

Public Document Pack

Joint Development Control Committee - Cambridge Fringes
Wednesday, 13 December 2017

JDC/1

JOINT DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE - CAMBRIDGE FRINGES

13 December 2017
9.30 am - 12.00 pm

Present: Councillors Bard (Chair), Blencowe (Vice-Chair), Baigent, Holt, Price, Tunnacliffe, Bradnam, Richards, de Lacey and Van de Weyer

Officers Present:

New Neighbourhoods Development Manager: Sharon Brown
Principle Planner: Philippa Kelly
Committee Manager: Emily Watts

Developer Representatives:

Marshalls/Endurance Estates: Richard Burton, Greg Blaquiere, Terence O'Rourke
Hill Residential: Jamie Wilding, Daniel Cox and Teresa Borsuk
Brookgate: Neil Waterson

FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE COUNCIL

17/16/JDCC Apologies

Apologies were received from Councillors Cuffley, Hudson, Harford, Nightingale and Bird

17/17/JDCC Declarations of Interest

Name	Item	Interest
Councillor Baigent	17/20/JDCC	Personal: He used to validate firefighters at Cambridge Airport.
Councillor Bradnam	17/21/JDCC	Personal: Cambridge North Station is partially within her Parish.

17/18/JDCC Minutes

Councillor de Lacey referred to 17/8/JDCC and queried whether the wording within the fuel storage informative ruled out the storage of a can of petrol.

The New Neighbourhoods Development Manager confirmed that the updated proposal did not allow any fuel to be stored on the site.

Councillor Bard referred to 17/12/JDCC and stated that the incorrect date had been included; it should read the minutes from the 18 October rather than 13 September.

Councillor Bradnam referred to 17/15/JDCC point x and asked for the word planter to replace the word foliage.

After making the changes to item 17/15/JDCC point x, the minutes of the meetings held on 18 October and 15 November were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

17/19/JDCC Land North of Cherry Hinton , Cambridge East

The Committee received a pre-application developer presentation from Terence O'Rourke on behalf of Marshalls of Cambridge on the Land North of Cherry Hinton, Cambridge East. The presentation:

- Outlined that the site was allocated for new development in the emerging Local Plans. It was predominantly agricultural land, with the western side of the site comprising part of land within Cambridge Airport. The development proposals included land outside the allocated area which was designated as greenbelt.
- Highlighted that the development would provide up to 1200 dwellings in a range of different styles. The Local Plan allocated 780 dwellings within the Cambridge City boundary and 420 in South Cambridgeshire.
- The site offered a number of services, including a primary and secondary school, a community centre, recreational facilities and other amenities. Sustainability played a key component in the development; its design would encourage green modes of transport and provide key cycle links.
- The developer had undertaken public consultation. Communication with local residents and community groups was ongoing and would be carefully considered.

Members raised comments/questions as summarised 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.

- Queried where the district boundary would sit within the development.
- Raised concern that some of the properties would be close to the airport and would be disrupted by both the general airport services and Ground Run Enclosure (GRE). Asked if noise contouring could be included in the application.
- Asked if 40% affordable housing could be provided on the site and whether any specifically designed housing for the elderly would be provided.
- Queried what community provision would be available in the centre and schools. Asked who would be responsible for these services and the park maintenance.
- Asked if the site would be fully permeable by cycles and if cycles would be given priority on every street.

The Chair called a comfort break at 10:50

The Committee reconvened at 11:00

17/20/JDCC Wing development , North of Newmarket Road

The Committee received a pre-application presentation from Hill Residential on the Wing Development, North of Newmarket Road. The presentation:

- Outlined the masterplan and building phasing strategy. This application would cover the first phase of development which included 500 dwellings.
- A shared vision drove the 'legacy project' of an urban village.
- The development had a large emphasis on sustainability and producing a green landscape with open spaces.
- Highlighted a requirement to set up a Design Code. They had worked closely with South Cambridgeshire District Council to achieve this.
- Gave a brief overview of the timeline for further phases.

Members raised comments/questions as summarised 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.

- Asked if there would there be a dedicated cycle route on other roads apart from the main road.
- Asked when the new cycle route through the development was likely to be linked to the old railway line.
- Requested reassurance that there would not be able any vehicle connection to Highditch Road.

17/21/JDCC Land adjacent to Cambridge North Station, Milton Avenue

The Committee received a presentation from Brookgate on the land adjacent to Cambridge North Station, Milton Avenue. The presentation:

- Sought to address the reasons given for the refusal of the original application.
- Confirmed that a meeting had taken place between the developer and Cambridge Cycling Campaign; this had been beneficial to understand the key concerns.
- Outlined the design of the new application and how it would differ from the original design in respect of:
 - Building size.
 - The degree that the building would be set back from the pavement
 - Provision and location of seating and cycle storage.
 - Location of trees and planters.

Members raised comments/questions as summarised 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.

- Welcomed the design changes.
- Asked if the retail space on the ground floor of the development would be removed.
- Queried which way the front doors to the development would open.
- Asked why the cycle path was designed to be flush with the pedestrian path.

The meeting ended at 12.00 pm

CHAIR