

JOINT DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE - CAMBRIDGE FRINGES

18 February 2015

9.30 - 11.50 am

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

Officers Present:

Head of Planning Services: Patsy Dell

New Neighbourhoods Development Manager: Sharon Brown

Principal Planner - New Neighbourhoods: Mike Ovenden

Development Officer (Growth): Sarah Lyons

Legal Advisor: Penny Jewkes

Committee Manager: James Goddard

Other Officers Present:

Noise Consultant: Gordon Brown

Planning Officer (County): Georg Urban

Developer Representatives:

Countryside Properties: Jonathon Gimblitt

Tate Hindle: David Cameron

Tate Hindle: Mike Jamieson

Townsmith Landscape: Martha Arm

FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE COUNCIL

15/6/JDCC Apologies

Apologies were received from Councillor Avery. Councillor Tunnicliffe attended as the Alternate.

15/7/JDCC Declarations of Interest

No declarations of interest were made.

15/8/JDCC Minutes

The minutes of the meeting of the 17th December 2014 were approved and signed as a correct record subject to the following amendment (shown as bold and struck through text):

15/4/JDCC Lot 2, North West Cambridge 14/1722/REM

- x The mix of housing for phase 1 was based on immediate key worker needs. Therefore most were 1-2 bedrooms, with a few 4 bedroom units in shared houses. 3-4 bedroom houses were expected as part of market house proposals **in the remainder of later** phase 1.

15/9/JDCC Meeting Dates 2015 -16

Members were advised that the agenda contained a typographical error listing 2015/16 as 2014/15.

Committee dates were unanimously agreed as follows for 2015/16:

2015/16	Committee Meeting	Development Control Forum
May	20 th	As required
June	17 th	As required
July	15 th	As required
August	19 th	As required
September	16 th	As required
October	21 st	As required
November	18 th	As required
December	16 th	As required
January	20 th	As required
February	17 th	As required
March	16 th	As required
April	20 th	As required
May	18 th	As required

15/10/JDCC S/0467/13/CM Chesterton Rail Freight Sidings, Chesterton Junction, Cowley Road, Cambridge, CB4 0DL

The Committee received an application for reconfiguration and consolidation of the existing minerals processing and transfer operation including the

installation of covered mineral storage bays, alterations and extensions to existing feeder unit, new office, welfare and workshop buildings, reconfiguration of site circulation and parking area, new boundary fencing and other works associated with relocating rail sidings to serve the mineral processing site.

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

- New conditions 9-12. Old condition 9 now becomes new condition 12, old condition 23 now becomes new condition 26 etc.
- The recommendation to grant permission was unchanged, except that the requirement to complete a legal agreement has been withdrawn.

Mr Hopwood (Applicant's Agent) addressed the Committee in support of the application.

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

- i. The city has grown to expand around industrial sites that were previously on the outskirts. There are concerns over the adverse impact of the proposal on residents, but it is an established site. If it were to be moved elsewhere, it would simply move the impacts elsewhere with it
- ii. Raised the following concerns:
 - A lot of industrial operations were moving near residential areas (including traveller sites).
 - Noise and dust impact of industrial operations on residential areas.
 - Height of the environmental screen.

In response to Members' questions regarding the noise assessment methodology Mr Brown said the following:

- i. Initially there was disagreement between the City Council and Applicant on how to undertake the noise assessment.
- ii. A complex assessment was undertaken during a period of change in national assessment standards. It was hard to integrate these into planning standards, which led to difficulties in agreeing the methodology to use.
- iii. The site has high levels of background noise, adding another noise source would have limited impact (absolute and relative).
- iv. There would be an increase in ambient noise level of 1 decibel, which would not be regarded as a significant impact in the context of National Planning Practice Guidance.

In response to Members' questions the Planning Officer said the following:

- i. Hours of operation were set out in (new) condition 12. The coated roadstone plant and mineral transfer facility shall not be operated except during the hours of 0630 to 1700 Mondays to Fridays and 0630 to 1300 on Saturdays. No operations shall take place on the site at any time on Sundays, Bank Holidays and Public Holidays.
- ii. Maintenance could be undertaken outside of normal operating hours.
- iii. No complaints had been received regarding the hours of operation. If they were restricted it would take away the existing rights of the operator leaving the Council open to complaint.
- iv. The Applicant had requested a variation to operating hours under paragraph 4.12. It was within the Committee's gift to grant this variation or continue the existing operating hours set out in (new) condition 12.
- v. There would be no intensification of site usage. This would require a new application.
- vi. Surface water drainage was addressed through conditions 24-26. Drainage plans eg SUDS would be worked out in future once submitted by the Applicant, and would be reviewed by the Environment Agency.
- vii. The noise attenuation barrier would mitigate noise from the site.
- viii. Noise assessment criteria was the same for static and mobile homes. There would be no difference in impact on either. Absolute noise levels already exceeded acceptable levels. A 1 decibel increase would not make a significant impact.
- ix. Dust mitigation measures were set out in (new) condition 18.
- x. Dust should not travel beyond the site boundary, but there may be other sources already in the area around the station. The aggregates depot was operating already, so would not be adding a new dust source to the area.

The Head of Planning Services added off-site dust monitoring was something that the operator and the mineral planning authority could agree between themselves.

- xi. The proposal should not impact on station access as the existing site access would be used by the reconfigured aggregates depot.

A general consultation regarding development around the station area had been undertaken as part of the Local Plan process.

Councillor de Lacey requested new condition 9 be amended to include a specific reference to lorries. This was agreed nem con.

The Committee:

Resolved (by 15 votes to 0 with 1 abstention) 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 amended conditions recommended by the officers.

15/11/JDCC 14/1736/REM Clay Farm Parcels 6 & 7

Councillor Blencowe assumed the Chair for this item.

The Committee received a reserved matters application (access, appearance, landscaping, layout and scale) pursuant to outline planning permission 07/0620/OUT for the development of 165 residential dwellings, plus associated open space, infrastructure and car parking

The Principal Planner referred to report paragraph 8.28: The s106 agreement contains a cascade mechanism to allow the approved affordable housing provider (BPHA) to seek a variation to the split based on appropriate evidence and financial appraisals explaining the need for the variation. Officers had not yet been able to complete this process due to holidays. It was expected to be W/C 23 February 2015.

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

- i. Complimented the design.
- ii. Storage was required for different sized/shape bikes.

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

- i. This development would deliver the affordable housing as 60% social rented and 40% intermediate. Figures could not go below those submitted, which were based on previous discussions.
- ii. The drag distance for southern courtyard waste bins should not be a problem for refuse crews.
- iii. The Ecology Officer raised no objections to the Clay Farm Parcels 6 & 7 development, in particular regarding the impact on bats or hedgehogs.

- iv. Information regarding sunlight and daylight suggested there should be no negative impact where two storey buildings were surrounded by higher ones. The street scene would also be improved by different building types and heights.
- v. The housing mix for the Reserved Matters Site was set out on P60 of the agenda pack.

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

- i. The s106 agreement had been agreed in the outline permission, which included affordable housing figures.
- ii. Financial viability information is required from housing providers. BPHA experienced a change in circumstances in 2011 due to HCA changes to national funding for affordable housing. BPHA resubmitted financial information reflecting the change in circumstances.

The Legal Advisor stated the s106 process had to be followed. If the Council is satisfied with the information submitted, it has no discretion to renegotiate the agreement. The cascade set out in the s106 agreement set parameters for the split of affordable housing in case the original figures were not deliverable. JDCC asked for final cascade figures to be reported back to committee in future. The Development Officer undertook to do so.

The Committee:

Resolved (by 8 votes to 0 with 0 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.

15/12/JDCC Pre-application Briefing: Parcels 8A & 8B Clay Farm

The Committee received a presentation from Countryside Properties on Parcels 8A & 8B Clay Farm.

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. What thought has been given to the size of trees on the development in 20-30 years? IE the impact of large trees on homes. It would be advisable to

avoid foreseeable problems.

2. There were no cars, street furniture, speed limits or road markings shown in presentation images. Could these be expected in future?

3. Sought clarification regarding parking spaces available, specifically around the park area.

4. Welcomed houses facing a variety of directions (north and south). Queried if measures would be put in place to prevent south facing properties overheating or experiencing glare.

5. Queried details regarding the planting scheme and how it would be managed.

The meeting ended at 11.50 am

CHAIR