

Your ref:
Our ref: MLW
dd: 01223 559305
df: 01223 559436
e: marcia.whitehead@bidwells.co.uk
Date: 9 July 2012

BIDWELLS

Sharon Brown
Cambridge City Council
The Guildhall
Market Square
Cambridge
CB2 3QJ

Trumpington Road
Cambridge CB2 9LD
t: 01223 841841
f: 01223 845150
bidwells.co.uk

Dear Sharon

Mixed Use Development comprising up to 1593 dwellings, primary school, community facilities, retail units (Use Classes A1, A2, A3, A4 & A5) and associated infrastructure including vehicular, pedestrian and cycleway accesses, open space and drainage works – NIAB 1 Land between Huntingdon Road and Histon Road, Cambridge

I write with reference to the Report prepared for the next meeting of the Joint Development Control Committee on 11 July 2012 in relation to the NIAB 1 site and would ask that the following matter be given further consideration.

Paragraph 6.2 of the Report details comments received from your Council's Sustainability Officer in relation to Code Level 4 and as a consequence, it is noted that Condition 29 of the Decision Notice relating to application C/07/0003/OUT has been revised in its entirety to delete reference to the development securing Code Level 3 and instead the entirety of the development achieving a minimum of Code Level 4.

Such an approach is not supported by your Council's adopted policies nor indeed any other policies of relevance. It is accepted that your Issues and Options Consultation document, in relation to your emerging Local Plan, does highlight this issue as an option for consideration but at this point in time, your Council's evidence base has in no way been open to any form of scrutiny. Such an approach is therefore entirely premature and one which is not considered appropriate. Furthermore, the entire viability of the NIAB 1 scheme and its delivery is based on the provision of dwellings to meet Code Level 3 and this work will need to be revised if Code Level 4 is to be achieved. Furthermore, impending changes to the Building Regulations will require development standards to increase and therefore this is a far more appropriate mechanism for securing such improved standards rather than a blanket Code Level 4 condition.

Paragraph 8.25 of your report comments that it would appear to be Officers' intentions to amend Condition 29 to require Code Level 4 only in conjunction with the policies which emerge from the new Local Plan, once it is adopted. This approach would be entirely acceptable and indeed is the mechanism which is currently built into Condition 28. It is therefore suggested, that Condition 29 be similarly amended to acknowledge the provision of residential buildings at Code Level 3, rising to Code Level 4 when there is a relevant adopted Local Plan policy. This approach is entirely consistent with the approach adopted on the other growth sites and is considered reasonable in all respects.

I would be most grateful if you could draw the content of this letter to the attention of the Committee Members.

A large, dark, irregularly shaped redaction mark covering the signature area.

**Marcia Whitehead BA (Hons) DMS MRTPI
Partner**

