

DEVELOPMENT PLAN SCRUTINY SUB-COMMITTEE

27 March 2013
4.30 - 5.45 pm

Present: Councillors Reid (Chair), Saunders (Vice-Chair), Blencowe, Price, Marchant-Daisley and Tucker

Executive Councillor for Planning and Climate Change – Councillor Ward

Officers Present:

Head of Planning – Patsy Dell
Senior Planning Policy Officer – Joanna Gilbert-Wooldridge
Planning Policy and Economic Development Officer - Stephen Miles
Housing Strategy Manager - Helen Reed
Committee Manager – Martin Whelan

FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE COUNCIL

13/17/DPSSC Apologies

There were no apologies for absence.

13/18/DPSSC Declarations of Interest

Councillor Saunders, Councillor Tucker and Councillor Reid	13/20/DPSSC	Member of Cambridge Past, Present and Future
Councillor Saunders and Councillor Reid	13/20/DPSSC	Member of Cambridge Cycling Campaign
Councillor Ward and Councillor Price	13/20/DPSSC	Conservator of the River Cam

13/19/DPSSC Public Questions (See Below)

There were no public questions.

13/20/DPSSC Cambridge Local Plan -Towards 2031 - Draft Policies and Chapters**Matter for Decision:**

Additional sections of Draft Plan for recommendation to Executive Councillor to put forward for Key Decision on the Draft Submission Plan for Consultation – Tranche 2 (of 4)

- Section Two (part) The Spatial Strategy - Standing Item, no recommendations
- Section Four - Supporting the Knowledge Economy and Managing Visitors
- Section Five - Maintaining a Balanced Supply of Housing (Draft policies on Specialist Housing, Lifetime Homes and Lifetime Neighbourhoods, Protecting Garden Land and Subdivision of Existing Dwelling Plots, Flat Conversions, Residential Moorings)

Decision of Executive Councillor for Planning and Climate Change:

The Executive Councillor resolved to:

- To agree that subject to drafting amendments to be agreed with Chair and Spokes, those draft plan sections to be put forward into the composite full draft plan;
- To also consider feedback from this committee on the accompanying policy justification documents for each draft policy which will be published alongside the draft plan as an audit trail of how the policy was evidenced, consulted on and assessed;
- To agree that any amendments and editing changes that need to be made prior to the version put to Environment Scrutiny Committee in June and Full Council in June should be agreed by the Executive Councillor in consultation with the Chair and Spokesperson.

Reason for the Decision:

As set out in the Officer's report.

Any Alternative Options Considered and Rejected:

Not applicable.

Scrutiny Considerations:

The Head of Planning Services introduced the report, and explained that formatting and typographical issues would be picked up in the next stages of the drafting process.

The Executive Councillor requested clarification from the Head of Planning Services regarding the current national picture with the approval of plans. The Head of Planning Services explained that there were reports of increased difficulties at various stages of the plan approval process. The Head of Planning Services agreed to report back to the committee with more information as it became available.

The Planning Policy and Economic Development Officer introduced the first section of the report. Members of the committee made the following comments on the first section of the report.

- i. Concerns were expressed about the potential tension between providing space for new companies to expand in the city, and major companies wishing to move to the city. It was suggested that the proposed removal of the selective management policy, would increase this tension. The Planning Policy and Economic Development Officer noted the concern and explained that the existing policy had been very successful, and that a number of options had been consulted upon. It was agreed that there was limited office space near the city centre, however there is a significant quantity of research and development space that will be developed on the edge of the city in Addenbrooke's, North West Cambridge and West Cambridge. The Chair reminded members of the committee that the removal of the selective management policy had been discussed at a previous meeting and that the supporting evidence for the proposed change was contained in the committee report.
- ii. It was suggested that the titles for proposed policies 22 and 23 should be revised to make their respective purposes clearer. Officers are agreed to review.
- iii. Concern was expressed about the potential implication of proposed policy 22 and whether it would reduce the ability of the Planning Committee to challenge potentially inappropriate developments. It was agreed that the City Centre needed to be defined, this is to be defined in a later Development Plan Scrutiny Sub-Committee.
- iv. Further information was requested on the proposals for the area surrounding the proposed Chesterton station, and whether it was intended to be a high rise area. The Head of Planning Services explained that a "planning for real" event had been organised for 12th

April involving local stakeholders to start looking at options for the area.

- v. Reservations were expressed whether the approached for growth and specifically the expected number of new jobs was too passive, are we seeking to encourage / manage this growth? It was also questioned how the infrastructure of the city would need develop to respond to this increase. The Head of Planning Services acknowledged the difficulty of considering chapters of the plan in isolation to each other, but assured the committee that the plans would become clearer when the chapters were brought together. The use of more neutral wording such as “not normally” will be considered for policies where members had reservations about the degree of assertion that could be implied from them..
- vi. Concerns were expressed about where we were expecting the people who would work in the 20,000 new jobs to live.
- vii. Clarification was requested on why small hi-tech industries were specifically highlighted for support, whereas other sectors hadn't been specifically mentioned. Officers agreed to look into this, but indicated that a similar provision existed in the current local plan. Members of the committee suggested that the plan also needed to consider the needs not just of “start-up” companies but also that some needed “accelerator” support. Officers agreed to contact Cambridge Network for advice.
- viii. It was requested that the references to Cambridge Science Parks were clarified and made consistent throughout the report. The comment was noted.
- ix. The Executive Councillor asked officers what were the industry standards for “ducting” (Policy 24). The Officers agreed to investigate and report back.
- x. Officers clarified the meaning of active frontage in response to a question from the committee, and agreed to ensure this was in the glossary.
- xi. Members of the committee questioned the implication of the proposed policy with regards to Anglia Ruskin University. The Head of Planning Services explained that Anglia Ruskin University would need more space in the future, and that the policy was intended to ensure that

the potential use of the university was considered as part of the development the Eastern Gateway. The Council would continue to work with Anglia Ruskin University on future masterplanning in the area. Officers agreed to look at strengthening the wording of policy 25. The Executive Councillor welcomed proposed policy 25 section a ii, which sought to promote pedestrian and cycle circulation.

- xii. Officers agreed to clarify references to Cambridge Bio-medical campus, so that the definition was clear.
- xiii. The intended meaning of section 4.26 (language schools) was clarified.
- xiv. With regards to policy 27 the meaning of key sites around Parkers Piece was clarified. The Executive Councillor suggested that references to three, four and five star hotels should be consistent between the policy and text. The comment was noted.
- xv. The meaning of “boutique” hotels was clarified, officers agreed to include in the glossary.
- xvi. Officers confirmed that the proposed policy would not automatically preclude the redevelopment of an existing budget hotel and the reference to no new budget hotels referred to net gain of bedrooms.

The Senior Planning Policy Officer introduced proposed policies 36, 40, 41, 42 and 43. The committee made the following comments.

- i. Concern was expressed the sentence (in proposed policy 36) “Where existing specialist housing does not meet modern standards, its refurbishment on development will be considered favourably”. Following discussion it was agreed that the sentence should be removed.
- ii. Concern was expressed that the proposed policy 41 appeared to increase the support for garden development. The Executive Councillor reassured the committee that the change of emphasis was to match the style of the National Planning Policy Framework, but that in practical terms it was expected to be limited change. Officers agreed to look at the emphasis again.

- iii. Further clarification was requested on paragraph 5.31 and specifically the definition of aparthotel. The Head of Planning Services explained that it would be very difficult to define aparthotels, and identify at what point a change of use occurred. The committee were advised that these issues were more appropriately addressed through the planning enforcement process. Officers agreed to look at this paragraph again.
- iv. It was suggested that the requirements related to traffic surveys should be clearer. The comment was noted.
- v. Officers agreed to look at paragraph 5.35 and revise the wording so its purpose was clearer.
- vi. With regards to proposed policy 42 (section iii), it was questioned whether the reference to “unacceptable” appeared to allow negative impact on the amenity. A similar comment was made on section iv.
- vii. It was suggested that cumulative impact of individual schemes should be considered in policy 42 as well as the supporting text.
- viii. Officers agreed to look at paragraph 5.36 with regard the wording around the use of surveys.
- ix. It was questioned whether the issue of the removal of resident parking rights in the event of subdivision could be addressed through this process. The Head of Planning Services expressed reservations about the ability of the local plan process to address these issues. It was noted that car parking would be considered at a future meeting.
- x. With regards to proposed policy 43 policy (section vii) the Executive Councillor suggested that it could be removed to avoid duplication the statutory role of the Cam Conservators, it was however agreed that the criterion should remain.

The Planning Policy and Economic Development Officer highlighted that a paper had been tabled, titled “Annex L1 – Protected Industrial Sites”.

The committee welcomed the proposals with regards to Jedburgh Court. Officers also clarified the current status of the industrial area in the vicinity of Church End.

The Committee resolved by 3 votes to 0 to endorse the recommendations, subject to a minor amendment to recommendation i (Changes underlined)

- i. To agree that subject to drafting amendments to be agreed with Chair and Spokes, those draft plan sections to be put forward into the composite full draft plan;

The Executive Councillor approved the recommendation.

Conflicts of interest declared by the Executive Councillor (and any dispensations granted)

Not applicable.

The meeting ended at 5.45 pm

CHAIR