

**JOINT DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE - CAMBRIDGE FRINGES**

17 December 2014  
10.30 am - 12.50 pm

**Present:** Councillors Bard (Chair), Blencowe (Vice-Chair), Avery, Baigent, Price, C. Smart, Ashwood, Hipkin, Kenney, Bygott, de Lacey, Nightingale and Van de Weyer

Councillor de Lacey left after the vote on item 14/72/JDCC

**Officers Present:**

Head of Planning Services: Patsy Dell  
New Neighbourhoods Development Manager: Sharon Brown  
Planning Team Leader: (SCDC) Paul Mumford  
Principal Planner: Janine Richardson  
Senior Planner: John Evans  
Principal Planner (New Neighbourhoods): Kirsty Carmichael  
Senior Planner (SCDC): David Thompson  
Planning Officer (County) Georg Urban  
Growth and Economy Business Manager, (County) Juliet Richardson  
Principal Urban Designer: Jonathan Brookes

Transport Strategy Officer (County): Mike Salter  
Highways Officer (County): Dr. Jon Finney  
Lead Engineer Development Control (County): Ian Dyer

Committee Manager: Toni Birkin  
Committee Manager: James Goddard  
Legal Advisor: Penny Jewkes

**Developer Representatives:**

Makower Architects: Tim Makower

**FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE COUNCIL**

**14/67/JDCC      Apologies**

Apologies were received from Councillors Dryden and Shelton.

## **Chair's Opening Remarks**

Councillor Bard informed the Committee that County Councillor Reynolds had passed away. The Committee praised his dedication and contributions to this and other Committees and his charitable works.

### **14/68/JDCC      Declarations of Interest**

There were no declarations of interest.

### **14/69/JDCC      Minutes**

The minutes of the meeting of the 19<sup>th</sup> November 2014 were approved and signed as a correct record.

## **Change to Published Agenda Order**

Under paragraph 4.2.1 of the Council Procedure Rules, the Chair used his discretion to alter the order of the agenda items. However, for ease of the reader, these minutes will follow the order of the agenda.

### **14/70/JDCC      14/1410/REM: Public Realm for Darwin Green Local Centre**

The Committee received a reserved matters application for Darwin Green One.

The application related to the construction of public square with hard surfaced pedestrian and cycle areas, access road, disabled and service bay parking, soft landscaping, drainage and utilities pursuant to outline approval 07/0003/OUT.

The Committee noted the following amendment presented in the amendment sheet and verbal updates to conditions as follow:

#### **Condition 2 – Bicycle Parking**

Removal of 4<sup>th</sup> sentence, to enable discussion for the most suitable position for the extra three Sheffield stands: *'and level with the existing Sheffield stands and proposed pebble bollards'*.

## Condition 7 - Landscaping

Part ii) to be revised to request an additional bench to provide more face to face seating: *'Provision of an additional bench to the south of the square, between the proposed community rooms and existing bench and planter features, to provide face to face seating'*.

Mark Sperrin addressed the Committee in support of the application on behalf of Barratt Eastern Counties.

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

- i. Sought clarification regarding predicted number of cycle movements
- ii. Expressed concerns that requiring cyclists to slow down in order to cross the square would be detrimental to the aspiration that this would become the main cycle route from Girton in to Cambridge.
- iii. Questioned the looped route that cars would take to cross the square.
- iv. Expressed concerns that existing bus route were being reduced due to congestion and questioned what the impact of additional demand would be.

In response to Members' questions the (Officer) said the following:

- i. The aspiration was for a fifteen minutes frequency for the bus service serving Darwin Green with initial funding coming from the developer to support this.
- ii. The shared space public realm in Cambridge City centre is generally successful. Conflicts between different modes of transport are not generally considered problematic.
- iii. The Design Code does not envisage a fast flowing dedicated cycle route through the Square. Appropriately designed street furniture will help to moderate cycle speeds, without creating too much obstruction through the public realm.

### The Committee:

**Resolved (unanimously)** to grant the reserved matters application in accordance with the revised officer recommendation and with minor alterations to the wording of conditions 2 and 7, for the reasons set out in the officer report, and subject to the conditions recommended by the officers.

**14/71/JDCC      C/05001/13/CC/C1 Land at Chesterton Sidings**

The Committee received an application for a Discharge of Condition.

The discharge related to Condition 25, details of footways and cycle ways attached to permission dated 23 July 2014 for construction of new railway station building and associated works.

Bob Menzies, addressed the Committee on behalf of the applicant and in support of the application.

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

- i. Expressed satisfaction that Mr Menzies, of the County Council Infrastructure Delivery Team, had confirmed that the crossing provision would be revisited if the volume of traffic proved to be different from the predicted levels.
- ii. Expressed scepticism for the predicted numbers and peak flow estimates.
- iii. Expressed disappointment that committee report pack had not included more detailed diagrams of the crossing points.
- iv. Expressed concerns at the temporary nature of the proposals.
- v. Questioned the figures used in the modelling of the proposed junctions.
- vi. Requested that the County Council reconsidered the speed limit for Cowley Road and suggested that 20 mph would be more appropriate than the current 30 mph.
- vii. Suggested that other options could have been explored and that the option for consideration was unsafe.

In response to Members' questions the Planning Officer (County Council) and Highway Engineer (County Council) stated the following:

- viii. Added clarity to the priorities for the various cycle and pedestrian crossing points and stated that the aim was to avoid conflict points. At three of the four crossing points, cyclists and pedestrians had priority.
- ix. Officers explained the rationale behind the choice of junctions, and confirmed that this was based on predicted traffic movements.
- x. Confirmed that the situation in the area could change requiring changes to the junctions as a later date.

The Head of Planning clarified the decision under consideration and suggested that Members should consider if the proposal before them was acceptable to allow the discharge of the condition. The situation would be monitored and the decision could be reviewed in 12 months time. Members agreed that requiring

this as a condition was unnecessary and the applicant had already given an undertaking to this effect.

The Committee:

**Resolved (by 10 votes to 1 with 2 abstentions)** to grant the discharge of condition 25, in accordance with the officer recommendation, for the reasons set out in the officer report, and subject to the conditions recommended by the officers.

**14/72/JDCC S/2296/14/OL: Orchard House, High Ditch Road, Fen Ditton Cambridge**

The Committee received an application for Outline planning permission.

The application related to for the erection of 2 dwellings, demolition of existing garage, alterations to the existing access and the creation of 2 new vehicular accesses.

The Committee noted the amendment sheet and the associated change to the recommendation as follow:

*The recommendation is amended to: Approval with delegated powers for officers to conclude a Section 106 Agreement (subject to outcome of legal advice) and the conditions listed in the report. Since drafting the report, the District Council has sought legal advice on the implications of the changes to the National Planning Policy Guidance. We are awaiting the outcome of this advice. Members' consent is sought to allow officers delegated powers to conclude a section 106 agreement prior to issuing the decision, if legal advice is that this would be lawful. This agreement would cover contributions to the provision of open space and infrastructure, as required by the policies of the LDF. Delegated powers are also sought so that if the legal advice is that a section 106 agreement can no longer be sought, an approval subject to conditions only could be issued without further reference to this committee.*

The Committee made the following comments expressed some concerns regarding delegations to officers.

The Committee noted the comments of the legal advisor regarding the changes to the ability to apply tariff style contributions to application with small unit numbers or of small size.

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

### **14/73/JDCC      Pre Application Briefing: Darwin Green One Local Centre**

The Committee received a presentation from Makower Architects on Darwin Green One Local Centre.

Members raised comments/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. Queried materials to be used in the design.
2. Sought clarification that brick design patterns would be implemented by builders as per the Architect's design ie how quality control.
  - Stated attractive brick colours should be chosen.
  - Were encouraged by the generous set back of the window reveals
  - Signposted issues with brick patterns/colours in Great Kneighton and asked the Architect to be mindful of these. Also how rendering was ageing unattractively in Orchard Park.
3. Queried why affordable housing had less than 3 bedrooms ie family sized houses were just in the market sections.
4. Asked for clarification on the density of housing across the site.
5. Noted parking spaces were available for health centre staff, and queried provision for visitors and how these would be managed.
6. Sought clarification on how (house) courtyards could be made attractive to look at (eg from house frontages) as they were essentially car parking spaces.
7. Noted trees would be planted in car parking areas and queried measures to be implemented to stop tree roots damaging the paving.
8. Queried how the supermarket design and operator would be integrated into the Darwin Green One Local Centre site. Tesco at Amersham was signposted as an example of good integration.

The meeting ended at 12.50 pm

**CHAIR**