

DEVELOPMENT PLAN SCRUTINY SUB-COMMITTEE 13 December 2012
4.30 - 6.30 pm

Present: Councillors Reid (Chair), Saunders (Vice-Chair), Blencowe, Price, 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
Urban Design & Conservation Manager - Glen Richardson
Principal Planning Policy Officer - Myles Greensmith
Planning Policy and Transport Officer – Matthew Bowles
Committee Manager – Toni Birkin

Also Present: Councillor Hipkin
Planning Policy Manager – South Cambridgeshire District Council – Keith Miles

FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE COUNCIL

12/67/DPSSC Apologies

12/68/DPSSC Declarations of Interest

Councillor Saunders and Councillor Reid	12/71/DPSSC	Member of Cambridge Past, Present and Future
Councillor Saunders, Councillor Tucker and Councillor Reid	12/71/DPSSC	Member of Cambridge Cycling Campaign

12/69/DPSSC Minutes

Minutes of previous meeting to follow.

12/70/DPSSC Public Questions (See Below)**Roger Crabtree: Representing the Federation of Cambridge Residents Associations**

- Why is there no integrated plan coordinating the work across the City, South Cambridgeshire and the County Council?
- Local Residents Associations reported that they are finding it difficult to comment on the proposals without an understanding of the future transport strategy.
- The consultation timetables are out of sync.

Councillor Ward stated that there was a long history of partnership working and that the lot of discussion had already taken place with South Cambridgeshire.

The Head of Planning confirmed that her team had been working jointly with South Cambridgeshire and closely with the County Council and that all sites under consultation had been discussed at a high level. Modelling work was underway to test the strategy. Cross authority meetings were planned for the New Year to consider the transport strategy.

Labour members suggested that they had pushed for a joint plan from the outset. The Chair and the Executive Councillor had no recollection of this. However, while they shared the speaker's disappointment that the transport modelling was not yet available, the feasibility of producing this, without some clarity on which sites were favoured, was problematic.

12/71/DPSSC Cambridge Local Plan - Towards 2031 Issues and Options 2 (Site Options Consultation)**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, this consultation would include:

- Part 1 – Joint consultation of Development Strategy and Site Options on the Edge of Cambridge;

- Part 2 – Site Options within Cambridge (including residential space standards and car and cycle parking standards).

The report provided the draft Part 1 (Appendix A of the Officer's report) and Part 2 (Appendix H of the Officer's report) consultation documents for consideration, and sets out the broad arrangements for consultation, which will take place for 6 weeks between 7 January and 18 February 2013.

Decision of Executive Councillor for Planning and Climate Change:

- i. Agreed the joint Part 1 document (Appendix A of the Officer's report) and supporting evidence base (Appendices B, C, D, E and F of the Officer's report) for consultation;
- ii. Agreed the Sustainability Appraisal of the Part 1 document for consultation (Appendix G of the Officer's report);
- iii. Agreed the Part 2 document (Appendix H of the Officer's report) and supporting evidence base (Appendix L of the Officer's report) for consultation;
- iv. Agreed the Sustainability Appraisal of the Part 2 document for consultation (Appendix M of the Officer's report);
- v. Agreed the consultation arrangements sets out in paragraphs 3.32 to 3.34 and the consultee list set out in Appendix N of the Officer's report; and
- vi. Agreed that any minor amendments and editing changes that need to be made should be agreed in consultation with the Executive Councillor, Chair and Opposition Spokes.

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 Cambridge Local Plan – Towards 2031, Issues and Options 2, Part 1 and Part 2 as detailed in the of the Officer's report. The Officer reported that South Cambridgeshire District Council had already agreed the consultation process for Part 1.

Part 1

The committee made the following comments in response to the reports.

- i. The report was difficult to understand and confusing for the members of public. Additional figures were needed where predicted growth was mentioned, as without an understanding of the current baseline numbers, future numbers were meaningless.
- ii. Phrases such as 'urban area' should be avoided, as they were open to different interpretations.
- iii. Adding a commentary regarding Marshall's renewed intentions towards their site north of Newmarket Road. would assist the public.
- iv. Missing numbers need adding to paragraph 6.21.
- v. The sustainability of Waterbeach and Bourn Airfield was questioned and Keith Miles, Planning Policy Manager for South Cambridgeshire District Council, informed the committee that the new settlement options were part of South Cambs' summer consultation and do not form part of this consultation. However, the limited availability of edge of City sites was driving the shift to new town options.
- vi. Officers clarified that the consultation exhibitions would be cross authority events and that web consultations would be cross-referenced where timeframes permitted.
- vii. Members suggested that the partnership aspects of the process needed to be a highly visible aspect of the consultation.
- viii. Page 45 of the report. Members discussed the question and commented that the wording might suggest that some development of Green Belt land was inevitable. Officers responded and stated that at this stage the question needed to be asked and that South Cambridgeshire District Council had already agreed the wording.
- ix. Site option GB6 was discussed. A number of inconsistencies were noted and the map was agreed to be misleading. The problems would be resolved in consultation with the Chair and Spokes.
- x. Page 58 of the report. Question 4 would be amended to make it clear that the stadium would serve the needs of the sub region.
- xi. Page 59 of the report. Question 7 would be amended to read 'Which *if any* of the following site options for a community stadium do you support or object to, and why?'
- xii. Member noted that the need for a stadium had been highlighted by a previous Cambridgeshire Horizons study, which had involved discussions with key sports clubs, the Cambridgeshire Football Association and local authorities.
- xiii. It was suggested that the inclusion of developer or landowner's preferences was subjective and unhelpful. The Head of Planning stated that, in the interest of openness, the most recent information from developers was included.

- xiv. Keith Miles confirmed that an additional proposal for a site at Sawston had recently come to light and was not included in the report. The site was reported to be of a small scale and not a sub regional facility.

Part 2

- i. It was suggested that the terminology was very technical. The Head of Planning confirmed that the consultation process would be accessible to the public and that residents living close to suggested developments would receive a letter in plain English.
- ii. Members queried the origin of Site R18 Barton Road. Myles Greensmith informed the committee that it had come from the SHLAA Consultation and Call for Sites.
- iii. The growth of the universities was discussed. Myles Greensmith stated that both universities would have to abide by the agreed growth option. The public consultation would invite comment on how much growth of the two universities was acceptable. The consultation process would allow the universities to put forward their own ideas.
- iv. Pages 210-213 of the report. Members suggested that the public would find this section confusing. An explanation for the lack of a minimum standard was suggested for car parking.
- v. Pages 213 of the report: Table J.1. The addition of the words 'up to' to the maximum car parking per dwelling was agreed.
- vi. Cycle parking standards were discussed and members agreed that, for many cyclists, convenience was more important than large-scale provision. The committee suggested the inclusion of more evidence base to this section.
- vii. Page 232 of the report: Local Green Spaces. Officers reported that the inclusion of Local Green Spaces in the report resulted from the Government's inclusion of this new designation within the National Planning Policy Framework. The designation of open spaces as Local Green Space has to be undertaken as a part of the plan making process. The inclusion of Question L.1 within the document for consultation provides an opportunity for members of the public to come forward with any sites which they consider to fulfil the Government's criteria for designation.

Consultation Arrangements

Members expressed satisfaction with the proposed consultation arrangements.

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 6.30 pm

CHAIR