

**JOINT DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE: CAMBRIDGE FRINGES**

18 April 2012  
10.30 am - 12.30 pm

**Present:** Councillors Bard (Chair), Nimmo-Smith (Vice-Chair), Blencowe, Dryden, Smart, Tunnacliffe, Znajek, Kenney, Orgee, Reynolds, Shepherd, Harford, Nightingale and Shelton

**Officers Present:**

Sharon Brown (New Neighbourhoods Development Manager – City), Kirsty Carmichael (Principal Planner (New Neighbourhoods) - City), Helen Durrant (Senior Planner (New Neighbourhoods - City), Patsy Dell (Head of Planning Services – City), James Goddard (Committee Manager – City), Penny Jewkes (Legal Advisor - City) and Elizabeth Rolph (Principal Planner (New Neighbourhoods - City)

**Developer Representatives:**

Harriet Bourne (Architect), Jonathan Gimbett (Director – Countryside Properties) and Mike Jameson (Architect).

**FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE COUNCIL**

**12/17/JDCC Apologies**

Apologies were received from Councillors Heazell and Pegram.

The Committee thanked Councillors Heazell, Nimmo-Smith and Znajek for their service and contributions.

**12/18/JDCC Declarations of Interest**

None.

**12/19/JDCC Minutes**

The minutes of the 21 March 2012 meeting were approved and signed as a correct record subject to the following amendment:

P3 12/15/JDCC Guidance Note For Marketing Signage For Cambridge Fringe Sites “Any site which crosses the city / district boundaries is to be discussed at an early stage by both Street Naming and Numbering (SNN) officers. A list of street names for each single development site ~~will be then compiled~~ will then be compiled from suggestions made by local Resident’s Associations or Parish Council’s. The combined list will then be forwarded to Royal Mail and Cambridgeshire Fire and Rescue Service for consultation. A final list of suitable names will then be compiled and issued to ward councillors for approval”.

**12/20/JDCC      11/0698/REM: Parcels 19 and 20, Clay Farm, Cambridge**

Councillor Nimmo-Smith took the Chair for this item.

The Principal Planner (New Neighbourhoods) introduced the report and tabled an amendment to the recommendation in Section 2.1 (a) of the report as follows:

Delete “Agree to the discharge of the condition...” and insert instead: “Raise no objections to the proposals on the basis of the information submitted.”

The reason for this being that development has already commenced on site, so the condition cannot be formally discharged

The Committee received a letter from Mr Harper objecting to the application which was read aloud and in full.

The letter addressed the following:

- (i) Concerns regarding:
  - a. The consultation process.
  - b. Height, density, scale and massing of the proposed development.
  - c. Overlooking of Mr Harpers property as a result of the configuration and orientation of the balconies.
  - d. A lack of acoustic site planning in relation to the southern elevation resulting in noise pollution. No attempt to reduce noise impact through the introduction of noise buffers and noise shields. The sole concession being a second floor balcony screen. Intrusive noise particularly at night would affect Mr Harpers amenity..

- e. Unacceptable noise associated with the construction process.
- (ii) Mr Harper stated that:
  - a. Balconies proposed in the application were inappropriate and should be removed.
  - b. The arrangement of the first floor and second floor balconies with external stairs from ground to first floor would allow for nearly 50m<sup>2</sup> of easily accessible first floor and second floor [balcony] space per dwelling. At this time the only attempt at attenuation had been to the second floor with nothing offered at first floor level.

A representation had also been received from Mr Brookes of 149 Shelford Road requesting that the Applicant/developer impose a restrictive covenant to prevent the removal of the 2/F rear glass which the Officer understood the developer was prepared to do.

Mr Wilding (for the Applicant) addressed the committee in support of the application.

A Member commented that there was a clear difference of opinion between Mr Harpers views and those of the Applicant.

To assist the Committee in understanding the points made by Mr Harper and Mr Brookes, and to be fully aware of the distances involved between the objectors properties and the proposed development including the orientation issues, a cross section plan and an aerial photograph was shown to the Committee.

In response to Member's questions the Principal Planner (New Neighbourhoods) confirmed the following:

- (i) Whilst discharges of conditions were not normally reported to Committee, in this instance the two objectors had raised concerns in relation to the proposed balconies at the time of the original Reserved Matters application (approved by the Committee in October 2011). They had therefore been consulted on the detailed balcony design proposals, subject to the condition and had objected. Under the Committee Scheme of Delegation this means that the decision has to be determined by Committee.
- (ii) The orientation of the proposed development and distances between the development and the nearest residential properties should minimise overlooking of neighbours from the proposed balconies. The balconies had also been raised in height since Mr Harper and Mr

- Brookes had made their original objections. Scheme amendments were set out in the Officer's report.
- (iii) Environmental Health Officers had been, and would continue to actively monitor building construction noise. Environmental Health Officers had raised no objections to date, either in relation to potential noise nuisance from the use of the balconies or from construction works.
  - (iv) Trees on site were the joint responsibility of the Applicant and adjoining Caravan Club.

Councillor Nightingale said he would find out from South Cambridgeshire District Council if the trees on the Caravan Club/development site boundary were protected by Tree Protection Orders.

The revised recommendation was noted.

The committee resolved (by 10 votes to 0 - unanimously) to raise no objection to the proposals submitted on the basis of the information provided in relation to Condition 13 in relation to the approved planning permission 11/0698/REM pursuant to the outline 07/0620/OUT.

Reasons for the decision:

The Committee was satisfied that it was appropriate to raise no objections to the proposals submitted and that Mr Harper's concerns in particular had been fully considered both at this meeting and earlier in the process and that Environmental Health Officers would take such action as may be necessary in relation to the construction noise.

The Chair expressed disappointment that the developer had started work on-site before relevant conditions had been discharged.

**12/21/JDCC Clay Farm Development Pre-Submission Briefing -  
Parcels 1b, 2 and 5 Land at Long Road, Clay Farm, 231 Dwellings  
(Countryside)**

The Head of Planning Services took the Chair for this item.

The Committee received a presentation from Countryside Properties on Parcels 1b, 2 and 5 land at Long Road, Clay Farm.

The meeting ended at 12.30 pm

**CHAIR**

This page is intentionally left blank