

JOINT DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE - CAMBRIDGE FRINGES

27 May 2020
10.30 am - 3.26 pm

Present: Councillors Baigent, Sargeant (Vice-Chair), Thornburrow, Tunnaclyffe, Harford, Wotherspoon, Chamberlain, Daunton, de Lacey (Chair), Williams, Wilson, Moore and Bradnam

Ward Councillors:

Councillor Ashton
Councillor McPherson

Officers Present:

Assistant Director Delivery, Cambridge City and South Cambridgeshire District Councils: Sharon Brown
Delivery Manager (Strategic): Chris Carter
Principal Planner: Philippa Kelly
Principal Environment Health Officer: Greg Kearney
Legal Adviser: Keith Barber
Committee Manager: Sarah Steed
Committee Manager: Claire Tunnicliffe

Other Officers Present:

Transport Assessment Manager: David Allatt
County Transport Assessment Officer: Jez Tuttle

Other Representatives:

Applicant's Agent: Greg Blaquiere
Local Resident
Cambridge Cycling Campaign representative

FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE COUNCIL

20/4/JDCC Apologies

Apologies were received from City Councillor Smart (City Councillor Moore attended as alternate), County Councillor Ashwood (County Councillor Bradnam attended as alternate) and County Councillor Richards (no alternate available) and SCDC Councillor Bygott (no alternate available).

20/5/JDCC Declarations of Interest

Member	Item	Interest
City Cllr Sargeant	20/8/JDCC	Personal: Was a member of Camcycle and Cambridge Area Bus Users
City Cllr Baigent	20/8/JDCC	Personal: Was a member of Extinction Rebellion and Cambridge Cycling Campaign
City Cllr Thornburrow	20/8/JDCC	Personal: City Council representative on the Board of Natural Cambridgeshire and Water Resources East.
SCDC Cllr Daunton	20/8/JDCC	Personal: Ward Councillor and also a member of Cambridge Area Bus Users
SCDC Cllr de Lacey	20/8/JDCC	Personal: Member of Cambridge Cycling Campaign
County Cllr Bradnam	20/8/JDCC	Personal: Was the County Division Member for the neighbouring division and had been in discussions regarding the likely impacts of the application on the Parish of Fen Ditton but had not expressed a view and came to this meeting afresh. Was also Chairman

			of Cambridge Area Bus Users.
County Wotherspoon	Cllr	20/8/JDCC	Personal: Had been Vice-Chair of the County Council's Economy and Environment Committee when the through road had been discussed. He was also Chair of the Cambridgeshire Peterborough Flood and Water Partnership which was part of the Flood Authority. He came to the meeting with a fresh mind.

20/6/JDCC Minutes

The minutes of the meetings held on 18 December 2019 and 22 January 2020 were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chair subject to the following amendment to the 22 January 2020 minutes:

on page 2 of the minutes item reference vi this should read (deleted text ~~struckthrough~~ and additional text underlined).

Commented that the noise modelling showed a bend to the east, so questioned whether this meant land at Cherry Hinton would be subject to noise from the airport to the west. Also commented that noise could carry a long way (~~even~~ especially at 4am in the morning) and be intrusive even at low levels.

20/7/JDCC Virtual Council Meetings

The Committee received a report proposing conventions on how the JDCC meetings would operate in a virtual way of working arising from the provisions in the Coronavirus Act 2020 and its associated regulations.

The Committee:

Resolved:

- (i) To adopt the conventions for virtual meetings as adopted and used by Cambridge City Council the administering authority for the JDCC and
- (ii) To agree that the conventions are reviewed by the JDCC by the end of July 2020.

20/8/JDCC 18/0481/OUT & S/1231/18/OL - Land north of Cherry Hinton

The Committee received applications 18/0481/OUT and S/1231/18/OL for outline planning permission (all matters reserved except for means of access in respect of junction arrangements onto Coldhams Lane, Cherry Hinton Road and Airport Way) for a maximum of 1200 residential dwellings (including retirement living facility (within Use Class C2/C3)), a local centre comprising uses within Use Class A1/A2/A3/A4/A5/B1a/D1/D2, primary and secondary schools, community facilities, open spaces, allotments, landscaping and associated infrastructure

The Committee heard two representatives speaking in objection to the application, the first a local resident, the second a representative from CamCycle.

The local resident representation covered the following issues:

- i. He would be directly affected by the development as he lived in March Lane which was next to the site.
- ii. The application would have a negative impact on the environment and wildlife.
- iii. The City and County Council were one of the biggest polluters in Cambridge. There were persistent roadworks, with temporary traffic lights which caused traffic jams and idling cars which polluted the city.
- iv. The area was already gridlocked particularly in rush hour and the proposal would add to congestion.
- v. The roads surrounding the proposed development would struggle to cope with additional cars.
- vi. The Councils did not have the road infrastructure to cope with the development.
- vii. Bus services could not use Coldham's Lane because of the low railway bridge.

- viii. He was aware that housing in the city was required but this was not the right place to build it.

The CamCycle representation covered the following issues:

- i. Thanked the applicants for improving the details of the access junctions, but their objection remained because it was dangerous to put a through-road in the middle of the new neighbourhood and past a primary school.
- ii. The proposed strategy for the primary street had two incompatible goals:
 - 1) trying to be a low-speed street to encourage walking and cycling, and
 - 2) also a bypass road to relieve Coldhams Lane and Church End.
- iii. Any through-route would be exploited by drivers and used as a bypass, no matter how much traffic calming was attempted. Motorists would try to push through as quickly as they can, even whilst families attempted to walk and cycle on the same street. This combination would be locked in for generations to come, and it would create pollution right into the heart of the neighbourhood.
- iv. Through-traffic should not pass through the middle of the neighbourhood, or in front of the primary school.
- v. Suggested a number of options for the Committee:
 - 1) defer the application and give instructions to return with a movement parameter plan that takes the relief road carrying motorised through-traffic around the edge of the site and away from homes and schools, while also ensuring that residential neighbourhoods were served by access-only streets.
 - 2) attach a condition, to secure the requirement for a bus gate on the primary street, and any necessary modal filters on other streets, eliminating any private motorised through-traffic by any route.
 - 3) defer and revise the application to use Option A from the SPD, takes away some, but not all, of the motorised through-traffic from some of the more populated residential areas.

(Greg Blaquiere) (Applicant's Agent) addressed the Committee in support of the application.

Councillor Ashton (Ward Councillor for Cherry Hinton) addressed the Committee about the application:

- i. Transport was the major issue with this development, there was no local support for this development.

- ii. Some relief that the County Council had changed its initial plan to have no access from Coldham's Lane through to Gazelle Way.
- iii. Referred back 30 years ago when it was appropriate for other new developments to have periphery roads serving them, including at Gazelle Way.
- iv. Commented that a spine road through development, despite a 20mph speed limit would create noise disturbance to residents.
- v. Questioned why there wasn't a periphery road around the estate to relieve congestion pressure. He believed that the reason why a periphery road was not included was because of the cost. Local residents were in favour of a periphery road.
- vi. Asked that the transport solution was revisited.

Councillor McPherson (Ward Councillor for Cherry Hinton) addressed the Committee about the application:

- i. Noted that the speed limit of 20mph for the through spine road was not enforceable.
- ii. The impact of the development on Cherry Hinton would change the character of Cherry Hinton as he knew it.
- iii. He was not aware of anyone who supported this development in its entirety.

A written statement from County Councillor Sandra Crawford was read out by the Committee Manager in which she wanted to inform the Committee:

- i. She wished to object to the application on the grounds of over development and the lack of infrastructure to support such a large development.
- ii. She also objected to the loss of the wildlife, the loss of the public amenity in the green public 'footpath' that goes along the whole route of this application site.
- iii. The identity of Cherry Hinton and Teversham would be severely compromised. She believed the wishes of residents who lived Cherry Hinton should be put before those yet to move there. Many residents live in Cherry Hinton because it is on the edge of the city and enjoy the openness. The Committee were asked to consider the impact on the community before deciding.
- iv. The plan did not make it clear where all the traffic would go. It was not possible to direct such an increase in traffic movement through either Cherry Hinton High Street nor the surrounding small roads which were already the subject of speeding and rat-running; Church End/Teversham Drift being the worst made more so by the primary access route through the development being a through route.

- v. The development if approved, needed a proper peripheral road or at the very least a 'spine' road. No diversions or cut throughs should be available.
- vi. At the construction stage; the primary access road needed to be built first so that the construction traffic was not using any of the surrounding residential roads of Cherry Hinton High Street.
- vii. A periphery road that continued from the Coldhams Lane/Barnwell Road Roundabout and continued to Airport Way would avoid serious traffic congestion in the High Street of Cherry Hinton and connecting roads leading off Coldhams Lane.

In response to Members questions, the Assistant Director (Delivery) confirmed that applications for key strategic conditions, including the design code, would be reported back to Committee.

Principle of Development and Land Use Parameters

The Committee made the following comments in response to the Officer's Committee report.

- i. Expressed concern about areas of open spaces including play areas being used for sustainable urban drainage (SUDs) systems. Consideration should be given to how these areas could be separated.
- ii. Voiced unease at an area on the master plan (section 3) which highlighted a multi-functional play area which incorporated a drainage feature. This area of green space was very close to the community hub (section 5) and questioned if this area would be designed to be a SUDs feature rather than a community green space.
- iii. Questioned if the building heights shown on the parameter plans were correct for residential and non-residential units. The three storey houses measured 12 metres high, which could appear to be a four-storey building. The additional height would possibly allow for an additional level in the roof space.
- iv. Questioned if the loss of high-grade agricultural land was acceptable when government policy is to make the UK more food independent.
- v. Questioned the security of the 40% affordable housing being delivered.
- vi. Asked if it was possible to guarantee that the greenbelt land used for recreational space on the site would not be used for future development.
- vii. Queried if all properties would be built to M4(2) standards with 5% of affordable homes to M4(3) standard as set out in the Cambridge Local Plan.

- viii. Questioned if there was a way to stop future dwellings being used as Airbnb lets.

In response to Members' questions the Principal Planner, Assistant Director (Delivery) said the following:

- i. Reminded members that the site was allocated within both the Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire District Local Plans therefore the principle of development was well established in planning policy terms.
- ii. Agreed careful consideration was required when looking at the detailed design to ensure that play spaces were usable and did not flood. Officers had worked with the Applicants to produce a drainage strategy, which would ensure play spaces would be usable even during times of high rainfall. There would be some doubling up on the use of land for open spaces and for SUDs systems.
- iii. Further modelling work had been undertaken by the applicant with regard to drainage. The Council's drainage and landscape officers were satisfied with these measures and the area would provide useable recreational spaces.
- iv. The building height parameter plan referred to maximum height of buildings. If buildings of greater storeys are proposed this would be contrary to the parameter plans and would require appropriate planning changes.
- v. Suggested that additional text should be included on the building heights parameter plan to clarify that building heights will not exceed maximum building heights in both metres and storeys. Design codes and the detailed reserved matters applications would also address the issue of the height of buildings which would be brought forward for the Committee's future consideration.
- vi. The South Cambridgeshire District Council's Local Plan included policies which relate to agricultural land which recognise that an allocated development site comes forward its loss as agricultural land is acceptable.
- vii. The development proposal sought to deliver 40% affordable housing on site; to be secured through the section 106 Agreement. There was also an opportunity to influence the phasing of the development with a phasing condition. Officers would also work with the applicants as part of

- the reserved matters process to determine the location of the affordable housing throughout the development.
- viii. It will not be possible to exceed the maximum number of dwellings (up to 1200 dwellings) if approved today as doing so would be in contravention of the outline approval.
 - ix. Any subsequent plans to alter the change of use on the greenbelt land would require its own specific application to be made for planning permission; therefore, the greenbelt is safeguarded.
 - x. There were relevant planning conditions relating to accessibility and residential space standards; these ensured that M4(2) standard with 5% of affordable homes to M4(3) standard as set out in the Local Plan policies would be met.
 - xi. Could not speculate on the future use of the dwellings or if they were to be used as an Airbnb.

Access and Transport Issues

The Committee made the following comments in response to the Officer's Committee report:

- i. Asked if the roundabout at Airport Way was subject to a s106 Agreement on the Marleigh development, which was the other side of Newmarket Road.
- ii. Referred to paragraph 13.51 of the Officer's report which referred to the impact of the development on Teversham village and the increased traffic. Officers were asked to comment on increased traffic through Teversham arising from the two schools provided on the development.
- iii. Asked from where the pupils attending the secondary school would be travelling as they did not think they would all be coming from Cherry Hinton or Teversham villages.
- iv. Asked if the locations of the level crossings in both Cherry Hinton High Street and Gazelle Way had been taken into consideration as part of the transport assessment.
- v. Questioned the robustness of the Transport Assessment and reliance on people travelling by bicycle.
- vi. Referred to the Officer's report which stated the 'residual highway impact would not be severe'. Members were not convinced by the public transport provision and expressed concerns regarding the spine road

through the site. Asked what would happen if either Airport Way or Coldham's Lane were closed and whether this meant the spine road would then become the main route.

- vii. Commented that the academy appointed to run the secondary school stated on their website that 50% of the school intake would be from outside the catchment area. Most people attending the school would travel by car which would cause transport problems and this wasn't taken into account as part of the transport modelling / assessment.
- viii. Questioned if Coldham's Lane would be segregated between pedestrians and cyclists on both sides of the road.
- ix. Questioned what the baseline was for the transport assessment and asked whether the impact of the incremental traffic was severe.
- x. Requested an addition to condition 9 (design code) regarding traffic calming measures.
- xi. Commented that vehicle trips would not only include trips for employment purposes but could include trips for shopping and noted the location of Tesco and Sainsburys in the vicinity.

In response to Members' questions the County Council Transport Assessment Manager, County council Transport Assessment Officer, Principal Planner and Assistant Director (Delivery) said the following:

- i. Confirmed that the roundabout at Airport Way was not part of the s106 proposals relating to the Marleigh development. The transport assessment modelled the built-out development and the trips which would be generated as the development was built out including the schools being fully operational. Confirmed the assessment considered the level of trips that the development 'uses' would generate and a cautious and robust calculation was taken in that regard. Sought to understand the distribution of those trips and apply them to the network to see if the network could tolerate that against the NPPF test.
- ii. The education trips were looked at using a gravity model. This considered the probability that people would walk, cycle or travel to school by car. Trips from Teversham were expected to be walking or cycle trips. Trips from Fulbourn might be made by car but it was not expected that there would be many trips from Fulbourn by car.
- iii. If there were already a lot of car trips to Teversham this was an existing problem and unfortunately could not be resolved as part of the current application. Infrastructure was being put in place for any school children who needed to travel from Teversham to Cherry Hinton as part of the current application. The level crossing was an existing situation. The

amount of traffic going through Cherry Hinton High Street was going to be relatively minimal because it was relatively low speed and had the level crossing. There would be minimal extra impact as it was expected that people would avoid a journey through an already congested route which had a level crossing.

- iv. A comprehensive transport mitigation package was contained in the Officer's report which had been agreed with County Council officers. Measures included financial contribution to strategic infrastructure, connectivity improvements, improvements to existing footpaths and cycle paths to facilitate linkages connecting with existing routes.
- v. A signalised junction was already proposed to Coldhams Lane. The safety of the junction had been assessed based on designs submitted and which were judged to be acceptable. Extensive discussions over a number of years had taken place looking at the highway impacts. The design would be worked up through a reserved matters application. A construction management plan would need to be in place to manage transport movements during its construction. Re-routing of traffic in the event of planned roadworks would be considered in advance of any works taking place. The spine road was not expected to be a desirable route as it had traffic signals at the proposed junction with Coldhams Lane.
- vi. A detailed protocol was being put in place between the City and District Councils and County Council staff for when the County Council are no longer part of JDCC or any successor planning committee set up along strategic joint working. Officers already work closely and would continue to do so. The County Council would be required to consult with the City and District Councils on certain applications, which included school applications. Representations could be made to the County Council on any future school application and there would be public speaking provisions at its meetings as well.
- vii. Officers were not aware at the time the transport modelling assessment was undertaken that the school would be accepting 50% of its pupils from outside of the catchment area. The school will need to have a travel plan in place which considered how they could accept 50% of pupils outside the catchment area without causing additional congestion/harm.
- viii. Where possible segregated cycle and pedestrian routes would be provided; however this was not always possible throughout the whole of the site because of constraints and one area where this wasn't possible was Coldham's Lane.
- ix. The baseline for transport modelling was the current situation and the incremental traffic calculated as a result of the development which would

not be, relatively speaking, severe given the package of mitigation measures provided.

- x. Details of the traffic management measures could be picked up in condition 9 of Appendix E as part of the site wide design code condition.
- xi. Hoped that people who did more frequent trips to a supermarket would walk or cycle and appreciated that some trips would be done by car. Anticipated that some people would seek to avoid travelling to the supermarket during rush hour / commuter traffic.

The Chair sought advice from the Assistant Director (Delivery) whether the Committee should continue to determine the application following a query from a Member regarding transport modelling.

The Assistant Director (Delivery) commented that this was an allocated site in the local plan and had been through a supplementary planning document (SPD) process. The County Council transport and highways officers had been through a detailed technical assessment process. She appreciated there were local concerns regarding the transport impact but these were inevitable when a strategic development site was brought forward. The transport and highways officers were the technical experts and had considered the transport impacts and supported the application. The impact of the school would be dealt with via the County Council's planning application process and through a protocol with the City and District Councils.

The County Council Transport Assessment Manager commented that they had been working on this application for a long period of time and there had been a number of briefings for Members. Following the last Member briefing they had worked further on the mitigation proposals. This area posed a number of strategic challenges which required strategic investment. Briefings had been provided by the Greater Cambridge Partnership. Localised mitigation had been guided by the SPD and the NPPF and linked back to the planning tests.

Housing Delivery and Social Community Infrastructure

The Committee made the following comments in response to the Officer's report:

- i. Welcomed the additional information regarding the space standards to allow for future review.
- ii. Expressed concern at suggested location for the affordable housing and should ensure that all developers on site delivered affordable housing on their developments.
- iii. Questioned why there was no social rent on the one and two bed units.

- iv. Asked why the Officer's report referred to the term pepper-potting with regards to affordable housing when it should be clustering. The two were different forms of build-out of social housing and pepper-potting was incorrect as this was not in City Council's SPD.
- v. Asked what proportion of the housing would be built to passivhaus standards.
- vi. Queried was meant by retirement living?
- vii. Wanted to ensure public accessibility to the facilities.
- viii. Expressed concerns regarding the length of time that it took to deliver community facilities on the Darwin Green development and requested an earlier trigger point for the delivery of both the temporary and permanent community facilities.
- ix. Asked if the allotments could be provided earlier than their current trigger point.
- x. Queried who would service the foul drainage, as Anglian Water said that they did not have capacity.
- xi. Queried where allotment holders would get water from.

In response to Members' questions the County Council Transport Assessment Manager, Principal Planner and Assistant Director (Delivery) said the following

- i. Would look to ensure that the affordable housing was distributed appropriately through across the site through the s106 agreement. This would allow an element of control of how much development was permitted and the requirement for affordable housing.
- ii. An affordable housing mix and tenure type was highlighted on p81 of the report which had been agreed with the Council's housing officers. A review mechanism will be built into the s106 Agreement.
- iii. Cambridge City's SPD was for guidance. Housing officers had provided advice based on recent experiences and it was best to avoid significant clusters of affordable housing. Would work with potential applicants on the details of the affordable housing schemes to ensure that officers were satisfied with the proposals at that time.
- iv. Advised that the normal approach on all the previous fringe sites had been to cluster the affordable housing; clustering and pepper-potting can have the same meaning, this will be clarified through the s106 Agreement.
- v. The s106 Agreement would be signed off in consultation with the Chair, Vice-Chair and Opposition Spokes.
- vi. Could not advise on the specific percentage of houses which would be built to passivhaus standard on site, the Council's sustainability officer had re-viewed the conditions and would review any discharge of condition applications.

- vii. The planning application included within its description 'retirement living facility' and would be secured through condition 15 see Appendix E. This could be private or affordable housing and would form part of the affordable housing component.
- viii. Confirmed there would be a community use agreement secured through the s106 Agreement. Work had been undertaken with community services officers to agree the delivery of the temporary facility.
- ix. Agreed to revise the trigger points for the delivery of the temporary community facilities to the 50th dwelling and the permanent facility to the 350th dwelling.
- x. Phasing of the development would preclude an earlier trigger point for the provision of allotments.
- xi. Anglian Water had committed to undertaking the necessary improvement work which would be required to be able to service the development.
- xii. The allotment management strategy would address how water was provided to the allotments.

Environmental considerations

The Committee made the following comments in response to the Officer's report:

- i. The Agent suggested a decision on the bund may have already been made but they understood this would be dealt with through reserved matters applications.
- ii. Questioned helicopter movements.
- iii. Queried lighting impact when the MUGA (multi use games area) was used.
- iv. Asked if hedgerows could be maintained and improved.

In response to Members' questions the Principal Planner, Environmental Health Officer (EHO – Environmental Services) and Assistant Director (Delivery) said the following:

- i. The Parameter Plan made provision for attenuation measures and the scheme had been assessed on that basis. Precise detail of the attenuation would be subject to a reserved matters application.
- ii. The City Council's Environmental Health Officer confirmed that there were various helicopter routes around the airport and one was through the centre of the site, this had been fully assessed in the noise impact assessment. However there are a limited number of daytime movements and at night time only the East of England Air Ambulance flew infrequently. Concluded that there was no unacceptable adverse noise impacts. In reality certain aircraft noise movements would be heard from

- time to time but any impacts would be reduced and mitigated to an acceptable level as part of building noise insulation scheme. This issue would be controlled by condition.
- iii. Flood lighting from use of the MUGA would be controlled through condition. The school would have a community access agreement in place.
 - iv. There were ecology aspirations which sought to retain existing hedgerows and trees on the site and the improvement of their condition. This would be covered through the ecological design and the landscape and environment plan.

Legal advice was sought on the fact that the free schools' admissions policy anticipated that 50% of pupils would attend the school from outside of the catchment area and this appeared not to have been taken into account as part of the transport modelling. Advice was also sought on whether the existence of a road in front of the school was an adequate reason to reject the planning application.

The Legal Adviser responded:

- i. The application had undergone extensive consultation and assessment before it had reached the Committee for determination. He reminded the Committee it was an allocated site in the local plan and the Officer's report had evidenced the application was policy compliant. The Local Highways Authority considered the transport assessment to show appropriate mitigation to eliminate certain elements of traffic.
- ii. The school could only be occupied after a travel plan had been approved by the County Council. Therefore, it was reasonable to conclude that any concerns regarding transport measures for the school would be addressed.

The County Council Transport Assessment Manager confirmed:

- i. A gravity model had been used when looking at the approach to the school; usually those closer would be more likely to use the school but the model had not excluded those who lived further away, although not postcode specific (as could not be certain where the students would be arriving from), this was the most sensible approach.

The Principal Planner clarified:

- i. The Sustainable Design and Construction SPD did not specify a percentage of housing that would be passive housing. A proportion was acceptable. The Council's Sustainability Officer had agreed to these conditions and any discharge of condition applications would be reviewed and signed off by the Sustainability Officer.

Conditions

In response to the conditions attached to the Officer recommendations the following comments were made:

- i. Condition 41 to also include: any replacement trees should also be maintained for five years from when any replacement planting occurred.
- ii. Condition 9 to also include: an additional criterion regarding traffic management measures.
- iii. Additional wording to be included on the Building Heights Parameter Plan to clarify the storeys and heights of buildings. Delegation to officers in consultation with Chair, Vice Chair and Spokes.

The Assistant Director (Delivery) concluded with the following:

- i. Reiterated this was an allocated development site in the current local plan but also in previous local plans. There was an SPD specifically for this site. There had been a pre-application process for this development. Significant work had been carried out between District Council officers and the Transport Team at the County Council to ensure a robust transport package to mitigate the impact of the development.
- ii. The development would provide 40% affordable housing and community development support secured through a s106 Agreement.
- iii. The development provided a significant contribution to the housing supply of both local authorities.

The Committee:

Resolved (by 11 votes to 2) to grant the application for planning permission in accordance with the Officer recommendation, for the reasons set out in the Officer's report, subject to:

- i. the prior completion of a Section 106 Agreement under the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 on the terms broadly referenced in Section

- 20 of the Officer's report, with delegated authority granted to officers to negotiate, secure and complete such an Agreement on terms as are otherwise considered appropriate and necessary. Prior to completing the Agreement the Chair, Vice Chair and Spokes of JDCC shall be provided with a summary of the planning obligations included in the settled draft Agreement and
- ii. that the Section 106 Agreement triggers for the permanent and temporary community facilities be amended as follows:
 - a. the permanent community facility – be provided and available for use prior to occupation of 350th dwelling.
 - b. The temporary community facility – be provided and available for use prior to occupation of 50th dwelling and
 - iii. the planning conditions set out in the Officer's report in Appendix E with delegated authority to officers to amend the planning conditions in consultation with the Chair, Vice Chair and Spokes of JDCC; and
 - iv. the following additional / amended conditions:
 - a. Building Heights Parameter Plan:

additional wording to be included thereon, which clarifies storeys and heights. Delegation to officers in consultation with Chair, Vice Chair and Spokes.

- b. Condition 9 (Site Wide Design Code):

additional criteria (v) to refer to traffic management/calming measures.

- c. Condition 41 (Replacement of Dead or Dying Trees):

replacement trees to be maintained for five-year period.

The meeting ended at 3.26 pm

CHAIR