

Public Document Pack

Development Plan Scrutiny Sub-Committee

DPSSC/1

Tuesday, 16 June 2015

DEVELOPMENT PLAN SCRUTINY SUB-COMMITTEE

16 June 2015
4.30 - 5.15 pm

Present: Councillors Sarris (Chair), Gawthrop (Vice-Chair), Ashton, Baigent, C. Smart and Tunnacliffe

Executive Councillor for Planning Policy and Transport: Councillor Blencowe

Officers:

Head of Planning Services: Patsy Dell

Urban Design and Conservation Manager: Glen Richards

Planning Policy Manager, Environment: Sara Saunders

Principal Conservation and Design Officer, Environment: Christian Brady

Senior Sustainability Officer (Design and Construction): Emma Davies

Sustainable Drainage Officer: Simon Bunn

Committee Manager: Claire Tunnicliffe

Others Present:

Cambridge University Representative: Grahame Jenkins

Cambridge University Representative: Paul Milliner

FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE COUNCIL

15/25/DPSCC Apologies

No apologies were received.

15/26/DPSCC Declarations of Interest

Name	Item	Reason
Councillor Sarris		Personal: Employed by Cambridge University.

15/27/DPSCC Minutes

The minutes of the meeting held on 9 December 2014 were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

15/28/DPSCC Public Questions

There were no public questions.

15/29/DPSCC Draft Cambridgeshire Flooding and Water Supplementary Planning Document (SPD)**Matter for Decision**

To consider the draft Cambridgeshire Flood and Water (SPD), which would sit alongside the Cambridge Local Plan 2014 once adopted.

Decision of Executive Councillor for Planning Policy and Transport

- i. Agreed the content of the draft Cambridgeshire Flood and Water SPD (Appendix A of the Officer's report).
- ii. Agreed that if any amendments were necessary, these should be agreed by the Executive Councillor in consultation with Chair and Spokes of Development Plan Scrutiny Sub Committee.
- iii. Agreed for the draft Cambridgeshire Flood and Water SPD to be subject to public consultation for 6 weeks in September – October 2015.

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 Sustainability Officer (Design and Construction), Environment.

The report referred to SPD which had been produced in order to support the implementation of flooding and water related policies across all of the Cambridgeshire local planning authorities. For Cambridge, the SPD supported policies 31 (integrated water management and the water cycle) and 32 (flood risk) of the submission version Cambridge Local Plan 2014. It provided detailed guidance on the steps that developers should undertake to ensure that developments were not at risk of flooding or increased the risk of flooding elsewhere.

On its adoption, the Cambridgeshire Flood and Water SPD would have the status of a material consideration when determining planning applications. As the draft SPD had been written to support the Cambridge Local Plan 2014, which was still currently being examined by the Secretary of State, the SPD would be adopted at the same time as, or shortly after, the Local Plan had been adopted. It would not be adopted for use in Cambridge before the Local Plan was adopted.

Comments from the Sub-Committee

- i. Sought clarification regarding the long term management and maintenance of the swales and water courses to ensure that they would not be neglected.
- ii. Asked if the Council had undertaken an audit of the City's various drains and culverts.
- iii. Queried why the consultation did not take place at the same time as the consultation on the Local Plan.
- iv. Enquired if the SPD extended to water features for cultural and aesthetic usage

Officers stated the following

- i. As an example, the City Council had adopted some sustainable drainage systems in public open spaces providing that they were designed in accordance with the design and adoption guide.
- ii. New requirements had been put into place in April 2015, requiring all major developments to utilise sustainable drainage systems. One of the key components of the adoption guide was to ensure that long term maintenance of those features were in place. All future applications should include the maintenance of those features, with consideration to cost and who would be responsible for the upkeep. It could be for the Council to adopt, maintenance companies approved by the developers or in some cases the responsible water authority.
- iii. The Council was responsible for maintaining Hobson's Conduit and the runnels on Trumpington Street. Both of which were maintained on a regular basis but were problematic due to the crossings which regularly collected a large amount of rubbish. Such issues could be learnt from, with developers moving forward to design systems that could easily be maintained and functioned robustly.
- iv. The City Council was currently working with the County Council to set up an asset database for significant flood risks across the City in

- accordance with the Public Water Management Act 2010. This would help to define the owner and their responsibilities across the City.
- v. The SPD had been developed in conjunction with each of the Cambridgeshire local planning authorities who were at different stages of producing their Local Plans. The SPD would be adopted after the Local Plan had been adopted. This was not uncommon for SPD's.
 - vi. Chapter 6 of the SPD (sustainable drainage features) would allow scope for formal water features. There would be discussions with developers at the pre application stage on this matter to incorporate features rather than hide them away.
 - vii. Work would be undertaken on the public realm strategy which would give the opportunity to incorporate water features into the public realm which would be overseen by the Development Plan Scrutiny Sub Committee.

The Committee **resolved** unanimously to endorse the recommendations.

The Executive Councillor approved the recommendations.

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

No conflicts of interest were declared by the Executive Councillor.

15/30/DPSCC New Museum's Development Framework Supplementary Planning Document (SPD)

Matter for Decision

To consider the approval of the draft New Museums Site Development Framework SPD.

Decision of Executive Councillor for Planning Policy and Transport

- i. Approved the content of the draft New Museums Site Development Framework SPD (Appendix A of the Officer's Report);
- ii. Agreed that if any amendments were necessary, these should be agreed by the Executive Councillor in consultation with Chair and Spokes of Development Plan Scrutiny Sub Committee;
- iii. Approve the draft New Museums Site Development Framework SPD for public consultation from 13 July to Monday 7 September 2015;

- iv. Approved the consultation arrangements as set out in paragraphs 3.39 to 3.41 and the proposed schedule of consultees in Appendix B 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 Head of Joint Urban Design (Environment),

The report referred to the draft SPD which had been produced in order to set out the joint aspirations of the Council and the University of Cambridge regarding future changes to the site. These should improve the urban form with changes to the public realm, provide better access for all and adopt more sustainable forms of development while respecting the site's heritage and surroundings. Future development on the site offered an opportunity to create an improved, more coherent development and especially to improve the public realm on the site.

Comments from the Sub-Committee

- i. Noted the public consultation ran from 13 July to 7 September, a period when many academics and administration staff would be away and asked if the time frame could be extended so that future and present users of the site could take part in the consultation.
- ii. Queried what improvements had been made to the site to negate the impact of traffic.
- iii. Enquired if the masterplan envisaged a single architect or architectural practice.

Officers and representatives from Cambridge University stated the following:

- i. The masterplan had been developed over a number of years through various Committees which had been cascaded down to staff and academics and a number of exhibitions and information sessions had been held. Therefore the University was confident that the staff and academics had been sufficiently consulted.

- ii. The site had been overdeveloped over a number of years and the aim was to reduce the amount of useable space which would improve access.
- iii. Detailed plans to the improvements for pedestrian access were available for further viewing.
- iv. Changes to access from Downing Street would further be investigated.
- v. A detailed traffic management plan had been put in place to elevate the impact on traffic to the area during construction.
- vi. As each phase of the build came forward there would be a procurement process to allow for open tenders process but the masterplan consultants would be retained.

The Committee **resolved** unanimously to endorse the recommendations.

The Executive Councillor approved the recommendations.

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 5.15 pm

CHAIR