

Public Document Pack

Joint Development Control Committee - Cambridge Fringes
Wednesday, 18 May 2016

JDC/1

JOINT DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE - CAMBRIDGE FRINGES

18 May 2016

10.30 am - 12.25 pm

Present: Councillors Bard (Chair), Blencowe (Vice-Chair), Baigent, Bird, Price, Holt, Ashwood, Hipkin, Cuffley, de Lacey, Nightingale, Van de Weyer and Harford

Officers Present:

New Neighbourhoods Development Manager: Sharon Brown
Principal Planner - New Neighbourhoods: Janine Richardson
Principal Planner – New Neighbourhoods: Thomas Webster
Legal Advisor: Cara de la Mere
Committee Manager: Sarah Steed

Other Officers Present:

Senior Urban Designer: Sarah Chubb
Education Officer: Rob Lewis
Business Manager, County Planning, Minerals and Waste: Emma Fitch

Developer Representatives:

(Frank Shaw Associates Limited), Norman Paterson

FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE COUNCIL

16/17/JDCC Apologies

Apologies were received from Councillors Shelton and Kenney. Councillor Harford attended as the alternate for Councillor Kenney.

16/18/JDCC Declarations of Interest

No interests were declared.

16/19/JDCC Update on Review of Fringe Sites Joint Development Control Committee Terms of Reference to Incorporate City Deal Schemes

The Committee received an update report on the review of the Joint Development Control Committee's – Cambridge Fringes terms of reference to accommodate City Deal infrastructure schemes.

The Committee noted the revised terms of reference which had been circulated prior to the Committee meeting. The Committee also noted that the operation of the revised Terms of Reference should be reviewed after 12 months.

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

- i. Asked what the difference was between the terms of reference which had been circulated prior to Committee and those included within the agenda pack.
- ii. Commented on the issue raised in paragraph 3.4 of the officer's report, which dealt with voting rights of Members which sat on the City Deal Board and the City Deal Assembly. Members who sat on the City Deal Assembly did not make decisions they made recommendations to the City Deal Board, they should therefore be able to make decisions on applications that came to the Joint Development Control Committee.
- iii. Commented that the name of the Committee should remain as it currently was the "Joint Development Control Committee".

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

- i. The terms of reference within the agenda pack had incorrect footnote references. It also removed the requirement for the Committee to make decisions on householder applications. These changes were still being proposed and had been highlighted in the original 2015 JDCC report but further to legal advice would need to come forward separately as officers did not want these to create un-due delay with the City Deal processes being agreed.
- ii. Confirmed that legal advice had been taken on the issue of City Deal Assembly Members' and the City Deal Board Members' attending the Committee. An updated advice note was read out at the meeting and confirmed that there was no bar on City Deal Assembly Members' attending and voting on planning applications. The advice is copied into the minutes for completeness. The connection between promotion of the scheme and deciding on related planning applications was weaker with assembly members and the Head of Legal Services' view was that there was less of a risk of damage to public confidence. There was still an element of risk in terms of perception if, say, an assembly member pressed for implementation of a scheme and then voted on the planning

application, but this was an issue generally within councils. There was not a legal bar, provided that the member considered the planning application properly. There was also not a Code of Conduct issue.

The Committee:

Resolved (unanimously) to:

- i. Note the agreed final version of the amended Joint Development Control Committee Terms of Reference as circulated at the Committee meeting.
- ii. Retain the existing name for the Committee being the Cambridge Fringe Sites Joint Development Control Committee.

16/20/JDCC 15/1670/REM Darwin Green One, Land Between Huntingdon Road And Histon Road Cambridge

The Committee received a reserved matters application pursuant to outline application 07/0003/OUT for 114 residential units and local centre including library, community rooms, health centre and retail units.

The Committee noted the amendments detailed on the amendment sheet.

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

- i. Praised the developers for working closely with Council Officers and re-working the scheme to address concerns.
- ii. Raised several questions regarding cycle parking, temporary parking, tenure mix of affordable housing and existing health centres.
- iii. Were pleased that the development would deliver 40% affordable housing. Questioned whether any indication had been given for who the registered provider would be. Referred to first floor apartments meeting lifetime standards however no lift were provided.
- iv. Questioned why there were no 3 or 4 bed units as part of this scheme and if these would be made up in the other parts of the site.
- v. Highlighted that the disabled toilet door within the library opened inwards and that this should open outwards.
- vi. Queried whether contamination of land had been considered.
- vii. Requested that within the car parking management plan there was a requirement for level access so that there were no obstacles which prevented disabled users accessing the site. Questioned whether delivery hours for the retail use needed to be conditioned.
- viii. Questioned if members of the public could be able to use the open space.

ix. Questioned the naming of streets on plans within the development.

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

- i. Issues raised in relation to cycle parking had been addressed within the report and a condition would ensure that visitor cycle parking was accommodated properly. In relation to the temporary parking issue, the outline consent required an interim arrangement before the roads were adopted, Officers did not feel that the temporary arrangements were appropriate and therefore delayed the discharge of the condition. The comments on the imbalance of the tenure mix of the affordable housing were on the original submission and had now been addressed. The procurement process for the new health centre was on-going but Officers were not aware of any intention to close existing facilities at this time.
- ii. No update had been provided by Barratt's as to who the registered provider was but discussions had been positive. The developer expressed concern about the on-going maintenance for lifts and the fact that the cost would be passed onto the tenants of the affordable units.
- iii. Councillor Price confirmed that the City Council had pressures on its housing register for 1 and 2 bed units. Later schemes which have a slightly lower density and which were not on the spine road would have more 3 or 4 bed units.
- iv. Confirmed that the disable door issues would be reported to the developer.
- v. Confirmed that there was an outline condition attached to the outline permission which dealt with the issue of contaminated land this had to be discharged before the developers could start on site.
- vi. The opening hours for the retail uses was controlled through the outline permission.
- vii. Confirmed that the open space was to be open to the public and that it would be adopted by the City Council.
- viii. Confirmed that the names given to streets on the plans were for assistance purposes only and the actual street names and numbering for the development would be completed by the officer responsible for the Council's Street Name and Numbering.

The Committee:

Resolved (unanimously) to grant the application for planning permission in accordance with the officer recommendation and the amendment sheet, for the reasons set out in the officer report, and subject to the conditions recommended by the officers.

16/21/JDCC 16/0208/REM Darwin Green One, Land Between Huntingdon Road And Histon Road Cambridge

The Committee received a reserved matters application pursuant to outline application 07/0003/OUT for 173 market and affordable dwellings with associated internal roads, car parking, landscaping, amenity and public open space.

The Committee noted the amendments detailed on the amendment sheet and the Principal Planner verbally updated the Committee on the following issues:

- i. The materials condition should re-instate the 'and' which had been removed on the amendment sheet so that the first paragraph would read (re-instated text underlined):

Prior to the commencement of development samples of the buildings approved and identified below and details of colour of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of buildings, which includes external features such as garage doors, entrance doors, windows, roof and hanging tiles, stone detailing, external metal work, balcony and balustrades, rain water goods, coping, bike and bin stores, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority.

- ii. The removal of conditions 13 and 14 as the applicant submitted revised plans which detailed appropriate widths for the cycle storage.

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

- i. The visitor parking allocation at 1 bay for every 11 dwellings was not sufficient. The location of the parking spaces was not good for disabled users.
- ii. Questioned whether the comments from the Walking and cycling Officer had been addressed.
- iii. The report stated that the dwellings did not meet lifetime homes standards and questioned if the position had changed since the publication of the agenda.
- iv. Welcomed the provision of 39.9% affordable housing and wanted the building of the affordable housing provision to commence.
- v. Commented that access for disabled users to take their rubbish to bin stores was not good.

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

- i. The number of visitor parking spaces was reasonable for the density of the development. Alternative layouts for the visitor spaces were explored with the Applicant however this would have required the re-design of the site.
- ii. Confirmed that the issues raised by the Walking and Cycling Officer had been addressed and referred to paragraph 8.91 – 8.103 of the Officer's report.
- iii. Officers did push for lifetime homes with the Applicant unfortunately these were not a requirement of the outline permission and the wording of the Lifetime Homes scheme definition makes it very difficult to insist upon incorporation of lifts..

The Committee:

Resolved (by 11 votes to 0 with 2 abstentions) to grant the application for planning permission in accordance with the officer recommendation subject to the amendments detailed in the amendment sheet and the verbal amendments detailed at the meeting, for the reasons set out in the officer report, and subject to the conditions recommended by the officers.

16/22/JDCC Pre-Application Member Briefing - Primary School site, Clay Farm Development Site, Long Road Cambridge

The Committee received a presentation from Frank Shaw Associates Limited on behalf of Cambridgeshire County Council on the Clay Farm Primary School.

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. Asked what was being done about energy and what the heating plans were for the building.**
- 2. Asked whether the school was going to be an academy or a free school.**
- 3. Asked if the 3G pitch would be managed by the school for community use.**
- 4. Asked if there was a lift to the 2nd floor of the school and if it would be wide enough to accommodate a standard wheelchair.**

- 5. Asked if there was a drop off area for people with accessibility requirements.**
- 6. Asked if there was a County Council objection to 2 storey primary schools.**

The meeting ended at 12.25 pm

CHAIR

This page is intentionally left blank