

JOINT DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE: CAMBRIDGE FRINGES

8 August 2012

10.30 am - 2.30 pm

Present: Councillors Bard (Chair), Blencowe (Vice-Chair), Dryden, Reid, Smart, Tucker, Pegram, Price, Shepherd, De Lacey, Corney, Kindersley, Nightingale, Shelton and Reynolds

Officers Present:

New Neighbourhoods Manager - Sharon Brown
Sustainable Drainage Engineer - Simon Bunn
Head of Strategic Housing - Alan Carter
Senior Sustainability Officer (Design and Construction) - Emma Davies
Head of Planning Services - Patsy Dell
Principal Scientific Officer - Jo Dicks
Highways Officer - Ian Dyer
Legal Advisor - Penny Jewkes
Principal Planner (New Neighbourhoods) - Mark Parsons
Transport Assessment Manager - Mike Salter
Senior Planning Officer - Michael Osbourn
Committee Manager - Martin Whelan
Head of Community Development - Trevor Woollams

FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE COUNCIL

12/37/JDCC Apologies

The committee received apologies from County Councillor Kenney and County Councillor Orgee. County Councillor Reynolds attended as an alternate.

12/38/JDCC Declarations of Interest

Councillor Price declared a personal interest as an employee of a college of Cambridge University.

The committee requested legal advice on whether it was recommended to declare membership of the USS pension scheme. The Legal Advisor advised the committee that due to the remoteness of the interest this was not required.

Councillor De Lacey indicated that as the local ward councillor for Girton and Chairman of Girton Parish Council he had been in discussions with the applicant, but that he was coming to the meeting with an open mind and had not fettered his discretion.

12/39/JDCC Minutes

The minutes of the meeting held on 11th July 2012 were approved as a true and accurate record of the meeting.

12/40/JDCC C/11/1114/OUT & S/1886/11 Land between Madingley Road and, Huntingdon Road, CB3 0LH

The committee received applications C/11/1114/OUT and S/1886/11 (Land between Madingley Road, Huntingdon Road and the M11, North West Cambridge, CB3 0LH) for consideration.

The committee received the amendment sheet and noted the following updates

Update to published report

i. Air Quality Monitoring (paras 8.460-8.463)

Following discussions between Council Air Quality Officers and the applicant it has been agreed that, given that the main source of potential air pollutants arising from the development is derived from vehicular movements and construction activities, in addition to paying a financial contribution to meet the cost of providing diffusion tubes to monitor the construction impacts of the development upon air quality, the applicant will also pay 20% of the cost of operating an existing air quality monitoring station on Huntingdon Road, to monitor the wider air quality impacts of the development arising primarily from traffic movements for a period of ten years. This sum equates to an additional

contribution of £17,600, above the sum already outlined in Appendix K, to be paid over a period of 10 ten years from the commencement of residential development on site. The percentage apportionment and trigger for meeting the operating costs of the existing monitoring station have been derived from the worst case, 'do minimum', transport movements anticipated along Huntingdon Road, as outlined within the Transport Assessment.

ii. Urban Design and Visual Impact

Within the Urban Design and Visual Impact section the report should note that heights specified are measured from the ground floor slab (at the principle entrance) to the apex of the roof but exclude any lightening conductors, weather vanes, rooftop plant, telecommunications equipment, floodlighting and aerals.

The section should note the zone within the local centre for the energy centre flue (as identified in Parameter Plan 06). This Parameter Plan allows for a flue of 0.6m diameter, and limits the height to 42.5m AOD, which is 5 metres above the suggested AOD in that area for building heights.

The Landscape and Visual Impact assessment for the flue was assessed in the Environmental Statement and while it will exceed the heights of the buildings in this area (this is a necessity for environmental reasons), the small diameter means that it will have limited impact on the wider setting of the site and the city and is considered acceptable. The detailed location and design will come forward at the reserved matters stage.

Additional Representations Received

A letter from Girton Parish Council has been received containing the following statement: 'To affirm the Parish Council's concern that it should be involved in the management of open spaces within NW Cambridge, and to request that the JDCC consults with the parish before any agreement on open space'.

Officer response: A meeting between Girton Parish Council and officers from both SCDC and the City Council is taking place on 7 August and outcomes from that meeting will be reported orally to the Committee.

A representation has been received by the East of England Faith Council (Faiths reference group for NWC development). They note the Cambridge

Horizons Study (Faith in new developments) and have stated that the optimum provision for community wellbeing for this site would be

- Homes for faith workers available from the first phase of building, with a minimum tenure of five years and maximum of seven years to give the stability that is so important for community formation
- At least 0.5 hectares of free land for a separate multi faith building OR a community centre sufficiently large to accommodate at least some of the meeting/worship space needs of the larger faith groups
- Land set aside at market value to meet the needs of minority faiths when they wish to purchase (it has been estimated, for example, that there will be at least 600 Muslims residing on the site once it is complete).

The representation states that four homes are to be provided for an initial three years on the site and that a community centre will be able to house faith meeting and worship needs. However their view is that this falls well short of the level of provision that should be provided.

They would also like to discuss how the governance/management arrangements for the facility would work.

Officer response: The Cambridge Horizons study is not a formally adopted document and limited weight can be afforded to it in determining planning applications. The report explains (para 8.194-8.195) the proposal in terms of faith housing that will be available in perpetuity (not just an initial 3 years) and will have affordable rent (in line with the key worker housing).

Officers are happy to meet and discuss the role of the faith groups in the design of the community facility and a meeting will be set up to discuss this in due course.

With regard to the final bullet point, it is beyond the remit of the planning process to determine/reserve market housing for any one particular person or group of people, and could not be reasonably achieved by any granting of planning permission here.

Amendments to Text

Para 8.185 should read. EU law does not necessarily outlaw private electricity supplies. Persons are entitled to own and operate electricity generation plants and distribution and supply networks without requirement for, as applicable, a generation, distribution or supply licence provided they fall within certain exemptions. Supplying private homes makes it more difficult to come within those exemptions.

Para 8.196 and 8.347 of the report should relate to 50% of residential properties being developed to lifetime homes standards on the site not 15%. Condition 22 citing 50% is correct.

At the start of bullet point 2 of para 8.286 the word 'pre-school' should read 'nursery provision'.

Para 8.453 should also reference swimming pool provision which will be provided either via public access to West Cambridge, unless this has not been provided within 7 years of 1st occupation when a fall back commuted sum of £343,000 will be paid.

Pre-Committee Amendments To Recommendation/draft conditions

Condition 42: should read 'Prior to, or concurrently with, the submission of the first reserved matters application for residential development, a strategy.

Condition 62: the word 'milestones' should be replaced by the words 'the end of each phase as identified within condition 5'

The committee noted the following oral updates to the conditions and informatives

- i. Condition 42: should read 'Prior to, or concurrently with, the submission of the first reserved matters application for residential development, a strategy...

- ii. Condition 62: the word 'milestones' should be replaced by the words 'the end of each phase as identified within condition 5'
- iii. Condition 63 should read 'no development shall take place 'before' the implementation of a programme of archaeological works...
- iv. Condition 59 on page 130 should include the words 'by the applicant to the satisfaction of the local planning authority' within the last sentence of the condition.
- v. And the informative relating to lighting on p138 of the report should refer to condition 51

Public Speakers

The committee received seven public speakers.

Mr Lachmann

Mr Lachmann expressed support for the general principle of the project, but raised concerns regarding

- i. The insufficient size of zone t from a neighbourliness perspective, and requested that the zone should be larger.
- ii. The importance of maintaining the medieval hedgerow and the pre-enclosure field systems.

Mr Lachmann also encouraged the committee to consider the traffic implications if the proposed improvements to the A14 did not proceed as planned, and whether a "plan b" should be developed.

Mr Hellawell

Mr Hellawell raised concerns regarding the application and the consequential implications for Castle Ward and the rest of the city. Mr Hellawell also raised the following concerns regarding the application

- i. The proposed scheme would be a "cuckoos egg" in the Castle Ward community.

- ii. Due to the location of the site, additional traffic would have to travel through the city.
- iii. Should seek improvements to Madingley junction with M11 to create four-way junction.
- iv. Should also create link through NIAB development.

Ms Mullikan

Ms Mullikan expressed support for the application, but encouraged the university and other parties to form a joint committee to manage the conservation and biodiversity aspects of the site.

Ms Simmons

Ms Simmons spoke on behalf of the Faith Reference Group for the North West Cambridge Group. Ms Simmons explained that the Faith Reference Group was generally in favour of the application; however were seeking improvements to the faith provision on the site.

Ms Simmons made the following suggestions for improving the faith provision

- i. Homes for faith workers available from the first phase of building, with a minimum tenure of five years and maximum of seven years to give the stability during the initial phase of community formation.
- ii. At least 0.5 hectares of free land for a separate multi faith building OR a community centre sufficiently large to accommodate at least some of the meeting/worship space needs of the larger faith groups
- iii. Land set aside at market value to meet the needs of minority faiths when they wish to purchase (it has been estimated, for example, that there will be at least 600 Muslims residing on the site once it is complete).

Mrs Lawson

Mrs Lawson spoke in objection to the application and raised concerns regarding

- i. Lack of secondary education provision

- ii. Insufficient transport infrastructure to support the impact of the development
- iii. Lack of starter homes for young people
- iv. The delivery of infrastructure by the developers

Jeremy Sanders (Pro Vice Chancellor – Cambridge University) and the University's agent (Heather Topel from Aecom)

Jeremy Sanders and the University's agent spoke in support of the application, and responded to the concerns raised by the public speakers.

In response to a member question, the principal planning officer clarified the size of zone T, and confirmed that this size and location would be reflected on the Building Heights Parameter Plan.

Consideration of the application

In accordance with section 14 (Attendance at the Committee by other members of the Councils) of the Joint Development Control Committee standing orders the Chair welcomed the following Ward Councillors to take part in the debate on the application.

Councillor John Hipkin	Cambridge City Council – Castle Ward
Councillor Belinda Brooks-Gordon	Cambridgeshire County Council – Castle Division
Councillor Tom Bygott	South Cambridgeshire District Council – Girton Ward

The Chair invited the committee to consider each section of the report in turn.

Introduction

Members of the committee made the following comments on the introduction section of the committee report.

- i. Support was expressed for the suggestion raised by one of the public speakers for the creation of a specific committee to proactively manage conservation, bio-diversity and ecology on the site. The Principal Planner

(New Neighbourhoods) explained that a conservation committee would be difficult to impose through the planning process, but that officers would encourage the university to actively engage with stakeholders regarding conservation, bio-diversity and ecology and particularly in relation to discharge of relevant conditions..

- ii. Clarification was requested on the meaning of 3 arm and 4 arm junctions. The Principal Planner (New Neighbourhoods) explained that the “arm” referred to the number of roads entering the junction.
- iii. It was said that the provision of 2000 bed spaces for students would have no effect on the rental prices in Cambridge, and would be restricted to students. The Principal Planner (New Neighbourhoods) reminded the committee that the 2000 bed spaces for students, were to provide collegiate bedspaces and would not be for general rent, different to the market and key work provision that would also be provided through the scheme.

Urban Design

Councillor Hipkin spoke in his capacity as Ward Councillor for Castle and welcomed the following aspects

- i. The design and provision of green space
- ii. The provision of a high quality food store
- iii. The proposed cycleway provision
- iv. The retention of historic features such as the horse chestnut avenue
- v. The engagement strategy of the university at all stages of the process.
The applicant was specifically congratulated

Councillor Bygott spoke in his capacity as Ward Councillor for Girton and expressed support for the comments made by Councillor Hipkin. The following additional comments were made

- i. The design needed to maintain the distinction between Girton and the rest of the city.

- ii. Concern was expressed about the verge provision.
- iii. Noted that some prospective residents would welcome gardens longer than the proposed 20 metres, where they back onto Storeys Way.

Councillor Brooks-Gordon spoke in her capacity as County Councillor for Castle Division and made the following comments on the application.

- i. The modifications to the application were welcomed, as was the facilitation of the university in developing the application.

Concerns were raised regarding the following aspects of the application

- i. Pressure on school places
- ii. The perceived over-provision of space for the food store, and the need to encourage the operator to consider alternative management arrangements.
- iii. The lack of a direct public transport service to the station.
- iv. The hours of work during the construction phase. It was suggested that work was restricted to 9 am to 5pm
- v. Lack of confidence in the proposed parking management arrangements
- vi. The need to carefully manage lorry movements on and around the site

The Principal Planner (New Neighbourhoods) welcomed the comments, however explained that it was important to differentiate between hours of work during construction and hours of operation of facilities once completed.

Members of the committee made the following comments on the urban design section of the committee report.

- i. The retention of existing features such as the horse chestnut avenue was welcomed, but officers were asked regarding the retention of historic features across the site. The Senior Planning Officer (New Communities) advised that the applicant was proposing to retain historic features such as the central oak, avenue of trees, woodland areas and SSSI, and integrate them within the proposed scheme.

Transport

Councillor Bygott spoke in his capacity as Ward Councillor for Girton and made the following comments

- i. Concern was expressed that if traffic calming was introduced in already congested areas, that congestion would be made worse. Clarification was requested on the proposed traffic calming for Huntingdon Road. The Principal Planner (New Neighbourhoods) explained that the details of the proposed work were not defined at this stage but that due to the size of the proposed financial allocation (£10,000), the work was likely to be limited to movement of signage and road markings.

Councillor Hipkin spoke in his capacity as Ward Councillor for Castle and questioned why consideration hadn't been given to enabling easy access to the park and ride site from the north, and what mechanisms were in place to discourage the site being used as a "cut through". The Principal Planner (New Neighbourhoods) summarised the travel management policy for the site.

Members of the committee made the following comments on the transport section of the committee report.

- i. The reliability of the modelling was questioned particularly the implication that traffic in certain areas would reduce. The County Council Transport Assessment Manager advised that the modelling had been produced using agreed methodology, which took into account the proposed mitigation measures.
- ii. The possibility of considering the extension of existing services such as the Citi 6 to serve the development was suggested.
- iii. Possible adverse impact to young people due to increased difficulties in Huntingdon Road following the development was highlighted.
- iv. Clarification was sought on whether all roads on the site would be constructed to adoptable standard. The Senior Planning Officer (New Communities) explained that a two stage adoption strategy was planned with the routes connecting Huntingdon Road and Madingley Road adopted at the earliest stage. The committee were advised that the applicant was proposing to develop certain roads to a standard required

for County Council adoption albeit with some elements that currently wouldn't be adopted, and that the applicant would retain maintenance responsibilities.

- v. The suggestion that traffic flows would decrease was questioned as it was indicated that certain flows in the appendix N of the report appeared to suggest an increase in flows would occur. Clarification was also requested on the mechanisms and systems available to manage problems in real time if unexpected consequences arose as a consequence of the development. The Transport Assessment Manager acknowledged that flows in the overall model area would increase, but that certain local roads, because of the change in travel patterns would decrease. The committee were advised that the traffic flows would be monitored as part of the travel plan, which included mitigation measures including major capital infrastructure to be funded by applicant if the targets were not met. The Head of Planning Services explained that the modelling had been developed based on the best information available and had been endorsed by the Highways Agency.
- vi. A requested was made for a condition to start monitoring immediately on all major surrounding roads so that the effect of the development could be accurately measured. The County Transport Assessment Manager cautioned against this approach due to the dynamic nature of traffic flows, and the difficulty of disaggregating over reasons for changes in traffic flows. Officers confirmed that monitoring would form part of the travel plan conditions, therefore a separate condition was not required.
- vii. Reservations were expressed about the number of traffic light controlled junctions on effectively a rural road, and the effect that this would have on the character of the area particularly if they were similar to the NIAB junction. The Principal Planner (New Neighbourhoods) explained that the NIAB junction was a different scenario due to the design requirements, and that the proposed junctions had greater flexibility in design and scope for landscaping to soften the impact.
- viii. Concern was expressed about the perceived predominance of car user against over users of the road. The Principal Highway Engineer advised that the SCOOT and MOVA system could be configured to maximise the

priority for different road users. County Council Officers were asked what the proposed priorities would be on the crossing. The committee were advised that the County Council was responsible for ensuring the most efficient management of the network.

- ix. Further information was requested on the provision for car club vehicles. The Principal Planner (New Neighbourhoods) confirmed that initially 12 spaces would be provided across the site.
- x. Concern was expressed about the proposal to introduce a service charge to cover the cost of maintaining the highways which would not be adopted by the County Council.
- xi. It was noted that the North West Cambridge Area Action Plan strongly discouraged the use of the connecting roads for private car travel, and it was strongly emphasised that this should not be diluted through the planning process. The Principal Planner (New Neighbourhoods) explained that the connecting routes were designed to be low speed, which discouraged “cut through” traffic. The Principal Planner (New Neighbourhoods) also explained that the 20 mph limit would be implemented, and has been shown to work elsewhere, based on evidence from data collected for the Ashford Ring Road.
- xii. Disappointment was expressed about the lack of detailed response to the issues raised by the Cambridge Cycling Campaign and the City Council Cycling and Walking Officer. The Principal Planner (New Neighbourhoods) acknowledged the concerns raised, however explained that in respect of assessing junction design the report needed to consider all material considerations with regards to the application and not just from one view point.
- xiii. Support was for the prompt planting of trees following the construction of the junctions. The Senior Planner (New Communities) explained that the although details have not been submitted at this stage, the applicant has indicated a desire to plant semi mature trees. The timing of landscaping will be secured by condition.
- xiv. In response to questions, the Principal Planner (New Neighbourhoods) explained the junction and traffic management strategy. Members were

re-assured that the junction upgrades were intended to be implemented at the earliest possible practical change.

- xv. It was highlighted that policy NW13 could not be used to support the use of the routes connecting Huntingdon Road and Madingley Road for car travel.

Affordable Housing

Members of the committee made the following comments on the affordable housing section of the committee report.

- i. It was highlighted that housing was a crucial part of the project and the reason for the site being removed from the green belt. It was noted that it was hoped that a site would be identified for specialist housing to support people who were able to be in employment but required additional support to live independently.
- ii. Whilst it was agreed that the housing elements of the scheme had been agreed following a long period of consultation which was open and transparent, people may still be confused why the allocation policy had been agreed in the form that it had been.
- iii. Members highlighted the importance of monitoring going forward, and the Head of Strategic Housing re-assured members that a mechanism is in place through the S106 agreement for this to happen.

Community Development and Open Space

Councillor Bygott spoke in his capacity as Ward Councillor for Girton and explained that he was keen to ensure that facilities were available on a free and unrestricted basis. Clarification was requested on whether South Cambridgeshire District Council would receive a share of the S106 allocation in the event of the swimming pool not being developed within the agreed time period. The New Neighbourhoods Manager explained that the details of the fall back arrangements had not yet been agreed, but would be subject to agreement of the two district councils.

Members of the committee made the following comments on the community development section of the committee report.

- i. Clarification was requested on the proposed size for the Community Centre. The New Neighbourhoods Manager confirmed that the minimum size would be 500 sq metres. The committee noted that it was intended to develop a strategic design brief in conjunction with all relevant stakeholders for the community centre.
- ii. The concerns of Girton Parish Council regarding the management arrangements were highlighted and the lack of representation for the Parish Council on the management board. The New Neighbourhoods Manager advised the management arrangements were not a planning issue as such and had been subject to consideration and negotiation with the University over a period of many months, dating abck prior to submission of the outline application. . It was noted that the Parish Council had only recently been informed of the joint venture proposals. It was noted that there would still be a requirement for the joint venture parties to coordinate closely with Girton Parish Council going forwards.
- iii. Significant concern was raised about the proposed charges to cover open spaces and highways maintenance, and the risk of creating “fenced” ghettos as a result. The New Neighbourhoods Manager explained that service charges were not a planning consideration, and that these arrangements were common in a range of formats across the country And also for some of the smaller areas of landscaping and open space within the Southern fringe developments, not being transferred to the City. It was also noted that the university would be covering the charges for key workers and any other university occupied buildings.
- iv. Clarification was requested on the access arrangements for facilities, and concern that non-residents would be discouraged. The New Neighbourhoods Manager confirmed that there would be free and unrestricted access to informal open space and play parks, in the same way as there would be for example the Trumpington Meadows country park which was not to be managed by the local authorities.
- v. It was noted that a swimming pool had been proposed for a significant period of time on the West Cambridge site and that there was an identified need, and that it was hoped that the project could proceed promptly.

- vi. Officers were asked for further details about the university charging arrangement and the exact meaning of recharging at cost. The New Neighbourhoods Manager explained that this would be raised with the university informally, but that as the university would be a major contributor due to covering the cost of key worker accommodation charges and employment uses, imposing a high cost would not be in the interests of the University..
- vii In response to a number of comments regarding wider community access, the Head of Planning Services explained that the ownership and management of facilities could not be controlled through the planning process but that all parties were committed to open access.

Local Centre

Members of the committee had no comments regarding the local centre.

Education

The Assistant Education Officer was asked to clarify the rationale for a 2.2 form entry primary school and whether in practical terms this meant a 3 form entry, and concern that this could undermine the Girton Glebe Primary School. The committee were advised that 2.2 form entry would operate as a 2 form entry but that due to the nature of the proposed school would have flexibility particularly in key stage 1 to manage fluctuations in the school population.

Sustainable Development

Members of the committee made the following comments on the sustainable development section of the committee report.

- i. Following discussion it was agreed that the word “not” was missing from paragraph 8.347.
- ii. Councillor Kindersley isappointment expressed disappointment that the site was not being developed as an exemplar site. The committee were re-assured by the Senior Sustainability Officer that the site was the largest sustainable development of this type and that many of the comparable developments such as Carbon Challenge had been downgraded. Members noted that before the introduction of feed in

tariffs, the proposals for the use of photo voltaic cells represented 1/3rd of the total cells used across the whole country.

- iii. Members agreed that it was important that the site continue to evolve with the types of technology used.

Flood Risk

Members of the committee made the following comments on the flood risk section of the committee report.

- i. A condition requiring the installation of automatic water level meters in the vicinity of Washpitt Brook was suggested. The Senior Planning Officer (New Communities) explained that conditions 26, 27 and 30 required the production of a surface water plan, and that at this stage it would not be appropriate to specify technologies.
- ii. Concern was expressed about the lack of willingness on the part of the Environment Agency to engage with Girton Parish Council and other stakeholders to put in place a long term solution to address the flooding issues in the area. The Sustainable Drainage Engineer confirmed that the Environment Agency was fully engaged in developing a long term solution.

Ecology

In response to a question, the Senior Planning Officer (New Communities) advised that there was no report on the health of the avenue of horse chestnut trees, but assured members that the horse chestnut avenue was covered by a tree protection order.

Environmental Health

Members sought assurances regarding infrastructure and whether the core infrastructure needs such as sewerage and electricity substations had been fully considered. The Principal Planner (New Neighbourhoods) confirmed that the learning from previous developments had been incorporated into the Standard Design Code condition, so that previous situations should be avoided.

Members expressed reservation at 8.1.4.3 which appeared to underplay the issues associated with poor air quality. The Senior Planner (New Communities) acknowledged the concern, but explained that the development would only have a very small negative impact based on construction and transport activities, which can be monitored and addressed through the Construction Environment Management Plan and Travel Plan respectively, with funding secured for monitoring secured through the S106 agreement.

Waste Strategy

Members expressed support for the proposed waste management strategy for the site.

Archaeology

Members of the committee had no comments regarding the archaeology section of the report.

3rd Party Representations

Members of the committee had no comments regarding the 3rd party representations section of the report.

S106

Members of the committee made the following comments on the S106 section of the committee report.

- i. Following a number of comments regarding traffic management, it was agreed that these could be addressed in the development of the detailed section 106 agreement.
- ii. Clarification was requested on why alternative fuel sources had been excluded from the CHP site. The Principal Planner (New Neighbourhoods) explained that S106 restricted the technology to those which had been tested through the Environmental Statement for the site, and that if alternative technologies were proposed a new permission would be required.

Resolved (Unanimously) to approve applications C/11/1114/OUT and S/1886/11 (Land between Madingley Road, Huntingdon Road and the M11,

North West Cambridge, CB3 0LH) subject to conditions and completion of the S106 agreement. The committee approved the application for the following reasons;

This development has been approved subject to conditions and following the prior completion of a S106 planning obligation because subject to those requirements, and in accordance with the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) (England and Wales) Regulations 2011 (SI 2011/1824) as amended and Environmental Statement submitted with the application dated September 2006, and amended in March with subsequent additions in June 2012, it is considered to generally conform to the Development Plan, particularly the following policies:

- National Planning Guidance: The National Planning Policy Framework; Outgoing Planning Policy Guidance Notes and Statements: PPS1, PPG2, PPS3, PPS9, PPS10, PPS12, PPG13, PPG15, PPG16, PPG17, PPS22, PPS23, PPG24, PPS25; Circulars: 11/95, 05/05; Community Infrastructure Levy: An overview (March 2010).
- Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan (CPSP) 2003 policies: P6/1, P8/10, P9/2B, P9/2C, P9/8 and P9/9.
- Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Waste Local Plan 2003 (Saved Policies): WLP18 and WLP20.
- Cambridge Local Plan (CLP): 3/1, 3/2, 3/3, 3/4, 3/5, 3/6, 3/7, 3/8, 3/11, 3/12, 3/13, 4/1, 4/2, 4/3, 4/4, 4/6, 4/9, 4/10, 4/11, 4/13, 4/14, 4/15, 4/16, 5/1, 5/5, 5/9, 5/10, 5/12, 5/13, 5/14, 7/1, 7/2, 8/2, 8/3, 8/4, 8/5, 8/6, 8/7, 8/10, 8/11, 8/16, 8/18, 9/1, 9/2, 9/3, 9/7, 9/8 and 10/1.
- South Cambridgeshire District Council LDF: ST/1, ST/2, DP/1, DP/2, DP/3, DP/4, DP/5, DP/6, DP/7, GB/1, GB/2, GB/3, SF/7, NE/4, NE/6, NE/9, NE/10, NE/11, NE/12, NE/14, NE/15, NE/16, NE/17, CH/2, TR/1, TR/3

- Cambridge City and South Cambridgeshire District Council Joint Policy, North West Cambridge Area Action Plan (2009): NW/1, NW/2, NW/3, NW/4, NW/5, NW/6, NW/7, NW/8, NW/9, NW/10, NW/11, NW/12, NW/13, NW/14, NW/15, NW/16, NW/17, NW/18, NW/19, NW/20, NW/21, NW/22, NW/23, NW/24, NW/25, NW/26, NW/27, NW/28, NW/29, NW/30, NW/31

This decision has been made having had regard to all other material planning considerations and in particular those areas where objection have been lodged. As such, it is considered that the proposal adequately addresses issues and objections to all issues highlighted in the officer's report particularly with regard to design issues, transport impact, drainage and flooding.

Revised plans to the application and EIA documentation were received to address many objections to the original submission. The final approved plans are listed on this decision notice.

Transport issues have been thoroughly addressed and neither the Highway Authority nor Highway Agency object to the proposal subject to the conditions and legal agreement being secured as part of this consent. Despite the objections raised locally, the scheme is considered to accord with the relevant local and national policies.

Drainage and floodrisk issues have been comprehensively considered with consultation with the relevant water providers, the Environment Agency and the Cambridge City Council technical Officers. It is considered that the proposal conforms to the principles set out within PPS25 and local policies within the CLP and SCDC LDF.

The proposal provides for sufficient open space and recreational provision, and provides for both primary and secondary education to the satisfaction of Cambridgeshire County Council. Community facilities have been adequately provided for and secured through the S106 agreement. The proposal meets sustainability policies in terms of design and renewable energy, ecology, biodiversity and waste management and sufficient mitigation is provided for noise and contamination issues. Air Quality issues can only be adequately

addressed on a strategic level. Notwithstanding that there are slight adverse impacts on air quality, only a combination of strategic action on transport issues and full use of sustainable development principles can maintain current levels of air quality and deliver growth of Cambridge. For these reasons, it is not considered that it would be reasonable to refuse the application under the terms of NWCAAP policy NW2.

Having considered all the representations it is not considered that any of those representations made constitute a significant material reason to refuse permission. Many of the representations have been addressed through revisions to the application or the proposed conditions as outlined in the Committee report. These reasons for approval are a summary of the reasons of the reasons for the grant of planning permission, for further detail on the decision please see the officer report by visiting either Councils' Planning Department.

The committee also requested that officers follow up the following issues.

- Ensure monitoring within the Travel Plan is comprehensive and that penalties for not hitting targets are set out in the travel plan.
- Through detailed legal drafting rephrase the word 'traffic calming' within the 'enhancing the traffic calming scheme along Huntingdon Road' payment in appendix K.
- Officers to discuss the proposed estate management charge further informally with the University post-Committee.

The meeting ended at 2.30 pm

CHAIR

