

**JOINT STRATEGIC TRANSPORT AND SPATIAL PLANNING GROUP**

16 November 2015

2.00 - 3.50 pm

**Present:**

Cambridge City Councillors Blencowe (Chair), C. Smart  
Cambridgeshire County Councillors Bates (Vice-Chair), Cearn, Hipkin  
South Cambridgeshire District Councillors Kindersley and Turner

**Officers Present:**

Cambridge City Council Officers  
Director of Environment: Simon Payne  
Planning Policy Manager: Sara Saunders  
Urban Extensions Project Manager: Julian Sykes  
Principal Planning Policy Officer: Joanna Gilbert-Wooldridge  
Committee Manager: Sarah Steed

County Officers

Acting Head of Transport and Infrastructure Policy and Funding: Jeremy Smith  
Business Manager (Growth & Economy): Juliet Richardson

South Cambs DC Officers

Planning Policy Manager: Caroline Hunt

<b>FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE COUNCIL</b>
---

**15/14/JSTSPG Apologies for absence**

Apologies were received from Councillors Herbert, Jenkins and Wotherspoon.  
Councillor Cearn attended as alternate for Councillor Jenkins.

**15/15/JSTSPG Declarations of Interest**

No declarations of interest were made.

**15/16/JSTSPG Minutes of the last meeting**

The minutes of the meeting held on the 28 October 2014 were approved as a correct record subject to the correction of the typographical errors including the spelling of Councillor Kindersley's surname contained in paragraph ii on p9 of the minutes.

### **15/17/JSTSPG Cambridge Local Plan Examination – Consideration of Further Work and Consequential Proposed Modifications**

The Committee received a joint report from the City's Planning Policy Manager and SCDC's Planning Policy Manager regarding the modifications to the Cambridgeshire and South Cambridgeshire Local Plans.

The presentation covered:

- i. The further meetings through which the modifications to the Cambridgeshire and South Cambridgeshire Local Plans would be considered.
- ii. The strategic issues considered through the joint examination hearings which were held between November 2014 and April 2015.
- iii. The Inspector's letter of 20 May 2015 which requested further work on the objectively assessed need for further housing, overall development strategy and conformity with revisions to National Planning Policy since the local plan was submitted for examination.
- iv. Outlined the proposed modification to South Cambridgeshire District Council's housing need to 19,500 dwellings therefore a total of 33,500 dwellings were required in Greater Cambridge.
- v. Looked at the work undertaken by the independent consultants and the conclusion was that the development strategy in the submitted plan with limited modifications provided the right balance for the local plan.
- vi. Outlined the agreed memorandum of understanding regarding housing supply which took into account a flexible start date for the delivery of the new town at Waterbeach and the Bourn Airfield new settlement and also the work with Marshalls regarding the second area north of Cherry Hinton through which 1200 new dwellings should be delivered.
- vii. Outlined the modification proposed for an extension to the south of Cambridge Biomedical campus and the reduction in size of the employment land adjacent to Peterhouse Technology Park following the latest independent Green Belt assessment.
- viii. Noted Parish Council led proposals for three sites in Great Abington and one site in Graveley.
- ix. Outlined conformity with National Planning Policy.

- x. Highlighted the proposed timetable for consultation on the modifications to the local plan between 2 December 2015 and 25 January 2016 and public exhibitions held by South Cambridgeshire District Council and City Council.

Members made the following comments in relation to the presentation:

- i. Expressed confidence in the local plan work which had been undertaken following the Planning Inspectors letter in May 2015 and hoped that the Planning Inspector would be persuaded that the plan was sound.
- ii. The new settlements policy had been strengthened.
- iii. The strategy relied on good transport links and substantial infrastructure, it was questioned whether the City Deal funding would be able to deliver the necessary transport infrastructure.
- iv. Expressed concern at disproportionate growth in student accommodation.
- v. Expressed dissatisfaction in the short length of time members had had to read through the agenda for the meeting.
- vi. Surprised there was no change to the Green Belt allocation.
- vii. Emphasized the need for affordable housing.
- viii. Commented that houses needed to be built in Cambridge that people on low incomes could afford.
- ix. Pleased to see Marshall's were for the time being to remain on their site, which provided 3500 skilled jobs.

In response to Members' questions the City's Planning Policy Manager and SCDC's Planning Policy Manager said the following:

- i. The new settlement transport report, undertook further transport modelling and looked at City Deal Schemes.
- ii. The green belt was considered against edge of Cambridge sites.
- iii. Bus trips were also looked at, this included park and ride locations set alongside the edge of Cambridge sites, better transport links were required.
- iv. The infrastructure delivery strategy was capable of coming forward and would include affordable housing developments. Developer's contributions would be looked into as well as other possible sources of funding.
- v. The modifications for land North of Cherry Hinton included a requirement for a Secondary School to serve east Cambridge. This was a work in progress. The County Council, Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire

- District Councils were working together as it could depend on the growth and housing mix which could impact on child yield.
- vi. Student Accommodation was not a particular issue that the Planning Inspector had raised as an issue at this stage but it would come up as part of the process later on in 2016.
  - vii. The challenges in delivering new settlements were not underestimated however there was plenty of experience following the development at Cambourne and the planning applications at Northstowe.
  - viii. Clarified the location where the County Council had proposed to locate the waste facility.
  - ix. Councils could always be at risk of speculative planning applications wherever they were in the local plan process, and officers were aware that there were landowners who had promoted proposals on sites which were not allocated in the local plan.
  - x. South Cambridgeshire District Council had a good reputation for delivering affordable housing on rural exception sites.

**Resolved:** The Joint Strategic Transport and Spatial Planning Group recommended that the consultation document with proposed modifications (Appendix A) and sustainability appraisal (Appendix B) be agreed by Cambridge City Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council at their respective committee meetings on 17 November 2015.

### **15/18/JSTSPG Cambridge Northern Fringe East Area Action Plan - Issues and Options**

The Committee received a report from the Urban Extensions Project Manager regarding the Cambridge Northern Fringe East Area Action Plan – issues and options.

The presentation covered:

- i. The progress to date with evidence based studies which included an Employment Options Study, with an initial viability assessment, an Issues and Options consultation and the Local Plan Examination into the Cambridge Northern Fringe East policy.
- ii. The review and refinement of the redevelopment options down to two main options, referred to as Option 2A and 4A within the report.
- iii. The next steps which included the provision of a submission draft based upon the Council's preferred development approach to the site. This would need to be supported by robust evidence to demonstrate deliverability which would include; an options assessment, A10 Transport

Study, Development Infrastructure and Funding Study and further investigations into the feasibility of relocating the Anglian Water Recycling Centre.

Members made the following comments in relation to the presentation:

- i. Councillor Hipkin questioned whether funding through a s106 agreement would be sufficient to be able to finance the relocation of the Anglian Water site.
- ii. Councillor Kindersley questioned whether there was a feasible location for Anglian Water to relocate to as it appeared that resources were being focussed on something which would never come forward. Proceeding with option 2a appeared to be the sensible option.
- iii. Councillor Cearns commented that the Economy and Environment Committee made a recommendation for a middle option. The County Council had far less resources than it had ever had and was under a lot of pressure.

In response to Members' questions the City's Urban Extensions Project Manager, SCDC's Planning Policy Manager and the Director of Environment said the following:

- i. Option 2 was easier as it did not have the same implication for relocating the water treatment works. The broader vision option 4A whilst more challenging was nevertheless still worth pursuing because of its greater delivery potential.
- ii. An Employment Option Study had been undertaken in the past and it indicated that there was a good possibility that Option 4A could be viable.
- iii. Commented that it was premature not to explore both options (2A and 4A) and that the development could be phased.

Members made the following further comments:

- i. Councillor Turner suggested that it was too early to reduce the options at this stage and that both Options 2A and 4A should continue to be investigated.
- ii. Councillor C.Smart commented that it would not be good at this stage in the process to rule out one of the options and proposed an additional recommendation - (d) for officers to 'investigate a phased approach between option 2A and 4A'.

- iii. Councillor Bates stated that he liked the idea of a middle ground option between 2A and 4A and with this in mind both should go forward for further consideration at this time.

**Resolved (5 – 0 votes):** The Joint Strategic Transport and Spatial Planning Group:

- i. Noted the summary of conclusions of responses to the AAP Issues and Options consultation (as referred to in appendices A and B); and
- ii. Agreed two revised options those being options 2A and 4A 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) Officers to investigate a phased approach from option 2A to Option 4A.

The meeting ended at 3.50 pm

**CHAIR**