

JOINT DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE

18 November 2020
10.30 am - 2.20 pm

Present: Councillors Baigent, Matthews, Sargeant (Chair), Thornburrow, Tunnacliffe, Bradnam (Vice-Chair), Bygott, Chamberlain, Daunton, Hawkins and Hunt

Officers Present:

Assistant Director Delivery, Cambridge City and South Cambridgeshire District Councils: Sharon Brown
Strategic Sites Manager: Chris Carter
Principal Planner: Philippa Kelly
Principal Planner: Guy Wilson
Legal Adviser: Keith Barber
Committee Manager: James Goddard
Meeting Producer: Liam Martin

Other Officers Present:

Local Highways Engineer: Jon Finney
Joint Housing Development Officer: Tracey Harrison

Developer Representatives:

Will Cobley, Technical Director: Terence O Rourke
AECOM Infrastructure: David Smith
Gillespies – Principal Landscape Design: Sheena Bell
Project Lead, University of Cambridge: Tom Traynor
Planning Manager, University of Cambridge: Mike Osbourn
Project Director, University of Cambridge: Brian Nearney

FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE COUNCIL

20/13/JDCC Apologies

Apologies were received from Councillor Smart.

20/14/JDCC Declarations of Interest

Item	Councillor	Interest
City Councillor Baigent	All	Personal: Member of CamCycle and

		Extinction Rebellion
--	--	----------------------

20/15/JDCC Minutes

The minutes of the meetings held on 21 October 2020 were approved as a correct record.

20/16/JDCC 20/02569/REM - Phase 1B, Marleigh, Land North of Newmarket Road, Cambridge

The Committee received a reserved matters application as part of Phase 1B pursuant to condition 5 (Reserved Matters) of outline planning permission S/2682/13/OL dated 30 November 2016 (EIA Development) for detailed access, appearance, landscaping, layout and scale for the creation of 308 new homes, non-residential floor space, laying out of playing fields, open space, allotments, associated infrastructure and internal roads.

The Principal Planner updated her report by referring to the following details in her presentation:

RECOMMENDATION:

1. **Approve** planning permission of reserved matters application reference 20/02569/REM, subject to conditions and informatives set out from Page 48 of the Agenda, **subject to amended condition 21 (road levels) as set out on the Amendment Sheet**, with authority delegated to officers to undertake appropriate minor amendments of those conditions and informatives prior to issue of the planning permission.
2. **Approve** the partial discharge of the outline planning conditions listed on Page 47 of the Agenda as they relate to the Phase 1B application proposals.

Mr Cobley (Applicant's Agent) addressed the Committee in support of the application.

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

- i. Queried if sufficient cycle parking was provided on site, particularly near the football field.
- ii. Queried if there would be conflict between vehicles, cycles, e-scooters and pedestrians travelling around the site; and if routes should be segregated.
- iii. Queried if appropriate levels of affordable housing were provided.

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

Principle of Development / Context of Site, Design and External Spaces / Housing Delivery

- i. The outline application and existing s106 Agreement for the development set affordable housing provision for the whole development. The viability assessment set the level of affordable housing at 30% for the whole site (this could not be changed at a reserved matters stage).
- ii. The site aimed to be a sustainable community that encouraged bike/pedestrian access/movement over cars.
- iii. The parameter plans approved at outline stage, including the movement and access parameter plan set out high level principles for the development of the site. Further detail was provided in the reserved matters applications.
- iv. Pedestrians could still access the woods through the courtyard squares, there was no impact on permeability through the alternative courtyard configuration.
- v. Routes into the woods were accessible for both able bodied and disabled people. The application would meet LTN1-20 criteria.

The Local Highways Engineer made the following points:

- vi. The site (layout) would reduce vehicle speed and encourage cycle/pedestrian movements as envisioned in LTN1-20.
- vii. The highway could be safely used by cycles and vehicles due to the predicted numbers of cars. Higher numbers of pedestrian/cycle movements were expected around the site.

The Assistant Director and Principal Planner said the following:

- viii. The hierarchy of access routes included segregated routes for pedestrians, cycles and vehicles eg primary routes and the highway and some shared spaces occurred on tertiary routes.
- ix. Cycle parking provision across the site met required standards.
- x. Affordable housing/apartments (located in site corners) overlooked open space. Local plan policy allowed for clusters of up to 25 affordable units. The application includes a clusters of 31 units. Officers considered this was appropriate given the types of unit and their locations.

- xi. The Joint Housing Officer gave a summary of the decision-making process for the type/location of the affordable apartments.
- xii. Self and custom build plots were not provided, as provision for these types of units had not been secured through the outline planning application nor as part of the s106 Agreement regulating the site-wide affordable housing provision.
- xiii. The Cambridgeshire Quality Panel and the Disability Consultative Panel made no objection to the sports pavilion or club house design.

Access and Transport / Social and Community Infrastructure

- xiv. Outline planning permission for the application was given in 2016. This covered levels of affordable housing and transport impacts/needs/mitigation. The Travel Plan process looked to ensure the transport principles set out in the outline permission were met.
- xv. The outline scheme included transport improvements which were secured through conditions and as part of the Section 106 agreement. The local planning authority's s106 officers would monitor site occupation rates so the infrastructure would be delivered as triggers were met.
- xvi. A condition in the outline permission required cycle and pedestrian access to Fen Ditton be accessible for all, safe and well lit. Officers were working with partners to achieve this.
- xvii. The technology available for electric vehicle charging points had changed over the last year. The charging points offered would be reviewed to ensure appropriate provision and power supply was offered (ref condition 17).
- xviii. EV charging points were not currently proposed for apartments. The Applicant said in today's presentation to Committee that an appropriate power supply would be retrofitted for apartments, but a commitment on the provision of EV charging points could not be given.
- xix. Conditions regarding secondary access were now more robustly worded that in the Trumpington Meadows site, so access/egress issues were not expected on this development.
- xx. Parking provision would be reviewed (as part of the separate pre-application process) if another sports pavilion application were made on or off- site (eg Cambridge United pitches). Re-iterated that sufficient (car/cycle) parking facilities were currently offered across the site.
- xxi. The construction road was currently used by construction traffic. This would later become an access road to the sports pitches.

Environmental Considerations / Impact on Residential Amenity / Third Party Representations

- xxii. The s106 Agreement set out open space management and maintenance arrangements for the site.
- xxiii. Gas heating were included in phase 1. The developer is considering alternatives as part of the subsequent phases of the development.
- xxiv. Condition 4 set out sports facility management/maintenance details and hours of operation.

Councillor Bygott proposed an amendment to the officer's recommendation that appropriate electric vehicle charging points and power supply be available.

This amendment was carried unanimously.

Councillor Bradnam proposed an amendment to the officer's recommendation for condition 14 such that solar panels should be provided on the sports pavilion/allotment clubhouse buildings.

This amendment was carried unanimously.

Councillor Thornburrow proposed amendments to the officer's recommendations:

- i. Condition 11: replacement trees to be maintained for five-year period;
- ii. An additional condition (No. 29) – Green Roofs: to include reference to their maintenance for the lifetime of the development.

The amendments were carried unanimously.

Councillor Tunnacliffe proposed an amendment to the officer's recommendation for an additional informative that letter boxes be located above 6 inches above the ground level.

This amendment was carried unanimously.

The Committee:

Unanimously resolved to approve:

1. Planning permission of reserved matters application reference 20/02569/REM, subject to the conditions and informatives set out from Page 48 of the Agenda, with authority delegated to officers to undertake

appropriate minor amendments of those conditions and informatives prior to issue of the planning permission, subject to the following:

i. Amended condition 21 (Road Levels) (as set out above).

ii. Additional condition relating to Visitor Car Parking (No. 28):

Prior to the commencement of development, details of the visitor car parking shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved details shall be implemented prior to first occupation/use of the buildings to which they relate.

iii. Amended condition 11 (Landscape Management and Maintenance Plan):

Replacement trees to be maintained for five-year period.

iv. Amended condition 14 (Implementation of Energy Strategy):

Approved energy strategy to be fully implemented prior to first occupation and the first use of the sports pavilion/allotment clubhouse buildings.

v. Amended condition 17 (EV charging):

To require the delivery of the appropriate industry standard EV charge points, with provision for the delivery of EV infrastructure and to secure the supply of electricity to the apartment buildings.

vi. Additional condition (No. 29) – Green Roofs (to replace Informative 4)

To include reference to maintenance for the lifetime of the development.

vii. Additional Informative – Letter Boxes

To be located above 6 inches from ground level.

2. The partial discharge of the outline planning conditions (planning application reference S/2682/13/OL) listed on Page 47 of the Agenda as they relate to the Phase 1B application proposals.

20/17/JDCC North West Cambridge: Eddington Phase 2
Infrastructure

Councillor Baigent left the committee and Councillor Harford joined as a Ward Councillor.

The Committee received a presentation from North West Cambridge on Eddington phase 2

Members raised comments/questions as listed below. Answers were supplied, and comments from officers, but as this was a pre-application presentation, none of the answers or comments are binding on either the intended applicant or the local planning authority so consequently are not recorded in these minutes.

1. Asked whether mature tree specimens would be included in the new planting scheme along the border with the M11, to improve the look of Eddington, and when this planting would take place.
2. Requested details of what is currently located in the vicinity of the junction with Huntingdon Road and what the anticipated impact on traffic of that junction would be.
3. Will the developers be providing edible planting throughout the landscaping?
4. When provision for older living is provided to the north of phase 2, does the landscaping accommodate improved access for older people in just this area or will standards for older people be carried out throughout the whole site?
5. As the large earth mounds located behind residents on Huntingdon Road were built up over several years, leading to extended periods of dust and noise pollution, can we have a logistic plan for removing the soil to minimise the length of time required and to ensure this is communicated to local residents in advance?
6. As some residents already living on site have found noise levels from the M11 excessive, what additional plans are in place to mitigate this issue?
7. In relation to some issues from phase 1 which have been taken into account when planning phase 2, are developers planning to retrofit phase 1? Specifically transition points where it is unclear where a pedestrian is moving

between a path and a road.

8. As cycling routes are designed by a range of authorities and developers, how consistent will provision be along the length of Huntingdon Road so cyclists don't have to keep adjusting to different environments along its length?

9. As the development area is on higher ground than the M11, will mitigation measures which need to be close to the source of the noise need to be quite tall to effectively protect those properties towards the top of the ridge?

10. Requested a copy of the draft Environmental Management Strategy.

20/18/JDCC NIAB site

The pre-application briefing was withdrawn from the agenda and should be reported to the December 2020 committee.

The meeting ended at 2.20 pm

CHAIR