

**DEVELOPMENT PLAN SCRUTINY SUB-COMMITTEE**

27 July 2017  
4.30 - 5.45 pm

**Present:** Councillors Sargeant (Chair), Gawthrope (Vice-Chair), Avery, Baigent, Bick and Smart

**Executive Councillors:** Blencowe (Executive Councillor for Planning Policy and Transport)

**Officers:**

New Neighbourhoods Development Manager: Sharon Brown

Planning Policy & Economic Development Officer: Stephen Miles

Planning Policy Officer: Frances Schulz

Committee Manager: James Goddard

**FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE COUNCIL**

**17/86/DPSSC Apologies**

No apologies were received.

**17/87/DPSSC Declarations of Interest**

No declarations of interest were made.

**17/88/DPSSC Minutes**

The minutes of the meeting held on 22 March 2017 were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

**17/89/DPSSC Public Questions**

There were no public questions.

**17/90/DPSSC Draft Land North of Cherry Hinton Supplementary Planning Document**

**Matter for Decision**

The draft Cambridge Local Plan 2014: Proposed Submission (as amended) allocated Land North of Cherry Hinton for residential-led development under Policy 12: Cambridge East. The site extends into South Cambridgeshire and the draft South Cambridgeshire Local Plan, similarly allocated their part of the site for residential-led development under Policy SS/3: Cambridge East. The Councils, as the Local Planning Authorities, have been working in partnership with local stakeholders to prepare an SPD that looks at how this residential-led allocation can be delivered successfully. The work has been guided by input from local stakeholders, including residents groups, local Councillors and other interest groups, at a series of workshops. The SPD would help guide the development of the area and would provide greater certainty and detail to support delivery of the site.

The draft Land North of Cherry Hinton SPD was produced for public consultation. Detailed local and stakeholder consultation has taken place to help inform the drafting of the SPD.

An eight week public consultation was proposed to take place commencing in August 2017.

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

- i. Agreed agree the content of the draft Land North of Cherry Hinton SPD (Appendix A of the Officer's report);
- 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;
- iii. Approved the draft SPD for public consultation to commence in August 2017;
- iv. Approved the consultation arrangements as set out in paragraphs 3.9 to 3.11 of the Officer's report and the proposed schedule of consultees in Appendix B.

### **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 & Economic Development Officer.

In response to the report Councillor Bick expressed disappointment that Cambridge East Area was being developed in segments instead of a site as a whole.

The Planning Policy & Economic Development Officer said the following in response to Members' questions:

- i. Policy 12 of the emerging Local Plan sought to replace CE8 and CE36 in the Cambridge East Area Action Plan.
- ii. Land was being taken out of the green belt but development would not be allowed until the Local Plan was reviewed.
- iii. It was recognised the land north of Cherry Hinton site would have to operate as a viable site with an airport next door to it. The constraints were recognised in the Supplementary Planning Document (see P63 & 91 in the Officer's report). The starting point was the site was viable for development and assessments (eg noise) would be considered in the pre-application stage.
- iv. South Cambridgeshire District Council Officers presented a report regarding site development to their portfolio 26 July, which was agreed without amendment. It was now up to the City Council to consider what it wanted to do with the site.
- v. It was up to Marshall's Airport if they wished to move the aircraft testing facility. This would be considered as part of a site viability assessment.

The New Neighbourhoods Development Manager said the following in response to Members' questions:

- i. Officer workshop sessions had taken place and more may do so in future.
- ii. Further Cambridge East sites may come forward for development in future. Officers have been in discussions with the Developer regarding sites to come forward. It had been agreed with the Developer that plans would not be included in the Supplementary Planning Document until sites were ready to come forward.
- iii. Feedback was being sought from Marshalls regarding further development of the site.
- iv. Noise issues affecting the site had been taken on board. A detailed technical briefing would be given to councillors in early September regarding aircraft testing facility noise. A report was coming to JDCC in future regarding spine road noise. The County Council Transport Team were taking a report to Economy & Environment Committee in

September, the City Council were awaiting the outcome from this. Further details would be included in the final Supplementary Planning Document.

- v. 40% of housing was expected to be affordable. The impact of the aircraft testing facility had been taken into account in the Wing Development viability study.
- vi. A Public Transport Strategy was a key feature.
- vii. The County Economy & Environment Committee would consider site in September. Further details would be available in the final Supplementary Planning Document.
- viii. Officers were discussing having a green landscape buffer along the site edge. Feedback from the public suggested that open views were desirable.
- ix. Design coding should lead to a good design for the site.
- x. There was an intention to put in a primary school to service the site.
- xi. The route of footpaths would be considered in the pre-application process.

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.

### **17/91/DPSSC Cambridge Local Plan Review: Modifications to Appendix M: Monitoring**

#### **Matter for Decision**

Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Local Plans were currently being examined by independent Planning Inspectors. The Inspectors asked the Councils to review the monitoring framework and requirements set out in their respective Local Plans to ensure that the monitoring indicators were SMART (specific, measurable, achievable, relevant, and time-bound).

The Councils have worked together to review their monitoring requirements and indicators, and where appropriate have made their requirements and indicators consistent. Modifications were proposed in order to make the plan sound.

The Officer's report addressed the proposed modifications to *Appendix M: Monitoring & Implementation* of the emerging Cambridge Local Plan, which, if approved by the Executive Councillor for Planning Policy and Transport, would be submitted to the Planning Inspectors for consideration.

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

Agreed:

- i. Proposed modifications to *Appendix M: Monitoring & Implementation* of the emerging Local Plan (Appendix A & B) for submission to the Inspectors examining the Local Plan as set out in the Officer's report and minutes below;
- ii. That delegated authority be given to the Joint Director of Planning and Economic Development to make any subsequent minor amendments and editing changes to Appendix M, in consultation with the Executive Councillor for Planning Policy and Transport, 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 Committee made the following comments in response to the report:

- i. Discussed the appropriateness of triggers and targets.
- ii. Discussed amendments, which were noted by the Planning Policy Officer who agreed to incorporate the changes:
  - Setting out more explicit commentary in the Annual Monitoring Report about whether targets were being met or not.
  - P189 Appendix A: Amended Appendix M: Monitoring and Implementation (Clean) – the target could be amended to differentiate if 1 large or several small developments did not meet the criteria.
  - (Text changes shown in bold/strikethrough) P193 Appendix A: Amended Appendix M: Monitoring and Implementation (Clean) - Trigger: ~~No less~~ **The loss of a/any** local heritage assets.

The Planning Policy Officer said the following in response to Members' questions:

- i. P165 Appendix A: Amended Appendix M: Monitoring and Implementation (Clean) – the target did not include developments legally allowed on the greenbelt.
- ii. P166 Appendix A: Amended Appendix M: Monitoring and Implementation (Clean) – Policy 2 did not include triggers as the City Council were not responsible for the Local Transport Plan.
- iii. P289 set out an audit trail for each proposed modification to *Appendix M*.
- iv. All indicators were annually monitored for the Local Plan.
- v. The methodology for assessing progress against the housing target was based on national guidance, as set by the Planning Inspector when commenting on the Local Plan

The Committee unanimously resolved to endorse the recommendations, subject to agreement of amendment wording by Chair and Spokesperson in consultation with the Executive Councillor for Planning Policy and Transport.

The Executive Councillor approved the recommendations, subject to agreement of amendment wording by Chair and Spokesperson.

**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 5.45 pm

**CHAIR**