

**PLANNING AND TRANSPORT SCRUTINY COMMITTEE** 12 January 2021  
5.30 - 8.56 pm

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

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

**Officers:**

Joint Director of Planning and Economic Development: Stephen Kelly

Strategic Director: Fiona Bryant

Assistant Director Strategy and Economy: Paul Frainer

Strategy and Economy Manager: Caroline Hunt

Principal Urban Designer: Jonathan Brookes

Principal Planning Policy Officer: Terry De Sousa

Senior Policy Planner: Mark Deas

Principal Planning Officer: Jenny Nuttycombe

Committee Manager: Claire Tunnicliffe

Meeting Producer: Liam Martin

**FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE COUNCIL**

**20/1/PnT Election of Chair and Vice-Chair**

The Joint Director for Planning and Economic Development assumed the Chair whilst the Committee elected a Chair.

Councillor Collis proposed, and Councillor Green seconded, the nomination of Councillor Bird as Chair.

**Resolved** unanimously that Councillor Bird be Chair for the ensuing year.

Councillor Bird assumed the chair from the Joint Director for Planning and Economic Development at this point.

Councillor Bird proposed, and Councillor Collis seconded, the nomination of Councillor Sargeant as Vice-Chair.

**Resolved** unanimously that Councillor Sargeant be Vice-Chair for the ensuing year.

### **20/2/PnT Apologies for Absence**

No apologies were received.

Councillor Hipkin left the meeting at 8.24pm

### **20/3/PnT Declarations of Interest**

<b>Name</b>	<b>Item</b>	<b>Interest</b>
Councillor Baigent	All	Personal: Cambridge Cycle Campaign and Extinction Rebellion

### **20/4/PnT Minutes**

The minutes of the meeting held on 29 September 2020 were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

### **20/5/PnT Re-Ordering Agenda**

Under paragraph 4.2.1 of the Council Procedure Rules, the Chair used her discretion to alter the order of the agenda items. However, for ease of the reader, these minutes will follow the order of the published agenda.

### **20/6/PnT Public Questions**

The following questions were asked:

Representing Cambridge Past, Present and Future (CPPF) speaking on item 6.

### **Historic Environment Strategy/Local Plan/Making Spaces for People SPD**

- i. Cambridge does not have a Historic Environment Strategy despite having world-class built heritage and it being a requirement of National Planning Policy.

- ii. Stated at the examination of the current Local Plan, the City Council convinced the Inspector it did not need a strategy because built heritage was, and would be, protected and enhanced through a range of other documents (Local Plan p189-90).
- iii. Without doubt, one of these documents would have been the proposed Making Space for People Supplementary Planning Document, would seek to protect and enhance built heritage at the same time as making the access improvements which would be necessary as a consequence of the significant growth included in the Local Plan.
- iv. The UK did not have a good track-record of protecting and enhancing heritage in transport and access schemes, largely due to the fragmented nature of responsibility for the public realm. Easy to find inappropriately sited and designed lighting, bins, benches, cycle stands, highway signs, paving materials, etc.
- v. The Committee were being asked to abandon the Supplementary Planning Document in place of a flimsy vision & principles document which made almost no reference to heritage.
- vi. Disappointed the Joint Director of Planning and Economic Development had not provided background to the report in relation to the Local Plan.
- vii. Requested the Committee deferred the decision until there was opportunity to consider the wider implications of the decision for protecting and enhancing heritage in the city.
- viii. If the recommendation in the report was to be accepted would ask the Council commits to producing a Historic Environment Strategy as part of the next Local Plan in order to be able to demonstrate a commitment to Cambridge's world class heritage.

**Inadequate priority given to heritage in the Vision & Principle document.**

- ix. CPPF had been involved in workshops discussing the vision and principles for this work and supported those proposed on the basis that, within the SPD, there would be detailed work setting out how the important built heritage of the city would be protected and enhanced.
- x. What officers are proposing contains no detail and, therefore, the Vision and Principles do not adequately reflect the importance of built heritage and this document is not adequate to protect and enhance it.
- xi. CPPF strongly support the principles and vision set out and understand the changing context and need to respond. However, in doing so it seems that heritage has been taken for granted and neglected. As drafted, this document could probably be applied to most cities in the UK.
- xii. Requested the Committee did not approve the Vision & Principles document as currently set out. But instructed officers to carry out further work to better reflect the importance of the world class built heritage and the need to protect and enhance it through any access schemes.

**General neglect of heritage in planning policy**

- xiii. Believed the Council understood and respected the importance of built heritage. However, because heritage in Cambridge is a “given” it was not being afforded the same policy treatment and attention as other issues. As an example, a heritage impact assessment was only belatedly commissioned as part of the next Local Plan evidence base, so late that its findings will not be available to inform decisions until very late in the day.
- xiv. The City did not have a Historic Environment Strategy or a Heritage Champion. The Historic Core Conservation Area Management Plan seemed to have vanished. The latest proposals for the Making Spaces for People SPD seem to provide further evidence of this malaise.
- xv. Kings College chapel was not under threat but the city’s heritage has been and will continue to be under threat from the cumulative impact of hundreds (thousands?) of changes to buildings, streets and public realm over a sustained period of time.
- xvi. Without strong commitment, adequate policies, and sufficient resources the council was in danger of neglecting its heritage.
- xvii. The relevance of Making Spaces for People and heritage and the security barrier on Kings Parade. Whilst the barrier is considered to be required because of the growing numbers of people in the city centre but its installation has great potential to damage the very thing that has attracted them in the first place. Some of the concerns raised around this barrier would also be applicable to the temporary access restrictions also popping up all over the city.

In response the Executive Councillor for Planning Policy and Open Spaces said the following:

- i. The creation of a successful city was contingent on key partners working together, united by the vision and principles set out within the document.
- ii. Noted the concerns regarding the heritage aspects within the document and would ask officers to look at this further, as set out in the amended recommendation 4 of the committee item.
- iii. Officers would also be willing to discuss wider heritage concerns direct, particularly in relation to the preparation of the Greater Cambridge Local Plan and updating of heritage studies.
- iv. The Local Plan set out on page 190 (Figure 7.1) the range of documents, guidance and Acts which encompass the Cambridge Historic Environment Strategy. This approach to the protection and enhancement of the historic environment across the whole of

- Cambridge City was considered by an independent Inspector to be sound during the examination of the Local Plan.
- v. The statutory Local Plan was of key importance in the determining of planning applications and continues to have full weight in decisions on planning applications, including the policies that protect and enhance the historic environment.
  - vi. Making Space for People was principally a spaces and movement project for central Cambridge.
  - vii. Acknowledged there was no doubt the historic environment is a key component across the city, but the project must also take into consideration and balance other central Cambridge issues including nature conservation and biodiversity, health and well-being, economic recovery, inclusivity as well as the how the city's streets and spaces should meet the needs of those living, working and visiting Cambridge.
  - viii. The committee report (paragraph 4.10) highlighted the document was not the conclusion of the Making Space for People project and that a more spatially specific strategy could be brought forward in due course.
  - ix. The purpose of the document was to primarily act as a coordinating tool between the different organisations which operate within central Cambridge and set out the Council's priorities and vision providing a framework for schemes being developed by others.
  - x. The urgency and timings which had informed the preparation of the document were also set out within the committee report as well as the rationale as to why a supplementary planning document had not been brought forward at this time.
  - xi. The Greater Cambridge Local Plan was currently being prepared and would be informed by a wide range of evidence documents, interim versions for some of which had already been published late last year.
  - xii. The Council were committed to protecting the historic environment as part of preparing the joint Local Plan and as such have commissioned studies to help inform the Plan.
  - xiii. The Council were also working closely with bodies such as Historic England and had been engaging with local organisations such as CPPF and others as part of the stakeholder workshops held late last year.
  - xiv. The Council, together with South Cambridgeshire District Council, would continue to protect and enhance the historic environment as part of the new Greater Cambridge Local Plan, working with statutory bodies and key organisations as part of this process. If Cambridge PPF had any specific suggestions on this, this would be welcomed.
  - xv. The historic environment was a key component in Central Cambridge, noted within the document. For example, the document referred to the historic environment as well as Historic England guidance 'Streets for

- All'. Additionally, Aim and Objective A5 stated to help achieve the Vision set out in the document, central Cambridge should be 'Well-curated, a place which was beautiful as well as being managed effectively to reflect its heritage as a cradle of innovation and learning.' This includes understanding and maintaining the areas unique character whilst accommodating pressures for growth and change.
- xvi. It should also be noted that several of the other aims and objectives within the document would also work towards protecting and enhancing heritage assets and their settings, albeit not explicit in its wording. For example, Aims and Objectives A2, A3 and A4 would all have varying degrees of benefits on the historic environment and how it is experienced by local people and those visiting Cambridge.
- xvii. The Making Space for People document had been informed by stakeholder engagement, including key local and statutory historic environment bodies and organisations, but also a Baseline Report presented to the Planning and Transport committee in July 2019 and published alongside the consultation document.
- xviii. The Baseline Report (found on the Councils website) noted the historic assets in the study area, their inter-relationship with the surrounding streets and open spaces and the challenges growth has presented on how we all experience these assets. This is covered within Sections 2 and 4 within the Baseline Report as well as in Section 6: *Summary Findings*.
- xix. The Greater Cambridge Local Plan was currently being prepared and would be informed by a wide range of evidence studies.
- xx. In the context of the historic environment, the Heritage Impact Assessment being undertaken to inform the Local Plan was underway. Additionally, the councils were also undertaking work relating to landscape character which also forms a key part of the Greater Cambridge context. The findings of these studies would come together with the wide range of evidence documents to feed into the preparation of the Preferred Options for the Local Plan when it was brought back to committee later this year to agree it for public consultation. This would give an opportunity for all stakeholders to give their comments on the proposed approach before the local plan itself is drafted.
- xxi. The Cambridge Local Plan set a series of robust and sound planning policies to protect and enhance the built and natural environment. Updating these policies would continue as the Councils prepared the Greater Cambridge Local Plan.
- xxii. It should also be noted that a publication such as a Historic Environment Strategy would not increase the weight to be afforded to heritage assets beyond the tests set out in the National Planning Policy Framework, the

- Listed Building and Conservation Act and the adopted policies within the adopted Local Plan.
- xxiii. Alongside the preparation of the new Local Plan, the shared planning service's Built and Natural Environment Team were currently reviewing the various Conservation Area Appraisals and Management Plans and drawing up a rolling timetable to review these.
- xxiv. The reference to the recent public realm measures which had been introduced emphasised the importance of the document. Several public realm works do not require planning permission. Therefore by establishing a collective vision across central Cambridge, which would hopefully be endorsed shortly by other key partners, it will help ensure that all future works and projects put people rather than vehicles at the centre of project planning and decision making and moves away from the current piecemeal approach to projects which we have seen in recent times.
- xxv. With specific reference to the King's Parade measures, these were introduced in response to police advice, recommending steps be taken to protect the large number of pedestrians who use this street throughout the year and is consistent with advice to councils across the country at high profile locations.
- xxvi. Would welcome further discussion with CPPF.
- xxvii. There would be further reference to heritage and protection in the document.

Cambridge PPF made the following supplementary points:

- i. Welcomed further discussion with officers.
- ii. Those public realm works which did not require planning permission did not get the protection of the Local Plan. Therefore, the Making Spaces for People document did 'hold a lot of weight' and reference to heritage throughout the document was required in detail.
- iii. Pleased to note that additional inclusion of heritage would be looked at.
- iv. Sought clarification that a space specific SPD would be produced.

The Executive Councillor for Planning Policy and Open Spaces responded:

- i. Comments had been received regarding a spatially specific strategy which officers did feel was a necessary part of the work to come; this would go through public consultation as required.

## **2. Representing CamCycle**

- i. Thanked the Greater Cambridge Partnership (GCP) and the City Council for their work on Making Space for People.

- ii. Camcycle agreed with the overall vision and principles of the work and the hierarchy of road users.
- iii. There were many good intentions in this document, but there was not enough detail that these intentions would be followed through.
- iv. There was the intention to make walking more accessible; however, beyond vague assertions of 'increasing the pedestrian priority area'. The document failed to make clear this would require interventions such as widening of footpaths, major improvements of crossings and junctions, introducing priority over side roads and changes to signalised junctions and improvements of surfaces. If these were not mentioned, would this mean they would be considered out of scope?
- v. Not looking for specific locations where these interventions would occur, but the document could make it clearer what kind of changes could be expected.
- vi. There were intentions to improve cycling and review cycle parking but there is no detail about what kind of interventions should be implemented. What did review cycle parking mean?
- vii. Pleased to note the intention to ensure streets are compatible with LTN 1/20; however, it was not clear in what context this would be applied.
- viii. Would all streets be reviewed against LTN standards and then improved to the required level, or would LTN 1/20 only be considered for new projects?
- ix. Welcomed the repeated intentions to reduce the volume of motor vehicles in the city centre but asked what strategies would be used to do this.
- x. Asked how the ideas in this document would be turned into reality, especially if not connected to an overall transport strategy for the region.
- xi. It was essential that GCP plans for demand management and motor traffic reduction are implemented for this vision and hierarchy to be achieved.
- xii. Would like to see greater specific consideration of inclusiveness and accessibility for disabled people and noted that this should include people who would wheel, walk, use walking aids, cycle and use adapted cycles, or would do so if the city environment was not so disabling, including taxis and car access.
- xiii. Noted the number of objections to the closure of the Mill Road bridge to motor traffic. Would like to ensure councillors took into consideration that these comments were provided during the time of the railway works, where the closure of the bridge was significantly different and the road less accessible to people walking and cycling than the current trial.

- xiv. It appeared that many of these comments for Mill Road had been made specifically in protest to that closure and not in response to the Making Space consultation, vision, or documents.
- xv. The pandemic had given people a chance to reimagine their streets and public spaces and experience the benefits of low traffic environments. Expect this experience and the experience of other trial schemes around the city will have led to more support for the Making Space vision and more engagement on these issues
- xvi. Appreciate that the Making Space for People work has been used to guide emergency changes to the city centre, these have not been bold enough to achieve the step-change desired by this project. With further lockdowns upon us and the likelihood of physical distancing requirements for many months to come, we would like to see more fast-tracked trials that truly prioritise those at the top of the hierarchy of users in the city centre to test some of the Making Space ideas.
- xvii. Overall, this was a good start with excellent intentions but would urge the GCP, councillors and officers to be bold and specific about how we can achieve these important goals.

In response the Executive Councillor for Planning Policy and Open Spaces said the following:

- i. The document set out a vision and principles to inform the approach to be taken when considering streets and spaces within Central Cambridge.
- ii. To achieve this increasing the amount of space as a pedestrian priority area is one of the ways in which this could be achieved.
- iii. The interventions identified by CamCycle are ways in which the reallocation of space could be brought forward to achieve the 'transformation' identified in paragraph 3.1.2 of the Making Space for People document. However, it was considered that such measures would need to be considered as part of the next phase of the Making Space for People project which will have a spatial approach and be based on a review of the street/network hierarchy in the City Centre as well as potentially other evidence studies.
- iv. At this stage we need to highlight the importance of cycle-based trips, but the interventions needed would come as part of the next phase of the project. The Council would seek to work constructively with stakeholders to understand and include needed changes.
- v. Consistency with LTN 1/20 is important and Principles S3 and S4 highlight the need to improve cycle facilities in Central Cambridge.
- vi. A review of routes will be needed to appraise them against LTN 1/20 standards and so bring existing routes up to a required standard as well

as promote new routes where possible. However, a balance will need to be struck between physical space available, pedestrian priority and historic environment considerations in parts of Central Cambridge and particularly within the 'Historic Core'.

- vii. Re-allocation of space requires choices to be made about the number of motor vehicles using streets in Central Cambridge. This document was intended to align key partners (see section 1.8 and paragraph 1.8.6) and achieve a consistency of approach and understanding. The detail of how and when this will be achieved would form part of the next phase of the Making Space for People project.
- viii. Meeting the needs of all users was crucial to planning how streets and spaces can operate in the future. The document has highlighted the importance of 'inclusive design' as a fundamental part of this approach (see paragraph 2.3.1). The vision states 'Central Cambridge should be an inclusive, green, healthy, vibrant and engaging place...'
- ix. Aware that LTN 1/20 refers to the equality act, legislation that must be considered, existing could be brought up to standard, not just applied to new projects.
  - x. Officers would be happy to revisit the identified 'principles' within the document to clarify the inclusive design approach further.
  - xi. Some of the issues raised had been taken on board and there were proposed amendments when the Committee came to consider this item. There would be further on-going discussions with external organisations.

As a supplementary the following was said:

- i. Welcomed the further detail and reassurance in the proposed document.

The Executive Councillor for Transport and Community Safety said:

- i. Valued all comments received from community groups and external agencies.
- ii. Further discussions would take place on this document.
- iii. Committed to being bold.

### **3. Representing Cambridge Market Traders Association (CMTA)**

- i. Cambridge market operated between 10 am and 4 pm daily.
- ii. Traders were required to set-up between 6:30 am and have vehicles offsite by 9:30 am.
- iii. Traders could begin bringing vehicles onto site from 4 pm onwards for take-down with some staying on site until 7 pm.
- iv. There was a flow of approximately 80 vehicles per day of various sizes ranging from estate care to Luton Van (plus trailer) in this movement.

- v. Organisations such as Marks and Spencer, TK Maxx and other shops around the market square had regular deliveries using large articulated lorries during the day. Often leading to congestion between market traders and shop deliveries during set-up and take-down.
- vi. Concept plans for the market indicate a possible narrowing of the road around the market but should be highlighted Traders are unable to use bus lanes etc during arrival or departure.
- vii. Would put forward the following questions to the Committee within the remit of the market but wider planning of the transport arrangements within the city centre.
  - While the road may be narrowed on the market square it will still need to be fit for the purpose and allow off-road or partial on-road parking during loading and unloading. Is this under consideration?
  - Will it be possible to ensure market traders are able to use bus lanes and appropriate other restricted roads, using vehicles registered with the council, during arrival and departure from the market. Under market regulations traders were required to take everything on and off site daily.

The Executive Councillor for Transport and Community Safety advised that the comments would be passed on to the Executive Councillor for Climate Change, Environment and City Centre, whose portfolio covered the market square. The public speaker would be welcome to attend the next meeting of the Environment and Community Scrutiny Committee where the market square project would be on the agenda.

The Principal Urban Designer said the following:

- i. There was currently concept level design for the market square. The detail and technical requirements would be done in consultation with traders as part of the redesign.
- ii. Making Spaces for People document did not go into the level of detail but did acknowledge the significant role the market square had at the heart of the City.
- iii. Opportunities would be looked at in terms of extending the use of the market square into the evening as part of sustaining the economic vitality of the city centre.
- iv. Acknowledged the importance for the traders to enter and exit the market square.
- v. General access would come through as the second phase of work; looking at what types of vehicles would require access and how.

- vi. Future planning would not be to prevent market stall holders to prevent trading.

The Joint Director for Planning and Economic Development advised the Making Spaces for People work should be a platform for discussion with several agencies to reach the common goal.

As a supplementary the following was said:

- i. There had been limited engagement with market traders, three formal meetings set up and no informal on the matter of the redevelopment of the market.
- ii. Would welcome further engagement.
- iii. Understood the plans were at the concept level but wanted to raise the issues now so they would not be forgotten.
- iv. Would happily raise the issues at other scrutiny committees.

The Executive Councillor thanked the public speaker for their comments.

## **20/7/PnT Making Spaces for People**

### **Matter for Decision**

The report referred to the Making Space for the People document prepared to act as a co-ordination tool to align thinking on future street, public space and movement projects between Cambridge City Council, Cambridgeshire County Council, the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority and the Greater Cambridge Partnership.

### **Decision of the Executive Councillor for Planning Policy and Open Spaces and Executive Councillor for Transport and Community Safety.**

- i. Noted the Consultation Report which includes the representations from the 2019 consultation.
- ii. Asked Officers to undertake further refinement of Making Space for People in light of comments raised at committee and by interested parties, to engage with relevant stakeholders as appropriate, and to bring a revised document to a future meeting.

### **Reason for the Decision**

As set out in the Officer's report.

## Scrutiny Considerations

### Any Alternative Options Considered and Rejected

Not applicable

## Scrutiny Considerations

The Joint Director for Planning and Economic Development advised the Committee of an amendment to the recommendation (additional text underlined; deleted text ~~struck through~~).

- i. Note the Consultation Report which includes the representations from the 2019 consultation.
- ~~ii. Resolve to agree the updated Vision, Aims, Objectives and Strategies document.~~
- ~~iii. Invite Cambridgeshire County Council, the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority and the Greater Cambridge Partnership to endorse the Making Space for People document and to use it to inform future scheme development within Central Cambridge.~~
- ~~iv. Agree that the Joint Director of Planning and Economic Development is granted delegated authority, in liaison with the Executive Councillor for Planning Policy and Transport, the Executive Councillor 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 finalisation and publication of the document.~~
- ii. Ask Officers to undertake further refinement of Making Space for People in light of comments raised at committee and by interested parties, to engage with relevant stakeholders as appropriate, and to bring a revised document to a future meeting.

The Committee received a report from the Principal Planning Officer

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

- i. Believed the phrase in para 1.1.1 'to have the Cambridge address' to be an unfortunate and cynical statement. Companies came to Cambridge for the purpose of clustering businesses and workforce. Terminology should be changed to describe the process.
- ii. Demand management (paragraph 1.1.6, footnote no4) should have the term 'and mode' at the end, as looking at the different modes of transport.
- iii. Paragraph 1.1.3 needed to refer to the concept of dwell space, the document was not just about movement but wanted space for people to

- stop and talk and to sit. This area had not been represented by the transport of hierarchy. It was important to note this was an equality and disability issue.
- iv. There should also be practical spaces such as spaces to park bikes, scooters etc.
  - v. Paragraph 1.1.3 should reference other innovative modes of transport, such as e-scooters. Technology and legislative changes would take place over time which should be considered when building the public space.
  - vi. The Vision Statement should also include 'meeting the needs of the local community'.
  - vii. Aims and Objectives, paragraph 4.1, A5; the sentence 'has an appropriate enforcement regime' should be added.
  - viii. Add a further bullet point under Aims and Objectives, paragraph 4.1, A5 a city centre which had materials, design, signage and street furniture and the fabric of the public realm which was a quality to the surrounding historic environment.
  - ix. Under Movement Focused Principles, 4.3 (s5,6,7&8) it was important to recognise the impact of change would have on those who live in the city centre.
  - x. The phrase 'day and night' should be changed to 'day and evening' under s17 and should be balanced with a statement connecting this to s11, regarding the dwell space and the enjoyment of the area.
  - xi. Surprised to note on p33 that the document had been endorsed by the City Council's Planning and Transport Scrutiny Committee before any scrutiny had taken place.
  - xii. Suggested the summary of the outline baseline report had missed the following and asked why these had been omitted from the report.
    - The city had lost ground compared with other cities.
    - The variable quality and maintenance of the public domain left much to be desired.
    - The quality of cycling, infrastructure, and facilities did not meet the city of cycling status.
    - Stakeholders (including retailers) had been left frustrated by current conditions in the city centre.
  - xiii. The document had to look at the potential conflicts that would persist whatever changes took place in the city; suggested conflicts were:
    - Tension between pedestrian and cyclists.
    - Tensions between pedestrians and café and restaurant owners and street furniture.
    - Tension between large buses and small streets.
    - Tension between cyclists and delivery vehicles.

- Tension between disabled persons and scatted A boards.
  - Tourism and the densification of people in the city centre.
  - The amenities of residents.
- xiv. The pandemic had provided residents an opening to experience changes to the city centre and recommended the consultation should be updated to reflect these changes. There should also be a report that considered LTN 1/20 which set a precedent for active travel, such changes had been:
- Less traffic and vehicle movement in the city with more people home working.
  - Safety measures introduced by the highways authority some of which would become permanent.
  - The current road closure on Mill Road; could this become permanent and how could this space become a well-designed pedestrian space for all to visit.
- xv. Noted there was no mention of the railway station.
- xvi. Would like to see Mill Road become a pedestrian route into the city.
- xvii. Signage and street furniture should be of the highest quality.
- xviii. Would welcome a specific date when the updated document be brought to committee.
- xix. Stated if the finished report could not be brought back to the next committee could an update paper be presented.
- xx. Queried if the document would be changed into an SPD.
- xxi. Pleased to hear that there would be further stages to the document but would want the County Council onboard to move forward. Would like to be informed at a future meeting that the document had been discussed with the relevant county officers.
- xxii. Expressed concern that both pedestrians and cyclists must be comfortable and asked how and where clear separation would occur.
- xxiii. Would like to see practical detail where pedestrian areas could be potentially placed in the city and how these could work.
- xxiv. Important to ensure there was accessibility for people whatever their disability.
- xxv. Evident from the consultation response to note the difference of opinion from residents, businesses, and utility companies.
- xxvi. Would welcome officers to look at the consultation response and take away the evidence and introduce simplified guidelines that could be introduced in future planning policy.
- xxvii. Recognised the competition between different types of transport mode.
- xxviii. Suggested guidance be provided for developers for new and redevelopment and how this should be approached.

- xxix. Would like to see how some of the consultation responses could be achieved such as cycling all the way into the city centre.
- xxx. A final document should be succinct and sufficient with recommendations that could be applied within the planning framework, easy for developers to understand and apply.

In response the Joint Director for Planning and Economic Development said the following:

- i. Acknowledged there were long term challenges with the tensions highlighted which would be difficult to reconcile for all users of the streets and spaces in the city.
- ii. The revised documentation would bring insightful and specific detail which addressed comments raised by the public, outside organisations, and the committee.
- iii. The revised document would be taken to external partners for endorsement and commitment. This would assist the City Council to collectively work through the issues that needed to be addressed for the city to adapt to future requirements.
- iv. The document sought to apply principles not just to planning decisions but to the wider range of responsibilities that both the City Council and its partners had.
- v. The ambition would be to bring the revised document to the next meeting so that it could be taken to partner organisations to jointly commit to the core principles. If this were not possible there would feedback and an update provided.
- vi. Recognised that areas such as heritage, changes to technology and possible legislation which could be captured in the further drafting.
- vii. Did not envisage a full round of consultation but moving forwards as the City Council's partners contemplate further revisions to transport strategy and further activity with the GCP and would consider for the document what was the most appropriate approach moving forward.

The Executive Councillor for Planning Policy and Open Spaces welcomed all the comments made. Acknowledged the amendment that would have been proposed by Councillor Bick had the recommendation not been amended which would have been endorsed. The following points were then raised:

- i. To achieve a spatially specific strategy would involve further evidence and study which could include a walking and cycling study; this would highlight some of the tensions that had been raised.
- ii. Would encourage a programme of works aligned with broader works around the city and surrounding areas.

- iii. The revised document would be brought back to the Planning and Committee before wider consultation.
- iv. Noted the comments of the dwell space and those individuals (including children) with hidden disabilities had to be recognised.
- v. LTN 1/20

The Executive Councillor for Transport and Community Safety in response said:

- i. It was important that issues such as e-scooters and electric type vehicles were addressed.
- ii. All comments received both in the meeting and outside of the meeting would be considered.
- iii. The document needed to be right so if it was not ready for the March meeting, a progress report should be given.
- iv. The COVID pandemic should be acknowledged and the ongoing effect this had, particularly on working and travel patterns.
- v. Needed to address what types of designs could be put in place to address electric vehicles misusing pedestrian space.
- vi. Highlighted the Mill Road closure was not permanent and would be under review after six months.

#### The Committee:

**Resolved (by 8 votes to 0)** to approve the amendment to the recommendation as proposed by the Joint Director for Planning and Economic Development.

**Resolved (by 8 votes to 0)** to approve the amended recommendation.

Both the Executive Councillors 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.

#### **20/8/PnT Cambridge City Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council - Authority Monitoring Report for Greater Cambridge 2019-2020**

The report referred to the Authority Monitoring Report (AMR) which all local authorities are obliged to publish every year.

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

- i. Agreed the Cambridge City Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council - Authority Monitoring Report for Greater Cambridge 2019-2020 (included as Appendix 1) for publication on the Councils' websites.
- ii. Delegated any further minor editing changes to the Cambridge City Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council - Authority Monitoring Report for Greater Cambridge 2019-2020 to the Joint Director for Greater Cambridge Shared Planning.

### **Reason for the Decision**

As set out in the Officer's report.

### **Scrutiny Considerations**

#### **Any Alternative Options Considered and Rejected**

Not applicable

### **Scrutiny Considerations**

The Committee received a report from the Senior Policy Planner.

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

- i. Stated the decision made on the first item considered by the committee negated the information on p197 under 'spaces and movement supplementary planning document.
- ii. Noted Cambridge was first in terms of prosperity but dropped down to 232 for happiness and welfare of its residents according to the Grant Thornton UK LLP Vibrancy Economy Index 2018
- iii. Sought clarification on the percentage figure on p213 related to the 110 litres per person per day in new developments.
- iv. Welcomed the data provided but asked why certain data was only available to South Cambridgeshire District Council.
- v. Queried whether the housing trajectory reference to deliver 14,000 residential units in Cambridge was correct (p194).
- vi. Noted the aparthotel on Milton Road School site was not completed; the report needed to reflect this.
- vii. Enquired if the projections were correct for the right kind of businesses on the employment sites; how do we consider those people working from home.
- viii. Welcomed the comments regarding student accommodation since the adoption of the approved Local Plan was tied to educational institutions.

- ix. Noted the report referred to the potential loss of hotels (p225) but was conscious of the loss of guest houses and bed & breakfast.
- x. Asked how reliable the figures regarding the types of employment (p338) were.
- xi. Noted jobs to be provided between 2011 and 2031 was 22,100 jobs, yet over the plan period (2011-2018) 24,000 jobs created. Asked how these target figures were calculated.
- xii. Highlighted the land allocated to employment without planning permission and would welcome comment from officers on this.
- xiii. The report concluded there was no need for a Gypsy and Traveller site but did not believe this to be true. There was an unmet need, particularly for transit travellers and this needed to be measured for both local authorities.
- xiv. Questioned whether the Council's affordable housing policy should be reviewed.
- xv. Requested further information on renewable energy that had been installed and asked why had more been installed in South Cambridgeshire.
- xvi. Asked what the percentage increase of hotels in terms of space was.
- xvii. Asked for further information on the Council's hotel policy.
- xviii. Noted there was data on biodiversity and questioned how successful the Council had been in protecting biodiversity in the City.

In response the Joint Director for Planning and Economic Development and Senior Policy Planner and Principal Planning Policy Officer said the following:

- i. Acknowledged that any changes to the decision on the Making Spaces for People Document would mean changes to the monitoring report.
- ii. The two local authorities had specific monitoring indicators through their own Local Plans which had been responded to.
- iii. The Local Plans do not have a flat line housing trajectory. A lower level of housing delivery in 2019-20 was expected but delivery is projected to pick up again over the next few years.
- iv. Because the aparthotel was not opened did not mean this was not complete, discrepancy in the definition of complete. We consider buildings complete when they are 'watertight'.
- v. The existing policies for employment projections were being monitored and there would be different ways in which people worked and how technology has been adapted; this would be picked up in the emerging Local Plan which would be evidence based.
- vi. Water efficiency: The figure of 29% was based on permissions with conditions. Measuring dwellings permitted through those conditions would give a higher figure.

- xix. Would look at the Grant Thornton UK LLP Vibrancy Economy Index 2018 which had been referenced.
- vii. Employment floor space sometimes, because of the nature of development, came forward in big blocks of square meters at a time; developments were completed in different time frames and figures went up and down each year.
- viii. Employment figures had been taken from the Business Register & Employment Survey; it would be beneficial to look at the longer-term trends.
- ix. The existing Gypsy and Traveller policy was continually monitored; a new needs assessment was being undertaken which would inform the new Local Plan.
- x. Appendix 2 (data tables) of the report showed the installed capacity of renewable energy by type and the potential.
- xi. Could not give the increased percentage of new hotel space. The hotel future work sought tenders for consultants as part of the new Local Plan, but no suitable bidder was found. This work would be revisited.
- xii. Acknowledged that the housing affordability ratio was a challenge. The new Local Plan would consider whether there was a capacity to increase the percentage of affordable housing compared with current policy objectives. Housing developments also need to consider wider objectives such as biodiversity, infrastructure and community facilities, therefore the cost of delivering affordable housing needs to be balanced with the costs of implementing these other objectives.

### The Committee

**Resolved (by 8 votes to 0)** to approve 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.

### **20/9/PnT To Note Record of Urgent Decision Taken by the Strategic Director**

**20/09/PnTa** Addressing the Implications for Businesses and The City Centre in the Context Of The Coronavirus Restrictions- Officer Decision ROD

The Strategic Director confirmed that the Record of Decision would be on the agenda for all relevant scrutiny committees and said the following in response to Members' comments.

- i. Noted the comments that the committee welcomed the expansion of the eligibility for free car parking from public and sector voluntary workers to included lower paid workers in all essential businesses.
- ii. The urgent decision reflected the availability of those permits for the November lockdown and any subsequent period of national lockdown up until March 31, 2021.
- iii. Permits had been available through the Council's business networks and other media platforms.
- iv. Employers had to justify why the permits were required for their for employees.
- v. 34 permits under the business permit worker had been issued.
- vi. Three organisations had requested applications to apply for their employees.
- vii. The permits were available for anyone who was required to work in the city centre during the periods of national lockdown when public transport was restricted for social distance reasons.
- viii. Normally a permit would be allocated to a car park closest to the business needs where the employee required their employees to work.
- ix. Public sector permits were also available.
- x. Surface car parks did have allocation for these permits.
- xi. The topic of the Market came under the Environment and Community Scrutiny Committee.
- xii. At the time the report was written there were market stall holders trading essential goods.
- xiii. There was a public health concern around this current lockdown of the new mutation and people congregating around the market square.
- xiv. The decision was taken that further action was required while and risk assessments were currently being written in consultation with the stall holders and Public Health England.

The Executive Councillor for Transport and Community Safety said the following:

- i. Was aware of some key workers in residential parking zones who struggled to find parking spaces because the County Council parking zone had been oversubscribed.
- ii. Had contacted the County Council to enquire if key workers in residential zones could be exempt from any enforcement issues at this moment in time.

- iii. Noted the comment that enforcement should take place on the City Council car parks
- iv. Acknowledged the comment there could be an issue of safety regarding the suggestion of key workers being exempt from enforcement in residential zones.

The decision was noted.

### **20/10/PnT To Note Record of Urgent Decision Taken by the Executive Councillor for Planning Policy and Open Spaces**

**20/10/PnTa** ROD: Planning White Paper Consultation Response

The decision was noted.

**20/10/PnTb** ROD: Changes to the Current Planning System Consultation Response

The decision was noted.

**20/10/PnTc** ROD Response to West Suffolk Local Plan (Regulation 18) Issues and Options

The decision was noted.

**20/10/PnTd** ROD Addendum to Greater Cambridge Statement of Community Involvement in Light of Covid-19 Restrictions

The decision was noted.

### **20/11/PnT To Note Record of Urgent Decision Taken by the Executive Councillor for Transport and Community Safety**

**20/11/PnTa** ROD: Response to the England's Economic Heartlands Draft Transport Strategy Consultation

The decision was noted.

**20/11/PnTb** ROD: Key Public Sector and Voluntary Sector workers free parking permits

The decision was noted.

**20/11/PnTc** ROD: Response to Network Rail's consultation on the Ely Area Capacity Enhancement Scheme

The decision was noted.

**20/11/PnTd** ROD: Cambridge South Station Consultation Response

The decision was noted.

The meeting ended at 8.56 pm

**CHAIR**