

JOINT DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE - CAMBRIDGE FRINGES

21 November 2018
10.00 am - 12.45 pm

Present: Councillors Blencowe (Chair), Page-Croft, Sargeant, Tunnacliffe, Harford, Richards, Hunt, Sollom, Williams, Moore, Thornburrow and Cuffley

Officers Present:

Assistant Director Delivery, Cambridge City and South Cambridgeshire District Councils: Sharon Brown
Committee Manager: Toni Birkin

Developer Representatives:

Pollard Thomas Edwards Architect: Teresa Borsuk
Hill Residential: Jamie Wilding
DRMM: Tonia Tkachenko
DRMM: Jonas Lencer
SACO / LOCKE: Charles Cresse

FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE COUNCIL

18/35/JDCC Apologies

Apologies were received from South Cambridgeshire DC Councillors de Lacey, Chamberlain and Bygott, County Councillors Hudson and Bradnam, City Councillors Smart and Bird

County Councillor Cuffley and City Councillor Thornburrow attended as alternates.

18/36/JDCC Declarations of Interest

There were no declarations of interest.

18/37/JDCC Phase 1a, Wing, Land North of Newmarket Road

The Committee received a presentation from Pollard Thomas Edwards Architects and Hill Residential regarding Phase 1a, Wing, Land North of Newmarket Road.

The presentation highlighted the following:

- i. The Masterplan details a development of 1,300 homes with associated local facilities.
- ii. It was anticipated that Phase 1 would include the delivery of the primary school and some local facilities.
- iii. Detailed the first residential area, Phase 1a, which would be delivered in line with the agreed design code.
- iv. The planning and building time line was outlined.

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. Would all residential units comply with the latest space standards and lifetime homes requirements?
2. Had the changes to the design code agreed at a previous JDCC been incorporated and would Phase 1a be compliant?
3. Sought assurances that High Ditch road would not be used by construction vehicles.
4. Raised concerns regarding the limited parking options near to the primary school.
5. Suggested that a pre-application briefing regarding the primary school was needed.
6. Questioned why waste collections could not mirror those agreed for Eddington and asked for details on space standards for bin and cycle storage.
7. Asked for details regarding density and percentages of affordable properties.
8. Questioned car parking provision for visiting healthcare professionals.
9. Sought assurances that speeding cyclists would not be in conflict with other footpath users such as wheelchairs, mobility scooters or push chairs.

10. Questioned how residents could be encouraged to use garages for car storage rather than as additional general storage.
11. Suggested that the parking provision near to the sports pitches might be insufficient to meet the demand.
12. Raised concerns about the park and ride car park becoming an overflow car park for the Wing development.

Asked for more details on the office space around the market square. Was this intended for individual businesses or could it be used as shared space?

18/38/JDCC Proposed hotel and apart-hotel, Eddington, Madingley Road

The Committee received a presentation from (developer) regarding the proposed hotel and apart-hotel, Eddington, Madingley Road.

The presentation highlighted the following:

- i. Outlined the core values of the developer as: lifestyle choices and aimed at the corporate client.
- ii. Explained how the scheme would be a split of 150 traditional hotel rooms under the Hyatt brand and 180 apart-hotel rooms or longer stays under the Locke brand.
- iii. Site was a key location fronting onto the Market Square.
- iv. Design had taken influences from the courtyard style of Cambridge University Colleges.
- v. Ground floor would be accessible to the community and would include retail outlets, cafes and a restaurant.
- vi. Rooftop venue would be a focal point.

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.

A number of questions were asked about the parking arrangements and for the ease of the reader, these have been grouped together.

Transport and car parking

1. How would the limited parking spaces be managed to avoid overspill into the Park and Ride car park?

2. Staff would be working anti-social hours. Where would they park?
3. Parking arrangements unsuitable for this out of town location.
4. Had the impact of displaced parking on surrounding communities been considered?
5. Rural communities in the vicinity of the development would be concerned that their tranquillity would be lost due to displaced parking and increased traffic on rural roads.
6. How far was the delivery point from the restaurant and how would that distance be managed?
7. How would coach drop off at the hotel be managed?

General Questions

8. Was there evidence of the demand for this hotel?
9. Was there an upper limit to the number of consecutive nights an apart-hotel room could be occupied?
10. Were the hotels suitable for disabled guests (including any shuttle bus service)?
11. Would the proposed cycle storage accommodate nonstandard bikes?
12. Other buildings surrounding the Market Square were innovative and award winning, this building was uninspired and bland.
13. Some areas of the internal courtyard would not receive much natural light. Had breaks in the building been considered?
14. How would commercial waste collection to any franchised outlet within the hotel be managed so that nearby residential units did not suffer noise disturbance?

The meeting ended at 12.45 pm

CHAIR