

JOINT DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE - CAMBRIDGE FRINGES

19 August 2015
10.30 am - 12.50 pm

Present: Councillors Bard (Chair), Blencowe (Vice-Chair), Baigent, Price, C. Smart, Holt, Ashwood, Kenney, Nethsingha, Cuffley, 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: Janine Richardson
Principal Planner – New Neighbourhoods: Thomas Webster
SCDC Team Leader, New Communities: Paul Mumford
SCDC Senior Planner: Katie Parry
Sustainable Drainage Engineer: Simon Bunn
Legal Advisor: Penny Jewkes
Committee Manager: Sarah Steed

Other Officers Present:

Cambridgeshire County Council Transport Assessment Manager: Mike Salter

Developer Representatives:

Carter Jonas: Richard Seamark
Countryside Properties: Jonathan Gimblett
Bidwells: Jake Nugent

Other Representative:

Indigo Planning: Sean McGrath

FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE COUNCIL

15/32/JDCC Apologies

Apologies were received from Councillors Bird and Orgee, Councillors Gawthrop and Harford attended as alternates.

15/33/JDCC Declarations of Interest

| Item Number | Councillor | Interest |
|-------------|--------------|-----------------|
| 15/35/JDCC | Cllr Harford | Chairmanship of |

| | | |
|------------|--------------|---|
| | | SCDC Planning Committee and member of Northstowe Joint Development Control Committee |
| 15/36/JDCC | Cllr Ashwood | Member of Trumpington Residents Association |
| 15/35/JDCC | Cllr Bard | Vice-Chair of South Cambridgeshire District Council Planning Committee |

15/34/JDCC Minutes

The minutes of the meeting held on the 15 July 2015 were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

15/35/JDCC S/1236/15/FL and 15/0994/FUL - Proposed Cambridge North Rail Station with associated infrastructure

The Committee received a report for two full planning applications for the proposed Cambridge North Rail Station with associated infrastructure.

The Committee noted revised conditions and a neighbour representation on the amendment sheet published pre-committee and the revised amendment sheet tabled 19 August 2015 which amended SCDC condition 22 and City condition 17 as follows (additional text was underlined).

SCDC condition 22

No development shall commence, except for underground enabling works, until an Operational Noise Management Plan (ONMP) for the operational phase of the development has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The ONMP shall include: noise sources; the time, duration and frequency of noise occurrences; noise control measures; noise levels to be achieved at the boundary of the site; methods to monitor noise and report the findings; reports of mitigation measures undertaken on site; procedures to accept investigate and resolve noise complaints. The approved plan shall be implemented in full.

Reason: To safeguard and protect the amenity of nearby sensitive receptors in accordance with policies NE/15 and DP/6 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Development Framework Development Control Policies (Adopted July 2007) and policy 3/11 of the Cambridge City Council Local Plan (2006).

Cambridge City Council condition 17

Prior to the occupation of the development the details in drawings:

CSPSIAW-ATK-HGN-00-DR-D-0001 Rev P06 Cowley Road Pedestrian / cycleway access – Planning condition 25 Drawing (Sheet 1 of 2)

CSPSIAW-ATK-HGN-00-DR-D-0002 Rev P05 Cowley Road Pedestrian / Cycleway Access – Planning condition 25 Drawing (Sheet 2 of 2)

CSPSIAW-ATK-HGN-00-DR-D-0006 Rev P03 Access at Nuffield Road Allotment for Planning Condition 25

NUFFIELDCLOSE/001 Rev A Planning Condition 25 Access from Industrial Estate to Busway

CSI/MOSSBANK/001 Rev B Planning Condition 25 Moss Bank Foot/Cycleway Access

Shall be implemented in full including a route to a minimum width of 2.5 metres along Cowley Road.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety and to mitigate the impact of travel to the development in accordance with policies DP/1, DP/2, DP/3, TR/1, TR/2 and TR/4 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Development Framework Development Control Policies (Adopted July 2007) and policies 8/2, 8/3 and 8/4 of the Cambridge City council Local Plan (2006).

The Committee received a representation from Sean McGrath on behalf of The Crown Estate who own and manage the Cambridge Business Park.

The representation covered the following issues:

- i. Supported the principle of a new train station but had concerns that some detailed matters would be overlooked for example the access to and from the Business Park to the new station needed to be accessible to pedestrians and cyclists.
- ii. South Cambridgeshire District Council Officers preferred an informative rather than a condition for Network Rail to facilitate a link to the Business Park, expressed concern as an informative could be ignored.
- iii. There was already a Grampian condition for the maintenance track to be made into a cycle link, requested the condition was amended to ensure that Network Rail had to work with The Crown Estates to deliver access

in accordance with The Crown Estates planning consent and to ensure that there was no ransom position.

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

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

- i. Requested clarification what a Grampian condition was and asked whether there was any objection to the amendment requested by The Crown Estate.
- ii. Asked whether there were any comments from the Quality Control Panel.
- iii. Questioned how far disabled parking spaces were from the station entrance and why there were no litter bins at the station.
- iv. Expressed concern that individuals would park in the side roads close to the train station rather than parking at the train station car park.
- v. Expressed concern regarding access arrangements.
- vi. Expressed concern regarding surface water drainage and air quality.
- vii. Queried the number of trains that would call or stop at the train station.

In response to Members' questions the Senior Planning Officer (SCDC), the Team Leader (SCDC) and Legal Advisor said the following:

- i. A Grampian condition was used to deal with an issue which arose outside of the red line application site. The test for a Grampian condition was that the condition was necessary, precise and reasonable.
- ii. There were several reasons why the condition requested by The Crown Estates had not been taken forward the first was that access to the site was controlled by a swipe card and the second was that it was considered that the condition did not meet the necessity test.
- iii. The application did not go back to the Quality Control Panel for consideration as the design of the building was the same as the extant permission.
- iv. There were 24 disabled parking spaces, the majority of which were within 50 metres of the station entrance; there would also be seating areas between the parking spaces and the station entrance in accordance with the British Standard.
- v. Litter bins were not provided at the station due to safety concerns. Condition 34 of the application specifically related to litter management.
- vi. The parking provision on the application site was 450 spaces, which was considered to be sufficient and was the same as the extant permission. The s106 agreement provided that an assessment of any displacement parking was carried out prior to and after the development had been

- constructed. If any impact was identified then Cambridgeshire County Council would work with Network Rail to resolve.
- vii. Access arrangements had not been agreed with Network Rail, a condition had been proposed which required details of the disabled access arrangements to be approved.
 - viii. Surface water drainage information had been submitted to the Council, which did not meet the requirements of the proposed condition. There was a move away from infiltration to permeable paving which would be tanked. The condition for surface water drainage required a lot more information to be submitted before it could be discharged.
 - ix. Air quality was addressed within the report at section 23, page 47. There was a condition that required a construction and management plan.
 - x. Advised that the exact number of trains was not known but that during peak times there would be four trains per hour.

Councillor Harford proposed and Councillor Smart seconded that the informative, which related to the requirement that Network Rail facilitated a link to the Business Park was changed to a Grampian condition. The reasons given for the condition was to improve access, permeability and connectivity to the Business Park and to reduce additional traffic to Cowley Road, it was felt by members that the condition was reasonable and necessary. When put to the vote this was agreed unanimously.

The Committee

Resolved (unanimously) to grant the application for planning permission in accordance with the officer recommendation, for the reasons set out in the report, subject to the completion of a section 106 Agreement with amendments to conditions as recommended by officers, which included the amendment sheet published pre-committee and the revised amendment sheet tabled 19 August 2015 which amended SCDC condition 22 and City condition 17. An additional amendment to Condition 30 (Appendix B of the report) and Condition 20 (Appendix C of the report) to require that pedestrian and cycle links to the Cambridge Business Park from the maintenance track (adjacent to the first public drain and Cowley Road) are submitted, approved and implemented.

15/36/JDCC 15/0844/REM - 251 Residential units and A1 to A3 uses at Parcel 8A and 8B, Clay Farm, Trumpington

Councillor Blencowe assumed the Chair for the rest of the meeting.

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 251 mixed tenure dwellings, which included 40% affordable housing, 967 metres squared of retail floor space, public open space, drainage and associated infrastructure.

Mr Gimblett (Applicant) addressed the Committee in support of the application.

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

- i. Pleased that the development had maintained the provision of 40% affordable housing. It was noted that one parcel on this Committee agenda provided slightly over and one parcel provided slightly under the 40% provision.
- ii. With regards to the tenure split, it was noted that an affordable housing provider had not been selected, it was queried what would happen if the provider could not carry out the agreed plans.
- iii. Clarification sought as to management of implications of the proposed development for badgers.
- iv. Expressed safety concerns regarding the footpaths and queried the provision of parking.
- v. Queried the provision of cycle parking for non-standard bicycles.
- vi. Queried the opening times of the convenience store.

In response to Members' questions the Principal Planner and New Neighbourhoods Development Manager said the following:

- i. This parcel of land was specifically excluded from the Cambridge Challenge affordable housing agreement. Condition 20 provided that the scheme had to be carried out in accordance with the agreed tenure plan. If this could not be delivered then the Applicant would have to submit a s73 application with evidence to support a departure from this.
- ii. There was a planning condition which dealt with the badger issue.
- iii. Would want to retain the Paget Close footpath link and discussions had been held as part of the construction and environmental management plan. If a footpath diversion application was made, officer would try to retain the link.
- iv. Visitor parking was limited on these two parcels. Parking had to be considered in the round, additional spaces had been provided on the spine road and at Hobson Square but the overall number of visitor parking spaces were limited by the original outline planning permission. Enhancements to bus services would be provided through funding secured through the various Southern Fringe development s106 agreements. The County Council Passenger Transport Team were

- considering the timings for these to be provided and what form these should take.
- v. The Cycling Officer had accepted the cycle parking provision, further spaces may be found around the podium and car parking areas.
 - vi. The applicant had proposed the opening time of the convenience store and the Environmental Health Officer had assessed the noise assessment on the proposed times. Expressed caution as residents were not in situ on this site yet, however if the applicant wanted to vary the opening time of the convenience store then they could submit an application to vary the condition at a later date, with further supporting information.

The Committee:

Resolved (unanimously – SCDC Councillors did not vote) to grant the application for reserved matters approval in accordance with the officer recommendation, for the reasons set out in the report and subject to the conditions recommended by the officer. An informative was to be included to advise the applicant to consider the requirements of future occupiers for cycle parking space for non-standard cycle types and cycle trailer parking.

15/37/JDCC 15/1002/REM - 49 Residential units at Parcels 9A and 9B, Clay Farm, Trumpington

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 49 mixed tenure dwellings, which included 40% affordable housing, public open space and associated infrastructure and included the relocation of the vehicular access into Parcel 9B and associated works.

The Committee noted revised conditions on the amendment sheet published pre-committee and the revised amendment sheet tabled 19 August 2015, which amended paragraph 2.2 of the officer's report and conditions 3, 7 and 10 (additional text was underlined and removed text was ~~struck through~~).

Amended paragraph 2.2:

The scheme is broken down into two parcels. Parcel 9BA provides for 31 of the 49 units (23 private and 8 affordable units), and parcel 9AB provides for the remaining 18 units (affordable units).

For ease of reference, 49% of all the properties are one and two bedroom units (flats and duplex). The remaining 51% comprises 3, 4 and 5 bedroom houses, which reflects the local centre and high density nature of the proposal. Of the units 49% of the properties are apartments, ranging from one bedroom flats to two bedroom units, with 51% of the properties proposed being 3, 4 and 5 bedroom houses, which reflects the local centre, high density nature of the proposal.

Additional plans to Condition 7 (approved plans)

- Wider Context Plan: Ref: AA5432-2002 Rev A;
- Masterplan – Ground Level: Ref: AA5432-2010 Rev A;
- Building Heights Plan: Ref: AA5432-2013 Rev A;
- Car Parking and Cycle Parking Strategy: Ref: AA5432-2015 Rev A;
- Masterplan – Roof Level: Ref: AA5432-2020 Rev A;

Amendments to condition 3 (Letter Boxes):

No development of the dwelling house flats or duplex properties shall commence until details of how the letter boxes to those properties will be made accessible to non residents have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The development shall subsequently be carried out incorporating the approved details.

Reason: In the interests of the accessibility of the postal facilities in accordance with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 3/7 and 3/12

Amendments to condition 10 (Parking Bays):

Notwithstanding the details shown on plan AA5432-2015 Rev A that indicates 2 visitor parking bays in front of garages for properties T6A and T5, this reserved matters permission specifically excludes these elements of the scheme. A revised plan showing the relocation of the two visitor parking bays in front of T6A and T5 shall be submitted to and approved by the LPA or alternative approach agreed by the LPA in writing prior to occupation of any dwellings and the development shall be implemented in accordance with the revised details approved.

~~Notwithstanding the details shown on plan AA5432/2020 that indicates 4 visitor parking bays in front of the garages for properties T6A and T5, this reserved matters permission specifically excludes these elements of the scheme. A revised plan omitting these bays shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the LPA prior to occupation of any dwelling and the development shall be implemented in accordance with the revised details approved.~~

Reason: To avoid the proliferation of parking across the site that is uncontrolled and can limit the proper functioning of the site, to ensure that parking management of the site is consistent at an early stage in its development, in the interests of sustainable travel choice and to ensure that the site does not become a parking refuge for commuters in accordance with Cambridge Local Plan policies 3/1, 3/7, 8/2 and 8/11)

Mr Nugent (Applicant's Representative) addressed the Committee in support of the application.

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

- i. Pleased that the development had maintained the provision of 40% affordable housing, however expressed concern that the affordable rented housing was all in one area.

In response to Members' questions the Principal Planner and New Neighbourhoods Development Manager said the following:

- i. The s106 agreement attached to the outline planning permission permitted a cascade mechanism on the tenure split from 75 25 in specific circumstances including partly in this instance the constraints of the site. The development was divided into two areas and Parcel 9A was smaller therefore larger properties had to be sited on Parcel 9B.
- ii. A meeting was held with the registered provider (BPHA) to discuss re-design options however this was not practical due to the size and layout of the site and financial implications.
- iii. The properties were tenure blind and all materials used on the site would be the same.

The Committee:

Resolved (unanimously – SCDC Councillors did not vote) to grant the application for reserved matters approval in accordance with the officer recommendation, for the reasons set out in the report and subject to the amended conditions recommended by the officer on the amendment sheet published pre-committee and the revised amendment sheet tabled 19 August 2015, which amended conditions 3, 7 and 10.

15/38/JDCC Amendment Sheet

The amendment sheet was noted.

The meeting ended at 12.50 pm

CHAIR