

Public Document Pack

Joint Development Control Committee - Cambridge Fringes
Wednesday, 20 July 2016

JDC/1

JOINT DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE - CAMBRIDGE FRINGES

20 July 2016
10.30 - 11.55 am

Present: Councillors Bard (Chair), Blencowe (Vice-Chair), Baigent, Price, Holt, Tunnacliffe, Cuffley, de Lacey, Nightingale, Smart and Williams

Officers Present:

New Neighbourhoods Development Manager: Sharon Brown
Committee Manager: Sarah Steed
Democratic Services Officer: Daniel Snowdon

Developer Representatives:

Richard Oakley, Development Director, Marshall Group Properties
Neal Jennion, Infrastructure & Compliance Director, Marshall Aerospace & Defense Group
Nick Smith, Bast Deflectors Incorporated
Rob Matthews, Vantage Planning

FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE COUNCIL

16/29/JDCC Apologies

Apologies were received from Councillors Ashwood, Bird, Hipkin, Turner and Van de Weyer. Councillors Smart and Williams attended as alternates.

The Chairman noted that the meeting was not quorate but proceeded with the planned agenda as there were no items of business that required a decision

16/30/JDCC Declarations of Interest

Item number	Councillor	Interest
16/32/JDCC	Baigent	Personal: Previously carried out consultation work for Marshalls Aerospace and Defence Group but had nothing to do with this project.

16/31/JDCC Minutes

As the meeting was not quorate the minutes of the meeting held on 21 June were noted and would be brought to the next meeting to be approved.

16/32/JDCC Pre-application Briefing - Cambridge Airport

The Committee received a presentation on the proposed engine testing facility at Cambridge Airport.

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 if alternative sites were considered for the facility such as RAF Mildenhall.
2. Commented that sites 3 & 4 were considerably closer to dwellings in Abbey and questioned whether residents in Abbey would be affected more than were currently by the present location of the engine testing site.
3. Questioned whether Blast Deflectors Incorporated were the only supplier of ground running enclosures.
4. Questioned whether the modelling of noise pollution was based on the largest engine that could be tested at the site.
5. Asked if the number of proposed affordable homes would decrease if additional costs were incurred by increasing the height of the facility.
6. Commented that the comparison data of noise pollution was not like for like and requested data for site 4.
7. Asked whether the noise levels at Nuttings Road would increase significantly for the residents if the facility was relocated to the preferred site (3).
8. Queried if the height of the facility was increased would it affect the safety of the airport.
9. Questioned what safeguards would be in place to ensure employee safety at the site.

10. Questioned who would benefit from the site being moved as there was little residential housing at the present location.
11. Commented that none of the site could be occupied as part of the proposals and questioned if that was a problem if land was sold off to developers.
12. Asked what defence aircraft would be tested at the site.
13. Questioned if there would be an increase to aircraft engine testing at the site if the development was approved.
14. Asked whether the 80db maximum noise output at the site could be adhered to when the latest Boeing 737 aircraft generated 90db.
15. Asked how safety would be ensured for the area surrounding the blast deflector site.
16. Questioned if air pollution levels would be affected by the development.
17. Questioned why the engine could not be attached to a smaller dolly rather than the aircraft.
18. Asked how long engine tests lasted for.
19. Questioned whether following the recent European Union referendum result Marshalls Aerospace and Defence were confident that business would not be affected.
20. Queried how plans for new schools in Cherry Hinton would be affected by the proposed development.
21. Questioned how air flow to the engine was maintained when the site was closed in.
22. Asked how testing was affected if the wind was coming from a different direction.
23. Asked whether monitoring reports would be submitted to the Council if the development was approved regarding noise and pollution levels.

24. Questioned the tolerance levels for the maximum noise outputs and whether they were modelled on actual aircraft using the facility.

The meeting ended at 11.55 am

CHAIR