

JOINT DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE

4 August 2020
10.30 am - 3.20 pm

Present: Councillors Baigent, Bradnam, Bygott, Chamberlain, Daunton, Hawkins, Hunt, Matthews, Page-Croft, Sargeant, Smart and Thornburrow

Officers Present:

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

Principal Planner: Ganesh Gnanamoorthy

Legal Adviser: Keith Barber

Committee Manager: Sarah Steed

Committee Manager: Claire Tunnicliffe

FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE COUNCIL

20/1/JDCC Election of Chair and Vice-Chair

The Assistant Director (Delivery) took the chair whilst the Committee elected a Chair.

Councillor Bradnam proposed, and Councillor Smart seconded, the nomination of Councillor Sargeant as Chair.

Resolved unanimously that Councillor Sargeant be Chair for the ensuing year.

Councillor Sargeant assumed the chair from the Assistant Director (Delivery) at this point.

Councillor Sargeant proposed, and Councillor Daunton seconded, the nomination of Councillor Bradnam as Vice-Chair.

Resolved unanimously that Councillor Bradnam be Vice-Chair for the ensuing year.

20/2/JDCC Apologies

Apologies were received from City Councillor Tunnacliffe (City Councillor Page-Croft was present as alternate).

20/3/JDCC Declarations of Interest

Councillor	Item	Interest
Councillor Baigent	20/06/JDCC	Personal: Member of Cambridge Cycling Campaign and a Member of Extinction Rebellion
Councillor Hunt	20/06/JDCC	Personal: Ward Councillors which part of the application sits in.
Councillor Bygott	20/06/JDCC	Personal: Member of Past, Present & Future

20/4/JDCC JDCC Standing Orders and Scheme of Delegation

The Committee received a report from the Assistant Director (Delivery).

The report referred to the County Council resolution in May 2020 to withdraw from the Joint Development Control Committee (JDCC) after July 2020. The effect of their withdrawal would mean the JDCC as then constituted would no longer be quorate.

The corporate processes for the establishment of the new Joint Development Control Committee, composed of members from both South Cambridgeshire District Council and Cambridge City Council had now been completed and the previous JDCC dissolved.

The changes made to the Terms of Reference, Standing Orders and Scheme of Delegation at each stage of the corporate processes were summarised in the officer's report.

Members of the new Joint Development Control Committee were asked to consider the Standing Orders and Scheme of Delegation in order that the Committee could proceed with business.

Recommendations

- i) To confirm the Standing Orders for the Joint Development Control Committee.
- ii) To confirm the Scheme of Delegation for the Joint Development Control Committee.
- iii) To agree that the Standing Orders and Scheme of Delegation will be reviewed on an annual basis.

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

- i. Indicated the wording to the appointment of Chair and Vice Chair should be re worded under p13 (Standing Orders) of the agenda pack, paragraph 1.1 and 1.2.
- ii. Suggested under Appendix A, Public Speaking Rights, p18 of the agenda pack there needed to be clarity on the order of public speakers.
- iii. Would be helpful to highlight at which point of the public speaking the Committee could ask for points of clarification.

The Assistant Director (Delivery) said the following in response to Members' questions:

- i. Noted the request for the rewording of the election and vice chair for the municipal year; this would be brought back to the next meeting for approval.
- ii. When considering raising the quorum it should not be set too high as there was a possibility that the meeting may not be quorate.
- iii. Previous Standing Orders requested a minimum of 3 members from Cambridge City Council and 3 members from South Cambridgeshire District Council as part of the quorum composition.
- iv. Points of clarification should be at the discretion of the Chair and used in exceptional circumstances. There could be an issue where the points of clarification took longer than the committee debate.
- v. Noted the request to include clarity on the order in which the public speakers addressed the committee; the wording would be presented to the Committee at the next meeting for approval.

Councillor Smart proposed the following amendment under item 4, Financial Implications, p4 of the officer's report (agenda page 6), additional text underlined, deleted text ~~struck through~~.

4. Implications

a) Financial Implications

The JDCC is managed by Cambridge City Council at present and the cost of the JDCC meetings are covered within the existing budgets. These costs ~~may~~ will form part of the shared services charging agreement.

On a show of hands, the amendment was unanimously carried.

Resolved (unanimously):

The JDCC is managed by Cambridge City Council at present and the cost of the JDCC meetings are covered within the existing budgets. These costs will form part of the shared services charging agreement.

Follow the suggestion that the quorum of the committee be raised, Councillor Sargeant proposed a vote be taken on increasing the quorum to four, six or keeping the Quorum to three as stated in the officer's report. After an informal count of the proposals the following was proposed.

Councillor Daunton proposed and Councillor Bradnam seconded the following amendment under item 6, Quorum, p14 of the agenda pack additional text underlined, deleted text ~~struck through~~.

The quorum of a meeting will be ~~three~~ six with no less than: -
4 3 Member from South Cambridgeshire District Council and
4 3 Member from Cambridge City Council

On a show of hands, 6 votes to 0.

Councillor Smart proposed that the quorum remained the same as stated in the officer's report which was as follows:

6.1 The quorum of a meeting will be three with no less than: -
1 Member from South Cambridgeshire District Council and
1 Member from Cambridge City Council

On a show of hands, 6 votes to 0.

As the vote was tied the proposals went to the Chair's casting vote, whose casting vote resulted in a resolution providing for the following:

The quorum of a meeting will be six with no less than: -
3 Member from South Cambridgeshire District Council and
3 Member from Cambridge City Council.

The Committee:

Resolved unanimously:

- i. To confirm the amended Standing Orders for the Joint Development Control Committee, subject to the further approval of the re-wording, for the election of Chair and Vice Chair, and order of public speakers, at the next JDCC meeting.
- ii. To confirm the Scheme of Delegation for the Joint Development Control Committee.
- iii. To agree that the Standing Orders and Scheme of Delegation will be reviewed on an annual basis.

20/5/JDCC Committee Dates 2020/21

The following meeting dates were approved for the municipal year 2020/21:

Wednesday September 16, 2020
Wednesday October 21, 2020
Wednesday November 18, 2020
Wednesday December 16, 2020
Wednesday January 20, 2021
Wednesday February 17, 2021
Wednesday March 17, 2021
Wednesday April 14, 2021

20/6/JDCC 19/1756/FUL and S/4532/19/FL The Meadows, Cambridge

The Committee received applications for full planning permission for the following:

S/4532/19/FL - The demolition of existing community centre and erection of 56 council rented dwellings, car parking, new play equipment, the creation of new vehicular accesses onto Daisy Close and St Catharines Road, the provision of new landscaping and associated land levelling, together with land reprofiling as part of wider proposal for the full Meadows site seeking permission for the demolition of existing community centre, and the erection of a new community hub 78 affordable dwellings, car parking, a replacement multi use games area, new play equipment, the creation of new vehicular accesses on to Arbury Road, Daisy Close and St Catharines Road, the provision of new landscaping and substation, the installation of drainage to the football pitch and associated land levelling together with land reprofiling.

19/1756/FUL - Erection of new community hub and 22 council rented affordable dwellings, car parking, replacement multi use games area, new vehicular access off Arbury Road and enhancements to the recreation ground and installation of substation (as part of wider proposal for the full Meadows site seeking permission for the demolition of existing community centre and the erection of a new community hub, 78 affordable dwellings, car parking, a replacement multi use games area, new play equipment, the creation of new vehicular accesses on to Arbury Road, Daisy Close and St Catharines Road, the provision of new landscaping and substation and the installation of drainage to the football pitch and associated land levelling together with land re-profiling).

The Committee received a representation in objection to the applications from 2 members of Friends of St Albans Rec Association:

- i. A total of 1500 residents had signed the Petition against the proposals.
- ii. The response presented to the Committee today had been written in conjunction with Cambridge Past, Present and Future.
- iii. Did not object in principle to redevelopment of the buildings to provide affordable housing but objected to the applications for the following reasons:
 - Would result in loss of public open space in a Ward with the lowest open space provision.
 - The development height was out of character and did not comply with the City Council's tall building policy.
 - The development proposal was not in the current Cambridge Local Plan (CLP), therefore this application was not Plan lead.
 - Said the CLP and the Open Spaces and Recreation Strategy recognised the Ward as the second lowest total areas of open space and recommended St Albans Road Rec be protected from development.
 - Building on the Rec opposed the Council's commitment to improve green spaces; development should not be used as justification.
 - population and reducing open spaces contradicted CLP which presumed overall net gain of amenity space not loss.
 - The open space had been designed as "green lung" benefitting the community both physically and mentally. More facilities and landscaping would not compensate the impact of towering buildings, including a six-storey high building.
 - COVID-19 had seen a significant increase in the use of the Rec; population increase on a reduced space during a pandemic would be a safety risk.
 - Believed local councillors were not representing residents as this was a joint Cambridge City Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council application.
 - Stated that the year 2020 should not be the year that the Councils started to take the recreation ground away and spoiled the open space.
 - The surrounding housing stock would be two-storey housing or bungalows with pitched roofs; the CLP, paragraph 60, stated tall building should be defined that any structure which breaks existing skylines, or significantly taller, and within suburbs buildings are four-storey or above would automatically trigger the need to address the criteria set out in the guidance.

- CLP made clear that support should only be given for new buildings which are appropriate to their context and contribute positively to both near and distance views.
- There was no reference in the applications to the tall building policy. The documentation submitted did not meet the criteria set out in that policy. Therefore, the application should be refused.
- CLP, policy 60 states that consideration must be given to the visual impact of any proposals from key distance and localised views including from adjacent streets and open spaces.
- Had there been any visualisation for this scheme showing how the skyline would appear in the local context, including views from local vantage points such as the back for the Rec; these images had not presented.
- The applications made comparison with Orchard Park, 120 metres away, five story buildings with no buildings in-between. This was misleading as a reference point, the nearest landmark buildings to this development were a mile away.
- If these applications were submitted by a private developer, they would be refused.
- Understood the need to provide affordable housing and the lack of the Council owned land to build on but would ask the Council to withdraw the scheme.
- Recommended the applications should be brought back in a manner that better represents the local context and was more acceptable to the community and compliant with the CLP.

David Digby (Agent) addressed the Committee in support of the application.

South Cambridgeshire District Councillor Cahn (Ward Councillor) addressed the Committee about the applications:

- i. The proposal to develop 78 dwellings of social housing meets a need which all political groups on South Cambridgeshire DC recognised which had been supported by Government money.
- ii. With the pressures of Government timescales such provision should not be put forward when it conflicted with local plan policies or at any cost.
- iii. If it was not for the provision of Government money and the pressures to provide a readily developable site, this site was not a site that would have been put forward for development as social housing, or any housing for that matter. The developers had tried hard to minimise the damage but could not get away from this intrinsic problem with the proposal.
- iv. This proposal had caused concern to residents for several reasons which had not been adequately addressed in the officer's report.

- v. Firstly, the scale and location of the development, which would provide 78 additional social dwellings immediately adjacent to one large existing development of affordable housing at King's Meadow managed by the Clarion Housing on the new Darwin Green development, but this would not be available for some years.
- vi. In addition, the new enclosed area for nursery age children by the café was less than one half the area currently available and little larger than the indoor space the nursery would use, a significant reduction in provision.
- vii. Therefore, despite the potential conformity with SC8, it was premature on open space grounds and so conflicted with policy SC7.
- viii. There is the limited parking provision. While the application stated to encourage sustainable travel behaviour, the provision of 0.5 spaces per dwelling was a recipe for problems.
- ix. Overflow parking was likely on Daisy Close which would cause nuisance to residents.
- x. While the 8H temporary bus service served this area well now, it would stop in a year and there was poor connectivity to employment opportunities on the Science Park and new North East Cambridge development which the area might otherwise be expected to serve.
- xi. If further parking for electric vehicles proved necessary, then it will have to come at the expense of further open space.
- xii. Concern was expressed that many people with mobility problems who used the centre would be stuck upstairs with an inoperable lift and no ramp to descend in case of fire.
- xiii. Glad to note the internal layout of the community centre had been designed to provide a terrace accessible on the level to enable a rescue to be provided in these circumstances.
- xiv. The internal layout of the first floor only provided one access to this which could be obstructed in case of fire, and an alternative access ought to be provided by providing an emergency fire door in room 2A.
- xv. The Committee should consider carefully the points raised and to consider the conflict with policies H10 and SC7 which, however well intentioned, the original desire to provide social housing, appear to render the proposal non-conforming with the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan.
- xvi. if a private developer had come forward with this proposal to develop on an area of open space, would the Committee have considered that it conformed to the local plan?
- xvii. If social housing like this had been proposed in a more affluent area of the city, for instance on Histon Road Recreation Ground or Nightingale Recreation Ground in the South of the city, would it had been accepted?

- xviii. Did residents of the City's and South Cambridgeshire's less prosperous areas not deserve equivalent consideration?
- xix. If the applications are approved, would recommend that a condition be imposed that the westernmost block only be constructed once adequate alternative informal open space has been provided to maintain at least the existing provision and that the area thus left temporarily vacant be maintained as open space during this period.

City Councillor Price addressed the Committee:

- i. Had been involved in this scheme from the beginning and supported the scheme as it would provide seventy-eight genuinely affordable Council homes; was part of a devolution deal to build over 500 such homes before April 2022.
- ii. The applications would provide an updated, state of the art BREEAM community hub that would benefit residents and those who lived further afield.
- iii. There would be a replacement multi use games area, new landscaping, an increase in the number of trees and the installation of drainage to the football pitch.
- iv. Believed this scheme was positive news for the North of Cambridge.
- v. No objections had been raised by the police, who praised the design of the development expecting it to achieve a Gold Standard in terms of a safe living environment for residents
- vi. Histon & Impington Parish Council, within whose boundaries part of the scheme falls, unanimously agreed to recommend approval of this development
- vii. Believed there to be misinformation being spread about open space in the north of the city, to the extent that taking some of the objections at face value, one would think this was the only open space in the area.
- viii. The area in the north of the city had an impressive amount of green open space, including a history of flatted developments such as Aylesborough Close and Edgcombe flats being built in impressive green open space surroundings for all residents to enjoy.
- ix. Recognised the Rec served the surrounding communities in a different way to the multiple informal green spaces nearby.
- x. As a result of consultation and listening carefully to objectors the application used just 6.4% of the Rec which comprises mainly incidental spaces around the car park currently offering very little recreational value, moreover the applications mitigated that loss through significant improvement to the Rec, including a Multi-Use Games Area, provision of a

new skate park area, new changing room facilities and improvements to biodiversity.

- xi. Pleased to note that Sport England supported the proposal as an enhancement to the opportunities on site for both indoor and outdoor recreational activities
- xii. Highlighted the following paragraphs of the report to bring to the Committee's attention:
 - 10.29, p59 - regarding the loss and re-provision of a community centre, the proposal is considered to provide an improved facility with the need being evidenced by the good level of usage of the existing centre. The facility is likely to attract the existing users and is likely to draw an increased number of visitors given the approved range, and quality, of facilities provided.
 - 10.30, p59 - with the above in mind, the proposal is compliant with policy SC/3 and 73 of the respective local plans.
 - 10.37, p60 - Conclusion on Principle states local planning authorities are required to assess a scheme against the local plan. A scheme is not expected to comply with every policy, and neither is a conflict with a single policy always sufficient to refuse an application outright.
- xiii. Stated that from the beginning of the proposals for this scheme there were those that were opposed for a variety of reasons and many of them have had their concerns answered and were no longer opposed. There are also those that were opposed at the very beginning and are still opposed because nothing other than the status quo would have persuaded them otherwise.
- xiv. Urged the Committee to support the officer recommendation for the development could be moved forward and provide much needed Council homes in the area and the improvements to the site the development would begin.

City Councillor Johnson (Executive Councillor for Housing) then addressed the Committee:

- i. The development would deliver 78 new Council rented homes at a time when significant need continued to exist for affordable housing in the City and South Cambridgeshire.
- ii. The site did not only deliver 78 Council homes but 106 new Council homes in total, if the separate, but linked Buchan Street application was also approved at a future Planning Committee.
- iii. The applications are an opportunity to deliver a state-of-the-art community hub with much improved and upgraded recreational and amenity facilities.

- iv. The development proposed would deliver far reaching and substantial benefits delivering long-lasting and positive change to the community.
- v. The development formed a key anchor to the City Council's Housing Investment Programme, which would deliver 546 additional Council rented homes in Cambridge. Although these would be managed by Cambridge City Council, South Cambridgeshire District Council would be able to claim an additional 56 units towards its own affordable homes target, as these homes would be situated on its side of the boundary with the City.
- vi. CLP identified a forecast of housing need in Cambridge city of around 14,000 new homes between 2011 and 2031.
- vii. A recent study (Savills in 2020) reported that Cambridge was still one of the least affordable housing markets in the country; median house price to median income ratio of 13, compared with the national average of 7.8.
- viii. The affordability of existing stock in Cambridge, across all tenures and compared to the distribution of household incomes showed an 'affordability gap' between £25,000 and £45,000, which households would have to spend more than 30% of their income on housing costs.
- ix. Though affordability in South Cambridgeshire was better than Cambridge; median house price to income ratio of 10.3 but was still significantly higher than the national average. The 'affordability gap' in South Cambridgeshire affected around 4,000 households, in the same income bands between £25,000 and £45,000 as Cambridge.
- x. Currently over 1600 people were on the housing needs register in Cambridge City, thirty percent had a preferred location for Arbury and King's Hedges.
- xi. Highlighted the following points on the planning submission:
 - 78 new apartments for Council rent, consisting of forty, one bed flats and thirty eights, two bed flats, all which all meet, or exceed, the standards prescribed in the Cambridge Local Plan.
 - Designed to be M4(2) compliant, two of each configuration will also be of the higher M4(3) standard.
 - Thirty-nine car parking spaces for residents, and storage for 118 residents' cycles.
- xii. The new community hub (1845 square metres) would serve the new and existing communities, replacing the existing two community centres at the present Meadows site and at Buchan Street. This would be slightly larger than the combined area of those existing facilities. There would also be forty car parking spaces and sixty-eight cycle spaces for users of the community hub.
- xiii. The Community Hub would be designed to BREEAM Excellent standards.

- xiv. There has been extensive consultation with staff and user groups which had served to enhance the designs of the community hub to maximise flexibility and future proofing whilst at the same time enhancing accessibility.
- xv. Nearly 94% of open space would remain which would be significantly enhanced with 109 net new trees.
- xvi. There would also be improvements within the open spaces, a new multi-use games area, new play areas, football pitch with better drainage, skate ramp, paths, enhanced meadows, and woodland.
- xvii. The application delivered a 68% percent carbon reduction on the 2013 Building Regulations, above the nineteen percent reduction target currently mandated.
- xviii. There would be EV charging points, green roofs, underground bin storage, storage space for 118 residents' cycles and a further 68 for users of the community hub.
- xix. The main energy sources for the development would be photovoltaic panels and electric air source heat pumps. It would be a gas free development.
- xx. Concluded this a site that could be delivered now, providing Council rented housing urgently required alongside a state-of-the-art community Hub and much improved recreation and amenity spaces for residents of Cambridge city and South Cambridgeshire.
- xxi. The scheme would help set the bar for new highly sustainable forms of development and will deliver a space that will be of benefit to the community for years to come.

Principle of development (loss of open space & loss of/replacement of Community centre)

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

- i. Sought clarification on the tall building policy.
- ii. Asked for clarification what percentage of the open space was going to be developed as on page 46 of the agenda at paragraph 2.5, the City Council part of the site was described as 'designated protected open space', but there appeared to be no such restriction on the South Cambs part of the site. However, on page 56 reference was made to the loss of 6.4% of the protected open space but it was not clear where the loss of open space would be from.
- iii. Asked if consideration had been given to providing the lost open space elsewhere in addition to improving the remaining open space on the site.

- iv. Also asked whether consideration had been given to improving the sustainability of the development from BREAM excellent to passivhaus standards.
- v. Expressed concerns that the child yield from the flats would be quite high and no contributions were required to pay for contributions towards early years / education / library costs.
- vi. Noted from the skatepark problems could arise if there was not sufficient noise abatement material put in during construction. Asked about the safety and lighting of the woodland area.
- vii. Questioned if the development would create social segregation.
- viii. Asked if the community hub terrace could be landscaped.

In response to Members' questions the Principal Planner said the following:

- i. Significant discussions had been undertaken with the Council's Urban Designer Officer to consider what development was appropriate. It was not just about physical location and consideration had to be given to the proposed development's surroundings. A four-storey block had been considered but it was felt that this would be lost in the context of the mature trees and large-scale infrastructure such as roads and junctions at the front of the site. Looking at the adjacent development at Crispin Close, these properties were shielded from the major road by a row of large trees. The application site did not benefit from the same protection. Therefore, a smaller footprint building with a taller height was less intrusive and more appropriate in this setting.
- ii. 6.1% of protected open space would be lost within the City and no loss of protected open space to South Cambs.
- iii. Passivhaus standards would be difficult to achieve on a 100% affordable housing development which included a BREAM excellent community facility. No other sites could have re-provided the lost open space. The significant improvement to the open space onsite outweighed the requirement to provide any financial contributions through a s106 planning obligation.
- iv. In the context of the tall buildings policy, buildings proposed to be higher than the skyline or existing buildings would be considered against the following criteria: location setting and context, the applicant would have to demonstrate through an appraisal how the development fits in the existing landscape / townscape. This had been undertaken during the pre-application process and through the CGI images which had been provided. The development steps down as it gets closer to the residential properties to the west. The assessment is how the development would sit in its context rather than just how tall the buildings would be. Due to the

proximity of existing buildings to the proposed 6 story building contextual drawings would offer little merit.

- v. County Council officers were consulted on education contributions and had considered the relevant statutory basis, policy contributions and s106 tests and concluded that there would not be any un-due strains on school facilities and therefore contributions were not required.
- vi. In relation to the woodland area there was a condition for site-wide external lighting to be provided to the local planning authority so this could be controlled. The police had also been consulted on the application and had not raised any concerns and expected a 'gold standard' application in terms of the level of safety secured by design. There was a skatepark already at the site and this would be replaced. The skatepark was 35m away from the residential blocks.
- vii. Noted comments about social segregation but explained that this comment needed to be considered in the context of the planning policy. The policy was written based on a policy-compliant mixed development of market housing with 40% affordable housing provision. It was not written in the unusual context of 100% affordable housing sites. In the above example what the policy sought to do was not have the market housing in one part of a site and then social housing in another part, it sought to mix market and affordable housing together within a development. The thrust and spirit of the policy was not intended with a 100% affordable housing development in mind. Further details of the community hub terrace would be sought in consultation with the Communities Team.

Access and Transport / Environmental considerations

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

- i. Noted that there was going to be 39 car parking spaces provided which meant 0.5 spaces per dwelling, expressed concerns that parking would displace to neighbouring side streets and asked if monitoring of this issue would take place. Asked why only 6 of the 39 car parking spaces would have EV charging points.
- ii. Questioned the layout of the car parking spaces. Also noted that there could be up to 230 people living at the development but only 118 cycle parking spaces being provided. Also asked whether there would be cycle parking provision for larger bikes (e.g. cargo bikes)
- iii. Expressed concerns regarding the car parking for block C (the six- storey block) and the community centre as there was relatively few parking spaces.
- iv. Also noted that the Disability Forum held meetings at the Meadows Community Centre because of its current car parking provision.

- v. Asked whether a door could be located on the eastern side of the development to make it easier to access for those who had travelled to the site by bike.
- xv. Would there be any electrical ducting going to where the cycle parking was located, if so, would it possible the e bikes could be charged at the cycle park?
- xvi. Asked if there would be any monitoring to avoid displacement parking around the surrounding streets.
- xvii. Conscious of zero carbon deadlines which had been agreed; if properties were being built which were not net zero or better this would not help to achieve these targets. These applications present an opportunity to demonstrate leadership on energy efficiency.
- xviii. Queried if residents moved towards community car sharing whether some of the carparking spaces could be given back to the for landscaping or cycle parking.
- xix. Enquired where the nearest bus stops to the site would be located.
- xx. Suggested a condition that additional land be set aside for cycle parking to be used when required.
- xxi. Questioned if officers had assumed that no one on site would using a work van.

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

- i. To minimise the visual impact of the development slender buildings broken up by car parking areas and planting was proposed. There was a parking management strategy condition to secure the best way to lay out the parking and to control the use of the parking spaces.
- ii. There was no planning policy which stated how many EV charging points had to be provided, just that charge points, or the infrastructure to facilitate these, should be provided where viable and practical.
- iii. Every parking space would have infrastructure for future EV charging but 6 residential car parking spaces and several of the community centre parking spaces would have EV charging points. This was based on an estimate of how many residents were likely to have an electric car and require an EV charging space.
- iv. The Councils would have a certain level of control over who occupied these dwellings and if those people required a certain level of car parking then this development might not be appropriate for them.
- v. The level of car parking for the community centre was based on advice from the Communities Team.

- vi. A door was not proposed on the eastern elevation except into the changing rooms and the design had been based on advice from the Communities Team; any changes could impact the integrity of the design and could change potential sizes of space.
- vii. Confirmed that there would be capacity for larger cycle bikes to be accommodated.
- viii. None of the cycles spaces were designed to be for E-cycles charging points, this was neither Council's policy that they should be provided.
- ix. It would be rare for a development to meet the full number of cycles spaces for the entire number of people who lived there due the size of the floor area required. The application was compliant with both the SCDC LP and CLP therefore could not refuse either of the applications for this reason.
- x. The management plan should address issues of the parking.
- xi. To advance energy efficiency both councils should address this matter in the developing Local Plan process. Members should engage in the development and direct their planning policy officers towards those goals to ensure they were encapsulated in the new local plans.
- xii. There were many competing priorities within the applications including a 100% affordable housing scheme delivering several recreational facilities as set out in the officer's report and worth to note the BREEAM standard community hub.
- xiii. Believed the applications were not just reaching the minimum requirement of energy efficiency but exceeded such as no gas on site with highly sustainable buildings on site.
- xiv. There were two bus stops the other side of Kings Hedges Road.
- xv. There was a fine balance to support sustainable modes of transport whilst recognising that people did have vehicles.
- xvi. The proposal includes a car club space on site, this could increase resident's knowledge of the car club and expand the use with other spaces made available.
- xvii. Not possible to impose a condition for additional land earmarked for cycle parking as may not be needed.
- xviii. Consideration would be given when allocating properties to tenants and their vehicles they used and if these could be accommodated.

Neighbouring amenity / other

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

- i. Asked if there would be a time limit when the flood lights would be switched off.

- ii. Stated there were several elements of the community hub which echoed that in Trumpington. This had been successful in bringing the community together.
- iii. Believed the applications would improve the biodiversity on site and this information should be shared around the site.
- iv. Enquired if the post boxes would be accessible to all.
- v. Suggested an outside water fountain which would provide accessible drinking water.
- vi. Noted the public art officer commented that the budget for public art was insufficient; could the fencing around the perimeter be reused as this was aesthetically pleasing in design.
- vii. Highlighted a consultee's response for a preference for more stair/ lift cores to accommodate the number of flats per floor. Request a second staircase on the building, even if this were on out the outside.
- viii. Queried if the planning condition regarding dust needed to be more robust.
- ix. Would like to make it known to the public speakers that their objections are considered and debated.
- x. Asked what the distance between the outside area of the community hub and block C (the closest dwelling) was and questioned what impact noise and light pollution would have on this residential dwelling.
- xi. Queried when would block A be built in the construction phase.

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

- i. There was a contribution of £90,000 towards the public art; it was difficult to successfully manage all the competing factors that the applications brought.
- ii. There were several conditions relating to flood light management which would look at the operation of the flood lights. There was also a condition for all external lighting on site.
- iii. The public art strategy clearly outlined the process of how the artwork would be commissioned. Reusing the perimeter fencing would reduce the scope of public art on site, there were no heritage reasons or planning policies to insist the fencing be reused.
- iv. Post boxes would be placed in the main lobby of the flats.
- v. There was no policy to support an outside water fountain and therefore this could not lead to a planning condition for installation of one.
- vi. The request to increase the stair/lift core was a preference, there was no planning policy stance to support this as a necessity. The Fire Service had

been consulted and raised no concerns; sprinkler systems would be installed in all the buildings.

- vii. Believed the wording for the condition on dust to be sufficient. Environmental health would look at the direction of the air flow and put the appropriate measures in place, such as adequate screening or fencing to mitigate the issue. Additional measures could also be put in place if required.
- viii. The distance between block C and the corner of the community hub was 10.5m.
- ix. The new community centre would open before the current buildings were demolished. Blocks A& B could only be built after the demolition of those community buildings.
- i. The site was not an exception site.

The Committee:

Resolved (by 11 votes with 1 abstention) to grant the applications for planning permission in accordance with the Officer recommendation, for the reasons set out in the Officer's report, and subject to the conditions recommended by the Officer.

The meeting ended at 3.20 pm

CHAIR