

DEVELOPMENT PLAN SCRUTINY SUB-COMMITTEE

29 January 2013
3.00 - 4.45 pm

Present: Councillors Saunders (Vice-Chair), Blencowe, Price and Tucker

Executive Councillor for Planning and Climate Change: Councillor Ward

Officers present:

Head of Planning Services – Patsy Dell
Planning Policy Manager – Andrew Lainton
Senior Planning Policy Officer – Joanna Gilbert-Wooldridge
Principal Planning Policy Officer - Myles Greensmith
Planning Policy and Transport Officer – Matthew Bowles
Senior Sustainability Officer - Emma Davies
Senior Planning Policy Officer - Bruce Waller
Committee Manager – Toni Birkin

Also Present: Councillor Hipkin

FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE COUNCIL

13/1/DPSSC Apologies

Apologies were received from Councillor Marchant-Daisley and Councillor Reid. It was noted that the alternates, Councillor Herbert and Councillor Stuart, were unable to attend. Councillor Saunders took the Chair.

13/2/DPSSC Declarations of Interest

Councillor Saunders	13/5/DPSSC	Member of Cambridge Past, Present and Future
Councillor Saunders	13/5/DPSSC	Member of Cambridge Cycling Campaign

13/3/DPSSC Suggested changes to meeting dates

A document outlining proposed changes to meeting dates was tabled. Members were asked to consider the dates and discuss any difficulties with Group Leaders.

13/4/DPSSC Minutes

The minutes of the meeting of the meeting of the 13th November 2012, 6th November 2013 and 13th December 2012, were approved and signed as correct records.

13/5/DPSSC Public Questions

There were no questions.

13/6/DPSSC Cambridge Local Plan - Towards 2031 – Airport Safety, Higher and Further Education, Tourism, Open Space and Community Facilities, Transport and Infrastructure**Matter for Decision:**

The Local Plan is a key document for Cambridge, and the review of the current Local Plan is currently underway. Following on from consultation on the Issues and Options Report, which took place between June and July 2012, officers are working on the analysis of the comments received to the consultation and developing the preferred approach to take forward into the draft Plan. It has previously been agreed that future reports would be brought to Development Plan Scrutiny Sub Committee to analyse the comments received and options to take forward in more detail in order to seek a steer from Members on the approach to take forward in the draft Plan.

This report considers the approach to be taken forward in relation to the Airport Safety, Higher and Further Education, Tourism, Open Space and Community

Facilities, Transport and Infrastructure sections of the Issues and Options Report as part of developing the content of the new Plan.

Decision of Executive Councillor for Planning and Climate Change

The Executive Councillor resolved:

- i. To consider the key issues related to Airport Safety, Higher and Further Education, Tourism, Open Space and Community Facilities, Transport and Infrastructure as set out in Appendices A,B, C, D and E of the Officer's report; and
- ii. To endorse the response and approach to take forward in the draft Plan, as set out in Appendices A, B, C, D and E and tables 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5 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 the Cambridge Local Plan – Towards 2013 – Airport Safety, Higher and Further Education, Tourism, Open Spaces and Community Facilities, Transport and Infrastructure.

Airport Safety

The Senior Planning Policy Officer used a map of the area to explain the zones around the airport and the twin issues of Public Safety Zones and Air Safeguarding Zones.

Members raised concerns that residents around the area of the airport had not been able to extend their properties due to concerns about the airport. The Officer confirmed that the airport would be a consideration of such planning application but would not preclude development in the area. Option 75 would seek to inform the public and a balanced approach would be taken.

Higher and Further Education

The Principal Planning Policy Officer introduced this section of the report. He suggested that the current needs of the University of Cambridge were well provided for by developments at West Cambridge and NW Cambridge. The two central sites in the current plan also provide a useful framework. However,

there was an emerging picture of future need on part of the Colleges to provide hostel accommodation to meet the University's forecasts of future growth in undergraduates and postgraduates. Consultation was on-going with the College Bursars Committee and some needs can be met within the existing College confines. The shortfall is for around 4,016 student rooms by 2031 but 1,000 of these could be found within the 2,000 rooms allocated at NW Cambridge. The Colleges would be expected come forward in the current consultation with other sites suitable for allocation as student hostels for consideration. Anglia Ruskin University was also reported to be facing a similar shortfall of available space for student hostels. The University are also about to initiate discussions about a shortfall in faculty space on their East Road campus.

Members questioned the number of units set aside in the North West development for students and key workers. Questions were asked about position of Post Graduates and Post Doctorate individuals working for the University. Were they classed as students or key workers? The Principal Planning Officer indicated post doctorates are not included in the undergraduate and postgraduate figures quoted. In addition, would other college workers, such as porters, be allocated any of the properties? The Head of Planning stated that these decisions had already been made elsewhere. She would supply written follow up information if required.

In response to Member's questions the Officers present confirmed the following:

- i. There was a capacity allocation for an additional college in the master plan. However, the funding for this was currently unclear.
- ii. The Department of Education favoured University Technical Colleges and funding was available. This could be considered at a later date.
- iii. Anglia Ruskin University playing fields on White House Lane were not an option for development as they were on Green Belt land.
- iv. Development on other college playing fields was not currently being considered and open spaces would be vigorously defended.

Tourism

The Principal Planning Policy Officer introduced this section of the report. Members discussed the need to manage in impact of tourism on the City. Councillor Hipkin questioned why a full discussion on an alternative use for the Guildhall had not been considered. The Head of Planning stated that the owners of both the Guildhall and the Shire Hall had made it clear that they were not currently supportive of a change of use. However, should things

change in the future, the fact that it was not included in the plan would not preclude a change of use.

Open Space and Community Facilities

The Senior Planning Policy Officer introduced this section of the report.

Members asked for more details on the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) and the requirements this would make for on-site and off-site open space provision. The Head of Planning stated that the development policy would define the CIL requirements. There were tensions, as some sites could not accommodate on site provision. This problem was greater in some wards and future policy would provide guidance to protect the interest of those wards. Members expressed a preference for on-site provision where possible, and suggested this be considered at the design stage of future developments.

Transport and Infrastructure

The Planning Policy and Transport Officer introduced this section of the report.

Members asked for clarification on how the plan would fit with the County Council's Transport Strategy. The Head of Planning confirmed that the two authorities had been working closely together and that the documents would go forward together. The Executive Councillor for Planning and Climate Change added that once the transport strategy had been agreed, the land linked to it would be protected.

In response to Member's questions the Officers present confirmed that best practice in urban design would inform issues such as pedestrian safety. However, puddles and maintenance were beyond the control of this committee.

Members discussed the merits of developing outside the City Centre as opposed to infill sites. The Head of Planning stated that the first choice was sites where there were existing, non-car choices. However, other locations would not be ruled out if infrastructure could be put in place.

The Committee resolved by 2 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.

The meeting ended at 4.45 pm

CHAIR