

DEVELOPMENT PLAN SCRUTINY SUB-COMMITTEE

14 March 2016

5.30 - 7.35 pm

Present: Councillors Gawthrope (Vice-Chair), Ashton, Baigent, C. Smart, Reid and M. Smart

Executive Councillor for Planning Policy and Transport: Councillor Blencowe

Other Councillor Present:

Councillor Hipkin

Officers:

Planning Policy Manager: Sara Saunders

Urban Design & Conservation Manager: Glen Richardson

Principal Planning Policy Officer: Joanna Gilbert-Wooldridge

Other Officers Present:

Managing Director, Greater Cambridge Housing Development Agency: Alan Carter

Housing Development Manager, Greater Cambridge Housing Development Agency: Nicola Hillier

Committee Manager: Claire Tunnicliffe

FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE COUNCIL**16/46/DPSSC Apologies**

Apologies were received from Councillors Sarris and Tunnacliffe.

Councillor Reid attended as an alternate for Councillor Tunnacliffe.

Councillor M Smart attended as an alternate for Councillor Sarris.

16/47/DPSSC Declarations of Interest

Name	Item	Reason
Councillor Ashton	16/50/DPSSC	Personal: Chairman of Cherry Hinton Residents' Association

16/48/DPSSC Minutes

The minutes of 8 December 2016 were approved subject to the following changes:

Page 8 of the agenda pack: Brampton Street changed to Brampton Road.

Page 8 of the agenda pack: Crowell Road changed to Cromwell Road.

16/49/DPSSC Public Questions

There were no public questions.

16/50/DPSSC Cambridge Local Plan - Proposed Modifications - Report on Consultation March 2016**Matter for Decision**

Decision of Executive Councillor for Planning Policy and Transport

- i. Agreed that the Report on Consultation (Appendix A), the Proposed Modifications (Appendix B) and the supplement to the Sustainability Appraisal Addendum (Appendix E), subject to any changes recommended by the Development Plan Scrutiny Sub-Committee, be submitted for consideration by Full Council on 23 March 2016 and approved for submission to the Inspectors examining the Local Plan.
- ii. Agreed that the documents attached to the committee report as Appendices F to J are noted and submitted as part of the evidence base for the Local Plan;
- iii. Agreed that delegated authority be given to the Director of Environment to make any subsequent minor amendments and editing changes, in consultation with the Executive Councillor for Planning Policy and Transport, the Chair and Spokesperson of the Environment Committee.

Reason for the Decision

As set out in the Officer's report.

Any Alternative Options Considered and Rejected

Not applicable.

Scrutiny Considerations

Councillor Hipkin addressed the Committee regarding the Local Plan. The following comments were made:

- i. Expressed admiration for the work that Officers had undertaken as the process had not been without considerable challenges.
- ii. Hoped that all political groups on the Council would continue to be united during this process.
- iii. At a meeting of the Joint Strategic Transport Spatial Planning Group held earlier that day the location of housing allocations in Cambridge had been questioned and it had been stressed how important it was to defend the City's Green Belt.
- iv. The compact character of the city appeared to be under threat and hoped that the Inspectors would be convinced by the argument that suggested settlements beyond the green belt was the most positive direction to take.
- v. Queried what was meant by 'market signals' and what these signals would be.
- vi. Questioned if building additional houses in the city would bring house prices down as house prices continued to escalate faster than the rest of the country.
- vii. The Council's housing strategy on affordable housing would continue to be undermined if the successful applications that developers were making based on viability continued.

The Committee received a report from the Planning Policy Manager.

The report followed on from the consultation on proposed modifications to the Cambridge Local Plan and South Cambridgeshire Local Plan held between 2 December 2015 and 25 January 2016. Any new proposed modifications considered necessary in response to issues raised during the consultation were identified as shown in Appendix A (Proposed Modifications - Report on Consultation March 2016) of the Officer's report.

The report identified the number of representations received to each proposed modification and provided a summary of the key issues raised, and the Councils' assessment. Both Cambridge City Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council had assessed the representations and key issues for each modification and topic area and taken the appropriate action to:

- a) carry forward the proposed modification as consulted on;
- b) carry forward the proposed modification with amendments, and/or;
- c) include a new proposed modification.

The proposed modifications to the Cambridge Local Plan, recommended for submission to the Local Plan Inspectors were contained in Appendix B of the Officer's report.

In response to the Committee's questions, Officers made the following statements:

- i. With regards to Appendix I of the Officer's report, the A428 study was separate to the City Deal project and had been produced to demonstrate the concerns raised by the Inspectors. The study is part of demonstrating that the overall strategy is sustainable and could be delivered.
- ii. In terms of market signals, this was one area that the Inspectors had advised the Council undertake further work on. Examples include house prices amongst other data.
- iii. With regards to the planning guidance relating to student accommodation, lessons had been learnt from the Mill Road public inquiry.
- iv. There have been a high number of planning applications for studio flats rather than cluster units for student accommodation which had been difficult to address through the Local Plan 2006 and the National Planning Policy Guidance.
- v. The Council's student accommodation study would focus on the type of accommodation, the type of student that would be recruited and the cost of new accommodation. It would cover a wide range of factors, including provision of amenity space, cycle parking and disabled parking
- vi. Recognised the concerns raised with regards to the time-scale taking to finalise and adopt the Local Plan.
- vii. Officers would confirm that Cherry Hinton Residents' Association was consulted directly and which members of the residents' association were directly consulted.
- viii. The transport assessment had been updated to include the Cherry Hinton access road from Coldham's Lane and Cherry Hinton Road. There were no proposals for access to be taken through the existing residential development south of the allocation and reference to the new spine road had been included in the proposed modifications.
- ix. Additional wording could be included to detail the access arrangement for the spine road further in consultation with the Executive Councillor for Planning Policy and Transport, the Chair and Spokesperson of Development Plan Scrutiny Sub-Committee.
- x. Noted the comments regarding the lack of public consultation on the transport assessment.

- xi. A comprehensive master-plan would be undertaken for land north of the Cherry Hinton but currently this did not include Hatherdene Close as it is in separate land ownership.

The Committee resolved unanimously to endorse the recommendations.

The Executive Councillor approved the recommendations.

Conflicts of Interest Declared by the Executive Councillor (and any Dispensations Granted).

No conflicts of Interest were declared by the Executive Councillor.

16/51/DPSSC Mill Road Depot Planning and Development Brief Supplementary Planning Document

Matter for Decision

To consider the draft Mill Road Depot Draft Planning and Development Brief SPD and to agree public consultation to commence in May 2016.

Decision of Executive Councillor for Planning Policy and Transport

- i. Agreed the content of the draft Mill Road Depot Draft Planning and Development Brief SPD (Appendix A);
- ii. Agreed that if any amendments are necessary, these should be agreed by the Executive Councillor in consultation with Chair and Spokes of Development Plan Scrutiny Sub Committee;
- iii. Approved the draft SPD for public consultation to commence in May 2016;
- iv. Approved the consultation arrangements as set out in paragraphs 3.10 to 3.11 and the proposed schedule of consultees in Appendix B of the Officer's report.

Reason for the Decision

As set out in the Officer's report.

Any Alternative Options Considered and Rejected

Not applicable.

Scrutiny Considerations

The Committee received a report from the Urban Design and Conservation Manager.

The report referred to the submitted Cambridge Local Plan (2014) which had allocated the Mill Road Depot and adjoining properties for approximately 167 residential units.

The City Council as the Local Planning Authority had been working in partnership with Allies and Morrison to prepare a planning and development brief. The planning and development brief would help guide the redevelopment of the site for housing and provide greater certainty and detail to support delivery of the allocation.

To support the proposal brief, the draft Mill Road Depot Planning and Development Brief SPD (Appendix A of the Officer's report) had been produced for public consultation.

Scrutiny Considerations

In response to the Committee's questions, the Urban Design and Conservation Manager made the following statement:

- i. The guidance would not preclude workspace on site.

The Committee resolved unanimously to endorse the recommendations.

The Executive Councillor approved the recommendations and advised

Conflicts of Interest Declared by the Executive Councillor (and any Dispensations Granted).

No conflicts of Interest were declared by the Executive Councillor.

16/52/DPSSC Planning Guidance Note for Park Street Car Park

Matter for Decision

To consider the content of the Planning Guidance Note for Park Street Car Park.

Decision of Executive Councillor for Planning Policy and Transport

- i. Agreed the content of the Planning Guidance Note for Park Street Car Park attached at Appendix A of the Officer's report.
- ii. Agreed that if any amendments were necessary, these would be agreed by the Executive Councillor in consultation with Chair and Spokes of Development Plan Scrutiny Sub Committee.

Reason for the Decision

As set out in the Officer's report

Any Alternative Options Considered and Rejected

Not applicable.

Scrutiny Considerations

The Committee received a report from the Urban Design and Conservation Manager.

The report referred to the proposal to demolish the existing Park Street Car Park and redevelop the site to provide a replacement car park, residential and commercial uses as agreed at the October 2015 meeting of the Strategy and Resources Committee. At this meeting, the Leader of Council requested a planning brief be prepared which is shown in Appendix A of the Officer's report.

In response to the Committee's questions, the Urban Design and Conservation Manager made the following statements:

- i. The planning guidance would ensure the proposed development would have no adverse effect on the existing surrounding street scene.
- ii. The planning guidance would ensure a financially viable scheme would be delivered.
- iii. Would need to replicate the existing number of cycle spaces with an aim to increase availability.
- iv. Currently Park Street Car Park stood at four stories in height and the building which was deemed as 'bullish' towards the Park Street elevation and detracted from this part of the conservation area. By reducing the height of the proposed car park, the building would become a better neighbour to the residential properties.
- v. The proposed building could be increased in height towards the CATS building.
- vi. The main concern with the Maypole Public House would be overshadowing and overlooking which would be avoided.

vii. A decision had not yet been made on the allocation of parking.

The Committee resolved unanimously to endorse the recommendations.

The Executive Councillor approved the recommendations.

Conflicts of Interest Declared by the Executive Councillor (and any Dispensations Granted).

No conflicts of Interest were declared by the Executive Councillor.

16/53/DPSSC New Museums Site Development Framework SPD

Matter for Decision

To consider the representation received to the New Museums Site Development Framework

Decision of Executive Councillor for Planning Policy and Transport

- i. Agreed the responses to the representations received to the New Museums Site Development Framework (Appendix B of the Officer's report) and the consequential amendments to the New Museums Site Development Framework (Appendix C of the Officer's report).
- ii. Approved the New Museums Site Development Framework (Appendix C of the Officer's report) in anticipation of the adoption of the Local Plan, and to agree that it should be carried forward for adoption as a Supplementary Planning Document at the same time as the Local Plan.

Reason for the Decision

As set out in the Officer's report.

Any Alternative Options Considered and Rejected

Not applicable.

Scrutiny Considerations

The Committee received a report from the Urban Design and Conservation Manager.

The report referred to the New Museums site as a key University of Cambridge site which had been allocated in the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 for

redevelopment/refurbishment. The Council were unable to adopt the New Museums Site Development Framework as an SPD until the Local Plan had been adopted.

In accordance with the process of preparing an SPD, consultation on the draft Development Framework had been carried out over a six week period between 13 July and 7 September 2016. The Officer's report outlined the following; Appendix A provided a brief summary of the key issues. Appendix B, summarised the representations received to the draft SPD and set out the proposed responses. Appendix C, a track-changed version of the SPD and Appendix D incorporated the Statement of Consultation.

No significant changes had been proposed as a result of the consultation. However some minor amendments to the SPD had been proposed as highlighted in Appendix C of the Officer's report, which reflected the comments received during the public consultation.

Councillor C Smart stated the redevelopment/refurbishment of the site had not been an easy decision to make but the alterations of the site paid sufficient respect to the historic surroundings.

The Committee resolved unanimously to endorse the recommendations.

The Executive Councillor approved the recommendations.

Conflicts of Interest Declared by the Executive Councillor (and any Dispensations Granted).

No conflicts of Interest were declared by the Executive Councillor.

The meeting ended at 7.35 pm

CHAIR

This page is intentionally left blank