

Public Document Pack

Joint Development Control Committee - Cambridge Fringes
Wednesday, 14 March 2018

JDC/1

JOINT DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE - CAMBRIDGE FRINGES

14 March 2018

10.30 am - 12.55 pm

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

Officers Present:

New Neighbourhoods Development Manager: Sharon Brown

Senior Planner: Mark Wadsworth

Principal Planning Officer (SCDC): Edward Durrant

Senior Planning Officer (SCDC): Katie Christodoulides

Legal Advisor: Keith Barber

Committee Manager: Sarah Steed

Other Officers Present:

Development Control Engineer: Jon Finney

Senior Urban Designer: Sarah Chubb

Developer Representatives:

Richard Carter

Elliott Page

FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE COUNCIL

18/5/JDCC Apologies

Apologies were received from Councillors Cuffley, DeLacey, Harford and Tunnacliffe.

18/6/JDCC Declarations of Interest

Name	Item	Interest
Cllr Bradnam	18/8/JDCC	District and County Councillor for Milton
Cllr Bradnam	18/9/JDCC	Application was in the Parish of Fen Ditton County Ward but did not fall within

		Cllr Bradnam's County division.
Cllr Price	18/9/JDCC	Personal and Prejudicial: Director of Cambridge Investment Partnership

18/7/JDCC Minutes

The minutes of the meeting held on the 21 January 2018 were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

18/8/JDCC S/4478/17/FL - Land adj Cambridge North Station, Cowley Road

The Committee received an application for full planning permission for the erection of a building comprising of 9,723m² of floor space for B1 (office) use, with 742m² of ancillary retail (A1/A3) floorspace, 396m² of cycle storage and 267m² of back of house use. In addition the proposal sought permission for associated landscaping, public realm improvements and a 125 space car park.

The Committee noted the amendments contained within the amendment sheet.

Neil Waterson (Applicant's Agent) addressed the Committee in support of the application.

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

- i. Welcomed the changes made to the application as they responded to the issues raised when the application last came to Committee.
- ii. Referred to the response provided by Cam Cycle at paragraph 6.24 of the Officer's report which expressed concerns regarding sharp turns and lack of alignment for the cycle routes across Milton Avenue and asked for trees to be planted slightly further away from the cycle path.
- iii. Questioned whether doors opened inwards and if this was in compliance with fire regulations.
- iv. Questioned if the reduction of car parking spaces after 10 years was a realistic expectation.

- v. Raised concerns about members of the public putting tables and chairs onto the pedestrian and cycle route.

In response to Members' questions the SCDC Senior Planning Officer said the following:

- i. The alignment of the cycle way would be secured through a s106 agreement so that it would be a free flowing cycle route.
- ii. Trees were proposed to be set back by 0.5m from the cycle route and this was considered to be sufficiently set back.
- iii. Doors would open inwards and only the front entrance doors would be rotating doors.
- iv. Car parking was not raised as an issue when the application last came to committee.

The New Neighbourhoods Development Manager confirmed that an informative could be added to address the concerns regarding doors and fire regulations.

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, subject to the amendments detailed in the amendment sheet, conditions recommended by the officers and with the additional informative:

That the applicant is advised that they will need to address Building and Fire Regulations in regard to inward opening doors for publicly accessible buildings.

18/9/JDCC S/4317/FL - 699 Newmarket Road

Councillor Price declared a prejudicial interest and withdrew from the meeting for this item and did not participate in the discussion or the decision.

The Committee received an application for full planning permission for the construction of a new car showroom, ancillary office accommodation and external display and parking forecourts together with canopied and semi enclosed washbay and photography booth.

Simon Page (Applicant's Agent) addressed the Committee in support of the application.

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

- i. Asked if the hours or intensity of the showroom lighting could be controlled at night by condition.
- ii. Asked if advertising controls could be used to control the illumination of the showroom.

In response to Members' questions the SCDC Principal Planning Officer said the following:

- i. The Ford sign was an integral part of the design of the building and there was a proposed condition which would allow officers to control obtrusive lighting.

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.

18/10/JDCC 17/2111/FUL - NIAB Huntingdon Road

Councillor Price rejoined the Committee.

The Committee received an application for full planning permission for the demolition of two existing dwellings, seed handling building, glass houses and associated structures, refurbishment of existing office building (DEFRA 1,080 m²) and laboratory building (Bingham & Old Granary 2,186 m²) and erection of new 3 storey laboratory building and energy centre (2,554 m²), reception building (539 m²) new orbital cycleway link, access road, car parking and associated landscaping.

The Committee noted the amendment presented in the amendment sheet.

David Neil and Adam Davies (Applicant's Agent) addressed the Committee in support of the application.

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

- i. Sought clarification where the orbital cycle route would go.

- ii. Referred to the comments made by the Disability Consultative Panel contained in paragraph 6.17 of the Officers report and asked for clarification where the disabled parking would be and if it would have hatched lines around the space.
- iii. Asked whether confirmation could be given that the existing NIAB site would be developed for residential development.
- iv. Queried what would happen beyond the White House Lane road boundary and the safety of vehicles exiting onto Huntingdon Lane.
- v. Questioned if cyclists would have priority on Lawrence Weaver Road.
- vi. Questioned what the surface of the orbital route would be.
- vii. Questioned the wording of condition 22.

In response to Members' questions the Development Control Engineer and the Senior Planner said the following:

- i. The orbital cycle route connected Huntingdon Road to Histon Road.
- ii. The disabled parking was 14m from the front entrance of the building. There was a drop off point at the secondary entrance which was close to the accessible lift. There were also disabled parking spaces in the basement and there was another drop off point which would provide close access to the accessible lift. Condition 25 also required a disability access statement which would be agreed by the Council's Access Officer.
- iii. The existing NIAB site was covered by the major development scheme allocation and the owner had indicated that the site would come forward for residential development but the Officer could give no further assurances.
- iv. The number of vehicles using White House Lane should not be increasing, therefore there should be no significant increase in the traffic to the development.
- v. Confirmed cyclists would be given priority. Lawrence Weaver Road was not currently adopted highway but once adopted waiting restrictions would be installed.
- vi. The surface of the orbital cycle route would be tarmac.
- vii. Confirmed that condition 22 related to the orbital route and not White House Lane.

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 amendments detailed in the amendment sheet and conditions recommended by the officers.

18/11/JDCC Transport Briefing: Land North of Cherry Hinton

The Committee received a Transport Briefing from Richard Carter, and Elliot Page on Land North of Cherry Hinton.

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. Questioned the bus provision and whether there would be two buses an hour.
2. Asked how late the bus provision would run.
3. Questioned the priority of the three crossings along the spine road and if these would be prioritised for pedestrians.
4. Questioned if Airport Way would have vehicular access going into and out of the site.
5. Asked if helicopter routes had been taken into consideration as part of the development of the application.
6. Commented that a 2m high bund would restrict Teversham resident's views.
7. Commented that it was easy to talk about average noise levels but emergency services call outs could occur during the night and require night flights.
8. Asked for timescales for when the application would be submitted.

The meeting ended at 12.55 pm

CHAIR