

JOINT DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE

17 March 2021
10.30 am - 1.55 pm

Present: Councillors Baigent, Matthews, Sargeant (Chair), Smart, Thornburrow, Tunnacliffe, Bradnam (Vice-Chair), Bygott, Chamberlain, Daunton, Hawkins and Hunt

Officers Present:

Joint Director for Planning and Economic Development: Stephen Kelly.
Assistant Director Delivery, Cambridge City and South Cambridgeshire District Councils: Sharon Brown
Legal Adviser: Keith Barber
Committee Manager: Claire Tunnicliffe
Meeting Producer: Sarah Steed

Other Officers Present:

Transport Assessment Team Manager (Cambridgeshire County Council): David Allatt
Principal Transport Officer, Transport Assessment Team (Cambridgeshire County Council): Tam Parry

Developer Representatives:

Terrance O' Rourke: Will Cobley
Henry James: Hill Group UK
JTP Architects: Dave Swindells
JTP Architects (Strategic Projects): Eric Holding
Jo Cowen Architects: Joanne Cowen
Present Made: Richard Jackson
Present Made: Alan Penfold
Churchman Thornhill Finch: Andrew Thornhill
Bidwells: Guy Kaddish

FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE COUNCIL

21/14/JDCC Apologies

No apologies were received.

21/15/JDCC Declarations of Interest

Councillor	Item	Interest
Councillor Baigent	All	Personal: member of Camcyle
Councillor Bradnam	21/17/JDCC	District Councillor for part of North East Cambridge. Discretion unfettered.

21/16/JDCC Minutes

Minutes of the meeting held on 20 January 2021 were approved as correct record and signed by the Chair subject to the following amendments.

- i. p4 of the agenda pack: Items 1, 2 & 3 - appropriate to be written in the past tense.
- ii. p6 (vii): Misspelling of availability
- iii. p7 (xv): Change flume to flue.
- iv. P10 (v): Sought clarification on this sentence. The Chair advised this was what he said at the last meeting and would stay in the minutes as recorded.

Committee Manager Note: Items 1, 2 & 3 are copied from the Amendment Sheet for information at the start of the minutes and copied as standard

21/17/JDCC North East Cambridge Area - Interim Transport Approach

The Committee received a report to note concerning the County Council Transport Team's intended approach to the assessment and consideration of traffic and transport impacts associated with proposed development within the North East Cambridge (NEC) Area Action Plan (AAP).

A report was presented by Cambridgeshire County Council's Transport Assessment Team Manager and Principal Transport Officer, Transport Assessment Team.

In response to Member's questions on trip budget enforcement the Transport Assessment Manager and Principal Transport Officer said the following:

- i. Acknowledged the need for significantly improved transport facilities for the NEC area prior to the completion of the development set out in the NEC AAP.
- ii. Developments would need to demonstrate how they could meet the objectives set out in the County's Transport Position Statement.
- iii. Long term, further transport infrastructure would be required to realise the sustainability of the area. Developments would be broken down and a monitor and manage approach taken.
- iv. The trip budget would be in place and monitoring would begin at the start of a development.
- v. If it were noted that trips had started to increase, this would be brought to the attention of the developer and they would be advised that the trend needed to reduce. Additional measures could be introduced, and the travel plan intensified to reverse a possible breach.
- vi. If the trip budget was irreversibly breached, then subsequent phases may be held back.
- vii. Large master plan areas would be broken down into smaller parcels. If a developer were failing to perform against the trip budget, they would not be allowed to continue beyond the parcel being developed.
- viii. Monitoring information such as the ability to track vehicles through automatic number plate recognition and the location of cameras on the entry and exit points of the development would be possible.
- ix. The Alconbury Weald development was an example of the monitor and manage approach which is a development of 5,000 dwellings broken down into smaller phases. Phase 1 comprising approximately 800 houses. As the subsequent phase(s) of the development were looked at the data would be based on the travel habits established on site so there was a much more educated and refined view towards Phase 2.
- x. There had been instances at Alconbury Weald where a specific junction would be monitored in future. If development trips had gone over a trigger point pre-agreed mitigation would be required and had been delivered.
- xi. Lessons had been learnt on the monitor and manage approach from developments such as Alconbury Weald. The monitoring technology had improved which allowed a greater understanding of when and why the trip patterns were emerging. This has led to a more effective response from officers.
- xii. The developers in the area were working to produce a shared transport strategy for the area, with support from the local authority officers.

Advised any recommendation provided by the Highways Authority to the planning authority would have considered the merits of the application about the Transport Position Statement.

The Assistant Director (Delivery) said the following:

- i. A large amount of evidence-based work had been undertaken which supported the NEC AAP transport work that had been progressed to date. The Position Statement produced by the County Council reflected this evidence base.
- ii. The negotiation with developers and their transport assessment would need to take into the account this evidence base and the Council's Position Statement.
- iii. The Position Statement could be considered a material consideration when applications came to the Committee for deliberation.

The Joint Director for Planning and Economic Development responded:

- i. The document outlined how the County Council's (as Highways Authority) methodology would be applied to these sites. Understanding that shift approach was an important part of considering the Highway Authority's responses to each application.
- ii. When considering applications, the Committee should give weight to the consultation response.

In response to Member's questions on how the trip budget could be facilitated the Transport Assessment Manager and Principal Officer said the following:

- i. Agreed that Park and Ride had an opportunity to take trips off the network and that Park and Ride-based solutions would be explored.
- ii. The Combined Authority as the local Transport Authority were tasked with transport strategy for the area and strategic interventions. The County Council, as the Highway Authority, were responsible with the day to day operation of the network. They were the consultee in the planning process, providing a technical view of a developer submission and would seek the opinion of the Combined Authority.
- iii. When talking about sustainability this was in the context of both the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) definition and everyday sustainability.
- iv. Would encourage developers to create an area that optimises a level of development that achieved a sustainable and logical way with a balance of employment and residential development.

- v. When looking at control measures, in the first instance, the technical information provided by a developer would be scrutinised to determine whether the phase in question would be sustainable.
- vi. If there were congestion this would not be identified at a point where it had become unmanageable but earlier as the development would be monitored from the start.
- vii. In worse case scenarios concerning control measures, the developer would have to pay a penalty and would not be able to continue to build further phases, reducing any further damage.
- viii. Agreed there was potential to restrict car parking and the use of cars in the area. However, did not want to eliminate the use of a car as an option but create a scenario where the car was not the obvious choice due to a range of options available.
- ix. Would recommend that the developer contributed to the package of local, internal and strategic transport infrastructure for the NEC area.
- x. The Greater Cambridge Partnership were currently working on the Cambridge to Waterbeach corridor and were engaged on the Cambridge Eastern Access study focusing on sustainability to the east.
- xi. Recognised the need to improve the connection to Cambridge North Railway Station.
- xii. The trip budget had included several committed developments including the Cambridge North railway station.
- xiii. The development in this area would be dependent on external agencies and would be looked at on a 'parcel on parcel basis'.
- xiv. Part of the transport assessment plan would be to look at the areas at risk of displacement parking, looking at the number of spaces already on site, the issues that may already be occurring, the proposals in question and identifying where displacement parking might take place.
- xv. Agreed that there could be a change of developers, but the conditions would not change.
- xvi. Acknowledged people's habits needed to be changed and use alternative transport, it was not as simple to reduce the number of carparking spaces but there needed to be a multifaceted approach.

The Joint Director for Planning and Economic Development said the following:

- i. As part of the new Joint Local Plan parking on new developments was being looked at, for example discreet parking on the parameters of the site and the reduction of road space for parking. Residents would have to walk to their car as they would to the nearest to the bus stop. This would help to create a modal change as the car would not be parked outside the property and there would be a walk to access the vehicle.

- ii. The Environmental Health Teams would be consulted on the matter of air quality. There were potential air quality issues along the transport corridors A14 and Milton Road. The environmental assessments would model and assess these areas when considering applications.
- iii. The Environmental and Planning Team were currently working on a wider air quality management.

The Committee noted the approach that the County Transport Team (as the Highways Authority) intended to take to the assessment and mitigation of transport effects from development proposals within the North East Cambridge Area Action Plan area until advised otherwise

21/18/JDCC Marleigh Phase 2

The Committee received a presentation on the Marleigh Phase 2 development.

Members raised comments/questions as listed below. Answers were supplied, and comments from officers but as this was a pre-application presentation, none of the answers or comments are binding on either the intended applicant or the local planning authority so consequently are not recorded in these minutes.

- i. Voiced concern that play equipment had been placed close to the Sustainable Drainage System (SuDS).
- ii. Enquired what source of data was being used for the SuDs. The data should be the most up to date. One Member requested a meeting with the developers and officers to discuss this matter further.
- iii. Asked if the SuDs were all intended as open swale or if there were to be underground tanks.
- iv. Expressed unease at the use of valley gutters between the houses. These could become blocked with leaves and overflow with heavy rain. It was possible heavy snow could cause these to collapse and asked if these issues had been addressed.
- v. Stated it was a design responsibility to ensure that maintenance could be undertaken on valley gutters by the occupier.
- vi. Described the buildings as 'boxy', all the same and not inspiring.
- vii. Questioned if there were plans for the flat roof buildings, such as solar panels or green roofs.
- viii. Queried if the open spaces were accessible to young people and asked where they would play.

- ix. Advised that the green spaces between the apartment buildings could be in the shade. This could lead to the space being difficult to maintain and that they could become cold and damp spaces; the higher the buildings the more problematic this could be.
- x. Challenged the term 'city' in the location description as the development was in a more urban area closer to Newmarket Road.
- xi. Enquired if there was any indoor community space or if this was just in Phase 1; could indoor workspace be considered?
- xii. Noted in Phase 1 there was a crescent overlooking a green space which offered an architectural feature of interest. Suggested softer solutions rather than 90-degree right angles for Phase 2.

21/19/JDCC Eddington Lots S1/S2

The Committee received a presentation on Eddington Lots S1/S2

Members raised comments/questions as listed below. Answers were supplied, and comments from officers but as this was a pre-application presentation, none of the answers or comments are binding on either the intended applicant or the local planning authority so consequently are not recorded in these minutes.

- i. Asked what level of the UK Code of Sustainable Homes would be reached.
- ii. Would like further information regarding safety in the community.
- iii. Would like to see fewer cars on site and the design should encourage car sharing.
- iv. Noted the cohesion for living and leisure but asked if there were any opportunities for working on the development.
- v. Asked for examples of completed developments that Present Made had been involved with.
- vi. Queried how the site would be managed by a company who were not local to the development.
- vii. Asked what plans were in place to ensure those living on the development would be part of the whole community of Eddington and not a sub-community.
- viii. Questioned what level of affordable housing would be provided.
- ix. Asked if there was provision for community space between S1/S2.
- x. Enquired if there was provision for the retirement community.
- xi. Queried if the trees would grow in certain locations on the development.

The meeting ended at 1.55 pm

CHAIR