

**JOINT DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE - CAMBRIDGE FRINGES**

19 March 2014  
10.30 - 11.55 am

**Present:** Councillors Bard (Chair), Blencowe (Vice-Chair), Price, Reid, Smart, Tunnacliffe, Ashwood, Hipkin, Kenney, Reynolds, Bygott, Corney, de Lacey, Nightingale and Van de Weyer

**Officers Present:**

New Neighbourhoods Development Manager: Sharon Brown  
Urban Design & Conservation Manager: Glen Richardson  
Principal Planner - New Neighbourhoods: Mark Parsons  
Senior Planner – New Neighbourhoods: Sophie Pain  
Senior Sustainability Officer (Design & Construction): Emma Davies  
Committee Manager: James Goddard

**FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE COUNCIL**

**14/16/JDCC Apologies**

Apologies were received from Councillors Dryden, Tucker and Shelton. Councillors Bygott and Tunnacliffe were present as alternates.

Apologies were also received from Penny Jewkes (Legal Advisor).

**14/17/JDCC Declarations of Interest**

<b>Name</b>	<b>Item</b>	<b>Interest</b>
Councillor Bygott	14/19/JDCC 14/20/JDCC	Personal: University of Cambridge Alumnus
Councillor de Lacey	14/19/JDCC 14/20/JDCC	Personal: University of Cambridge Alumnus and former teacher
Councillor Reid	14/20/JDCC	Personal: Director of Joint Management Vehicle

**14/18/JDCC Minutes**

The Committee agreed to defer reviewing the minutes of the 22 February 2014 JDCC until 16 April 2014.

**14/19/JDCC 13/1827/REM - Lot 3 North West Cambridge**

The Committee received a reserved matters application (access, appearance, landscaping, layout and scale) pursuant to 11/1402/S73 for the construction of 232 keyworker units (including 87 one bedroom units, 140 two bedroom units and 5 four bedroom shared units). Also included within this application is a semi-basement car park and cycle parking, a flexible community space, residential car parking courts for wider local centre uses and the adjacent access Lane from the primary street to the residential courts, landscaping, utilities and associated ancillary structures.

The Committee noted the following amendment presented in the amendment sheet:

A further plan has been received which enables an amendment to condition 7 as follows:

The allocation of visitor and permit holder's car parking spaces along the access lane shall be carried out in accordance with drawing NWC1-MOL-01-ZZZ-GF-DRG-AR-00065 PA01.

REASON: To ensure that there are adequate parking spaces available for the uses proposed and in the interests of vitality and viability of the local centre (NWCAAP policies NW19 and NW21).

An additional informative should be added to define the works included as 'enabling works'.

'For clarity, piling (instalment of pile caps and ground beams) will be included under the term 'enabling works' as described within the relevant conditions that are part of this Reserved Matters Permission.

This is because piling works in the instance of Lot 3, will not prejudice the discharge of conditions worded as 'prior to the commencement, except for enabling works.'

An amendment to the wording within condition 2 (ii & iii), from parking courtyards to residential courtyards for consistency with the application submission documents.

Ms Topel (Applicant's Representative) addressed the Committee in support of the application.

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

- i. Welcomed the design of the application.
- ii. Sought clarity over statements in the report about the site in relation to the administrative boundary.
- iii. Key worker housing does not meet the usual requirements in terms of clustering, but was acceptable due to special circumstances for the site.
- iv. Letter boxes and door bells needed to be accessible from the street.
- v. Expressed concern that people may park their cars in unsafe areas eg pavements if there was inadequate (on street etc) provision of spaces. Suggest carrots (incentives), not just sticks (ie lack of provision/enforcement) were required to encourage people to switch from private cars to public transport, walking or cycling to/from the site.
- vi. Expressed concern that the height of the building may create a wind tunnel.

In response to Members' questions the New Neighbourhoods Development Manager, Principal Planner, Senior Sustainability Officer and Senior Planning Officer said the following:

- i. The University's site was spread over an area within both City Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council boundaries. This particular site was within Cambridge City boundary.
- ii. Undertook to clarify in future planning reports/maps where municipal boundaries lay, to show if an application was within a particular council's boundaries.
- iii. Referred to conditions controlling car parking set out in the Officer's report. Estate management would monitor where people parked their cars, and were responsible for taking enforcement action when cars were parked outside designated parking areas.
- iv. The site was supported through the City Council and University Key Workers Car parking Strategies, plus the University's Travel Plan. The

site could be accessed by private car plus cycle and public transport links. Various amenities and travel plan measures (eg the car club) would be available in phase 1 of the development to encourage people away from car usage. The number of car parking spaces applied for, and use of car club would be monitored for future phases.

- v. All residential units were expected to reach code level 5 and have adequate levels of sunlight. Cambridgeshire Quality Panel comments on P63 & 64 of the Officer's report referred to the lowest performing units.
- vi. A small number of apartments don't achieve maximum code for sustainable homes day-lighting credits. In doing this those units still obtain code level 5, with 157 of the units achieving the maximum 3 day-lighting credits.
- vii. The design aimed to balance attractiveness with features such as recessed windows to minimise overheating. Windows would be chamfered to stop birds roosting in them.
- viii. There was no policy reason for JDCC to recommend a condition requiring external mail boxes and door bells, therefore an informative had been suggested by officers.

JDCC Members asked for the informative listed on the amendment sheet to be reworded to make it clear JDCC expected mail boxes and door bells to be accessible.

- ix. The different heights of buildings should not create a wind tunnel.
- x. Shared key worker housing were duplex units split over two floors for communal living by four individuals.
- xi. The term "Faith Worker" was defined in the s106 agreement. On-site Faith Workers would be located near to 'customers' and housed according to their needs ie as a single person or family group.
- xii. The Key Worker Strategy and University Housing Needs Study provided the evidence base for housing need. The documents informed decisions for the site and were available for inspection upon request.

The Committee:

**Resolved (unanimously)** to grant the reserved matters application for planning permission in accordance with the officer recommendation, for the

reasons set out in the officer report, and subject to the conditions recommended by the officers with an additional informative as set out below:

The mailboxes shown on drawing D-A-G100-RMA-P1 shall be laid out in accordance with the drawing. Any changes to these proposals will be discussed with officers first and should there be any changes to this, then the University should be clear on the means by which residents can obtain information and external parties can deliver information about community events or matters that may be of interest to residents in order to ensure that residents are part of the community and the wider area. The Joint Development Control Committee expressed a keen desire for the letterboxes to be externally accessible for the above reasons and a dialogue will be maintained between the applicant and the local authority relating to this matter through the established steering group meetings.

**14/20/JDCC      13/1828/REM - Lot 7 North West Cambridge**

The Committee received a reserved matters application (access, appearance, landscaping, layout and scale) pursuant to 11/1402/S73 for the community centre and nursery, alongside a pedestrianized Community Square, with cycle parking, landscaping, utilities and associated ancillary structures.

The Committee noted the following amendment presented in the amendment sheet.

An additional informative should be added to define the works included as 'enabling works'.

'For clarity, piling (instalment of pile caps and ground beams) will be included under the term 'enabling works' as described within the relevant conditions that are part of this Reserved Matters Permission.

This is because piling works in the instance of Lot 3, will not prejudice the discharge of conditions worded as 'prior to the commencement, except for enabling works.

Ms Topel (Applicant's Representative) addressed the Committee in support of the application.

In response to the report the Committee commented the tower would be a landmark building and so needed to be attractive.

In response to Members' questions the Urban Design & Conservation Manager and Senior Planning Officer said the following:

- i. The eastern elevation tower CGI was not the best drawing to show the building's features.

There was detailing in the brick work to soften its features and make the building look interesting. The design aimed to balance functionality, sustainability and attractiveness.

- ii. Conditions were in place to control materials. High quality materials were required for the design.
- iii. Car parking provision should be sufficient on site. There would be a local car parking pool that could be used at different times by different facilities (eg shops and community centres) as they would be open at different times.
- iv. 319 car parking spaces across all the local centre uses is deemed appropriate through the North West Cambridge Area Action Plan (NWCAAP) standards, this was reduced to 304 when it was felt appropriate that the number of spaces could be rationalised by sharing them between different local centres.
- v. There is no separation between visitor and staff spaces in the NWCAAP standards.
- vi. Car parking provision was based on expected 'normal' not 'exceptional' use. Officers were looking to see if primary school parking could be used out of hours for exceptional events.
- vii. Good public transport links should help mitigate car parking issues.
- viii. Community centres were intended for multi-use through their general design. Faith Workers etc could then use the buildings when they required.
- ix. The community square was a mixed use area for pedestrians and cyclists. It included raised areas for socialising on the outer edges away from the shared surface.
- x. The ridgeway provided a cycle route from Storey's Way through Market Square and towards Girton. Trees and street furniture near the community square were deliberately positioned to highlight to cyclists

that they were approaching a shared area and encourage slower speeds before entering the mixed use community square. This design had been used on the continent and evidenced showed it worked i.e. was safe for all users.

- xi. Lot 7 buildings included parapets to mask photovoltaic panels and other 'plant' features.
- xii. Public art was not included in Lot 7, but would be available on the wider site (eg part of market square within Lot 2). The Public Art Strategy was running in parallel with the overall site development. Public art details would be submitted to JDCC.
- xiii. All local centres' car parking needs were reviewed in-line with car parking standards. Officers reviewed which facilities could share spaces and expected visitor types eg emergency services and shoppers. Officers were confident there was adequate car parking provision in-line with parking standards.
- xiv. Paragraph 8.66 (agenda P86) may unintentionally confuse bird names. However, the Ecology Officer was happy birds referred to in the report would be attracted to the locations indicated.

The Senior Planning Officer undertook to review references to birds in paragraph 8.66.

#### The Committee:

**Resolved (unanimously)** to grant the reserved matters application for planning permission in accordance with the officer recommendation, for the reasons set out in the officer report, and subject to the conditions recommended by the officers.

The meeting ended at 11.55 am

**CHAIR**