

## JOINT DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE

17 November 2021  
10.30 am - 1.05 pm

**Present:** Councillors D. Baigent, Bradnam (Chair), Chamberlain, Dauntton, Fane, Gawthrope-Wood, Hunt, S. Smith, Scutt and Thornburrow

### **Officers Present:**

Assistant Director (Delivery) Cambridge City and South Cambridgeshire District Councils: Sharon Brown  
Principal Planner: Charlotte Burton  
Legal Adviser: Keith Barber  
Committee Manager: Claire Tunnicliffe

### **Developer Representatives:**

Development Director (Barratt Developments plc): Asa Chittock

## FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE COUNCIL

### **21/54/JDCC Apologies**

Apologies were received from Councillor M Smart, Cllr Gawthrope-Wood attended as the alternate.

Apologies were received from Councillor Hawkins, Cllr Fane attended as the alternate.

Apologies were received from Councillor Bygott.

Apologies were received from Councillor Thornburrow, Councillor Scutt attended as the alternate.

*\* Committee Manager note: Councillor Thornburrow arrived for item 21/59/JDCC*

### **21/55/JDCC Declarations of Interest**

| Item | Councillor | Interest  |
|------|------------|-----------|
| All  | Baigent    | Personal: |

|  |  |   |
|--|--|---|
|  |  | Member of<br>Cambridge Cycling<br>Campaign. |
|--|--|---|

## **21/56/JDCC Minutes**

The minutes of the meeting held on 17 September were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

## **21/57/JDCC S/1355/17/FL – Land Immediately West Of The Electricity Pylon And Foul Pump Station Histon Road Impington, 07/0003/NMA2 – Land Between Huntingdon Road And Histon Road Cambridge Cambridgeshire CB3 0LE, S/0001/07/NMA1 – Land Immediately West Of The Electricity Pylon And Foul Pump Station Histon Road Impington**

The Committee received the following applications:

- i. S/1355/17/FL – Land Immediately West Of The Electricity Pylon And Foul Pump Station Histon Road Impington.
- ii. 07/0003/NMA2 – Land Between Huntingdon Road And Histon Road Cambridge Cambridgeshire CB3 0LE.
- iii. S/0001/07/NMA1 – Land Immediately West Of The Electricity Pylon And Foul Pump Station Histon Road Impington.

Mr Asa Chittock addressed the Committee in support of the application on behalf of the applicant.

The Principal Planner introduced the application.

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

- i. A tree survey provided by the applicant did not reflect the change made during the course of the application to discharge the pond on the western side and not the northern side.
- ii. An updated tree implication assessment had been requested through condition with tree protection measures.
- iii. Suggested there would likely be a loss of one or two of the trees on the boundary.

- iv. The application did not provide an alternative proposal for the original pond location site. This land now formed part of the Darwin Green 2 & 3 site allocations for which there is no outline consent.
- v. Pre-application conversations concerning an outline consent for Darwin Green 2 & 3 are taking place between the relevant parties. The applicant will present their proposals to the Committee early next year when there will be an opportunity to discuss and influence the proposals.
- vi. The relocation of the balancing pond had first been discussed in 2015, as the allocation of Darwin Green 2 & 3 sites moved forward through the South Cambridgeshire District Council Local Plan process.
- vii. The relocation of the pond had been administered in parallel with the reserved matters proposals brought forward within Darwin Green 1.
- viii. Noted the Committee's comments about the potential loss of open space should houses be placed on the original pond location site. These concerns could be dealt with as the Darwin Green 2 & 3 development come forward through the pre-application process. Members could provide a very clear and strong steer to the developer team with their views on open space and what should be provided.
- ix. Referenced paragraph 8 of the Officer's report which outlined the history of the application. The original balancing pond had received consent though full planning permission granted by South Cambridgeshire District Council. This included an access road and the consent remained extant.
- x. The current proposal was for a revised full planning application for the balancing pond's relocation.
- xi. The application is an important and essential part of the infrastructure of Darwin Green 1. The drainage infrastructure would also support the development moving forward while the proposals for Darwin Green 2 & 3 were under discussion.
- xii. The site of the original balancing pond is already within the Darwin Green 2 & 3 site allocation and currently not Green Belt land. This site allocation includes the provision of up to 1000 homes and whether development is located on that site is still to be determined through an planning application.
- xiii. In terms of hedge removal referenced on p25 and p29 of the agenda pack: an updated arboricultural implications assessment and method statement would be secured through conditions which will be reviewed by the Council's Tree Officers. This was an opportunity to ensure that the removal of the hedge was kept to a minimum.
- xiv. The application should be considered on its individual merit.
- xv. Suggested an additional informative for the removal of the hedge should be minimised.

- xvi. With regards to the replacement of the hedge with native species, the planting plan was subject to a landscaping condition and an informative could be included to the type of species that should be planted.
- xvii. Temporary access arrangement for maintenance would be provided until an alternative access was available through Darwin Green 2 & 3 development.
- xviii. The City Council would be in control of the access provisions for maintenance.
- xix. Confirmed that the proposed site of the relocated balancing pond would be within Green Belt land.
- xx. The balancing pond is considered as appropriate development within the Green Belt, therefore the proposed location was appropriate.
- xxi. Noted the comment that the balancing pond would enhance the landscape of the Green Belt.
- xxii. The initial ecological survey conducted in 2016 found off site badger activity. An updated survey has been requested through condition as recommended by the Ecology Officer which would identify if badgers were living in the area.
- xxiii. The ecology survey would include details confirming the status and distribution of setts, details of avoidance and mitigation measures, and confirmation whether a Natural England badger mitigation licence was required.
- xxiv. The archaeological condition was the standard approach used by Cambridgeshire County Council's Historical and Environment team. If there were any significant finds this would be reported back to the County and work would not proceed until an investigation had been concluded.
- xxv. An updated flood risk assessment had been submitted and reviewed by the Drainage Engineer and the lead local flood authority. Both consultees had given assurance the assessment met the requirements for Darwin Green 1. No objections had been raised on technical grounds.
- xxvi. Cambridge City Council would be responsible for the management of the proposed balancing pond through the S106 Agreement and would a long-term obligation.
- xxvii. It was important to note the balancing pond would primarily serve the Darwin Green 1 development which was in advanced stages of development. The pond would form part of the overall drainage strategy and therefore was key to enabling the other phases of Darwin Green 1 scheme.
- xxviii. If a proposal came forward for housing on the land in South Cambridgeshire to the northern end of the Darwin Green 1 development

this would be a matter which would come to Committee for determination. It would be considered as a separate application and the planning decision should be considered on its own merit.

- xxix. Noted the comment that there was no reason why the balancing pond could not be installed its original location and questioned the need for the relocation.
- xxx. The Darwin Green 2 & 3 site allocation had gone through the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan which would have been scrutinised by the relevant Examination process. The Council had set out the intention for that site in detail of up to 1000 homes, a secondary school, and a country park on the retaining Green Belt and therefore deemed available for development.
- xxxi. Darwin Green 1 allocation was made in the Cambridge Local Plan 2006, whereas the Darwin Green 2 & 3 was made in the more-recently adopted South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2018. During this time there was the approval of the Darwin Green 1 outline consent in 2013.

The Legal Advisor confirmed there was extant permission for the balancing pond. The application sought to relocate the pond which was necessary for the infrastructure of Darwin Green 1. The issue of the Green Belt had been addressed in the Officer report and was acceptable infrastructure which in itself is appropriate development within the Green Belt. The application could be considered in isolation to any other hypothetical application which may be submitted for future consideration.

Councillor Porrer proposed to defer the decision which was seconded by Councillor Smith.

#### The Committee:

**Resolved by 6 votes to 4 to defer** the applications as further information was required in relation to:

- i. more detailed justification for the need to relocate the balancing pond including setting out any advantages in terms of biodiversity. More information on the timing to secure a fully functioning balancing pond to ensure there is no delay with the delivery of the remainder of the Darwin Green 1 parcels

#### **21/58/JDCC      Eddington Lot 4 (Hill)**

The Committee received a Developer presentation on Eddington Lot 4

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 were binding on either the intended applicant or the local planning authority so consequently were not recorded in these minutes.

- i. Queried the dimension size of the back gardens for the three and four bed properties.
- ii. Questioned the location and size of the main open space on site.
- iii. Asked if there was enough bike storage on site for the entire development.
- iv. Enquired as to what extent had the plans changed to accommodate the new National Planning Policy Framework.
- v. Suggested that more detail was required on the landscaping of the site.
- vi. Doubted if the bike storage was sufficient to park cargo bikes in sufficient numbers.
- vii. Suggested there should be a green open space for each apartment.
- viii. Asked what sustainable planting, particularly trees, would be used on site.
- ix. Expressed concern at the removal of individual bike storage on the properties.
- x. Asked if dogs would be permitted on the green open spaces.
- xi. The application should promote active travel, yet a third of the space on site was allocated to car parking.
- xii. The provision of a cycle policy should be considered to ensure cycles paths were accessible and would encourage active travel.
- xiii. Suggested there should be a cycle space per individual and not per bedroom.
- xiv. Suggested a net zero construction on site would be welcome.
- xv. Advised provision for electric vehicle charging points.
- xvi. Welcomed the change of colour on the buildings.
- xvii. Should consider the installation of heating systems which could be reversed to a cooling system when required; the top floor flats could get very hot.
- xviii. Asked what active play provision for children would be on site.
- xix. Queried what fossil fuels would be used.
- xx. Suggested there were some planning elements which were last century and should be updated.

The meeting ended at 1.05 pm

**CHAIR**