

JOINT DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE

19 October 2022
10.00 am - 12.20 pm

Present: Councillors S. Smith (Chair), Bradnam (Vice-Chair), Carling, Gawthrope Wood, Page-Croft, Cahn, Fane, Hawkins and Stobart

Present virtually via Microsoft Teams: Councillors Flaubert, Porrer and Thornburrow

Officers Present:

Head of Commercial Services: James Elms
Delivery Manager (Strategic Sites): Philippa Kelly
Major Projects & Programme Manager: Sarah Tovell
Legal Adviser: Keith Barber
Committee Manager: James Goddard
Meeting Producer: Chris Connor

Developer Representatives:

David Fletcher
Alexis Butterfield
Ulrich van Eck
Will Nicholls

FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE COUNCIL

22/40/JDCC Apologies

Apologies were received from Councillors Porrer (Councillor Page-Croft attended as an Alternate), Scutt (Councillor Gawthrope Wood attended as an Alternate) and R. Williams.

Councillor Porrer, a substantive member of the Committee, was unable to attend the meeting in person and instead attended virtually via Microsoft Teams. Councillor Page-Croft attended in person as her Alternate.

It was noted that those who attended the meeting virtually could not vote but could contribute to debate. Councillor Porrer attended virtually via Microsoft Teams as an observer.

22/41/JDCC Declarations of Interest

Item	Councillor	Interest
All	Stobart	Personal: Member of Cambridge Cycling Campaign.
22/44/JDCC	Bradnam and Cahn	Personal: District and County Councillor for Ward that abuts development. Discretion unfettered.

22/42/JDCC Minutes

The minutes of the meetings held on 22 June 2022 were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chair subject to the following amendment on page 4, under item relating to 21/03244/FUL – Cambridge Airport Newmarket Road Cambridge, after second sentence add:

‘A JDCC site visit was held on Monday 13 June 2022. The purpose of the visit was to see the existing H16 radar; to see the proposed H17 radar site; and to observe the H16 radar in operation and to listen close up and at a distance’.

22/43/JDCC Reserved Matters 3, Land North of Cherry Hinton, Cambridge

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.

1. Would young people have input into the design of outside play space?
2. Would the proportion of adopted roads increase?
3. Was there sufficient space for cars to park, and garage doors to open, without taking up pavement space?
4. Could grass survive in the play spaces if spaces were used as per the design?
5. Could all housing be made dual aspect?
6. Did single aspect homes have noise attenuation measures?

7. Were post boxes located outside flats in an accessible location?
8. Welcomed the Play Strategy and Trim Trail. Could cyclists access the site?
9. Were allotments provided, and if so, where? Would there be an associated community building for allotments?
10. How could bricks from this development be re-used at the end of the site's life to minimise its carbon footprint?
11. What water efficiency measures were in place eg water meters or grey water recycling?
12. Queried if the following were available:
 - a. Electric vehicle charging points?
 - b. Photovoltaic panels on roofs?
 - c. A focal point for children and adult social activities?
 - d. Space for cargo bike storage?
 - e. A car share scheme?
13. Was it possible to service several properties from one air source heat pump instead of requiring one for each property?
14. Could mechanical ventilation be installed with other features to 'personalise' homes in future?
15. Queried size of parks in the development?
16. Would trees be planted in the small squares, particularly near houses?
17. Could waste/refuse trucks and the bus network use the adopted roads?
18. How to meet the challenge of cooling flats, particularly when the weather was especially hot?
19. What facilities were in place to dry clothes as people did not want to put them on radiators?
20. What facilities were in place for electric bikes and scooters:
 - a. Access?
 - b. Storage?
 - c. Hiring? (So people did not have to go off site.)
21. How would management companies be established to oversee maintenance service charges? Arrangements needed to be accountable and transparent.
22. Could flat roofs be green roofs?
23. Could roofs be retrofitted in future to take photovoltaic panels once the Cambridge Airport leaves its current site?
24. Requested a copy of the guidance provided to the airport that stated photovoltaic panels could not be used on roofs at present due to the impact of glare and reflection.

25. Please spread affordable housing across different types/tenures instead of locating in one type eg single aspect buildings.
26. Play areas needed to be in place from phase 1.

22/44/JDCC Cambridge Operational Hub - 59, 68, and 72 Cowley Road, Cambridge, CB4 0DN

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.

1. Asked if existing operations from the current depot site would be relocated to the new one on Cowley Road.
2. How would the development fit into the North East Area Action Plan?
3. What plans were in place for the wash down area and the protection of the nearby public drain?
4. How would staff be encouraged to change their travel arrangements from cars to bikes and public transport?
5. Would this application be:
 - a. An exemplar site for staff to work at?
 - b. Attractive in design?
 - c. Net zero footprint?
6. Would the site have appropriate parking and be accessible for people with mobility issues?
7. Were car club or car share facilities in place?
8. Would the development increase traffic levels in Cowley Road?
9. Would there be charging facilities for electric bikes on-site?
10. Asked what water recycling facilities would be in place and how water would be heated eg solar thermal?
11. How could roofs be used eg siting solar panels?
12. Could ground source heat pumps be used instead of air source heat pumps?
13. Queried if site treatment had been discussed? The design used a lot of concrete, how could this be mitigated?
14. What structural support was in place for the projecting part of the building?
15. Were mowers stored in the main building for security reasons?
16. Cambridge Assessment did a good consultation exercise circa 2020, please learn from their good practice.

The meeting ended at 12.20 pm

CHAIR

This page is intentionally left blank