

JOINT DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE - CAMBRIDGE FRINGES

20 March 2019

10.30 am - 12.20 pm

Present: Councillors Blencowe (Chair), Bird, Sargeant, Tunnacliffe, Harford, Hudson, Richards, Chamberlain, Hunt and de Lacey (Vice-Chair)

Officers Present:

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

Senior Planning Policy Officer: Nancy Kimberley

Principal Planner: John Evans

Principal Environmental Health Officer: Greg Kearney

Legal Adviser: Keith Barber

Committee Manager: Toni Birkin

FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE COUNCIL

19/9/JDCC Apologies

Apologies were received from City Councillor Smart, County Councillor Bradnam and South Cambs Councillors, Bygott and Sollom.

Councillor Tunnacliffe left after the consideration of item 19/12/JDCC

19/10/JDCC Declarations of Interest

Councillor Chamberlain (South Cambs) declared a personal interest in item 19/13/JDCC as a Director of a Company with premises adjacent to the site.

19/11/JDCC Minutes

Minutes of the meeting of the 23rd January 2019 were agreed and signed as a correct record.

19/12/JDCC 18/1195/REM - Lot S3 North West Development Site

The Committee received a reserved matters application pursuant to application 13/1402/S73.

The Committee noted the amendment sheet.

The application sought approval for the construction of 186 residential units, access road, cycle parking, car parking, landscaping, utilities and associated ancillary structures.

The Committee received a representation in objection to the application from a local resident.

The representation covered the following issues:

- i. As a local resident with no connection to the developer or the University, had concerns about the proposals.
- ii. Main issues were light pollution and the height and density of the site.
- iii. Guidance documents suggested that this would be a 3 storey development. It now appears to be 5 storeys.
- iv. The area has a village feel to which would be lost by a building of this size.
- v. There are gaps between the blocks but when viewed from an angle, it would appear as a solid block.
- vi. The density also causes concern. 200 small apartments would result in a lot of windows overlooking existing properties.
- vii. Light pollution would be an issue.

Jamie Wilding (Applicant's Agent) addressed the Committee in support of the application.

Member of the Committee made the following comments regarding the application:

- i. Suggested that local residents were expecting a development of no more than three floors and while the scheme conforms to the outline plan and design code, residents might feel they had been misled. More meaningful conversation with surrounding communities was needed in future.
- ii. Expressed concerns that many developments near to Park and Ride sites appears to see them as a viable alternative parking arrangement.

In response to questions the Principal Planner stated the following:

- i. Indoor, wall hanging, cycle storage was an additional amenity which people with expensive cycles valued. There was sufficient alternative cycle parking, such as the basement.
- ii. The properties were likely to be fitted with bespoke blinds as the residents would want privacy. This would also address light pollution.
- iii. Confirmed that Lansdowne Road and Conduit Road were over 100 metres from the nearest building on the site.
- iv. Disabled parking spaces with electrical charging points would be restricted to disabled users.
- v. The gradient of the ramp leading to Turing Way footpath was not known but it had been approved by the disabilities panel.
- vi. Confirmed that internal corridors were 2.2 metres wide with wider passing points.
- vii. Confirmed that on site visitor parking spaces had increased significantly since the outline plan was agreed. A holistic approach to visitor parking was being taken with pockets of parking across the scheme.
- viii. Confirmed that letter box access would be in central foyer area.
- ix. Refuse collection would be via the underground system already in use on the site.
- x. Plans for a localised green waste collection point had not yet been finalised.
- xi. Confirmed that there was no affordable housing on this site in accordance with the outline permission. However, it was anticipated that the nearby Darwin Green site would deliver 40% affordable housing

The Assistant Director stated that a long period of time had elapsed between the original outline permission for the North West Cambridge development and the more detailed application now being considered. Lessons learned in phase one (including this scheme under consideration) would help to shape future phases of the development.

The Committee:

Resolved (by 7 votes to 3) to grant the reserved matters application in accordance with the officer recommendation, for the reasons set out in the officer report, and subject to the conditions recommended by the officers.

19/13/JDCC New Odour Assessment of Cambridge Water Recycling Centre

Matter for discussion

- i. Cambridge City Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council commissioned consultants Odournet to undertake an Odour Impact Assessment, in order to assess the level and risk of odour impact posed by Cambridge Water Recycling Centre (CWRC) to both inform the North East Cambridge Area Action Plan and aid consideration of development proposals. That assessment had been completed.
- ii. To accompany the study, a technical note had been prepared jointly with Environmental Health to set out how officers intend to interpret the results of the Odournet Assessment.
- iii. Members of the three Committees (Joint Development Control Committee – Cambridge Fringes, Cambridge City Planning Committee and South Cambridgeshire DC Planning Committee) were asked to note both reports.

Recommendation

- i. It is recommended that Committee note the findings of the 'Odour Impact Assessment for Cambridge Water Recycling Centre (2018) (appendix A), and the Technical Note on interpretation of 'Odour Impact Assessment for Cambridge Water Recycling Centre' (October 2018) (Appendix B), for the purposes of considering planning applications in the vicinity.

Discussions

The Committee received a report from the Senior Planning Policy Officer Shared Planning Service and the Principal Environmental Health Officer.

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

- i. Questioned the reports assessment that footpaths were areas of low sensitivity and suggested that local residents might place a higher value on them as an amenity.

The Officer's said the following in response to Members' questions:

- i. Confirmed that the Minerals and Waste Strategy was under revision and that the County boundaries could be revised.
- ii. Confirmed that permitted development would be restricted and that major applications, would normally need to come to committee for decision.
- iii. Control of permitted development on existing building would be difficult although some options using environmental health regulations might be possible.

- iv. Previously, matters were considered on an individual basis consulting with environmental health, as technical information was not available. The new document would allow for a more robust approach in future.
- v. Confirmed that, should the treatment plant be relocated, the guiding principles of the odour impact assessment would be respected. However, any new treatment plant would be using newer technology which would greatly reduce the impact on its neighbours.

The Committee:

The Committee **unanimously** resolved to note the findings of the 'Odour Impact Assessment for Cambridge Water Recycling Centre (2018) (appendix A), and the Technical Note on interpretation of 'Odour Impact Assessment for Cambridge Water Recycling Centre' (October 2018) (Appendix B), for the purposes of considering planning applications in the vicinity.

19/14/JDCC Meeting Dates 2019/20

The committee **resolved (unanimously)** to approve the proposed meeting dates.

The meeting ended at 12.20 pm

CHAIR