

**JOINT DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE - CAMBRIDGE FRINGES**

18 July 2018  
10.30 - 11.20 am

**Present:** Councillors Blencowe (Chair), Bird, Page-Croft, Price, Tunnacliffe, Harford, Hudson, Richards, Bygott, Hunt, de Lacey (Vice-Chair), Sollom, Williams and Topping

**Officers Present:**

Assistant Director Delivery, Cambridge City and South Cambridgeshire District Councils: Sharon Brown  
Senior Planner (City): Adam Bridgeman  
Senior Planner (City): John Evans  
Trainee Planner, Environment: Aaron Coe  
Legal Advisor: Keith Barber  
Committee Manager: Toni Birkin

**FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE COUNCIL**

**18/20/JDCC Apologies**

Apologies were received from Councillor Smart (City) and Councillor Chamberlain (SCDC). Councillor Sargeant (City) and Councillor Topping (SCDC) were present as alternates.

**18/21/JDCC Declarations of Interest**

| Name       | Item       | Interest   |
|------------|------------|--|
| Cllr Price | 18/23/JDCC | Prejudicial Interest: Director of Cambridge Investment Partnership (appointed by Cambridge City Council). Councillor Price left the meeting while this item was under consideration. |

|               |                              |   |
|---------------|------------------------------|---|
| Cllr de Lacey | 18/25/JDCC and<br>18/23/JDCC | Personal: Had<br>previously reminded<br>developers of their duty<br>to secure planning<br>consent before erecting<br>large signage. |
|---------------|------------------------------|---|

The Committee noted an error in the text of item 18/25/JDCC which incorrectly stated that Hill was the applicant. This was not the case as this was a Council guidance document and therefore Councillor Price did not have a prejudicial interest in this item.

### **18/22/JDCC Minutes**

The minutes of the meeting of 20<sup>th</sup> June 2018 were approved and signed as a correct record.

### **18/23/JDCC Planning Report - 18/2799/17/AD**

The Committee received an application for Advertisement Consent.

The application sought approval for erection and retention of 6 No. standalone marketing advertisement signage boards.

Councillor Harford and de Lacey raised concerns that Girton Parish Council had not been consulted regarding signage that would impact on Girton. Councillor de Lacey reported that the Parish Council, along with residents of Girton, were unhappy with the size and magnitude of the proposed erection of a new advertisement at the corner of Huntingdon Road and Eddington Avenue.

The Assistant Director advised that the consultation might have been undertaken some time ago as the application had been linked to a parallel City Council application that had been determined separately. It was also likely that the consultation had outlined two applications, one South Cambs and one City, at the same time.

The Case Officer checked the records and confirmed that Girton Parish Council had been consulted on the 16 January 2017 but no response had been received.

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

- i. The proposed signage to Huntingdon Road was large and would adversely impact on the green separation between the City gateway and the village of Girton.
- ii. The area was rural and green in nature and large sign would be out of keeping with the area.
- iii. The location of the large sign would be at the symbolically important end of Girton Gap.
- iv. There were no objections to the signage further in the site.
- v. The Harris fencing already carried a lot of advertising for the developer.
- vi. On the Sainsbury sign a compromise had been reached and a smaller totem sign had been approved following negotiation and a refusal.
- vii. A similar application had been refused for Madingley Road and it could be argued that Huntingdon Road was more rural in character when compared to the urban nature of Madingley Road. Huntingdon Road therefore needed more protection.

The Assistant Director reminded the Committee that where planning applications sought approval for signage in more than one location, the recommendations could be considered individually.

#### The Committee:

The Committee decided to deal with each matters individually (as detailed in paragraph 2.1 of the officer's report) in the following manner:

#### Recommendations 1:

- b) the retention of three advertisements on the western side of Eddington Avenue within the NWC development, and
- c) the erection of two new advertisements on the eastern side of Eddington Avenue.

**Unanimously resolved:** to grant the advertising consent (part (b) and (c) as above) in accordance with the officer recommendation, for the reasons set out in the officer report, and subject to the conditions recommended by the officers.

#### Recommendation 2:

- a) the erection of one new advertisement at the corner of Huntingdon Road/ Eddington Avenue

**Resolved (by 12 votes to 1)** to reject the officer recommendation to approve the application (part (a) as above).

**Resolved (by 12 votes to 0 and 1 abstention)** to refuse the application (part (a)) contrary to the officer recommendation for the following reasons:

The proposed Huntingdon Road homes marketing sign (labelled blue on the location plan), by reason of its prominent location and overall size would be unduly strident and visually intrusive, out of character with its surrounding context on a key approach into the City. As such the proposal would cause significant harm to visual amenity, contrary to policies NW2 and NW4 of the North West Cambridge Area Action Plan 2009, government guidance contained within the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2012 and the Town and County Planning (Control of Advertisements) (England) Regulations 2007.

#### **18/24/JDCC      Planning Report - 18/0513/FUL - 11 Harness Close**

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for a single storey side and rear extension.

Committee Members raised concerns that they had little control over changes to properties on fringe sites as permitted development rights had not been restricted.

The Assistant Director confirmed that a working group had been established to consider the removal of permitted development rights from some future development where ad hoc changes to properties could impact on the overall scheme design.

#### The Committee:

**Unanimously resolved** 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.

#### **18/25/JDCC      General Item - NW Quadrant Temporary Retail Signage Guidance**

The Committee received a request to endorse the North West Quadrant – Temporary Signage, Informal Guidance Note.

The application sought approval for the Temporary Retail Signage – Informal Guidance note which had been produced to complement existing marketing signage guidance for the Cambridge Fringe Sites.

The Committee welcomed the report and were pleased to note that off-site signage had also been included in the Guidance.

Officers confirmed that illuminated signage would not be acceptable.

The Committee welcomed the clarity over the status of signage once the construction phase was completed. Once building work was completed and businesses and residential units were occupied, signage should be removed.

The Committee:

**Unanimously resolved:** To endorse the North West Quadrant – Temporary Signage, Informal Guidance Note.

The meeting ended at 11.20 am

**CHAIR**