

JOINT DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE

16 December 2020
10.30 am - 4.48 pm

Present: Councillors Baigent, Sargeant (Chair), Smart, Thornburrow, Porrer, Bradnam (Vice-Chair), Chamberlain, Daunton, Hawkins, Hunt and Howell

Officers Present:

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

Delivery Manager (Strategic): Chris Carter

Principal Planner: Charlotte Burton

Legal Adviser: Keith Barber

Committee Manager: Sarah Steed

Meeting Producer: Liam Martin

Other Officers Present:

County Highway Engineer: Jon Finney

FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE COUNCIL

20/19/JDCC Apologies

Apologies were received from City Councillor Matthews and SCDC Councillor Bygott, City Councillor Porrer and SCDC Councillor Howell attended as alternates.

20/20/JDCC Declarations of Interest

Item	Councillor	Interest
20/21/JDCC	Baigent	Personal: Member of Cambridge Cycling Campaign and Extinction Rebellion.

20/21/JDCC 07/0003/NMA1 - Non-material amendment to Darwin Green outline consent and 19/1056/REM - Reserved Matters application for Darwin Green BDW2

The Committee received an application (07/0003/NMA1) for a non-material amendment to the Darwin Green outline consent and a reserved matters

application (19/1056/REM) for the Darwin Green 1 development for parcel 'BDW2'.

The Committee noted the amendments presented in the Amendment Sheet.

The Committee received representations in objection to the application from two local residents.

The first representation covered the following issues:

- i. Asked the Committee to note that almost all the residents of Woodlark Road opposed the application.
- ii. Did not resist development but this site would be over developed. 40% of homes did not meet the National Space Standards and 33.8% of the affordable homes did not meet this standard.
- iii. The density of homes was higher than authorized by the outline planning permission.
- iv. The application did not meet condition 8 of the outline planning permission.
- v. The case officer had stated the average length of a garden for a Barrett David Wilson (BDW) home would be 9.5m, however in many cases gardens would be only 6 to 7m.
- vi. The reduced garden length would impact Grosvenor Court and 1 Hoadly Road.
- vii. The developer had stated publicly the buildings would be 18m away from Grosvenor Court, but there was a distance 15.5m for one of the buildings which would have a significant impact on residential amenity. Requested the Committee considered a condition to ensure a distance of 18m.
- viii. Because the side elevation to 1 Hoadly Road was 9m the Committee were asked to ensure similar condition of 18m be applied to this plot there would be a significant impact on daylight / sunlight.
- ix. Requested that permitted development rights be removed for those buildings boarding Woodlark Road.

The second representation covered the following issues:

- i. Residents who adjoined the site would have their local amenity significantly impacted by the scheme due to its proximity.
- ii. Throughout the planning process residents' expectations had been poorly managed by the developer. The current plans differed considerably to the

outline planning artist's impressions and answers given at public meetings with the goal posts moving.

- iii. In the outline planning approval, there was room for 20m gardens but now had been advised it was not possible. No good reason had been given for this change.
- iv. The pavilion was going to be a residential unit and a focal point of the development, but it had now been put up for sale.
- v. A new hedge is to be planted alongside the Woodlark Road boundary. The plans now show only repairs to the existing Woodlark Road hedge, in the case of Grosvenor Court it would be in the BDW2 gardens and in other areas there would be gaps. This did nothing to increase this important wildlife corridor and was not supportive of the Council's policy of increasing biodiversity.
- vi. Requested the Committee protect the Council's biodiversity policy and safeguard residents from the risk of flooding by making the following points are the subject of conditions of any planning approval.
 - 1. Work on the hedge, ditch and service pathway should be completed before work began on the site.
 - 2. The new boundary hedge needed planting on the developer's land along the entire boundary and without any gaps.
 - 3. A scale plan drawing is produced showing the exact:
 - Location and width of the hedge.
 - Width of the ditch.
 - Width of the service path/ roadway
 - The hedge height is specified at a minimum of 3m in the maintenance agreement.
- vii. The loss of the residential units at the Old Pavilion and the developer miscalculating the Woodlark Road ditch could be filled in, this loss of available land had contributed significantly to the site being over-developed. This had led to the reduction in the size of gardens and hedges and houses being built closer to the boundaries with over 40% of the total houses not meeting the Council's policy for adequate floor space.

Alan Davies (Applicant) addressed the Committee in support of the application.

A written statement was read out on behalf of City Councillor Payne (Ward Councillor for Castle) raising the following points:

- i. The County Council Flood Authority had carried out detailed work to survey the risk of flooding to Woodlark Road.

- ii. Sought clarification about the order of works to the ditch, hedge and service corridor between Woodlark Road and this application (BDW2).
- iii. The renewal and ongoing maintenance of the hedge and maintenance of the ditch were critical to protecting all Woodlark Road from flooding. Asked if this work would be completed before further activity took place on site to ensure the existing properties were protected.
- iv. Commented that the officer report was not accurate in stating, on page 49, that plots 71-73, adjacent to 1 Hoadly Road, follow the same pattern as those backing onto Woodlark Road. The proposal was for these plots to sit between 6 and 9 metres from the boundary of 1 Hoadly Road, whilst the plots behind Woodlark Road all were at least 18 metres from the property boundaries. This was considerably closer to 1 Hoadly Road than to the other impacted properties along Woodlark Road. This would have a huge impact on the privacy of all residents; it should be reconsidered to bring the distance in line with the Woodlark Road properties.
- v. The developers and their agents had publicly committed, twice, to ensure there would be a distance of 18m from the new dwellings and Grosvenor Court. This was not reflected in the plans with new dwelling on plot 134 being 15.5m from Grosvenor Court. The position of plot 134 should be reconsidered. Asked the Committee to consider removing permitted development rights for rear extensions to those dwellings on plots 131-134.
- vi. Reinforced the Environmental Quality & Growth team's comment on page 5 of the officer report that the noise impacts and hours of use should be considered for the Pavilion when it was taken on by new developers in the future. Highlighted that neighbouring residents on Huntingdon Road were concerned that the building had been allowed to fall into disrepair. Commented that residents might get some reassurance if this building could be maintained in the interim period before it is taken into new ownership.

SCDC Councillor de Lacey (Ward Councillor for Dry Drayton, Girton and Madingley) addressed the Committee about the application.

- i. Shared the concerns which had been raised by the objectors regarding the significant changes which had been made to this development particularly with non-compliance.
- ii. Primary concern was about sustainability.

- iii. Noted gas boilers were due to be installed and hoped the developers might look again at air source heat pumps.
- iv. Queried the 3 pin plug for EV charging referred to on p57 of the officer's report and whether informative 3 on p68 was sufficient to ensure the EV charging provision would provide what users wanted rather than the minimum type of EV charging provision the developer could install.

Members Questions

Principle of Development / housing delivery / amenity of future occupiers.

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

- i. Asked how many dwellings fell below the national space standards, where the dwellings were located and sought to know why they fell below. Expressed concerns given more people were working from home following the Covid-19 pandemic.
- ii. Queried paragraph 133 of the officer's report which summarised Counsel's advice as to whether internal space standards could be taken into consideration by the Committee in determining the application. Asked for the date of the caselaw referred to.
- iii. Queried how many homes would be built to M42 / M43 accessibility standards and whether this requirement could be conditioned.
- iv. Noted the Amber units were 18sqm under national space standards, Opal units were 13sqm under, NS4 was 6sqm under. Looked to the external amenity space nothing the gardens for the Amber and Opal units were 4-5m, which were very small. Noted the 4-bed houses were not policy compliant for cycle parking. Felt the amenity space would be affected.
- v. Asked if the application could be deferred to look at the issue of space within the homes and asked for the date of the Counsel's advice.
- vi. Highlighted paragraph 137 of the officers' report which reported a 2-bedroom house with a floor space of 51.5 square metres which was 18.48 square metres (200 square feet) below space standards. A great deficit for a loss of space for a dwelling which could house up to four people. The matter of space standards needed to be addressed before the application progressed further.

- vii. Stated that both the Combined Authority and Homes England would not approve grants for homes which were below 85% of the National Space Standard. One of the units was below 75% of national space standards which was too low.
- viii. Stated that the space standards should not be referenced and that the individual house types which fell below the space standards should be reviewed and assessed as family homes and consideration should be given as to whether the buildings were fit for purpose. Asked how bicycles could access the garden.
- ix. Requested the case officer clarify the external space referenced in the officer report.
- x. Expressed concerns for the developer's reasons of why clustering exceeded the guidance in the Council's Supplementary Planning Document - further justification was needed.
- xi. Asked to see the plans which showed the NS4 units and for confirmation these plots had a 5sqm garden. Asked where the storage space was within the units.
- xii. Referred to p41 and paragraph 151 of the officer's report which talked about play spaces. Focussed on the T-park and the pocket park and questioned how the T-park could contribute to open space and also be a local area of play as it appeared to be a semi pedestrianised street with extra planting and elsewhere in the report it referred to this area as being a through route for cyclists.
- xiii. The NS4 3 storey units had a fire door break at the bottom of the stairs which did not meet building regulations. On the 2-bed house there was no fire break door between ground floor and first floor. Noted officer comments that the 2 bed units provided an opportunity for people to afford a house rather than a flat but noted that the floor space for the 2 bed unit was equivalent to the space standards for a flat which were only 1 storey.
- xiv. The pocket park was very small and just a patch of flower beds to stop through traffic. The only open space for play appeared to be the pavilion green. It was a high density development which did not have sufficient intermediate open spaces. The school playing fields would be enclosed; more usable open space was required.
- xv. Thought there was provision for a lift in some of the units and asked when Counsel's advice had been provided.
- xvi. Noted that the outline permission gave permission for 1593 dwellings and asked whether the reserved matters application could be refused if

Members felt the site was not suitable to build 328 houses as per the reserved matters application.

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

- i. A breakdown of the houses which did not meet space standards was included in the officer's report at paragraph 135. The locations of the Amber, Opal, NS4 and SH39 house types discussed in the report were shown to Members on the proposed site plan. Officers had encouraged the applicant to meet the space standards. The units had been designed in response to the particular locations.
- ii. The issue with internal space standards arose because the outline permission was granted under the 2006 Local Plan. The reserved matters application is limited to those matters which could be considered under a reserved matters application namely appearance, scale, layout and landscaping. Counsel's advice stated that space standards did not fall within the definition of 'reserved matters' and as the outline application did not require compliance with space standards or future space standards as a condition, national space standards could not be applied. However the residential amenity of future occupiers still remains a material consideration and floor space standards could be used as a guide to determine whether what was proposed was acceptable in conjunction with external amenity space and public open space.
- iii. Policies requiring M42 / M43 standards in the City Council's current Local Plan 2018 do not apply to the outline permission or the reserved matters. The outline permission secured lifetime homes.
- iv. Referred to paragraph 138 of the officer's report which stated that smaller Amber and Opal homes might be an alternative housing model which may be a more affordable home and of comparable floorspace to a flat but with a private external amenity space.
- v. It would not be appropriate to defer the application to look at the issue of space within the homes as this would have a significant impact on the site layout; a new application would be required. Counsel's advice was obtained in 2019.
- vi. Counsel's advice had been summarised in the officer report, which was standard procedure as the advice had been provided on a confidential basis and included reference to other sites.

- vii. The Amber homes referred to in paragraphs 136-137 of the officer's report, was the house type referred to as being 18sqm under the space standards and was located around the pedestrianised T-park. Bicycle access would be from the parking areas through a gate into the back gardens.
- viii. The Opal homes will be 13sqm under the space standards; external space made a different contribution to residential amenity than internal space and couldn't fully compensate for a lack of internal space and needed to be weighed in the overall balance of residential amenity.
- ix. The affordable housing mix had been agreed with the affordable housing officer. Higher density areas in the middle of the site and the lower density areas towards the periphery determined a certain arrangement of house types. The development had evolved from the illustrative masterplan in the design code. The applicant had sought to create pedestrian friendly environments and this was where mews streets had emerged. The applicant had tried to mitigate clusters by mixing the tenure of the affordable housing within the clusters. More information on the management of the areas had been requested from the applicant. Reference was made to the applicant's affordable housing statement in paragraph 127 of officer's report.
- x. The gardens of the NS4 units were amended during the application process. Bin stores were brought into the front garden area where possible. Confirmed which of the NS4 units had a 5sqm garden area. Stated that the red dotted lines shown on the plans showed the lifetime home requirements.
- xi. Legal advice confirmed that a condition would have been required in the outline planning permission for space standards to be enforced. The quality of the development in terms of accommodation and garden sizes and the future occupier amenity could be considered by Members.
- xii. Open space needed to be considered by looking across the site. There was a large park in close proximity to this particular parcel (BDW2). The pavilion green and allotments were key pieces of open space to be delivered as part of this parcel. The T-park and mews areas provided additional informal space. Confirmed that the T-park was a multi-functional space. There were small areas of open space at key road junctions.

- xiii. Counsel's advice regarding space standards topic was provided in 2019.
- xiv. Asked Members to exercise caution in considering the application based on a certain number of houses being built. They should focus on issues such as the quality of development, the levels of amenity offered by the development, the quality of the accommodation and garden spaces / external amenity.

Movement / access / response to character

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

- i. Asked how people would access the allotments and how many bike stores there were.
- ii. Queried the phasing of the development as originally the next stage of the phasing was meant to begin at Histon Road.
- iii. Queried whether the development was in accordance with the transport plan as the outline permission provided for public transport to go through the site.
- iv. Questioned the rationale / objective for including the orbital cycling route.
- v. Asked if the cycleways would be segregated.

In response to Members' questions the Principal Planner, the Assistant Director and the County Highway Engineer said the following:

- i. Allotments would be accessed by the vehicular access from Falmouth Avenue. There were 12 cycle parking spaces for the allotments.
- ii. In terms of phasing of the development, BDW2 was coming forward in advance of other parcels which were closer to Histon Road due to road works currently being undertaken by the Greater Cambridge Partnership. The primary route through the site was due to be delivered concurrently or before the delivery of this parcel. Delivery of bus stops was not expected until the 500th occupation.
- iii. The orbital cycling route was from Huntingdon Road to Histon Road, cycling access into BDW2 was a secondary connection.
- iv. Suspected the cycle route through Windsor Road might be used more heavily than Huntingdon Road. Internal infrastructure carriageways were now in place so there was a vehicular link between Huntingdon Road and Histon Road but it wasn't open to the public yet as was being used for construction traffic. Plans were in place for construction traffic to have

access differently as the site was developed. A Toucan crossing would be triggered by the development of this parcel.

- v. The primary cycling routes would be segregated (except at the market square where it was a shared use facility). The secondary cycling routes would not be segregated.

Environmental issues (sustainability and drainage)

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

- i. Queried EV charging provision. Noted that 3 pin plugs referred to on p57 of the officer's report were insufficient to charge an electric vehicle but also noted reference on p68 of the officer's report to 7kw charge points which were suitable.
- ii. Queried how future proof the houses were in terms of air source heat pumps rather than gas boilers.
- iii. Asked why the development was working towards Code Level 4 for sustainability.
- iv. Asked if the ditch drainage works could be conditioned to start on site before the rest of the works. Also asked if there was running water for hand washing and toilets available at the allotments.
- v. Asked which local plan should be referred to: the current local plan (2018) or the local plan (2006) in place at the time that the outline permission was granted.
- vi. Asked if there were any conditions relating to insulation standards.
- vii. Asked who the community could turn to if the maintenance work (ditch drainage) was not done when it should be.
- viii. Queried broadband provision.
- ix. Queried arrangements for the maintenance of the open spaces.

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

- i. With a reserved matters application a local planning authority is limited to aspects which could only be considered through a reserved matters application for example: access, layout, scale and landscaping, current local plan policies could be applied to those aspects. The more technical aspects such as EV charging do not relate to 'reserved matters' and therefore new local plan policies could not be applied unless there were specific conditions on the outline permission which required compliance

of those details. The applicant had committed to providing a 3 pin charging point for each of the dwellings in the communal parking areas. It would not be reasonable to require a 3 pin or 7kw charging point by condition therefore an informative was proposed. The infrastructure for EV charging points could be included within the informative.

- ii. The sustainability standard of Code Level 4 was secured on the outline permission, referred to para 239 of the officer's report. The Sustainability Officer was assessing the application on this basis and was confident that the applicant was on track to deliver this.
- iii. Concerns regarding the maintenance of the ditch to rear of Woodlark Road related to concerns the applicant was not maintaining this ditch as they should be. The condition sought a maintenance agreement and had to be complied with before the commencement of works. The Lead Local Flood Authority also had other statutory powers it could rely upon requiring the maintenance of the ditch.
- iv. The City Council would be adopting the allotments and there were still details which needed to be worked through.
- v. There was no specific condition relating to insulation but this may fall under the Code Level 4 requirements.
- vi. Enforcement of the ditch maintenance could be by the Lead Local Flood Authority or alternatively by enforcement of the relevant planning condition. The condition could be looked at to see if it could be strengthened.
- vii. Future proofing of the development could be included within a relevant informative.
- viii. Broadband was covered by paragraph 255 of the officer's report and condition 15 of the outline permission and the condition had been fully discharged.
- ix. Some of the open space would be adopted by the City Council and some would be maintained by a private management company and in the case of the latter residents would have to pay a private management charge. The adoption plan was still to be agreed.

Residential amenity on neighbours

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

- i. Asked the officer to take Members through the discrepancies in distances which had been raised by objectors.
- ii. Asked what weight should be given to the Design Code.

- iii. Queried heights of buildings proposed to be built behind 1 Hoadly Road.
- iv. Queried separation distances behind Grosvenor Court and that originally in the outline permission which was 18m and now proposed to be 15.5m.
- v. Queried if properties proposed behind and to the north-west of 1 Hoadly Road would have windows at the first floor and expressed concerns regarding the residential amenity of future occupiers.
- vi. The outline permission provided that 15 % of the houses were meant to be accessible but the reserved matters application only provided for 5% of homes to be accessible under M43.
- vii. Asked how many houses would have permitted development rights (PDRs) removed and also asked that any houses which were undersized according to the City's Local Plan should have their PDRs removed. Queried if the number of occupants in a house could be controlled.
- viii. Asked that where there was on-site private parking, that PDRs were removed to prevent infill development as this would push cars on to the roads.
- ix. Asked for the roof terraces to have PDRs removed.
- x. Queried the number of houses which could be built under the outline permission.

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

- i. Comments had been made regarding compliance with the Design Code in the lower density areas on the edge of the development. The Design Code included a section referred to by objectors which indicated gardens should be of a comparable length to the Woodlark Road properties. The Design Code stated that this should be 'where possible'.
- ii. The Design Code was a discharge of condition and a material consideration. There were mandatory and non-mandatory parts of the Design Code. The length of gardens did not appear to fall within the mandatory element of the Design Code.
- iii. There was about a 10m gap between the proposed new properties and the Woodlark Road properties. The 10m was comprised of the width and length of the ditch and the width and length of the Woodlark Road gardens. There were some exceptions and the officer referred to page 47, paragraph 215 of the officer's report in relation to Hoadly Road. The impact on residential amenity and character should be taken into consideration.

- iv. Confirmed the properties to the north-west of 1 Hoadly Road would be 2 storeys and not 2.5 storeys.
- v. The officer had assessed the impact of the closer distance from plot 134 to Grosvenor Court in the report.
- vi. The dwellings proposed to the north-west of 1 Hoadly Road would have windows on the side elevation but not on the rear elevation looking towards 1 Hoadly Road. A condition had been proposed to remove PDRs from these properties to remove any overlooking.
- vii. The access officer was referring to the current local plan in terms of 5% of the houses complying with M43 standards. The condition on the outline permission was referring to Lifetime homes and 15% of the houses would need to meet this standard.
- viii. The removal of PDRs was controlled under recommended condition 10 and applied to plots 71, 72 and 73 (plots to rear of 1 Hoadly Road) and 131, 132, 133 and 134 (plots to rear of Grosvenor Court). Planning reasons would need to be given for PDRs to be removed from other units and assessment of the impact on surrounding properties would need to be undertaken before such a condition could be imposed. Members would have to provide parameters for officers to undertake a review of each unit. Planning powers could not be used to control the number of occupants in a house.
- ix. Agreed that units which had on-plot parking spaces could have PDRs removed.
- x. Opal units which had a roof terrace could have PDRs removed because of residential amenity concerns.
- xi. The outline permission granted permission for a maximum of 1593 homes. The phasing plan approved under the outline permission divided the site up into parcels of land for development. There had been changes to the phasing. The application was within the limit set out within the outline permission. There could be some changes between the number of houses in each parcel.

Members took a minded to agree vote to include an additional condition regarding the removal of PDRs concerning for extensions from Amber, Opal and NS4 dwellings which would only attach to the reserved matters permission if the officer's recommendation was agreed. Inclusion of the condition was carried by 7 votes to 4.

Members took a minded to agree vote to include an additional condition regarding the removal of PDRs for those dwellings which had an on-site parking space which would only attach to the reserved matters permission if the officer's recommendation was agreed. Inclusion of the condition was carried by 9 votes to 2.

The Committee:

Resolved (by 7 votes to 4) to approve the non-material amendment application reference 07/0003/NMA1 detailed in paragraph 275 of the officer's report.

Members took a 'minded to agree' vote on the officer's recommendation (paragraph 274 of the officer's report) to approve the reserved matters application reference 19/1056/REM. Members indicated unanimously that they were minded to reject the officer's recommendation.

Members provided officers with a list of 'minded to refuse' reasons to refuse the reserved matters application reference 19/1056/REM. There was a short adjournment whilst officers drafted the reasons for refusal. On return from adjournment Members then voted on each of the draft reasons as follows:

Members unanimously supported the following text as a reason why they were minded to refuse the application.

1. The proposed development would fail to provide an acceptable level of residential amenity for the future occupants. This is by virtue of the small internal floor space of the Amber, Opal and NS4 house types which would provide a poor quality internal living accommodation, failing to provide convenient accessible housing for the future occupants and the inadequate external amenity spaces for these and other dwellings. Also by virtue of the inconvenient and inaccessible provision of public open space. As such the proposal would fail to comply with Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policies 56 and 57, and the National Planning Policy Framework 2019.

Members unanimously supported the following text as a reason why they were minded to refuse the application.

2. The proposal would fail to provide acceptable supporting infrastructure for the future occupants in terms of the provision high quality and accessible public open space, play areas and inadequate cycle parking provision. As such the proposal is contrary to Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policies 55, 56, 57 and 59, and the National Planning Policy Framework 2019.

Members supported the following text by 10 votes to 1 as a reason why they were minded to refuse the application.

3. The proposal would have an unacceptable impact on the residential amenity of neighbouring properties. This is by virtue of the proximity of the proposed dwellings to the site boundary with properties at Grosvenor Court and Hoadly Road. The proposed dwellings would have an unacceptable overbearing and overlooking impact on the properties at Grosvenor Court and Hoadly Road. As such the proposal fails to comply with Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policies 55, 56 and 57, and the National Planning Policy Framework 2019.

Members unanimously supported the following text as a reason why they were minded to refuse the application.

4. The proposed development would fail to provide sustainable and cohesive communities. This is by virtue of the clustering of affordable homes in groups of between 18-42 dwellings contrary to the guidance within the Cambridge City Council Affordable Housing Supplementary Planning Document 2008. As such the proposal would fail to comply with Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policies 45 and 56.

The Committee resolved unanimously to reject the Officer recommendation to approve the application.

Resolved (unanimously) to

- A. (i) refuse the application reference **19/1056/REM** for the following reasons and
(ii) with delegated authority to officers (in consultation with the Chair and Vice-Chair) to make any minor text changes to the wording of the reasons:

1. The proposed development would fail to provide an acceptable level of residential amenity for the future occupants. This is by virtue of the small internal floor space of the Amber, Opal and NS4 house types which would provide a poor quality internal living accommodation, failing to provide convenient accessible housing for the future occupants and the inadequate external amenity spaces for these and other dwellings. Also by virtue of the inconvenient and inaccessible provision of public open space. As such the proposal would fail to comply with Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policies 56 and 57, and the National Planning Policy Framework 2019.
 2. The proposal would fail to provide acceptable supporting infrastructure for the future occupants in terms of the provision high quality and accessible public open space, play areas and inadequate cycle parking provision. As such the proposal is contrary to Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policies 55, 56, 57 and 59, and the National Planning Policy Framework 2019.
 3. The proposal would have an unacceptable impact on the residential amenity of neighbouring properties. This is by virtue of the proximity of the proposed dwellings to the site boundary with properties at Grosvenor Court and Hoadly Road. The proposed dwellings would have an unacceptable overbearing and overlooking impact on the properties at Grosvenor Court and Hoadly Road. As such the proposal fails to comply with Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policies 55, 56 and 57, and the National Planning Policy Framework 2019.
 4. The proposed development would fail to provide sustainable and cohesive communities. This is by virtue of the clustering of affordable homes in groups of between 18-42 dwellings contrary to the guidance within the Cambridge City Council Affordable Housing Supplementary Planning Document 2008. As such the proposal would fail to comply with Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policies 45 and 56.
- B. delegated authority to officers to determine by way of approval or refusal (as appropriate and in the light of part A of this resolution) for discharge

of condition applications for those conditions set out in the table within paragraph 276 of the officer's report.

20/22/JDCC NIAB site

The Committee ran out of time to consider the pre-application developer briefing and it was anticipated that the briefing would be deferred until the January 2021 meeting.

The meeting ended at 4.48 pm

CHAIR