

JOINT DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE - CAMBRIDGE FRINGES

19 June 2019
10.30 am - 1.05 pm

Present: Councillors Thornburrow, Moore, Porrer, Sargeant (Vice-Chair), Smart, Tunnacliffe, Ashwood, Bradnam, Harford, Richards, Bygott, Chamberlain, Hunt, de Lacey (Chair), Williams and Wilson

Officers Present:

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

Principal Planner: Philippa Kelly

Senior Planner (New Neighbourhoods) – City: Aaron Coe

Legal Adviser: Keith Barber

Committee Manager: James Goddard

Ward Councillors Present for 18/0481/OUT:

Councillors: Ashton, Daunton and Dryden

FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE COUNCIL

19/20/JDCC Election of Chair and Vice Chair

The Assistant Director Delivery took the Chair whilst the Committee elected a Chair.

Councillor Smart proposed, and Councillor Thornburrow seconded, the nomination of Councillor Sargeant as Chair.

Councillor Williams proposed, and Councillor Hunt seconded, the nomination of Councillor de Lacey as Chair.

Resolved (by 9 votes to 7) that Councillor de Lacey be Chair for the ensuing year.

Councillor de Lacey assumed the Chair from the Assistant Director at this point.

Councillor Smart proposed, and Councillor Thornburrow seconded, the nomination of Councillor Sargeant as Vice Chair.

Resolved (unanimously) that Councillor Sargeant be Vice Chair for the ensuing year.

Councillor de Lacey said Spokespersons could be confirmed after the meeting had finished.

19/21/JDCC Apologies

Apologies were received from:

- City Councillors Baigent (Councillor Moore attended as the Alternate) and Page-Croft (Councillor Porrer attended as the Alternate). Also Councillor Lord (sent apologies, but was not required to attend as an Alternate).
- County Councillor Nethsingha.
- South Cambs City Councillors Cone and Howell (who were not required as Alternates).

19/22/JDCC Declarations of Interest

Name	Item	Interest
Councillor Bradnam	19/24/JDCC	Personal: Application was located within her county division but she had not discussed it or fettered her discretion.
Councillor Porrer	19/25/JDCC	Personal: Application was located within her ward division but she had not discussed it or fettered her discretion.

19/23/JDCC Minutes

The minutes of the meeting held on 17 April 2019 were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chair subject to the following amendments:

Councillor	Item	Interest
-------------------	-------------	-----------------

South Cambs Councillor Bygott	19/18/JDCC	Personal: South Cambs County Councillor representing Girton
South Cambs Councillor de Lacey	19/18/JDCC	Personal: South Cambs County Councillor representing Girton
County South Cambs Councillor Richards	19/18/JDCC	Personal: County Councillor representing Castle Ward
County South Cambs Councillor Harford	19/18/JDCC	Personal: County Councillor representing Bar Hill
County South Cambs Councillor Bradnam	19/19/JDCC	Personal: County Councillor representing Milton

19/24/JDCC 18/1782/FUL - 50-55 Cowley Road

The Committee received an application for full planning permission for a four storey office development (B1 use) with associated car and cycle parking, plant room, substation and landscaping.

The Senior Planner updated his report. The wording of Paragraph 9.37 within the committee report has been amended to:

- The energy strategy remains consistent with the original application 16/2058/FUL with additional PV placement on the roof to ensure the building design adopts sustainable principles to provide at least 10% of the developments total predicted energy requirements on site from renewable energy sources.
- The triggers of conditions 9, 10, 12, and 13 were amended from 'or phase of' to 'or each phase of development where phased' to be consistent with condition 11.

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

- i. The application was on a sensitive site. It could exacerbate existing traffic issues in the area.
- ii. Officers should consult the Highways Authority, Public Transport Team and Combined Authority when seeking comments on highway matters.

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

- i. Specialist advice had been sought from the County Transport Team. They had suggested no changes to the application, after reviewing the accompanying Transport Strategy, due to the extant permission. The Highways Authority had liaised with the Public Transport Team with regard to cycling provision. On-going discussions were held with the Combined Authority to check which applications they wished to be consulted on. This application was not of sufficient scale to warrant formal consultation.
- ii. There was an agreed timescale to bring forward the North East Cambridge Area Action Plan. The City Planning Policy Team were liaising with the County Transport Team in case interim guidance for smaller scale developments was required to ensure consistent development in the area before the Area Action Plan was adopted.
- iii. Officers had taken specialist advice (agenda pack P21) at face value that the development would not have a significant impact on transport in the area.
- iv. (Ref para 2.7 P14). The number of car parking spaces had reduced from the amount in the extant permission. A condition had been included requiring a Traffic Management Plan.
- v. Traffic modelling was based on the original extant permission numbers, so the application should now have less of an impact in the area as the number of car parking spaces had reduced from 116 to 96.
- vi. There were a number of targets in the Travel Plan to encourage a modal shift from cars to other forms of transport. If the modal shift did not occur, some form of mitigation would be required.
- vii. It was not possible stipulate that a gas assisted system for two tier cycle racking system must be in place, but an informative recommending one could be included.
- viii. Officers would draw the applicant's attention to Members' request for fire proof cladding and a sprinkler system through an informative. Details would be covered through building regulations.
- ix. Materials would remain the same as extant permission approved in 2017. Conditions would control the look and quality of materials, they would be assessed in detail. The issue of the cladding could be dealt

with as part of this conditions submission. Officers would ensure appropriate landscaping was provided as per condition 5.

- x. Conditions would control the future provision of electric vehicle charging points. The Sustainability Officer was satisfied that sufficient points had been provided. The situation would be monitored through the discharge of the condition.

Councillor de Lacey proposed an amendment to the officer's recommendation to include informative requesting a gas assisted system for two tier cycle racking system.

This amendment was carried unanimously.

Councillor Bradnam proposed amendments to the officer's recommendation to include informatives requesting high quality fire resistant materials and a sprinkler system

These amendments were carried unanimously.

Councillor Thornburrow proposed an amendment to the officer's recommendation to include a bird and bat boxes condition.

This amendment was carried unanimously.

The Committee:

Unanimously resolved 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 plus the amendments below.

Amended wording of condition No.4 (materials):

Prior to the commencement of the development hereby approved, with the exception of below ground works, full details including samples of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces (including the grey fibre cement cladding) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure that the appearance of the external surfaces is appropriate. (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policies 55 and 57)

Amended triggers of conditions 9,10,12,13:

The triggers of conditions 9, 10, 12, and 13 were amended from 'or phase of' to 'or each phase of development where phased' to ensure consistency with condition 11.

Additional condition- (No.33) - Bird and bat boxes

No development shall commence until a plan has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Authority detailing the proposed specification, number and locations of bird and bat boxes on the site. The installation shall be carried out and subsequently maintained in accordance with the approved plan.

Reasons: to provide ecological enhancements for protected species on the site. In accordance with Cambridge Local Plan policy 70.

Amended wording of paragraph 8.45

The energy strategy remains consistent with the original application 16/2058/FUL with additional PV placement on the roof to ensure the building design adopts sustainable principles to provide at least 10% of the developments total predicted energy requirements on site from renewable energy sources.

Additional informative: Sprinkler system

The Local Planning Authority strongly advises the applicant to install an adequate fire sprinkler system within the development site in order to protect the future employees, the property and the environment.

Additional informative: Gas assisted system for two tier racking system

The Local Planning Authority recommends that the two tier cycle rack system approved as part of the development be gas assisted to improve the usability of the system for all cyclists.

Additional informative: High quality materials

The Local Planning Authority advises the applicant to ensure that the proposed materials for the external surfaces are of a high quality and the cladding material will not impose increased risks in terms of fire safety/combustion issues.

19/25/JDCC 19/0523/FUL - 10 Lapwing Avenue

The Chair offered to hand over to the Vice Chair for this item but he declined.

The Committee received an application for full planning permission for a second floor side extension to three storey dwelling.

The Committee received a representation in objection to the application from a local resident.

The representation covered the following issues:

- i. Referred to comments from the Urban Design Team.
- ii. Took issue with details in the drawings of the application.
- iii. Expressed concern that:
 - a. The roof extension design.
 - b. It would set a harmful precedent if approved.
 - c. The design was out of scale with neighbouring properties and out of character with the area.
 - d. The application would have a negative impact on car parking and road safety in the area.

Mr Handley (Applicant's Agent) addressed the Committee in support of the application.

In response to the report the Committee commented it would be helpful to see how the application would affect other houses in the terrace (rather than viewing pictures of just 10 Lapwing Avenue) and asked if similar elevations could be included in future committee reports. The Senior Planner displayed pictures of the street scene via Google Maps to show the context of the application.

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

- i. The Clay Farm Design Code was a material consideration but there was flexibility to make changes provided that these were considered to be acceptable and were highlighted as changes to the Code.
- ii. The Design Code did not go into details regarding extensions to individual properties. It provided high level principles for the wider development in terms of layouts of roads/streets and use of materials etc. The Local Plan set out detailed policies on extensions and other changes to existing buildings.
- iii. The Urban Design Officer (relative to an earlier application for the site) has advised that previous concerns about the scale and location of the proposed extension had been addressed through the new application now before Committee. The urban design officer had been involved in the design code as well as the two planning applications so there was consistency of urban design inputs.
- iv. 3m of terrace amenity space would be lost through the application. If a neighbour wished to extend their terrace property too, then any such application would be determined on its merits.
- v. The application site was not in a Conservation Area, Permitted Development rights existed, resulting in less control on any development than if the site had been in a Conservation Area.
- vi. Permitted Development rights had not been removed from the garages so spaces could be transferred for other uses. The existence of any restrictive covenants across the Skanska (Seven Acres) development was noted in the Officer's report, but these are not material planning considerations.
- vii. An obscure glazed privacy screen is proposed within the application and prevents overlooking of neighbouring properties.

The Committee:

Resolved by 8 votes to 1 (SCDC Councillors did not vote) 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.

19/26/JDCC 18/0481/OUT - Land North of Cherry Hinton - Application Update

The Committee received a presentation from the Principal Planner.

In response to Member and Ward Councillor questions the Principal Planner said the following:

- i. The GRE/runway application would be assessed on its own merits when it comes forward in future. It had been considered as part of Environmental Health Officer comments on the 18/0481/OUT application.
- ii. A bund was proposed on Aircraft Way. Officers were considering the most appropriate height to use to balance noise control against (negative) visual impact.
- iii. A technical briefing would be given prior to the application coming to committee. Topics would include:
 - a. Vehicle movements.
 - b. Staggering of the junction.
 - c. New bus route(s).
 - d. Traffic issues and rat running in the greater Cherry Hinton area.
 - e. School provision.
- iv. The lighting of sports pitches would be reviewed in future. This was now permitted under Central Government policy as of 2019.
- v. The spine road could be a general connection route or limited to bus only. This flexibility was approved through the County Council Economy and Environment Committee.
- vi. The application focused on the east-west spine road, not a periphery road (to address rat running concerns in the area).
- vii. Playing pitches could be secured through s106 funding. The Streets and Open Spaces team would ensure quality pitches were delivered.
- viii. Up to 1,200 dwellings would be delivered, but no more. The intention was to deliver the maximum amount.
- ix. The developer was expected to deliver 40% of housing onsite as 'affordable', because no comments to the contrary had been received. The s106 Agreement would be framed on this basis.
- x. A viability assessment would be carried out in future. This would review the impact of contaminated land as the situation had changed since the application was submitted.
- xi. Land North of Cherry Hinton was allocated as a development site in the Local Plan.

- xii. Current drawings were indicative, ie for information not approval. Details would be agreed through future applications.

The meeting ended at 1.05 pm

CHAIR