

DEVELOPMENT PLAN SCRUTINY SUB-COMMITTEE 17 November 2015
5.30 - 5.00 pm

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

Executive Councillor for Planning Policy and Transport: Councillor Blencowe

Officers:

Head of Planning Services: Patsy Dell

Planning Policy Manager: Sara Saunders

Julian Sykes: Urban Extensions Project Manager

Principal Planning Policy Officer: Joanna Gilbert-Wooldridge

Senior Sustainability Officer (Design and Construction): Emma Davies

Committee Manager: Claire Tunncliffe

FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE COUNCIL

15/31/DPSSC Apologies

No apologies were received.

15/32/DPSSC Declarations of Interest

Name	Item	Reason
Councillor Ashton	15/37/DPSSC	Personal: Chairman of Cherry Hinton Resident's Association

15/33/DPSSC Minutes

The minutes of the meeting held on 16 June 2015 were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

15/34/DPSSC Public Questions

Mr Carpen addressed the Committee with the following three questions:

- 1. Why are the plans for Cambridge United Football Club (as reported at the following link: not included in the amendments to the local plan?**

<http://www.cambridge-news.co.uk/Abbey-Stadium-revamp-Cambridge-Sporting-Village/story-26518963-detail/story.html>)

The Principal Planning Policy Officer explained that the City Council were addressing the issues raised by the Inspectors in their letter of 20 May 2015. This letter had not made reference to the Abbey stadium proposal. The Abbey stadium site had not been allocated in the plan for development, but this did not prevent development coming forward which could happen as part of a planning application.

The Council had carried out a new Green Belt Study as part of the work to address the Inspectors' issues, which confirmed that the land south of Trumpington Meadows was of importance to the Green Belt purposes. As such, the Council did not propose this land be released from the Green Belt. The landowner had already made representations to the Local Plan with regard to development of the site for a sporting village. This proposal would be considered by the Inspectors as part of hearings on omission sites at a later stage in the examination.

2. What consideration has been made for the Fulbourn railway station?

The Principal Planning Policy Officer advised that the County Council's adopted Transport Strategy for Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire made reference to new stations potentially being provided at Addenbrooke's, Cherry Hinton, and Fulbourn in the longer term. It has not been included in South Cambridgeshire's Local Plan, given that it is a longer term aspiration outside the plan period.

3. What protection would there be for the disused railway line that used to go out to Mildenhall?

The Principal Planning Policy Officer replied that there were no proposals for this route as part of the current Transport Strategy for Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire.

Mr Carpen thanked Officers for their comments and stated that one of the main issues with the Abbey stadium was the flow of supporters entering and exiting the stadium. With growth of development in Fulbourn there was a great demand on traffic to and from the city and a station would help mitigate these problems.

15/35/DPSSC Record of Executive Decision**15/35/DPSSCa Cambridgeshire Local Flood Risk Management Strategy**

The record of decision was noted.

15/36/DPSSC Cambridge Local Plan Examination – Consideration of Further Work and Consequential Proposed Modifications**Matter for Decision**

To consider modifications undertaken on the City Council and South Cambridgeshire Local Plans following initial conclusions received from the Inspectors examining the plans in a letter dated 20 May 2015.

Decision of Executive Councillor for Planning Policy and Transport

- i. Agreed that the consultation document with proposed modifications (Appendix A) and sustainability appraisal (Appendix B), subject to any changes recommended by the Development Plan Scrutiny Sub-Committee, be submitted for consideration by Full Council on 30 November 2015 and approved for public consultation between 2 December 2015 and 25 January 2016;
- ii. Agreed that any amendments and editing changes that need to be made to the consultation material with proposed modifications (Appendix A) and sustainability appraisal (Appendix B) be agreed by the Executive Councillor in consultation with the Chair and Spokesperson;
- iii. Agreed that the documents attached to the committee reports as Appendices C to J were noted and submitted as part of the evidence base for the Local Plan;
- iv. 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.

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 Manager.

The report referred to further work undertaken on the Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Local Plans following the letter dated 20 May 2015 received from the Inspectors examining the plans. The Officer report and attached documentation detailed the Councils' response to the issues raised by the Inspectors and proposed modifications to the Local Plans arising from the additional work.

The modifications proposed in the Officer's report would be submitted for consideration by Full Council on 30 November 2015 and, subject to the agreement of Full Council, would subsequently be made available for public consultation between December 2015 and January 2016.

Comments from the Sub-Committee

- i. Going forward, major development in Cherry Hinton could have a substantial negative impact on the transport system unless a suitable traffic management plan was in place.
- ii. Traffic entry and exit points to any new development in Cherry Hinton must be off the spine road only.
- iii. Requested a commitment from Officers that the spine road in Cherry Hinton would be addressed.
- iv. Needed to be recognition of the existing traffic congestion problems in Cherry Hinton such as Coldham's Lane.
- v. Residents of Cherry Hinton should be involved in the consultation process as the proposed development of the ward was so large.
- vi. Queried if the 14,000 referenced in the report include student accommodation.

Officers stated the following

- i. The issue of traffic impact in Cherry Hinton would be addressed as part of the consultation, including proposed modification to the policy (comprising investigation to the spine road).
- ii. Agreed that there should be no adverse effect on traffic management in Cherry Hinton created by the proposed development.
- iii. The 14,000 dwellings referenced in the report were market and affordable houses only.

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.

15/37/DPSSC Cambridge Northern Fringe East Area Action Plan – Issues and Options Consultation Feedback

To consider whether two revised redevelopment options should be taken forward for further investigation, including transport and development viability assessments, ahead of the preparation of the draft Plan.

Decision of Executive Councillor for Planning Policy and Transport

- i. To note the summary and conclusions of responses to the AAP Issues and Options consultation (as referred to in Appendices A and B); and To agree revised option 2a for the potential range of development for the purposes of;
 - a) testing the potential environmental and infrastructure impact and the economic viability of the emerging AAP proposals;
 - b) informing the preparation of other ancillary assessments required to ensure the deliverability and soundness of the draft AAP; and
 - c) guiding further conceptual urban design work that will inform the ultimate preferred development approach.

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 Extensions Project Manager.

The report referred to the Cambridge Northern Fringe East (CNFE) area as one of the most significant brownfield regeneration opportunities in Greater Cambridge. The emerging Local Plans for both Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire recognised that regeneration and redevelopment of the area was important, both in the short term, aligned with the opportunity presented

by the opening of a new rail station, and in the long term to ensure that maximum regeneration benefits are captured for Greater Cambridge.

Comments from the Sub-Committee

- i. An additional recommendation to the report proposed by Councillor Smart at a meeting of the Joint Strategic Transport and Spatial Planning Group on 16 November 2015 had been accepted (5 votes to 0, with 2 abstentions). The Officer's recommendation in the report and Councillor Smart's additional recommendation had also been approved at the South Cambridgeshire District Council's Planning Portfolio Holder meeting in the afternoon of the 17 November 2015.
- ii. Option 4a, referenced in the Officer's report, should be kept as new investigations (with updated technology) may demonstrate it is deliverable to relocate the Water Recycling Centre to another site, when previously it had not been shown to be feasible.
- iii. Would not want to see development on the 2a option (referenced in the Officer's report) without option 4a being investigated. Therefore both options recommended by the Officer should be left open.
- iv. There had been many discussions over a number of years (ten years approximately) regarding the relocation of the Water Recycling Centre. Previously Anglian Water had indicated that relocation of the Water Recycling Centre to Fen Ditton had been the only option but this had been refused.
- v. Did not want to see 'history repeating itself' with no action taken on the site and only open ended discussions for a further ten years.
- vi. Questioned who would fund the relocation of the Water Recycling Centre.
- vii. Queried if a new stadium could be proposed by Grosvenor Estates instead of housing if the Water Recycling Centre was relocated.

Officers stated the following

- i. Grosvenor Estate had confirmed they were having positive discussions with Anglian Water on how to go forward. Both parties had agreed a contribution to the cost of a transport study and supported the recommendation that both options (2a and 4a) should be investigated further.
- ii. The relocation of the Water Recycling Site offers a major sustainable opportunity to develop a brownfield site and accommodate significant levels of development.

- iii. The Employment Options Study has provided confidence that option 4a could be viable.
- iv. Previous exploration of the relocation of the Water Recycling Centre had determined that this was not necessarily the best option and there had been some resistance. However the proposed investigation would be looked at differently with the support of Anglian Water.
- v. If the opportunity was not taken to explore the possibility of relocating the Water Recycling Centre the prospect could be permanently lost.
- vi. The resources needed to investigate options 2a and 4a were not significantly different.
- vii. Further detail on option 4a could be brought back to the Committee in approximately eight months' time. This would include whether a longer term phased approach would be realistic and how this strategy could be taken forward.
- viii. The development of this site was not being relied upon in the 14,000 properties referenced in the Local Plan.

Councillor Smart proposed an additional recommendation (d) of the Officer's recommendations (additional text underlined) which was the same as the additional recommendation agreed previously by both the Joint Strategic Transport and Spatial Planning Group and South Cambridgeshire District Council Planning Portfolio Holder.

- i. To note the summary and conclusions of responses to the AAP Issues and Options consultation (as referred to in Appendices A and B); and To agree two revised options for the potential range of development for the purposes of;
 - a) testing the potential environmental and infrastructure impact and the economic viability of the emerging AAP proposals;
 - b) informing the preparation of other ancillary assessments required to ensure the deliverability and soundness of the draft AAP; and
 - c) guiding further conceptual urban design work that will inform the ultimate preferred development approach.
 - d) investigate a phased approach from option 2a to option 4a.

Resolved (2 votes to 4) to endorse the additional recommendation. The additional recommendation was therefore lost.

Councillor Sarris next proposed an amendment to the Officer's recommendations (deleted text ~~struck through~~ and additional text underlined).

- i. To note the summary and conclusions of responses to the AAP Issues and Options consultation (as referred to in Appendices A and B); and To agree revised options 2a for the potential range of development for the purposes of;
- a) testing the potential environmental and infrastructure impact and the economic viability of the emerging AAP proposals;
 - b) informing the preparation of other ancillary assessments required to ensure the deliverability and soundness of the draft AAP; and
 - c) guiding further conceptual urban design work that will inform the ultimate preferred development approach.

Resolved (4 votes to 2) to endorse the amended recommendations.

The Head of Planning of Services requested that it was minuted that the amendment had been against the recommendation of Officers.

The Executive Councillor approved the recommendations.

The Executive Councillor stated that the approval of the amended recommendation ensured a realistic vision for the City as it was unacceptable to leave this site in an indeterminate state; there was also an issue of financial viability. At the meeting of the Joint Strategic Transport and Spatial Planning Group reservations to option 4A had been raised.

Option 4 had also been rejected by the County Council at the Issues and Options stage as they did feel this option was viable within the local plan period and would not be deliverable. The County also believed that there was no feasible site to be found.

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

No conflicts of interest were declared by the Executive Councillor.

15/38/DPSSC Local Development Scheme 2015

To consider an amendment to the Local Development Scheme, as set out in Appendix A of the Officer's report, to reflect the current timetable for the preparation and adoption of the new Cambridge Local Plan and the Cambridge Northern Fringe East Area Action Plan (CNFE AAP).

Decision of Executive Councillor for Planning Policy and Transport

- i. Agreed the proposed changes to the Local Development Scheme (LDS) in respect of the timetable for the preparation of the Cambridge Local Plan and the Cambridge Northern Fringe East Area Action Plan, as contained in Appendix A of this report.
- ii. Agreed to bring the new LDS into effect once approved.

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 Manager.

The report referred to receipt of a letter from the Inspectors examining the Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Local Plans in May 2015, the examination had been suspended until March 2016. The implications of addressing the Inspectors' letter on the Local Plans and investigating redevelopment options for the CNFE AAP had led to the Local Development Scheme being updated.

Comments from the Sub-Committee

No comments were made on this item.

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