

**JOINT DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE - CAMBRIDGE FRINGES**

21 June 2016  
9.30 - 11.10 am

**Present:** Councillors Bard (Chair), Blencowe (Vice-Chair), Baigent, Bird, Price, Holt, Tunnacliffe, Ashwood, Kenney, Hipkin, Walsh, Cuffley, de Lacey, Nightingale, Turner and Van de Weyer

Councillors Baigent, Blencowe and Price left the meeting after item 16/24/JDCC

**Officers Present:**

New Neighbourhoods Development Manager: Sharon Brown  
Planning Team Leader, South Cambridgeshire District Council, Paul Mumford  
Legal Advisor: Cara de la Mere  
Committee Manager: Sarah Steed  
Democratic Services Officer: Dawn Cave

**Other Officers Present:**

Team Leader – Cycling Projects, Cambridgeshire County Council, Mike Davies  
County Cycling Officer, Cambridgeshire County Council, Patrick Joyce

**Developer Representatives:**

Hill Residential, Joanna Thorndike  
Pollard Thomas Edwards Architects, Teresa Borsuk  
Robert Myers Associates, Dawn Purves

**FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE COUNCIL**

**16/23/JDCC Election of Chair and Vice-Chair**

Councillor Bard opened the meeting.

The New Neighbourhoods Development Manager assumed the Chair and invited nominations for the Chair.

Councillor Bard was proposed by Councillor Nightingale, and seconded by Councillor Ashwood.

On a show of hands, Councillor Bard was elected unanimously. He assumed the Chair.

The Chair invited nominations for the Vice Chair.

Councillor Blencowe was proposed by Councillor Price and seconded by Councillor Bird.

On a show of hands, Councillor Blencowe was elected unanimously.

### **16/24/JDCC Apologies**

Apologies were received from Councillors Blencowe, Baigent and Price, who had to leave the meeting to attend another engagement.

### **16/25/JDCC Declarations of Interest**

No declarations of interest were made.

### **16/26/JDCC Minutes**

The minutes of the meetings held on 20 April and 18 May were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

With the agreement of the Committee, the order for the rest of the agenda was changed so that the North West Cambridge development pre-briefing was considered first.

### **16/27/JDCC Pre-application Briefing - Chisholm Trail Scheme, Cambridge**

The Committee received a pre-submission briefing from the County Council Infrastructure team regarding the City Deal Strategic Cycling and Walking route with associated bridge.

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. Noted the lighting for the proposed Newmarket Road underpass, asked whether lights would be included in the other underpass, and along other, currently unlit, sections, commenting that there had been issues with security on the Redways in Milton Keynes.

2. Pointed out that the batteries for the stud lighting had a limited life, and required maintenance.
3. Asked about the issues for services (e.g. power, sewage) when excavating the proposed Newmarket underpass.
4. Asked if the public seating on the bridge would all be on the pedestrian side.
5. Commented favourably on the cyclist and pedestrian segregation on the bridge, and asked to what extent there would be segregation along the rest of the Chisholm Trail.
6. Asked if the Coldhams Lane crossing would be rearranged and highlighted issues with visibility/sightlines on Coldhams Common.
7. Thanked officers for the thorough consultations undertaken, especially regarding the bridge, which had resulted in a much better scheme and community buy-in.
8. Commented that the current proposals meant that some section from Cambridge North and the link to Wing would be poorly lit in winter, and this may discourage commuters from using it.
9. Asked if the road crossing on Newmarket Road would remain.
10. Asked what the gradient would be on the underpass ramps.
11. Suggested that the seating on the bridge needed arms or something similar, so that those with mobility issues could push themselves up.
12. Asked if there would be tactile paving so that the blind and partially sighted would know that they were on the pedestrian side of bridge.
13. Asked if there would be a Compulsory Purchase Order (CPO) element to the application.
14. Commented that the Conservators of Cam were concerned about the jetty, and the associated reduction in navigation and sightlines on the Cam.

**The meeting adjourned for 10 minutes.**

### **16/28/JDCC      Pre-application Briefing - Lot M3, North West Cambridge Development**

The Committee received a presentation on Lot M3, North West Cambridge Development.

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 the orientation of the scheme, especially the central Long Gallery, in relation to sunlight, and commented that it would be useful to have summer and winter views, including shadow diagrams.

2. Asked if the cycle parking included designated spaces for residents as it appeared to be quite scattered, and whether residents would have guaranteed cycle parking.
3. Asked whether the Long Gallery would be private, or whether there would be public access. The Member commented that it would be helpful to have guidance from officers regarding public access.
4. Asked if all residents would have access to the roof garden.
5. Asked for clarification on the term 'University commercial space'.
6. Queried the anticipated resident numbers, and the number of car and cycle parking spaces.
7. Expressed concern about the proposal to have "*some designated cycle parking in Long Gallery*", observing that there was the potential for a clutter of bicycles in that space.
8. Asked what provision was proposed for visitors' cycle parking.
9. Asked about disabled access, including access for disabled residents' vehicles.
10. Commented that the waste containers were too far away for disabled residents, and a solution should be sought which enabled disabled residents to independently use waste facilities.
11. Queried the distance from the development to the cricket pitch.
12. Urged against impeding the views to the green open space from the lower storeys from landscaping.
13. Asked if there was a shared boundary with any landowner other than Storeys Field.
14. Asked how many of the apartments would have provision for disabled residents.
15. Queried the percentage of affordable housing.

The meeting ended at 11.10 am

**CHAIR**