

JOINT DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE - CAMBRIDGE FRINGES

17 February 2016
10.30 am - 12.05 pm

Present: Councillors Bard (Chair), Blencowe (Vice-Chair), Baigent, Bird, Price, C. Smart, Holt, Ashwood, Hipkin, Orgee, Cuffley, de Lacey, Nightingale and Van de Weyer

Officers Present:

New Neighbourhoods Development Manager: Sharon Brown
Principal Planner - New Neighbourhoods: Janine Richardson
Principal Planner: Christopher Mohtram
Principal Planner: Tom Webster
Legal Advisor: Cara De La Mare
Committee Manager: Toni Birkin

Other Officers Present:

Urban Design & Conservation Manager: Glen Richardson
Cambridgeshire County Council, Business Manager: Emma Fitch
Cambridgeshire County Council, Highways Department: Dr Jon Finney
Cambridgeshire County Council, Education Department: Rob Lewis

FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE COUNCIL

16/1/JDCC Apologies

Apologies were received from Councillor Shelton and Councillor Kenney. Councillor Harford was present as an alternate.

16/2/JDCC Declarations of Interest

No interests were declared.

16/3/JDCC Minutes

The minutes of the meeting of the 18 November 2015 were agreed and signed as a correct record.

16/4/JDCC C/5000/15/CC - Darwin Green One, Land Between Huntingdon Road and Histon Road, Cambridge

The Committee received an application for full planning permission for a 2 Form Entry (420 pupil) Primary School, together with a Children's Centre, play space, sports pitches, car parking, and associated landscaping.

David Fletcher (Applicant's Agent) addressed the Committee in support of the application.

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

- i. Expressed concerns about the safety aspects of the teaching stairs.
- ii. Expressed disappointment that there was no representative of the future Board of Governors or Sponsor present.
- iii. Welcomed the community engagement regarding the design of shared facilities such as the kitchen attached to the community rooms.
- iv. Members were disappointed that the disabled parking arrangements required users to enter the building from the rear instead of the front door. Councillor Bird stated that this was unacceptable.
- v. Members expressed disappointment that the cycle parking arrangements, while meeting minimum standards, lacked vision and aspiration.

Dr Finney responded to questions regarding the pedestrian crossing. He stated that it was not possible to predict pedestrian and cyclist behavior at this stage of the development. The planning condition would ensure that the school would set aside funding for a crossing, should this prove to be needed at a later date. It was not possible to require this as part of a S106 agreement as this was a Regulation 3 application. It was possible that a crossing might not be needed as the site would be relatively car free. Alternatively, this road might prove to be a popular through route for those seeking an orbital route short cut.

The New Neighbourhoods Development Manager stated that as this was a stand-alone application other developments could not be considered. Subsequent allocations would include their own mitigation measures.

In response to Members' questions the Business Manager Emma Fitch and Education Department representative, Rob Lewis said the following:

- i. Stated that the safety of the teaching stairs was not a planning consideration. However, similar arrangements worked well in other schools. Firm rules on student use ensured their safety.

- ii. Explained that as this school had no firm opening date, there was no Sponsor or Board of Governors in place yet.
- iii. If planning consent was granted, the applicant would have three years to start work on site before the permission lapsed.
- iv. Confirmed that the development of this site had been moved back several times and therefore the trigger points were flexible.
- v. Confirmed that the sprinkler tank had been located away from areas used by children and would be safely sealed. Due to insurance issues, it was not possible to locate this facility underground.
- vi. The proposed opening date of the school was outside the control of Cambridgeshire County Council. However, measures were in place to allow the school to grow with the build out of the development to minimize the impact on other schools in the area. The current triggers were linked to the transfer of land and consent was needed now to allow flexibility.
- vii. Child yield figures were based on the latest data available. However, this would need to be revisited as the site evolved.
- viii. Stated that the cycle parking, both inside and outside the school premises, was generous.
- ix. A robust travel plan would be in place to manage any car drop off issues.
- x. Councillor Bird's comment regarding the disabled parking was noted.
- xi. Agreed that whilst visual images provided showed mature planting, the actual planting would be younger specimens. However, the species illustrated were correct and were included in the planning conditions.

The Committee:

Resolved (by 14 votes to 0 with 1 abstentions) 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.

Councillor Blencowe chaired items 16/5/JDCC and 16/6/JDCC . Only City and County Councillors voted on these items.

16/5/JDCC 15/2216/REM Hudson Close Cambridge, Cambridgeshire

The Committee received an application for full planning permission for the development of eight apartments in a barn style building and the re-siting and re-use of existing Pole Barn to provide for cycle parking and refuse storage with associated access, car parking, landscaping and all other works necessary to facilitate the proposed development.

The Committee noted the amendments presented in the amendment sheet.

Marcia Whitehead (Applicant's Agent) addressed the Committee in support of the application.

The Committee:

Resolved – unanimously (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.

16/6/JDCC 15/2296/S73 - Parcel 21, Clay Farm Development Site

The Committee received a Section 73 application to alter the width of the public footpath (Public Footpath 117- running along the rear of Foster Road properties) from 1.2m to 2m (loss of 0.8m landscape strip) as part of approval 14/1201/REM (208 residential dwellings and 540sqm of A1, A2 and A5 uses), at Parcel 21 Clay Farm development site. Ref:15/2296/S73. It was noted that a deviation order would also be needed.

In response to Members' questions, the New Neighbourhoods Development Manager, explained that due to the current Terms of Reference (ToR) for this committee, small applications were being caught in the decision making process. It had been agreed that the major changes to ToR regarding the City Deal decisions needed to be ratified first. Once this had been completed, the minor changes needed to exclude minor decisions, which could be more efficiently dealt with elsewhere, would be ratified.

The Committee:

Resolved - unanimously (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 12.05 pm

CHAIR