

**DEVELOPMENT PLAN SCRUTINY SUB-COMMITTEE** 11 September 2012  
4.30 - 6.45 pm

**Present:** Councillors Reid (Chair), Saunders (Vice-Chair), Blencowe, Herbert and Tucker

**Officers Present:**

Head of Planning Services: Patsy Dell,  
Planning Policy Manager: Sara Saunders  
Senior Planning Policy Officer: Bruce Waller  
Senior Planning Policy Officer: Brendan Troy  
Senior Planning Policy Office: Joanna Gilbert-Wooldridge  
Planning Policy and Transport Officer: Matthew Bowles  
Committee Manager: Toni Birkin

**Also present:**

Councillor John Hipkin  
Representatives of Peter Brett Associates: Executive Director, John Baker and Associate, Paul Jobson.

<b>FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE COUNCIL</b>
---

**12/40/DPSSC Apologies**

Apologies were received from Councillor Marchant-Daisley

**12/41/DPSSC Declarations of Interest**

Name	Item	Interest
Councillors Reid & Saunders	12/44/DPSSC 12/45/DPSSC	Personal: Member of Cambridge Past, Present & Future
Councillors Reid & Saunders	12/47/DPSSC	Personal: Member of Cambridge Cycling Campaign

**12/42/DPSSC Public Questions (See Below)**

There were no public questions.

**12/43/DPSSC Minutes**

The minutes of the meeting of the 17<sup>th</sup> July 2012 were agreed as a correct record.

**12/44/DPSSC Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Infrastructure Delivery Study 2012****Matter for Decision:**

In March 2010 Cambridge City Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council commissioned an Infrastructure Delivery Study. This was part of the requirement under Planning Policy Statement 12 (PPS12) that local planning authorities, as part of the plan making process, develop a robust evidence base in relation to physical, social and green infrastructure to ensure sustainable communities are delivered. PPS12 has since been replaced by the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), which also requires that infrastructure planning must be part of plan making. The Executive Councillor was recommended to adopt the study as part of the evidence base for the Local Plan and CIL

**Decision of Executive Councillor for Planning and Sustainable Transport:**

The Executive Councillor agreed:

To endorse the Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Infrastructure Delivery Study for use as an evidence base document for the review of the Cambridge Local Plan and the Cambridge Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL).

**Reason for the Decision:**

As set out in the Officer's report.

**Any Alternative Options Considered and Rejected:**

Not applicable.

**Scrutiny Considerations:**

Following a presentation from John Baker, Executive Director of Peter Brett Associates, the Committee received a report from the Senior Planning Policy Officer regarding Cambridge City Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council Infrastructure Delivery Study.

The consultant responded to question from members as follows:

- i. The funding appears to peak in the mid period of the plan due to the reluctance of service providers to commit to long-term plans.
- ii. Developers were increasingly looking for infrastructure to be in place at the early stages of development projects and this creates a funding stream timing mismatch. Large spends would be required in the early years of the plan.
- iii. Members were reminded that this is an evolving document and initial costing had been based on the 2006 Plan and would need to be updated.
- iv. Funding for telecommunication appears to show conflicting information due to the differing requirements and extent of existing provision across the area.
- v. At present there was insufficient information on health care costing and therefore this is listed with a zero value.

Councillor Reid suggested that the energy infrastructure needs appeared to be based on the outdated 'predict and provide' approach. She suggested increasing the profile on low carbon and reduced energy solutions for future development within the plan.

In response to a question from Councillor Hipkin, Mr Baker stated that the test of what was critical to the plan would be based on deliverability. The critical elements would include any measures needed to ensure that acceptable development came forward. The viability of future developments would be dependant on balancing the relationship between funding streams and the need to provide affordable housing with the requirement for infrastructure.

The Committee resolved (*nem con*) to endorse the recommendations.

The Executive Councillor approved the recommendation.

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

Not applicable.

## **12/45/DPSSC Interim Planning Policy Guidance (IPPG) on The Protection of Public Houses in the City of Cambridge - Report on key issues arising from Public Consultation**

### **Matter for Decision:**

On 12<sup>th</sup> June 2012 the Development Plan Scrutiny Sub Committee approved the Interim Planning Policy Guidance (IPPG) on The Protection of Public Houses in the City of Cambridge for public consultation from 15<sup>th</sup> June until 27<sup>th</sup> July 2012.

Members' views are sought on a number of key issues that have been raised during the six-week period of public consultation.

### **Decision of Executive Councillor for Planning and Sustainable Transport:**

The Executive Councillor agreed the proposed responses to the key issues as set out in Table 3.1 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 Officer regarding the Protection of Public Houses in the City of Cambridge public consultation. In response to a member question he summarised the responses as individuals who had concerns about specific Public Houses or saw them as having a community value and other members of the public who suggested that non-viable businesses should be allowed to fail. Business responses suggested that they would not welcome onerous additional bureaucracy.

In response to members' questions the following points were clarified:

- i. Recent inspector interventions had developed a means of assessing how community support could contribute to the viability of an establishment. This would be referenced in the final report and the appeal decisions would be used as background information.
- ii. Poor management of a Public House could affect a pub's viability.
- iii. The final report would note the consultation responses.
- iv. The report focused on existing provision rather than new Public Houses. A policy could be included in the new Local Plan for new public houses.

- v. Suggested changes to the IPPG criterion 4(c) were discussed and it was agreed that the contents would be moved/simplified but not deleted from the guidance
- vi. Clarification was provided regarding the use of any specific wording suggested by consultees and reference to recent appeal decisions.

Members suggested that the final document needed to be flexible on matters such as car parks and garden space where their loss could be acceptable in some cases to ensure pub viability.

The Committee resolved to endorse the recommendations with the amendments discussed

The Executive Councillor approved the recommendation.

## **12/46/DPSSC Draft Consultation Response to South Cambridgeshire Local Plan - Issues and options Report**

### **Matter for Decision:**

- i. The City Council, South Cambridgeshire District Council and Cambridgeshire County Council have a long and effective history of joint working on planning matters, particularly on plan-making. As part of the duty to cooperate, the three councils have agreed to work collaboratively and in parallel on new Local Plans and a transport strategy for the Cambridge area. This approach will ensure that cross-boundary issues and relevant wider matters are addressed in a consistent and joined-up manner.
- ii. On 12<sup>th</sup> July 2012, South Cambridgeshire District Council published their Local Plan – Issues and Options Report for consultation, hereafter referred to as Issues and Options. This consultation forms the first stage in preparing an updated Local Plan for South Cambridgeshire that will set out the vision for the district for the period up to 2031.
- iii. The report sets out the Council's suggested consultation response to the Issues and Options to be submitted to South Cambridgeshire District Council. The representations are set out in Appendix A of the Officer's report.

### **Decision of Executive Councillor for Planning and Sustainable Transport:**

The Executive Councillor agreed the comments as set out in Appendix A of the Officer's report and that these are subsequently submitted to South

Cambridgeshire District Council as Cambridge City Council's formal response to the consultation.

**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 Officer regarding draft consultation response to the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan – Issues and Options report. She confirmed that cross-boundary issues had been taken into account in drafting representations and officers would remain engaged in working with South Cambridgeshire District Council to progress both Local Plans.

Members welcomed the quality of the representations and suggested the following additions:

- i. Q57 Gypsy and Traveller provision. The wording would be strengthened to reinforce a positive approach to closer working with South Cambridgeshire on shared provision, possibly in the boundary areas.
- ii. Q75 Retail Provision. Highlight the need for smaller, independent units to be encouraged in new development sites as per the policy option in the Cambridge Local Plan Towards 2031 – Issues and Options report.
- iii. Q103 Cycle Parking. A comment encouraging cycle parking provision should be added.

The Committee resolved to endorse the recommendations.

The Executive Councillor approved the recommendation.

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

Not applicable.

**12/47/DPSSC Representations to the Transport Strategy for Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire (TSCSC)**

**Matter for Decision:**

- i. Cambridgeshire County Council is consulting on what a new Transport Strategy for Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire (TSCSC) should look like. This is the first step in the process and the document (Appendix B of the Officer's report) highlighted some of the main issues and challenges for transport in the area, and asked what approach they should take in developing a new transport strategy to address these issues.
- ii. The Executive Councillor is recommended to agree the City Council's proposed representations to the County Council consultation on a Transport Strategy for Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire, as set out in Appendix A.

**Decision of Executive Councillor for Planning and Sustainable Transport:**

The Executive Councillor agreed the City Council's proposed representations to the County Council consultation on a Transport Strategy for Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire, as set out in Appendix A of the Officer's report and subject to the amendments discussed below.

**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 Planning Policy and Transport Officer regarding the representations relating to the Transport Strategy for Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire. The officer tabled an amendment sheet updated the report.

Members raised the following points:

- i. The validity of the statistics for travel modes in other cities was questioned and members requested details on the source of the data.
- ii. Members suggested that the strategy lacked reference to the City of Cambridge ambitions for reduced carbon emissions and suggested this be added to the representations.
- iii. The strategy was thought to be unambitious, which might be acceptable for a holding document, but suggested that they would support a more challenging final document.
- iv. A additional comment supporting additional Park and Ride sites, possible located further afield, and/or expansion of existing provision was suggested. However, this needed to be mindful of any impact on rural bus provision.

- v. Members requested more clarity regarding Community Bus Subsidies and how this would work in an urban environment.
- vi. A stronger introduction to the representations was requested to reflect the need for a detailed transport strategy sooner rather than later. This would also need to acknowledge infrastructure funding issues.

The Committee resolved to endorse the recommendations. The Chair and Spokes to agree the final draft to include the above suggestions.

The Executive Councillor approved the recommendation.

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

Not applicable.

The meeting ended at 6.45 pm

**CHAIR**