Question 1: Hurst Park Estate Residents' Association (John Beasley)
Arbury Court Redevelopment

Introduction:
Good afternoon, my name is John Beasley, representing the Hurst Park Estate Residents' Association and my question relates to the documentation and scrutiny arrangements for the Arbury Court redevelopment project.

Background:
The documentation accompanying the agenda of the 6 October scrutiny committee meeting did not include, or refer to, the latest design plans, nor was there a clear justification for the proposed building height and accommodation density in relation to the immediate locality. In addition, members noted a lack of financial information, and an outdated equality assessment.

Consequently, members were asked to scrutinise the Arbury Court redevelopment proposals in the absence of material information, and yet officers present indicated that the scheme was unlikely to be the subject of further formal scrutiny prior to the submission of the planning application.

Question:
Does Cabinet agree that full scrutiny of a complete and final programme plan — including the latest design proposals, a complete financial plan, and all agreed inputs from the Community Panel — is essential before seeking planning permission, and that the Arbury Court redevelopment scheme should therefore return for a further holistic scrutiny session prior to submission?

Question 2: (Andrew Milbourn)
In March, the council convened an Extraordinary Full Council meeting specifically to oppose the loss of democratic control over planning. Its conclusion was that development arrangements must not come at the expense of local democratic oversight and that residents could otherwise lose their voice. The Council's subsequent public statement called it " *completely unjustified"* to transfer major decisions from elected councillors to an unelected body. Council Leader Katie Thornburrow warned *that, "a top down model risks a severe democratic deficit".*
However, with Arbury Court the Cabinet has granted exceptionally broad discretion over Arbury Court's housing numbers, mix, tenure, development route and land arrangements to an appointed officer. There are no requirements for the developed proposal to return to Full Council before submission for planning permission. It is only through Full Council that the democratic voices of residents from affected wards can be heard.

Central Government could, quite reasonably, argue that the Development Corporation is operating on the same delegated basis as the Council. Therefore, the Council has no case for managing the development as they are not operating in a more democratic manner. The number of dwellings is only just below the threshold anyway.
How are the Council's democratic principles consistent with Cabinet granting such exceptionally broad discretion to an appointed officer?

Question 3: Arbur y Road East Residents Association **(Ian Cooper)**

Update on Homes England Strategic Partnership, Development Portfolio Approach
Arbury Court & Kingsway Redevelopments & Davy Road Redevelopments
Project: Arbury Court Redevelopment,

Issue addressed: Lack of Full City Council debate

Background
The full City Council has previously held substantive debates about the principles underlying major council-led developments, including Mill Road Depot, Meadows and Buchan Street, and the ATS/Murketts site on Histon Road. Those debates allowed councillors to address affordable housing, scale of development, open space, community facilities and the treatment of existing communities.
In July 25, the Full Council was scheduled to debate the Arbury Court redevelopment but ran out of time to debate it.
The scheme proposed for the redevelopment of Arbury Court has exceptional density, heights of up to 7 storeys, setting precedents which could apply across suburban and residential areas in the city. It will also require new heavy good vehicle rerouting down Alex Wood Road, significant loss of public parking, and community impacts before, during and after construction.

Question:
Why are the proposals for redeveloping Arbury Court not being treated in the same way as the City's other developments and being subjected to a full council debate?