

DEVELOPMENT PLAN SCRUTINY SUB-COMMITTEE

17 December 2013

4.30 - 7.20 pm

Present: Councillors Reid (Chair), Blackhurst, Blencowe, Herbert and Price

Executive Councillor for Planning and Climate Change: Councillor Ward

Officers:

Head of Planning Services: Patsy Dell

Principal Planning Policy Officer: Joanna Gilbert-Wooldridge

Committee Manager: James Goddard

Other Officers Present:

Senior Sustainability Officer: Emma Davies

Planning Policy & Economic Development Officer: Stephen Miles

FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE COUNCIL

13/50/DPSSC Apologies

Apologies were received from Councillors Marchant-Daisley and Saunders.

Councillors Blackhurst and Herbert were present as alternates.

13/51/DPSSC Declarations of Interest

Name	Item	Interest
Councillor Blackhurst	13/55/DPSSC	Personal: His employer registered interest in the Triangle site (CB1).
Councillors Reid	13/55/DPSSC	Personal: Member of Cambridge Cycling Campaign

13/52/DPSSC Minutes

The minutes of the 5 November 2013 meetings were approved and signed as a correct record.

13/53/DPSSC Public Questions

No public questions were asked.

Members of the public asked a number of questions in the Local Plan section of the meeting (13/55/DPSSC).

13/54/DPSSC Annual Monitoring Report**Matter for Decision**

Monitoring is an important part of the planning process, providing feedback on the performance of development plan policies in terms of their use and implementation. The Council is required to produce an Annual Monitoring Report on at least a yearly basis.

The draft Annual Monitoring Report was attached as Appendix A of the Officer's report for agreement.

Decision of Executive Councillor for Planning and Climate Change

Agreed the content of the Annual Monitoring Report (Appendix A 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 Planning Policy Officer.

In response to Members' questions the Head of Planning Services and Planning Policy Officer said the following:

- i. Circa 700 houses needed to be completed each year for the Council to meet projected need. Provision was below this amount prior to 2007, but increasing from 2011.
- ii. Housing trajectory has assessed using housing completions and projections looking at:
 - Existing site allocations from the 2006 Local Plan;
 - Sites of 10 or more dwellings with planning permission

- Allocations identified in the Local Plan 2014: Proposed Submission.
- iii. The Council as local planning authority had done all that it could to make sites available for development. House building figures had been affected by the economic down turn. Completion figures were higher since 2011 due to growth sites and urban extensions coming forward.
- iv. A rise in demand had led to pressure to bring development sites forward. Annual Monitoring Report figures were based on evidence provided by developers. Demand was expected to rise in future.
- v. An Annual Monitoring Report would be produced on an annual basis as the Local Plan progresses.

Councillors requested a change to the recommendations. Councillor Reid formally proposed to withdraw the following recommendation from the Officer's report as it was no longer required (no amendments were made at DPSSC):

- (Former 2.1b) To agree that if any amendments are necessary, these should be agreed by the Executive Councillor in consultation with Chair and Spokes of Development Plan Scrutiny Sub Committee.

The Committee approved withdrawing this recommendation unanimously.

The Committee resolved unanimously to endorse the recommendation (former 2.1a) as amended.

The Executive Councillor approved the recommendation.

Conflicts of Interest Declared by the Executive Councillor (and any Dispensations Granted)

No conflicts of interest were declared by the Executive Councillor.

13/55/DPSSC Cambridge Local Plan 2014 – Submission

Public Question

Members of the public asked a number of questions, as set out below.

1. Mr Flynn (January's) raised the following points:

- i. Queried if the announcement of the Council's successful City Deal application would impact on the Local Plan.
- ii. Queried if the Local Plan Development Strategy would be reconsidered due to the City Deal.

The Executive Councillor for Planning and Climate Change responded:

- i. The City Council put a joint case to Central Government with South Cambridgeshire District Council that housing need could be met, but would be implemented faster if transport infrastructure was in place.
- ii. The Development Strategy would not be reconsidered. Confirmation of the City Deal was linked to the timescale for delivery of the local plans.

2. Ms Lindsay (PACT) raised the following points:

- i. **Expressed concern that PACT had not been notified of today's DPSSC meeting.**
- ii. **Expressed concern that the Howard Mallett Centre had been included in the Local Plan as a potential site for development. Suggested this had occurred without consultation with PACT.**
- iii. **Said the Howard Mallett Centre site had been given to residents as a community space, it was not intended as a housing development site.**
- iv. **Expressed concern over the potential loss of open space and requested the Howard Mallett site be removed from the Local Plan.**
- v. **Expressed concern over the reporting of resident's representations in the Local Plan consultation.**

The Head of Planning Services responded:

- i. Referred to section 3.9 (P84) of the Local Plan which covered the Eastern Gate Opportunity Area (including the Howard Mallett Centre).
- ii. The Eastern Gate Opportunity Area was approved through the development and adoption of the Eastern Gate Area Development Framework Supplementary Planning Document, details of which were included in the Local Plan. No new details were added to the Local Plan in relation to the Howard Mallett Centre over and above those from the Supplementary Planning Document.
- iii. The Plan set out some broad principles for the site if it came forward for redevelopment, but did not specify its use eg residential.

Ms Lindsay raised the following supplementary points:

- i. **Reiterated concern that the Howard Mallett centre was included as a site for development in the Local Plan, possibly for residential use.**
- ii. **Asked Planning Officers to protect the site.**

The Principal Planning Policy Officer responded:

- i. Stated a consultation had been undertaken on the Local Plan over the summer of 2013. Reiterated no new details were added to the Local Plan

in addition to those from the Eastern Gate Area Development Framework Supplementary Planning Document.

- ii. Stated there was no reference to dwellings/residential use of the Howard Mallett site in the Local Plan.
- iii. Hypothetically, development was proposed for the Howard Mallett Centre site which involved a loss of community use, policy 5/11 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 and its successor policy in the Cambridge Local Plan 2014 (Proposed Submission) would be applied to address the need for community facilities.

The Executive Councillor for Planning and Climate Change added that reference was made to the number of storeys buildings could have on the Howard Mallett site (if approved) to limit the maximum number. If this limit were removed from the Local Plan, there would be no limit on building height on the site.

3. Mr Lucas-Smith (Cambridge Cycling Campaign) raised the following points:

- i. **The Cambridge Cycling Campaign worked to increase road safety and cycle friendly access routes.**
- ii. **Took issue with how the Local Plan represented public responses on cycling. Referred to Cambridge Cycling Campaign representations and suggested these had been ignored.**
- iii. **Suggested the Local Plan should facilitate more journeys by bike.**
- iv. **Suggested the Local Plan only required developers to meet minimum requirements.**

The Executive Councillor for Planning and Climate Change stated that no new substantive issues had been raised in the Local Plan consultation. The Local Plan was brought before DPSSC today to consider if it was sufficiently developed for consideration by the Environmental Scrutiny Committee and Council.

The Head of Planning Services said:

- i. The City Council had followed due process for consultation on the submission stage Local Plan.
- ii. Conflicting demands for land use had been fed back through the consultation. The Council had to balance different growth and development needs around the city.

- iii. The constitution allowed for a pause in the process for Councillors to decide at DPSSC today if the Local Plan was ready to go forward or required amendment.
- iv. Referred to a letter received from Graham Hughes (Cambridgeshire County Council) regarding joint work being undertaken by the City, County and South Cambridgeshire Councils.

As a supplementary point, Mr Lucas-Smith asked the Council to decide planning issues locally instead of referring them to Central Government.

The Executive Councillor for Planning and Climate Change stated:

- i. City growth discussions were focussed on sustainable infrastructure development.
- ii. DPSSC and Environment Committees, plus Council would set local planning policy. Planning Inspectors would consider any challenges of planning policy by developers. The intention was to keep the city compact and protect the Cambridge Green Belt.

Matter for Decision

The Development Plan Scrutiny Sub-Committee has over the last three years considered and commented on the evidence base and individual draft sections of the new Local Plan, prior to it being approved by Full Council for publication for the purposes of public consultation on 27 June 2013. That 'draft plan' is known as the 'Proposed Submission' plan.

Consultation on that plan has taken place (19 July – 30 September 2013) and 2,995 representations have been received to this stage of consultation and have been considered by officers. The Council now has to decide whether to continue to progress with the plan, with or without amendments. If so, and if the amendments were not too extensive, the Council could agree to formally 'submit' the plan to government for independent examination. If the amendments were extensive (e.g. new sites added or existing ones deleted), then the Council may decide to re-consult before 'submitting' the plan for examination.

For this committee, the Officer's key recommendation was that the plan should make its way to Environment Scrutiny Committee on 14 January 2014, and thereafter, to Full Council on 13 February 2014.

If Full Council approves the plan, it will then be submitted to the Secretary of State for public examination by an independent planning inspector.

Decision of Executive Councillor for Planning and Climate Change

The Executive Councillor for Planning and Climate Change supported the following recommendations to Environment Scrutiny Committee and Full Council:

- i. The Council seeks fuller details on the County's Transport Strategy for Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire to provide the City Council with adequate assurances that transport requirements to deliver the Local Plan will be in place.
- ii. Changes to the wording in Appendix B: Schedule of Proposed Changes text to be approved by Executive Councillor, Chair and Spokes.
- iii. That the Cambridge Local Plan 2014: Proposed Submission document and Proposed Policies Map (as approved by Full Council on 27 June 2013) be 'submitted' for examination in accordance with Regulation 22 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012, together with the sustainability appraisal and associated evidence material in support of the plan, and including the Key Issues (Appendix A of the Officer's report) and Schedule of Proposed Changes (Appendix B).
- iv. That the Duty to Cooperate Report (Appendix C) be agreed and submitted as part of the evidence base for the Local Plan.
- v. That, in the interests of expediency, delegated authority be given to the Head of Planning Services to undertake appropriate negotiations and make further minor additions to the Schedule of Proposed Changes during the examination of the Local Plan (i.e. post 'submission') if in the opinion of the Head of Planning Services it is appropriate and necessary to do so to facilitate the smooth running of the plan through the examination period, (except where changes would be of such significance as to substantially alter the meaning of a policy or allocation). The exercise of this delegation to be reported back to Development Plan Scrutiny Sub-Committee through the course of the examination process.
- vi. That the Head of Planning Services is authorised to prepare and submit reports, proofs of evidence, technical papers, statements of common ground and other such documents required in the presentation of the Local Plan through the examination process and reflecting the Council's

agreed position on these matters and to take such other steps as are conducive or incidental to the submission and examination of the Local Plan.

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 Services.

Members of the committee discussed the report section by section and made the following comments:

Section 2

- i. Councillor Herbert referred to Policy 5: Strategic Transport Infrastructure and said the City Council could not evidence transport needs without County Council input. Councillor Herbert referred to the letter from Graham Hughes and said that it contained general information that was open to interpretation.

The Executive Councillor for Planning and Climate Change plus DPSSC Members all felt that it would be a good idea to invite a County Council representative to January Environment Committee to input into the Local Plan discussion; specifically around transport infrastructure.

- ii. The Head of Planning Services said County Council Transport Strategy was brought to DPSSC for approval of the consultation response in September 2013 and was available on the County Council website.

In response to Members' questions the Head of Planning Services and Principal Planning Policy Officer said the following:

Section 2

- i. The City Council, South Cambridgeshire District Council and Cambridgeshire County Council have a history of joint working on planning matters. South Cambridgeshire District Council made a representation in support of the city's housing need assessment. DPSSC agreed representations to the Draft Transport Strategy for Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire in September 2013.

- ii. There were no further formal updates since June 2013 to the proposed Grosvenor Developments/Wrenbridge Ltd proposed regarding land west of Hauxton Road, Trumpington and at the Abbey Stadium, Newmarket Road. This item will be brought back to committee when required in future.

Section 3

- iii. The Eastern Gate Area Development Framework Supplementary Planning document had weight for the 2006 Local Plan. Details were incorporated into the 2014 Plan.

Section 8

- iv. The City Council had a duty to co-operate with the County plus South Cambridgeshire Councils; but was not obliged to agree with their views. The City Council did not have a suitable site in its Local Plan for a secondary school in the city, hence the County Council's objection to the City Council's Local Plan. The City Council was discussing how to overcome this with the County plus South Cambridgeshire District Council.

Appendix B: Proposals Schedule

- v. Extant permission applied to Site R44: Betjeman House from 2006. Should a planning application come forward regarding this site, the Council's interim planning policy guidance on public houses would be applied; as would National Planning Policy Guidance para 70 and policies under the 2014 Local Plan.
- vi. There was an unresolved issue regarding the provision of a household waste site in the south of the city. The City Council was discussing how to overcome this with the County plus South Cambridgeshire District Council.
- vii. The rewording of PM/2/2003 was designed to require universities to allocate accommodation on a room by room basis to protect dwelling provision (reference Local Plan policy 46).
- viii. There were no changes in the Local Plan regarding policy 68 (open space).

Councillors requested changes to the wording in Appendix B: Schedule of Proposed Changes.

- Councillor Reid formally proposed to amend PM/3/007 as follows: "g. create a distinctive gateway to the city and a high quality urban edge, which is sensitive to the transition from the rural to the urban landscape and respects key views, particularly when approaching the city from the

~~south and south-east, as approached by road from the south and respect key views;”~~

- Councillor Herbert formally proposed to amend PM/3/016 to make specific reference to non-car access to the station;
- Councillor Blencowe formally proposed that the change in wording for PM/B/004 relating to the Site R12 Ridgeons also be applied to Site R10 Mill Road Depot.
- Councillor Blencowe formally proposed to amend PM/6/001 to remove the table column referring to on/off-site provision.

The Committee resolved unanimously to endorse the above changes.

Councillors requested a change to recommendations. Councillor Herbert formally proposed to amend recommendations from the Officer’s report by adding the following as new (i) and (ii); to make the former (i) to (iv) now (iii) to (vi):

- (New) The Council seeks fuller details on the County’s Transport Strategy to provide the City Council with adequate assurances that transport requirements to deliver the Local Plan will be in place.
- (New) Changes to the wording in Appendix B: Schedule of Proposed Changes text to be approved by Executive Councillor, Chair and Spokes.

The Committee unanimously approved the additional recommendations.

The Chair decided that the recommendations highlighted in the Officer’s report should be voted on and recorded separately:

The Committee endorsed recommendations (i) and (ii) as amended by 2 votes to 0.

The Committee endorsed recommendations (iii) – (vi) unanimously as amended.

The Executive Councillor approved the recommendations as amended.

Conflicts of Interest Declared by the Executive Councillor (and any Dispensations Granted)

No conflicts of interest were declared by the Executive Councillor.

The meeting ended at 7.20 pm

CHAIR

This page is intentionally left blank