

# Public Document Pack

Joint Development Control CommitteeJDC/1 Wednesday, 15 December 2021

## JOINT DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE

15 December 2021  
10.30 am - 3.00 pm

**Present:** Councillors Bradnam (Chair), Chamberlain, Daunton, Hawkins, Porrer, Smart (Vice-Chair), S. Smith, Thornburrow, Gawthrope Wood and Nethsingha

Councillor Nethsingha left before consideration of item 21/64/JDCC.  
Councillor Daunton left before the vote on item 21/64/JDCC.

### Officers Present:

Assistant Director Delivery, Cambridge City and South Cambridgeshire District Councils: Sharon Brown  
Principal Planning Officer: Yole Medeiros  
Principal Planning Officer: Guy Wilson  
Legal Adviser: Keith Barber  
Committee Manager: Sarah Steed

### Other Officers Present:

Principal Transport Officer: Tam Parry

## FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE COUNCIL

### 21/60/JDCC Apologies

Apologies were received from Councillors D.Baigent, Bygott, Hunt and Page-Croft (Councillors Gawthrope Wood and Nethsingha attended as alternates).

### 21/61/JDCC Declarations of Interest

Item	Councillor	Interest
21/65/JDCC	Porrer	Personal: One of the owners of the land were Universities Superannuation Pension Scheme (USS). Had a pension but was a current non-contributor with USS Pension. Discretion

		unfettered.
21/65/JDCC	Gawthrope Wood	Personal: One of the owners of the land were Universities Superannuation Pension Scheme (USS). Had a pension with USS Pension. Discretion unfettered.
21/65/JDCC	Daunton	Personal: One of the owners of the land were Universities Superannuation Pension Scheme (USS). Had a pension with USS Pension. Discretion unfettered.
21/64/JDCC	Chamberlain	Personal: Was the Chairman of Caravan Club which operated at Cherry Hinton Caravan site.

## 21/62/JDCC Minutes

The Chair proposed the following amendments to the October JDCC minutes deleted text ~~struck through~~, additional text underlined:

On page 9 of the agenda:

Councillor Scutt proposed an amendment to the Officer's recommendation to include an informative drawing the Applicant's attention that it was their responsibility to address concerns about damage to buildings ~~caused through tree impact on the soil~~ as a consequence of trees being close to the buildings – soil drying out leading to subsidence etc.

At the top of page 12 of the agenda:

iv. Ground water would be evacuated through controlled discharge ~~from~~ to the sewer.

On p16 of the agenda under 'the Committee raised the following concerns in response to the Officer report':

ii. People would have to travel past the site then double back to access it by bus or cycle. Requested an additional access point in the north west ~~top-left~~ corner of site.

The minutes would be checked with the officers present at the meeting and then tabled at a future meeting for approval.

**21/63/JDCC 21/03619/REM - Land between Huntingdon Road and Histon Road, Cambridge (Darwin Green 1 BDW 5 & 6)**

The Committee received a reserved matters application for fifth and sixth housing phases and Allotment 3 (collectively known as BDW5 and 6) including 411 dwellings and allotments with associated internal roads, car parking, landscaping, amenity and public open space. The reserved matters include access, appearance, landscaping, layout and scale related partial discharge of conditions 6, 8, 10, 14, 15, 17, 18, 22, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 35, 40, 49, 52, 58, 62, 63, 66 and 69 pursuant to outline approval 07/0003/OUT.

The Committee noted the amendments to conditions 3 and 13 and the additional condition regarding obscured glazing contained in the Amendment Sheet.

The Committee received two representations in objection to the application from local residents.

The first representation covered the following issues:

- i. They had emailed Committee members in advance of the meeting with their concerns.
- ii. Had met with Ray Houghton, (the Applicant's representative) to discuss concerns and felt that the only suitable option would be to remove Plot 202 or place it elsewhere on the site as the current position would cause a detrimental and overbearing impact on the amenity of their property.
- iii. Was disappointed that a workable solution had not been accepted.
- iv. Plot 202 impacted on the street scene of Martingale Close.

- v. Suggested the space vacated by Plot 202 could alternatively be used as a wildlife corridor.
- vi. Asked that they were afforded the same rights, amenity and enjoyment as every other resident along the eastern boundary of the site.
- vii. Asked the Committee to refuse the application due to the unacceptable overbearing impact of the development on the neighbouring properties.

The second representation covered the following issues:

- i. The landscape masterplan bore no resemblance to the original design which had been circulated by the developers.
- ii. The original plans should be retained. No privacy would be protected by the new plans.
- iii. Noted that tree canopy was important to provide benefits to residents.
- iv. Asked the Committee not to approve the application without the improvement of planting in the area.

(Ray Houghton) (Applicant's Agent) addressed the Committee in support of the application.

The Committee raised the following concerns in response to the report.

- i. The effect of Plot 202 on the residential amenity of existing properties.
- ii. Compliance with fire safety regulations.
- iii. Requested the removal of Permitted Development rights for above garage spaces to retain amenity space.
- iv. Queried the landscape condition.
- v. Queried allotment phasing.
- vi. Queried garden size.
- vii. Requested an amendment to condition 4 so that this referred to EV charging points not ducting.
- viii. Requested an informative regarding cargo bike parking provision for visitors and residents.
- ix. Expressed concerns about Plot 202 and why this was a marker building.
- x. Expressed concerns regarding Plots 197 and 312.
- xi. Asked for clarification regarding the clustering requirements.
- xii. Asked for clarification regarding space standards.
- xiii. Asked for the objector's photographs to be shown to the Committee.
- xiv. Asked what community facilities would be available.
- xv. Asked if the internal roads would be adopted.

- xvi. Asked if there was any provision for lifetime homes.

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

- i. Did not feel the impact of Plot 202 was at a level to require a review of the proposals.
- ii. The Fire Service had not raised any objections to the proposed development and had only requested fire hydrants.
- iii. The tree planting met the landscaping requirements and had been approved by the Landscape Officer.
- iv. Allotment phasing was set out in the allotment plan which had been approved at the outline application stage.
- v. There was no minimum size for gardens set out in the outline permission, most were approximately 40 square metres although noted there were some smaller units.
- vi. Enhancements between the proposed and existing properties would be improved through the arboricultural assessment.
- vii. A cargo bike informative could be included. She stated she was not recommending the discharge of condition 49 relating to bicycles.
- viii. The intention for Plot 202 to be a marker building was a strategy with the Design Code.
- ix. The units were under the clustering requirements except for block F1 which had 13 units and block P1 and Q1 which had 26 units instead of 25 units.
- x. The internal layout had been assessed to be flexible enough to accommodate the number of beds proposed per unit.
- xi. The houses on the eastern elevation were not added late and had been included in the pre-application discussions. Officers had visited the site and concluded they were happy with the views.
- xii. A community facility was being provided which would serve the whole of the Darwin Green development. It was not located within the site boundary.
- xiii. Confirmed the internal roads would be constructed to adoptable standards.
- xiv. Confirmed there was a condition which required 15% of the homes to be accessible and adaptable.

The Committee:

**Unanimously resolved** by the exercise of one single vote taking together paragraphs 227 and 228 of the Officer recommendation to grant the application for planning permission in accordance with the Officer recommendations set out in paragraph 227 and to approve or refuse the partial discharge of the conditions as set out in paragraph 228, for the reasons set out in the Officer's report, subject to:

- i. the planning conditions set out in the Officer's report; and
- ii. the amendments contained in the Amendment Sheet; and
- iii. amendments to the following conditions with the detailed wording delegated to officers in consultation with the Chair and Vice-Chair:
  - a. condition 18 to extend the removal of Permitted Development rights to integral terraces and to remove Permitted Development rights from all dwellings along the eastern boundary.
  - b. condition 4 to refer to EV charge points and not ducting, and
- iv. an additional modification condition:
  - a. to remove Plot 202 in its entirety from the scheme and
  - b. the review / redesign of Plots 197 and 312 with the detailed wording being delegated to officers in consultation with the Chair and Vice-Chair; and
- v. an informative included on the planning permission in respect of cargo bike parking provision for visitors and residents.

**21/64/JDCC 20/05040/FUL - Land to the West of Peterhouse Technology Park, Fulbourn Road, Cambridge**

Councillors Gawthrope Wood, Porrer and Smart weren't present when this application was last considered at the October 2021 Committee but as the application would be considered afresh all Members in attendance could engage in the determination and vote on the application.

The Committee received an application for full planning permission for the erection of a new building comprising E(g) floorspace with car and cycle parking, landscaping and associated infrastructure.

The Committee noted the amendments to paragraph 7 and 126 of the Officer report and the updated recommendation detailed in the Amendment Sheet.

The Principal Planning Officer also noted the main change since the item was last reported to Committee was the addition of a condition restricting access to the roof terrace.

(Ian Wright) (representing the Applicant) addressed the Committee in support of the application.

The Committee raised the following concerns in response to the report.

- i. Queried the travel plan and asked if specific targets could be put on traffic movements.
- ii. Asked for clarity regarding foul drainage capacity detailed in paragraphs 80 and 81 of the Officer's report.
- iii. Expressed concerns about the surface water drainage.
- iv. Noted the swale was in the Green Belt.
- v. Queried why no green roof was proposed.
- vi. Queried landscaping.
- vii. Expressed concern about the impact of the development on off-street parking in residential areas.
- viii. Expressed concerns about overshadowing.
- ix. Queried the sunlight / day assessment.
- x. In view of the Access Officer's comments, asked for the inclusion of a condition regarding sliding doors and a changing places cubicle.
- xi. Queried biodiversity net gain.
- xii. Expressed concern regarding the travel plan and thought Cherry Hinton was already at capacity.
- xiii. Requested an informative regarding cargo bike parking provision.
- xiv. Asked if the cycle store could have a green or brown roof.
- xv. Queried EV charging provision.
- xvi. Queried how the restriction of access to the roof terraces would be monitored.

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

- i. The Applicant had not sought to amend the scheme but had provided extra information including a daylight / sunlight assessment.
- ii. The Applicant had submitted further information which provided examples as to how they could meet the targets set out in the travel plan. Was comfortable that this application could meet the travel plan targets.
- iii. Paragraphs 80 and 81 of the Officer report clarified that Cambridge Water Recycling Centre did not have capacity to accept foul drainage but

- Anglian Water would be obligated if planning consent was granted to accept the foul drainage.
- iv. Confirmed that condition 13 regarding surface water drainage could be amended to require details of parties responsibilities for long term maintenance to be submitted.
  - v. Confirmed the swale on the southern part of the site was within the Green Belt and was intended to deal with the flow from the fields. The Applicant had undertaken an infiltration assessment to check the drainage capacity of the swale.
  - vi. Officers felt the landscaping proposals were acceptable.
  - vii. Noted that the development next door (Arm) had been conducting traffic surveys for the past 3-4 years and if the application was approved the Applicant would then carry the traffic surveys on. If any impact on off-street parking was found the section 106 Agreement secured a financial contribution to alleviate any impact.
  - viii. Officer's view was that it was unlikely there would be any harmful impact from overshadowing and there was no noticeable loss to daylight.
  - ix. The sunlight / daylight assessment had mapped out each window and any impact resulting from the development. There would be some limited overshadowing inside the winter solstice although this was acceptable under Building Research Establishment (BRE) guidance.
  - x. Confirmed there would be a 15% biodiversity net gain.
  - xi. Noted that there had been a lot of development in Cherry Hinton and that the Greater Cambridge Partnership (GCP) were implementing transport measures. The Applicant had looked at other developments in Cherry Hinton and had modified traffic flow. Officers were happy with the traffic plan as it proposed a lot of mitigation measures.
  - xii. Noted that a green roof and planting to the south side of the cycle stores could be secured by a condition.
  - xiii. EV charging provision was proposed in the permanent parking spaces.

The Committee:

**Resolved (by 6 votes to 2)** to grant the application for planning permission in accordance with the Officer recommendation for the reasons set out in the Officer's report, subject to:



- i. the prior completion of a Section 106 Agreement under the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 with delegated authority to Officers to negotiate, secure and complete such an Agreement on the terms set out within the Officer's report and any others considered appropriate and necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms; and
- ii. the planning conditions specified in the Officer report with the final wording of any significant amendments to be agreed in consultation with the Chair and Vice Chair prior to the issuing of planning permission; and
- iii. an amendment to condition 13 requiring the submission of details of the surface water management responsibility; and
- iv. additional conditions regarding:
  - a. sliding doors and an accessible changing cubicle;
  - b. green roof on the cycle store and planting to the south of the cycle store;
- iv. the informatives as set out in Appendix 1 of the Officer's report to be included at the discretion of Officers with an additional informative included in respect of cargo bike parking provision.

**21/65/JDCC Deed of Variation to S106 Agreement (Country Park provisions) attached to the outline permissions dated 9 October 2009 (080048/OUT and S/0054/08/0) for the Trumpington Meadows development, Hauxton Road Cambridge**

This application could not be considered as the meeting was inquorate. Item deferred to the next meeting.

**21/66/JDCC Meeting Dates 2022/23**

This item could not be considered as the meeting was inquorate. Item deferred to the next meeting.

The meeting ended at 3.00 pm

**CHAIR**

This page is intentionally left blank