

JOINT DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE - CAMBRIDGE FRINGES

17 July 2019

10.30 am - 12.50 pm

Present: Councillors Baigent, Sergeant (Vice-Chair), Smart, Tunnacliffe, Ashwood, Harford, Richards, Bygott, Chamberlain, Hunt, de Lacey (Chair), Wilson and Lord

Officers Present:

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

Principal Planner: Philippa Kelly

Principal Planner: John Evans

Committee Manager: Toni Birkin

Other Officers Present:

Tim Watkins: Greater Cambridge Partnership

Developer Representatives:

David Fletcher: Strutt and Parker

Jo Morrison: Landscape Architect

Miles Leigh: Allies and Morrison

Tristan Radgers: Allies and Morrison

Harriet Wooler: Bidwells Planning

Emma Thompson: Bidwells Planning

Justrice Nyakatawa: Barratt Cambridgeshire

FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE COUNCIL

19/27/JDCC Apologies

Apologies were received from Councillors Thornburrow, Page-Croft, Williams and Bradnam.

Councillor Lord was present as alternate for Councillor Page-Croft.

19/28/JDCC Declarations of Interest

No interests were declared.

19/29/JDCC Trumpington - new Park and Ride, Junction 11, M11

The Committee received a presentation from David Fletcher (Strutt and Parker), Jo Morrison (Landscape Architect) and Tim Watkins (GCP) regarding the Trumpington Park and Ride Junction 11, M11.

The presentation highlighted the following:

- i. A travel hub with parking for 2,500 spaces was envisaged.
- ii. Site was at the junction of the M11 and A10.
- iii. A number of potential sites were considered and a public consultation was undertaken.
- iv. The proposed site was in the green belt and its proximity to the observatory required additional consultations.
- v. Protecting heritage sites such as Churches in Grantchester and Trumpington had been a priority as had the visual impact of the site.
- vi. The large site would allow for easy traffic flows.
- vii. A balance between the aspiration to use solar panels and desire to keep the site green and expand wildlife habitation needed to be found.
- viii. There was potential to expand the site at a future date.

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. Could the existing site be expanded to hold more vehicles?
2. Was the Travel Hub expected to complement or replace the existing provision?
3. How would the public know which site had available parking and the best bus connections?
4. Would increasing provision just increase demand?
5. Was this a good use of public funding?
6. Would further parking decks be needed in the future?
7. What progress had been made regarding Foxton rail station and any additional parking provision there?

19/30/JDCC BDW2 Scheme, Darwin Green, Huntingdon Road

The Committee received a presentation from Miles Leigh (Allies and Morrison), supported by representatives from Bidwells Planning and Barratt Cambridgeshire regarding the BDW2 Scheme, Darwin Green, Huntingdon Road.

The presentation highlighted the following:

- i. BDW2 parameter plans were approved some time ago.
- ii. Plan approved 330 homes.
- iii. The spine road had been completed.
- iv. Site would have a grid layout with larger buildings at key points and corners locations.
- v. Site was designed to reduce the dominance of cars across the site.
- vi. Could accommodate 1.5 cars per dwelling.
- vii. 40% of dwellings would be affordable and would be tenure blind.
- viii. Range of unit sizes from 2 to 4 bedrooms.
- ix. There would be two phases of construction.

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. Questioned why the site did not conform to latest space standards.
- 2. How would the limited parking provision be controlled?
- 3. Requested further details on the entrance from Huntingdon Road.
- 4. Asked how the affordable housing would be split between rented and shared ownership.
- 5. Why is cycle parking at the rear of the units? This is not convenient for cyclists, in particular those using cargo bikes.
- 6. What constrains prevented the site from mirroring Eddington and having underground bins?
- 7. What community provision would be available in the pavilion?
- 8. How many properties would share each parking court?

The Assistant Director (Delivery) reminded members that standards required under the New Local Plan were not enforceable to older applications that already had approved outline permission. Counsel advice had been sought regarding this matter. However, developers would be encouraged to comply with the new standards.

19/31/JDCC Wing update, Land north of Newmarket Road

The Principal Planner gave a post submission briefing on the Wing Development, Land North of Newmarket Road.

Members sought clarification regarding:

- i. The majority of the site was located in South Cambridgeshire.

- ii. Site would have low rise building to the perimeter with taller building to the central area.
- iii. Woodland perimeter belt would be retained.
- iv. Would contain 30% affordable units.
- v. There was an obligation to deliver the units within four years.
- vi. Homes England had provided funding for the relocation of the Engine Testing Bay. This was needed in order to deliver the site.
- vii. Phase 1a was in the planning pipeline.
- viii. The public realm and Market Square formed part of phase 1a.

Members raised comments/questions as listed below. Answers were supplied, but as this was a post submission presentation, none of the answers were to be regarded as binding and so are not included in the minutes:

1. Why are the cycle paths shared with pedestrians? This arrangement was unpopular with both groups.
2. Would the developer be encouraged to install car charging points at the initial build stage to avoid the need to retrofit?
3. Would the affordable units be pepper potted and tenure blind?
4. S106 funding had been agreed for a bus to the Bio Medical Campus. Are there any details on this and would there be any additional local buses?

The Chair invited South Cambridgeshire Ward Councillor for Fen Ditton and Fulbourn, Councillor Daunton to ask questions of the officer as follows:

1. How would access from Fen Ditton be managed for cyclists, pedestrians and motor vehicles?
2. Would any shared access be adequate?

The Assistant Director Delivery stated that a briefing from the County Council Transport Manager and the Greater Cambridge Partnership would be arranged.

The meeting ended at 12.50 pm

CHAIR