

COUNCIL13 February 2014
6.00pm - 10.12 pm

Present: Councillors Saunders (Mayor), Pippas (Deputy Mayor), Abbott, Ashton, Benstead, Bick, Bird, Birtles, Blackhurst, Blencowe, Boyce, Brierley, Brown, Cantrill, Dryden, Gawthrope, Hart, Herbert, Hipkin, Johnson, Kerr, Kightley, McPherson, Meftah, Moghadas, O'Reilly, Owers, Pitt, Price, Reid, Reiner, Roberts, Rosenstiel, Smart, Smith, Stuart, Swanson, Todd-Jones, Tucker, Tunnacliffe and Ward

FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE COUNCIL

The Mayor gave permission for Mr Taylor to film the meeting. It was confirmed that filming would cease if members of the public or speakers expressed a desire not to be filmed.

Request to film the meeting

The Mayor gave permission for Mr Taylor to film the meeting. It was confirmed that filming would cease if members of the public or speakers expressed a desire not to be filmed.

14/1/CNL Apologies for absence

Apologies were received from Councillor Marchant-Daisley.

14/2/CNL Declarations of interest

Councillor	Item	Interest
Reid	14/5/CNL	Personal: Member of Cambridge Past, Present and Future
Hipkin	14/5/CNL	Personal: Cambridge County Councillor
Blackhurst	14/5/CNL	Personal: Employee of Cambridge Assessments
Smith	14/5/CNL	Personal: Employee of Cambridge University

Re-ordering of the agenda

Under paragraph 4.2.1 of the Council Procedure Rules, the Mayor used his discretion to alter the order of the agenda to take item 4 before item 3. However, for ease of the reader, these minutes will follow the order of the published agenda.

14/3/CNL Petitions

A petition had been received containing over 500 valid signatures stating the following:

“We the undersigned call on Cambridge City and South Cambs Councils to withdraw all sites in the Green Belt proposed for development in the draft Local Plan.

* We oppose further destruction of the Green Belt. There are no exceptional circumstances that justify it.

*We oppose urban sprawl that will destroy the historic, compact character of Cambridge, its surrounding villages and countryside and will further add to traffic congestion.

*The Councils’ plans are based on out-of-date growth forecasts and first consideration should be given to greater re-use of existing sites (including brownfield) not in the Green Belt.”

Mr Jones presented and spoke in support of the petition.

The following points were made:

- i) Referenced to an open letter which had been sent to all Councillors.
- ii) The draft Local Plan failed on sustainability grounds due to the distance of facilities.
- iii) Netherhall and Newbury were high-quality arable farms which had been downgraded to satisfy the City planners’ aspiration.
- iv) Significant issues around bio diversity and geology.
- v) Data used in the report was out of date.
- vi) City Planners had a duty to consider brownfields site first.
- vii)The City Planners had failed to identify a brownfield site owned by the City Council.

- viii) The city would experience an increase in traffic.

Councillors debated the issues raised for the allocated 15 minutes.

The Leader of the Council thanked the petitioners for attending. The issues raised by the petition related to the content of the Local Plan and would therefore be the subject of the main debate.

A further petition had been received containing over 500 valid signatures stating the following:

“We the undersigned share concerns about the proposals for the Ridgeons (R12) site in the Local Plan. We want to see changes to the proposal that include:

- i) Reducing the overall density of the site down to 35dph or less.
- ii) Ensuring that the housing mix meets the needs of the local community with more affordable family homes (3/4/5 bedrooms and ALL bedrooms of a decent size) being built with gardens to redress the balance of Cromwell Road as a result of previous unsustainable development on the street.
- iii) Green open spaces that are accessible and usable by all.
- iv) A new pedestrian and cycle bridge over the railway line.
- v) Change use of site from Residential to mixed – to accommodate local, grass roots enterprises and businesses.”

Ms Gaillard presented and spoke in support of the petition.

The following points were made:

- i) The petition was not about stopping progress and development.
- ii) Residents were happy to see that the site had been identified for development but there needed to be a balance of amenity and houses.
- iii) The number of homes had been doubled and should be reduced to the original number of 120.
- iv) There was a need for mixed family homes to enhance a community environment.

- v) Cromwell Road area had been failed by the City Planners and this was opportunity to enrich the area.
- vi) It was clear that the community had been able to influence the planning policy.
- vii) Crownwell Road is on the edge of two school catchment areas and should not be allowed to become a “catchment black hole”.
- viii) This was an opportunity to relive pressure on existing services in the area.
- ix) Requested the consideration of a new pedestrian railway crossing.

Councillors debated the issues raised for the allocated 15 minutes.

The Leader of the Council thanked the petitioners for attending. The issues raised by the petition related to the content of the Local Plan and would therefore be the subject of the main debate.

14/4/CNL Public Questions Time

Mr Sarris addressed the Council and made the following points:

- i) Green spaces are valued and should be retained.
- ii) Current high water levels demonstrate the need for the flood plain.
- iii) The new railway station in Chesterton would increase pressure to build on land liable to flood.
- iv) Questioned what measures would be undertaken to control building on flood plains.

The Executive Councillor for Planning and Climate Change responded:

- i) The Local Plan would direct building away from areas prone to flooding and quoted policies 31 & 32 of the Local Plan.
- ii) This Authority has not allowed development against advice of the Environment Agency.
- iii) New developments were required to provide Sustainable Drainage Systems.

Mr Underwood addressed the Council and made the following points:

- i) The Howard Mallet Centre site had enjoyed the designation of land for the community for many years.
- ii) Successive uses of the building have supported this designation.

- iii) Any proposed development should respect that the land has been dedicated to Community use.
- iv) Building student accommodation on the site would not satisfy the conditions attached to the land.
- v) Access to any redevelopment of Mill Road depot via residential streets should not be allowed.
- vi) Side streets would be used as rat runs.
- vii) Local residents had major concerns about this matter.

The Executive Councillor for Planning and Climate Change responded:

- iv) The Local Plan does not propose any particular use for the Howard Mallet site.
- v) Any planning application would have to adhere to planning policy.
- vi) The potential to enhance St Matthew's Piece would be fully explored.
- vii) Any development would have to meet the criteria.
- viii) No decision has been made regarding access to the Mill Road Depot site.
- ix) The Council would be considering an amendment to the Plan regarding this matter later in the meeting.

Mr Underwood's supplementary question:

- i) Residents in the area are fearful regarding what would be built and there was a strong likelihood that the land would be used for development.

Mr de Bois addressed the Council and made the following points:

- i) Concerns regarding Policy 23.
- ii) Residents of Mill Road do not want the Conservation Area redefined as a Development Area.
- iii) The character of Mill Road needs to be protected and the Local Plan has failed to do this.
- iv) There is a good mixture of shops and houses on Mill Road.
- v) The consultation process does not recognise the existing housing on Mill Road.
- vi) The Local Plan refers to the provision of generous pavements on Mill Road
- vii) Options appear to show shared use of the road/pavement and widening the footpaths which would not be possible in such a confined area.
- viii) Expressed concerns that if pavements were widened the roads would become narrower, with any development bringing an increase in traffic.

- ix) A request for additional wording regarding housing was submitted to the Environment Scrutiny Committee in January.
- x) Red line highlights a potential development area on Mill Road.
- xi) Requested that the residential nature of the area be protected.

The Executive Councillor for Planning and Climate Change responded:

- x) There was no suggestion that Mill Road would lose its Conservation Area status.
- xi) The existence of houses on Mill Road was recognised in the main document.
- xii) The homes on Mill Road were protected.
- xiii) Accepted that that the phrase “more generous pavements” could be replaced by “improvements to pavements”.
- xiv) The red line highlights an opportunity area not a specific development.

Mr Pellew addressed the Council and made the following points:

- i. Questioned how the principle of the development sequence referenced in 2.26 of the Local Plan would be enforced.
- ii. Developers would favour greenfield development sites.
- iii. Central urban sites would remain untouched.
- iv. Requested that the City Council consider including a statement in the Local Plan that urban areas be developed first.
- v. Referenced the Local Plan for Reigate Council which had a policy to protect the Green Belt and to promote the conservation and enhancement of the landscape.
- vi. Green Belt land should only be released if needed for five-year housing supply

The Executive Councillor for Planning and Climate Change responded:

- vii. This was a misunderstanding of 2/26 of the Local Plan.
- viii. Alongside this, the Council, along with South Cambridgeshire District Council has had to consider whether the 2006 development strategy remains the most appropriate or an alternative would be more suitable.
- ix. A range of options had been considered and strategic land assessments undertaken.
- x. 98.03% of Green Belt land within the city’s administrative boundary is being protected.

Mr Pellew supplementary question:

- i. Noted that the Executive Councillor had not answered queries regarding phasing of development so that all brownfield sites are fully developed before any greenbelt sites are considered.

The Executive Councillor for Planning and Climate Change responded:

- ii. Officers did not consider this to be needed or appropriate for the current circumstances in Cambridge.

Mr Baigent addressed the Council and made the following points:

- i) Reminded Councillors that 500 people had signed a petition against the proposals for the Ridgeon's (R12) site in the Local Plan.
- ii) Questioned if the Council would take into consideration the opinion of those 500 individuals and highlighted the need for 'Localism and Democracy'.
- iii) The proposed development would have an impact on the Conservation Area.
- iv) Flats built on Cavendish Road would lean into the Conservation Area.
- v) Concerned about access onto Mill Road via Cavendish Road.

The Executive Councillor for Planning and Climate Change responded:

- xv) The conservation area would be taken into account and would remain.
- xvi) More detailed questions would be picked up in the planning application.
- xvii) There was no government planning policy regarding who could purchase properties. This was not a planning consideration.

Mr Baigent's supplementary question:

- i. Highlighted the need for housing for local people.

The Executive Councillor for Planning and Climate Change responded:

- ii. 40% would be affordable housing for local people.

Mr Huntsman addressed the Council and made the following points:

- i. There is a serious traffic problem on the south side of the City.
- ii. A number of bus companies (including the Park & Ride) use Worts' Causeway as short cut to avoid the traffic.
- iii. Developments around Worts' Causeway would have a serious impact on the bypass used by buses.
- iv. Before any development suitable arrangements would have to be agreed to avoid an adverse impact on traffic.
- v. Questioned if Babraham Road would be able to cope with the additional traffic.

The Executive Councillor for Planning and Climate Change responded:

- vi. The Local Plan did acknowledge a number of challenges regarding transport issues.
- vii. Suitable arrangement would have to be agreed before development begins.

Mr Huntsman supplementary question:

- i. Any additional traffic to the South of the City would create serious problems.

The Executive Councillor for Planning and Climate Change responded:

- ii. The wider transport strategy would be considered by Cambridgeshire County Council.

Mr Mitchell addressed the Council and made the following points:

- i. Would welcome the development of the Cherry Hinton Chalk Pit Lakes.
- ii. The Lakes could be transformed into a recreational and ecological park.
- iii. Urged the Council to 'dream big' with the development of the Lake.
- iv. With the right leadership and funding the Cherry Hinton Chalk Pit Lakes could be a 'jewel' in the open spaces of Cambridge.
- v. The Lakes could provide a safe outdoors environment that promotes and supports health activities to the people of Cambridge.

The Executive Councillor for Planning and Climate Change responded:

- vi. He thanked Mr Mitchell and Cambridge Lakes for their support.

14/5/CNL To consider the recommendations of the Executive for Adoption

Cambridge Local Plan 2014 - Submission Stage

The Executive Councillor for Planning and Climate Change introduced the item.

Amendments from the Labour Group

Councillor Blencowe proposed and Councillor Johnson seconded the following amendment to the Local Plan:

Section 2, Page 35, Policy 7 – River Cam

Add g) *not impinge nor have adverse impact on the floodplain.*

On a show of hands the amendment was lost by 21 votes to 19

Section 3, Page 46, Policy 11 – Fitzroy/Burleigh Street etc

In a) include Fitzroy Street

On a show of hands the amendment was lost by 21 votes to 19

Section 3, Page 61, Policy 16 – Cambridge BioMed Campus

Between d) and e) add 'be self-sufficient in car park provision'

On a show of hands the amendment was lost by 22 votes to 19

Section 5, Page 144, Policy 44 – Specialist Colleges

Change 5.32 wording to remove *'will be flexible in considering any'* and replace with *'will require a'*.

On a show of hands the amendment was carried unanimously.

Section 7, Page 189, Policy 69 – Protection of sites of local nature conservation importance

Change wording of fourth line from:

'Where development is permitted, proposals must include measures' to:

'Where development is permitted, proposals will include measures'

On a show of hands the amendment was lost by 21 votes to 19

Councillor Blencowe proposed and Councillor Herbert seconded the following amendment to the Local Plan:

Appendix B, R10, Mill Road Depot, Pages 243/244

Remove line:

"site will need careful review of highway access"

And replace with:

"vehicular access to be from Mill Road"

On a show of hands the amendment was lost by 21 votes to 18

Councillor Ward proposed the following amendment to the Local Plan:

Appendix B, R10, Mill Road Depot, Pages 243/244

Remove line:

“site will need careful review of highway access”

And replace with:

“vehicular access to be from Mill Road only, subject to detailed testing”

On a show of hands the amendment was carried unanimously.

Resolved (by 21 votes to 1) subject to the amendments agreed above, to approve:

a. 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) and Schedule of Proposed Changes (Appendix B);

b. that the Duty to Cooperate Report (Appendix C), be agreed and submitted as part of the evidence base for the Local Plan;

c. 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;

d. 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;

e. that any changes to Appendices A, B and/or C required by Full Council be agreed by the Chair and Spokes of Development Plan Scrutiny Sub-Committee and the Executive Councillor for Planning and Climate Change.

The meeting ended at 10.12 pm

CHAIR