

**JOINT DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE - CAMBRIDGE FRINGES**

23 October 2019  
10.30 am - 12.45 pm

**Present:** Councillors Baigent, Page-Croft, Sargeant (Vice-Chair), Smart, Thornburrow, Tunnacliffe, Bradnam, Harford, Richards, Williams, Wilson and Daunton

**Officers Present:**

Assistant Director Delivery, Cambridge City and South Cambridgeshire District Councils: Sharon Brown  
Principal Planner: John Evans  
Delivery Manager - Strategic Chris Carter  
Committee Manager: Toni Birkin

**Developer Representatives:**

Alexis Butterfield, PTE Architects  
Sean Harries, Hill Residential  
Dan Cox, PTE Architects  
Chris Flood, Marshalls'  
Mark Mathews, Mott Macdonald, Associate Town Planner  
Ed Ducker, Mott Macdonald

<b>FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE COUNCIL</b>
-------------------------------------------

**19/41/JDCC      Apologies**

Apologies were received from SCDC Councillor Chamberlain, SCDC Councillor de Lacey, SCDC Councillor Hunt (SCDC Councillor Daunton was present as alternate) and County Councillor Ashwood.

**In the absence of Councillor de Lacey, Councillor Sargeant (Vice Chair) assumed the Chair**

**19/42/JDCC      Declarations of Interest**

Councillor	Item	Interest
------------	------	----------

Councillor Baigent	19/44/JDCC and 19/45/JDCC	Personal: Member Cambridge Cycling Campaign
--------------------	---------------------------------	---------------------------------------------

### **19/43/JDCC Minutes**

The minutes of the meetings of the 21 August 2019 and 18 September 2019 were agreed and signed as correct records.

### **19/44/JDCC Phase 1b, Marleigh (Wing), Land North of Newmarket Road**

The Committee received a presentation from Alexis Butterfield, PTE Architects, Dan Cox PTE Architects, Chris Flood, Marshall's and Sean Harries, Hill Residential regarding Phase 1b, Marleigh (Wing), Land North of Newmarket Road.

The presentation covered:

- i. A recap on what was included in Phase 1b of the development.
- ii. Highlighted the route connecting Newmarket Road, through the site and linking the open spaces.
- iii. Considered the constraints, objectives and character of the site.
- iv. Highlighted the open space area known as the 'Plains'.
- v. Detailed the timelines of the build programme.

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. Was there a commitment to maintain the open spaces in perpetuity?**
- 2. When would the improvement work to the Airport Way roundabout be undertaken?**
- 3. Expressed disappointment at the 30% affordable housing figure.**
- 4. Requested further details on the tenure mix across the site.**
- 5. Asked for details on how the open spaces would be protected from development in the future.**
- 6. Suggested that the houses should be orientated to make the best use of solar energy.**
- 7. Questioned how non-resident parking would be addressed.**
- 8. Asked for more details on the planned planting. Would mature / semi mature trees be used?**

9. Had the drainage systems been designed to cope with 100 year events and future increases in rain fall?
10. The 'Plains' presented a large area to one side of the site which would make it an attractive option for future building.
11. Valley gutters were often problematic. Why had this style been chosen?
12. Suggested the team visit South Trumpington to view the excellent example of allotment provision.
13. Questioned the 'lifetime homes' standards of the design brief.
14. Sought confirmation that gardens and open spaces would be Hedgehog friendly.
15. Suggested grouping parking spaces together rather than on plots so that they could be surrendered at a future date and turned into usable open spaces.
16. Questioned the accessibility of High Ditch Road as a through route.
17. Asked for clarity regarding the role of the ha-ha. Was it part of the drainage system or was it designed for added security to householders?
18. Expressed a hope that front doors and letterboxes would be located in sensible accessible places.
19. Suggested the site be aspirational, car free and zero carbon.
20. Asked if the roads would be wide enough for buses to serve the entire site.
21. Asked for more details regarding the Land Trust. Would this be an existing organisation or a new entity related to the management of the site?
22. Requested confirmation that the affordable rents would be in line with local housing allowance rates.
23. Asked for confirmation regarding a future viability review mechanism.
24. Suggested that the Market Square needed an alternative name to avoid confusion with other Market Squares.
25. Requested good connectivity and signage to Fen Ditton Village.
26. Sought an assurance that Fen Ditton Parish would not be required to assume any responsibility for the site.
27. Had proposals from Sustrans regarding converting the old railways line to a cycle route in the area been taken into account?
28. What impact would a potential relocation of the Airport have on the scheme?
29. Questioned the use of the term mews as the roads did not appear to be of mews style.

**19/45/JDCC      Rural Travel Hub, Junction of Bartlow Road and A1307**

The Committee received a presentation from Mark Mathews, Mott Macdonald, Associate Town Planner and Ed Ducker, Mott Macdonald.

The presentation covered:

- i. An overview of the wider transport issues and projects.
- ii. Detailed Greater Cambridge Partnership projects relating to 'Cambridge South East Transport'.
- iii. Outlined timelines for the highways projects.
- iv. Confirmed that considerable public consultation would be undertaken.
- v. Outlined 2 proposed improvements to the Cambridge to Haverhill Road.
  - a. Scheme 15 Bartlow Road Roundabout and rural hub.
  - b. Scheme 4 Haverhill Road, the Gog Farm Shop road safety improvement.

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. The existing park and ride sites are often full. Could the rural hub be bigger?**
- 2. As additional park and ride provision is expected in the next few years, would there be a long term need for the Hub?**
- 3. The Hub would attract cars rather than encouraging alternative modes of transport.**
- 4. Had research been undertaken to establish where vehicles were coming from?**
- 5. Suggested that traffic from the Gogs Farm Shop needed to be forced to turn left rather than cross oncoming traffic.**
- 6. Scheme 4 would not improve safety and would not assist cyclists or pedestrians.**
- 7. Traffic in the Gog Magog / Wandlebury area needed to be slowed to 30mph.**
- 8. Sightlines for drivers approaching the Gogs Farm Shop turning from Haverhill were poor and, at some times of day, the problems were compounded by glare from the shiny road surface. Installing a pedestrian crossing at this point would be extremely dangerous.**
- 9. Questioned where the budget for the projects was coming from.**
- 10. Suggested that a road safety audit was needed for both projects and this needed to pay special attention to the needs of cyclists.**

- 11. Suggested that the schemes were not logical and, in their current form, would be unlikely to be supported by this committee.**

The meeting ended at 12.45 pm

**CHAIR**