

JOINT DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE

12 February 2024

10.00 - 11.25 am

Present: Councillors Bradnam (Chair), S. Smith (Vice-Chair), Baigent, Porrer, Smart, Thornburrow, Cahn, Fane, Hawkins, Stobart and J.Williams

Councillors Baigent, Hawkins and Stobart were present virtually via MS Teams.

Officers Present:

Delivery Manager: Toby Williams

Strategic Sites Team Leader - Emerging Growth Sites: Jonathan Brookes

Principal Planner (Strategic Sites): Janine Richardson

Legal Adviser: Keith Barber

Committee Manager: James Goddard

Meeting Producer: Claire Tunnicliffe

Developer Representatives:

In person:

- Jonny Anstead (Developer, TOWN)
- Mike Bodkin (Developer, TOWN)
- Ben Cartwright (Developer, Landsec U+I)
- James Cox
- Angela Woda (Architect, Kjellander Sjoberg)

Online:

- Programme Director – Major Regeneration (Cambridge City Council): Fiona Bryant
- Gabriela Costa (Sustainability, Expedition Engineering)
- Max Goode (Carter Jonas)
- Stefan Sjoberg (Architect, Kjellander Sjoberg)
- Nick Taylor (Planning, Carter Jonas)
- David Watson (Transport, Pell Fischmann)

FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE COUNCIL

24/5/JDCC Apologies

Apologies were received from City Councillors Flaubert, Levien and SDCD Councillor R. Williams, (Councillor J. Williams attended as his Alternate).

SDCD Councillor Stobart said that he would join the meeting via Teams after 10am (joined for Core site/Hartree, North East Cambridge).

24/6/JDCC Declarations of Interest

Item	Councillor	Interest
Core Site/Hartree, North East Cambridge	Bradnam	Personal: Her ward was the neighbouring Parish of Milton (and Waterbeach) but come to the matter with discretion unfettered.

24/7/JDCC Core Site/Hartree, North East Cambridge

The Committee received a briefing/presentation from developer representatives.

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. To what extent were you informed of the principles of the Area Action Plan?
2. Referred to summary in developer presentation. It was indicated that 5,600 new homes were needed, but approximately four times more commercial and research and development (R&D) space was proposed compared to the Area Action Plan. Please clarify why?
3. Queried if the height and densification of properties would be affected by the target figure of 5,600 homes? Would properties be built higher and closer together to fit them onto the site to also accommodate the business workspace?

4. Referred to the importance of roofscapes. Queried how to make the design as attractive as possible? Beauty was subjective in planning terms.
5. What was the evidence for the need for R&D space?
6. Queried how much flexibility was in the design as the need for lab space or other facilities increased or decreased over time.
7. Queried justification for more work space for businesses when more housing was needed?
8. There was an increase in business space provision just outside the development site. Queried how this was factored into facilities/properties offered on site?
9. More people lived and worked from home since lockdown. How would this be facilitated to prevent someone working from their bedroom etc?
10. Suggested the commercial zone could be a dead zone (no-one using it) during evenings and weekends. This was a concern.
11. Sought information regarding environmental future proofing of the development eg for fluctuations in rainfall and temperatures.
12. Were there exclusion zones around the Anglian Water infrastructure and how could they be re-used or incorporated into the design of the development?
13. Would the site provide sufficient open space and play facilities for the development and wider area?
14. Suggested locating play areas on travel routes to schools.
15. Play areas should be visible, safe and well lit (not behind other facilities).
16. Queried how to mitigate the impact of noise from the A14 on nearby green spaces?
17. Expressed concern about noise and air pollution coming onto the site from the A14. Queried how to mitigate this?

18. How to accommodate railway facilities on site in future as part of the transport offer?
19. How would car clubs and delivery vehicles be facilitated on site?
20. Requested as many roads as possible were built to adoptable standards set by the Highways Authority.
21. What consultation was undertaken with the County Council and Network Rail regarding Fen Road crossing? The crossing was not on site but was located nearby and could be a potential site access, but the crossing may be closed in future.
22. Was the City Council paying for your services as a developer?
23. Queried property service charge levels.
24. Preferred properties to be commonhold rather than leasehold.
25. Thought the consultation process could be used as good practice example for other developments.
26. Queried tenures of properties on offer? People wanted to move into their own properties when they moved out of rented flats.
27. Queried the location of mobility hubs? These should be located where they reduced the amount of driving around the site.
28. Queried which company was used for the public consultation?
29. Requested that further iterations of the masterplan came back for another briefing.

The meeting ended at 11.25 am

CHAIR

This page is intentionally left blank