not be appropriate or necessary. The Inspector will look at sites in person and if there are certain points or features which parties would like her to see or if they feel she should visit at certain times then they can ask her to do so.

- **Question 29 – An observation was made that due to the modifications which are most likely necessary the timetable for the initial programme may need to be lengthened. It was also noted that the speaker’s clients had made representations but were not identified on the lists of participants. A question was also asked as to whether the order of the housing and employment sessions could be amended as the strategy is to provide housing for employment.**

The Inspector advised the speaker to contact the PO regarding his client’s representations. The speaker has made written comments regarding the programme which the Inspector has seen briefly but will look at in full. The Inspector is of the initial view that many of the suggested changes would not be required or incorporated. Housing may be needed to support the economy but this will be looked at as part of the session considering the objectively assessed need for housing and the Inspector was not convinced changing the order would make a significant difference. The Inspector confirmed that the hearings programme may change and interested parties are responsible for checking the website and keeping in touch with the PO. If last minute changes are made participants will be notified.

- **Question 30 – The Inspector was asked about the deadline for requesting amendments to the programme.**

The Inspector clarified that she was not inviting requests to change the programme. Individuals can comment on the programme for future blocks as they are published, but the inability of parties to attend at certain times would not result in changes to the programme. Notification of an alternative speaker would be acceptable.

9. The Inspector then invited the Councils to discuss the Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) which they had submitted prior to the hearing. The Councils explained that the MoU had been agreed by both Councils and reflects recent appeal decisions at Waterbeach and other changes of circumstance (National Planning Practice Guidance, City Deal, etc). It also envisages that the housing trajectories of the two Councils should be considered together; although the Council confirmed that this approach remained consistent with both plans. The Inspector stated that she has had a brief look and had noted that the document envisaged that major modifications would be needed. The Council confirmed that this was likely but it would be a matter for the Inspector to advise on. The Inspector added that she can only recommend modifications which make the plans sound and, as such, the Councils will need to identify the current soundness issue and explain how the modifications will overcome this. The Council confirmed that this would be addressed in their statements.

- **Question 31 – It was noted that the above discussion was an admission that the existing plan is unsound. A question was asked as to when the modifications would be published to allow time to comment. It was asked whether these can be published as the examination progresses and not in one block (there is precedent for**

this). The speaker noted that they would like to take the modifications into account when preparing their statements.

The Inspector encouraged the Councils to publish a rolling list of main modifications as the examination progresses. However, she stated that formal consultation on any main modifications would take place after the hearings have concluded. The modifications procedure is set out in the Guidance Notes.

- **Question 32 – It was asked when the parties would be informed if the Inspector identified a ‘showstopper’**

The Inspector confirmed that this would happen ASAP and explained that this is the reason for allowing gaps between hearing sessions.

- **Question 33 – The request for upfront knowledge of the modifications and the timetable for them in the interests of efficiency was reiterated by another speaker.**

The Inspector advised that she hoped these would be addressed in the Councils’ statements and agreed that the sooner this was done the better.

- **Question 34 – A participant advised that they were feeling disenfranchised as they had not seen the MoU and had not had chance to understand the implications of it.**

The Inspector advised that the document was already in the public domain but would be placed in the examination library over the next few days. If their representations touch on the same issues then the Inspector explained that there would still be approximately one month to read the short MoU and address it in their statements.

- **Question 35 – A plea from a local resident was made for the Inspector not to send them back to square one as a great deal of work and cooperation has been undertaken.**

The Inspector noted the request.

10. The Inspector closed the meeting by advising anyone with any further queries to contact the PO and by stressing paragraph 31 of her guidance note which explains that written representations carry equal weight to oral submissions. The Inspector thanked everyone for their attendance and the meeting closed at 16:20

Cambridge Local Plan Examination: Witness List

The list below represents an interim list of those appearing at the examination for Cambridge City Council in respect of the Cambridge Local Plan. This list may be subject to change.

Name	Title	Topic/Matter
Mrs Sara Saunders	Planning Policy Manager	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Matters 1 – 5 and all subsequent matters
Ms Joanna Gilbert-Wooldridge	Principal Planning Policy Officer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Matters 1 – 5 and all subsequent matters
Mr Stephen Miles	Planning Policy and Economic Development Officer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Matter 3: Housing Need • Matter 4: Employment and Retail • Sites • Employment • Retail • University related development
Mrs Emma Davies	Senior Sustainability Officer (Design and Construction)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Matter 1: Legal Process and requirements • Sustainability Appraisal • Sustainable Design and Construction • Flood Risk
Mr Bruce Waller	Senior Planning Policy Officer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Open Space • Community and leisure facilities • Hotels • Public houses • Sites
Miss Frances Schulz	Planning Policy Officer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Housing delivery • Transport • Monitoring
Mr Julian Sykes	Urban Extensions Project Manager	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sites
Mr Alan Carter	Head of Strategic Housing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Housing
Ms Helen Reed	Housing Strategy Manager	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Housing
Mr Stephen Hills	Director of Housing, South Cambridgeshire District Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gypsy and Travellers
Mr Glen Richardson	Urban Design and Conservation Manager	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sites • Urban design • Historic environment
Ms Sharon Brown	New Neighbourhoods Development Manager	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sites

Ms Dinah Foley-Norman	Principal Landscape Architect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Matter 2: Overall Spatial Vision and general issues • Green Belt and landscape character
Mr Jonathan Brookes	Principal Urban Designer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Urban design
Mr Christian Brady	Principal Conservation and Design Officer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Historic environment
Mr John Williamson	Manager, Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Joint Strategic Planning Unit	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Matter 2: Overall Spatial Vision and general issues • Matter 3: Housing Need • Matter 4: Employment and Retail
Mrs Rebecca Roebuck	Research Manager (Economy), Cambridgeshire County Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Matter 3: Housing Need • Matter 4: Employment and Retail
Mr Matthew Bowles	Transport and Infrastructure Officer, Cambridgeshire County Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Transport
Mr Jeremy Smith	Transport and Infrastructure Strategy Manager, Cambridgeshire County Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Transport • Matter 2: Overall Spatial Vision and general issues • Matter 5: Infrastructure/Monitoring/ Viability
Mr Simon Bunn	Consultant	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Flood risk
Mr Jo Dicks	Principal Scientific Officer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Environmental health
Ms Clare Rankin	Cycling and Walking Officer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Transport
Mr Guy Belcher	Nature Conservation Projects Officer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Open space

South Cambridgeshire Local Plan Examination: Witness List

The list below represents an interim list of those appearing at the examination for South Cambridgeshire District Council in respect of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan. This list may be subject to change.

Name	Title	Topic/Matter
Mrs Caroline Hunt	Planning Policy Manager	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Matter 1: Legal and Process Requirements • Matter 2: Overall Spatial Vision and general issues • Matter 3: Housing need • Matter 4: Employment and Retail • Matter 5: Infrastructure/Monitoring/ Viability • All subsequent matters
Mr Jonathan Dixon	Principal Planning Policy Officer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Matter 1: Legal and Process Requirements • Matter 2: Overall Spatial Vision and general issues • Matter 3: Housing need • Matter 4: Employment and Retail • Matter 5: Infrastructure/Monitoring/ Viability • All subsequent matters
Mr David Roberts	Principal Planning Policy Officer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Matter 1: Legal and Process Requirements • Matter 2: Overall Spatial Vision and general issues • Matter 3: Housing need • Matter 4: Employment and Retail • Matter 5: Infrastructure/Monitoring/ Viability • All subsequent matters
Ms Alison Talkington	Senior Planning Officer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Communities • Natural and Historic Environment • Sites
Mrs Claire Spencer	Senior Planning Officer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Design • Transport • Sites

Name	Title	Topic/Matter
Miss Jenny Nuttycombe	Senior Planning Officer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Climate change • Sites • Housing delivery
Mr David Hamilton	Landscape Design Officer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Landscape
Mr Rob Mungovan	Ecology Officer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ecology
Mr Ian Howes	Principal Urban Designer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Urban Design
Ms Bonnie Kwok	Lead Urban Design Project Coordinator	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Urban Design
Mr Greg Kearney	Environmental Health Officer (Planning Specialist)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Environmental Health
Mr James Fisher	S106 Officer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Matter 5: Infrastructure/ Monitoring/ Viability
Mrs Jane Green	Head of New Communities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strategic Sites
Ms Lois Bowser	Northstowe Joint Team Leader	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strategic Sites
Mr Paul Mumford	Team Leader - New Communities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strategic Sites
Mr Pat Matthews	Drainage Manager	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Flood risk
Mr Stephen Hills	Director of Housing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Affordable Housing • Gypsies & Travellers
Mrs Julie Fletcher	Housing Performance Team Leader	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Affordable Housing • Gypsies & Travellers
Mrs Schuyler Newstead	Head of Housing Strategy & Development	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Affordable Housing • Gypsies & Travellers
Ms Dinah Foley-Norman	Principal Landscape Architect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Matter 2: Overall Spatial Vision and general issues • Green Belt and landscape character
Mr John Williamson	Manager, Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Joint Strategic Planning Unit	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Matter 3: Housing Need • Matter 4: Employment and Retail
Mrs Rebecca Roebuck	Research Manager (Economy), Cambridgeshire County Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Matter 2: Overall Spatial Vision and general issues • Matter 3: Housing Need • Matter 4: Employment and Retail
Mr Matthew Bowles	Transport and Infrastructure Officer, Cambridgeshire County Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Transport

Name	Title	Topic/Matter
Mr Jeremy Smith	Transport and Infrastructure Strategy Manager, Cambridgeshire County Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Transport• Matter 2: Overall Spatial Vision and general issues• Matter 5: Infrastructure/Monitoring/Viability

