

**DEVELOPMENT PLAN SCRUTINY SUB-COMMITTEE**

21 July 2016  
4.30 - 5.40 pm

**Present:** Councillors Sarris (Chair), Gawthrop (Vice-Chair), Avery, Bick, Sargeant and Smart

Executive Councillor for Planning Policy and Transport: Councillor Blencowe

**Officers:**

Planning Policy Manager: Sara Saunders  
Glen Richardson, Urban Design and Conservation Manager  
Democratic Services Officer: Dan Snowdon  
Committee Manager: Sarah Steed

**FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE COUNCIL**

**16/60/DPSSC Apologies**

Apologies were received from Councillor Baigent, Councillor Sargeant attended as an alternate.

**16/61/DPSSC Declarations of Interest**

Item number	Councillor	Interest
16/65/DPSSC	Sargeant	Personal: Member of Friends of Mitcham's Corner

**16/62/DPSSC Public Questions**

There were no public questions.

**16/63/DPSSC Ridgeon's, Cromwell Road Planning and Development Brief SPD**

**Matter for Decision**

To consider and comment before decision by the Executive Councillor for Planning Policy and Transport.

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

- i. Agreed the responses to the representations received to the Ridgeons site, Cromwell Road Planning and Development Brief (Appendix A) and the consequential amendments to the Ridgeons site, Cromwell Road Planning and Development Brief Supplementary Planning Document (Appendix B);
- ii. Approved the Ridgeons site, Cromwell Road Planning and Development Brief (Appendix B) in anticipation of the adoption of the Local Plan, and agreed that it should be carried forward for adoption as a Supplementary Planning Document at the same time as the Local Plan subject to the amendment of principle 12 on p170 to include 'failing that, safety requirements to two existing crossings'.

### **Reasons 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. Figure 123 on page 178 of the report was replaced due to the incorrect drawing being included in the report.

The Committee made the following comments in response to the report:

- i. Questioned what the consensus was at the start of the process with regard to the mix of housing that would be constructed.
- ii. Expressed concern regarding school provision in the area and the absence of a strategy.
- iii. Questioned whether public information regarding the consultation process, in particular what comments would be deemed relevant to the consultation could be improved.
- iv. Raised concerns regarding car parking at the proposed development.
- v. Questioned the rationale behind a "marker building".
- vi. Questioned why existing schools could not be enlarged, in particular St Phillips Church of England Primary School.
- vii. Emphasised the need to be clear and robust with Cambridgeshire County Council regarding school provision and the options assessment being undertaken, in order to ensure that the data used was of the highest quality.

- viii. Questioned what the consequences would be if Cambridgeshire County Council failed to produce a school strategy that was convincing.
- ix. Questioned whether other railway crossings that were close by could be improved as they were of poor quality and item 12 on page 170 of the report be amended to include making safety improvements to the existing 2 railway crossings if it was not feasible for a new bridge to be built.

The Urban Design and Conservation Manager and the Planning Policy Manager said the following in response to Members questions:

- i. Options regarding the density of housing and mix of housing types had been modelled. The modelling had demonstrated that a traditional terrace would achieve a higher density of housing but at the expense of green space and sustainable drainage. The mix of housing could still vary up to the detailed planning stage.
- ii. Education provision had been addressed as part of the Local Plan with Cambridgeshire County Council and work was taking place between both authorities to develop an education strategy. Officers noted the need for a robust strategy that was based on good quality data.
- iii. Consultations could often become a catch-all for issues concerning the public and it was important that the public were not discouraged from participating in the consultation process. Although it was unfortunate that some responses were not relevant with regard to the proposed development they were useful in a broader context.
- iv. Car parking was a difficult balance to achieve and the number of cars parked would largely depend on the eventual mix of housing types. A consultant had been employed to review current and future car parking arrangements and officers were confident that car parking was manageable.
- v. The marker building was designed to terminate the view and was an opportunity for something creative and different that would define the area.
- vi. Improvements to the existing 2 railway crossings would be included in the document.

The Committee unanimously resolved 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.

## **16/64/DPSSC Draft Mitcham's Corner Development Framework SPD**

### **Matter for Decision**

To consider and comment before decision by the Executive Councillor for Planning Policy and Transport.

### **Decision of Executive Councillor**

- i. Agreed the content of the draft Mitcham's Corner Development Framework SPD (Appendix A);
- ii. Agreed that if any amendments were necessary, they should be agreed by the Executive Councillor in consultation with Chair and Spokes of Development Plan Scrutiny Sub Committee;
- iii. Approved the draft development framework SPD for public consultation to commence in September 2016;
- iv. Approved the consultation arrangements as set out in paragraphs 3.9 to 3.11 of the report and the proposed schedule of consultees in Appendix B.

### **Reason for 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 and the Planning Policy Manager.

The Committee made the following comments in response to the report:

- i. Questioned what the process would be for the development of other sites such as Barclays Bank and the Westbrook Centre.
- ii. Requested further information regarding discussion that had taken place with Cambridgeshire County Council on behalf of the City Deal with regard to the road lay out.
- iii. Questioned whether it was possible for a bus interchange to be included in the plan. An interchange would increase footfall for local shops and businesses and relieve congestion pressure with regard to the number of buses entering the city centre.
- iv. Expressed concern that there was no provision for wider pavements to accommodate pedestrians.

- v. Questioned whether Section 106 funding could be released.
- vi. Questioned whether the Staples site would be developed in the near future.

The Urban Design and Conservation Manager and the Planning Policy Manager said the following in response to Members questions:

- i. Need to be careful as to how non allocated sites are treated in the draft SPD in order to avoid developing new policy. Officers agreed to consider the presentation of other potential development opportunities in the draft SPD and make sure there was a clear explanation.
- ii. Discussions had taken place with the County Council regarding traffic flow and highlighted that there was a difference between traffic flowing and the experience of road users and pedestrians being a good one.
- iii. Widening of pavements to accommodate street-life would be incorporated within the plans.
- iv. The feasibility of a bus interchange would be considered during the detailed planning stage as bus routes and timetables would have to be analysed carefully.
- v. The owner of the Staples site had not come forward with any development proposals for the immediate future.

The Committee unanimously resolved to endorse the recommendations.

The Executive Councillor approved the recommendation.

**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 5.40 pm

**CHAIR**