

Joint Development Control Committee - Cambridge Fringes

Date: Wednesday, 23 January 2019

Time: 10.30 am

Venue: Committee Room 1 & 2, The Guildhall, Market Square, Cambridge, CB2 3QJ

Contact: democratic.services@cambridge.gov.uk, tel 01223 457000

Agenda

Member Development Programme

9.30 to 10.30 AM - **Committee Room One**

Update on the Housing Strategy - Helen Reed, Housing Strategy Manager.

1 Apologies

2 Declarations of Interest

3 Minutes (PAGES 3 - 14)

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

4 Proposed hotel and aparthotel, Eddington

Joint Development Control Committee - Cambridge Fringes Members:

Cambridge City Council: Cllrs Blencowe (Chair), Bird, Page-Croft, Sargeant, Smart and Tunnacliffe, Alternates: Holt, Nethsingha, Moore and Thornburrow

Cambridgeshire County Council: Cllrs Bradnam, Harford, Hudson and Richards, Alternates: Cuffley, Kavanagh, Kindersley, Nethsingha, Whitehead and Wotherspoon

South Cambridgeshire District Council: Cllrs Bygott, Chamberlain, Hunt, de Lacey (Vice-Chair), Sollom and Williams, Alternates: Allen, Cone, Ellington, Howell, Cheung Johnson, Topping, Waters and Van de Weyer

Information for the public

The public may record (e.g. film, audio, tweet, blog) meetings which are open to the public. For details go to:

www.cambridge.gov.uk/have-your-say-at-committee-meetings

For full information about committee meetings, committee reports, councillors and the democratic process:

- Website: <http://democracy.cambridge.gov.uk>
- Email: democratic.services@cambridge.gov.uk
- Phone: 01223 457000

JOINT DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE - CAMBRIDGE FRINGES

24 October 2018

10.30 am - 12.15 pm

Present: Councillors Blencowe (Chair), Bird, Page-Croft, Sargeant, Smart, Tunnacliffe, Bradnam, Harford, Richards, Bygott, de Lacey (Vice-Chair), Sollom, Williams and Cheung Johnson

Officers Present:

Assistant Director Delivery, Cambridge City and South Cambridgeshire District Councils: Sharon Brown

Business Manager: Emma Fitch

Development Management Officer: Jonny Rankin

Legal Advisor: Keith Barber

Committee Manager: Sarah Steed

Other Officers Present:

Lead Engineer Development Control: Ian Dyer

FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE COUNCIL**18/31/JDCC Apologies**

Apologies were received from County Councillor Hudson, South Cambs Councillor Chamberlain, South Cambs Councillor Hunt.

South Cambs Councillor Cheung Johnson attended as South Cambs Councillor Hunt's alternate.

18/32/JDCC Declarations of Interest

Name	Item	Interest
South Cambs Councillor Bygott	18/34/JDCC	Personal: Had not been provided with training and therefore did not take part in the vote on the applications.
South Cambs Councillor Williams	18/34/JDCC	Personal: Was a member of GCP Assembly

South Cambs Councillor Sollom	18/34/JDCC	Personal: Was a member of GCP Assembly and a Ward Councillor
----------------------------------	------------	---

18/33/JDCC Minutes

The minutes of the meeting of the 18th July 2018 were agreed and signed as a correct record subject to the correction in 18/27/JDCC which referred to South Cambs Councillor Bygott as a County Councillor.

Councillor Bradnam abstained from voting on the minutes as she was not present at the previous meeting.

18/34/JDCC C/5001/18/CC and 18/0840/CTY - Trumpington Park and Ride Site, Hauxton Road, Cambridge CB2 9FT

The Committee received an application (under Regulation 3 of the Town and Country Planning General Regulations 1992 (as amended)) for full planning permission for the continued operation of existing Park and Ride Site on 24hr basis together with a proposed extension to accommodate 274 additional car parking spaces (including disabled parking bays); additional bus and coach stops and layout area; reconfiguration of existing car parking and the site entrance; provision of pedestrian and cycle links to Trumpington Meadows and replacement/new undercover cycle parking with associated infrastructure and landscaping.

The Committee noted the amendments contained in the amendment sheet and the addendum amendment sheet circulated at Committee.

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

Philip Allen (Chair of South Trumpington Parish Meeting) addressed the Committee and made the following comments:

- i. South Trumpington Parish were supportive of the application and were aware of traffic implications in the area.
- ii. Discussed drainage.
- iii. Referred to concerns contained on p22 of the committee report regarding hours of construction and asked that these would meet Cambridge City Council hours of construction.

- iv. Asked if works undertaken around the school could be done during the school holidays

In response to Members' questions the Development Management Officer, Business Manager and Assistant Director (Delivery) said the following:

- i. Confirmed that an informative may be used to refer to legislation other than planning legislation, which was different to planning conditions as there were specific planning requirements that needed to be met for these to be lawful.
- ii. Additional disabled parking bays were being provided, although he could not comment why these were not located next to existing disabled parking bays.
- iii. The Applicant had submitted projections of cycle use and the cycle parking provision exceeded projections. The cycle route through the site was detailed on submitted plans.
- iv. She could not comment on whether the proposals would affect any future autonomous vehicle plans.
- v. It would be difficult to enforce parking restrictions for the use of certain parking bays during un-social hours. Environmental Health Officers did not raise any concerns about noise to residents or the school.
- vi. Air quality had been addressed.
- vii. The south west car park would be approximately 285m from the school. 923 trees were due to be removed as part of the application but 1040 would be planted and 40 bird boxes should be provided. Planning Officers had been made aware of pre-application correspondence between the school and the applicants regarding the vegetation removal and no concerns were raised.
- viii. Environmental Health Officers did not raise any concerns regarding MUGA use.
- ix. The maintenance of the drainage system would fall to the site operator and or its owner. The applicant had had to submit a lot of detail to ensure that concerns were overcome.
- x. Noted concerns expressed about tree removal, however a number of trees type had been changed for trees with a wider base to offer more immediate screening. If the trees did not take, condition 11 dealt with their replacement.
- xi. Officers would encourage the applicant to be a considerate contractor but it was not possible to condition that works were undertaken during school holidays.
- xii. Confirmed that an informative would be added to the permission, if approved, regarding CCTV for public safety at the bus layover point.

- xiii. Changes had been made to the width of the cycle parking to meet the Cambridge City Council requirements as detailed in paragraph 8.60 of the officer's report.
- xiv. Noted Members comments that pedestrian walkthroughs should follow desire lines however the applicant had to comply with health and safety legislation and therefore walkways would be located in accordance with health and safety requirements.
- xv. Confirmed that fences being approved off site as part of the residential development would be located on the boundary of residential properties and would not cut through residential gardens.
- xvi. Confirmed officers would check the number of parking spaces following a member highlighting a discrepancy on the plans.
- xvii. Confirmed that the parent and child parking bays would become regular parking bays, they were not being removed.
- xviii. Commented that the reason for the dog-legged area and bollards was to ensure vehicles could not use the shared cyclist and pedestrian route.
- xix. There was an urgent need for the additional parking spaces; the current site was working at full capacity. This was an immediate short term solution a longer term strategy would need to be considered.
- xx. It was important to have a link between the park and ride site and Trumpington Meadows.
- xxi. This application did not consider electric charging points.
- xxii. Noted that informative 4 needed to have the word 'shall' corrected to 'should'.
- xxiii. Noted that whilst there was a net loss of cycle parking provision this was balanced against the quality of the cycle parking provision.

The Committee:

Resolved (by 9 votes to 3 with 2 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 subject to the changes set out on the 2 amendment sheets and additional informatives (below), with delegation to officers in consultation with the Chair, Vice-Chair and Spokes to confirm the on-plan discrepancy identified by Members in relation to the overall number of car parking spaces

The identified discrepancy was an additional parking bay and reconfigured soft landscaping area on the western site boundary, adjacent to the shared cycle and pedestrian access into Trumpington Meadows. This is to be shown

consistently on all of the submitted plans and be clear on the number of new parking spaces being provided..

Additional Informatives

Surface Water Drainage

All surface water from roofs ~~shall~~ should be piped direct to an approved surface water system using sealed downpipes. Open gullies should not be used.

CCTV

CCTV should be set up within the site, to address issues of anti-social behaviour. In particular in the bus layover area.

The meeting ended at 12.15 pm

CHAIR

This page is intentionally left blank

JOINT DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE - CAMBRIDGE FRINGES

21 November 2018
10.00 am - 12.45 pm

Present: Councillors Blencowe (Chair), Page-Croft, Sargeant, Tunnacliffe, Harford, Richards, Hunt, Sollom, Williams, Moore, Thornburrow and Cuffley

Officers Present:

Assistant Director Delivery, Cambridge City and South Cambridgeshire District Councils: Sharon Brown
Committee Manager: Toni Birkin

Developer Representatives:

Pollard Thomas Edwards Architect: Teresa Borsuk
Hill Residential: Jamie Wilding
DRMM: Tonia Tkachenko
DRMM: Jonas Lencer
SACO / LOCKE: Charles Cresse

FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE COUNCIL

18/35/JDCC Apologies

Apologies were received from South Cambridgeshire DC Councillors de Lacey, Chamberlain and Bygott, County Councillors Hudson and Bradnam, City Councillors Smart and Bird

County Councillor Cuffley and City Councillor Thornburrow attended as alternates.

18/36/JDCC Declarations of Interest

There were no declarations of interest.

18/37/JDCC Phase 1a, Wing, Land North of Newmarket Road

The Committee received a presentation from Pollard Thomas Edwards Architects and Hill Residential regarding Phase 1a, Wing, Land North of Newmarket Road.

The presentation highlighted the following:

- i. The Masterplan details a development of 1,300 homes with associated local facilities.
- ii. It was anticipated that Phase 1 would include the delivery of the primary school and some local facilities.
- iii. Detailed the first residential area, Phase 1a, which would be delivered in line with the agreed design code.
- iv. The planning and building time line was outlined.

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. Would all residential units comply with the latest space standards and lifetime homes requirements?
2. Had the changes to the design code agreed at a previous JDCC been incorporated and would Phase 1a be compliant?
3. Sought assurances that High Ditch road would not be used by construction vehicles.
4. Raised concerns regarding the limited parking options near to the primary school.
5. Suggested that a pre-application briefing regarding the primary school was needed.
6. Questioned why waste collections could not mirror those agreed for Eddington and asked for details on space standards for bin and cycle storage.
7. Asked for details regarding density and percentages of affordable properties.
8. Questioned car parking provision for visiting healthcare professionals.
9. Sought assurances that speeding cyclists would not be in conflict with other footpath users such as wheelchairs, mobility scooters or push chairs.

10. Questioned how residents could be encouraged to use garages for car storage rather than as additional general storage.
11. Suggested that the parking provision near to the sports pitches might be insufficient to meet the demand.
12. Raised concerns about the park and ride car park becoming an overflow car park for the Wing development.

Asked for more details on the office space around the market square. Was this intended for individual businesses or could it be used as shared space?

18/38/JDCC Proposed hotel and apart-hotel, Eddington, Madingley Road

The Committee received a presentation from (developer) regarding the proposed hotel and apart-hotel, Eddington, Madingley Road.

The presentation highlighted the following:

- i. Outlined the core values of the developer as: lifestyle choices and aimed at the corporate client.
- ii. Explained how the scheme would be a split of 150 traditional hotel rooms under the Hyatt brand and 180 apart-hotel rooms or longer stays under the Locke brand.
- iii. Site was a key location fronting onto the Market Square.
- iv. Design had taken influences from the courtyard style of Cambridge University Colleges.
- v. Ground floor would be accessible to the community and would include retail outlets, cafes and a restaurant.
- vi. Rooftop venue would be a focal point.

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.

A number of questions were asked about the parking arrangements and for the ease of the reader, these have been grouped together.

Transport and car parking

1. How would the limited parking spaces be managed to avoid overspill into the Park and Ride car park?

2. Staff would be working anti-social hours. Where would they park?
3. Parking arrangements unsuitable for this out of town location.
4. Had the impact of displaced parking on surrounding communities been considered?
5. Rural communities in the vicinity of the development would be concerned that their tranquillity would be lost due to displaced parking and increased traffic on rural roads.
6. How far was the delivery point from the restaurant and how would that distance be managed?
7. How would coach drop off at the hotel be managed?

General Questions

8. Was there evidence of the demand for this hotel?
9. Was there an upper limit to the number of consecutive nights an apart-hotel room could be occupied?
10. Were the hotels suitable for disabled guests (including any shuttle bus service)?
11. Would the proposed cycle storage accommodate nonstandard bikes?
12. Other buildings surrounding the Market Square were innovative and award winning, this building was uninspired and bland.
13. Some areas of the internal courtyard would not receive much natural light. Had breaks in the building been considered?
14. How would commercial waste collection to any franchised outlet within the hotel be managed so that nearby residential units did not suffer noise disturbance?

The meeting ended at 12.45 pm

CHAIR

This page is intentionally left blank