

JOINT DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE - CAMBRIDGE FRINGES

14 December 2016

10.30 - 11.15 am

Present: Councillors Bard (Chair), Blencowe (Vice-Chair), Baigent, Bird, Gawthrope, Holt, Tunnacliffe, Ashwood, Harford, Orgee, Cuffley, de Lacey, Nightingale and Van de Weyer.

Officers Present:

New Neighbourhoods Development Manager: Sharon Brown

Planning Team Leader: Paul Mumford

Senior Planning Officer: Katie Christodulides

Senior Planning Officer, Andrew Winter

Legal Advisor: Richard Pitt

Democratic Services Officer: Daniel Snowdon

Developer Representatives:

Bidwells: Mr Nugent

FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE COUNCIL

16/48/JDCC Apologies

Apologies were received from Councillors Hipkin, Kenney, Price and Turner. Councillors Gawthrope and Harford attended as alternates.

16/49/JDCC Declarations of Interest

Item number	Councillor	Interest
51	Ashwood	Personal: Member of Trumpington Residents Association

16/50/JDCC Minutes

The minutes of the meeting held on 16 November 2016 were agreed and signed as a correct record subject to the addition of Councillor Turner who attended the meeting and Councillor Nightingale who gave his apologies.

16/51/JDCC S/2176/16/RM and 16/1488/REM - Trumpington Meadows, Riverside Phase 9

The Committee received applications for 122 residential dwellings, 80 units of which were located within South Cambridgeshire and 42 within Cambridge City. The application included associated infrastructure, surface car parking, landscaping, amenity and public open space, pursuant to outline planning approvals S/0054/08/O and 08/0048/OUT.

The Committee noted the amendments detailed in the amendment sheet.

Mr Nugent (Applicants Agent) addressed the Committee in support of the application.

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

- i. Expressed concern that a major application had been presented without plans or illustrations of the proposed development included in the officer report.
- ii. Noted that the proposed development appeared to represent a solid barrier to the country park and questioned the level of impact on existing residents' amenity.
- iii. Clarified the car parking availability for the development.
- iv. Questioned whether the car parking spaces were sufficiently large enough to accommodate modern vehicles and the trend for large Sports Utility Vehicles (SUVs).
- v. Asked whether there was sufficient space within the cycle parking scheme for cargo cycles.
- vi. Welcomed the level of affordable housing that would be provided within the development.
- vii. Questioned the provision of affordable 3 and 4 bed properties within the development.
- viii. Drew attention to the impact of un-adopted roads on residents of affordable housing.
- ix. Noted the interaction of the proposed development with the wider site and commended the scheme for the level of affordable housing provided.
- x. Expressed concern regarding the PROW building and questioned whether it was envisaged within the design process to construct a predominantly different building.
- xi. Questioned how the Design Code remained up to date with changing design standards.

- xii. Clarified why the development was named Riverside and its proximity to the river.
- xiii. Expressed concern regarding the context of the development with regard to the view of the development from the river.
- xiv. Highlighted the issues of car parking and requested that more imaginative solutions be developed to manage the issue.
- xv. Noted and welcomed the response of the Cambridgeshire Quality Panel and questioned whether the Quality Panel had the opportunity to provide further comments following the comments of officers.
- xvi. Clarified the wording of paragraph 5.3 of the report.
- xvii. Noted that the concern of the Refuse Team contained in paragraph 6.4 of the report did not appear to have been addressed along with the concerns raised in paragraph 6.12 by the Drainage Officer.

In response to Members' questions Officers said the following:

- i. The site consisted of a combination of 2 and 4 storey blocks combined with open spaces such as Pipers Green that ran through the centre of the site. The curved nature of site would also soften the visual impact of the buildings.
- ii. Specific car parking was allocated to the proposed Riverside development and visitor parking was provided by the Trumpington Meadows site as a whole.
- iii. The size of car parking spaces were determined by an assessment of average car size.
- iv. The cycle parking had been developed in accordance with the design code and that a mixture of parking was available including garages, cycle stores and Sheffield Hoops with 1m clearance between the hoops.
- v. Phases 7 and 8 included larger affordable properties and that the Riverside development was designed to provide smaller affordable accommodation units and taking into account that this was a higher density part of the overall development. .
- vi. Un-adopted roads would be managed by the same company that currently managed the wider Trumpington Meadows site. The affordable housing provider, BPHA , had been consulted on the proposals at pre-application stage and had not raised concerns regarding the impact of service/maintenance costs on the affordability of the units where roads were unadopted.
- vii. The PROW building had developed through numerous iterations and had been challenging to incorporate within the scheme. The design was intended to follow the ridge line across the country park.

- viii. Standards had not changed significantly since when the Design Code was written.
- ix. The Riverside name had arisen from the Design Code name for the character zone and confirmed that the site would not be marketed as Riverside.
- x. As is standard practice, The Quality Panel had not had the opportunity to provide further comment on this Reserved Matters application but the wider issue would be discussed at a meeting of the Quality Charter Steering Group.
- xi. Paragraph 5.3 was standard wording that appeared in reports regarding the material weight that could be attributed to emerging policies within negotiations.
- xii. The Refuse Team and the Drainage officer had confirmed that they were satisfied with the proposals.

The Committee:

Resolved unanimously to approve the application in accordance with the officer recommendation and subject to the conditions set out in the officer report.

The meeting ended at 11.15 am

CHAIR