

PLANNING AND TRANSPORT SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

16 July 2019
4.30 - 7.00 pm

Present: Councillors Smart (Chair), Baigent, Bick, Chadwick, Collis, Green, Hipkin, McGerty and Davies

Executive Councillors: Massey (Executive Councillor for Transport and Community Safety) and Thornburrow (Executive Councillor for Planning Policy and Open Spaces)

Officers:

Strategy & Economy Manager - Shared Planning Service: Caroline Hunt

Principal Urban Designer: Jonathan Brookes

Principal Planning Policy Officer: Stuart Morris

Principal Planning Policy Officer: Jonathan Dixon

Committee Manager: Claire Tunnicliffe

FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE COUNCIL

19/28PnT Apologies for Absence

No apologies were received.

19/29PnT Declarations of Interest

No declarations of interest were made.

19/30PnT Public Questions

There were no public questions.

19/31PnT 19/31PnT Making Space for People: Vision, Principles & Strategies - Working towards a Supplementary Planning Document

Matter for Decision

The report referred to the public consultation for the Making Space for People interim consultation for work to inform a future Supplementary Planning Document (SPD). The interim consultation document will be consulted for a

period of six weeks, ensuring the needs and aspirations of communities and stakeholders were understood and taken into account in drafting the Making Space for People SPD.

Decision of Executive Councilor for Planning Policy and Open Spaces and the Executive Councilor for Transport and Community Safety

- i. Agreed the draft Making Space for People: Vision, Principles & Strategies document (Appendix 1 of the Officer's report) for consultation purposes.
- ii. Approved the draft Baseline Report (Appendix 2 of the Officer's report) for consultation purpose as amended.
- iii. Noted the consultation period would take place for six weeks between Monday 2 September and Monday 14 October 2019.
- iv. Approved the Joint Director of Planning and Economic Development was granted delegated authority, in liaison with the Executive Councilor for Planning Policy and Open Spaces, the Executive Councilor for Transport and Community Safety and the Chair and Spokes for the Planning Policy and Transport Scrutiny Committee, to make any editing changes prior to commencement of the consultation period.

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 Principal Urban Designer referring to the Making Space for People project which would lead to the production of a Supplementary Planning Document (SPD). This would provide planning guidance for the streets and public spaces that formed the public realm in Central Cambridge.

The Principal Urban Designer informed the Committee of an amendment to recommendation 2.1.2 of the Officers report which would read as follows (additional text underlined).

The draft Baseline Report attached to this committee report at Appendix 2 for consultation purposes is noted and published as part of the evidence base for the Making Space for People: Vision, Principles & Strategies document

The Committee **unanimously agreed** the amendment.

The Chair welcomed the Executive Councillor for Climate Change, Environment and City Centre to the meeting who made the following comments following the Committee discussion:

- i. A separate review of car parks in the city centre and the Council's office strategy were currently being undertaken.
- ii. Did not believe the Council had ever supported the notion 'the more tourists the better'.
- iii. The Council did not have the power to determine where coaches parked in the city but had worked with the County Council to create a coach strategy.
- iv. The coach strategy outlined plans for coaches to park at the Park and Rides sites (but more coach parking would be required). Spaces at Cambridge Backs would have to be pre-booked, however did not agree that coach parking along the Backs was the most suitable.
- v. Visit Cambridge had been in discussion with other heritage cities regarding the introduction of a tourist tax. Ultimately this would be down to Central Government. A tourist tax would be based on overnight stays in the city.
- vi. The Council and Visit Cambridge had been working hard to reduce the number of day trippers and encourage overnight stays and would continue to do so.
- vii. Disputed the claim that the city centre was 'grubby'.
- viii. A recent Cambridge Improvement District (BID) survey had approximately 80% of responses agreeing that the City was clean or very clean.
- ix. Would enquire with Officers about the possibility of transferring a proportion of County Council's food and drink licenses to the City Council concerning those restaurants in the city offering outside seating.

The Principal Urban Designer said the following in response to Members' questions:

- i. The impact that an increased bus service in Emmanuel and Drummer Street would have on the city centre would be further investigated while

working with the Greater Cambridge Partnership and as the SPD was further developed.

- ii. Was not in the Council's gift to grant a clean air policy in the city centre but the consultation document made reference to this and how it could be achieved, such as electric vehicles, traffic enforcement and working with outside agencies.
- iii. Further work would be carried out detailing reliable enforcement mechanisms to underpin motor vehicle access controls.
- iv. The document references that inclusive design will be paramount to create a City Centre which was accessible, inclusive and safe.
- v. It was imperative to ensure that disabled users enjoyed the same access to the city centre as all users: the document made reference to inclusivity for all.
- vi. Recognised there would be a challenge to balance the allocation of spaces for pedestrians, cyclists and public with transport links in and around the city.
- vii. Would look at how the dispersal of tourists could be encouraged around the city centre.
- viii. Traffic audits would investigate the flow of traffic into the city centre and parking and how to inspire the use of park and rides services.
- ix. The SPD would pick up the issue of city centre street furniture, including ideas around management of table and chairs, when considering the reallocation of space; whilst examining the quality of the space for the hierarchy of users.
- x. The document looked the rebalancing of streets and spaces looking at the streets of the city as spaces and not just movement corridors.
- xi. Would look at the wording of the document to ensure it was clear that Cambridge was a working city as well as a tourist attraction and home to local residents living in the centre.
- xii. The document acknowledged the importance of local businesses in the city centre and the contribution they made to the local economy; it was imperative the day to day operational needs to support those businesses were not disrupted.
- xiii. The SPD would explore delivery strategies in the city such as last mile deliveries and delivery hubs.
- xiv. The document would focus on the vision and principles while the SPD would concentrate on the more detailed strategies and how they could materialise.
- xv. Noted the comment regarding overreaching; concepts were being explored early in the process while the SPD would focus on strategies

that would fit within the context of the Greater Cambridge Partnership and the work they were undertaking.

- xvi. With reference to the term 'alternative to car parking', this could mean creating cycle to work schemes, promoting public transport, moving barriers to sustainable movement in the city.
- xvii. Would work on the term 'demand management' to how to achieve a 24% reduction in vehicles in the city referenced in the document.
- xviii. There was a separate project looking at the market place which the document would make reference to.

The Committee **unanimously endorsed** the Officer recommendations with amendments.

The Executive Councillors approved the recommendations as amended.

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

No conflicts of interest were declared by the Executive Councillors

19/32PnT Greater Cambridge Local Plan Inception and Joint Planning & Transport Advisory Group Terms of Reference.

Matter for Decision

To agree the terms of reference for the proposed Joint Planning & Transport Advisory Group.

Decision of Executive Councilor for Planning Policy and Open Spaces

- i. Noted information regarding the inception of the Local Plan.
- ii. Agreed the terms of reference for the proposed Joint Planning & Transport Advisory Group as outlined in Appendix A (amended).
- iii. Agreed that Cambridge City Council representation on the Joint Planning & Transport Advisory Group should comprise two nominations from the Labour group and one from the Liberal Democrat group.

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 Strategy & Economy Manager.

The report referred to the proposed Joint Planning & Transport Advisory Group: a non-decision making joint member group intended to facilitate the development of a shared policy understanding to allow the timely preparation of the new Greater Cambridge Local Plan, coordinated with transport policy.

The Committee was informed of the following amendments to the terms of reference (additional text underlined and deleted text ~~struck through~~).

Joint Local Planning and ~~Transport~~ Advisory Group Draft Terms of Reference

Outline

The Group is non decision-making and will offer a steer at Member level for the development of land use plans, ~~and~~ integrated with transport strategy. It will meet in public. The group will facilitate cooperation between the authorities and better decision making through the relevant processes.

The Group will report its recommendations to the respective Local Planning Authorities, for decision-making to be completed through each Council's existing democratic processes.

Purpose

The group will provide efficient and effective coordination of spatial planning ~~including land use and integrated transport strategy~~ for the Cambridge City and South Cambridgeshire districts.

The group will provide opportunity for three-way discussion on other strategic and cross-boundary issues, at the discretion of the Chair in discussion with Vice Chairs.

The group will provide high level oversight of the Greater Cambridge growth strategy. There will be liaison with bordering authorities when appropriate.

Outcomes

The outcomes from the group will be:

(a) to ~~ensure~~ facilitate a shared policy position that will allow the timely development of the new Greater Cambridge Local Plan, coordinated/integrated with transport policy; and

(b) to ~~ensure~~ facilitate a shared policy position that will allow the timely development of other key planning policy ~~and transport~~ documents within the Greater Cambridge area.

Membership

The group will consist of three Members from each of Cambridge City Council, South Cambridgeshire District Council, and one from Cambridgeshire County Council. The membership of the group will be determined by each authority.

Each authority should also nominate substitutes should the core participants not be able to attend particular meetings.

Frequency of meetings

Every two months or as necessary, hosted on a rotating basis.

Secretariat

The secretariat for the group will be provided by either Cambridge City Council or SCDG South Cambridgeshire District Council. The Chairman and Vice-Chairman will be from Cambridge City Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council and will alternate annually.

Chairmanship and vice chairmanship will be determined each year on the anniversary of the first meeting.

Winding Up of the Group

The Group will be wound up by any one of the following means:

(a) ~~(i)~~ five years from today's date; ~~or~~

~~(iii)~~ adoption of the Greater Cambridge Local Plan by the authorities, with no other Development Plan Documents still in preparation;

~~(c)~~ on withdrawal from the Advisory Group ~~of~~ by one of Cambridge City Council or South Cambridgeshire District Council; or

~~(d)~~ on a simple majority vote by Members of the Advisory Group.

The Committee **unanimously agreed** the amendments.

In response to Members questions the Strategy & Economy Manager said the following:

- i. Would look at the wording of the winding up of the group.
- ii. Advice had been taken on the political proportionality from both of the democratic services teams.
- iii. The make-up of the JLPAG was comparable to the Joint Strategic Transport and Spatial Planning Group (expired) in preparation of the last separate but aligned Local Plan and Area Action Plans; both local authorities had rejected the suggestion of a statutory joint committee.
- iv. Officers had found the previous JSTSPG to be very useful as there was a close relationship between the historical city of Cambridge (Cambridge City Council) and the surrounding area (South Cambridgeshire District Council).
- v. The JLPAG was intended to provide an opportunity for both councils to meet in advance of their formal decision making meeting; members could identify issues which affected each local authority, and suggest a way forward before their relevant decision making meeting. This should allow a resolution in the decision making meeting and reduce the need for decisions to be taken away outside of the meeting under delegated authority.
- vi. The first stage of the new Greater Cambridge Local Plan would be for members to look at a draft issues and options document. If the document was brought to each local authority separately it would be only natural to heavily focus on their relevant geographical areas; the JLPAG would allow the documents to be looked at holistically as a whole.
- vii. The JLPAG would vote on a recommendation which would be taken to each local authority's decision making meeting; JLPAG representatives would be present with the benefit of knowing what the other council's view were.
- viii. It was the gift of both local authorities to determine if representatives from the County Council should sit on the advisory group.
- ix. It was the task of the officers to undertake the technical work and development of documents. It was not unusual to have a high-level officer group assisting those officers working on these documents.
- x. A joint high-level officer group comprising representatives of both councils, Greater Cambridge Partnership, Cambridgeshire County Council and the Combined Authority had been set up and would meet on a monthly basis to help steer the development of the forthcoming Local Plan. Ultimately it is Members who make the decisions.

The Committee endorsed the Officer recommendations with amendments by **8 votes to 0**.

The Executive Councillor approved the recommendations as amended.

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

No conflicts of interest were declared by the Executive Councillor.

** Committee Managers Note: There has been a minor amendment to the JLPAG terms of reference as recommended by the South Cambridgeshire District Council Portfolio Holder and agreed by the Executive Councillor for Planning Policy & Open Spaces on 13 August 2019.*

The change can be seen under the title Purpose of the attached document: last paragraph/sentence: There will be liaison with bordering authorities when appropriate. The word bordering to be changed to "neighbouring authorities and other relevant bodies".

19/33PnT Local Transport Plan 2019 – Consultation Response

Matter for Decision

The purpose of the report was to inform Cambridge City Council's response to the Cambridgeshire Peterborough Combined Authority Draft Local Transport Plan consultation.

Decision of Executive Councilor for Transport and Community Safety.

- i. Noted the initial response to the Local Transport Plan consultation as set out in appendix 1 of the Officer's report.
- ii. Agreed the wording of a final joint response and/or any individual response through an out of cycle decision, in consultation with Chair and Spokes

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 Principal Planning Policy Officer.

The report referred to the Devolution Deal of 2017 which gave the Combined Authority (CPCA) the role of the Local Transport Authority from Cambridgeshire County Council. One of the key responsibilities of the Local Transport Authority was the development of a new Local Transport Plan (LTP), to set out plans and strategies for maintaining and improving all aspects of the local transport system.

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

- i. Noted the comment regarding the need for a mid or even short term strategy to reduce traffic within the city and improve transport links which should not be ignored when considering the long term local transport plan.
- ii. Acknowledged a new dual-carriageway standard route, from Cambridge to Chatteris, March and Wisbech would encourage investment in north Cambridgeshire, and share the benefits of the success of the Greater Cambridge area. However this was not a priority project but there were plans for the fenland area to improve rail links, including Wisbech station.
- iii. The issue of maintenance had been picked up in the plan under policy theme 19.
- iv. Policy theme 18 of the plan proposed to identify a key local road network, identified parts of the network which should be prioritised for management and maintenance. This policy would also address measures to reduce number of vehicles, picking up on issues addressed in other policy themes.
- v. Reference to social context and issues had been referenced throughout the document such as affordable travel for all.
- vi. Discussion of the Dutch-type segregated walking and cycling infrastructure was to give an idea of what could be achieved but did not mean that this was the preferred choice.

The Committee **unanimously endorsed** the Officer 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.

19/34PnT A428 Black Cat to Caxton Gibbet Preferred Route consultation

Matter for Decision

The purpose of the report was to inform Cambridge City Council's response to the current A428 Black Cat to Caxton Gibbet Detailed Alignment consultation, by setting out response points to inform discussion and agreement of key issues to inform a full response being agreed by the Executive Councillor in an out of cycle decision in consultation with Chair and Spokes and submitted ahead of the consultation deadline.

Decision of Executive Councilor for Transport and Community Safety.

- i. Noted the key response points to the A428 Black Cat to Caxton Gibbet Preferred Route consultation.
- ii. Agreed the wording of a final joint response and/or any individual response published through an out of cycle decision, in consultation with Chair and Spokes.

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 Principal Planning Policy Officer.

The report set out key response points for discussion, to be refined following the meeting. Discussion with South Cambridgeshire District Council suggests that there is potential to include Cambridge's comments within a joint response, potentially also with other partners.

In response to Member's comments and questions the Principal Planning Policy Officer said the following:

- i. The preferred choice for the Oxford to Cambridge arc would go either via Cambourne or Bassingbourn entering Cambridge via the south.
- ii. The draft response would expand on the different projects undertaken by the Greater Cambridge Partnership schemes and the impact on the city acknowledged.

Following a general discussion the Committee noted the critical importance of the A428 being considered as part of a coherently planned local and regional transport network, that of necessity should interact and integrate with capacity being provided elsewhere.

The Committee **unanimously endorsed** the Officer 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 7.00 pm

CHAIR