

## **JOINT DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE - CAMBRIDGE FRINGES**

21 October 2015  
10.30 am - 1.00 pm

**Present:** Councillors Blencowe (Vice-Chair), Baigent, Bird, Price, C. Smart, Holt, Hipkin, Kenney, Cuffley, de Lacey, Nightingale, Shelton and Van de Weyer

### **Officers Present:**

New Neighbourhoods Development Manager: Sharon Brown  
Principal Planner - New Neighbourhoods: Mark Parsons  
SCDC Planning Team Leader, New Communities: Paul Mumford  
SCDC Head of New Communities: Jane Green  
Senior Planning Officer: Katie Parry  
Legal Advisor: Cara de la Mere  
Committee Manager: Sarah Steed

### **Other Officers Present:**

Environmental Health Officer (University): Greg Kearney  
Senior Technical Officer: Adam Finch

### **Additional Members Present for the Pre-application Briefings:**

Councillor Tim Moore

### **Developer Representatives:**

Miles Lee  
Ben Williamson

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

### **15/8/JDCC Apologies**

Apologies were received from Councillors Bard, Ashwood and Orgee and Councillor Harford attended as alternate for Councillor Orgee.

Councillor Kenney provided apologies for lateness.

To note:

County Councillor Hipkin attended the meeting as a Committee member as he had replaced County Councillor Nethsingha on the Committee. Notification of

the change to the Committee membership was provided after the agenda had been sent to print therefore County Councillor Hipkin's name did not appear in the agenda papers.

Councillor Blencowe chaired the meeting.

### **15/9/JDCC Declarations of Interest**

No declarations of interest were made.

### **15/10/JDCC Minutes**

The minutes of the meeting held on the 18 September 2015 were approved as a correct record subject to the inclusion in item 6 paragraph 9 'Haslingfield Parish Council and residents' on p4 of the minutes.

### **15/11/JDCC 15/1553/S73 - North West Cambridge Development (Lot 1)**

The Committee received a s73 application for permission to vary condition 20 previously imposed on planning application 13/1748/REM.

The Principal Planner (New Neighbourhoods) updated the Committee that the first line of the report should read 2014 and not 2013.

The Applicant's Representative Heather Topel and Noise Consultant Nigel Mann addressed the Committee in support of the application.

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

- i. If the deliveries related to items which had to be delivered first thing in the morning, for example newspapers, may have considered the application differently.
- ii. The noise created by the engine of a delivery vehicle can be turned off, as can the cooler noise but the noise of the cages to carry deliveries from the delivery vehicle into store can be very noisy and would disturb residents.
- iii. The Applicant's Representative had referred to average noise levels created by deliveries; the Committee was concerned with the maximum level of noise which could affect residents' amenity.
- iv. Questioned what types of ventilation had been considered.
- v. Acknowledged that there could be business reasons to request a change to delivery times and this could make a difference to the quality of the

produce. However expressed concern at delivery times during peak periods for example when people were driving to work or children to school.

- vi. There was no reason to change delivery times; the case put forward by the Applicant had not been particularly well made.
- vii. Questioned which direction the bedrooms faced.
- viii. Some Members felt that the impact on residents would not be so severe as to justify refusal.

In response to Members' questions the Principal Planning Officer made the following comments:

- i. Mechanical ventilation had not been proposed as part of this application; members were reminded that they could only consider the application which was before them.
- ii. Residential amenity was the key issue; no other key material considerations had been presented which would change the Officer's recommendation.
- iii. Confirmed that the bedrooms faced onto the primary street and would be affected by the delivery route.

**Resolved (by 7 votes to 6)** to reject the officer recommendation to refuse the application.

**Resolved (by 7 votes to 6)** to approve the S73 application. The approval decision notice would be updated to include all relevant conditions from the original reserved matters permission, otherwise than as varied by this approval. The reasons for approval to be finalised and agreed via the Chair, Vice Chair and Spokes of the Committee.

### **15/12/JDCC Consultation Review of South Cambridgeshire Planning Committee Scheme of Delegation**

The Committee received a consultation paper for the review of South Cambridgeshire District Council's Planning Committee Scheme of Delegation.

The SCDC's Head of New Communities updated the Committee on an alternative proposal, which had emerged following a stakeholder workshop that had been held with SCDC members and Parish Council members. This would replace the automatic referral system that was currently in place so that Parish Council's would need to request an application to go to Planning Committee based on the strength of local feeling.

It was highlighted that this report only related to decisions by the South Cambridgeshire District Council Planning Committee.

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

- i. The intention of the revised proposals were not to disenfranchise Parish Council's but to provide Parish Council's with a platform by which they could act and represent their local communities better and more effectively.
- ii. Planning Officers were not always aware of local views and concerns.
- iii. In these particular circumstances, the discretion of the Chair to agree for an application to go to Planning Committee was a good balance.
- iv. In the City, Ward Councillors picked up issues relating to planning applications through residents associations.

**Resolved (unanimously)** to support the proposed changes to the South Cambridgeshire District Council's Planning Committee Scheme of Delegation as set out in the published officer's report and also asked that the Portfolio Holder gave consideration to the alternative proposal as outlined at Committee, subject to the consultation with SCDC Planning Committee, Parish Councils and interested parties.

### **15/13/JDCC Pre-application Member Briefing - Trumpington Meadows Phase 9**

The Committee received a presentation on the Trumpington Meadows Phase 9 site.

Members raised comments and questions as listed below. Answers were supplied but as this was a pre-application presentation, none of the answers were to be regarded as binding and so are not included in the minutes.

1. Questioned what cycle access was proposed on the site as this was just as important as the cycle parking provision.
2. Questioned what, if any space was proposed for home working or office space.
3. What consideration had been given to the types of trees proposed to be planted along the access roads.
4. Questioned the tenure plan and noted that there sometimes could be a difference of opinion between the Planning Department and registered providers about the distribution of affordable housing on sites but that

this needs to be considered in accordance with the affordable housing supplementary planning guidance requirements.

5. How did the site provide disabled access, for example had the position of street furniture been considered.
6. Questioned the parking provision for affordable units and the average allocation of parking across the site.

### **15/14/JDCC Pre-application Member Briefing - Darwin Green 1 - BDW1 Residential Phase**

The Committee received a presentation on the Darwin Green 1 BDW1 residential phase.

Members raised comments and questions as listed below. Answers were supplied but as this was a pre-application presentation, none of the answers were to be regarded as binding and so are not included in the minutes.

1. Suggested that a higher density of residential development could overlook the supermarket and the nature corridor.
2. Questioned whether parking provision for the ageing population had been considered as sometimes individuals' required extra care at their home, therefore parking needed to be provided close to the property.
3. Pleased to see open parking as part of the residential plots which may prevent the incorporation of the garage within the property and a loss of parking for the properties.
4. Questioned whether any of the properties were designed with elderly or less able residents in mind.

The meeting ended at 1.00 pm

**CHAIR**

This page is intentionally left blank