

**PLANNING AND TRANSPORT SCRUTINY COMMITTEE**

30 June 2020  
5.30 - 9.30 pm

**Present:** Councillors Smart (Chair), Bird (Vice-Chair), Baigent, Bick, Chadwick, Collis, Green, Porrer and Hipkin

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

**Officers:**

Director of Planning and Economic Development: Stephen Kelly

Strategic Director: Fiona Bryant

Assistant Director Strategy and Economy: Paul Frainer

Planning Policy Manager: Caroline Hunt

Heather Jones: Strategic Lead 3C Building Standards

Principal Planning Policy Officer (Transport): Jonathan Dixon

Special Projects Officer: Hana Loftus

Senior Planning Policy Officer: Terry DeSouza

Committee Manager: Sarah Steed

**FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE COUNCIL**

**20/55PnT Apologies for Absence**

No apologies were received.

**20/56PnT Declarations of Interest**

<b>Name</b>	<b>Item</b>	<b>Interest</b>
Councillor Baigent	All	Personal: Member of CamCycle and Extinction Rebellion.

**20/57PnT Minutes**

The minutes of the meeting held on 14 January 2020 were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

**20/58PnT Public Questions**

There were no public questions.

### **20/59PnT Temporary arrangements for car parking in response to the COVID-19 situation**

The decision was noted.

### **20/60PnT ROD - City Centre Centre Parking Fees June - August 2020**

Councillor Bick made the following comments:

- i. Noted that this was a subsequent decision to 20/59PnT.
- ii. Noted that people who worked in public sector jobs and in essential food jobs had free parking.
- iii. From June onwards free parking arrangements ended, people who worked in retail (either essential or non-essential) would be charged £10.50 / day.
- iv. Questioned why different arrangements were proposed for those working in the public sector to those working in the private sector. Questioned why the Executive Councillor thought this was ok.
- v. Believed the decision would be difficult to defend.

The Strategic Director said the following:

- i. Public Sector workers and those working in the voluntary sector would be providing support to those who were vulnerable and could be shielding and may not be able to social distance because of the support being provided. Therefore some people needed to travel by car to avoid cross-contamination. For the next 3 months it was considered appropriate to offer these people access to free parking.
- ii. Wouldn't be able to offer free parking to all, it seemed fairer to group all businesses together.
- iii. Some businesses were offering employees discounted parking or parking permits.
- iv. Was aware of government's advice and would review the decision in July.
- v. Wanted to ensure that there was adequate space in the car parks.

The Executive Councillor for Transport and Community Safety commented:

- i. The number of people coming into work was increasing and there might not be capacity for these workers in the car parks.
- ii. If individual employers had any issues then they needed to discuss this with the council.
- iii. The decision would be reviewed in July.

The Strategic Director said the following:

- i. There was a tight application process in place for people who wanted to access the free parking. Free parking was not automatically given. Each applicant had to demonstrate a need to have the free parking and they needed to have the support of their employer as well before their application would be granted.

## **20/61PnT ROD - Greater Cambridge Housing Trajectory and Five Year Housing Land Supply**

Councillor Green made the following comments:

- i. Noted that this was a clear statistical document which suggested that 700 houses would be built per year.
- ii. Questioned how much affordable housing was being delivered and what proportion was being built by the private sector.

The Joint Director of Planning and Economic Development made the following comment:

- i. The Council published a separate monitoring report which detailed the number and type of houses that were built each year which recorded the performance against the housing trajectory. This was available on the council's website.
- ii. This was a heavily statistical report which had a forward looking calculation of completions.

The Executive Councillor for Planning Policy and Open Spaces:

- i. Thanked officers for preparing the document.
- ii. The monitoring report showed that over the last 5 years in Cambridge City the average number of affordable houses delivered was 41%.
- iii. Would provide the Committee with the average number of social rented affordable houses which had been delivered.

Councillor Green commented:

- i. Wanted to know what the two authorities were doing to increase the supply of affordable housing; particularly by the private sector.
- ii. Referred to page 3 of the appendix of this agenda item. There had been an increase in affordable homes, 60 in 2011, 667 in 2017 and 345 in 2019.
- iii. Wanted reassurance that the private sector would deliver affordable housing.

- iv. Was worried the burden of providing affordable housing would fall on the council.
- v. Had concerns especially in light of the pandemic.
- vi. Needed more affordable housing on stream.

The Joint Director of Planning and Economic Development made the following comment:

- i. Was happy to bring a report back to Committee.
- ii. The affordable housing figures were likely to be private sector provision as the figures referred to completions and the City Council's affordable housing programme had not yet been completed.
- iii. Would provide a breakdown between the private and public sector of affordable housing provision.

#### **7a ROD - Greater Cambridge Planning Service and Building Control Shared Services Business Plans 2020/21**

The decision was noted.

#### **7b ROD - Addendum to Greater Cambridge Statement of Community Involvement in light of COVID-19 Restrictions**

The decision was noted.

#### **20/62PnT Annual Report of 3C Building Control Service & Planning Shared Service 2019/20**

##### **Matter for Decision**

The report summarised the performance of the 3Cs Building Control Shared Services and the Greater Cambridge Shared Planning Service during 2019/20.

##### **Decision of Executive Councillor for Planning Policy Open Spaces**

- i. Noted the contents of the 3Cs Building Control Shared Services report.
- ii. Noted the contents of the Greater Cambridge Shared Planning Service report.

##### **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 reports from the Strategic Lead 3C Building Control and the Strategic Director, Joint Director of Planning and Economic Development.

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

- i. In relation to Building Control, congratulated the service on their awards and noted the customer feedback was good and the service was exceeding targets. Noted in the past that a confidential appendix would be provided detailing fee generating income; exempt from publication as the service competed with the private sector. Asked how the council was doing in terms of the market share.
- ii. In relation to the Planning Service, thought the tide was turning. Noted complaints stemmed from a backlog of validating applications. Asked what the position was in relation to the backlog and how long it would be until it was resolved.
- iii. In relation to the Planning Service asked what could be done for more public engagement particularly for residents who were not part of a Residents Association. Noted that SCDC had Parish Forums, questioned if Area Committees could take on this role.

The Strategic Lead 3C Building Control and the Strategic Director, Joint Director of Planning and Economic Development said the following in response to Members' questions:

- i. Was happy to provide the committee with a brief summary of how the Building Control Department was performing in terms of the market share but did not want to discuss this in a public meeting as this information would disclose commercially sensitive information.
- ii. The backlog of application validating and determination had been impacted by the effects of the service wide restructure and the introduction of the new joint software on which all future planning applications would be processed. The backlog of validating applications was reducing and, there were 21 householder applications, 21 outline applications and 6 listed building consent applications awaiting validation in the City as of 29 June.
- iii. The Technical Support Team were prioritising householder and business applications. An update would be provided on the backlog position to the Committee following the meeting.
- iv. The Planning Application Service had been restructured so that they were now organised into 3 x area planning teams with dedicated officers for each area. The service was exploring how these new teams could be 'introduced' to the public. Each Team had already run a virtual

introductory meeting for Parish Councils and they were looking to see how else they could promote the service within the community.

The Committee **unanimously resolved** to endorse the recommendations.

The Executive Councillor approved the recommendations and congratulated the teams on their achievements.

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

No conflicts of interest were declared by the Executive Councillor.

### **20/63PnT North East Cambridge Area Action Plan - Draft Plan for Consultation**

#### **Matter for Decision**

The report introduces the draft Area Action Plan (AAP) being prepared jointly by Cambridge City Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council that presented the Councils' preferred approach for managing development, regeneration and investment in North East Cambridge (NEC) over the next fifteen years and beyond. It followed public consultation on Issues & Options in February 2019 that sought to elicit views on a wide range of options on how the area might change, the issues and challenges facing the area, and how these might be addressed.

#### **Decision of Executive Councillor for Planning Policy and Open Spaces**

- i. Agreed the name of the AAP be formally changed to the North East Cambridge Area Action Plan (NECAAP);
- ii. Agreed the draft North East Cambridge Area Action Plan (Appendix A); the draft North East Cambridge Policies Map (including amended boundary) (Appendix B) and Topic Papers (Appendix C) for a ten-week period of public consultation under Regulation 18 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 and that this consultation also includes the evidence documents (listed in the draft AAP with relevant policy and published on the shared planning service website);
- iii. Agreed the Statement of Consultation (Appendix D) including responses to comments received to the Issues & Options (February 2019);
- iv. Noted the findings of the updated Joint Equalities Impact Assessment, Draft Sustainability Appraisal, Draft Habitats Regulation Assessment; and Duty to Cooperate Statement (Appendices E, F, G and H respectively);

- v. Delegated authority to the Cambridge Executive Councillor for Planning Policy and Open Spaces (in consultation with the Chair and Spokes for the Planning and Transport Scrutiny Committee) and the Deputy Leader of South Cambridgeshire District Council to agree the further Topic Papers as set out at paragraph 4.17 of the officer's report ahead of public consultation.
- vi. Delegated authority to the Joint Director of Planning and Economic Development, in liaison with the Cambridge Executive Councillor for Planning Policy and Open Spaces (in consultation with the Chair and Spokes for the Planning Policy and Transport Scrutiny Committee) and the Deputy Leader of South Cambridgeshire District Council, to make editorial changes to the Draft NEC AAP consultation report (including graphics) and supporting documents (prior to the commencement of the consultation period) to comprise minor amendments and factual updates and clarifications.
- vii. Noted the update on the Fen Road access issues at paragraphs 4.19 and 4.20 of the officer's report.

### **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 Senior Planning Policy Officer, Assistant Director, Special Projects Officer

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

- i. Questioned if the pandemic would delay the work on the NECAAP.
- ii. Referred to policy 8 which dealt with open space; the member had expected 39 hectares of open space to be provided for a development of this size. Expressed disappointment that the topic paper stated it was unlikely that the full quantum of open space would be provided on site.
- iii. Questioned the impact of the development on water supply / provision in the city and the surrounding network.
- iv. Queried how limiting water consumption would be enforced.
- v. Questioned the response rate to the NECAAP and what arrangements were being put in place for access over the railway line at Fen Road.
- vi. Noted the AAP stated that 1 building would be built to BREEAM (Building Research Establishment Environmental Assessment Method)

- outstanding standard and asked whether this criterion could be increased.
- vii. Asked whether the paragraph regarding passive housing could be re-worded.
  - viii. Queried if an area within the AAP could be reserved if land was required to resolve the Fen Road / railway access issue.
  - ix. Referred to policy 13c and noted that housing for local workers was not included within the current City Local Plan and questioned how key workers could be helped.
  - x. Noted some buildings were proposed to have 13 stories and questioned if the ceiling heights were reduced to achieve this building height whether that would provide enough room to accommodate passive housing.
  - xi. Questioned whether people would be able to afford to move to bigger houses in view of the COVID-19 recession.

The Senior Planning Policy Officer, Assistant Director and the Special Projects Officer said the following in response to Members' questions:

- i. Officers had consulted with Community Forums to explore whether work on the NECAAP should be delayed; residents said that they would prefer for the work to continue. Officers adopted a 'digital first' approach which had been successfully used during the Local Plan consultations.
- ii. Exploration of the type of open space which should be provided as part of the development was inconclusive. Options had been considered like Parkers Piece style open space or more dispersed open space areas. Previous respondents to the consultation had said that they wanted a wide variety of open space provision. Multifunctional and multi-use open space was therefore being proposed.
- iii. Was aware of concerns regarding growth and the impact on water supply and water cycle. An independent Water Survey had been commissioned. Wanted to promote low water consumption on the site and was looking at limiting water usage to 80 litres per person per day. The issue of water consumption was a growth issue and not a geographic issue. The NECAAP set high standards across both residential and non-residential development. For non-residential developments, the plan sought to ensure that development would be built to BREAAAM 'good' standards.
- iv. Limiting water consumption would be enforced at source and through metering. Monitoring requirements on consumption would seek to ensure delivery of this objective.
- v. The consultation had received more responses than any other AAP the City had done before. People were able to dip in and out of the

- NECAAP. Officers wanted to capture as many consultation responses as possible.
- vi. Discussions were on-going regarding maintenance of the public realm.
  - vii. The plan provides for a bridge over the railway line for pedestrian and cycle access.
  - viii. Officers were looking at whether they could increase the number of buildings which would be built to BREEAM outstanding standard.
  - ix. Officers confirmed that they would look at the wording of the passive housing paragraph.
  - x. The Fen Road crossing was a complex but existing issue, which the AAP could not resolve directly. Officers were seeking to engage Network Rail in discussion on options, if Network Rail intended to close the crossing then they would have to fund an alternative route of access. The cost of resolving the access issue via the North East Cambridge site would be high, both land cost and the physical infrastructure crossing the railway and the rules about planning policy meant that only impacts arising as a result of the plan proposals could be mitigated directly by planning policy requirements. This means resolution of the Fen Road access issue would require a broader approach, working with Network Rail.
  - xi. Would look at whether housing could be tethered to the new employment space for people on the science and business park. Could look to see whether employers could be encouraged to purchase land to accommodate their staff.
  - xii. Building height assumptions presumed at standard 3m per storey allowance.
  - xiii. Officers would keep under review the implications of the COVID-19 pandemic on future development trends and values / requirements for sustainable and healthy living.

The Executive Councillor commented:

- i. If the water treatment centre was able to relocate then this site was the right place for development; more jobs and housing was required by the area to meet existing and future needs.
- ii. Prior to 2015, councils were able to set requirements for water usage as part of planning applications. The development should not rely on mains water and should look at ways to re-use water. She wanted to challenge the Government to permit councils to set water usage conditions as part of planning applications.

The Committee resolved by 5 votes to 0 with 4 abstentions 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.

**20/64PnT Greater Cambridge Local Plan: Issues & Options Feedback and Next Steps**

**Matter for Decision**

The report sought to feedback on the Greater Cambridge Local Plan Issues and Options consultation – ‘The First Conversation’. This formed part of the early stages in preparing the next Local Plan for the area, being prepared jointly by Cambridge City Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council.

**Decision of Executive Councillor for Planning Policy and Open Spaces**

- i. Noted the report on Initial Feedback from the First Conversation consultation included at Appendix 1
- ii. Agreed additional informal member and stakeholder engagement and Preferred Options stages be added to the Local Plan making process
- iii. Agreed the approach to addressing the Duty to Cooperate included as Appendix 3 to the report, subject to any material changes necessary as a result of consultation with Duty to Cooperate bodies.

**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 and Economy Manager and Planning Policy Manager.

The Committee resolved by 8 votes to 0 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.

## **20/65PnT Update of Greater Cambridge Local Development Scheme**

### **Matter for Decision**

To agree an update to the Greater Cambridge Local Development Scheme (LDS).

### **Decision of Executive Councillor for Planning Policy and Open Spaces**

- i. Adopted the updated Local Development Scheme for Greater Cambridge included at Appendix 1 of this report, to take effect from 13 July 2020.
- ii. Delegated authority to the Joint Director of Planning and Economic Development, in liaison with the South Cambridgeshire Lead Cabinet member for Planning and the Cambridge City Council Executive Councillor for Planning Policy and Open Spaces (and also the Chair and Spokes for the Planning Policy and Transport Scrutiny Committee), to make any minor editing changes and corrections identified prior to publication.

### **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 and Economy Manager and Planning Policy Manager

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

- i. Thought more debate was required on how growth related to climate change and exploring sustainability means both in social and environmental aspects. Welcomed what was being proposed as this would give more time for debate. The change in the schedule made sense and wanted to harness the contribution of housing from the AAP into the Local Plan. The timeline seemed to be set by the DCO (Development Consent Order) process.
- ii. Asked that because of the length of time involved in the development scheme process that an interim report should be brought back to Committee in 2021.

The Strategy and Economy Manager and Planning Policy Manager said the following in response to Members' questions:

- i. It was good practice at each stage in the local plan process to reflect and check on the local development scheme.
- ii. When the preferred option report was brought back to committee a report would be provided to confirm how the programme related to the local development scheme at that time and whether any further updates were necessary.

The Committee resolved by 8 votes to 0 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.

### **20/66PnT Joint Development Control Committee-terms of reference**

#### **Matter for Decision**

The County Council resolved in May 2020 to withdraw from the Joint Development Control Committee (JDCC) after July 2020. The effect of their resolution will be for the current JDCC to no longer be quorate.

The report sought agreement to the establishment of a new Committee (the Greater Cambridge Joint Planning Committee GCJPC) and set out the proposed terms for the new Joint Committee to come into effect from 1 August 2020.

#### **Decision of Executive Councillor for Planning Policy and Open Spaces to recommend to the Civic Affairs Committee to:**

- i. Dissolve the JDCC between Cambridge City Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council as surviving members, pursuant to section 101 (5) Local Government Act 1972 and cease all delegations to the same with effect from 31 July 2020;
- ii. Establish a new joint planning committee between Cambridge City Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council (to be called the Joint Development Control Committee) with the Terms of Reference detailed in Appendix A as amended to increase the membership from 3 to 6 members for both Cambridge City Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council and that the Chair and Vice-Chair positions rotate between the councils each municipal year and to delegate functions to the joint committee and officers as set out therein, pursuant to section

- 101 (5) and section 102 Local Government Act 1972 with effect from 1 August 2020
- iii. Agree that any ongoing planning matters or any other continuing action which would otherwise fall to be determined by the JDCC will, after 31 July 2020, transfer to the Greater Cambridge Joint Planning Committee for determination
  - iv. Authorise the Joint Director of Planning and Economic Development to decide whether to refer any development control matters for determination by the Greater Cambridge Joint Planning Committee where the boundary of the site concerned overlaps or is adjacent to the boundary between Cambridge City Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council
  - v. Authorise the Monitoring Officer to make any consequential amendments to the Council's constitution arising from the above decisions
  - vi. Comment upon the proposed draft standing orders for the Committee as appropriate.

### **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 Joint Director of Planning and Economic Development. He updated his report to state that:

- i. Members had queried the proposed name of the Committee.
- ii. Members may wish to consider the number of members who sat on the committee.
- iii. Clarified the geographical areas which would be covered by the new Committee.
- iv. The terms of reference should be amended to include the ability for County Members to exercise speaking rights at the Committee.
- v. Members had requested that the chair position rotated between SCDC and the City Council.

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

- i. Agreed that the new Committee should consider major planning applications rather than householder applications.
- ii. Thought that the number of members sitting on the committee should be increased.

- iii. Suggested the number of members sitting on the committee should comprise 6 members for both SCDC and the City Council.

The Joint Director of Planning and Economic Development and Democratic Services Manager said the following in response to Members' questions:

- i. Thought the matter of the size of the committee would be commented upon by SCDC councillors as well.
- ii. The Committee could suggest how many councillors they thought the committee should comprise but noted this would still be a matter for negotiation between the two councils.

Councillor Baigent proposed and seconded by Councillor Porrer the following amendment:

- i. Amend the membership of the committee so there would be 6 Cambridge City Council members and 6 South Cambridgeshire District Council members rather than 3 members each.

Councillor Smart proposed and Councillor Baigent seconded the following amendment:

- ii. Retain the name of the Committee as the Joint Development Control Committee rather than the Greater Cambridge Joint Planning Committee and reflect this throughout the terms of reference document.

Councillor Baigent proposed and Councillor Smart seconded the following amendment:

- iii. Confirm that the Chair and Vice-Chair positions rotate between Cambridge City Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council each municipal year.

The Committee approved the amendments unanimously.

The Committee unanimously resolved to endorse the amended recommendations.

The Executive Councillor approved the amended 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 9.30 pm

**CHAIR**