

JOINT DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE

17 August 2022
10.00 am - 3.30 pm

Present: Councillors Bradnam (Vice-Chair, in the Chair), Carling, Flaubert, Gawthrope Wood, Porrer, Thornburrow (Vice-Chair), Fane, Garvie and Hawkins

Officers Present:

Delivery Manager (Strategic Sites): Philippa Kelly

Principal Planning Officer: Guy Wilson

Principal Sustainability Officer: Emma Davies

Planning Officer (Strategic Sites): James Truett

Legal Adviser: Keith Barber

Committee Manager: James Goddard

Meeting Producer: Claire Tunnicliffe

FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE COUNCIL**22/28/JDCC Apologies**

Apologies were received from:

- City Councillors S. Smith and Scutt. Councillor Gawthrope Wood attended as Alternate.
- South Cambs Councillors Stobart, Cahn and R. Williams. Councillor Garvie attended as Alternate.

Councillor Bradnam proposed, and Councillor Gawthrope Wood seconded, the nomination of Councillor Thornburrow as Vice Chair for this meeting.

Unanimously resolved that Councillor Thornburrow be Vice Chair for this meeting.

22/29/JDCC Declarations of Interest

Item	Councillor	Interest
22/32/JDCC	Hawkins	Personal: Observer on quality panel for site.

22/30/JDCC 21/04036/REM - Lots S1 and S2 North West Cambridge Development, Eddington Avenue, Cambridge CB3 0LH

The Committee received a reserved matters application for the approval for appearance, landscaping, layout and scale for 373 dwellings, access roads, cycle and pedestrian routes, cycle and car parking, landscaping, utilities and associated ancillary structures at Lots S1 and S2, North West Cambridge Development following outline planning permission S/1886/11 as varied by planning permission S/2036/13/VC.

The Committee received a representation in objection to the application from a resident of Huntingdon Road.

The representation covered the following issues:

- i. Huntingdon Road and Girton residents had been severely negatively impacted by the Eddington centre development.
- ii. Referred to comments submitted by residents on the original application, many of them did not receive notice of the revised application.
- iii. Issues with the Eddington development had been going on for circa a decade but the final stage S3 (and associated infrastructure) were the applications which particularly concerned residents, being directly to the rear of their properties. Looking out of the rear windows of some of the properties, one could see the impact of stage 1 – instead of hedges with low lying fields beyond, there were huge mountains of spoil, only grassed after much agitation, which towered over 8 foot hedges. When created, these ‘mountains’ caused disruption plus noise and air pollution, and appeared to be permanent.
- iv. Requested a construction management plan to mitigate issues such as anti-social work hours or inadvertent spoil mounds.
- v. Residents’ gardens were now prone to flooding, believed to be a result of the huge mounds created at the back of their properties where water run off rates as well as underground water streams may have resulted in rising water tables. Residents had no opportunity to be made aware or to object to the spoil mounds and believed they should have required detailed planning permission.
- vi. Queried what was happening to the existing large rubble mountains on the S1/2 site? Expected clear conditions that when removed they were not put anywhere near residents.

- vii. Noted the encroachment, rather than redesign, since the discovery of the incorrectly assumed boundary lines on the other side of the S1/S2 development. The designers had shifted the whole development 5 metres west, due to the boundary line discovery. This increased the encroachment on and coalescence with Girton properties (especially once S3 is built) - which the North West Action Plan said was to be avoided. The same goes for some of the increase in height of some of the buildings. Expressed concern this gave little or no reassurance that anything in the original masterplan could be relied upon.
- viii. Residents had no confidence in the University or developers being a considerate neighbour - or contractor, given experience to date and so needed clear conditions and monitoring.

The Committee received a representation in objection to the application from a local resident.

The representation covered the following issues:

- i. The proposal departed from the Design Code and planning conditions.
- ii. Expressed concern:
 - a. Local Plan criteria was too readily set aside.
 - b. Loss of privacy due to northern and eastern boundary treatment.
 - c. Insufficient Swales.
 - d. The hydrology of the area would be changed by the development.
 - e. Loss of trees.

The Committee received a representation in objection to the application from a local resident.

The representation covered the following issues:

- i. Larger and denser properties were proposed but there was no update to environmental data in the Officer's report (this should be reviewed/revised).
- ii. The wildlife corridor was insufficient and needed better security.
- iii. There was no provision for management of construction work eg work hours. Residents had endured issues from other applications and expected them to re-occur.

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

The Chair agreed that one of the Objectors could display a diagram to illustrate their concern that buildings on the northern and eastern boundaries were higher density than described in the agenda pack. The Principal Planning Officer referred to the site plan in his presentation. The development complied with the Design Code although density was higher.

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

- i. Expressed concern about:
 - a. Overlooking of other properties.
 - b. Overheating due to single aspect properties.
 - c. Ventilation.
 - d. Building blocks were too long (their outline needed to be broken up).
 - e. Trees that had been planted were already dying and needed replacing.
- ii. Queried if modifications to north and south facing apartments were appropriate eg location of windows and balconies.
- iii. Needed to implement and strengthen existing landscape conditions. Queried if greenspaces would be developed for housing in future.

In response to Members' questions the Principal Planning Officer said the following:

- i. The surrounding area to the north and south of the site would be developed in future as shown on the parameter plan. The hatched lines were multi-use areas that could be housing or other uses. They would start as green spaces then be built on in future eg area to west of S2.
- ii. Landscape and street maintenance arrangements would be the responsibility of the developer in future. They had modelled how this would work and confirmed that waste collection vehicles could access the site. Details would be controlled through conditions such as Landscape Management Plan.
- iii. Officers could take enforcement action if management was considered poor.
- iv. Properties would have mechanical ventilation in future. Officers were also looking at how to future proof the development such as installing

ground source heat pumps. These considerations were outside of this application.

- v. Buildings complied with Building Regulations and fire regulations (eg internal egress routes).
- vi. Shared spaces had green paving, but major access routes did not. On site management would control grass area maintenance be responsible for stopping people parking in grass/pavements and damaging them.
- vii. The 2013 Environmental Impact Assessment did not need to be updated. Referred to paragraph 3.9 of the Officer's report. There were no significant details in S1 or S2 that required a new Environmental Impact Assessment.

In response to Members' questions the Principal Sustainability Officer said the following:

- i. The single aspect of properties had been modelled and the Applicant would mitigate ventilation and overheating issues through building regulations. 2020 and 2050 climate change scenarios had been reviewed. The application passed TN59 scenarios as per Part O of Building Regulations.
- ii. Not all apartments had been modelled in scenarios, but a selection to sample check across the development.
- iii. Parametric modelling looked at all lighting issues to ensure appropriate glazing was in place in single aspect properties so there was suitable daylight in all rooms and they would not overheat. Each unit was assessed against the Code for Sustainable Homes Level 5.

Councillor Porrer proposed an amendment to the officer's recommendation that boundary, fencing and tree cover should be appropriate and maintained in future.

This amendment was carried unanimously.

Councillor Bradnam proposed an amendment to the officer's recommendation that if the permanent public right of way on the ridgeway was lost during construction, a temporary replacement alternative route should be put in place.

This amendment was carried unanimously.

Following Councillors' comments the Strategic Sites Delivery Manager proposed amendments to the officer's recommendation:

- i. Not to discharge Outline Condition 11 (soft landscaping) in outline planning permission.
- ii. Addition of a condition so all reasonable ways would be considered to maintain access to the ridgeways during construction.
- iii. Expand Condition 9 to ensure replacement trees would be maintained for 5 years as per any they would replace.
- iv. Withhold partial discharge of Outline Condition 43 to enable review of cycle parking to ensure suitable storage stands were available.

The amendments were carried unanimously.

Councillor Thornburrow proposed an amendment to the officer's recommendation that the Applicant needed to submit details to certify the 80 litres use per day was complied with before occupation.

This amendment was carried unanimously.

Councillor Flaubert took part in the debate but left the meeting (and did not return) before the Committee voted on recommendations.

The Committee:

Resolved (by 5 votes to 1) to approve reserved matters application reference 21/04036/REM subject to the planning conditions and informatives as set out in Appendix 1 of this report with authority delegated to Officers to undertake appropriate minor amendments to any of those conditions and/or informatives prior to issue of the planning permission.

Additional Conditions:

- i. Details of phased construction of the site.
- ii. Developer to put in all reasonable access through the Ridgeway where possible.
- iii. Amend Condition 9 to require replacement trees to be maintained for five years after planting.
- iv. Applicant needed to submit details to certify the 80 litres use per day was complied with before occupation

Delegated authority for Officers to agree wording of conditions with the Chair and Vice Chair.

Resolved (by 6 votes to 0) to approve the part discharge of the following outline planning conditions (planning application reference S/2036/13/VC) in so far as they relate to this reserved matters application site according to the recommendations for each condition set out in the table on P56 of the agenda pack.

Revised conditions:

- i. Not to discharge outline Condition 11 – so boundary to wet woodland could be reviewed.
- ii. Not to discharge outline Condition 43 so bike stands could be reviewed.

22/31/JDCC 22/02591/FUL - RSC 40 and Land South of Robinson Way, Addenbrookes Hospital

Councillor Carling joined the meeting from the start of this item.

The Committee received an application for full planning permission for the retention, change of use and extension of Regional Surge Centre 40 (RSC 40) to Provide Orthopaedic Theatres, Orthopaedic Wards, new and realigned vehicular access, and associated infrastructure for a temporary period of 10 years.

Ms Charlton (Applicant's Representative) addressed the Committee in support of the application.

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

- i. Expressed concern that temporary buildings could become permanent. Queried how to prevent this. Temporary buildings were built to different standards compared to permanent ones.
- ii. Queried how to ensure long term orthopaedic facilities on site.

The Planning Officer (Strategic Sites) said the following in response to Members' questions:

- i. The Applicant would not divert a water course and put other parties at flood risk. This was controlled by condition.
- ii. A green roof was not appropriate for the site.
- iii. The site provided above the normal level of staff bike parking facilities.
- iv. There were two main pick up and drop off times allocated for the site. These had arisen from modelling and the Highways Agency Transport Assessment.

Ms Charlton added that parking by the facility was purely for surgery patients. After surgery care would be undertaken by outpatient department, so little patient commuting was expected.

- v. The building structure complied with most standards. Where it did not, it was just below and off-set elsewhere, so overall acceptable.

The Strategic Sites Delivery Manager said Condition 2 controlled materials to be used.

The Committee:

Unanimously resolved to grant the application for planning permission in accordance with the Officer recommendation, for the reasons set out in the Officer's report, and subject to the conditions recommended by the Officer, subject to the amended wording of condition 18 (fire hydrants) to read as below:

Prior to the first use and occupation of the building for the purposes hereby approved of the RSC 40 extension a scheme for the provision and location of fire hydrants to serve the development to the standard recommended by the Cambridgeshire Fire and Rescue Service shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall not be occupied or brought into use until the approved scheme has been fully implemented. The approved scheme shall thereafter be retained and maintained at all times.

Reason: To ensure an adequate water supply is available for emergency use.

22/32/JDCC 22/01966/S73 and 22/01967/S73 - Land North of Cherry Hinton (LNCH), Coldhams Lane, Cambridge

The Committee received two s73 applications 22/01966/S73 and 22/01967/S73 to vary conditions 5 (Compliance with Plans), 13 (Accessible and Adaptable Dwellings), 14 (Wheel Chair User Dwellings) and 17 (Sustainability Statement) of S/1231/18/OL (Outline Planning Application (all matters reserved except means of access in respect of junction arrangements onto Coldhams Lane Cherry Hinton Road and Airport Way) for a maximum of 1200 residential dwellings (including retirement living facility (within Use Class C2/C3)) a local center comprising uses within Use Class A1/A2/A3/A4/A5/B1a/D1/D2 primary and secondary schools community

facilities open spaces allotments landscaping and associated infrastructure) to allow for a variation to the approved parameter plans and to amend condition wording.

The Committee received a representation in objection to the application from a representative of Cambridge Ramblers:

- i. Requested that public footpath 109 was kept open during construction.
- ii. Expressed disappointment footpath 109 was closed April to October 2022.
- iii. Referred to Public Right of Way Officer comments.
- iv. The variation to the route was not particularly good.
- v. Suggested the developer should only get planning permission if the footpath was kept open.

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

The Strategic Sites Delivery Manager said the following in response to Members' questions:

- i. Condition 13 required 100% compliance with M42 except in the coach houses.
- ii. The County Council and City Council were monitoring demand for a school and would deliver when required.

The Planning Officer (Strategic Sites) said the following in response to Members' questions:

- i. There was an exclusion zone around the high pressure gas main on site to restrict land usage near it. The gas main went through open spaces and followed along the road.
- ii. Officers had no updates to the Quality Panel comments but were satisfied with the proposal.
- iii. The Adoption Plan set out the City Council would adopt most parks/open spaces. Some would be privately owned.

The Principal Sustainability Officer said the following in response to Members' questions:

- i. It was possible to retrofit the application to passivhaus standard to enhance energy performance in future although the application had high standards now.

- ii. Officers would feedback discussion points from today's meeting to the Applicant, such as Councillors requested consideration be given to install water meters for individual dwellings.

Councillor Bradnam proposed an amendment to the Officer's recommendation that Condition 8 be firmed up to ensure public right of way was kept in place.

This amendment was **carried unanimously**.

Councillor Porrer proposed an amendment to the Officer's recommendation that condition 15 contain details about specialist housing. Housing designated and designed for elderly living should be M43 compliant.

This amendment was **carried unanimously**.

The Committee:

Unanimously resolved to:

- i. Approve application reference 22/01966/S73, subject to:
 - a. The conditions and informatives set out below in this report; and
 - b. With authority delegated to officers to carry through minor amendments to those conditions and informatives (and include others considered appropriate and necessary) prior to the issuing of the planning permission.
- ii. Approve application reference 22/01967/S73, subject to:
 - a. The conditions and informatives set out below in this report; and
 - b. With authority delegated to officers to carry through minor amendments to those conditions and informatives (and include others considered appropriate and necessary) prior to the issuing of the planning permission.
- iii. Delegated authority to officers, in consultation with the Chair, Vice Chair and Spokes, to draft and include the following additional conditions:
 - a. Amend Condition 8 to ensure public right of way was kept in place.
 - b. Amend Condition 15 contain details about specialist housing. Housing designated and designed for elderly living should be M43 compliant ie wheelchair accessible.

22/33/JDCC S/1231/18/COND9 and 18/0481/COND9 - Land North of Cherry Hinton (LNCH), Coldhams Lane, Cambridge - Design Code

Due to issues with the version of Design Code included in the agenda pack, Officers recommended Councillors should not determine this item today.

The Committee:

Unanimously resolved to defer the application from today's Agenda.

The meeting ended at 3.30 pm

CHAIR