



FOWLmere PARISH COUNCIL

re-consultation response on Greater Cambridge Shared Planning Obligations Supplementary Planning Document (SPD)

This is the response of Fowlmere Parish Council to the re-consultation on the Planning Obligations SPD. We made a response on the first consultation.

- Page 14, para 2.3, second bullet. This now reads “Where approval is recommended, the detailed proposed heads of terms will need to have been agreed prior to the application being considered by the Planning Committee (Cambridge City Council Planning Committee, South Cambridgeshire District Council Planning Committee and the Joint Development Management Committee)”. This replaces the requirement for a fully agreed and executed s.106 agreement to accompany the planning application. In our view this is a retrograde step. The negotiation of planning obligations tends to be lengthy where negotiation is delayed until after the committee resolution. We very much doubt that detailed heads of terms will stop this. In short, the adrenaline disappears after the resolution, the assumption is that all is agreed, done and dusted, and planning officers are required to deal with the next application (which is usually more interesting than spending time with lawyers) and the process becomes protracted. This has been the professional experience of the chair of our planning committee who acted at one time or another for developers, landowners and local planning authorities in the negotiation of their planning agreements.

We strongly urge SCDC and CCC to return to the original wording.

- Page 21, para 2.38. We are surprised that the monitoring and administration fees are being reduced. Reducing the charge will make monitoring and enforcement of planning obligations worse. SCDC’s experience with the community centre at Northstowe, should have burned into them and neighbouring authorities the need for close monitoring of development progress against planning obligation triggers. We urge SCDC and CCC to be absolutely certain that the fees they propose will improve monitoring and administration of s.106 agreements so that the obligations in them are delivered in full, on time.
- Page 24, para 2.50. We do not understand why the reference to the need to follow a UK recognised professional standard has been omitted, together with the example of the RICS. It is vital that development appraisals are reliable. To omit reference to recognised professionals and their regulatory bodies simply invites risky and unreliable shortcuts from persons not held to the highest standards of integrity.
- Page 42, para 4.35: “versus” not “verses”.
- Page 85, Table 13-2: the reductions in the burial cost per dwelling are very substantial. The original figures have gone down to less than a third of the original version. Are SCDC and CCC councillors certain the new figures are correct?

Angela Mulholland.
Clerk, Fowlmere Parish Council
Box 273, Royston, SG8 1ES
clerk@fowlmereparishcouncil.gov.uk