

**PLANNING AND TRANSPORT SCRUTINY COMMITTEE** 11 January 2022  
5.30 - 8.00 pm

**Present:** Councillors D. Baigent (Chair), S. Smith (Vice-Chair), Bick, S. Davies, Gawthrop Wood, Pounds, Sargeant and Scutt

Executive Councillor for Planning Policy and Transport: Councillor Thornburrow.

**Officers:**

Joint Director of Planning and Economic Development: Stephen Kelly

Head of Human Resources: Deborah Simpson

Corporate Business & Executive Support Manager: Sharon Line

Natural Environment Team Leader: John Cornell

Nature Conservation Projects Officer: Guy Belcher

Principal Planning Officer: Stuart Morris

Jenny Nuttycombe: Principal Planning Policy Officer

Mark Deas: Senior Policy Planner

Principal Planning Policy Officer: Terry De Sousa

Strategic Planning Consultant: Matt Patterson

Committee Manager: Claire Tunnicliffe

**FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE COUNCIL**

**22/1/PnT Apologies for Absence**

Apologies were received from Councillors Bond and Page-Croft. Councillor Porrer attended as a substitute.

**22/2/PnT Declarations of Interest**

No declarations of interest were made.

**22/3/PnT Minutes**

In response to minute item 21/41PnT, The Joint Director of Planning and Economic Development confirmed that Anthony Browne MP and Daniel Zeichner MP had been contacted to request they support the Environmental Principles concerning creating a vision for the Oxford-Cambridge Arc, a response to consultation and OxCam ARC Environmental Principle

Both Councillor Scutt and Councillor Smart had been omitted from the attendance list of those Councillor present at the previous meeting.

*Committee Manager's Note: The minutes have been rectified are the attendance list is now correct.*

[Choose agenda document pack - Planning and Transport Scrutiny Committee 11 January 2022 - Cambridge Council](#)

The minutes of the meeting held on 28 September 2021 were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

## **22/4/PnT Public Questions**

Members of the public asked the following questions or statements as set out below.

### **Q1)**

The following letter had been submitted for the Committee's attention which had also been sent to South Cambridgeshire District Council Scrutiny Committee (16 December meeting)

- i. Writing on behalf of Save Honey Hill (SHH), a community group formed to challenge the proposed relocation of the fully functioning Cambridge Wastewater Treatment Plant (WWTP).
- ii. Officer's recommendation to SCDC Cabinet in relation to the proposed submission Area Action Plan (AAP) set in paragraph 6 of the covering report, is to, in summary 'agree (the AAP, all supporting documents and evidence) for future public consultation, contingent on the sperate Development Control Order (DCO) being undertaken by Anglia Water (AW) for the relocation of the WWTP being approved'. Despite deferring any public consultation until the DCO application has ben determined, which may not be until 2023 or 2024, the Committees are also recommended that any subsequent alterations to the AAP are delegated to individual members and officers and are not be reconsidered by any Committees of the two Councils before consultation and submission. This is considered to be at odds with the democratic process.
- iii. The proposed submission (Regulation 19) stage of a Local Plan is an important milestone and the Councils have to be satisfied, as set out in paragraph 12 and 13 of the cover report, that the APP they are agreeing to is 'sound and capable of being submitted for independent examination'.
- iv. The recommendations in paragraph 6 are extra-ordinary and do not accord with good Local Plan practice. It is premature to agree the submission AAP at this time. It sets out radical and contentious

proposals for high density development on a site on the edge of Cambridge, while also being entirely contingent on the separate approval of the DCO for relocation of the WWTP.

- v. Officers have provided no clear arguments as to why the proposed submission AAP needs to be agreed. At this point, in the proposed submission AAP also appears to be being rushed through, following very limited examination by the purely advisor Joint Local Plan Advisory Group (JLPAG) meeting on 30 November 2021.
- vi. The Committee should set aside the Officer's recommendation and follow the third option set in paragraph 45 which is to 'not agree the Plan and supporting documents' and defer consideration of the content of any proposed submission AAP until such time as the outcome of AW's DCO is known. This would also, crucially give more time for the changes in housing and employment behaviour, which are happening as a result of the COVID pandemic, to become clearly established and allow further considered thought to be given to the more radical aspects of the AAP and allow proper account to be taken of the wider strategic proposals in the emerging Greater Cambridge Local Plan.
- vii. There are other important considerations, which support deferral of the AAP. These include:
  - The AAP is, in effect, seeking the release of a large area of Green Belt land to enable a large amount of housing development, entirely outside the formal Local Plan process. No attempt is being made by the Councils in the Plan to justify that land release as meeting the policy trusts for development in the Green Belt set out in the National Policy Planning Framework (NPPF). Arguably, this failure alone makes the APP 'unsound'.
  - The relocation of the WWTP to a prominent Green Belt site is an unavoidable consequence of the AAP, as it stands, but this has not been properly considered in the sustainability appraisal of the AAP. It is not a scheme to be considered 'cumulatively' with either the AAP or the GCLP policies but should be considered as a core part of these plans. As it stands, the sustainability appraisal of the APP ignores the significant environmental impacts of the relocation of the WWTP. Without this proper assessment the Sustainability Appraisal (SA) is deficient, and the APP may be considered 'unsound'.
  - The Councils, despite repeated requests, have never published the 'exploration of the viability and feasibility of redevelopment of the Cambridge WRC, either elsewhere or on the current site' that was promised as 'part of feasibility investigations in drawing up the AAP' in paragraph 3.35 of the adopted Cambridge Local Plan. This

should be a crucial part of the supporting documents and evidence for the AAP and does not appear to exist in publishable form. Without these feasibility studies, the evidence base for the AAP is incomplete.

- The AAP cannot, at this stage, be given any weight or be adopted for development management purposes. Agreeing the proposed submission version now will create continuing uncertainty for key landowners and potential developers within the APP area.
- viii. For these reasons, SHH called upon both Committees to defer and not agree the proposed submission AAP.

The Executive Councillor responded with the following:

- i. The DCO process was an entirely separate statutory planning process from the plan-making process, which was being undertaken for the AAP, as such it would be determined under different planning legislation. It was therefore not a project or proposal within the scope of the emerging Greater Cambridge Local Plan (GCLP).
- ii. Both plans were being prepared on the basis the WWTP would be relocated, but this was not a requirement of either Plan.
- iii. As part of the DCO application to move the plant, the applicant would need to respond to NPPF requirements, including as necessary to demonstrate very special circumstances for development within the greenbelt for the new plant.
- iv. It was not for the AAP to demonstrate very special circumstances as the AAP area did not fall within the Green Belt and therefore not relevant to the soundness of the AAP.
- v. The AAP was predicated on the relocation of the WWTP through the separate DCO process. If the DCO process was successful, the Plan would seek to maximise the opportunity provided by the relocation of the WWTP. It is the proper and legally sound approach for the SA of the AAP to consider the WWTP as a separate project under the cumulative effects section of the SA and therefore the SA is not deficient in this regard and the AAP is not unsound on this basis.

**Q2)**

- i. Every day across the city of Cambridge, vulnerable road users mix with motor traffic on roads that have a speed limit of 30mph. However, best practice on such roads is to have a 20mph speed limit: a 20mph default speed limit is recommended on urban roads by the United Nations, the World Health Organization and Public Health England.
- ii. A default 20mph limit:

- reduces stopping distance by 50%, that is three car lengths instead of six car lengths; - prevents around 20% of casualties;
  - Halves traffic noise.
  - Encourages active travel.
  - Creates more liveable neighbourhoods.
  - Reduces pollution.
  - Is fairer.
- iii. The costs of implementing default 20mph speed limits were returned within months with fewer casualties.
- iv. 28 million people in the UK live in places committed to normalising 20mph. Many cities were moving towards 20mph speed limits as normal. Wales would have a default 20mph speed limit by 2023.
- v. A growing number of Cambridgeshire parish and town councils were voting to encourage 20mph as standard.
- vi. Would Cambridge City Council now prioritise the lives of vulnerable road users and vote to adopt 20mph speed limits for the whole city?

In response the Executive Councillor said the following:

- i. Cambridge City Council welcomed lower speed limits where appropriate. Between 2012 and 2016 had led the introduction of 20mph controls in most residential and shopping streets across Cambridge.
- ii. The City Council were not the highway authority responsible for local roads across the city, but to achieve this had worked in close partnership with Cambridgeshire County Council, and Cambridgeshire Police. The scheme was designed to be as 'self-enforcing' as it could be, with the speed limit on each street best reflecting its character, and usage.
- iii. The Council undertook extensive traffic speed monitoring work, consulted widely across the city with all residents, known stakeholders and representative organisations, and made recommendations to the County Council on changes following detailed consideration of the findings by the four Area Committees, Environment Scrutiny Committee and (then) Executive Councillor for Planning, Policy & Transport.
- iv. Whilst there was overall support for the changes they were not without opposition, and the Council needed to ensure that decisions taken were consistent with national and local guidance and the policies of key partners, and were supported by a strong evidence base.
- v. Some five or more years on believed the Council to be successful in their objectives, both in reducing traffic speeds but also in influencing culture and expectation. Whilst there were still busy main roads subject to higher maximum speed controls, we were able to introduce 20mph across more than 85% of the city's road network and this lower level now felt much more like the accepted 'norm' than previously.

- vi. The Greater Cambridge Partnership (GCP), the delivery agency for Government's City Deal award for Cambridge, have been consulting with the public on plans to radically transform access to and within the city, with the objective of further driving forward the sustainable and active travel agenda. This work is expected to include a review of road hierarchy and classification, with the potential to consider further reductions in traffic speed controls. The City Council is contributing eagerly to this work and will be encouraging both the GCP and the County Council to set speed limits consistent with these objectives and the city's needs, both now and those expected in the future.
- vii. Welcomed the public speakers continued efforts which the Council would endeavour to support wherever practicable.

**Q3)**

- i. The Proposed Submission North East Cambridge Area Action Plan (NECAAP) Regulation 19. November 2021 states:

“In May 2019, the UK government declared a climate emergency, and set a target for carbon emissions in the UK to reduce to net zero by 2050. Both Cambridge City and South Cambridgeshire District Councils also declared a climate emergency in 2019. The City Council's Climate Change Strategy 2021-26 shares a vision for Cambridge to be net zero carbon by 2030 and sets out six key objectives which include reducing emissions from its own buildings and vehicles, homes and buildings and transport, reducing consumption of resources, promoting sustainable food and supporting adaptation to the impacts of climate change. Achieving net zero carbon requires us to rethink all aspects of planning and placemaking; not just how buildings are designed and constructed, but also siting development where it will be well served by public transport, cycling and walking as well as renewable and low carbon energy. Addressing the climate emergency was not just about carbon, it involved the sustainable use of all resources, and water is a local concern. Biodiversity is also a high priority, both at national and local levels. The NECAAP therefore sets ambitious targets for net zero carbon buildings and driving placemaking and development to be a, low impact, biodiverse exemplar. This section sets out the policies that will ensure it has positive impacts on the environment, and is resilient and adaptable to the changing climate over its lifetime.”

It also states:

“Residential developments of 150 homes or more and non-residential development of 1,000m<sup>2</sup> or more should calculate whole life carbon

emissions through a nationally recognised Whole Life Carbon Assessment and demonstrate actions to reduce lifecycle carbon emissions and prioritise materials with low embodied carbon where practicable (for example engineered timber).”

Finally:

“Development at North East Cambridge (NEC) will take place over 25 years, and as such will take place alongside the UK’s transition to a net zero carbon society by 2050, in line with the requirements of the Climate Change Act 2008”.

- ii. Why was the embodied carbon in the current wastewater treatment works, which were proposed for demolition and then reconstruction elsewhere, not part of this carbon calculation?
- iii. The whole project was dependent on AW relocating the WWTP (some residents will know this as the “sewage works”). There was no operational need for the relocation, as admitted by AW and subsequently reported in the Cambridge Independent: *“The new plant is not an operational necessity for the water company, but is required to enable the development of NEC, which represents prime residential and commercial space.”*<sup>1</sup>
- iv. The waste water treatment works (or sewage works) is currently fit for purpose, and will continue to be, the whole purpose of the proposed relocation is to create a space for new development housing, and thus the two proposals are intrinsically linked. To assess the climate impact of this proposed development requires assessment of the entire impact of the project.
- v. Stating that “NECAAP was predicated on the relocation of the Waste Water Treatment Plant (WWTP) having taken place<sup>2</sup>” is not good enough - I put it to the committee that to omit this major source of omissions comes across as a clear case of “creative” carbon accounting and we judge it as overt greenwash.
- vi. Why does the City Council not speak out against a project that requires the completely unnecessary destruction, relocation and rebuilding of the waste water treatment works, thus creating a brownfield site by

---

1. <sup>1</sup> <https://www.cambridgeindependent.co.uk/news/anglian-water-selects-its-proposed-site-for-new-waste-water-treatment-plant-serving-cambridge-region-9154532/#:~:text=Anglian%20Water%20has%20announced%20the,plant%20serving%20the%20Cambridge%20area.&text=The%20new%20plant%20is%20not,prime%20residential%20and%20commercial%20space.>

2. <sup>2</sup> <https://democracy.cambridge.gov.uk/documents/s57251/Written%20Question%20supplementary%20response.pdf>

- displacing the facility into a greenfield site (notably in the Green Belt) in the context of a declared climate emergency?
- vii. Referring to this (the relocation of the wastewater treatment works) as the responsibility of AW is not good enough, the City Council must take responsibility for continuing to plan a project dependent on this wastage of perfectly good infrastructure.
  - viii. The City Council had made a climate emergency declaration that it would achieve net zero carbon by 2030 from specified sources of emissions, and shared “a vision for Cambridge to be net zero carbon by 2030, subject to Government, industry and regulators implementing the necessary changes to enable the city and the rest of the UK to achieve this<sup>3</sup>”
  - ix. The implementation of the NECAAP would take place well after the deadline for the Council’s net zero vision for the city and that, to be consistent with this net-zero vision.
  - x. Encouraged the Council to object to the WWTP relocation on the grounds that it was a perfectly good facility and goes against the climate emergency declared by the Council.
  - xi. Requested the Committee rejected the document going forward for consultation until a revised version had been produced that calculated the entire lifetime carbon emissions of the destruction, rebuilding and relocation of the new WWTP, as well as the buildings proposed for the site after these steps have been taken.
  - xii. The revised document should represent an honest and complete carbon calculation for the Committee and residents to have an accurate understanding of the environmental impact.

The Executive Councillor responded:

- i. Thanked the public speaker.
- ii. It was not possible or appropriate at the plan making stage to undertake a full carbon impact assessment, including arising from demolition and proposed development, because that level of detail is not normally available.
- iii. The Sustainability Appraisal supporting the Proposed Submission AAP considered the cumulative effects of the Plan in combination with other plans and projects, including the relocation of the WWTP, to the extent appropriate for the stage of the project at the time of the assessment.
- iv. In terms of embedded carbon associated with the new proposal, this is addressed at paragraph 5.36 of the Sustainability Appraisal (SA). The

---

3. <sup>3</sup><https://www.cambridge.gov.uk/media/9581/climate-change-strategy-2021-2026.pdf>



- SA would be kept under review as the AAP and the DCO processes move forward, to consider any new information.
- v. The Scoping Opinion relating to the DCO process for the new WWTP had now been published by the Planning Inspectorate. With specific reference to the decommissioning and demolition of the existing plant, it required assessment of the cumulative impacts of the proposal for the new works, together with the effects of waste generated from demolition activities at the existing sewage works. This would include an assessment of cumulative carbon impacts.
  - vi. Policy 2 of the Proposed Submission Area Action Plan required planning applications to calculate carbon emissions through a Whole Life Carbon Assessment, to demonstrate actions to reduce life-cycle carbon emissions and to reduce construction waste.
  - vii. The Environmental Assessment supporting any planning application for development on the NEC site would be expected to include consideration of the demolition of existing structures and the potential for waste reduction and reuse on site. This would inform the Whole Life Carbon Assessment required by the AAP.
  - viii. There were different legal processes involved for the AAP and the DCO but this did not mean there was any reduction in the level of scrutiny of the two projects. All matters would be considered in the correct forum and in the correct way subject to scrutiny from independent planning inspectors before they can be approved.
  - ix. There would be no creative carbon accounting and any assessment would be open and transparent reflecting the commitment of the climate emergency.
  - x. The Council had for decades aspired to see development come forward in this area.
  - xi. The potential relocation of the WWTP was being led by AW through the DCO process and could unlock this significant brownfield site for comprehensive regeneration which would help meet the development needs of the area over the next 20-30 years.
  - xii. The principle of redevelopment of this area was already established in the adopted Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Local Plans. It was the role of the AAP to set out in more detail how this site should come forward for development including the mix of uses and amount of development.
  - xiii. AW had stated that the proposed facility would be smaller than the current Cowley Road site but flexibly designed to enable it to respond to growth past 2050. There would no need to expand further and would be better at dealing with stormwater and extreme weather events. The new

- facility provided the opportunity to be operationally net zero and significantly reduce
- xiv. If the Councils did not progress the AAP, then it would be difficult to ensure comprehensive and coordinated development as well as the necessary infrastructure to support the development.
  - xv. Approving the Officer's recommendation would bring a close to the draft AAP stage and provide a statement of support for the proposed aspirations for this part of NEC.
  - xvi. The DCO process would consider the planning merits of the proposed relocation of the WWTP, including the material considerations, sustainable development, and the justification of the proposed greenbelt location.
  - xvii. Local Plan evidence had shown that NEC was the most sustainable location for development in Greater Cambridge, due to the location on the edge of the City and transport links.
  - xviii. A delay to the APP process would mean the Inspector of the DCO process would refer to the earlier draft AAP papers to assess the planning merits. The previous draft was less certain of the form and did not reflect the Council's current position of key issues as building heights, density, open space provision and development numbers. This could also impact the DCO process which would delay the preparation and adoption of the proposed Greater Cambridge Local Plan.
  - xix. It was important to note that after the DCO had been made and prior to the next round of consultation on this AAP, a 'health check' was likely to be undertaken to safeguard the document and reflect any material changes and circumstance.

The following supplementary points were made:

- i. With the approval to relocate Cambridge Police Station into the greenbelt; it felt this was 'business as usual' when considering development on the greenbelt and questioned if this should be the Council's response to a climate and ecological emergency.
- ii. Asked if the Gypsy, Roma, and Traveller (GRT) community had been consulted to enquire if they would value a permanent or transient site. Where would the Committee suggest these sites are developed in Cambridge? The GRT community faced many disadvantages in their daily lives with a massive shortage of sites throughout the country.
- iii. Questioned if the GRT sites had been discounted before the Gypsy, Traveller Needs Assessment had been published.

*Committee Managers Note: The following written response was provided to be included in the minutes:*

- i. The planning approval to relocate the Cambridge Police Station to Milton was a decision made by the local planning authority for that area, South Cambridgeshire District Council. Whilst this is therefore not a question that I am able to answer directly, for proposals in the Green Belt, there is clear national and local planning policy for such proposals, which must demonstrate very special circumstances to justify their proposals. As part of earlier engagement and consultation on the emerging North East Cambridge Area Action Plan, the councils specifically engaged with the Fen Road community both informally, as part of the previous NEC Community Liaison Forum, a targeted leaflet drop about the consultations as well as speaking with residents directly. The main issue raised by the residents was the Fen Road level crossing and the associated access issues, something that was also raised by others living and working locally and something that the councils are keen to address through further discussions with Network Rail.
- ii. It too early for any community consultation to have taken place and where/whether any sites are developed will depend on a whole range of things – not least identifying available land.
- iii. Regarding the wider Gypsy and Traveller Needs Assessment, this study has been delayed as no face-to-face interviews were able to take place during COVID restrictions. However, the study remains ongoing and as the Local Plan continues to progress, its findings will feed into preparation of the draft Local Plan, recognising that this is an important aspect of the new plan.

*Committee Manager Note: Similar written question had been put forward to the Council meeting of the 3 March 2021 which can be viewed in the Information Pack at the link below (p34-p35)*

[\(Public Pack\)Information Pack Agenda Supplement for Council, 03/03/2022 18:00 \(cambridge.gov.uk\)](#)

**Q4)**

- i. There are many things to commend in the environmental aspirations for the NECAAP but disappointingly the provision on natural green space was not one of them.
- ii. The amount of informal green space met the minimum amount required by the Council's policies but two thirds of this is provided on a business park, described on p26 of the Open Spaces Report as "these green spaces aren't perceived as being accessible to the wider public". It should be noted that the green space on the business park already exists, so it is not new space.

- iii. Only a third of the green space is provided in conjunction with housing. Most of this is provided as linear green space or pocket parks, small areas of green space that are loomed over by high-rise buildings. There is one larger park but the size of this is not provided in any of the documents. Extrapolating from the plans, it is estimated that this is around 3 hectares in size.
- iv. Fig 20 in the Officer's report includes an infographic which aims to compare the amount of open space in the AAP with other Cambridge parks, the comparison is misleading because the parks which are used for comparison are just that, parks. A better comparison would be the main park proposed for the new development. At circa 3hectares this is small in comparison to the other parks, given that it is to cater for 16,000 people
- v. At a bare minimum, the proposals for the AAP might possibly provide for the day-day open space needs of the new residents. But what it would not do is provide the kind of green spaces that people in high density developments need access to, which is large natural greenspace.
- vi. There is of course somewhere for them to do that, it is Milton Country Park (MCP) and a subway is proposed under the A14 so that residents can get to it. That would be great if it were not for the fact that the park is already at capacity and cannot cope with 16,000 more visitors.
- vii. In the hundreds of pages text associated with the AAP there is almost no mention of MCP at all, let alone if it can meet the needs of the development.
- viii. There has been no assessment of whether MCP had the capacity to cope and what mitigation might be required to enable it to do so. Could see no requirement for S106 contributions to support the park to cope, only a vague paragraph on p54 of the Open Spaces & Recreation Topic Paper.
- ix. To make matters worse, the north of Cambridge would also see 20,000 people at Northstowe and 22,000 at Waterbeach. Where would these 58,000 people go to meet their green space needs?
- x. This is an area which has been highlighted in the evidence base for the next Local Plan as already suffering from a deficit of green infrastructure and recreational pressure.
- xi. This report, informing the Local Plan, highlights NEC Cambridge to Waterbeach as a priority area for green infrastructure with its enhancement marked as of 'critical importance'.
- xii. Officers have suggested that the funding for that critical green space could be provided through a new requirement in the next Local Plan, and if that is possible then it would be very welcome and would alleviate our concerns.

- xiii. However, there is no proposal in place for such a scheme and it would need to be approved by a planning inspector, in short at this stage this is an “if” rather than an agreed solution. If that does not prove possible then it would be essential that s106 contributions are secured from the NEC development towards this.
- xiv. Would the Scrutiny Committee recommend that the AAP is not progressed until there is a commitment within the AAP for development contributions towards mitigating the impacts on MCP and providing the larger scale green space that will be desperately needed by the future 58,000 residents of NEC, Waterbeach and Northstowe. Either from a new mechanism in the Local Plan, or failing that, through a S106 Agreement.

The Executive Councillor said the following:

- i. The AAP required development to bring forward 27.6 hectares of new informal and children’s play space across the area which is the equivalent of around 34.5 football pitches or around three times the size of Parker’s Piece.
- ii. In combination with the existing open spaces at NEC, including existing and enhanced spaces on the employment parks. The Plan would therefore meet the informal and children’s play space requirements in the adopted Local Plans on-site, meaning all residents would have access to open space within a 5-minute walk of their homes for day to day informal recreation and access within the NEC, to a range of different types of spaces for people to enjoy.
- iii. Some of the proposed open spaces areas were substantial in size and altogether, the spaces on NEC account for an area larger than MCP. The new large green space was 4.1ha which is around the same size as Christ’s Pieces or 5 football pitches.
- iv. Similarly, the main linear park was between 70m and 100m wide, which is the length of a football pitch, and over 1.3km long.
- v. As required by the AAP, a landscape led approach to designing these spaces would ensure there would be opportunities for individuals and families, residents and workers to go for walks, run, play and experience nature on their doorstep.
- vi. As set out in the First Proposals Local Plan, the councils also sought to bring forward new strategic scale green spaces as well as development.
- vii. The nearest area identified to NEC lies immediately north of the A14 between the top of Cambridge, Waterbeach New Town and Northstowe. This could provide new opportunities for open space

to serve not only these developments but also existing communities. These wider proposals fall outside of the AAP area and, due to their more strategic role, will be considered further as the councils prepare the Greater Cambridge Local Plan.

- viii. Policy 8 of the Area Action Plan already required that Planning obligations (S106 agreements) or conditions will be applied to ensure the delivery of on and off-site provision (*of open space*) linked and effectively phased to the delivery of new homes'. Therefore, the AAP already proposed to seek contributions towards off-site open space provision to support the development.
- ix. Whilst noting the lapsed planning permission for an extension to MCP, earmarking such contributions solely to that project would, at this stage, not be sensible given that the delivery of that additional open space area for formal sports is not, at this stage assured.
- x. Instead, through the AAP proposed policy, there would remain scope to invest in deliverable new off-site infrastructure to serve this and other communities formal open space needs.

The following supplementary statement was provided.

- i. The wording regarding S106 contributions implied that each development would have to make a case to secure these contributions. This could create difficulties in securing funding for those developments there were not built on Council land.
- ii. The detail around the S106 to mitigate the impact of MCP needed to be made clearer.

#### Q5)

- i. The very hidden consequence of NECAAP is the destruction of a large area of Green Belt.
- ii. Although this Green Belt is outside the City Council boundary, it for 4 miles from Cambridge and an amenity for the people of the city of Cambridge. It forms an important entry to the city with views to the area from the River Cam corridor and is part of the Wicken Fen Vision.
- iii. Stated the space had been defined by AW who were not representatives for the people of Cambridge but shareholders.
- iv. NECAAP and the Local Plan deal with the long term vision for Cambridge, and by not allowing this loss of Green Belt to be discussed at the same time as evaluating NECAAP, how can the Council claim to be looking after the future of Cambridge?

The Executive Councillor responded:

- i. Thanked the speaker for their question.
- ii. The DCO process was an entirely separate statutory planning process from the plan-making process, which was being undertaken in relation to the AAP, it would be determined under different planning legislation.
- iii. Therefore, it was not a project or proposal within the scope of the emerging GCLP or AAP to influence. Both plans were being prepared on the basis the WWTP would be relocated, but this was not a requirement of either plan.
- iv. As part of the DCO application, the applicant will need to respond to NPPF requirements, including as necessary to demonstrate very special circumstances for development within the Green Belt.

**Q6)**

- i. National Planning Policy required developing local plans to be flexible to accommodate changes in circumstances. It was also a requirement that all reasonable alternatives have been identified and considered, that the plans are achievable and reflect National and Local Planning Policies<sup>4</sup>.
- ii. NECAAP has now been incorporated into the emerging Local Plan First Proposals. The outcome of the Public Consultation (Reg 18) is yet to be published. During the consultation phase much was raised in the media about the housing and employment growth target in the context of sustainability (e.g. Water infrastructure), impact on existing communities and the housing requirement (given the impact in the longer term of COVID). Growth and delivery targets may yet be changed, a reduction from the Medium + Growth Option to Medium alone would reduce the additional housing allocation requirement by 2,500 homes. This would have a significant impact on the new site allocations in the emerging Local Plan including the 4,000 allocated to NECAAP in the plan period. It also remained to be seen if the 10% buffer was required accounting for 4,500 homes of the 11,500 allocation.
- iii. Greater Cambridge Shared Planning Service had asserted that 'neither the emerging GCLP nor NECAAP required the relocation of WWTP, though both plans were being prepared on the basis that the WWTP would be relocated<sup>5</sup>'.
- iv. It was important Cambridge City Council (CCC) remained open to alternatives and does not commit to plans earlier than necessary. The

---

<sup>4</sup>[https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/1005759/NPPF\\_July\\_2021.pdf](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/1005759/NPPF_July_2021.pdf)

<sup>5</sup> Greater Cambridge Partnership Service Nov 2021 : Report to Joint Local Planning Advisory Group – Item NECAAP : Proposed Submission (Regulation 19) From Stephen Kelly – Joint Director for Planning & Economic Development

- Public Consultation of NECAAP Reg 19 was not scheduled for a further 2 years.
- v. An employment-based development of 15,000 jobs was still an option for NEC which was established in the existing Plan.
  - vi. AW's DCO application had meant by the letter of planning law, NECAAP and the relocation of WWTP are independent, however they are inextricably linked.
  - vii. AW were only pursuing an alternative site in order to enable joint councils to build houses on the site they currently operate from. There is no operational requirement for AW to relocate<sup>6</sup>. This separation of planning process had in effect decoupled the two projects. This has had implications in the way costs and benefits of NECAAP had been portrayed in local planning documents such that the merits of NECAAP 'building on a brownfield site with good sustainability criteria' are promoted with no reference to the consequences or costs.
  - viii. The absence of reference in local planning documents to the cost of pursuing NECAAP, in effect blind siding the public, has raised concerns by the public and Council members at scrutiny committee about the lack of transparency of NECAAP documentation and in turn the emerging Local Plan First Proposals (Reg 18)<sup>7</sup>. In response to concerns raised, Greater Cambridge Shared Planning Service have advised that : 'The DCO process was an entirely separate statutory planning process from the plan-making process which is being undertaken in relation to the AAP and as such would be determined under different planning legislation. It was therefore not a project or proposal within the scope of the emerging GCLP or AAP to influence<sup>8</sup>.'
  - ix. To prevent the risk of any further apparent bias or influence towards the relocation within Local Planning Process and to maximise influence CCC can assert over AW DCO Reg 19 submission and mitigation proposals, it would be prudent to postpone agreement of the proposed NECAAP submission until after the DCO submission and allow the examination to be undertaken on its own merits.

The Executive Councillor responded with the following:

- i. The Committee were being asked to agree the proposed submission for future consultation and not a final document.

---

<sup>6</sup> HIF Business Case : Cambridge Northern Fringe East (CNFE) 2018

<sup>7</sup><https://scambs.moderngov.co.uk/documents/g9208/Public%20reports%20pack%20Monday%2010-Jan-2022%2010.00%20Cabinet.pdf?T=10>

<sup>8</sup> Greater Cambridge Partnership Shared Planning Service Dec 2021 – Written Response to Public Question at Scrutiny & Overview Committee



- ii. The Councils would only go to public consultation if the DCO was approved. It would be at this point the outcome of the DCO process would be considered as may be appropriate as part of the health check for the AAP.
- iii. Understood how the request for a postponement was based upon concern around the full impact of the proposals contained within the NECAAP being considered, notably the effects of the relocated WWTP on the communities close to the proposed site in Honey Hill. As the report had tried to set out, the two processes of plan making and the consent process for the WTW were handled separately.
- iv. The Council's local plan evidence base made clear that NEC is one of the most sustainable locations for future need to be accommodated.
- v. The argument in favour of the funding provided to allow for the WWTP relocation is that it enabled sustainable growth to be delivered on the NEC site.
- vi. From a process started in 2014, both Cambridge City Council and SCDC had been exploring ways in which this area could be developed effectively. This was because it was needed to be known that if we cannot develop the area effectively, we would need to meet that need in other ways, on other sites, in other locations – which are likely to include greenfield sites elsewhere in SCDC. It was already known from evidence base work that NEC was the most sustainable location for future growth.
- vii. Given the long-term ambition for the NEC area, did believe it was right to continue to quantify and shape the redevelopment of the NEC area and set out clearly how the potential of this site can be realised - as part of the AAP process. The AAP would not progress to consultation until the DCO process, including its identification of impacts had concluded.
- viii. The Councils would not be able to finalise the spatial strategy for the whole of Greater Cambridge until the outcome of that process was known. It was important to continue to progress work on this in parallel to the DCO process, not least to provide a context for proposals that may well come forward ahead of the AAP's adoption on those parts of the site that are less impacted by the WTW use.

The following supplementary statement was given:

- i. If the DCO was successful, this would permit the relocation of the WWTP. Therefore, it would not matter if homes were built in NEC, if at all. The relocation would have taken place with the negative impacts highlighted amongst future uncertainty to what, if any benefits there would be to NEC.

*Committee Managers Note: The following written response was provided to be included in the minutes:*

- i. The proposed relocation of the WWTP is being enabled through the Housing Infrastructure Fund (HIF). This funding has been made available to local authorities across the country for infrastructure to unlock housing. The North East Cambridge AAP is predicated on the proposed relocation taking place and the North East Cambridge site being freed up for housing, employment, and other uses. The AAP is clear on the councils' aspirations for this new city district and the benefits of comprehensive and coordinated development for both existing and future communities in this part of the city. NEC has also been identified as a key part of the strategy for the Greater Cambridge Local Plan First Proposals if the relocation of the WWTP takes place.

## **22/5/PnT Review of Taxicard and Transport Initiatives**

### **Matter for Decision**

At the June Planning and Transport meeting, the Executive Councillor approved the undertaking of a review in relation to the Council's Transport Initiatives. This would include the City Council's Taxicard Scheme, Cambridge City Bus Subsidies and Cambridge Dial-a-Ride.

The review was to have been undertaken working with the Council's partners including the Greater Cambridge Partnership (GCP) but had been completed without input from the GCP due to resource constraints.

The report referred to the recommendations in relation to the review.

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

- i. Approved the proposed changes to the Taxicard scheme for Taxicard members to be implemented from 1 April 2022.
- ii. Agreed to stop the provision of the City Council's subsidy for the Citi 1 Night Bus Service from 1 April 2022.
- iii. Approved the continuation to fund Cambridge Dial-a-Ride with a Grant Agreement for the 2022/23 financial year to the value of £40k.
- iv. Noted future joined up working with Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority (CPCA) and the GCP regarding existing City bus subsidies linked with the Bus Service Improvement Plan and City Access projects.
- v. Continued to approve the Head of Human Resources' delegated authority, in liaison with the Executive Councillor for Planning and

Transport, and consultation with the Chair and Spokespersons for Planning and Transport Scrutiny Committee, to make any changes that may be necessary to support the transport initiatives and schemes going forward, until such time as a wider decision around the policy and strategy decisions is agreed

### **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 Head of Human Resources and the Corporate Business & Executive Support Manager.

The Corporate Business & Executive Manager informed the Committee there was an error in the report at paragraph 3.2, in respect of the times of operation for the Stagecoach Citi 2 and 3 services, in so far as the times not all being shown as a 24-hour clock. For the Citi 2, '1046' should have read '2246' and for the Citi 3, '1032' as '2232'. To confirm, the Citi 3, 2240, 2310 and 2340 departures from Cherry Hinton Tesco run as commercial services.

In response to comments made by the Committee, the Head of Human Resources, the Corporate Business & Executive Support Manager and Executive Councillor said the following:

- i. In respect of Citi 2 and 3 bus services the times had not been converted to the 24-hour clock.
- ii. As the Taxicard scheme continues a report should be brought to committee at a later date to provide an update on how the changes to the scheme had met the original aim of increasing Taxicard membership and to feedback on how the scheme was being promoted which to date had included Cambridge Matters and Open Door.
- iii. The taxi card scheme is relevant to an individual; if there are two members of a family eligible to qualify for a Taxicard they could apply and receive vouchers in their own right.
- iv. Would hope there would be an increase in the number of individuals using the scheme when the next report was brought to Committee.
- v. Noted the comment that the budget for the provision of Bus Subsidies would be reduced if the recommendations were approved to stop the provision of the Citi 1 Nightbus.

- vi. Noted the concern expressed at the equalities audit in relation to the Taxicard scheme which had looked at the scheme in general but did not address what would happen to those individuals who run out of vouchers.
- vii. Advised that the budget for the Taxicard scheme had been underspent for many years and there was no proposal to cut the budget for this scheme; the vouchers could only be used in the full amount and therefore with the revision of different denominations of voucher value, the option to use as many vouchers per trip and the changes made to the eligibility criteria on the application form would mean greater flexibility for members.

Councillor Porrer proposed and Councillor Bick seconded the following amendments to the recommendation (additional text underlined, and deleted text struck through):

~~1. Approve the proposed changes to the Taxicard scheme for Taxicard members to be implemented from 1 April 2022 – see 3.1.1.~~

Defer the proposed changes to the Taxicard scheme until a full report of the budgetary context of the reduced value of vouchers provided to eligible participants has been considered by councillors, along with further feedback on how those who will run out of vouchers can be supported, in particular those on lower incomes and with protected characteristics, and a revised Equalities Audit provided which fully notes the survey responses and the reduction in allowance per scheme member.

~~2. Stop the provision of the City Council's subsidy for the Citi 1 Night Bus Service from 1 April 2022 – see 3.2.1~~

Councillor Bick then proposed and Councillor Porrer seconded the following amendments to the recommendation (additional text underlined, and deleted text struck through):

2(a) Review and decide the future of the subsidy for the Citi 1 Night Bus only when information on users, costs and contract can be presented for consideration;

2(b) Seek to recover the subsidy paid over the period that the service was not operated and to recommence payments as soon as Stagecoach is prepared to re-start the service.

3. Continue to fund Cambridge Dial-a-Ride with a Grant Agreement for the 2022/23 financial year to the value of £40k - see 3.3.1.

4. Note future joined up working with Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority (CPCA) and the GCP regarding existing City bus subsidies linked with the Bus Service Improvement Plan and City Access projects – see 3.4.1

5. Continue to approve the Head of Human Resources' delegated authority, in liaison with the Executive Councillor for Planning and Transport, and consultation with the Chair and Spokesperson for Planning and Transport Scrutiny Committee, to make any changes that may be necessary to support the transport initiatives and schemes going forward, until such time as a wider decision around the policy and strategy decisions is agreed.

A vote on was taken on both amendments which was lost by 3 votes to 5 votes.

### **The Committee**

The Committee endorsed the Officers recommendations by 5 votes to 3 Votes.

The Executive Councillor for Planning Policy and Transport 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.

## **22/6/PnT Authority Monitoring Report 2020-21**

### **Matter for Decision**

The report referred to the Authority Monitoring Report (AMR) for Greater Cambridge 2020-2021.

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

- i. Agreed the Cambridge City Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council - Authority Monitoring Report for Greater Cambridge

2020-2021 (included as Appendix A of the Officer's report) 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 2020-2021 to the Joint Director of Planning and Economic Development, in consultation with the Executive Councillor for Planning Policy and Transport, and the Chair and Spokes for the Planning Policy and Transport Scrutiny Committee, including the final designed version of Appendix 3.

### **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 Policy Planner and Principal Planning Policy Officer who in response to Members' questions said the following:

- i. The main reason the total number of completions of affordable housing was lower than 40% was that the policy only requires 40% affordable homes on schemes of 15 dwellings or more, a lower requirement of 25% affordable homes applies to schemes of 10-14 dwellings, and there is no requirement for affordable housing on sites with 10 dwellings or less in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework.
- ii. It is important to differentiate between permissions and completions when looking at the affordable housing data. A planning permission that secures 40% affordable homes may not complete 40% affordable homes each year, instead the proportion of affordable homes completed on a development will vary each year.
- iii. Out of the 850 completions so far at the Eddington site, 686 were affordable, therefore currently at 81% affordable homes. The policy is for 50% affordable homes on this development, and therefore this is what we would expect to see when the scheme is completed.
- iv. The reference to life expectancy in the city was looked at in terms of general impacts of our policies and therefore is considered at district level.

- v. The AMR currently looks at delivery of new developments in terms of new homes and new buildings, but can look to include wider information in future, such as delivery of other infrastructure like the bus route through Darwin Green. Also, in terms of transport schemes, the AMR does not provide an update on all schemes, it just highlights those where progress has been made in the monitoring year, which is why the Greater Cambridge Partnership Milton Road Scheme has not been specifically mentioned.
- vi. With regards to the local centres with below 50% retail, the 6 centres had been referenced on p298 of the Officer's report.
- vii. The purpose of the AMR is to look backwards and therefore reports up to April 2021. There is also now an obligation to report on s106 outcomes each year. Neither would pick up outstanding works, but this was something that could be looked at for future reporting.

### **The Committee**

The Committee **unanimously endorsed** the Officers recommendations.

The Executive Councillor for Planning Policy and Transport approved the recommendations.

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

## **22/7/PnT Biodiversity Supplementary Planning Document**

### **Matter for Decision**

The report recommended that the Biodiversity Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) as amended was adopted, to be used as a material consideration in planning decisions supporting implementation of the adopted Local Plan.

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

- i. Considered the main issues raised in the public consultation, agreed responses to the representations received and agreed proposed changes to the SPD as set out in the Statement of Consultation (appendix 1 of the Officer's report).

- ii. Agreed the adoption the amended Greater Cambridge Biodiversity SPD (appendix 2 of the Officer's report).
- iii. Agreed to delegate to the Joint Director of Planning and Economic Development, in consultation with the Executive Councillor for Planning Policy and Transport, the Chair and Opposition Spokes for the Planning Policy and Transport Scrutiny Committee, the authority to make any necessary editing changes to the SPD 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 Natural Environment Team Leader.

In response to comments made by the Committee, the Natural Environment Team Leader, Nature Conservation Projects Officer, Principal Planning Officer and the Joint Director for Planning and Economic Development said the following:

- viii. Noted the Committee's positive comments on the statutory 10% and the aspiration of 20% biodiversity.
- ix. Suggested the SPD could be reviewed at the point of adoption of the new Local Plan; if additional guidance on biodiversity net gain was required at this point this would be an option to explore.
- x. One of the challenges writing the SPD had been the changes in national legislation and guidance as the document developed. These changes would continue to evolve over time; therefore, it was important to note these changes and determine if reassessment would be required as and when.
- xi. Confirmed that when scrutinising applications against policy on both large and small sites that biodiversity was being achieved and documented.
- xii. Started to reference best practice with the appropriate links throughout the SPD, however, it was not possible to provide the whole spectrum of solutions that officers advised on individual applications. This would have also increased the length of the SPD; some feedback received during the consultation process was that the document was too lengthy.



- xiii. There was an intention to show best practice on the relevant pages of the city council website rather than in the SPD which meant these pages could be updated regularly.
- xiv. Developments that successfully met the statutory biodiversity had done so with collective conversations with officers and support of the council. As this continued it would be likely the additional ambition of biodiversity would be taken forward.
- xv. With regard to S106 and offsetting, officers were investigating the possibility of offsite biodiversity net gain where it was not possible to meet onsite biodiversity.
- xvi. The emerging Local Plan was an opportunity to develop and assist with infrastructure contributions towards the delivery of green infrastructure and biodiversity net gain.
  - i. Noted the comment it was important to acknowledge the harm of biodiversity and habitat located on the perimeter of a development site; work should be undertaken through survey data and written into policy the protection of those areas so developers could not build on the boundaries.
  - ii. Officers were working with other local authorities to develop best practice for long term biodiversity through clear extended ownership and cohesive planning.
  - iii. Currently there was little guidance from Central Government on long term biodiversity.
  - iv. It was critical going forward that monitoring for sustainable quality biodiversity was in place; this would emerge from national legislation which the department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (DEFRA) were assembling. The balance of onsite and offsite biodiversity was complex and was not without challenges.
  - v. There was best practice on biodiversity net gain (the principles could be used when looking at offsite provision) one of which was on good governance, this could be used as an interim while waiting for further Government guidance.
  - vi. There was no reason why the SPD could not be used as a guide to determine if enforcement action should be taken.
  - vii. Noted the request for a report on the progress of policies and long-term net gain term biodiversity.

### **The Committee**

The Committee unanimously endorsed the Officers recommendations.

The Executive Councillor for Planning Policy and Transport 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.

**22/8/PnT North East Cambridge Area Action Plan: Proposed Submission (Regulation 19)****Matter for Decision**

The report sought agreement of the Proposed Submission North East Cambridge Area Action Plan (AAP) that establishes the Councils, policies, and proposals for managing development, regeneration, and investment in North East Cambridge over the next twenty years and beyond.

**Decision of the Executive Councillor for Planning Policy and Transport.**

- i. Agreed the North East Cambridge Area Action Plan: Proposed Submission (Regulation 19) (Appendix A1) and Proposed Submission Policies Map (Appendix A2) for future public consultation, contingent upon the separate Development Control Order being undertaken by Anglian Water for the relocation of the Waste Water Treatment Plant being approved.
- ii. Noted the Draft Final Sustainability Report (Appendix B of the Officer's report), and Habitats Regulation Assessment (Appendix C of the Officer's report) and agree them as supporting documents to the North East Cambridge Area Action Plan: Proposed Submission (Regulation 19) that will also be subject to future public consultation.
- iii. Agreed the following supporting documents to future public consultation:
  - a. Statement of Consultation, including the Councils' consideration of and responses to representations received to the draft North East Cambridge Area Action Plan (Regulation 18) consultation 2020 (Appendix D of the Officer's report)
  - b. Duty to Cooperate Compliance Statement (Appendix (Appendix E of the Officer's report)
  - c. Draft Duty to Cooperate Statement of Common Ground (Appendix F of the Officer's report)
  - d. Equalities Impact Assessment (Appendix G of the Officer's report)
  - e. Topic papers (Appendix H of the Officer's report).

- iv. Agreed the findings of the following background evidence documents prepared by the Councils that have informed the North East Cambridge Area Action Plan: Proposed Submission and are proposed to accompany future public consultation:
  - a. Typologies Study and Development Capacity Assessment (Appendix I1 of the Officer's report);
  - b. Surface Water Drainage Core Principles (Appendix I2 of the Officer's report)
  - c. Chronology of the feasibility investigations of redevelopment of the Cambridge Wastewater Treatment Plant (Appendix I3 of the Officer's report).
- v. Noted the findings of the background evidence documents that have informed the North East Cambridge Area Action Plan: Proposed Submission and are proposed to accompany the public consultation (see Background documents to the Officer's report)
- vi. Agreed that any subsequent material amendments be made by the Cambridge Executive Councillor for Planning Policy and Transport in consultation with Chair and Spokes, and by the South Cambridgeshire Lead Member for Planning, both in consultation with the Joint Local Planning Advisory Group (JLPAG).
- vii. Agreed that any subsequent minor amendments and editing changes be delegated to the Joint Director of Planning and Economic in consultation with Cambridge Executive Councillor for Planning Policy and Transport and by the South Cambridgeshire Lead Member for Planning.

### **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.

In response to Member's comments the Principal Planning Policy Officer, Strategic Planning Consultant and Joint Director of Planning and Economic Development said the following:

- i. As part of the AAP the retail and town centre evidence-based study had been updated, considering the revised development numbers and amendments to the spatial framework.
- ii. Five local centres had now been proposed rather than the original four.
- iii. All homes would be within a five-minute walk of the retail centre that would accommodate resident's day to day needs.
- iv. The shop policy had been designed to encourage a variety of individual retailers. In total there would be around 107 units available.
- v. Appreciated that residents would need access to supermarkets and the AAP outlined five food stores to come forward within those centres.
- vi. Advised that people's shopping habits had changed with an increase in on-line shopping; were promoting consolidation hubs which would minimise vehicle movements within the APP area.
- vii. With no onsite secondary school provision, safe and convenient pedestrian and cycle routes for children to access local schools in the area had been explored.
- viii. Welcomed the redevelopment of the Cambridge Business Park which would include a mix of business, residential and community use.
- ix. One of the constraints of the Science Park was the lengthy leases that some of the buildings had, if development had been allocated on to those individual plots it would not be possible to demonstrate that the Plan was deliverable within the plan period.
- x. Envisaged that residential streets in the AAP area would not be a place where vehicles would be parked, and the streets would become part of public life.
- xi. Reluctant to place a definition on the term 'local people' used in the AAP. However, there was a local connection test used for brownfield sites which could be applicable.
- xii. Privately managed community facilities were secured with a community use agreement through planning permission which ensured community use. Those facilities also had to remain commercially viable.
- xiii. Affordable housing needed to be truly affordable. Housing officers would assist in setting the correct rent levels.
- xiv. Currently there were provision for three primary schools. Discussions were being held with County Council Officers to rethink how a school

- building should be designed, moving away from the single storey land hungry element, and becoming multi-functional.
- xv. A secondary school had not been proposed as The County Council forecast did not deem a secondary school necessary in the AAP area. This would also mean those living in the area would integrate more widely with those outside of the area.
  - xvi. Secondary schools were incredibly land hungry and expensive to deliver and there would be significant implications on some of the delivery of the AAP should such a school be built.
  - xvii. Agreed it was important to understand the delivery of spaces and the quantity of activities that could take place within them.
  - xviii. Recognised the significance of the relationship between density, open space and the impact on residents including their mental health.
  - xix. Officers had spent large amount of time over a number of years speaking with representatives from the Science Park to discuss how the space could be integrated within the community.
  - xx. Acknowledged the comment that the Arcadia development was viewed as 'insular' by residents and had engaged with the landowners to ensure that new facilities were much more generous and open.
  - xxi. Noted the concern expressed regarding the amount of formal open space provision.

Councillor Bick proposed and Councillor Porrer seconded the following amendment to the recommendation (additional text underlined, and deleted text struck through):

The Executive Councillor is recommended to:

~~1. Agree the North East Cambridge Area Action Plan: Proposed Submission (Regulation 19) (Appendix A1) and Proposed Submission Policies Map (Appendix A2) for future public consultation, contingent upon the separate Development Control Order being undertaken by Anglian Water for the relocation of the Waste Water Treatment Plant being approved;~~

~~2. Note the Draft Final Sustainability Report (Appendix B), and Habitats Regulation Assessment (Appendix C) and agree them as supporting documents to the North East Cambridge Area Action Plan: Proposed~~

~~Submission (Regulation 19) that will also be subject to future public consultation;~~

~~3. Agree the following supporting documents to future public consultation: a. Statement of Consultation, including the Councils' consideration of and responses to representations received to the draft North East Cambridge Area Action Plan (Regulation 18) consultation 2020 (Appendix D); b. Duty to Cooperate Compliance Statement (Appendix E); c. Draft Duty to Cooperate Statement of Common Ground (Appendix F); d. Equalities Impact Assessment (Appendix G); e. Topic papers (Appendix H).~~

~~4. Agree the findings of the following background evidence documents prepared by the Councils that have informed the North East Cambridge Page 762 Report page no. 3 Agenda page no. Area Action Plan: Proposed Submission and are proposed to accompany future public consultation: a. Typologies Study and Development Capacity Assessment (Appendix I1); b. Surface Water Drainage Core Principles (Appendix I2); c. Chronology of the feasibility investigations of redevelopment of the Cambridge Waste Water Treatment Plant (Appendix I3).~~

~~5. Note the findings of the background evidence documents that have informed the North East Cambridge Area Action Plan: Proposed Submission and are proposed to accompany the public consultation (see Background documents to this report);~~

~~6. Agree that any subsequent material amendments be made by the Cambridge Executive Councillor for Planning Policy and Transport in consultation with Chair and Spokes, and by the South Cambridgeshire Lead Member for Planning, both in consultation with the JLPAG;~~

~~7. Agree that any subsequent minor amendments and editing changes be delegated to the Joint Director of Planning and Economic in consultation with Cambridge Executive Councillor for Planning Policy and Transport and by the South Cambridgeshire Lead Member for Planning.~~

1. Defer decisions on the North East Cambridge Area Action Plan: Proposed Submission (Regulation 19) and Proposed Submission Policies Map for the

shortest feasible period until options of alternative mixes allowing greater on-site achievement of the Local Plan policy standard for formal open space have been considered by members.

The Joint Director for Planning and Economic Development advised the work required to consider the alternative mix of land use and the consultation process would take a further twelve-months to develop and then to engage with statutory consultees. A delay could create a risk that the Development Consent Order Process would not proceed until the AAP had been agreed which would impact the Local Plan and AAP timetable. The current trajectory for adoption of the Local Plan was that the Plan would be more than five years old. An out of date Local Plan would mean that local polices would be given less weight for planning decisions.

The amendment was lost by 3 votes to 5 votes.

### **The Committee**

The Committee endorsed the recommendations as set out in the Officer's report by 5 votes to 0.

The Executive Councillor for Planning Policy and Transport 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.

### **22/9/PnT \*\*\*ROD Creating a Vision for the Oxford-Cambridge Arc (Spatial Framework) Consultation Response**

The decision was noted.

### **22/10/PnT \*\*\*ROD: Greater Cambridge Local Plan: Preferred Options (Regulation 18) Post Scrutiny Committee Changes**

The decision was noted.

### **22/11/PnT \*\*\*ROD Network Rail's Ely Area Capacity Enhancements 2 Consultation**

The decision was noted.

The meeting ended at 8.00 pm

**CHAIR**