

JOINT DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE - CAMBRIDGE FRINGES

14 September 2016
10.30 am - 12.20 pm

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

Officers Present:

New Neighbourhoods Development Manager: Sharon Brown
Principle Planner: Toby Williams
Principle Planner: John Evans
Planning Officer: Mark Wadsworth
Legal Advisor: Rory McKenna
Democratic Services Officer: Daniel Snowdon

Other Officers Present:

Cambridgeshire County Council, Business Manager: Emma Fitch
Cambridgeshire County Council, Development Management Officer: Elizabeth Verdegem

FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE COUNCIL

16/37/JDCC Apologies

Apologies were received from Councillors Holt, Orgee and Tunnecliffe. Councillor Harford and Moore attended as alternates.

16/38/JDCC Declarations of Interest

Item number	Councillor	Interest
16/41/JDCC	De Lacey	Personal: Member of Girton Parish Council
16/43/JDCC	Ashwood	Personal: Member of Trumpington Residents Association

16/39/JDCC Minutes

The minutes of the meeting held on 17th August 2016 were agreed and signed as a correct record.

Change to published agenda order

Under paragraph 4.2.1 of the Council Procedure Rules, the Chair used his discretion to alter the order of the agenda items. However, for ease of the reader, these minutes will follow the order of the agenda.

16/40/JDCC C/5004/16/CC - Clay Farm

The Committee received an application for the development of a new 3FE primary school, and 52 place early years centre/nursery with associated car, bicycle and scooter parking, hard play areas, means of enclosure and landscaping.

The Committee noted the amendments detailed on the amendment sheet.

David Fletcher (Applicants Agent) addressed the Committee in support of the application.

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

- i. Questioned whether the size of the sports pitches was disproportionate to the to the size of playing area for the children and whether community use of the facilities had been anticipated and between what hours was community use likely to take place.
- ii. Asked whether there was a need to add a condition to the application regarding the times the site would be available for community use in case such use took place in the future.
- iii. Noted and welcomed the comments and attention of the Design Quality Panel. Requested that the normal Quality Panel section should be included on this in reports.
- iv. Questioned the level of bicycle parking available to staff at the proposed site.
- v. Asked whether there was a specific drop off area for parents to use when dropping children off by car.

- vi. Commented that walking to school was important for the children's health and should be promoted by the school.
- vii. Queried the provision for disabled children to be dropped off at the school safely and whether they could reach the school easily along public footpaths.

In response to Members' questions Officers said the following:

- i. Confirmed that the applicant had worked closely with the head teacher regarding the development of the site and the pitches met the requirements set out by Sport England. It was also confirmed that there would be no community use for the site as the nearby secondary school would provide such facilities.
- ii. Explained that due to the proximity of the surrounding housing there were restrictions in place regarding the hours the sports pitches could be used.
- iii. Advised that the level of bicycle storage available at the site for staff to use was compliant with the Local Plan standards. Bicycle use was to be encouraged and there was some flexibility in the number of spaces that could be made available for staff use.
- iv. Confirmed that drop-off points did not normally feature in school designs because the management of them would be the responsibility of the school.
- v. Confirmed that the car park would allow disabled children to be dropped off easily and the Disability Consultative Panel were broadly supportive of the plans. There was also step free access to the school from the nearby Guided Busway stop.

The Committee:

Resolved (unanimously) to grant the application in accordance with the officer recommendation subject to the conditions set out in the report. Further conditions required would be set by officers under delegated powers.

16/41/JDCC 16/1242/ADV - North West Cambridge Development Site, Madingley Road and Huntingdon Road.

The Committee considered an application for the erection of two temporary illuminated totem signs on Madingley Road and Huntingdon Road. The signs would be erected on a temporary basis for a period of 3 years in order to assist with the opening of the store.

Brian Nearny (Applicants Agent) addressed the Committee in support of the application.

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

During the course of discussion Members:

- i. Highlighted the concerns of residents on the impact on Huntingdon Road, the scale of the signs and their illumination. The location of the signs within the Cambridge Green Belt in close proximity to a major traffic light junction.
- ii. Commented that the proposed signage defied the notion that the store was intended for use by local people and would encourage other retailers in the area to make similar applications.
- iii. Questioned whether a wayfinding scheme on site would represent an adequate replacement to the proposed signage that was more akin to an out of town supermarket.
- iv. Expressed concern regarding the size of the signs.
- v. Expressed concerns regarding the lack of consultation with Girton Parish Council and that the signs were merely advertisements designed to attract passing trade.
- vi. Drew attention to the potential for increased traffic congestion that would be caused by the signs attracting additional custom to the store and noted that another store on Newmarket Road that was under construction did not have such large, illuminated signage.

In response to Member comments officers explained that the visual impact of the sign would reduce as foliage at the site matured and emphasised that the signs were temporary and intended to assist the store in establishing itself.

The Committee:

Resolved (unanimously) to refuse planning permission contrary to the officer recommendation for the following reasons; the proposed two totem signs by reason of their prominent location, height, width and illumination would be unduly strident and out of character with their surrounding context on two key approaches into the City. As such the proposal would cause significant harm to visual amenity, contrary to policies NW2 and NW4 of the North West Cambridge Area Action Plan 2009, government guidance contained within the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2012 and the Town and County Planning (Control of Advertisements) (England) Regulations 2007 for the reason above.

16/42/JDCC 16/0442/FUL - Concrete Batching Plant, Cowley Road, Cambridge, CB4 0DL

An application for full planning permission for the erection of replacement plant, equipment and ancillary facilities at the Tarmac facility on Cowley Road, Cambridge was considered by the Committee.

The Committee noted the amendments detailed in the updated conditions sheet circulated at the Committee meeting.

During discussion Members:

- i. Questioned why the planned height of the silos was significantly higher than the ones they were replacing if there was no intensification of activity at the site.
- ii. Asked whether planning permission would affect the wider re-development of the Cambridge Northern Fringe East.
- iii. Questioned whether the proposed silos exceeded the existing height of nearby trees and whether some visual screening would be provided.
- iv. Highlighted and expressed concerns regarding paragraph 6.4 of the report and appeared to be contrary to planning policy.

- v. Noted that the site had been operational for approximately 20 years and was located in an industrial commercial area of the city. The demand for concrete within the city was high and the current plant machinery was obsolete and required replacement.
- vi. Questioned whether the silos could be made wider but shorter in order to reduce the visual impact of them but retain the same volume of storage
- vii. Expressed concerns regarding air quality and the amount of dust generated by the site.

In response to Members' questions Officers said the following:

- i. The Applicant had confirmed there was no intensification of use of the site and the current plant machinery was obsolete and required replacement.
- ii. Explained that there was a variety of scale of development in the area with several 2, 3 and 4 storey structures nearby. Officers confirmed that the Area Action Plan (AAP) had not progressed to a point where any weight could be given to the objectives of the AAP. The application therefore had to be judged on its own merits and that a key consideration was that the use of the site for concrete batching operation was long established.
- iii. Confirmed that the silos would be approximately the same height as the surrounding trees.
- iv. Explained that due to the specialist function of the machinery it was difficult to prescribe how the silos should be designed
- v. Confirmed discussions had taken place with Environmental Health Officers and air quality and noise pollution had been addressed to the satisfaction of Environmental Health Officers. The application represented an upgrade for the site and therefore be more effective at controlling levels of pollution. Officers drew the attention of Members to the Informative contained within the report that clarified that the applicant would require approval of variations to the existing environmental permit

The Committee:

Resolved (by 13 votes to 1 with 0 abstention) to grant the application in accordance with the officer recommendation and subject to the conditions set out in the officer report.

16/43/JDCC AI/JS/39/117 - Public Footpath 117- running along the rear of Foster Road properties

The Committee received an application for an order to permanently divert a public right of way involving diversion of part of Public Footpath No. 117 Cambridge, required to enable further development of the Clay Farm site, Trumpington.

During discussion Members:

- i. Expressed concern regarding the proposed footpath that would be 1 metre narrower than the current footpath. Fencing of the footpath would mean a loss of open green space and the use of the path by residents visiting nearby allotments and dog walkers was highlighted.
- ii. Expressed concern regarding the path being narrower and the hazard it posed to cyclists

In response to Members' comments officers explained that similar concerns had been raised at the Committee meeting in February 2016 where the application was heard and approved. The Joint Development Control Committee did not have the jurisdiction to re-visit the application.

The Committee:

Resolved (by 6 votes to 0 with 3 abstentions):

- a) That the Joint Planning Control Committee gives their approval that the proposed diversion of Cambridge Footpath No. 117 meets the legislative tests set out in s.257 of the Town and County Planning Act 1990.
- b) That this approval be reported to Cambridgeshire County Council, as agents for Cambridge City Council and indicate an order should be made.

That the final route be inspected by Cambridgeshire County Council as Highway Authority and certified as satisfactory before the Order comes into effect.

The meeting ended at 12.20 pm

CHAIR