

**DEVELOPMENT PLAN SCRUTINY SUB-COMMITTEE**

8 December 2015  
4.30 - 5.00 pm

**Present:** Councillors Sarris (Chair), Blencowe, Baigent and C. Smart and M Smart

Executive Councillor for Planning Policy and Transport: Councillor Blencowe

**Officers:**

Urban Design and Conservation Manager: Glen Richards

Planning Policy Manager, Environment: Sara Saunders

Principal Planning Policy Officer: Joanna Gilbert-Wooldridge

Planning Policy Officer: Frances Schulz

Committee Manager: Claire Tunnicliffe

**FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE COUNCIL**

**15/39/DPSSC Apologies**

Apologies were received from Councillors Ashton, Gawthrope and Tunnacliffe.

Councillor M Smart attended as an alternate for Councillor Gawthrope.

**15/40/DPSSC Declarations of Interest**

Name	Item	Reason
Councillor Baigent	15/44/DPSSC	Personal: Lives opposite the proposed development. Withdrew from discussion and room, and did not vote.

**15/41/DPSSC Minutes**

Councillor C Smart requested that under 15/37/DPSSC: (*Cambridge Northern Fringe East Area Action Plan, Issues and Options Consultation Feedback*), to delete the following text and replace with the following (deleted text ~~struck through~~ additional text underlined).

**Any Alternative Options Considered and Rejected**

~~Not applicable~~ Alternative options considered as outlined in Appendix A of the Officer's report.

Following these amendments the minutes of 17 November 2015 were then approved and signed by the Chair as a correct record.

**15/42/DPSSC Re-ordering of the Agenda**

Under paragraph 4.2.1 of the Council Procedure Rules, the Chair used his discretion to alter the order of the agenda items. However, for ease of the reader, these minutes will follow the order of the agenda.

**15/43/DPSSC Public Questions**

There were no public questions.

**15/44/DPSSC Ridgeons Site, Cromwell Road****Matter for Decision**

To consider the draft Ridgeons Cromwell Road Planning and Development Brief Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) (Appendix A) produced for public consultation. The document outlined the aspirations of the site, key issues, constraints and opportunities that would influence how future development on the site would take place. Detailed local and stakeholder consultation had taken place throughout 2015 and assisted with drafting of the brief.

**Decision of Executive Councillor for Planning Policy and Transport**

- i. Agreed the content of the draft Ridgeons Cromwell Road Draft Planning and Development Brief SPD (Appendix A of the Officer's report)
- ii. Agreed that if any amendments were 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 from 18 January to 29 February 2016
- iv. Approved the consultation arrangements as set out in paragraphs 3.10 to 3.12 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 adopted Cambridge Local Plan 2006 which had allocated the southern part of the Ridgeons site for housing (site allocation 5.14) and the emerging Local Plan which allocated the entire site for 245 homes (R12). The proposals scheduled in the emerging Local Plan states that 'the site promoters would be expected to prepare a Planning and Development Brief for the site demonstrating how development would successfully integrate with the existing residential area as well as addressing the constraints and opportunities of the site. Scale, massing and density considerations in the design and disposition of new and existing housing would be expected to have regard to the character of the existing area'.

**Comments from the Sub Committee**

- i. Stated that the Chisholm Trail consultation had included Cromwell Road and Brampton Road as alternative routes but there seemed to be no reference to the Chisholm Trail and Cromwell Road in the Officer's report.
- ii. Recommended that references to Veritas Court in the consultation document should be changed Pym Court.
- iii. The map on page 63 of the agenda pack showed Thoday Street in Petersfield which was incorrect.
- iv. Queried what the area of development would be called and should be in keeping with the area.
- v. Suggested the development could be named after Katherine Chidley, a female leader of the Levellers.
- vi. Sought reassurance that the relevant stakeholders concerning the Chisholm Trail had been contacted as part of the process when compiling the consultation document for this development.
- vii. Sought clarity about the approach to car parking standards.

Officers stated the following:

- i. Highlighted that page 55 of Appendix A referenced the Chisholm Trail with the proposed route to the North of the development.
- ii. The County Council's preferred route was access to the East which connected to Brampton Street but it was also intended to have a side spur to run through the site to link to Crowell Road.
- iii. Agreed to check the rewording, and potentially amend, from Veritas Court to Pym Court.
- iv. Names of the development had not yet been discussed.
- v. Confirmed that the map would be updated with the correct names as required.
- vi. Agents on behalf of Ridgeons and City and County Officers had worked with Chisholm Trail representatives and would continue to do so. It was important to the developers that cyclists would be able to use and have access through the site.
- vii. Confirmed that the approach to car parking standards would be in accordance with the Local Plan and a section relating to car parking standards is set out in the draft SPD.

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.

**15/45/DPSSC Annual Monitoring Report 2015****Matter for Decision**

To consider the Annual Monitoring Report.

This is an important part of the planning process, providing feedback on the performance of development plan policies in terms of their use and implementation. The Council is required to produce an Annual Monitoring Report (AMR) at least on a yearly basis.

## **Decision of Executive Councillor for Planning Policy and Transport**

- i. Agreed the content of the AMR (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.

### **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 Planning Policy Officer.

The report referred to how comprehensive monitoring was essential in order to establish whether the Council was succeeding in promoting and managing the future development of Cambridge. The Localism Act 2011 and Section 34 of the Town and Country Planning Act (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 had established the statutory need for monitoring reports.

The Planning Policy Officer highlighted the tabled amendments to paragraphs 8.26 and 8.27 of the report due to the amended data that had been received from Cambridgeshire County Council.

### Comments from the Sub Committee

- i. Requested confirmation on how many Public Houses were on unprotected sites in the City.
- ii. Enquired how the figure of 23.8% (key services) under the heading of the Accessibility of Services referenced in 8.27 of the amendment sheet had been calculated.
- iii. Asked if the £78 million spend in the local area per annum generated by Language schools referenced in 8.3 of the Officer's report related to student spending.

### Officers stated the following:

- i. The number of safeguarded public houses currently stood at a total of 102. The Council has produced Interim Planning Policy Guidance

(IPPG) on the Protection of Public Houses, and this document is used to deal with planning applications affecting public houses. The IPPG confirmed that safeguarded public houses are those which were operating as public houses on 21 July 2006 (when the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 was adopted). As sites came forward for Public House use, the IPPG would continue to be used, until replaced by policy in the emerging Local Plan, and the Annual Monitoring Report would be updated as any new public houses come forward or any public houses close.

- ii. The figure of 23.8% signified the percentage of new housing developments which were within 15 minutes public transport or walking distance of six key services. The six key services included retail centre, area of employment, primary school, secondary school, GP surgery and hospital with outpatients. Information had been taken from new developments completed within the monitoring year.
- iii. No further data could be obtained from the County Council regarding the population in Cambridge who were within fifteen minutes of the six key services when using public transport.
- iv. The £78 million related to the fees and income generated from the Language Schools and spend in the local area generated from the presence of language schools.

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 5.00 pm

**CHAIR**