

Public Document Pack

Joint Development Control Committee - Cambridge Fringes
Wednesday, 17 June 2015

JDC/1

JOINT DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE - CAMBRIDGE FRINGES

17 June 2015
10.30 am - 1.45 pm

Present: Councillors Bard (Chair), Blencowe (Vice-Chair), Baigent, Bird, Moore, Price, C. Smart, Holt, Hipkin, Kenney, Orgee, Cuffley, de Lacey, Nightingale, Shelton and Van de Weyer

Councillors Price and Shelton left after the decision on 15/25/JDCC.

Councillors de Lacey, Nightingale and Smart left after the discussion on 15/26/JDCC.

Councillor Moore (Alternate joined for the discussion on 15/27/JDCC.

Officers Present:

New Neighbourhoods Development Manager: Sharon Brown
Principal Planner - New Neighbourhoods: Janine Richardson
Principal Planner - New Neighbourhoods: Mike Ovenden
Principal Planner (SCDC): Ed Durrant
Legal Advisor: Penny Jewkes
Committee Manager: James Goddard

Developer Representatives:

Chesterton Rail Sidings and Cowley Road
Consultant: Martin Gregson.
Bidwells: Kimberly Brown.
Carter Jonas: Richard Seamark.
Network Rail: Katherine Scott

Parcels S1 and S2

University of Cambridge: Heather Topel
Countryside Properties: Jonathon Gimblett
Proctor Matthews Architects: Andrew Matthews
Landscape Architect, Camlins : Sam Roberts

FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE COUNCIL

15/20/JDCC Election of Chair and Vice Chair.

Councillor Bard opened the meeting.

The New Neighbourhoods Development Manager assumed the Chair and invited nominations for the Chair.

Councillor Bard was proposed by Councillor Cuffley and seconded by Councillor Kenny.

On a show of hands, Councillor Bard was elected unanimously. He assumed the Chair.

The Chair invited nominations for the Vice Chair.

Councillor Blencowe was proposed by Councillor Price and seconded by Councillor Nightingale.

On a show of hands, Councillor Blencowe was elected unanimously.

The roles of spokes for the three councils would be agreed outside the meeting.

15/21/JDCC Apologies

Apologies were received from Councillors Ashwood (substantive Member) and Loynes (Alternate).

15/22/JDCC Declarations of Interest

No declarations of interest were made.

15/23/JDCC Minutes

The minutes of the meeting held on 18 March 2015 were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

15/24/JDCC 14/1792/FUL Glebe 3

The Committee received an application for full planning permission for residential development of 30 new mixed tenure dwellings with associated open space, landscaping, car parking and infrastructure.

The Committee noted revised conditions on the amendment sheet published pre-committee, and the revised amendment sheet tabled 17 June 2015.

The Committee received representations in objection to the application from the following:

- Ms Moulding.
- Mr Taylor.

The representations covered the following issues:

- i. Specific concerns regarding:
 - Loss of view as a result of the development.
 - Overshadowing.
 - Overlooking.
 - Loss of privacy.
 - Safety concerns over the access road. This is a private road that would be turned into a public access for pedestrians, bikes and vehicles. It would be unsuitable for this purpose as it is too narrow and lacks street lighting.
 - Took issue with the perceived lack of consultation by the County Council over the proposal to adopt the access road, which currently serves one dwelling, and turn it into a more formal link for pedestrians and cyclists.
 - Height of the development.
- ii. Suggested the design would be more in-keeping with the character of the area if it were 2 storey not 3.
- iii. Detached houses that had been bought by existing residents would now become part of an estate. Originally they had been deliberately bought as standalone dwellings located away from neighbours.

Mr Hunt (Applicant's Agent) addressed the Committee in support of the application.

The Committee made the following comments in response to the report.

- i. Welcomed the design of the application, it tried to fit in with neighbours and provided green spaces.
- ii. A single track access road was acceptable in principle. This was in line with other developments.

In response to Members' questions the Principal Planner and New Neighbourhoods Development Manager said the following:

- i. Officers considered the (current) private access road would be suitable for use as a public access for pedestrians, bikes and motor vehicles. (Reference paragraph 8.9 on P21 of the Officer's report). There was enough room for a car and a bike to pass.
- ii. The map of the application included in the Officer's report omitted access links that would be in place. This was an error.
- iii. The access road was not adopted by the Highways Authority at present. The County Council was the land owner of the main site. Glebe Farm had access rights over this.
- iv. The Police Secured by Design advisor suggested that the access route would provide unnecessary permeability (ie access), other Officers had supported the access road (reference paragraph 8.10 on P21 of the Officer's report), so the advantages of the road were considered to outweigh the disadvantages.
- v. The purpose of s106 funding was to provide appropriate access for the proposed new residential units, not to address historic problems.
- vi. The wording in condition 28 (amendment sheet) regarding the need for refuse bins to be in place before buildings go up appeared to require further refinement. Final wording would be confirmed in future.
- vii. Solar panels could be fixed to 'green roofs' on the proposed units.
- viii. Overshadowing of Glebe Farm House was not significant. It would vary during the year, being more noticeable March to September; in comparison to January to March then September to December.

The Committee:

Resolved (by 13 votes to 0 with 2 abstentions) to grant the application for planning permission in accordance with the officer recommendation, for the reasons set out in the officer report, and subject to the amended conditions recommended by the officers.

15/25/JDCC S//0506/15/F Land Adjacent to Greenhouse Park Innovation Centre, Newmarket Road

The Committee received an application for full planning permission for the erection of an ice arena and associated plant building, landscaping and cycle parking.

Professor Harris (Applicant's Representative) addressed the Committee in support of the application.

In response to Members' questions the Principal Planner (SCDC) said the following:

- i. The stadium would have a 500 seat capacity, but was not expected to be filled on each event.
- ii. The County Council recommended including a management plan condition to minimize the impact of large (ie full capacity) events.
- iii. Ice rink and Park&Ride peak usage times should be different. Therefore there should be no issue with ice rink users parking in the Park&Ride site during the evening when the facility was open. Enforcement would be managed through conditions. Further details would be determined in future.
- iv. Undertook to amend conditions on P62-71 of the Officer's report to take into consideration Councillors' concerns that the rink was not connected to the main sewer system, so there was no clear information on how flood water would be dealt with in an emergency, or when the ice rink was deliberately melted then refrozen to renew it. Members noted the Environment Agency had made no objections to the design.
- v. Disabled parking would be located on the north of the site, which was the closest part of the parking area to the rink. 10 spaces were proposed.

The Committee:

Unanimously resolved to grant the application for planning permission in accordance with the officer recommendation, for the reasons set out in the officer report, and subject to the amended conditions recommended by the officers:

- The County Council would be informed of large events by the Applicant as part of parking management procedures.
- An event management plan was required to deal with planned/unplanned ice melt events.

15/26/JDCC Post-Submission Member Briefing - Chesterton Rail Sidings and Cowley Road

Members noted an error on the agenda front sheet for this item. It would be a post-submission developer briefing rather than a pre-submission one (as listed on the agenda) which meant that the site was currently subject to a “live” application.

The Committee received a presentation from:

- Consultant: Martin Gregson.
- Bidwells: Kimberly Brown.
- Carter Jonas: Richard Seamark.
- Network Rail: Katherine Scott

In response to Members’ questions the Presenters said the following:

- i. The presenters were in discussion with officers regarding cycleway and pedestrian access.
- ii. A design workshop would occur in future with officers to look at pedestrian, cyclist and vehicle access. For example, pedestrians could access the station various ways on-site (eg from the car park) and off-site (eg from the guided busway).
- iii. The car park was being moved to allow space for decking. Some spaces would be provided when the station was opened, more could be added in future. 450 car parking spaces and 1,000 stands for 2,000 bikes were proposed.
- iv. Shorter canopies would be provided over railway platforms, passengers could wait in shelters.
- v. Platforms could accommodate 12 car trains.
- vi. British Rail had undertaken a survey to assess expected passenger numbers. A transport assessment was included in the application pack. Further modelling was included in the environmental impact assessment.
- vii. The ongoing Area Action Plan discussions would confirm (new) building usage.

15/27/JDCC Pre Application Member Briefing - Parcels S1 and S2, North West Cambridge

The Committee received a presentation from Countryside Properties

Members raised comments/questions as listed below. Answers were supplied, but as this was a pre-application presentation, none of the answers were to be regarded as binding and so are not included in the minutes.

1. Noted trees were planned to be planted near to houses. Trees block light to nearby houses when they grow above first floor height. Queried how trees and houses would be integrated to avoid this. Trees had initially been welcome near houses in Romsey, but had become a problem when they blocked light.
2. Asked for details on how housing by Hills Residential and Countryside Properties would integrate on the same site as they were provided by two separate companies.
3. Asked whether there were plans to mitigate loss of biodiversity associated with densification of the city?
4. How to prevent further loss of hawthorn hedges in Huntingdon Road?
5. Do houses have individual gardens?
6. Asked how wheelchair users could access houses?
7. Queried car parking facilities.

The meeting ended at 1.45 pm

CHAIR

This page is intentionally left blank