

JOINT DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE

19 July 2023
10.30 am - 1.02 pm

Present: Councillors Bradnam (Chair), S. Smith (Vice-Chair), Baigent, Smart, Thornburrow, Cahn, Fane, Hawkins, Stobart, R.Williams and Levien

Councillor Fane left after item 23/30/JDCC

Councillor R.Williams left during item 23/31/JDCC

Also present (virtually) Councillor: Porrer

Officers Present:

Strategic Sites Manager: Philippa Kelly

Principal Planner: Rebecca Ward

Senior Planner: Julia Briggs

Legal Adviser: Keith Barber

Committee Manager: Sarah Steed

Meeting Producer: Laurence Damary-Homan

Developer Representatives:

David Fletcher (Strutt and Parker)

Alexis Butterfield (Pollard Thomas Edwards)

Ulrich van Eck (Bellway - Latimer)

FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE COUNCIL**23/28/JDCC Apologies**

Apologies were received from Councillor Flaubert with Councillor Levien attending as alternate.

Councillor Porrer attended online via Teams; it was noted that Councillor Porrer could participate in the debate but would not be able to vote because she was not present in person at the meeting.

23/29/JDCC Declarations of Interest

Item	Councillor	Interest
23/30/JDCC	Thornburrow	Had been involved in the Clay Farm application when a

		Trumpington Ward Councillor. Would step down from the Committee's determination today although speak as a Ward Councillor.
All	Baigent	Is a member of Cambridge Cycling Campaign.

23/30/JDCC 13/0751/COND15A & 13/0751/COND16A - Linear park parcels 15 and 18 Clay Farm Development Site, Cambridge

The Committee received two discharge of condition applications for the submission of details required by condition 15 (Linear Park details) of planning permission 13/0751/REM and submission of details required by condition 16 (LAPS) of planning permission 13/0751/REM.

The Committee received a representation in objection to the application from a local resident on behalf of a number of residents.

The representation covered the following issues:

- i. Were largely in favour of the proposals, which were based on a feasibility study the Baker Lane community had produced in 2020. This was based on a Design and Access Statement approved in 2013.
- ii. Only wanted unnecessary and intrusive elements of the proposals omitted which would save capital and maintenance costs.
- iii. The proposals may have been policy compliant but they did not have the support of the community.
- iv. Wanted the Applicant to re-engage with the community and resubmit the application.
- v. Referred to the hoggin path at paragraph 10.3 of the Officer's report: considered this invited travel from both sides of the Linear Park and there was already provision in place for this. This would impact the picnic table and turn this area into a thoroughfare.
- vi. Noted Officer comments on trees contained in paragraph 17.1 of the Officer's report. Considered the trees had not been planted in the positions shown on the drawings. There was a gap in tree provision because of a clash with the highway. If the drawings were approved,

existing trees would need to be removed and replaced. Residents wanted the existing maturing trees to remain.

Susie Hartas (Applicant's Agent) addressed the Committee in support of the application.

County Councillor Slatter (County Ward Councillor for Trumpington) addressed the Committee about the application.

- i. Houses around Baker Lane park were completed in 2018. She had lived in the area since 2016.
- ii. Some trees had been planted but most of the area was grassed. There had been occasional grass cutting but no further landscaping had been completed.
- iii. Noted that there had been lots of discussions and plans had been drawn up by not only the Applicant but by residents as well.
- iv. Noted Councillors had been involved in discussions with residents.
- v. Noted correspondence from 2019 which detailed the changing views of residents for the area. Their preference was for less hard landscaping, more habitats for wildlife and a substantial area of level grass which could continue to be used for ball games, picnics etc.
- vi. Noted residents had bought a picnic table and wooden seat which was moved around the open space when various activities took place.
- vii. Residents' views for the area had changed since the original application was submitted (2013). The way in which outdoor space was used had also changed as a result of the covid pandemic.
- viii. Referred to other open space areas managed by the City Council which included diverse habitats (invertebrates banks).
- ix. Welcomed the proposed seating on hardstanding which could be used all year round and which should be constructed from recycled materials which did not need maintenance.
- x. The grassed area outlined in the plan should be left clear of obstacles.
- xi. Did not want to lose the flexible space.
- xii. Was of the view that the scheme did not meet the requirements of the outline play strategy.

City Councillor Thornburrow addressed the Committee as a previous Ward Councillor for the area.

- i. Considered the delay in delivering this application was an opportunity (to improve upon the application).
- ii. Residents had been involved in the community garden application.

- iii. Considered lessons needed to be learnt and that residents needed to be engaged with landscaping elements of planning applications: that the delivery of the detail of the project needed to be done as a community project; and that the scheme should be resubmitted with clearer areas of community planting.
- iv. Queried if an informative could be included to reflect concerns which had been raised by residents.

In response to Members' questions the Strategic Sites Manager, Legal Advisor and Senior Planner said the following:

- i. Advised that it was not possible to add a condition to a decision for a discharge of condition application. Members must therefore come to a decision on the scheme as submitted. Officer's view was that the application was acceptable in planning terms. An informative to guide the management of the open space could, nevertheless, be added to an approval decision notice.
- ii. The applicant needed to discharge conditions attached to the outline permission. There was scope to include wildflower planting etc. as part of the management of the open space.
- iii. The trees currently in situ had been planted as per the proposed plans.
- iv. It was confirmed that the open space would be transferred to the City Council to maintain.
- v. There was an existing drain which had an easement. The Landscape Officer had been consulted as part of the application process and they were happy with the location of the trees in their current location and they do not interfere with the easement.

The Strategic Sites Manager offered Members the following draft wording for the informative based on the issues which had been raised by Members during debate: To encourage the landowner to actively involve local residents and community groups in the future consideration of management, maintenance issues and the evolution of these spaces.

The Committee:

Resolved (unanimously) to approve the discharge of conditions 15 and 16 as detailed in applications 13/0751/COND15A and 13/0751/COND16A subject to the inclusion of an informative 'encouraging the landowner to actively involve local residents and community groups in the future consideration of management, maintenance issues and the evolution of these spaces' with

precise wording delegated to Officers in consultation with Chair and Vice-Chair of the Committee.

23/31/JDCC Springstead Village, Land North of Cherry Hinton, Coldhams Lane, Cambridge

The Committee received a pre-application presentation on Springstead Village, Land North of Cherry Hinton, Coldham's Lane, Cambridge.

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

1. Questioned the landscaping proposed and requested that shrubs etc were included as well as trees.
2. Asked if the play area proposed to the eastern side of the development would also act as a swale.
3. Asked for a clear car parking management plan to be in place at the start of the development. Also asked that there was clear designation for residents' and visitor parking.
4. Noted the proposed tenure plan and asked if there could be a mix of shared ownership / rented / private accommodation facing the open space.
5. Asked if the custom build properties would be built in a way to make future loft conversion possible.
6. Asked if new forms of construction materials would be used to keep carbon cost down.
7. Noted that all housing was proposed to be dual aspect and asked whether all windows would be openable.
8. Asked if there was a plan to manage residents' water consumption.
9. Asked if the Design Code helped in designing the development.
10. Queried if the affordable housing was compliant with the Council's pepper potting policies.
11. Queried the use of the name 'Parkside' as there was already a location /community within Cambridge called 'Parkside' having two might create confusion.
12. Queried garden sizes.
13. Queried location of cycle parking and if there would be EV charge points located outside houses.

14. Queried if there would be any car club spaces.
15. Queried if there would be a conflict between car parking and 'play streets'.

The meeting ended at 1.02 pm

CHAIR