

JOINT DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE

6 April 2022
10.00 am - 3.26 pm

Present: Councillors Bygott, Daunton, Hawkins, Hunt, Porrer, S. Smith, Thornburrow, Gawthrope Wood and J. Williams

Also present (virtually) but did not take part in item 22/15/JDCC were Councillors: Bradnam and D. Baigent.

Officers Present:

Joint Director of Planning and Economic Development: Stephen Kelly
Legal Adviser: Keith Barber
Committee Manager: Sarah Steed
Meeting Producer: James Goddard

Officers Present virtually:

Delivery Manager (Strategic Sites): Philippa Kelly
Principal Planner: Rebecca Ward
Principal Urban Designer: Joanne Preston
Principal Development Management Engineer – Jon Finney
Housing Officer: Tracey Harrison

Developer Representatives:

Guy Kaddish
Miles Leigh
Andrew Maclaren
Matt Jarvis
Peter McKeown
David Fletcher
Alexis Butterfield

FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE COUNCIL

22/13/JDCC Apologies

Apologies were received from Councillors D. Baigent, Bradnam, Chamberlain, Page-Croft and Smart. Councillor Williams attended as alternate for Councillor Bradnam.

Councillor S. Smith attended Committee and acted in his capacity as Ward Councillor for item 22/15/JDCC and Councillor Gawthrop Wood attended as his alternate for this item.

Councillor Thornburrow was elected Chair for the meeting in the absence of the Committee's standing Chair and Vice-Chair.

Post meeting note: Councillor Hawkins was nominated as the Vice-Chair for this meeting to ensure political balance regarding consultation requirements (see Committee resolution) for decisions made in accordance with the conventions of the Joint Committee.

22/14/JDCC Declarations of Interest

No interests were declared.

22/15/JDCC 21/03609/FUL - National Institute of Agricultural Botany (NIAB), Huntingdon Road, Cambridge

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

As part of the Principal Planner's officer presentation, she updated her report:

- by referring to representations listed on the Amendment Sheet and further details contained on the Council's planning portal / file
- noted a further letter had been received the day before the Committee from Plymouth Close and Falmouth Close residents which had also been uploaded onto the portal planning file
- Councillor Simon Smith (in his capacity as Ward Councillor) had also emailed the Case Officer suggesting amendments to condition 43 - landscape condition and condition 52 - service and delivery plan
- advised that the application had originally been heard on 16 March 2022 but a decision was deferred as the Committee sought more affordable private rented homes be provided as part of the proposal. The applicant confirmed an increase in the number of affordable rented homes from 37 as originally proposed to 58. All the affordable housing would be provided on site.

The Committee received representations in objection to the application from the following

- Residents of Howes Place.
- Residents of Plymouth Close and Falmouth Close

The representation on behalf of residents in Howes Place covered the following issues:

- i. Howes Place was recognised as a local heritage asset for the architectural interest of its buildings, the street scene value of the buildings setting within formal landscaping and the importance of NIAB and Howes Place in the social and economic history of Cambridge.
- ii. Noted that the Committee would be asked to consider officer recommendation A or B.
- iii. Recommendation A was informed by the place making principle of permeability and connectivity which paid no regard to:
 - a. the exemplar of historic place making vision and urban and landscape design for Howes Place which established a community life of peace and tranquillity after a period of death and destruction during the First World War
 - b. the irreversible harm to the heritage assets of Howes Place and the close-knit community ethos nurtured by future generations
 - c. intensifying the use of Howes Place which would put pedestrians and cyclists in an environment of undue hazard where vehicles would be manoeuvring and where pedestrians and cyclists may not be expected.
- vi. Recommendation B (also known as the ‘heritage access arrangements’) would protect Howes Place as required by Local Plan Policy 62. The number of protected trees requiring removal was reduced and hedgerows would be introduced to enhance the delineation between Howes Place and the development site.
- vii. Howes Place was not designed to service a 200-bed Aparthotel nor to provide pedestrian and cycle access to 300 residential dwellings.
- viii. Option B has been jointly developed between residents of Howes Place and the applicant. With the exception of refuse collection from the Aparthotel, all vehicle, pedestrian, and cycle connections would be onto Lawrence Weaver Road, a purpose-built highway with dedicated footpaths and cycle lanes.
- ix. Option B avoided Howes Place being used as a short route for pedestrians and cyclists from the proposed development to the City centre and being used as overflow for amenity space and car parking.
- x. Option B protected the heritage assets of Howes Place and improved highways safety. It was supported by the residents of Howes Place, the applicant and City and County Councillors for Castle Ward.

The representations on behalf of residents in Plymouth Close and Falmouth Close covered the following issues:

- i. objected to the proposed terrace buildings C, D and E

- ii. requested the Committee adopted the proposed amendments to protect the amenity, privacy, and well-being of current and future residents
- iii. wished to enjoy family life without:
 - a. the privacy of bedrooms, living rooms and back gardens being compromised due to overlooking from 37 first and second floor windows and external walkways
 - b. residents' domestic peace being disturbed by noise from the proposed three storey blocks due to back-to-back distances of 18.5m comprising a 12.5m multi-functional space providing a 3-6m wide footpath, four dedicated communal children and teenager play areas within 3m of residential boundaries and three cycle storage buildings abutting residents' garden fences-
- iv. inconsistency in planning between the Darwin Green and the NIAB developments. For Darwin Green, a parameter plan ensured residents of eleven existing streets such as Plymouth Close and Falmouth Close would benefit from limited overlooking and loss of privacy due to:
 - a. new development limited to two floor houses with permitted development rights removed for dormers
 - b. minimum back-to-back distances of 22.5m with private gardens between the houses
 - c. overlooking would be minimised by placing bathrooms to the rear, offsetting the houses with breaks between pairs of semis and short terraces-
- v. their streets would be harmed from maximum overlooking and loss of privacy due to:
 - a. three floor flats
 - b. back-to-back distance of 18.5m with a 12.5m multi-function space, which was materially different from backing onto a private garden
 - c. overlooking maximised by a continuous line of 19 first floor and 18 second floor bedrooms with external walkways which would allow residents to gaze down to gardens, kitchens, living rooms and bedrooms
- vi. asked the Committee to make the following amendments:
 - a. to limit the height of the proposed buildings C, D and E to 2 floors
 - b. to remove all external walkways to buildings C, D and E and the party terrace at building E
 - c. to increase the back-to-back distance from 18.5m to a minimum of 22.5m.
 - d. to re-design the space between the flats and resident's' boundary fence as follows:
 - i. to relocate the four proposed communal children and teenage play spaces 7m away from the boundary

- ii. to condition the hours of use of the communal children and teenage play spaces and sources of noise nuisance at all hours
- iii. to plant and maintain shrubs and trees on the additional 4m of land together with a 3m high, 1m wide hedge along the boundary
- iv. to replace the three proposed cycle stores of an unspecified height to abut garden fences with basement cycle parking spaces.

Peter McKeown (Applicant's Agent) addressed the Committee in support of the application.

Councillor Simon Smith (City (Castle) Ward Councillor) addressed the Committee about the application:

- i. noting that a Development Control Forum (DCF) had taken place regarding this application on the 4 November 2021 and that Committee Members had noted that a better outcome could be achieved. Gave credit to the applicant for their collaboration with Howes Place residents and agreeing the 'Option B heritage access arrangements
- ii. the massing of the development had not been addressed - residents at Falmouth Close and Plymouth Close would be the most adversely affected
- iii. it was a material planning consideration that cycle parking and car parking only met within the red edge line
- iv. expressed concerns regarding overlooking due to 3 storey buildings namely, C, D and E which affected Plymouth Close and Falmouth Close residents
- v. noted comments made at the DCF that Howes Place was a local heritage asset which needed to be protected and enhanced. That there should be no vehicular access via Howes Place. The desire line for access needed to be via Lawrence Weaver Road
- vi. noted officer recommendation Option A which officers stated would allow residents to access Howes Green. Residents of Howes Place had signed a petition saying that they did not want this
- vii. noted that the site had a detailed area conservation appraisal drawn up but that this had been withdrawn pending the submission of a planning application
- viii. only recommendation B would comply with Local Plan Policy 62
- ix. noted in relation to the prior approval permission that the applications for the discharge of conditions 2 and 3 were refused
- x. asked the Committee to make the following amendments to protect the amenity of Plymouth Close and Falmouth Close residents:
 - a. to limit the height of the proposed buildings C, D and E to 2 floors

- b. to remove all external balconies and walkways to buildings C, D and E and the party terrace at building E
- c. to increase the back-to-back distance from 18.5m to a minimum of 22.5m
- d. to re-design the space between the flats and boundary fence as follows:
 - i. to relocate the four proposed communal children and teenage play spaces 7m away from the boundary
 - ii. to condition hours of use of the communal children and teenage play spaces and sources of noise nuisance at all hours
 - iii. to plant and maintain shrubs and trees on the additional 4m of land together with a 3m high, 1m wide hedge along the boundary
 - iv. to relocate the cycle parking to the basement of the car park.

The Committee Manager read out the following points on behalf of Councillor Payne (City Castle Ward Councillor):

- i. noted positive and constructive meetings had taken place between the applicant and the residents of Howes Place and Darwin Green and that these had resulted in the development of mutually agreeable alternative 'heritage' access arrangements (referred to as Option B) for the proposed development
- ii. there was unanimous support from the residents of Howes Place for the 'heritage' access arrangements (Option B) on the following grounds:
 - a. with the exception of refuse collection for the aparthotel and emergency services, the 'heritage' access arrangements (Option B) removed all vehicle connections between the proposed development and Howes Place
 - b. the 'heritage' access arrangements (Option B) included four dedicated cycle and pedestrian access points and one multi-modal access point which provided residents of and visitors to, the proposed development with direct and easy connectivity to the purpose-built roadways, footpaths and cycle lanes on Lawrence Weaver Road and fully support sustainable transport requirements. Noted the County Council needed to adopt Lawrence Weaver Road so that the legislation to protect cycle lanes from being used for parked cars could be implemented
 - c. the 'heritage' access arrangements (Option B) significantly improved highways safety by removing the multi-modal and cycle and pedestrian access points on Howes Place (an unadopted,

- poorly constructed, unlit, and narrow residential street) proposed under the Option A access arrangements
- d. the 'heritage' access arrangements (Option B) minimised the harm to the appearance, character and setting of the heritage assets of Howes Place by:
 - i. reducing the number of protected mature pleached lime trees requiring removal to as few as three trees
 - ii. significantly reducing the scale of hard landscaping works to the reconstruction / widening of up to fifty (50) metres of existing footpaths
 - iii. introducing additional hedgerows to create a natural delineation between Howes Place and the proposed development-
 - iii. the 'heritage' access arrangements (Option B) minimise the harm to the amenity of current and future residents of Howes Place by:
 - a. avoiding the creation of short cuts along Howes Place which would divert pedestrians and cyclists travelling to and from the City centre, including electric scooters and motorised two-wheeled vehicles, away from Lawrence Weaver Road and onto Howes Place and place both pedestrians and cyclists in an environment of undue hazard where vehicles are manoeuvring and where pedestrians and cyclists may not be expected
 - b. avoiding the creation of Howes Place as the 'back yard' of the proposed development by removing direct and easy access to overflow amenity space and car parking in Howes Place for residents of, and visitors to, the proposed development
 - c. avoiding the use of Howes Place for commercial vehicles / deliveries and drops-offs and pick-ups for residents of, and visitors to, the proposed development, including the central open public space and amenities-
 - iv. supported the adoption of the 'heritage' access arrangements (Option B) in the event that permission was granted.

The Committee Manager read out the following points on behalf of Councillor S. Baigent (City Castle Ward Councillor):

- i. noted that members of the Committee would be asked to make a choice between the access Option A and Option B, the heritage option. Felt the latter option protected Howes Place
- ii. had asked residents to explain why Howes Place was important which brought to life the enduring impact of great place making
- iii. voice of a resident who has brought up three children in Howes Place
 - a. referred to the history of Howes Place where the vision for a self-contained community informed the design, layout, landscape and how

- their vision and the place and the people shaped family and community life over four generations
- b. the first residents were former First World War soldiers and their families. There was a communal laundry, a communal hot water system and communal gardens to the front and rear
 - c. the next generation of residents were the widows and families of RAF personnel who were killed during the Second World War. As these families grew, their homes and community ethos were passed to a new generation of owner occupiers and tenants
 - d. my experience of living here is that you get to know everyone and share responsibilities with each other; we look out for the safety and care of the children and the elderly. It's an enduring joy to see the children playing in the front gardens and learning how to ride their bicycles in the street knowing they are safe
 - e. howes Place is an unusual and unique environment which sat in people's hearts all their lives
- iv. Voice of a new resident:
- a. Cambridge is a beautiful ancient City now plagued by areas of cheap looking newbuild apartment blocks. These developments have no soul or longevity we must challenge their free expansion and protect the City's heritage so it can be enjoyed by future generations
 - b. Howes Place is a beautiful and quiet part of Cambridge and the Option B access arrangements are the only way to protect it
- v. Voices of long-term residents:
- a. noted that the developer's architect states Howes Place was an underused asset commenting it was their home, community and wasn't an asset to monetise
 - b. to be linked to the proposed development (of a 201-room Aparthotel and 297 flats) would completely overwhelm the 21 homes in Howes Place
 - c. Howes Place was like a country lane—never intended as a multi-modal route for a large-scale development.
 - d. Option A would bring irreversible change resident's children would not be safe to play together and we would lose our community spirit
 - e. the ideas were out of a textbook and didn't make sense in Howes Place which was designed to be a self-contained place and community
 - f. it was the Council's responsibility to plan for better new neighbourhoods, not to destroy existing ones which work. Asked why the Council considered Option A when there was no benefit to existing residents and no need to do it
 - g. Howes Place was a quiet oasis which needed to be saved so future generations could enjoy it, as previous people had

- h. it was only after the Development Control Forum that the developer began to listen - resident's agree Option B was a good solution
- v. agreed with resident's that Option B was the only option which would protect Howes Place in perpetuity.

The Committee Manager read out the following points on behalf of Councillor Rae (County Ward Councillor):

- i. supported Option B (Heritage option) access arrangements and opposed Option A
- ii. noted that Option B was supported by residents of Howes Place and fellow Castle Ward Councillors. This support was based on the following grounds:
- iii. option B (the 'heritage' option) access arrangements removed all vehicle, pedestrian and cycle connections between the proposed development and Howes Place except for refuse collection for the aparthotel and emergency services.
- iv. option B fully supports sustainable transport requirements as it includes four dedicated cycle and pedestrian access points and one multi-modal access point. These would provide residents of, and visitors to, the proposed development with direct and easy connectivity to the purpose-built, lit and adoptable footways, cycle paths and highway on Lawrence Weaver Road whilst fully supporting sustainable transport requirements. These are the direct routes to the facilities of Darwin Green and Eddington on which residents of the new development will need to rely due to the lack of on-site facilities notably amenity space.
- v. option B significantly improves highways safety by removing the possibility of turning Howes Place (an unadopted, poorly constructed, unlit and narrow residential lane) into a busy multi-modal and cycle and pedestrian access route points as proposed under the Option A site / access arrangements.
- vi. option B minimises the harm to the appearance, character and setting of the heritage assets of Howes Place by:
- vii. reducing the number of protected mature pleached lime trees to be removed to (2) trees;
- viii. significantly reducing the scale of hard landscaping works for the reconstruction / widening of up to fifty (50) metres of existing footpaths; and
- ix. introducing additional hedgerows to create a natural delineation between Howes Place and the proposed development.
- x. option B minimises the harm to the amenity of current and future residents of Howes Place by:

- xi. avoiding the use of Howes Place as a short cut (primary desire line) for which it is unfit;
- xii. avoiding the creation of Howes Place as the 'back yard' of the proposed development by removing direct and easy access to overflow amenity space and car parking in Howes Place for residents of, and visitors to, the proposed development; and
- xiii. avoiding the bad neighbour anti- social use of Howes Place for commercial vehicles / deliveries and drops-offs and pick-ups for residents of, and visitors to, the proposed development, most notably the Apart-Hotel and the late night opening micro-brewery and bar.

The Director of Planning and Sustainable Development, Principal Planner, Legal Officer and Principal Urban Designer, Principal Development Management Engineer made the following in response to issues raised by public speakers:

- i. noted the comments which had been made on behalf of public speakers and Ward Councillors requesting amendments to the application, but the siting, design, and layout of the development was fixed within the current application. Changes to building heights or relocating buildings would be substantive changes to the physical form of the development proposal and could not be addressed by planning conditions. If Members found these issues unacceptable then the appropriate option open to the Committee would be to refuse the application
- ii. noted reference to a Prior Approval Permission and cycle parking concerns associated with that planning permission but commented that this application should be viewed separately. This application could not be used to resolve issues regarding conditions attached to another permission
- iii. responded to concerns raised regarding overlooking—noting that the Mews units intended to back onto Plymouth Close were 2.5 storeys high rather than 3 storeys high. Condition 35 should provide screening to open circulation areas with the screens expected to be 1.7m in height. 18m separation distances between buildings had been used on Lawrence Weaver Road. The land to the east of buildings C, D and E would be a communal private garden area. It would not be accessible by the general public but would be accessed by the residents of the Mews buildings. This area would have 'play along the way' features and would not have features like slides or swings. it would be possible to consider planting to provide a buffer in relation to overlooking concerns
- iv. the scale and massing of the Mews buildings was considered at pre-application stage and the Urban Design Officers were comfortable with the relationship

- v. confirmed there was to be a 15-year clawback mechanism for the build to rent units in the s106 planning agreement which meant that if, during that 15-year period the units were not used as build to rent units then compensation would be payable;
- vi. confirmed the affordable private rented units would be provided in perpetuity and in the event these units were taken out of affordable housing use then the developer would need to provide an affordable housing commuted sum (based on market values) to the Council for the loss of on-Site provision.

The Committee raised the following concerns in response to the report:

- i. queried reference to 2 and 3 miles in relation to affordable housing allocation
- ii. queried if the ownership of the build to rent flats could be controlled (page 34, paragraph 85 of the officer's report)
- iii. queried where the 24-hour management of the build to rent affordable units would be
- iv. welcomed the additional affordable housing provision on site
- v. noted play provision would also be available off site at Darwin Green
- vi. queried the additional conditions put forward by Councillor S. Smith
- vii. asked for clarification on why the developer did not need to provide 40% affordable housing
- viii. asked if buildings C, D and E could be removed from the development in response to concerns raised by public speakers
- ix. queried why a shortfall in open space provision should be compensated by improvements to facilities off-site
- x. welcomed improvements in sustainability and energy but queried why air source heat pumps were not being proposed
- xi. wanted to see green roofs and PV panels and asked if flats had their own energy meters
- xii. noted that condition 29 required the provision of at least one rapid electric charge point but noted that if only one was installed it might negatively impact residents who did not have the charge connector for the unit which was installed
- xiii. asked if the electricity supplier would need to increase capacity to be able to service the development
- xiv. queried why there was no reference to the Biodiversity Supplementary Planning Document (SPD)
- xv. asked if the scheme included a grey water recycling system
- xvi. noted the felling of 10 Pleached Lime trees asking if any of the trees would be replanted elsewhere

- xvii. asked where the food growing space would be and who would look after the it if residents did not
- xviii. noted that residents of Plymouth Close and Falmouth Close had asked for a 3m wide and 1m high hedge to be planted - asking if this could be conditioned
- xix. noted the Aparthotel facilities would be open to the general public enquiring how traffic and noise generated by these facilities would be monitored
- xx. noted that two car club spaces were proposed-asking if this facility were to prove popular could more could be provided
- xxi. that vehicles parked in cycle lanes on Lawrence Weaver Road and expressed concerns about overspill parking
- xxii. noted residents had expressed concerns about overlooking and the varying distances between blocks
- xxiii. queried the level of discount to be offered to residents who wanted to use the amenity facilities provided as part of the new development
- xxiv. queried what play equipment would be installed at the 'play along the way' area
- xxv. queried the height of the sheds and
- xxvi. expressed concerns about healthcare contribution and noted the existing healthcare capacity issues in the area.

The Joint Director of Planning and Economic Development, Principal Planner, Legal Officer and Urban Design Officer said the following in response to Member questions:

- i. the affordable housing criteria was two miles for people who had a local connection and three miles for those who had no work connection to the area
- ii. Central Government was keen to stimulate private sector investment, therefore it had changed the minimum requirement in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) for affordable build to rent provision down from 40% to 20%
- iii. Building G would contain the management facilities on the ground floor
- iv. off-site mitigation contributions for public open space would go to Histon Road Recreational Ground which is 900m from the development
- v. a s106 Agreement would secure planning obligations to secure the affordable housing in perpetuity with a financial clawback mechanism to be applied in the event of any affordable units taken out of affordable use. Restrictions could not be placed on land ownership which prevented alienation
- vi. to remove buildings C, D and E from the application would be a fundamental alteration to the scheme before the Committee going to the

- heart of the application. If Members felt strongly that these buildings were inappropriate, then Members would need to consider refusing the application
- vii. with reference to the additional conditions requested by Councillor S. Smith, the additional protection to boundary treatments could be included in condition 43. The amendments to condition 52 regarding controlling vehicle movements should not restrict emergency vehicle movements. Noted that the final condition listed in Appendix 2 regarding the dry riser was not numbered but required the submission of details in the interests of residential amenity
 - viii. roof terraces and courtyards were not identified in the Councils open space planning policy however officers felt there to be a good level of amenity space being provided on site. In some circumstances improvements to open space areas off site could be proposed
 - ix. it was an all electric development with air source heat pumps for the Aparthotel
 - x. the development would have biodiverse roof space including PV panels. Noted that there would need to be a trade-off regarding one or more renewable energy sources for example PV panels and air source heat pumps
 - xi. condition 29 required a site wide electric policy. This was a standard condition applied to developments of this scale. Noted that the condition required a minimum of one EV charging point, but most housebuilders put in more
 - xii. the Biodiversity SPD had only recently been adopted by the Councils, but the Council's Biodiversity Officer had been consulted throughout the scheme
 - xiii. Planning policy required water efficiencies of 110 litres per person per day. The applicant had agreed a reduction to 100 litres per person per day which would be achieved through condition 40. Rainwater harvesting was included in the development
 - xiv. noted that there had been electricity capacity issues in Cambridge. The developer would need to ensure a connection was put into the grid
 - xv. understood residents would be responsible for their own electricity bills but water charges would be included within the unit's service charge
 - xvi. a tree strategy plan had been received which provided details of trees to be felled and those to be re-planted
 - xvii. the growing vegetable space would be contained on roof terraces for which further details were required as part of the Landscape Plan. The Management Company would be responsible for monitoring this area
 - xviii. officers could look at plant species to provide the hedge buffer requested by Plymouth Close and Falmouth Close residents

- xix. the Aparthotel / gym facilities were ancillary to the development. The swimming pool within the Aparthotel was not the size of the Parkside pool and it was anticipated that only local people would use it and therefore its use would not generate a lot of extra vehicle movements from users
- xx. The applicant had proposed two car club spaces - consideration could be given to amending the condition to permit more if the need arose
- xxi. noted the cycle lanes were around the width of a car and that once roads were adopted by the highway authority Traffic Regulation Orders (TROs) could be introduced which would be monitored and enforced by Local Parking Enforcement Officers. Currently about 35m of Lawrence Weaver Road was adopted highway with the remainder was the responsibility of the developer. In the longer term the Darwin Green area would be covered by parking restrictions. There were designated visitor parking spaces in the basement of the Aparthotel
- xxii. commented that separation distances varied between 18-21m between the proposed and existing properties. 18m separation distance was considered acceptable and was identified elsewhere on the Darwin Green development. 18m was considered good practice in urban design terms. Privacy screens would help to obscure windows behind the screens but were likely to be 'slatted' to allow light into the bedrooms
- xxiii. residents would be offered a 30% discount if they wanted to use the amenity facilities being provided as part of the development
- xxiv. only residents of buildings C, D and E would have access to the 'play along the way' space. There would not be swings or a slide provided but there would be features such as stepping stones; and
- xxv. the sheds would be single storey, 1-2m in height having a green roof so there would be no overbearing impact. Noted that condition 43 provided scope to finesse the citing of the cycle store.

The Joint Director of Planning and Economic Development summarised the following amendments which were proposed arising from concerns raised by Members during debate:

- i. minor revision to condition 7 to include car clubs
- ii. amendment to condition 29 increasing the number of EV charging points to two
- iii. revise condition 43 under point (c) to include
 - a. retention and protection of existing mature hedgerows along the north western boundary between Howes Place and the proposed development
 - b. provision and maintenance of a 2m high 1m wide hedgerow along the boundary with a 1.2m mesh fence pending the maturity of the

- new hedgerow (subject to the needs for accommodating agreed vehicle access for services, refuse and emergency)
- c. a scheme for the installation of a new hedge along the boundary of the site with both Plymouth Close and Falmouth Close
- iv. revise condition 54 which was incomplete adding the details of locations of all dry rises of the Aparthotel be submitted to the Local Planning Authority
- v. an additional condition to require details of cycle parking for Buildings C,D and E to be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority
- vi. the Chair and Vice-Chair to be consulted on the final terms of s106 Agreement prior to completion
- vii. the s106 agreement to include a 30% fee reduction for residents wishing to use the amenity facilities provided as part of the development; and
- viii. delegate drafting the amendments in respect of the condition amendments and additional condition together with the terms of and the completion of the s106 Agreement to the Director of Planning and Sustainable Development.

The Committee:

Resolved (by 6 votes to 2) to grant the application for planning permission in accordance with Officer recommendation Option B detailed in paragraph 269 of the report, for the reasons set out therein, subject to:

- i. the prior completion of an Agreement under s106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as set out in Appendix 1 to the Officer's report
- ii. the planning conditions and informatives contained in Appendix 2 of the Officer's report with delegated authority to Officers:
- a. independently to negotiate, settle and complete the terms of the s106 Agreement substantially reflecting the obligations set out in Appendix 1 of the Officer's report subject, before completing the Agreement to Officer consultation with the Chair and Vice-Chair of the Committee
- b. independently to settle any minor non-significant amendments to the conditions
- c. in the case of any significant amendment or the introduction of additional conditions to do so in consultation with the Chair and Vice Chair of Committee
- iii. delegated authority to Officers to draft and include the following amendments and additions to the following conditions:
- a. minor revision to condition 7 to include car clubs

- b. amendment to condition 29 increasing the number of EV charging points to two
- c. amend condition 43 under point c to include boundary treatments including the type, positions, design, species and materials of boundary treatments to be erected as follows:
 - i. retention and protection of existing mature hedgerows along the north western boundary between Howes Place and the proposed development
 - ii. provision and maintenance of a 2m high 1m wide hedgerow along the boundary with a 1.2m mesh fence pending the maturity of the new hedgerow (subject to the needs for accommodating agreed vehicle access for services, refuse and emergency)
 - iii. a scheme for the installation of a new hedge along the boundary of the site with both Plymouth Close and Falmouth Close
- d. amend condition 54 which was incomplete so as to include the locations of all dry rises of the Aparthotel be submitted to the Local Planning Authority
- e. an additional condition requiring the submission of details of cycle parking for Building C D and E for approval by the Local Planning Authority; and
- f. to seek a commitment in the s106 Agreement to secure a 30% cost reduction for residents' use of the amenity facilities provided as part of the development – subject to such a commitment (if in the form of a planning obligation) being CIL compliant.

22/16/JDCC Outline proposal for mixed use development including up to 1,000 dwellings, a secondary school, primary school, community facilities, provision for outdoor sports facilities, informal open space and allotments on site area approximately 80 hectares on land between Huntingdon Road and Histon Road

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

1. Asked if there was a legal mechanism to retain the Country Park as an open space ensuring that it did not get developed.
2. Asked about the car parking strategy.
3. Asked about cycle connections through the Country Park to the A14.

4. Asked for further details about the bund and planting along the A14.
5. Requested decent garden sizes.
6. Asked about EV charging points.
7. Queried why the primary road went in front of the school.
8. Asked for further information about drainage and the balancing pond.
9. Queried if existing properties were in the red line boundary.
10. Queried on-site provision of community services and support.
11. Asked about 5k park run on the Country Park.
12. Asked about biodiversity.
13. Asked about skateboarding provision.
14. Asked about allotments and the water table

The meeting ended at 3.26 pm

CHAIR