

JOINT DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE - CAMBRIDGE FRINGES

16 April 2014
10.30 am - 12.35 pm

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

Councillors Corney, de Lacey, Nightingale and Van de Weyer left after the vote on item 14/25/JDCC

Officers Present:

Head of Planning Services: Patsy Dell
New Neighbourhoods Development Manager: Sharon Brown
Principal Planner - New Neighbourhoods: Kirsty Carmichael
Principal Planner - New Neighbourhoods: Mike Ovenden
Principal Planner - New Neighbourhoods: Mark Parsons
Principal Planner - New Neighbourhoods: Elizabeth Rolph
Senior Environmental Health Officer: Victoria Whitelaw
Legal Advisor: Penny Jewkes
Committee Manager: James Goddard

Other Officers Present:

Assistant Engineer (County): Jon Finney

FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE COUNCIL

14/21/JDCC Apologies

Apologies were received from Councillors Reid, Tunnacliffe and Shelton.

14/22/JDCC Declarations of Interest

Name	Item	Interest
Councillor Ashwood	14/28/JDCC	Personal: Member of Trumpington Resident's Association

14/23/JDCC Minutes

The minutes of the meeting of the 26 February and 19 March 2014 were agreed as a correct record.

14/24/JDCC 07/0003/FUL - Darwin Green One, Land Between Huntingdon Road and Histon Road, Cambridge

The Committee received an application to discharge Condition 9 for a Strategy for Youth and Play Provision, pursuant to the outline permission 07/0003/OUT approved on December 18th 2013 for mixed use development of up to 1593 dwellings, primary school, community facilities, retail units and transport infrastructure and open space.

In response to Members' questions the Principal Planner said the following:

- i. The multi-use game area in the Central Park would be for children and for teenagers.
- ii. This application specifically concerned facilities for children and teenagers. The central park would provide general facilities for all age groups.
- iii. Officers had discussed facilities for teenagers that could be provided in the central park. Although a climbing wall had been suggested, this was not practicable. Officers would look at the possibilities of providing one on Darwin Green Two.
- iv. There were mechanisms in place to ensure that play areas would be provided at appropriate times so they would be available when houses were built. A Phasing Strategy would come to JDCC in June 2014 to set out how delivery would be phased. S106 also had triggers requiring play areas to be in place when a set number of houses were completed.
- v. Barratts would bring forward larger play areas at the same time as the smaller play areas (as triggered by housing numbers).
- vi. Officers had not discussed if water themed play facilities would be stocked with anything such as fish.

The Principal Planner undertook to review if water themed play facilities would be stocked with fish etc as part of the central park planning application.

- vii. P27 of the agenda report pack contained a typographical error stating various facilities would be located on 0.6 hectares of land. This should in fact read 6 hectares of land.

The Committee:

Resolved (by 13 votes with 1 abstention) to discharge condition 9 in respect of 07/0003/OUT with amendment to page 13 of the document to correct the area of Central Park to 6 hectares.

14/25/JDCC 14/0109/REM- Lot 8 located Within Land Between Huntingdon Road, Madingley Road, NW Cambridge

The Committee received a reserved matters application for 73 residential units, including 20 one bedroom key worker units and 53 two bedroom key worker units, alongside car and cycle parking, landscaping, public realm, utilities and associated ancillary structure pursuant to 13/1402/S73.

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

The Informative relating to enabling works to also include the following text:

Underground enabling works for the purpose of conditions is defined as works approved under planning permissions 13/0537/REM and S/0857/13/RM (Earthworks) and 13/1401/REM and S/2037/13/RM (Underground Infrastructure within this application boundary).

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

- i. Key worker and market housing integration was different to the normal configuration, but JDCC accepted the reason for doing so as an exception to the norm.
- ii. Sought reassurance that details signed off by JDCC (eg cycle parking facilities, access roads) would be implemented, and asked what procedures are in place to ensure that development is carried out as agreed.
- iii. Sought reassurance that disparate reserved matters applications would link together as they were coming forward piecemeal.
- iv. Welcomed sustainable transport measures, such as the car club.

In response to Members' questions the Principal Planner said the following:

- i. A combination of overarching strategies such as the Phasing Plan, along with conditions attached to the outline consent and S106 clauses ensured that details in the different reserved matters applications linked together. For example, to ensure that sites were accessible by walking, cycling, private car and public transport.
- ii. For this application, access routes (car, bike and walking) would be in place as part of phase 1. Officers wanted to encourage cycling as a means of transport from an early stage.
- iii. Officers would monitor details signed off by JDCC to ensure they are delivered. Enforcement action could be undertaken if this did not occur. The Highways Authority had mechanisms to resolve issues on adopted roads. Unadopted roads would be covered by clauses set out in the s106.

The Assistant Engineer said the site was covered by the Highways Act (1970), so the Highways Authority had various enforcement powers to use if it chose to. The aim was to engage with developers in the first instance, and use legal powers as a secondary option.

The New Neighbourhoods Development Manager said an Officer Steering Group was working with the developer to monitor implementation on site.

- iv. Roofs could not be used as amenity space as they hosted solar panels and features such as brown roofs that linked into the Drainage Strategy. However, more than adequate amenity space was provided in courtyards and open areas.
- v. The developer provided sufficient bike parking facilities to meet minimum policy requirements. There was potential to provide more, which can be discussed with the applicant.
- vi. The location of underground waste collection facilities were set out in the approved plans. These were based on Design Code and City Council refuse collection requirements.

The Committee:

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

14/26/JDCC Change of Chairs

Only City and County Members have voting rights on Bell School and Clay Farm applications.

Councillor Blencowe took the Chair for these sections of the meeting.

14/27/JDCC 13/1786/REM - Bell School Development Site, Babraham Road, Cambridge

The Committee received a reserved matters application (access, appearance, landscaping, layout and scale) pursuant to outline permission 13/1118/S73 for 270 dwellings (including Affordable Housing), 100 bed student accommodation for Bell Language School, public open space, associated roads, footpaths/cycleways and drainage infrastructure.

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

Condition 22 Approved plans refers to drawing AA2671/2.1/805P 'Rev E'. It should read 'Rev F'.

Ms Thorndyke (Applicant's Agent) addressed the Committee in support of the application.

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

- i. Welcomed the amendment to affordable home locations on the site.
- ii. Welcomed having a mix of affordable, retirement and life time homes.

In response to Members' questions the Head of Planning Services, New Neighbourhoods Development Manager and the Principal Planner said the following:

- i. The development as a whole met or exceeded internal space standards. A very small minority of properties did not, but Officers felt the development as a whole was acceptable.
- ii. Internal space standards were included in the 2014 emerging Local Plan, but only limited weight could be accorded to this as yet as the policy had been subject to objections.
- iii. The distribution of affordable housing complied with Supplementary Planning Document criteria. The distribution of affordable housing was agreed with BPHA as the affordable housing provider.
- iv. The issue of on-site community facilities had been debated as part of outline planning permission in 2008. A 'temporary' community building

secured through an outline permission condition (separate to the retirement building) would be in place for 5 years, it would then be open to the City Council to adopt as a permanent facility if considered appropriate in the future. There would also be a community area within the over 55s block.

- v. The Bell School development was contributing towards off-site community facilities on Clay Farm, such as library facilities.
- vi. On-site bike storage facilities exceeded policy standards.
- vii. Mobility scooter charging points would be available in the retirement building.

The Committee:

Resolved (by 8 votes to 0 with 2 abstentions (SCDC Councillors did not vote)) to grant the application for planning permission in accordance with the officer recommendation as amended, for the reasons set out in the officer report, and subject to the conditions recommended by the officers.

14/28/JDCC 14/0093/FUL Land Between Long Road and Shelford Road (Clay Farm/Showground Site), Cambridge

The Committee received an application for full planning permission for the erection of a five storey building to accommodate community facilities, library, café, youth facilities, touchdown space for police and social services, medical centre 20 affordable housing units, and associated parking, amenity areas, refuse storage and landscaping.

The Committee received a representation in objection to the application from Mr Roberts, Chair of Trumpington Residents Association.

The representation covered the following issues:

- i. Trumpington Resident's Association supported the design of the application in principle.
- ii. Raised the following concerns:
 - Condition 15 (times of usage) – These were too restrictive for youth groups.
 - Condition 17b (noise control) - It was unrealistic to expect people to leave doors and windows closed in hot weather.
 - Walking, cycle and public transport links were required from day 1.

Mr Carter, Head of Strategic Housing at the City Council, representing the City Council as the applicant addressed the Committee in support of the application.

In response to public speakers' comments the Principal Planner and Senior Environmental Health Officer made the following responses:

- i. Conditions were imposed to balance the needs of different building users. These could be reviewed if required.
- ii. The building had been designed to limit the impact of noise on residents and neighbours.
- iii. A noise assessment had been undertaken, and a number of standard conditions were attached to mitigate noise impact.
- iv. A ventilation statement produced by the applicants had been reviewed. Mechanical ventilation (not full air conditioning) was in place, so there should be no need for doors and windows to be opened in hot weather.

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

- i. Expressed concern regarding the limited provision of on-site car parking and suggested that a lack of capacity may limit the opportunity for facilities within the building to generate revenue if 'customers' were unable to access them.
- ii. Transport links appeared to be focussed on new rather than existing Trumpington residents who wanted to access libraries and community centres etc.

In response to Members' questions the Head of Planning Services, New Neighbourhoods Development Manager and the Principal Planner gave the following responses:

- i. The site wide Master Plan approved with the outline permission limited the number of car parking spaces that could be made available in Clay Farm. There were 22 allocated for the community centre, 5 of which were for disabled people, and 12 were allocated to the medical centre for priority booking. There were a further 34 pay and display parking spaces in the nearby area. The site was also accessible by walking, bike, mobility scooter and public transport. Strategic walking and bicycle links were located nearby, as was a guided bus stop.
- ii. A traffic regulation order covered the Clay Farm site to mitigate parking outside of authorised areas.
- iii. BPHA (affordable housing provider) was marketing homes as car free, to attract residents without cars. Homes were aimed at Addenbrooke's key workers who were expected to commute on public transport.

- iv. The Southern Fringe Community Forum would continue to review travel plan arrangements for the site. The Forum were liaising with the County Council to ensure bus services operated in the evening. Stagecoach had agreed to do this in principle, a start date was still to be determined. City and County Council Officers would continue to review wider Trumpington transport issues.
- v. The use of short term pump priming from the Clay Farm S106 is in place to provide additional bus services to the site, with the expectation that these routes would become permanent and self-financing.
- vi. The site had limited space. The number of car parking spaces had to be limited in order to fit maximum facilities on-site.
- vii. There were sufficient storage facilities for residents' bike and trailers. These were aimed at key workers, not people with children.
- viii. A mix of 1 and 2 bedroom housing units were available to accommodate key workers' needs in accordance with balanced and mixed community's requirements.
- ix. The community centre had capacity for approximately 200 people. It would be marketed as a venue with sustainable transport links ie accessible via park & ride rather than by car. It was designed to host a variety of user groups and minimise the impact of noise on neighbours. The Southern Fringe Community Forum would represent users' views and liaise with City Council Officers on whether the building was fit for purpose. The community centre management company will monitor the situation and resolve any queries that arose.

The Legal Advisor said that as the land owner, the City Council could set lease conditions to control building usage.

The Committee:

Resolved (by 7 votes to 1 with 2 abstentions (SCDC Councillors did not vote)) to grant the 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 12.35 pm

CHAIR