

Public Document Pack

Joint Development Control Committee - Cambridge Fringes
Wednesday, 20 February 2019

JDC/1

JOINT DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE - CAMBRIDGE FRINGES

20 February 2019
10.30 am - 12.00 pm

Present: Councillors Blencowe (Chair), Bird, Page-Croft, Sargeant, Smart, Tunnacliffe, Bradnam, Harford, Hudson, Richards, Bygott, Cheung Johnson, de Lacey (Vice-Chair), Sollom and Williams

Officers Present:

Assistant Director Delivery, Cambridge City and South Cambridgeshire District Councils: Sharon Brown

Principal Planner: John Evans

Growth Projects Officer (Community & Culture): Julian Adams

Legal Adviser: Keith Barber

Committee Manager: James Goddard

FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE COUNCIL

19/5/JDCC Apologies

Apologies were received from SCDC Councillors Chamberlain and Hunt. Councillor Cheung Johnson attended as the alternate.

19/6/JDCC Declarations of Interest

Councillor	Item	Interest
South Cambs Councillor Bygott	19/8/JDCC	Personal: Had not undertaken planning training so would not vote.

19/7/JDCC Minutes

The minutes for the meeting of the 19th December were agreed and signed as a correct record subject to the following amendment:

18/40/JDCC Declarations of Interest

Councillor	Item	Interest
South Cambs Councillor Bygott	18/42/JDCC	Personal: Had been offered not been provided with planning training but not attended .

19/8/JDCC 18/0355/FUL - Darwin Green One, Land Between Huntingdon Road and Histon Road Cambridge

The Committee received an application for full planning permission for the temporary use of the ground floor of Block B, Plot 70, BDW1 (first residential phase) as a Community Room

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

- i. Asked for the minutes to show that Councillors had received an email from the Windsor Road Resident Association asking for a concern to be addressed. Would granting approval for a change in the implementation date of the community rooms (temporary prior to the 50th dwelling at Darwin Green One, and permanent upon completion of the 300th dwelling occupation); enable the developer to say circumstances had changed and not fulfill its obligations?
- ii. Expressed concern there appeared to be a delay in delivery of community facilities. The options given appeared to be having no facilities for 18 months if the application were refused or having inadequate facilities for 18 months (estimated completion date for 50th dwelling).
- iii. Queried if Barratts would delay the delivery of permanent facilities until after the 300th dwelling occupation.
- iv. Expressed concern there appeared to be inadequate play provision and facilities for young people.
- v. In contrast to the above views about Darwin Green One, Trumpington Meadows was also built by Barratts and seen as a good development.

In response to Members' questions the Principal Planner said the following:

- i. A compromise solution was negotiated by Community Development Officers to get a community facility available in the first year. This was now under construction. No public realm delivery issues were expected, any that arose would be addressed.

- ii. At the current rate of building it would take 1-2 years before 300 dwellings were completed and so trigger the permanent provision of facilities.
- iii. Officers would ensure there was sufficient space and marking out of (permanent) disabled parking on-site. A temporary space was provided for the temporary sales centre. The centre also had an accessible toilet. This could be controlled through conditions.
- iv. Environmental Health Officers would monitor if temporary facilities would disturb neighbouring properties. Planning conditions would control/manage this (also for permanent facilities) and inappropriate usage of parking by visitors.

In response to Members' questions the Growth Projects Officer said the following:

- i. It was good practice to have appropriate community facilities in place on-site in a development.
- ii. The s106 pot had a limited number of funds to manage facilities with. This would be for initial set up and running of facilities prior to the management being taken over by another party.
- iii. The initial proposal was for the 100th dwelling occupation to be the trigger for community room delivery. Health and safety concerns were then raised regarding access of community facilities across a building site, so the 500th dwelling occupation was suggested as the trigger point. Officers negotiated a compromise whereby temporary facilities would be provided when the 50th dwelling at Darwin Green One was first occupied, allowing the permanent community rooms to be delivered upon completion of the 300th dwelling occupation.
- iv. The trigger was changed from 0 dwelling occupations to 50 because demand was required for services to ensure their future provision. The intention was to build up a programme of activities then pass the centre over to another provider to run after s106 funding ceased.

In response to Members' questions the Assistant Director said the following:

- i. Outline planning permission was granted in 2013. This set out play provision.
- ii. The development had taken a long time to come forward. The 2019 application was bound by the 2013 scheme.
- iii. It was a complicated scheme to build, so facilities were being delivered in phases to ensure safe access once building work had started.

- iv. Officers did not have all the logistical details at the outline planning stage, they were only coming to light now. Issues had arisen as one team had reviewed details at the outset then another team became involved during the practical delivery stage. Changes in responsibility were usual in house building.
- v. The application was at a similar stage of development in terms of facility provision (relative to occupation) as other sites had been eg Clay Farm.
- vi. The County Council has a strategy for school provision across the county. The application satisfied policies in the strategy.
- vii. Play facilities and (general) activities were currently available and open daily at the Eddington development.
- viii. If the proposal for 50 dwellings as a trigger point was rejected officers would have to ask Barratts if they could deliver facilities earlier. This would re-open negotiations and it would be difficult to influence Barratts to make changes to their proposal. Re-iterated that facilities were currently being built and Barratts expected to have temporary/permanent community facilities open when the 50th/300th dwellings were occupied. A Community Development Officer would be based in the Darwin Green Centre to manage it for residents (as paid for by s106).
- ix. "Occupation" would occur as per s106 triggers ie when people moved into dwellings. This was monitored by Barratts, City Council Community Development Officers and the Council's Construction Monitoring Officer.
- x. The development would be built by one developer, and so done in a co-ordinated way, which would be difficult to achieve on another site being built by several developers.
- xi. It was not possible to deliver community facilities in-line with the original trigger point. Officers spent 2 years negotiating with Barratts, taking local and national factors into consideration. The Community Development Team were satisfied with the recommended delivery timelines and access to facilities.
- xii. The Strategy for Community Facilities sets out provision across north west developments. Storey's Field would be a big play facility provider, smaller facilities would be available in Darwin Green. Cross-use was expected between sites. There was no logistical impediment for travel. Storey's Field had an underground carpark (at Sainsbury's). It was possible to travel between the two sites via a 15 minute walk across Huntingdon Road.
- xiii. Storey's Field was open every day and managed by the City Council. As were other facilities in the Greater Cambridge area.

Councillor Bradnam proposed an amendment to the officer's recommendation that an informative be added strongly advising coordination with the Meadows

and Storeys Field Community Centres for implementation of strategic community development.

This amendment was carried unanimously.

The Committee:

Resolved (by 11 votes to 3) 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. With additional informative to be added strongly advising coordination with the Meadows and Storeys Field Community Centres for implementation of strategic community development.

The meeting ended at 12.00 pm

CHAIR

This page is intentionally left blank