

OAKINGTON & WESTWICK PARISH COUNCIL

Clerk's Report for 9th March 2026 Meeting

Subject	Comments
Pavilion	CCTV engineer reported that 2 x screens were faulty. Chair kindly replaced them with two of his own.
Anti-social behaviour	17.2.26 – Rec grass damaged by tyre tracks. ‘ No Dogs’ signs also damaged. 2.3.26 – similar incident occurred. This time observed – 2 x young persons riding illegal e-bikes round car park at speed and on Rec. Reported to Police.
Anti-social behaviour	Resident reported that noisy motorbikes are being ridden on the fields to the south of Westwick. He has submitted around 20 reports to the Police but had no response. Following Cllr Warren-Green’s suggestion, this has now been reported via the SCDC anti-social behaviour online form.
Planted Containers	Garden centre owner has advised EAG that he won’t be making a charge for the Spring and Autumn 2025 planting.
Pavilion	External woodwork decorating scheduled for w/c 8 June 2026
White Horse Pub	Asset Community Value (ACV) relisting application submitted. Decision within 8 weeks.
Environment	Histon resident reported plastic tree coverings laying on ground near newly planted hedging, Mansell Wood and at Centenary Wood. I contacted County Farms Estate and was advised that they would ask their contractor to take a look when they next complete the biannual maintenance of both woods. They should be completing the first visit in April.

Consultation Response – Establishing a Greater Cambridge Development Corporation

Oakington and Westwick Parish Council formally submits the following response to the consultation on the proposed Greater Cambridge Development Corporation.

While we recognise the economic significance of the Greater Cambridge region, our primary duty is to represent the residents of a distinct rural community. Our responses below highlight the critical need for local accountability and the protection of village character.

Consultation Responses:

1. What do you think about the current delivery of infrastructure and homes in Greater Cambridge? Infrastructure—for example flood mitigation and drainage, primary care and GP services, and sustainable transport—consistently lags behind housing delivery. For smaller villages, "success" cannot be measured by urban housing numbers alone; it must include the resilience of the rural infrastructure that supports existing residents.

2. What do you think about the proposal to create a centrally-led Urban Development Corporation? We have significant reservations. A centrally-led body risks bypassing local democratic accountability. Decisions regarding village character and the Green Belt should remain with elected local representatives who understand the specific constraints of our parish, rather than an appointed body focused on macro-scale growth.

3. What matters most to you about the future of Greater Cambridge? Our priorities are:

- **Village Identity:** Maintaining the physical and social separation of Oakington and Westwick from the urban sprawl.
- **Environmental Integrity:** Strict protection of the Green Belt and flood-risk areas.
- **Infrastructure First:** Solving existing utility capacity issues before committing to further growth.

4. Do you have any views on the objectives of the GCDC as set out? The objectives lack a commitment to proportionality. Economic growth must be balanced against the preservation of the "necklace" of villages that define this region. Objectives should explicitly include the protection of rural heritage and biodiversity.

5. What do you think about the proposed boundary of the Development Corporation?

The inclusion of the entire South Cambridgeshire district risks a "one-size-fits-all" urban policy. We are concerned this boundary will lead to Oakington and Westwick being treated as a mere extension of the urban core, ignoring our rural status.

6. What do you think about the proposed approach to powers for the Development Corporation?

We oppose the displacement of existing council functions. Plan-making powers should remain with the Local Planning Authority to ensure that development is led by locally adopted Neighbourhood Plans and Local Plans.

7. Do you have any other views on the proposed powers and functions? Powers must be restricted to land acquisition and financing for major strategic infrastructure. They should not

extend to the determination of local planning applications which do not have a regional impact.

8. What do you think about the proposals to give the Corporation powers to determine planning applications? We object to this transfer of power. Planning determination is a core local government function. Removing this from local councils dilutes the community's voice and reduces the transparency of the decision-making process.

9. Do you agree with using thresholds for decision-making powers? What thresholds are appropriate? Thresholds must be set exceptionally high (e.g., 500+ dwellings) to ensure that village-scale and "windfall" developments remain under local control. Low thresholds would strip the Parish Council of its ability to represent residents on almost all local matters.

10. Do you have any other views on the proposed approach to the Corporation's powers? Any powers granted to the Corporation must be time-limited and task-specific. We propose a mandatory 'sunset clause' whereby the Corporation's planning authority automatically reverts to the Local Planning Authority once defined infrastructure milestones are met. This ensures that extraordinary powers do not become a permanent bypass of local democracy.

11. What do you think about proposed local representation on the Board? Board membership must go beyond Local Authority leaders. There must be a formal mechanism for Parish Council representation to ensure the voices of rural communities are not overshadowed by national or urban interests.

12. What do you think about the board having expertise in planning, development, and environment? Technical expertise is necessary but must be balanced with local contextual knowledge. The board should include experts in rural hydrology and small-settlement planning to prevent "urban-centric" decision-making.

13. Do you have any views on the impacts for people with protected characteristics? Rural isolation is a major risk. Large-scale strategic development often prioritises major transport corridors, which can further marginalise elderly or disabled residents in villages who rely on local, non-strategic connectivity.

Conclusion

Oakington and Westwick Parish Council urges the Government to adopt a model that strengthens partnerships with existing councils rather than replacing them. Local accountability must be preserved to ensure that growth does not come at the expense of our community's heritage and environment.

Oakington & Westwick Parish Council

Payments & Income Schedule – March 2026

Invoices	Details	Net	VAT	Total
SSE Electric	Street lighting energy 1.1.26 -31.1.26	35.09	1.75	36.84
Replay Maintenance Ltd	3G drag brush visit 22/22	150.00	30.00	180.00
Replay Maintenance Ltd	3G drag brush visit 1/15	150.00	30.00	180.00
Connections Bus Project	Youth work sessions Jan-Feb 26	1776.00		1776.00
CAPALC	New Councillor training	70.00		70.00
CAPALC	New Councillor training	75.00		75.00
Hedges Direct (Pro forma)	Beech saplings, Viburnum -seating areas	151.39	30.28	181.67
Unity Trust Bank	Service charge	7.50		7.50
Salaries	Salaries (net)	1162.90		1162.90
	Expenses	15.00		15.00
HMRC	PAYE/NI	196.55		196.55
NEST	Pensions	167.91		167.91
Charge Card				
Lloyds Bank	Monthly charge card fee	3.00		3.00
Zoom Communications Inc	Zoom Workplace Pro (Direct debit)	129.90	25.98	155.88
Totals		4090.24	118.01	4208.25
Income	VAT reclaim 1.10.25 – 28.2.26	3163.87		3163.87
Total				3163.87