

# Public Document Pack

Planning and Transport Scrutiny Committee

P&TCm/1

Monday, 4 November 2024

**PLANNING AND TRANSPORT SCRUTINY COMMITTEE** 4 November 2024  
5.30 - 8.00 pm

**Present:** Councillors Nestor (Chair), Baigent (Vice-Chair), Bick, Clough, Divkovic, Griffin, Porrer and Swift

Executive Councillor: Thornburrow (Executive Councillor for Planning, Building Control and Infrastructure)

Also present: Councillor A Smith

## **Officers:**

Assistant Chief Executive, Chief Executive's Office: Andrew Limb

Deputy Director, Greater Cambridge Shared Planning and 3C Building Control: Heather Jones

Planning Policy Manager: Jonathan Dixon

Strategic Planning Manager: Caroline Hunt

Delivery Manager: Toby Williams

Environmental Health Manager: Yvonne O'Donnell

Principal Planning Policy Officer: Nancy Kimberley

Planning Policy and Strategy Team Leader: Stuart Morris

Planning Policy and Strategy Team Leader: Terry De Sousa

Principal Planning Policy Officer: Lizzie Wood

Health Prevention Programme Officer: Suzanne Goff

Committee Manager: Claire Tunncliffe

Meeting Producer: Boris Herzog

## **Others Present:**

Cambridgeshire & Peterborough Combined Authority, Executive Director of Place and Connectivity: Judith Barker

## **FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE COUNCIL**

### **24/17PnT Apologies for Absence**

No apologies were received.

### **24/18PnT Declarations of Interest**

<b>Name</b>	<b>Item</b>	<b>Interest</b>
Councillor Baigent	All	Personal: Member of Cambridge Cycle Campaign

Councillor Clough		Personal: Member of South Newnham Neighbourhood Forum. Was neither pre-disposed or pre-determined but withdrew from voting.
-------------------	--	---

**24/19PnT Minutes**

*Committee Manager’s Note: The Cambridge Development Group referenced is now known as the Cambridge Growth Company.*

Councillor Baigent informed the Committee at the March meeting he believed it had been agreed there would be an agenda item at every future meeting to bring an update on the Cambridge Delivery Group (CDG) and the Cambridge 2040 programme which had not been referenced in the minutes.

The Chair advised the Committee Manager would include Councillor Baigent’s comments in the November minutes, so they were recorded.

The Deputy Director of GCSP and 3c Building Control informed Members that the Leader of the Council, Council Davey, was now the Lead Member, so any updates would go through the Strategy & Resources (S&R) Scrutiny Committee.

Councillor Baigent advised he was uncomfortable with the change in scrutiny process. The Leader should attend future Planning & Transport Scrutiny Committee meetings to advise Members for the opportunity of scrutiny and debate.

The Deputy Director of GCSP and 3c Building Control advised she would take back Councillor Baigent’s comments to the Joint Director of Planning and Economic Development to discuss with the Executive Councillor for Planning, Building Control and Infrastructure.

The Executive Councillor informed the Committee it was correct that any updates should be taken to the S&R Committee with the Joint Director of Planning and Economic Development to attend that meeting, as currently this was a high-level strategy item. When the CDG and Cambridge 2040 programme came down to planning policy or transport issues then there may be matters which the Committee should consider.

Councillor Baigent responded he would like the Leader of the Council and the Joint Director of Planning and Economic Development to provide an update on this item at the next meeting.

The Chair advised that the request had been noted and if appropriate and all relevant Officers and the Leader agreed then this should be placed on the next meeting agenda.

The minutes of the meeting held on 19<sup>th</sup> March were then approved as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

*Committee Manager's Note: The Chief Executive confirmed on 11/1//24 with The Deputy Director of GCSP and 3c Building Control, the Leader would be reporting to the Strategy and Resources Committee on the Cambridge Delivery Group (CDG).*

## **24/20PnT Public Questions**

A member of the public asked a question as set out below.

- i. Very little seems to have been mentioned about lifelong learning in the SPD - noting that the Adult Education Budget falls within the Combined Authority's remit. Furthermore, Cambridge lacks a specialist lifelong learning centre that it used to have until the 1980s, and that other towns and cities still have.
- ii. Please could you ensure that not only the Combined Authority is consulted, but that existing providers of adult education (specialist centres in other towns and cities) are invited to comment and suggest how developers could contribute towards the much-improved provision of lifelong learning facilities. Furthermore, please could you ensure that the wealthy sci-tech sectors that regularly raise the issues of chronic skills shortages are asked how best their existing and future developments could contribute towards new facilities that could enable more people to switch careers into those industries with chronic shortages.

The Executive Councillor for Planning, Building Control and Infrastructure responded:

- i. Subject to consideration at this meeting the Council would be consulting on all of the agreed SPDs for a period of 8 weeks, to allow everyone with an interest to provide feedback.
- ii. Having raised the matter of lifelong learning we can consider how this relates to the SPD. The consultation will include consulting the Cambridgeshire & Peterborough Combined Authority (CPCA), and other education stakeholders would be able to comment as well.
- iii. The responsibility for adult education has become a devolved matter within the remit of the CPCA. Whilst it doesn't deliver direct services the CPCA supported adult education providers through Government funding through the devolution deal.
- iv. Supporting skills development and training was something the Council were interested in, as shown in the Council's Community Wealth Building Strategy. The draft SPD included chapters looking at how we can support this through planning obligations and would be looking to do even more through the emerging Greater Cambridge Local Plan.

**Supplementary Question:**

- i. Would like to highlight the House of Commons Education Committee report, HC 278, 19 December 2020; a plan for an adult skills and lifelong learning revolution. The report recommends a new learning centre in every town.
- ii. Would like to formally submit a copy of the report HC 278 to the consultation.
- iii. At a CPCA meeting held earlier today had tabled a question regarding transport access to new learning centres. It seemed like so much had taken place since this question was first submitted as there were four similar meetings taking place in one week, the Planning and Transport Scrutiny Committee being one. It had been difficult to digest so much information.
- iv. The Minister for Housing had made comment about how much Cambridge was due to develop, this made the matter of adult learning even more pressing, that a suitable forum was required.

- v. Would like to submit a paper from the House of Commons library (dated 12 June 2024) on Unitary Local Government and a second paper titled All Things light Rail which should be considered in all the Supplementary Planning Documents consultations.

The Executive Councillor thanked the public speaker for their time and the paperwork submitted for Officer's information.

## **24/21PnT Cambridge City Council response to CPCA Bus Reform Consultation**

### **Matter for Decision**

The report referred to Cambridgeshire & Peterborough Combined Authority belief that the way local buses were run needed to change to improve the local bus system for communities that relied on it. The CPCA consultation document explained why the Combined Authority recommends bus franchising as the way to do this, based on its assessment of the Proposed Franchising Scheme.

### **Decision of Executive Councillor for Planning, Building Control and Infrastructure.**

- i. Agreed Cambridge City Council's response to the Cambridgeshire & Peterborough Combined Authority consultation on bus franchising.

### **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 Assistant Chief Executive, who then introduced the CPCA's Executive Director of Place and Connectivity, Judith Barker.

Councillor A Smith was also present as the City Council's Transport Lead at the CPCA.

In response to Members' questions the Executive Director of Place and Connectivity, the Assistant Chief Executive and Councillor A Smith said the following:

- i. The business case covered a thirty-year period from 2023 to 2054 and highlighted funding made up for a medium level investment scenario, highlighting the following:
  - a) Under the franchising model the CPCA would receive the fare income (currently received by the bus operating companies) which would be a large part of the affordability.
  - b) Assumed that Government grants would continue at current levels and not increase.
  - c) Cambridgeshire County Council and Peterborough City Council as the Highways Authorities paid a transport levy to the CPCA to undertake the role of the Strategic Transport Authority, which would continue.
  - d) The forecast for the Mayoral precept would increase over the period.
- ii. The business case assumed the mayoral precept of £12 in the year 2023/24 rather than the £36 precept of 2024/25 due to the year the document was written.
- iii. Would highlight that some of the income discussed was less than certain, the Mayoral precept was set annually as part of the budget setting process, made in consideration of the spending requirements and the funding available.
- iv. As part of the process of setting the business case a range of various funding options had been considered. However, had only included the options that offered the greatest income potential in the business plan.
- v. If franchising were to go ahead, there would be a considerable amount of change to be made before the decision could be implemented. It had taken Greater Manchester Combined Authority (GMCA) three years from the Mayoral decision to the first phase of franchising to be applied.
- vi. The CPCA would continue to work on the Greater Cambridge Transport Strategy alongside the emerging Greater Cambridge Local Plan; one of the issues to be addressed would be congestion.
- vii. Several work streams had been identified before implementation such as the commercial and procurement strategy, customer service, ICT

- requirements, governance, staffing etc. All of which had to be resilient and the appropriate risk management in place.
- viii. It was important to ensure that the small and medium operators would be able to access the market.
  - ix. Believed that franchising offered greater control, with a possibility of cross subsidy from routes that had greater profit-making ability.
  - x. Needed to look at how the system worked as whole and the connectivity. With a better functional bus service, it could be assumed that more people would use public transport meaning fewer people would choose to use their cars.
  - xi. The CPCA Transport and Infrastructure Committee had met earlier today and discussed the Greater Cambridge Transport Strategy and the ongoing commitment to sustainable travel.
  - xii. The Council's response had been drafted in a way that positively supported the proposals but given the complexity of the proposals it did not hold the Council accountable as there was a degree of risk and uncertainty.
  - xiii. The CPCA was taking a slightly different approach to GMCA and to London Transport; London was governed by a different set of legislation but was following the 2017 Bus Services Act as GMCA had. However, the CPCA had a different business plan as GMCA had not only taken control of the bus routes but had purchased the buses and were contracting operators to deliver sections of their service splitting the area covered by the Combined Authority into three.
  - xiv. The CPCA had a bus depot strategy which had identified the funding in the business case to run the depot but would contract the buses and the operations together.
  - xv. The consultation would run to 20 November and would go through due process with the CPCA Board and then a Mayoral decision early 2025.
  - xvi. Could not pre-determine the decision which was why implementation would take time as outlined there would be a large amount of work to be completed.

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

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.

## **24/22PnT Greater Cambridge Local Plan Timetable**

### **Matter for Decision**

The report provided an update regarding the Local Plan Timetable (previously called the Local Development Scheme (LDS)), which was a timetable for the production of new or revised development plan documents that set out the planning policy framework for Greater Cambridge. It was being prepared jointly between South Cambridgeshire District Council and Cambridge City Council as the Plans in preparation were both joint Plans for the authorities' combined area. The Councils were required to keep the Timetable up to date.

### **Decision of Executive Councillor for Planning, Building Control and Infrastructure**

- i. Agreed the Local Plan Timetable Update at Appendix 1 (of the Officer's report) be added as a November 2024 Addendum to the Greater Cambridge Development Scheme 2022 (updating the current March 2024 Addendum) and published on the Greater Cambridge Planning website.
- ii. Agreed an updated formal Greater Cambridge Local Plan Timetable be brought to Members in spring 2025 once there is clarity on the transitional date for plans under the current plan-making system to be submitted, and also on the outcome of the Cambridge Wastewater Treatment Plant Development Consent Order.

### **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 and Strategy Team Leader



In response to Members' questions the Planning Policy and Strategy Team Leader, Strategic Planning Manager and Deputy Director, Greater Cambridge Shared Planning and 3C Building Control said the following:

- i. Officers agreed there was a level of risk and uncertainty regarding the impact of the Cambridge Development Group (CDG)'s work on the Greater Cambridge Local Plan.
- ii. Engagement with the CDG had not yet been in depth, but the Government had announced a re-set of that relationship in the Summer. With the October 2024 budget announcement of funding towards a growth in Cambridge it was hoped there would be further clarity and engagement between Officers and Government Ministers.
- iii. In the engagement that was taking place with Government, all opportunities were being taken to highlight the work on the emerging Local Plan and issues raised, through regular meetings with Ministers, through the CPCA and the Water Scarcity Group. Officers have been advocating in all meetings that the Local Plan should be the first step for any longer term growth ambitions; the evidence already produced should form the basis for any future planning.
- iv. Officers suggested that the proposed approach of continuing work on the emerging Local Plan, whilst continuing to engage with the CDG, was a proactive and positive response to the current context, noting that Government's wider ambitions were for local authorities to progress local plans as quickly as possible.
- v. The proposed draft revised timetable aim was to submit the Greater Cambridge Local Plan by the end of December 2026, to meet the Government's proposed cut-off date for submitting Local Plans for Examination under the current system. The timetable deadlines involved were tight. It was important that dialogue between Officers and the Committee was kept open and that Members were kept updated.
- vi. Officers would engage with Government to ensure that work already done could be transferred to the new system if necessary, in case the December 2026 date could not be met.
- vii. Officers were mindful of uncertainties in any Plan. The aim was to produce a flexible Plan, but also recognising the need to remain evidence based to be found sound at examination.

The Executive Councillor stated that the Leader of the Council, Councillor Davey had met with Peter Freeman (Chair of the CDG), and it would be appropriate that certain questions were directed to Councillor Davey rather than Officers

The Committee **unanimously endorsed** 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

### **24/23PnT Draft Greater Cambridge Planning Obligations Supplementary Planning Document**

The report referred to the purpose of the draft Greater Cambridge Planning Obligations Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) which was to provide guidance on how the Council sought to apply planning obligations, through the Section 106 process, to new development proposals.

The SPD would supplement Policy 85: Infrastructure delivery, planning obligations and the Community Infrastructure Levy of the Cambridge Local Plan 2018 and Policy TI/8: Infrastructure and New Developments of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2018, alongside other policies within the adopted development plans that sought to secure infrastructure necessary to support the needs generated by proposed developments.

### **Decision of Executive Councillor for Planning, Building Control and Infrastructure**

- i. Agreed the draft Greater Cambridge Planning Obligations Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) (attached at Appendix 1) and accompanying Equalities Impact Assessment (EqIA) (Appendix 2) subject to public consultation.
- ii. Agreed that the preparation of materials and the running of the consultation be delegated to the Joint Director of Planning and Economic Development.
- iii. Agreed that any subsequent material amendments prior to consultation be made by the Executive Councillor for Planning, Building Control and

Infrastructure, in consultation with the Chair and Opposition Spokes and that any subsequent minor amendments and editing changes that do not materially affect the content prior to consultation be delegated to the Joint Director of Planning in consultation with the Executive Councillor for Planning, Building Control and Infrastructure.

### **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 Delivery Manager.

In response to Members' questions the Planning Policy Manager, the Delivery Manager and Deputy Director of GCSP 3C Building Control said the following:

- i. The SPD had been in prepared in accordance with the latest Housing Strategy but would check that it was consistent with the guidance on shared ownership.
- ii. The introductory part of the S106 SPD dealt with viability robustly. There was a need to cross reference this within the SPD to ensure there was not an automatic assumption that the amount of affordable housing provided would reduce in percentage terms if viability could not be meet.
- iii. Officers were aware of problems with adopted roads, but the issue was not for this SPD but planning conditions which could deal with this area directly.
- iv. There was a standard condition which could be implemented when dealing with private highways that outlined roads should be built to an adopted standard and charges to be fair and reasonable. This condition could be promoted with Officers.
- v. Could look to strengthen the wording on Biodiversity Net Gain to outline the requirements and what were aspirational targets.
- vi. The Council's Statement of Community Involvement outlined how the Council engaged on planning matters including SPDs.

- vii. This document was one of the more technical SPD's, this was deliberate to try to speed up and clarify the process that was used for planning obligations.
- viii. Officers feed into community led social media platforms through the communications strategy, both at Cambridge City Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council, for consultation events.
- ix. A face-to-face event was also being planned but this would be for the Cambridge Biomedical Campus as it was believed there would be more interest in that SPD.
- x. When comments to the consultation had been received, Officers would collate the information and identify any changes. The consultation responses and the proposed changes would be shared with the Planning and Transport Scrutiny Committee at a later meeting.
- xi. Would seek to clarify the percentages of s106 sites above 15 homes to be allocated for social rent (paragraph 4.23, p107 & p108 of the agenda pack).
- xii. Safeguards in the Housing Strategy document and the SPD were in place, so affordable housing provision mirrored market housing provisions.

### **Decision of Executive Councillor for Planning, Building Control and Infrastructure**

- iv. Agreed the draft Greater Cambridge Planning Obligations Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) (attached at Appendix 1) and accompanying Equalities Impact Assessment (EqIA) (Appendix 2) subject to public consultation.
- v. Agreed that the preparation of materials and the running of the consultation be delegated to the Joint Director of Planning and Economic Development.
- vi. Agreed that any subsequent material amendments prior to consultation be made by the Executive Councillor for Planning, Building Control and Infrastructure, in consultation with the Chair and Opposition Spokes and that any subsequent minor amendments and editing changes that do not materially affect the content prior to consultation be delegated to the Joint Director of Planning in consultation with the Executive Councillor for Planning, Building Control and Infrastructure.

**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 Delivery Manager.

In response to Members' questions the Planning Policy Manager, the Delivery Manager and Deputy Director of GCSP 3C Building Control said the following:

- xiii. The SPD had been prepared in accordance with the latest Housing Strategy but would check that it was consistent with the guidance on shared ownership.
- xiv. The introductory part of the S106 SPD dealt with viability robustly. There was a need to cross reference this within the SPD to ensure there was not an automatic assumption that the amount of affordable housing provided would reduce in percentage terms if viability could not be met.
- xv. Officers were aware of problems with adopted roads, but the issue was not for this SPD but planning conditions which could deal with this area directly.
- xvi. There was a standard condition which could be implemented when dealing with private highways that outlined roads should be built to an adopted standard and charges to be fair and reasonable. This condition could be promoted with Officers.
- xvii. Could look to strengthen the wording on Biodiversity Net Gain to outline the requirements and what were aspirational targets.
- xviii. The Council's Statement of Community Involvement outlined how the Council engaged on planning matters including SPDs.
- xix. This document was one of the more technical SPD's, this was deliberate to try to speed up and clarify the process that was used for planning obligations.
- xx. Officers feed into community led social media platforms through the communications strategy, both at Cambridge City Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council, for consultation events.

- xxi. A face-to-face event was also being planned but this would be for the Cambridge Biomedical Campus as it was believed there would be more interest in that SPD.
- xxii. When comments to the consultation had been received, Officers would collate the information and identify any changes. The consultation responses and the proposed changes would be shared with the Planning and Transport Scrutiny Committee at a later meeting.
- xxiii. Would seek to clarify the percentages of s106 sites above 15 homes to be allocated for social rent (paragraph 4.23, p107 & p108 of the agenda pack).
- xxiv. Safeguards in the Housing Strategy document and the SPD were in place, so affordable housing provision mirrored market housing provisions.

The Committee **unanimously endorsed** 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 Committee **unanimously endorsed** 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.

#### **24/24PnT Health Impact Assessment Supplementary Planning Document**

##### **Matter for Decision**

The report referred to the purpose of the draft Health Impact Assessment (HIA) SPD which was to provide supplementary guidance on policies in the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan and Cambridge Local Plan that were related to an assessment of health impacts of development.

Publication of the draft SPD for comment would ensure the needs and aspirations of the communities and stakeholders were understood and considered when finalising the document.

### **Decision of Executive Councillor for Planning, Building Control and Infrastructure**

- i. Agreed the draft Health Impact Assessment Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) (attached at Appendix 1 of the Officer's report) and the accompanying Equalities Impact Assessment (EqIA) (Appendix 2 of the Officer's report) subject to public consultation.
- ii. Agreed that the preparation of materials and the running of the consultation be delegated to the Joint Director of Planning and Economic Development.
- iii. Agreed that any subsequent material amendments prior to consultation be made by the Executive Councillor for Planning, Building Control and Infrastructure, in consultation with the Chair and Opposition Spokes and that any subsequent minor amendments and editing changes that do not materially affect the content prior to consultation be delegated to the Joint Director of Planning in consultation with the Executive Councillor for Planning, Building Control and Infrastructure.

### **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 Principal Planning Policy Officer.

In response to Members' questions the Principal Planning Policy Officer, the Planning Policy Manager and Deputy Director of GCSP 3C Building Control said the following:

- i. The SPD sets out the requirements for a full HIA at one hundred plus dwellings which would cover the larger planning applications such as urban extensions.

- ii. If developers came in slightly under this dwelling threshold there is also a catch-all threshold which could be used if the development could have a significant impact on health.
- iii. Would consider how and if the following comments could be referenced in the SPD:
  - The report referenced healthy homes having semi-private external spaces but believed the current Local Plan stated access to private external spaces was a requirement.
  - A comment to developers on mitigation of single aspect homes.
  - Advice on future proofing for dwellings (retro fitting) for air source heat pump.
- iv. The flowchart (p307 of the agenda pack) outlined the general HIA process to the point of submitting a planning application. The difference in screening between South Cambridgeshire District Council (SCDC) and Cambridge City Council (CCC) was down to the adopted Local Plans. SCDC's Local Plan was very specific regarding the threshold and requirements (twenty to one hundred dwellings)
- v. Had recommended a higher threshold for CCC of one hundred dwellings or more as the current SCDC Local Plan could not be changed, felt that one hundred dwellings was appropriate based on Officer's experience and knowledge and the differences between the urban and rural areas.
- vi. There was also an opportunity to look at the threshold differently with developments with potentially significant health impacts; this allowed the threshold to be lowered if considered appropriate.
- vii. The best process would be taken forward in the emerging Greater Cambridge Local Plan.

The Committee **unanimously endorsed** 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.



## **24/25PnT Cambridge Biomedical Campus Supplementary Planning Document Draft for Consultation**

### **Matter for Decision**

The report referred to the Greater Cambridge Biomedical Campus Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) drafted to provide planning guidance to inform development at the existing Cambridge Biomedical Campus (CBC).

The draft SPD did not create policy but set out principles that should be considered in early stages of the planning process to deliver high quality development across the Campus.

The guidance provided in the SPD supported existing policies set out in the Cambridge City Council Local Plan (2018) and South Cambridgeshire District Council Local Plan (2018) for the Campus and would form an integral part of the development management process, setting out material considerations for determining planning applications.

### **Decision of Executive Councillor for Planning, Building Control and Infrastructure**

- i. Agreed the draft Greater Cambridge Biomedical Campus SPD (attached at Appendix 1 of the Officer's report) and accompanying Equalities Impact Assessment (EqIA) (Appendix 2 of the Officer's report) be subject to public consultation.
- ii. Agreed that the preparation of materials and the running of the consultation be delegated to the Joint Director of Planning and Economic Development.
- iii. Agreed that any subsequent material amendments prior to consultation be made by the Executive Councillor for Planning, Building Control and Infrastructure, in consultation with the Chair and Opposition Spokes and that any subsequent minor amendments and editing changes that do not materially affect the content prior to consultation be delegated to the Joint Director of Planning and Economic Development in consultation with the Executive Councillor for Planning, Building Control and Infrastructure.

**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 Principal Planning Policy Officer.

In response to Members' questions the Principal Planning Policy Officer and Planning Policy and Strategy Team Leader said the following:

- i. Cambridge South Station had been planned in terms of a four-platform station.
- ii. Early engagement with local community groups had identified there were constraints and pinch points concerning movement and bus stop locations.
- iii. There would be compromises made due to the size and location of the site.
- iv. Work had been done on entrance and exit points to the station as part of the movement strategy.
- v. The station would be operational within the next six to twelve months. Officers would be evaluating how the station was being used, working with Network Rail, The Combined Authority and other external partners, looking at lessons learnt that could be built into emerging Local Plan Policy.
- vi. Noted the comment that Members thanked Officers for their work on this as there was no Master Plan for this site. There had been so many planning applications on a piecemeal basis, considered by the Joint Development Control Committee, that the document was extremely useful.
- vii. Officers were aware that water was a considerable issue and agreed there should be a reduction of water usage for non-clinical usages. Conditions were used for those non-clinical applications regarding water usage through the planning committee process.
- viii. The SPD would supplement the existing adopted Local Plan while work on the emerging Local Plan would maximise delivery of accessibility.

- ix. The SPD set out in principle the promotion of active travel, encouraging parking for a variety of cycles and other alternative travel alternatives to the car.
- x. Developers were asked to look at strategies to prioritise the cycling and walking infrastructure and show how they had considered alternative car parking strategies on the campus as part of their planning application.
- xi. Appreciated that car parking was a significant issue in the local area. Officers had and would continue to work with resident groups, businesses and the landowner group to determine what strategies were required to be put in place. More detailed worked on transport modelling would be undertaken.
- xii. Officers were also working closely with the County Council as the Highway's Authority and other external partners such as the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority.
- xiii. There were currently adopted car parking standards for the city through the adopted Local Plan, the SPD could not introduce new policy.
- xiv. There would be individuals when visiting the hospital who had no other choice but to drive, such as those with limited mobility issues or who were sick, and parking needed to be provided.
- xv. Had noted that some of the planning applications which had been considered by JDCC, had referenced temporary parking and included future use of car parking when no longer required.
- xvi. There were several schemes planned that could change the way that people went in and out of the campus including South Cambridge Station, Cambridge Southeast Transport Scheme (CSET) and the Sawston Greenway.

The Committee **unanimously endorsed** 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.

## **24/26PnT Neighbourhood Plan Toolkit**

The report referred to the Neighbourhood Planning Toolkit which had been updated to cover neighbourhood planning across Greater Cambridge.

The toolkit reflected national and local changes and requirements and provided up to date guidance that was effective in supporting neighbourhood forums and parish councils. It had been amended to be more user friendly, with the Toolkit now all being in one document with accompanying appendices.

### **Decision of Executive Councillor for Planning, Building Control and Infrastructure**

- i. Agreed the updated version of the Neighbourhood Planning Toolkit (2024) (attached at Appendix 1 of the Officer's report) for use in supporting communities producing neighbourhood plans, and for publication on the Greater Cambridge Shared Planning website.
- ii. Agreed that any future minor amendments required to the Toolkit to keep it up to date, such as updates to links, legislation and other guidance, be delegated to the Joint Director of Planning and Economic Development, and agreed that any material amendments that are required to keep the Toolkit up to date be delegated to the Joint Director of Planning and Economic Development, in consultation with the Executive Councillor for Planning, Building Control and Infrastructure, the Chair and Opposition Spokespersons.

### **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 Principal Planning Policy Officer.

In response to Members' questions the Principal Planning Policy Officer said the following:

- i. Welcomed Members comments that the updated toolkit was a positive and sensible approach in the development of supporting those who wished to produce neighbourhood plans.

The Committee **endorsed the recommendations** by 6 votes to 0 with 1 abstention.

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.

### **24/27PnT To Note Record of Urgent Decision Taken by the Executive Councillor for Planning, Building Control and Infrastructure**

Response to West Suffolk Local Plan (Regulation 19) Submission Draft consultation

The decision was noted.

Response to Government Consultation: Strengthening Planning Policy for Brownfield Development.

The decision was noted.

Response to Government Consultation: Changes to Various Permitted Development Rights

The decision was noted.

Greater Cambridge Housing Trajectory and Housing Land Supply Report

The decision was noted.

Greater Cambridge Brownfield Land Register 2023

The decision was noted.

The Local Highways Improvement (LHI) Panel.

The decision was noted.

South Newnham Neighbourhood Plan – Response to consultation on the submission plan

The decision was noted.

Response to Government Consultation: Proposed reforms to the National Planning Policy Framework and other changes to the planning system

The decision was noted.

RoD Response to Uttlesford Local Plan (Regulation 19) Submission Draft consultation

The decision was noted.

The meeting ended at 8.00 pm

**CHAIR**