

DEVELOPMENT PLAN SCRUTINY SUB-COMMITTEE

17 July 2012
4.30 - 6.00 pm

Present: Councillors Reid (Chair), Saunders (Vice-Chair), Blencowe, Marchant-Daisley and Tucker

Executive Councillor for Planning and Sustainable Transport: Councillor Ward

Officers: Patsy Dell (Head of Planning Services), Brendan Troy (Senior Planning Policy Officer) and Toni Birkin (Committee Manager)

Also present: John Williamson (Manager, Cambridgeshire Joint Strategic Planning Unit)

FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE COUNCIL

12/34/DPSSC Apologies

Apologies were received from Councillor Herbert.

12/35/DPSSC Declarations of Interest

There were no declarations of interest

12/36/DPSSC Minutes

The minutes of the meeting of the 12th June 2012 were agreed as a correct record.

12/37/DPSSC Public Questions (See Below)

There were no public questions.

12/38/DPSSC Community Infrastructure Levy for Cambridge

Matter for Decision:

The Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) powers came into force in April 2010. Essentially it allowed local authorities to levy a charge on new development in their area. The money could be used to fund a wide range of infrastructure that was needed as a result of the development. This includes new or safer road schemes, flood defences, schools, hospitals and other health facilities, park improvements, green spaces, etc.

It was agreed at Development Plan Scrutiny Sub Committee on 22/03/2011, that the Council's CIL approach would be prepared and taken forward in parallel with the Local Plan review, with the intention of adopting a CIL Charging Schedule by April 2014. The purpose of this report is to inform the Committee of the project plan and timetable for the production of a CIL.

Decision of Executive Councillor for Planning and Sustainable Transport:

Agreed the CIL Project Plan as set out in paragraphs 3.13 to 3.18 and Table 1 and 2 of the Officer's report.

Reason for the Decision:

As set out in the Officer's report.

Any Alternative Options Considered and Rejected:

Not applicable.

Scrutiny Considerations:

The Committee received a report from the Senior Planning Policy Officer regarding Community Infrastructure Levy for Cambridge.

Members asked for clarity on a number of points and the Senior Planning Policy Officer and the Head of Planning confirmed the following:

- i. Post 2014 the use of S106 arrangements to raise funds would be more limited.
- ii. Money raised using CIL would not have an expiry date.
- iii. A list of local infrastructure priorities would be drawn up.
- iv. Money from different schemes could be pooled to resource larger projects.
- v. Services provided by other bodies, such as education, would also have access to the funds raised.

- vi. It was expected that the amount raised would be more than was currently generated by S106. However, as this varied from area to area there was no projection available.
- vii. The CIL charge would be levied according to the area of internal floor space.
- viii. The County Council would have funding agreements with each of the districts.

Members discussed fringe sites and how charges would be set for cross boundary developments. Councillor Ward stated that the joint bodies currently set S106 arrangements for such sites and he expected that a similar process would be agreed for CIL's. Lessons learn in other authorities would be applied.

Members discussed the position of social housing and CIL. At the moment this was proposed to remain outside the CIL regime and would be dealt with by s. 106. A decision on whether this would fall within the CIL regime in future was expected in October. Members were concerned that the definition of social housing was unclear. Would this include housing Co-ops and Colleges which were classed as charities? Experiences from elsewhere suggested that student accommodation did not count as a charitable activity.

The Committee resolved by 4 votes to 0 to endorse the recommendations.

The Executive Councillor approved the recommendation.

Conflicts of interest declared by the Executive Councillor (and any dispensations granted)

Not applicable.

12/39/DPSSC Joint Statement on the Development Strategy for Cambridgeshire and Peterborough

Matter for Decision:

The report provided an update on progress since the Cambridgeshire Authorities agreed the Joint Statement on the Development Strategy for Cambridgeshire in Autumn 2010. An updated Joint Statement has been prepared for agreement to cover the period before a new non-statutory spatial framework is agreed.

Decision of Executive Councillor for Planning and Sustainable Transport:

Approved the updated Joint Statement on the Development Strategy for Cambridgeshire and Peterborough as set out in Appendix A, subject to amendments to paragraph 4.4 being agreed with the Chair and Spokesperson. The previous statement is attached at Appendix B of the Officer's report, for information.

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 Planning regarding the Joint Statement on the Development Strategy for Cambridgeshire and Peterborough. She confirmed that was a long history of joint working with South Cambs and the County Council and that this would continue. The Joint Statement was an interim measure whilst a new high-level strategic spatial framework was developed.

Members expressed concerns about paragraph 4.4 of the report. It was suggested that this endeavoured to capture a raft of ideas, was prescriptive and could be seen to be tilting new development towards fringe site. Concerns were raised that the wording of this paragraph could be viewed as pre determination. Members were also concerned that there should be some acknowledgement of the hard work of the previous partnerships and the need for sustainable development.

John Williamson, Manager of Cambridgeshire Joint Strategic Planning Unit, joined the table and agreed to amend the working of paragraph 4.4 to reflect members concerns. However, there was a need to get the document agreed quickly and the partner authorities would also need to agree the changes. The Chair and Spokes would agree the amended wording.

Paragraph 4.2 was discussed. Members felt that this paragraph needed further explanation. A background note would be placed on file to give further information on this issue.

The Committee resolved by 4 votes to 0 to endorse the recommendations subject to the amendment to paragraph 4.4.

The Executive Councillor approved the recommendation.

Conflicts of interest declared by the Executive Councillor (and any dispensations granted)

Not applicable.

The meeting ended at 6.00 pm

CHAIR