

**JOINT DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE - CAMBRIDGE FRINGES**

20 April 2016  
10.30 am - 2.30 pm

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

**Officers Present:**

New Neighbourhoods Development Manager: Sharon Brown  
Principal Planner - New Neighbourhoods: Janine Richardson  
SCDC Planning Team Leader: New Communities: Paul Mumford  
SCDC Principal Planning Officer: Edward Durrant  
Legal Advisor: Cara de la Mere  
Committee Manager: Sarah Steed

**Other Officers Present:**

Senior Urban Designer: Sarah Chubb  
Education Officer: Rob Lewis  
Development Control Engineer: Jon Finney  
Transport Assessment Manager: Mike Salter

**Developer Representatives:**

(Bidwells) Alison Wright  
(Terrance O Rouke) Julia Jardine

<b>FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE COUNCIL</b>
---

**16/12/JDCC      Apologies**

Apologies were received from Councillor Shelton and Ashwood Councillor Wotherspoon and Councillor Williams attended as alternates.

**16/13/JDCC      Declarations of Interest**

No interests were declared.

**16/14/JDCC      Minutes**

The minutes of the meeting held on the 16 March 2016 were agreed and signed as a correct record.

**16/15/JDCC S/2682/13/OL & 13/1837/OUT - Land North of Newmarket Road, Cambridge East**

Councillor Dent left the meeting before the vote was taken on this item.

The Committee received two concurrent applications, the South Cambridgeshire application consisted of development of up to 1300 homes including up to 30% affordable housing across the development as a whole, primary school, food store, community facilities, opens, landscaping and associated infrastructure. The City application consisted of the proposed demolition of buildings, hard standing and construction of tennis courts, allotments, store room toilets, informal open space, local areas of play, provision of drainage infrastructure, footpath, cycleway links and retention and management of woodlands.

The Committee noted the amendment sheet circulated prior to committee.

The SCDC Principal Planning Officer confirmed that a representation from Teversham Parish Council should have been appended to the report following a request from the Parish Council but mistakenly it had not been. The representation covered objections to the reduction in affordable housing provision and claw back provisions.

The Committee received a representation to the application which covered the following issues:

- i. Overall in favour of the development and pleased to see provision of off-site health centre.
- ii. Objected to the reduction in provision of affordable housing from 40%.
- iii. Was not happy with the description of the application which stated 'up to 30%' affordable housing as this did not accord with Council policy.
- iv. No thought had been given to cemetery provision.

Julia Jardine (Applicant's Agent) addressed the Committee in support of the application.

Councillor Johnson (Ward Councillor for Abbey) addressed the Committee about the application:

The representation covered the following issues:

- i. Permeability was seen as a key priority of the Wing development.
- ii. Expressed disappointment that the affordable housing was proposed to be reduced and that the tenure split was to be 30/70.
- iii. Balanced communities should be at the forefront of developer's minds.
- iv. Understood the relocation cost of the engine facility but affordable housing was a key priority in Cambridge.
- v. Asked that the application was deferred until the developers could come up with an application which met the Council's affordable housing policy.

Councillor Turner (The SCDC Wilbrahams Ward Councillor) addressed the Committee about the application.

The representation covered the following issues:

- i. Represented Fen Ditton and referred to the Fen Ditton Parish Council's comments in the Officer's report at p27.
- ii. Stated that there would be a loss of 3500 jobs if Marshalls move and relocated and commented that developments needed to provide jobs as well as housing.
- iii. Disappointed at the 30% affordable housing provision.
- iv. Risk of an appeal on the grounds of non-determination if the application was not determined today.
- v. Would rather the application description was amended to read 30% affordable housing provision rather than 'up to 30%'.
- vi. Urged members to support the application.

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

- i. Asked whether there could be a measure to prevent right turns out of the development and commented that measures should be put in place to discourage traffic entering Cambridge and instead direct them to the next roundabout. Stated that there could be segregation on the roundabout so that road users knew which lane to choose. The banning of a right turn out of the site would add to the attractiveness to use the bus, to cycle or walk.
- ii. Questioned cycle movement within the site.
- iii. Questioned if the design of the site would lead to a segregated community as there was no access through to other sites.
- iv. The Officer's report stated that 2% of the buildings would be wheelchair accessible which equated to 8 properties across the development. Asked whether a wheelchair accessible dwelling was the same as a dwelling built to lifetime standard.

- v. Questioned what secondary school provision was being provided and how far from the site it would be.
- vi. Asked why sports pitches were always provided as part of developments and asked if alternative provision, for example a climbing wall could be provided instead.
- vii. Biodiversity was important; mammals and insects were equally as important as birds.
- viii. Expressed dissatisfaction with the reduction in affordable housing provision from 40% and a change in the tenure mix. Also questioned whether the viability assessment should have been provided in full and not redacted.
- ix. Expressed concern that green belt land had been released for affordable housing provision and that this would not be provided at 40%.
- x. Asked whether the s106 agreement affordable housing provision could be amended so that more affordable housing could be provided and other contributions reduced to fund this.
- xi. Questioned if further information on the cascade mechanism for affordable housing provision could be provided.
- xii. Questioned if the engine testing facility was not delivered whether more affordable housing could be put back onto the site.
- xiii. Commented that if starter homes were introduced by Central Government then even less affordable housing would be delivered as part of the development.
- xiv. Questioned whether additional waste vehicles would be required to service the development.
- xv. Commented that the 'aviation activity' condition on p107 of the Officer's report was too precisely worded.
- xvi. Questioned cemetery provision.
- xvii. Questioned who would make the decision on the design code and also asked whether cycle parking would be considered as part of the design code. Also questioned whether roads would be adopted by the County Council.
- xviii. Questioned what would happen if Marshall did not get permission to relocate the engine testing facility and how long Marshalls had to relocate.

In response to Members' questions Officers said the following:

- i. To incorporate measures to prevent a right hand turn out of the development would have a significant impact on the next roundabout, highways officers would object to this on grounds of highway safety and highway capacity. During peak periods the number of vehicle movements turning left would be 180 the number of vehicle movements

- turning right would be 140, preventing a right turn may have a deterrent effect but it was considered that this would not be hugely significant. For junctions full details need to be approved. In the s106 agreement there was a requirement for a travel plan Co-Ordinator.
- ii. The internal design would be part of a reserved matters application. Segregated road crossings would not be attractive to cyclists but were attractive to pedestrians and particularly those with a disability. Pedestrians were first in the street hierarchy. No objections had been raised by Cambridge Cycling Campaign.
  - iii. The Area Action Plan had a requirement that there would be no access route through to other sites however there was the ability for vehicular access in the future.
  - iv. Lifetime homes allowed the property to be adapted.
  - v. For secondary school provision a site had been identified and would be consulted on. The site was within the 3 mile walking and cycling distance.
  - vi. Sports provision to support the schools would be provided on school sites with community access secured.
  - vii. Biodiversity would be picked up at condition stage.
  - viii. Officers believed that the current affordable housing package was the best available in the context of the viability considerations. The s106 provisions had to be based on the planning need and satisfy the s106 agreement tests. The affordable housing policy requires 40% provision but the policy wording references that this is subject to a viability assessment. The 30% affordable housing provision would be secured through a s106 agreement.
  - ix. The Cambridge East Area Action Plan is the relevant planning policy document for this site.
  - x. The s106 agreement could include a mechanism to reallocate funding to provide more affordable housing or improve the tenure split if it was not spent. The S106 package proposed reflects what is considered to be needed to mitigate the impacts of the development.
  - xi. The s106 agreement would have a review mechanism for viability and cascade provisions. The review would look at the delivery of the development and if a certain amount of development was not delivered within a certain time scale, would trigger a full scale viability assessment. The cascade review allowed for transfer between tenure mixes of affordable housing.
  - xii. The s106 agreement would have a mechanism to ensure the delivery of the engine testing facility.
  - xiii. Confirmed that Starter Homes were not formally introduced yet as an affordable housing product.

- xiv. Confirmed that existing waste vehicles would be able to service the development would be used and there would be no need for additional waste vehicles to be purchased.
- xv. Commented that the aviation activities associated with the wider existing airport could not be controlled by this planning permission.
- xvi. This application was an urban extension to Cambridge and therefore extra cemetery provision was not required.
- xvii. Condition 8 (Phasing) would go to this Committee for a decision and confirmed that the approach to cycle parking would be considered under the design code. Stated that Officers did not have control over the adoption of roads these could either be adopted by the County Council or maintained by the developer.
- xviii. The S106 and planning conditions would also require the relocation of the engine testing facility prior to the occupation of residential properties.

An amendment to the officer's recommendation was proposed that a mechanism was included within the section 106 agreement to reallocate funding for Newmarket Road transport improvements to affordable housing, should a specific scheme for transport improvements not be forthcoming and the reference to "up to 30% affordable housing" in the proposal description should be amended to read "30% affordable housing".

The Committee:

**Resolved (by 11 votes to 3 with 1 abstention)** to grant the application for planning permission in accordance with the officer recommendation subject to the amendment to the s106 agreement to reallocate funding for Newmarket Road transport improvements to affordable housing, should a specific scheme for transport improvements not be forthcoming and the reference to "up to 30% affordable housing" in the proposal description should be amended to read "30% affordable housing", for the reasons set out in the officer report, and subject to the conditions recommended by the officers.

**16/16/JDCC      S/0107/16/RM - Trumpington Meadows Development Site,  
Hauxton Road**

Councillors Price, Nightingale and Williams left the meeting prior to the start of this item.

The Committee received a reserved matters application for phase 9 of the Trumpington Meadows development for 122 dwellings which included affordable housing with associated internal roads, car parking, landscaping, amenity and public open space, pursuant to outline planning approvals S/0054/08/O and 08/0048/OUT.

Alison Wright (Applicant's Agent) addressed the Committee in support of the application.

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

- i. Expressed surprise at the number of statutory consultees who had not provided a response.
- ii. Noted that 75% of affordable housing were flats compared to 25% of market housing. Questioned whether the needs of those that sought affordable housing were so different to those who sought market housing.
- iii. Commented that the proposed residential units on both sides of the road should relate to each other in design terms.

In response to Members' questions the SCDC Planning Team Leader, New Communities said the following:

- i. The County Council were the Lead Flood Authority. Conditions for drainage off site would be looked at by the City Council Drainage Officer. No comments meant that no concerns had been raised by the consultees.
- ii. The Design Code provided that this area would have a higher percentage of flats, this was why there was a higher percentage of affordable housing flats. The clustering of the affordable housing was similar to schemes that had previously been approved. Block Q was designated for affordable housing and had very good views. The developers may have preferred to have sited market housing in this position because of the views, but the benefit of this scheme was that the block was affordable housing.

The Committee:

**Resolved (unanimously)** 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 conditions recommended by the officers.

The meeting ended at 2.30 pm

**CHAIR**