

## DRAFT Notes

### Northstowe Phase 1 Open Space Management & Maintenance

#### Steering Group Meeting

21 April 2022

Teams Meeting - Time: 10:00 am

#### Attendees

- (CG) Clare Gibbons, SCDC – Communications and Communities (Chair and Drafting Notes)
- (EB) Ellen Bridges, SCDC – Communications and Communities
- (SF) Stuart Field, L&Q Estates
- (TP) Tam Parry, Northstowe Transport Planner, Cambridgeshire County Council
- (MN) Mark Nokkert, Clerk, Northstowe Town Council
- (DML) Dan delaMare-Lyon, Chair, Longstanton Parish Council

#### Apologies:

- (LH) Lee Hillam, Principal Operations Manager (Awarded Water Courses/Environment Ops) SCDC
- (AWy) Andrew Wycherley, Longstanton Parish Council
- (LM) Luke Mills, Senior Planner (Strategic Sites)
- (SS) Stephen Sage, L&Q Estates
- (RO) Cllr Richard Owen, Mayor, Northstowe Town Council
- (PL) Cllr Paul Littlemore, Deputy Mayor, Northstowe Town Council
- (CBS) Cllr Carla Bros Sabria, Northstowe Town Council
- (RW) Robin Waddell, Greenbelt

TC= town council PC=parish council LPA=Local Planning Authority AW = Anglian Water

	Notes	Action
1.0	<b>Apologies received.</b>	
2.0	<b>Minutes and Actions of Previous Meetings</b>	
2.1	Notes of previous meeting were agreed.	
2.2	<b>Table Tennis Tables:</b> The licence agreement has now been signed and sealed by both parties. MN and DML underscored the need for L&Q to make clear what remedial drainage work would need to be undertaken to resolve the waterlogging at the site intended. <b>Action SS to clarify the actions to be undertaken.</b> <b>Action: EB to liaise with TGOGC to arrange an installation date once a timeline for the remediation work has been established.</b>	SS/EB
2.3	<b>Kingfisher Pond:</b> LM has met with Mike Huntingdon. LM intends to follow up further with Stephen Kelly re. next steps.	LM

<b>3.0</b>	<b>Greenbelt update</b>	
3.1	<p><b>Outstanding actions:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>RW to provide a list of site wide and parcel specific charges.</b></li> <li>• <b>RO to liaise with RW re. billing issue highlighted in March</b></li> </ul> <p>As RW was not at the meeting, it is expected these items will be actioned ahead of the steering group in May.</p>	RW/RO
3.2	<b>Litter bins</b> – LM has liaised with RW on this issue, requesting further details and confirmation of the planning questions that were being raised.	
<b>4.0</b>	<b>L&amp;Q update on works (SS)</b>	
4.1	<p><b>LEAP 3</b></p> <p>SF reported that there was a delay in the determination of planning application 21/05490/REM relating to LEAP 3 because SCDC’s Landscape team had objected on the basis of there being a requirement to provide play equipment for older children in addition to those aimed at 2-4 year olds. SF explained that the site wide strategy for play provision had been consulted on extensively prior to the REM applications for the other LEAPS 1,2 and 4/ NEAP, including a positive review by the Design Panel. MN said that the town council had already submitted its comments on the REM proposal and asked by what process would they be able to comment further if the plans were subsequently changed. DLM stated that the plans that were available to residents when purchasing their houses should not be significantly altered – he recollected the consultation feedback given by Longstanton PC at the time and offered to share this with NTC, which acknowledged that with housing on three sides, restricting play equipment to the younger age group would be appropriate to the location. TP commented that the plan provided excellent activity.</p> <p>It was noted that there was an appetite from residents for more formal play equipment, for which there will be further opportunities elsewhere in the development in subsequent phases.</p> <p><b>Action EB: to follow up with LM and liaise with the Landscape Team.</b></p>	EB
4.2	<p><b>Sports Pavilion</b></p> <p>SF stated L&amp;Q were very close to being ready to complete <b>land transfer</b> to SCDC, with only a plan now needed to append to the transfer documents and anticipates this will go through by the end of May.</p>	
<b>5.0</b>	<b>Western Park</b>	
5.1	<p>EB reported that the following progress has been made re. <b>certification process</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The 3G has been inspected and the report expected today.</li> <li>• MUGA – inspection has been scheduled for next week,</li> <li>• Grass Pitches - yet to be lined. SS has had difficulty in finding a company with availability to do this. The pitches cannot be inspected without being lined.</li> <li>• The bowling green, some management is required prior to inspection, this has yet to be scheduled.</li> </ul> <p><b>Action SS - to ready the pitches/bowling green for inspection</b></p>	SS
5.2	EB reported that a meeting with SS had taken place to identify a location for an <b>on-site storage container</b> for the sports equipment. A site next to the MUGA has been selected – EB to supply SS with dimensions of the	

	<p>container for a site plan to be provided in order to progress to a licence agreement.</p> <p><b>Action EB – liaise with SS as above</b></p>	EB
<b>5.0</b>	<b>Allotments</b>	
5.1	<p>SF has written to Philippa Kelly re. discharging their responsibility under the s106 agreement to set up the escrow like account. This has been received and is now being formally logged. This will allow a formal response to be generated.</p> <p><b>Action Philippa Kelly/LM – formal response required.</b></p>	LM
5.2	<p>EB reported that the procurement process to secure a contractor to solve water pooling across the allotment tracks and hard standing has concluded and the contract awarded.</p> <p>EB has liaised with SCDC’s New Build team, the LPA and L&amp;Q re. the contractors using the sports pavilion car park land as a temporary storage site and to gain access to the allotments land via this entry point. All parties now satisfied with this proposal. The NHA has been informed and EB will liaise with them and the contractor to ensure disruption is kept to a minimum.</p> <p><b>Action EB, to liaise with contractors and the NHA prior to commencement.</b></p>	EB
<b>6.0</b>	<b>Drainage and waterlogging of open spaces</b>	
6.1	SS to update on progress at the next meeting.	SS
<b>7.0</b>	<b>Cycle connections</b>	
7.1	<p><b>Path Link between Longstanton Park and Ride and Waterpark</b></p> <p>TP reported that the pathway connection will be included within the contract to deliver the final section of the busway. Unfortunately there is still no timescale for delivery. However a degree of site clearance has already happened and a soil assessment has been undertaken. The final design is being worked up.</p>	
7.2	<p><b>Surfacing of the Busway crossing to Rampton.</b></p> <p>TP is drafting a history of the Rampton Drift crossing for information and use by the Town Council. TP stated that the most impactful improvements have already been made, i.e. reduction in the speed limit to 30mph and cutting back of the vegetation on the Northstowe side to improve visibility. There will always be a need to lift cycles over the tracks (as the guide rail is necessary to steer the buses around the bend).</p> <p>MN reported that Rampton PC is also keen to be informed as students travel to Northstowe secondary college via this route.</p> <p><b>Action: TP to provide details to TC</b></p>	TP
7.3	<p><b>Cycleway alongside the B1050.</b></p> <p>L&amp;Q have received the cycle path proposal across land forming the 3<sup>rd</sup> works, which will be accompanied by a formal request to designate the part as Highway, and this is currently under consideration by L&amp;Q.</p>	

	<p>DML suggested that Simon Manville could present the plans for the cycle way at the forthcoming Longstanton PC AGM.</p> <p>Action: TP to provide contact details for Simon to DML.</p>	TP
7.4	<p><b>Hatton Road Ponds</b></p> <p>DLM reported that Longstanton residents have been complaining that their access to Hattons Road Ponds has been disrupted by the landowner ploughing across what they perceive to be a right of way across the land to the third works area. In reality no right of way exists.</p> <p><b>TP to alert the PROW team at the county council of this issue.</b></p> <p>SF confirmed that since SCDC refused the first, second and third works, the responsibility to find a long-term management solution for these rests with L&amp;Q. DLM restated LPC's interest in taking on the third works, but this was still contingent on L&amp;Q finding a solution for the first and second works, which LPC would not be in a position to take on. Clearly, the impact of the cycle way on the third works would also need to be clarified before this could be progressed.</p> <p><b>Action SF to resolve the first and second works issue and reconsider the offer from LPC once the cycle way details were agreed.</b></p> <p>TP thanked SF for assisting the county in bringing forward the cycleway.</p>	TP
<b>8</b>	<b>Waterpark</b>	
8.1	<p>Dogs running loose around the Waterpark was an issue raised by the Town Council. MN stated that there were risks to the wildlife but also to cyclist, pedestrians and other dog walkers who wanted to keep their dog away from others.</p> <p>CG stated that this issue had been raised previously and suggested we adopt the approach taken at Trumpington Meadows Country Park, where there are defined areas where dogs are allowed off lead, on lead and banned. DLM agreed this offered a good model, which users of this country park appeared to obey. The signage gave clear maps indicating the various areas.</p> <p>CG suggested the TC have a role in establishing a consensus with residents as to how the areas of open space be defined. MN felt this was a landowner responsibility. It was agreed that</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SCDC would draft an illustrative plan with a first suggestion for zoning, which could be used to initiate a conversation with residents.</li> <li>• L&amp;Q could incorporate responsible dog walking messaging into the signage planned for the Waterpark.</li> </ul> <p>EB had been advised by the SCDC Environment Health team that problematic dog owners could be served with a Community Protection Warning, but details about the owner and the offences would need to be catalogued for action to be taken (the law requires dogs to be "under the control" of their owner. Further offences could result in a Community Protection Order being issued. Any attack/biting incident would be a police matter.</p>	EB SF
<b>10</b>	<b>Community Bookings</b>	
10.1	<p>EB reported that a request for a licence had been made by a kebab van to locate in Northstowe five evenings a week (Mon-Fri). They had been directed to Food Revolution/Northstowe Foodies, but they were not willing to take up the offer of a monthly pitch. They had put forward two</p>	EB

	<p>locations for consideration, one being the maintenance bay next to the lights on Station Road, the other being the west bound carriageway on Stirling Road, opposite The Green, on the bus lay by.</p> <p>MN raised that this is not a matter for the Town Council to decide on, as it is probably a matter for the land owner and licensing agencies, but would be happy to provide general input into the discussions. Although MN recognised that some residents would welcome this addition, it was also raised that accepting a food van outside of the established and successful Northstowe Foodies framework could potentially undermine its success and ambition to create a sustainable food culture. It was also suggested by an attendee that the proposed locations at the entry to Northstowe may not support the image of Northstowe as a Healthy New Town and may be considered detrimental in marketing terms by the housebuilders. The B1050 was not considered to be an option due to safety concerns, particularly as it could generate parking. This land had been transferred to Highways so any application for a licence would need to be directed to them. MN raised the matter of the existing hog roast van generating dangerous parking situations, something which was raised with him by a resident just the other day, and suggested that the landowner for the proposed site for the kebab van, L&amp;Q, may want to take this on board in their decision, as this proposal could replicate that problem. The group agreed that ultimately this would be a decision for the current landowner of the unadopted roads, L&amp;Q, and the licencing team, and SF agreed to take this back to L&amp;Q, and EB would pass on thoughts to the licensing team.</p>	
<b>12</b>	<b>AOB</b>	
12.1	<p>Ramps – MN asked if further work could be done to improve the ramps from pavements in Stirling Road and elsewhere, as several people with disabilities have approached the town council to say they were difficult to use. <b>Action: EB to forward MN’s e-mail to SS, MN to follow up with further detail.</b></p>	EB/MN/SS
<b>13</b>	<p>Next meeting – 12 May 10am. NOTE this is a permanent change to the meeting schedule. New invitations will be issued.</p>	All note