

DEVELOPMENT PLAN SCRUTINY SUB-COMMITTEE

25 January 2017
4.30 - 6.50 pm

Present: Councillors Gawthrope (Vice-Chair), Avery, Baigent, Smart

Executive Councillor for Planning Policy and Transport: Councillor Blencowe

Officers:

Planning Policy Manager: Sara Saunders

Principal Planning Policy Officer: Joanna Gilbert-Wooldridge

Senior Sustainability Officer: Emma Davies

Senior Urban Designer: Sarah Chubb

Democratic Services Officer: Daniel Snowdon

FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE COUNCIL

16/72/DPSSC Apologies

Apologies were received from Councillor Bick and Sarris. In the absence of the Chairman, Councillor Gawthrope acted as Chairman for the meeting.

Councillor Sargeant attended as an alternate.

16/73/DPSSC Declarations of Interest

Item Number	Councillor	Interest
16/76/DPSCC	Sargeant and Smart	Personal: Both have provided homestay accommodation to students.

16/74/DPSSC Minutes

The minutes of 6 December 2016 were agreed as a correct record

16/75/DPSSC Public Questions

There were no public questions.

16/76/DPSSC CAMBRIDGE LOCAL PLAN EXAMINATION – FURTHER PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS FOR STUDENT ACCOMMODATION, GYPSIES AND TRAVELLERS, AND ACCESSIBLE HOMES**Matter for Decision**

To consider and comment before decision by the Executive Councillor for Planning Policy and Transport.

Decision of Executive Councillor for Planning Policy and Transport

- To agree that the further proposed modifications and the Sustainability Appraisal be submitted for consideration by Full Council on 23 February 2017 and approved for submission to the Inspectors examining the Local Plan;
- To agree the findings of the Assessment of Student Housing Demand and Supply for Cambridge City Council;
- To agree the findings of the further work on provision for Gypsies and Travellers;
- To agree the findings of the further work on Accessible Homes in Cambridge;
- To agree that the documents attached to this report as Appendices C, D and E be submitted as part of the evidence base for the emerging Local Plan;
- To agree that the documents attached to the report as Appendices C, D and E be endorsed as a material consideration in decision making;
- To agree that delegated authority be given to the Joint Director of Planning and Economic Development to make any subsequent minor amendments and editing changes, in consultation with the Executive Councillor for Planning Policy and Transport, Chair of and Spokes of Development Plan Scrutiny Sub Committee.

Reasons 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 Principle Planning Officer.

Dr Gemma Burgess and Michael Jones, consultants, were invited by the Chairman to assist with the answering of Member questions on the report.

The Committee made the following comments in response to the report:

- i. Highlighted student accommodation within the city that did not meet the needs of students with limited study and communal areas that was expensive and beyond the means of most students reliant on grants and loans. As a result the accommodation was not being filled and in one instance rooms were being advertised on the internet as a hotel.
- ii. Questioned the lack of growth projected for Anglian Ruskin University.
- iii. Drew attention to student car parking arrangements and raised concern regarding parking controls.
- iv. Highlighted the importance of the connection between the developer and the University and questioned whether there was national legislation regarding the maintenance of accommodation.
- v. Drew attention to the national position regarding accessible homes now being weaker resulting in the amendment of the emerging Local Plan to account for the changes.
- vi. Questioned the link between constructing purpose built student accommodation and residential houses becoming available on the open market.
- vii. Questioned whether there was a danger of over provision of student accommodation if there was a decline in the higher education sector.
- viii. Asked whether there were examples of policies that ensured accommodation was used for student accommodation.
- ix. Questioned whether a developer could build accommodation that housed 6 students or fewer.
- x. Noted the need to identify accommodation for language schools and summer schools, and questioned how accommodation for homestay students and language students worked.
- xi. Questioned the assessment of Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Needs.
- xii. Expressed disappointment with the required ratio of accessible homes, noting that disability affects people of all means

The Principle Planning Officer said the following in response to Members questions:

- i. Confirmed that work was continuing with planning officers regarding enforcement action at specific sites. Officers were optimistic that the working group would address the issue of parking at sites.
- ii. Confirmed that Anglia Ruskin University was not seeking to expand its Cambridge City site following a short period of growth. There was uncertainty within the sector following the result of the European Union referendum.
- iii. Confirmed that work would take place to identify whether there were schemes in operation in other parts of the country that could be adopted regarding car parking controls.
- iv. Explained that work was ongoing nationally involving Environmental Health and housing regarding maintenance of accommodation for students.
- v. Explained that the Steering Committee regarding Gypsies and Travellers reviewed the evidence base and concluded that there was no identifying need. However, there was flexibility within the policy in case the need arose in the future.
- vi. Advised that the changes to accessibility standards for new housing were made by the Government however, the revised standards were an improvement on what was contained within the 2006 Local Plan.
- vii. Explained that a percentage of properties may become available if purpose built student accommodation was constructed however, there was no clear correspondence between the two. It was more likely that houses would return to the rental market as houses of multiple occupation. The housing market in Cambridge primarily consisted of shared accommodation or every expensive accommodation and it was therefore unlikely that any accommodation would return to affordable family housing.
- viii. Explained that although the higher education sector as a whole was shrinking the market in Cambridge was buoyant with post-graduate and contract/research staff.
- ix. Advised that there were no examples found of any policies in other parts of the country that ensured accommodation was used for students only.
- x. Confirmed that accommodation with 6 or fewer students would be classed as houses of multiple occupancy and therefore addressed under different policies within the Local Plan.
- xi. Explained that policies 44 and 46 addressed specialist colleges and courses of a year or more. Accommodation could also be utilised outside of term time when accommodation was available.
- xii. Advised that there were Gypsies and Travellers lived in Cambridge in permanent accommodation. Engagement with families was attempted but

had no success following communities having been advised not to engage with the needs assessments.

- xiii. Advised that the ratio of accessible accommodation was set by the Government and Councils were required to work to that requirement. The first accessible home was required on the 20th affordable home constructed. If it was determined that under-provision of accessible homes had taken place then action could be taken.

The Committee unanimously resolved 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.

16/77/DPSSC Mitcham's Corner Development Framework Supplementary Planning Document

Matter for Decision

To consider and comment before decision by the Executive Councillor for Planning Policy and Transport.

Decision of Executive Councillor

- To agree the responses to the representations received during public consultation and the consequential amendments proposed to the Mitcham's Corner Development Framework;
- To approve the Mitcham's Corner Development Framework in anticipation of the adoption of the Local Plan, and to agree that it should be carried forward for adoption as a Supplementary Planning Document at the same time as the Local Plan.

Reason for 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 Urban Designer.

The Committee made the following comments in response to the report:

- i. Noted that the Mitcham's Corner gyratory was effective in managing the movement of vehicular traffic but was poor for pedestrians and cyclists. It was also difficult for people travelling by bus as there were a number of bus stops spread over the area. Members emphasised the need to create a shared space for all road users.
- ii. Questioned how the project would be funded.
- iii. Questioned what safeguards there were to prevent a developer from constructing something that was contrary to the Supplementary Planning Document (SPD).
- iv. Drew attention to the dangers faced by pedestrians and cyclists that travelled around the gyratory. Members noted that there was no data on cycles or pedestrian movements and suggested that a comprehensive survey was carried out of pedestrians and cyclists to inform the design of Mitcham's Corner.
- v. Expressed concern regarding the funding of the project. The City Deal could not be relied upon as the objectives were not entirely the same and more consideration should be given to alternative funding streams.
- vi. Highlighted the importance of capturing the views of students who travelled to college by bicycle.
- vii. Drew attention to the Comments from Bidwells within the report and requested that the Council took a more proactive approach.
- viii. Expressed concern regarding the modified wording on page 53 of the SPD that appeared to water down the linkages from Chesterton Road to Grassmere Gardens.
- ix. Queried progress regarding the Tivoli public house.
- x. Emphasised the importance at not only looking at what was happening with regard to cycling and pedestrian movements but also setting out the vision for what the area could be. – have tried to set out vision of what this space could be setting out the benefits. Has to handle a certain degree of traffic movements. Not lost vision of space.
- xi. Suggested that an application be developed for use on people's smart phones that could track their movements that could inform any survey of pedestrian and cycle movements across the city and inform the design of the gyratory.

The Senior Urban Designer said the following in response to Members questions:

- i. Explained that the stage of the design where cycle lanes should be routed had not been reached yet and drew Members attention to the key objectives for remodelling the gyratory set out on page 34 of the SPD.
- ii. Drew attention to funding available in tranche 2 of the City Deal. The City Deal had expressed an interest in contributing toward the cost of the project but it would require a clear business case for the investment that demonstrated improvements to transport and the public realm.
- iii. Advised that planning application would be assessed in accordance with the current Local Plan and linked to the emerging Local Plan. The adoption of the SPD would also demonstrate the Council's position with regard to the development of the area.
- iv. Welcomed the suggestion of a survey of pedestrian and cycle movements and would discuss further with the City Deal regarding a city wide survey.
- v. Explained that funding sources for the project were limited with only the Section 106 funds or Community Infrastructure Levy available. The City Deal provided a great opportunity that was unlikely to be available again in the future.
- vi. Advised that a meeting would take place with Bidwells following the Committee meeting.
- vii. Explained that the wording on page 53 of the SPD was amended to reflect land ownership issues.
- viii. Advised that the specific guidance was contained within the framework to enhance and repair the frontage of the Tivili. Discussions had taken place between officers and representatives of JD Whetherspoon regarding the site.
- ix. Welcomed the innovative suggestion for a smart phone application to be developed to assist with surveying pedestrian and cycle movements and would discuss it further with consultants.

The Committee unanimously resolved 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 6.50 pm

CHAIR