

# **JOINT DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE - CAMBRIDGE FRINGES**

## **Membership**

**Cambridge City Council:** Cllrs Blencowe (Vice-Chair), Baigent, Bird, Price, Holt and Tunnacliffe, Alternates: Gawthrope, T. Moore and Smart

**Cambridgeshire County Council:** Cllrs Ashwood, Kenney, Hipkin and Walsh, Alternates: Harford, Kavanagh, Loynes, Nethsingha, Whitehead and Williams

**South Cambridgeshire District Council:** Cllrs Bard (Chair), Cuffley, de Lacey, Nightingale, Turner and Van de Weyer, Alternates: Bygott, Cattermole, Corney, Wotherspoon, Lockwood, Davies and Stonham

**Date:** Tuesday, 21 June 2016

**Time:** 9.30 am

**Venue:** Council Chamber, The Guildhall, Market Square, Cambridge, CB2 3QJ

**Contact:** Sarah Steed

**Direct Dial:** 01223 457013

## **AGENDA**

### **1 Election of Chair and Vice-Chair**

### **2 Apologies**

To receive any apologies for absence.

### **3 Declarations of Interest**

Members are asked to declare at this stage any interests that they may have in an item shown on this agenda. If any member of the Committee is unsure whether or not they should declare an interest on a particular matter, they should seek advice from the Head of Legal Services **before** the meeting.

**4 Minutes (Pages 7 - 22)**

To confirm the minutes of the meeting held on the 20 April and 18 May 2016 as a correct record.

**All Committee members are welcome to attend the pre-application briefing**

**5 Pre-application Briefing - Chisholm Trail Scheme, Cambridge**

Delivered by the County Council Infrastructure Team - City Deal Strategic Cycling and Walking route with associated bridge.

**All Committee members are welcome to attend the pre-application briefing**

**6 Pre-application Briefing - Lot M3, North West Cambridge Development**

Hill Residential - Market Housing.

### **Quorum for This Item/Application:**

The quorum for the Committee comprises 3 members of Cambridge City Council, 3 members of South Cambridgeshire District Council and 2 members of Cambridgeshire County Council.

### **Speaking at the Committee by Other Members of the Councils**

A member of any of the councils who is not a member of the committee or a member of a parish council (in respect of applications relating to sites in their own parish) may speak at a meeting of the committee at the request or with the permission of that committee or of its Chair made or obtained before the meeting. Such request or permission shall specify the matters in respect of which the member shall be permitted to speak.

## **Information for the Public**

**Location** The meeting is in the Guildhall on the Market Square (CB2 3QJ).

Between 9 a.m. and 5 p.m. the building is accessible via Peas Hill, Guildhall Street and the Market Square entrances.

After 5 p.m. access is via the Peas Hill entrance.

All the meeting rooms (Committee Room 1, Committee 2 and the Council Chamber) are on the first floor, and are accessible via lifts or stairs.

**Public Participation** Some meetings may have parts, which will be closed to the public, but the reasons for excluding the press and public will be given.

Members of the public who want to speak about an application on the agenda for this meeting may do so, if they have submitted a written representation within the consultation period relating to the application and notified the Committee Manager that they wish to speak by **12.00 noon on the day before** the meeting.

Public speakers will not be allowed to circulate any additional written information to their speaking notes or any other drawings or other visual material in support of their case that has not been verified by officers and that is not already on public file.

For further information on speaking at committee please contact Democratic Services on 01223 457013 or [democratic.services@cambridge.gov.uk](mailto:democratic.services@cambridge.gov.uk).

Further information about speaking at a City Council meeting can be found at;

<https://www.cambridge.gov.uk/speaking-at-committee-meetings>

Cambridge City Council would value your assistance in improving the public speaking process of committee meetings. If you have any feedback please contact Democratic Services on 01223 457013 or [democratic.services@cambridge.gov.uk](mailto:democratic.services@cambridge.gov.uk).

**Representations on Planning Applications**

Public representations on a planning application should be made in writing (by e-mail or letter, in both cases stating your full postal address), within the deadline set for comments on that application. You are therefore strongly urged to submit your representations within this deadline.

The submission of late information after the officer's report has been published is to be avoided.

A written representation submitted to the Environment Department by a member of the public after publication of the officer's report will only be considered if it is from someone who has already made written representations in time for inclusion within the officer's report. Any public representation received by the Department after 12 noon two business days before the relevant Committee meeting (e.g by 12.00 noon on Monday before a Wednesday meeting; by 12.00 noon on Tuesday before a Thursday meeting) will not be considered.

The same deadline will also apply to the receipt by the Department of additional information submitted by an applicant or an agent in connection with the relevant item on the Committee agenda (including letters, e-mails, reports, drawings and all other visual material), unless specifically requested by planning officers to help decision-making.

**Filming, recording and photography**

The Council is committed to being open and transparent in the way it conducts its decision making. The public may record (e.g. film, audio, tweet, blog) meetings which are open to the public.

<b>Facilities for disabled people</b>	<p>Level access to the Guildhall is via Peas Hill.</p> <p>A loop system is available in Committee Room 1, Committee Room 2 and the Council Chamber.</p> <p>Accessible toilets are available on the ground and first floor.</p> <p>Meeting papers are available in large print and other formats on request prior to the meeting.</p> <p>For further assistance please contact Democratic Services on 01223 457013 or <a href="mailto:democratic.services@cambridge.gov.uk">democratic.services@cambridge.gov.uk</a>.</p>
<b>Queries on reports</b>	<p>If you have a question or query regarding a committee report please contact the officer listed at the end of relevant report or Democratic Services on 01223 457013 or <a href="mailto:democratic.services@cambridge.gov.uk">democratic.services@cambridge.gov.uk</a>.</p>
<b>General Information</b>	<p>Information regarding committees, councilors and the democratic process is available at <a href="http://democracy.cambridge.gov.uk/">http://democracy.cambridge.gov.uk/</a></p>
<b>Mod.Gov App</b>	<p>You can get committee agenda and reports for your tablet by using the mod.gov app</p>

This page is intentionally left blank

**JOINT DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE - CAMBRIDGE FRINGES**

20 April 2016  
10.30 am - 2.30 pm

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

**Officers Present:**

New Neighbourhoods Development Manager: Sharon Brown  
Principal Planner - New Neighbourhoods: Janine Richardson  
SCDC Planning Team Leader: New Communities: Paul Mumford  
SCDC Principal Planning Officer: Edward Durrant  
Legal Advisor: Cara de la Mere  
Committee Manager: Sarah Steed

**Other Officers Present:**

Senior Urban Designer: Sarah Chubb  
Education Officer: Rob Lewis  
Development Control Engineer: Jon Finney  
Transport Assessment Manager: Mike Salter

**Developer Representatives:**

(Bidwells) Alison Wright  
(Terrance O Rouke) Julia Jardine

**FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE COUNCIL**

**16/12/JDCC Apologies**

Apologies were received from Councillor Shelton and Ashwood Councillor Wotherspoon and Councillor Williams attended as alternates.

**16/13/JDCC Declarations of Interest**

No interests were declared.

**16/14/JDCC Minutes**

The minutes of the meeting held on the 16 March 2016 were agreed and signed as a correct record.

**16/15/JDCC S/2682/13/OL & 13/1837/OUT - Land North of Newmarket Road, Cambridge East**

Councillor Dent left the meeting before the vote was taken on this item.

The Committee received two concurrent applications, the South Cambridgeshire application consisted of development of up to 1300 homes including up to 30% affordable housing across the development as a whole, primary school, food store, community facilities, opens, landscaping and associated infrastructure. The City application consisted of the proposed demolition of buildings, hard standing and construction of tennis courts, allotments, store room toilets, informal open space, local areas of play, provision of drainage infrastructure, footpath, cycleway links and retention and management of woodlands.

The Committee noted the amendment sheet circulated prior to committee.

The SCDC Principal Planning Officer confirmed that a representation from Teversham Parish Council should have been appended to the report following a request from the Parish Council but mistakenly it had not been. The representation covered objections to the reduction in affordable housing provision and claw back provisions.

The Committee received a representation to the application which covered the following issues:

- i. Overall in favour of the development and pleased to see provision of off-site health centre.
- ii. Objected to the reduction in provision of affordable housing from 40%.
- iii. Was not happy with the description of the application which stated 'up to 30%' affordable housing as this did not accord with Council policy.
- iv. No thought had been given to cemetery provision.

Julia Jardine (Applicant's Agent) addressed the Committee in support of the application.

Councillor Johnson (Ward Councillor for Abbey) addressed the Committee about the application:

The representation covered the following issues:



- i. Permeability was seen as a key priority of the Wing development.
- ii. Expressed disappointment that the affordable housing was proposed to be reduced and that the tenure split was to be 30/70.
- iii. Balanced communities should be at the forefront of developer's minds.
- iv. Understood the relocation cost of the engine facility but affordable housing was a key priority in Cambridge.
- v. Asked that the application was deferred until the developers could come up with an application which met the Council's affordable housing policy.

Councillor Turner (The SCDC Wilbrahams Ward Councillor) addressed the Committee about the application.

The representation covered the following issues:

- i. Represented Fen Ditton and referred to the Fen Ditton Parish Council's comments in the Officer's report at p27.
- ii. Stated that there would be a loss of 3500 jobs if Marshalls move and relocated and commented that developments needed to provide jobs as well as housing.
- iii. Disappointed at the 30% affordable housing provision.
- iv. Risk of an appeal on the grounds of non-determination if the application was not determined today.
- v. Would rather the application description was amended to read 30% affordable housing provision rather than 'up to 30%'.
- vi. Urged members to support the application.

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

- i. Asked whether there could be a measure to prevent right turns out of the development and commented that measures should be put in place to discourage traffic entering Cambridge and instead direct them to the next roundabout. Stated that there could be segregation on the roundabout so that road users knew which lane to choose. The banning of a right turn out of the site would add to the attractiveness to use the bus, to cycle or walk.
- ii. Questioned cycle movement within the site.
- iii. Questioned if the design of the site would lead to a segregated community as there was no access through to other sites.
- iv. The Officer's report stated that 2% of the buildings would be wheelchair accessible which equated to 8 properties across the development. Asked whether a wheelchair accessible dwelling was the same as a dwelling built to lifetime standard.

- v. Questioned what secondary school provision was being provided and how far from the site it would be.
- vi. Asked why sports pitches were always provided as part of developments and asked if alternative provision, for example a climbing wall could be provided instead.
- vii. Biodiversity was important; mammals and insects were equally as important as birds.
- viii. Expressed dissatisfaction with the reduction in affordable housing provision from 40% and a change in the tenure mix. Also questioned whether the viability assessment should have been provided in full and not redacted.
- ix. Expressed concern that green belt land had been released for affordable housing provision and that this would not be provided at 40%.
- x. Asked whether the s106 agreement affordable housing provision could be amended so that more affordable housing could be provided and other contributions reduced to fund this.
- xi. Questioned if further information on the cascade mechanism for affordable housing provision could be provided.
- xii. Questioned if the engine testing facility was not delivered whether more affordable housing could be put back onto the site.
- xiii. Commented that if starter homes were introduced by Central Government then even less affordable housing would be delivered as part of the development.
- xiv. Questioned whether additional waste vehicles would be required to service the development.
- xv. Commented that the 'aviation activity' condition on p107 of the Officer's report was too precisely worded.
- xvi. Questioned cemetery provision.
- xvii. Questioned who would make the decision on the design code and also asked whether cycle parking would be considered as part of the design code. Also questioned whether roads would be adopted by the County Council.
- xviii. Questioned what would happen if Marshall did not get permission to relocate the engine testing facility and how long Marshalls had to relocate.

In response to Members' questions Officers said the following:

- i. To incorporate measures to prevent a right hand turn out of the development would have a significant impact on the next roundabout, highways officers would object to this on grounds of highway safety and highway capacity. During peak periods the number of vehicle movements turning left would be 180 the number of vehicle movements

- turning right would be 140, preventing a right turn may have a deterrent effect but it was considered that this would not be hugely significant. For junctions full details need to be approved. In the s106 agreement there was a requirement for a travel plan Co-Ordinator.
- ii. The internal design would be part of a reserved matters application. Segregated road crossings would not be attractive to cyclists but were attractive to pedestrians and particularly those with a disability. Pedestrians were first in the street hierarchy. No objections had been raised by Cambridge Cycling Campaign.
  - iii. The Area Action Plan had a requirement that there would be no access route through to other sites however there was the ability for vehicular access in the future.
  - iv. Lifetime homes allowed the property to be adapted.
  - v. For secondary school provision a site had been identified and would be consulted on. The site was within the 3 mile walking and cycling distance.
  - vi. Sports provision to support the schools would be provided on school sites with community access secured.
  - vii. Biodiversity would be picked up at condition stage.
  - viii. Officers believed that the current affordable housing package was the best available in the context of the viability considerations. The s106 provisions had to be based on the planning need and satisfy the s106 agreement tests. The affordable housing policy requires 40% provision but the policy wording references that this is subject to a viability assessment. The 30% affordable housing provision would be secured through a s106 agreement.
  - ix. The Cambridge East Area Action Plan is the relevant planning policy document for this site.
  - x. The s106 agreement could include a mechanism to reallocate funding to provide more affordable housing or improve the tenure split if it was not spent. The S106 package proposed reflects what is considered to be needed to mitigate the impacts of the development.
  - xi. The s106 agreement would have a review mechanism for viability and cascade provisions. The review would look at the delivery of the development and if a certain amount of development was not delivered within a certain time scale, would trigger a full scale viability assessment. The cascade review allowed for transfer between tenure mixes of affordable housing.
  - xii. The s106 agreement would have a mechanism to ensure the delivery of the engine testing facility.
  - xiii. Confirmed that Starter Homes were not formally introduced yet as an affordable housing product.

- xiv. Confirmed that existing waste vehicles would be able to service the development would be used and there would be no need for additional waste vehicles to be purchased.
- xv. Commented that the aviation activities associated with the wider existing airport could not be controlled by this planning permission.
- xvi. This application was an urban extension to Cambridge and therefore extra cemetery provision was not required.
- xvii. Condition 8 (Phasing) would go to this Committee for a decision and confirmed that the approach to cycle parking would be considered under the design code. Stated that Officers did not have control over the adoption of roads these could either be adopted by the County Council or maintained by the developer.
- xviii. The S106 and planning conditions would also require the relocation of the engine testing facility prior to the occupation of residential properties.

An amendment to the officer's recommendation was proposed that a mechanism was included within the section 106 agreement to reallocate funding for Newmarket Road transport improvements to affordable housing, should a specific scheme for transport improvements not be forthcoming and the reference to "up to 30% affordable housing" in the proposal description should be amended to read "30% affordable housing".

The Committee:

**Resolved (by 11 votes to 3 with 1 abstention)** to grant the application for planning permission in accordance with the officer recommendation subject to the amendment to the s106 agreement to reallocate funding for Newmarket Road transport improvements to affordable housing, should a specific scheme for transport improvements not be forthcoming and the reference to "up to 30% affordable housing" in the proposal description should be amended to read "30% affordable housing", for the reasons set out in the officer report, and subject to the conditions recommended by the officers.

**16/16/JDCC      S/0107/16/RM - Trumpington Meadows Development Site,  
Hauxton Road**

Councillors Price, Nightingale and Williams left the meeting prior to the start of this item.

The Committee received a reserved matters application for phase 9 of the Trumpington Meadows development for 122 dwellings which included affordable housing with associated internal roads, car parking, landscaping, amenity and public open space, pursuant to outline planning approvals S/0054/08/O and 08/0048/OUT.

Alison Wright (Applicant's Agent) addressed the Committee in support of the application.

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

- i. Expressed surprise at the number of statutory consultees who had not provided a response.
- ii. Noted that 75% of affordable housing were flats compared to 25% of market housing. Questioned whether the needs of those that sought affordable housing were so different to those who sought market housing.
- iii. Commented that the proposed residential units on both sides of the road should relate to each other in design terms.

In response to Members' questions the SCDC Planning Team Leader, New Communities said the following:

- i. The County Council were the Lead Flood Authority. Conditions for drainage off site would be looked at by the City Council Drainage Officer. No comments meant that no concerns had been raised by the consultees.
- ii. The Design Code provided that this area would have a higher percentage of flats, this was why there was a higher percentage of affordable housing flats. The clustering of the affordable housing was similar to schemes that had previously been approved. Block Q was designated for affordable housing and had very good views. The developers may have preferred to have sited market housing in this position because of the views, but the benefit of this scheme was that the block was affordable housing.

The Committee:

**Resolved (unanimously)** 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 2.30 pm

**CHAIR**

**JOINT DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE - CAMBRIDGE FRINGES**

18 May 2016

10.30 am - 12.25 pm

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

**Officers Present:**

New Neighbourhoods Development Manager: Sharon Brown  
Principal Planner - New Neighbourhoods: Janine Richardson  
Principal Planner – New Neighbourhoods: Thomas Webster  
Legal Advisor: Cara de la Mere  
Committee Manager: Sarah Steed

**Other Officers Present:**

Senior Urban Designer: Sarah Chubb  
Education Officer: Rob Lewis  
Business Manager, County Planning, Minerals and Waste: Emma Fitch

**Developer Representatives:**

(Frank Shaw Associates Limited), Norman Paterson

**FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE COUNCIL**

**16/17/JDCC Apologies**

Apologies were received from Councillors Shelton and Kenney. Councillor Harford attended as the alternate for Councillor Kenney.

**16/18/JDCC Declarations of Interest**

No interests were declared.

**16/19/JDCC Update on Review of Fringe Sites Joint Development Control Committee Terms of Reference to Incorporate City Deal Schemes**

The Committee received an update report on the review of the Joint Development Control Committee's – Cambridge Fringes terms of reference to accommodate City Deal infrastructure schemes.

The Committee noted the revised terms of reference which had been circulated prior to the Committee meeting. The Committee also noted that the operation of the revised Terms of Reference should be reviewed after 12 months.

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

- i. Asked what the difference was between the terms of reference which had been circulated prior to Committee and those included within the agenda pack.
- ii. Commented on the issue raised in paragraph 3.4 of the officer's report, which dealt with voting rights of Members which sat on the City Deal Board and the City Deal Assembly. Members who sat on the City Deal Assembly did not make decisions they made recommendations to the City Deal Board, they should therefore be able to make decisions on applications that came to the Joint Development Control Committee.
- iii. Commented that the name of the Committee should remain as it currently was the "Joint Development Control Committee".

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

- i. The terms of reference within the agenda pack had incorrect footnote references. It also removed the requirement for the Committee to make decisions on householder applications. These changes were still being proposed and had been highlighted in the original 2015 JDCC report but further to legal advice would need to come forward separately as officers did not want these to create un-due delay with the City Deal processes being agreed.
- ii. Confirmed that legal advice had been taken on the issue of City Deal Assembly Members' and the City Deal Board Members' attending the Committee. An updated advice note was read out at the meeting and confirmed that there was no bar on City Deal Assembly Members' attending and voting on planning applications. The advice is copied into the minutes for completeness. The connection between promotion of the scheme and deciding on related planning applications was weaker with assembly members and the Head of Legal Services' view was that there was less of a risk of damage to public confidence. There was still an element of risk in terms of perception if, say, an assembly member pressed for implementation of a scheme and then voted on the planning



application, but this was an issue generally within councils. There was not a legal bar, provided that the member considered the planning application properly. There was also not a Code of Conduct issue.

The Committee:

**Resolved (unanimously) to:**

- i. Note the agreed final version of the amended Joint Development Control Committee Terms of Reference as circulated at the Committee meeting.
- ii. Retain the existing name for the Committee being the Cambridge Fringe Sites Joint Development Control Committee.

**16/20/JDCC 15/1670/REM Darwin Green One, Land Between Huntingdon Road And Histon Road Cambridge**

The Committee received a reserved matters application pursuant to outline application 07/0003/OUT for 114 residential units and local centre including library, community rooms, health centre and retail units.

The Committee noted the amendments detailed on the amendment sheet.

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

- i. Praised the developers for working closely with Council Officers and re-working the scheme to address concerns.
- ii. Raised several questions regarding cycle parking, temporary parking, tenure mix of affordable housing and existing health centres.
- iii. Were pleased that the development would deliver 40% affordable housing. Questioned whether any indication had been given for who the registered provider would be. Referred to first floor apartments meeting lifetime standards however no lift were provided.
- iv. Questioned why there were no 3 or 4 bed units as part of this scheme and if these would be made up in the other parts of the site.
- v. Highlighted that the disabled toilet door within the library opened inwards and that this should open outwards.
- vi. Queried whether contamination of land had been considered.
- vii. Requested that within the car parking management plan there was a requirement for level access so that there were no obstacles which prevented disabled users accessing the site. Questioned whether delivery hours for the retail use needed to be conditioned.
- viii. Questioned if members of the public could be able to use the open space.

ix. Questioned the naming of streets on plans within the development.

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

- i. Issues raised in relation to cycle parking had been addressed within the report and a condition would ensure that visitor cycle parking was accommodated properly. In relation to the temporary parking issue, the outline consent required an interim arrangement before the roads were adopted, Officers did not feel that the temporary arrangements were appropriate and therefore delayed the discharge of the condition. The comments on the imbalance of the tenure mix of the affordable housing were on the original submission and had now been addressed. The procurement process for the new health centre was on-going but Officers were not aware of any intention to close existing facilities at this time.
- ii. No update had been provided by Barratt's as to who the registered provider was but discussions had been positive. The developer expressed concern about the on-going maintenance for lifts and the fact that the cost would be passed onto the tenants of the affordable units.
- iii. Councillor Price confirmed that the City Council had pressures on its housing register for 1 and 2 bed units. Later schemes which have a slightly lower density and which were not on the spine road would have more 3 or 4 bed units.
- iv. Confirmed that the disable door issues would be reported to the developer.
- v. Confirmed that there was an outline condition attached to the outline permission which dealt with the issue of contaminated land this had to be discharged before the developers could start on site.
- vi. The opening hours for the retail uses was controlled through the outline permission.
- vii. Confirmed that the open space was to be open to the public and that it would be adopted by the City Council.
- viii. Confirmed that the names given to streets on the plans were for assistance purposes only and the actual street names and numbering for the development would be completed by the officer responsible for the Council's Street Name and Numbering.

The Committee:

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

**16/21/JDCC 16/0208/REM Darwin Green One, Land Between Huntingdon Road And Histon Road Cambridge**

The Committee received a reserved matters application pursuant to outline application 07/0003/OUT for 173 market and affordable dwellings with associated internal roads, car parking, landscaping, amenity and public open space.

The Committee noted the amendments detailed on the amendment sheet and the Principal Planner verbally updated the Committee on the following issues:

- i. The materials condition should re-instate the 'and' which had been removed on the amendment sheet so that the first paragraph would read (re-instated text underlined):

Prior to the commencement of development samples of the buildings approved and identified below and details of colour of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of buildings, which includes external features such as garage doors, entrance doors, windows, roof and hanging tiles, stone detailing, external metal work, balcony and balustrades, rain water goods, coping, bike and bin stores, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority.

- ii. The removal of conditions 13 and 14 as the applicant submitted revised plans which detailed appropriate widths for the cycle storage.

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

- i. The visitor parking allocation at 1 bay for every 11 dwellings was not sufficient. The location of the parking spaces was not good for disabled users.
- ii. Questioned whether the comments from the Walking and cycling Officer had been addressed.
- iii. The report stated that the dwellings did not meet lifetime homes standards and questioned if the position had changed since the publication of the agenda.
- iv. Welcomed the provision of 39.9% affordable housing and wanted the building of the affordable housing provision to commence.
- v. Commented that access for disabled users to take their rubbish to bin stores was not good.

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

- i. The number of visitor parking spaces was reasonable for the density of the development. Alternative layouts for the visitor spaces were explored with the Applicant however this would have required the re-design of the site.
- ii. Confirmed that the issues raised by the Walking and Cycling Officer had been addressed and referred to paragraph 8.91 – 8.103 of the Officer's report.
- iii. Officers did push for lifetime homes with the Applicant unfortunately these were not a requirement of the outline permission and the wording of the Lifetime Homes scheme definition makes it very difficult to insist upon incorporation of lifts..

### The Committee:

**Resolved (by 11 votes to 0 with 2 abstentions)** to grant the application for planning permission in accordance with the officer recommendation subject to the amendments detailed in the amendment sheet and the verbal amendments detailed at the meeting, for the reasons set out in the officer report, and subject to the conditions recommended by the officers.

### **16/22/JDCC Pre-Application Member Briefing - Primary School site, Clay Farm Development Site, Long Road Cambridge**

The Committee received a presentation from Frank Shaw Associates Limited on behalf of Cambridgeshire County Council on the Clay Farm Primary School.

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. Asked what was being done about energy and what the heating plans were for the building.**
- 2. Asked whether the school was going to be an academy or a free school.**
- 3. Asked if the 3G pitch would be managed by the school for community use.**
- 4. Asked if there was a lift to the 2<sup>nd</sup> floor of the school and if it would be wide enough to accommodate a standard wheelchair.**

- 5. Asked if there was a drop off area for people with accessibility requirements.**
- 6. Asked if there was a County Council objection to 2 storey primary schools.**

The meeting ended at 12.25 pm

**CHAIR**

This page is intentionally left blank