

DEVELOPMENT PLAN SCRUTINY SUB-COMMITTEE

6 December 2012
4.30 - 5.30 pm

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

Executive Councillor for Planning and Climate Change: Councillor Ward

Officers present:

Head of Planning Services – Patsy Dell
Planning Policy Manager – Sara Saunders
Senior Planning Policy Officer – Joanna Gilbert-Wooldridge
Sustainable Drainage Engineer - Simon Bunn
Urban Design & Conservation Manager - Glenn Richardson
Senior Sustainability Officer (Design and Construction) – Emma Davies
Planning Policy Officer - Frances Schulz
Committee Manager – Toni Birkin

FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE COUNCIL

12/61/DPSSC Apologies

Apologies were received from Councillor Price. Councillor Reid sent apologies for a late arrival.

Councillor Saunders took the Chair for items 12/61/DPSSC to 12/65/DPSSC

12/62/DPSSC Declarations of Interest

Councillor Saunders and Councillor Reid	12/66/DPSSC	Member of Cambridge Past, Present and Future
Councillor Saunders, Tucker and Councillor Reid	12/66/DPSSC	Member of Cambridge Cycling Campaign

12/63/DPSSC Minutes

The minute of the meeting of the 16th October 2012 were agreed as a correct record.

12/64/DPSSC Public Questions

There were no public questions.

12/65/DPSSC Annual Monitoring Report 2012**Matter for Decision:**

To consider the Annual Monitoring Report (AMR) which the Council is required to produce on at least an annual basis. Monitoring is an important part of the planning process, providing feedback on the performance of policies in terms of their use and implementation.

Decision of Executive Councillor for Planning and Climate Change:

- i. Endorse the AMR (Appendix A of the Officers report).
- ii. Agreed that if any amendments are necessary, the Executive Councillor in consultation with Chair and Spokes of Development Plan Scrutiny Sub Committee should agree these.

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 Manager regarding the Annual Monitoring Report.

The following points were clarified, following questions from members:

- i. P. 47 Figure 5; Dwelling Completions. The figures were based on replies from developers, agents and planning professionals. This information is, however, influenced by market conditions and economic circumstances, and therefore may change significantly over time.

- ii. P. 23 Bouygues were reported to be a national company, who have previously been involved in a number of Private Finance Initiative schemes, including hospital provision.
- iii. P. 24 Members asked a number of questions regarding the Community Infrastructure Levy. Officers clarified that the Community Infrastructure Levy will be brought forward in step with the review of the Local Plan and that viability work was currently underway to help ascertain the level of levy needed to fund a wide range of different forms of infrastructure, including education, open space, healthcare, sewerage and transport.
- iv. P. 32 It was noted that there had been a decrease in the Gross Median Household Income in Cambridge.
- v. P. 32 With regard to the Indices of Multiple Deprivation, Members questioned why Cambridge appeared to have moved down the rankings. Officers confirmed that this could be related to Cambridge having moved down the rankings with a rise in deprivation and/or other local authorities having moved up the rankings. Officers will provide a written response to Members on this issue.
- vi. P. 37 With reference to paragraph 4.3, the AMR records the number of times a policy has been used within the monitoring year. Low figures should not be read as downgrading the importance of protection of biodiversity as they simply reflect the number of applications which have come forward in the monitoring year where there is a potential impact upon habitats or species which are the subject of Biodiversity Action Plans.
- vii. P. 46 Density figures had risen since the previous monitoring year due to the nature of recent developments in city centre locations.
- viii. P. 61 It was noted that the final heading in the table under paragraph 8.15 should read ‘% of population who are within 15 minutes public transport time of key services.’ The error in the table heading will be corrected prior to publication of the AMR.
- ix. In relation to the significant level of development occurring in the urban extensions to Cambridge, Members suggested that additional acknowledgement should be made of the fact that much of the new development straddles District Council boundaries.
- x. Members asked for details on the number of cycle parking spaces to be provided within the railway station’s new cycle parking facility. Officers confirmed that this figure would be checked.
- xi. P. 89 References to open spaces within the table (Indicator column, rows 3 and 4) will be amended to read ‘Area of Protected Open Space per 1,000 population’ and ‘Area of total Protected Open Space accessible to the public per 1,000 population.’

- xii. P. 84 Rough sleeping figures were the most recent available, although it was recognised that these figures might be out of date.
- xiii. P.86 Figures on Building for Life ratings within the city did not correlate with the figures provided on Page 41 of the report. It was confirmed that the figures on Page 41 were correct and that the table on Page 86 would be amended.
- xiv. P. 91 It was agreed that additional information regarding the total retail floorspace in the city would add clarity to Table BD4 and Chapter 6.
- xv. P. 113 Deleted Policies: It was noted that policies may have been deleted in 2009, but may subsequently be relevant given the revocation of a range of Circulars, Planning Policy Statements and Guidance Notes upon the adoption of the National Planning Policy Framework. Officers reported that the new Local Plan would include a range of policies that would meet the needs of Cambridge.

The Committee resolved unanimously to endorse the recommendations.

The Executive Councillor approved the recommendation.

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

Not applicable.

12/66/DPSSC Cambridge Local Plan - Towards 2031 Analysis of Comments and Options

Matter for Decision:

The Local Plan was 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.

The report considered the approach to be taken forward in relation to the water and flooding, design, landscape, public realm, historic environment, tall buildings, biodiversity, trees and density 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:

- i. Considered the key issues related to water and flooding, design, landscape, public realm, historic environment, tall buildings biodiversity, trees and density as set out in Appendices A, B, C and D
- ii. Endorsed the response and approach to take forward in the draft Plan, as set out in Appendices A, B, C and D and tables 1, 2, 3 and 4.

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 Manager regarding the approach to draft plan sections relating to: water and flooding, design, landscape, public realm, historic environment, tall buildings, biodiversity, trees and density.

The following matters were discussed:

- i. Option 57: Concerns were raised with regards to surface water discharge rates for previously developed land. It was confirmed that this relates to redevelopment proposals on previously developed land. The policy will be informed by discussions with Anglian Water and modelling of capacity within the surface water sewers.
- ii. Option 59: Councillor Saunders stated that whilst this policy seemed to represent a good approach, he was concerned that green roofs were not necessarily appropriate in all situations. Officers confirmed that this policy is intended to give a stronger steer to developers on the appropriate use of green roofs, while acknowledging that there will be some situations where they will not be appropriate.
- iii. Option 60: Councillor Marchant-Daisley raised a query regarding the need for development briefs. Officers confirmed that development briefs were not used on every site, but where the Council has used them to date a more informal approach has been taken, which has proved successful. It was also noted that where strategic site policies are developed, these would be carefully worded to provide more detail on design principles.
- iv. Option 75: Members asked why this option was not being discussed at this meeting of Development Plan Scrutiny Sub-Committee. Officers stated that they were waiting for further information from Marshall

- regarding the safeguarding restrictions affecting the airport and the surrounding city. This option would be discussed at a future meeting of the committee, as would policy options on different forms of pollution.
- v. Options 79, 80 and 81: Members questioned the crossover between these and option 64. Officers stated that major developments would still need to complete a biodiversity checklist for major developments and would need to enhance biodiversity, but option 64 also allowed smaller developments to be included in the requirement to enhance biodiversity.

Members welcomed the creative thinking in the options and the opportunity to include density and internal space standards at a policy level for the first time.

Councillor Reid stated that there was fresh thinking around density levels and their links to sustainability through the ReVISIONS. She proposed that the University of Cambridge be invited to speak to members about the latest research in this area.

The Committee resolved by 3 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 5.30 pm

CHAIR