

**JOINT DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE: CAMBRIDGE FRINGES**

11 July 2012

10.30 am - 12.30 pm

**Present:** Councillors Bard (Chair), Blencowe (Vice-Chair), Dryden, Reid, Smart, Tucker, Kenney, Orgee, Shepherd, Corney, Harford, Kindersley, Nightingale, Shelton and Reynolds

**Officers Present**

Head of Planning Services – Patsy Dell  
New Neighbourhoods Development Manager – Sharon Brown  
Principal Planner (New Neighbourhoods) – Mark Parsons  
Principal Planner – Michael Ovenden  
Senior Planning Officer – Michael Osbourn  
Legal Advisor – Penny Jewkes  
Committee Manager – Martin Whelan

**Also Present**

Representatives of WSP, Atkins and Peter Brett Associates

**12/32/JDCC Apologies**

Apologies for absence were received from County Councillor Pegram, County Councillor Reynolds attended as an alternate.

**12/33/JDCC Declarations of Interest**

Cllr Reid a personal interest in item 12/JDCC/35 as a member of Cambridge Cycling Campaign.

**12/34/JDCC Minutes**

The minutes of the meeting held on 13 June 2012 were agreed as an accurate record.

## **12/35/JDCC Briefing - Sub-regional transport model and application to North West Cambridge development**

WSP, Atkins and Peter Brett Associates gave a presentation on the "Cambridge Sub-Regional transport model and application to North West Cambridge".

The committee received the presentation and made the following comments

- i. Had any additional allowance been factored into the model to account for the greater than normal population changes? The committee were advised that this had not been factored in, as there was insufficient evidence available on the impact of greater than normal population changes.
- ii. Were journeys from outside of the model area included where they related to leisure or retail? The committee were advised that they were factored into the model.
- iii. Clarification was requested on the status of the Cambridgeshire Housing Strategy. The committee were advised that the document had been produced in 2003.
- iv. Did the model take into account seasonal variation? The committee were advised that the model did take seasonal variation into account.
- v. The possibility of making greater use of coaches, and utilising park and ride sites for coach passenger transfer was suggested, in order to reduce the number of vehicles entering the city centre. The comments were noted.
- vi. Members suggested the possibility of a more detailed briefing for interested members and a short summary of the key issues to be produced. The comments were noted.
- vii. Clarification was requested of the accuracy of the model and the mechanism by which trip banking would operate. The committee were advised that the model was developed based on, and complying with Department of Transport guidelines. The committee were informed of how it was expected that trip banking would operate. Further comments were made about the accuracy of modelling, and particularly the potential for unintended consequences to arise from developments.

- viii. The committee asked about the implication of exceeding the 40% ceiling for car journeys into the site for employment uses. The committee were advised that the position would be carefully measured, and in the event of a default against the target the section 106 agreement provided for the developers to have to make adjustments to its travel plan, with the ultimate sanction physical improvements to the M11 junction.
- ix. Clarification was provided on the basis to which the flow assessments had been made with regards to specific examples.
- x. Was any consideration given to travel between the different university sites? The committee were advised that it was hoped to reconfigure existing bus services to serve the site, the railway station and the Addenbrookes site.
- xi. The need to ensure that junctions were appropriate, safe and fit for purpose was agreed.
- xii. Had any consideration been given to creating an access from the north to Madlingley Road Park and Ride? The committee were advised that the option had been considered and discounted due to a number of issues including ecological sensitivities north of the existing park and ride site.
- xiii. In response to a question, the committee were advised that the modelling had been based on the 2001 census.

**12/36/JDCC 07/0003/OUT - Land Between Huntingdon Road And Histon Road Cambridge CB3 0LE & S/0001/07/F - Land west of Histon Road Cambridge**

The committee received an update on the NIAB1 outline application and the related SCDC full application for the access to Histon Road that have been to the Joint Development Control Committee (JDCC) on two previous occasions. The report assessed the proposals in the light of recent policy changes, and took the opportunity to address other matters that have changed since the application was last considered by the JDCC.

The committee received the amendment sheet and noted the following updates

**Errata: Appendix D proposed conditions relating to S/0001/07/F**

The title of the Appendix is given as "NIAB 2 proposed conditions". No application for NIAB2 has been submitted. The conditions relates to the South Cambridgeshire District Council element of the NIAB1 development.

**Minor corrections of wording of conditions 2, 11 and 17 on S/0001/07/F**

Condition 2- The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Figure 3.1 Land Use Rev I, Figure 3.3 Landscape Rev G, Figure 3.4 Access Rev H, Figure 3.6 Urban Design Framework Rev 5, 93681/OS/049/1 Rev K, 93681/OS/049/2 Rev K and 93681/OS/049/3 Rev K.

Reason: To facilitate any future application to the Local Planning Authority under Section 73 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

Condition 11 - There should be no collection or deliveries to the site during the demolition and construction stages outside the hours of 10:00 hours and 14:00 hours on Monday to Saturday and there should be no collections or deliveries on Sundays or Bank and public holidays, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority pursuant to criteria D of the Construction Environmental Management Plan within condition No. 8.

Reason: To protect the amenity of the adjoining properties and to ensure that the surrounding transport network is capable of accommodating the construction traffic in accordance with Policies DP/3 and DP/6 of the adopted Local Development Framework 2007.

Condition 17 - Prior to the commencement of development, a Detailed Waste Management Plan (DWMP) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The DWMP shall demonstrate how the construction accord with the detail of the principles of the Outline Waste Management Plan. The DWMP shall include details of:

a) The anticipated nature and volumes of waste.

- b) Measures to ensure the maximisation of the reuse of waste.
- c) Measures to ensure that effective segregation of waste at source including waste sorting, storage, recovery and recycling facilities to ensure the maximisation of waste materials both for use within and outside the site.
- d) Any other steps to ensure the minimisation of waste during construction.
- e) The location and timing of provision of facilities pursuant to criteria b/c/d.
- f) Proposed monitoring and timing of submission of monitoring reports.
- g) The proposed monitoring and timing of submission of a Waste Management Closure Report to demonstrate the effective implementation, management and monitoring of construction waste during the construction lifetime of the development.

Unless otherwise agreed in writing, thereafter the implementation, management and monitoring of construction waste shall be undertaken in accordance with the agreed details and no individual building subject to a Detailed Waste Management Plan shall be occupied until the Waste Management Closure Report has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure the sustainable management of construction waste and in accordance with Policies CS28 and CS29 of the Cambridge and Peterborough Minerals Plan 2011 and the Recycling in Cambridgeshire and Peterborough (RECAP) Waste Design Plan SPD 2012.

The committee received a representation from Cllr John Hipkin (Castle Ward Councillor). Cllr Hipkin raised a number of concerns regarding the proposals, namely

- i. Delays in the finalisation of the section 106
- ii. Uncertainty for residents in the neighbouring areas and lack of consultation
- iii. Proximity to the conservation area

In responding to the points that Councillor Hipkin raised, officers noted that there had been only minor changes to the proposals (and those changes related mainly to the education and health S106 provisions) since the applications were previously reported to the JDCC. Officers advised that the time lag between the three NW Quadrant developments had made it difficult for the local authorities to finalise S106 provisions, particularly in relation to education and health and this had contributed largely to the delays in completing the S106.

The New Neighbourhoods Development Manager advised that a meeting of the North West Forum took place in late winter 2012 to update the local community on the North West Quadrant developments, including NIAB1.

Councillor Reid asked that officers ensure that ward councillors were kept informed of North West Forum dates/events.

Members noted the letter from Bidwells attached to the amendment sheet and the representations it contained in relation to the amendments to the energy efficiency conditions. However, they were minded to agree the amended conditions as worded, notwithstanding this.

**Resolved** (Unanimously)

- i. That the development is in conformity with the NPPF subject to conditions listed in Appendix C attached to this report and the S106 Agreement
- ii. To put an additional condition on the outline permission requiring the provision of fire hydrants (condition 74)
- iii. That the committee agrees to the changes in wording of the energy efficiency conditions (condition 28 and 29)
- iv. To note the amended County Council strategy for primary school provision
- v. To note the progress so far on the S106 agreement and that officers will report this back to the JDCC for determination if there is a future stalling of progress

The meeting ended at 12.30 pm

**CHAIR**