

# Appendix B, DCF Minutes 16 April 2024

## Case by Applicant

- i. Was a live application.
- ii. Had been significant liaison with different groups and was ongoing.
- iii. Site located north of Mitchams Corner. Access to site off Milton Road.
- iv. Current hardscape would be turned into public landscape space.
- v. Currently there is no connection to Gilbert Road or Corona Road.
- vi. Discussion points with public was access points for pedestrians and cyclists to Lilywhite Drive and Corona Road.
- vii. There had been five consultations during the process. Engagements with local community. Two youth engagements with Milton Road Primary School.

## Case by Petitioners (In Support)

- i. Was a resident of Corona Road.
- ii. The original plan of applicant included the addition of walking and cycling links.
- iii. Developers carried out 5-month consultation with residents. These consultations concluded that links should be removed from the final planning submission based on resident's feedback.
- iv. Stated that another entry point onto Mitchams Corner was not safe.
- v. Objections to links during consultation included, lack of privacy, preservation of quiet area.
- vi. Links would worsen already dangerous cycling patterns on Mitchams Corner.
- vii. Mitchams Corner was already dangerous for cycling and pedestrians. Adding a link would increase this danger.
- viii. Pavement around Mitchams Corner was very narrow.
- ix. Stated pavement widths on Corona Road were not sufficiently wide.
- x. Stated that increased foot and cycling traffic would cause a danger.
- xi. There was a green margin separating commercial and residential areas and this area provided a barrier between the two areas. The proposed links would remove large sections of this green margin. This would affect mature trees in the border as well.
- xii. The proposed new building would be taller than previous and removing green barrier would cause a loss of privacy to neighbouring homes.
- xiii. Felt links would add an increased risk in crime.

## Case by Petitioners (Against)

- i. Petitioners were residents of Lilywhite Drive.

- ii. Were supported by walking charity Living Streets and Cambridge Cycling Campaign.
- iii. Cambridge City Council published report on North of Cambridge stating that one of the highest priorities for residents is a safer, better-connected cycling and walking network for local trips.
- iv. Problem that needed to be addressed was Westbrook Centre forms part of a large block bound by Gilbert Road, Milton Road and Victoria Road and it was not possible to cross by foot.
- v. Lack of connectivity has several consequences including unsafe walking routes. This limits the area that could be covered by foot.
- vi. Made it difficult to avoid areas that were dangerous for walking and cycling.
- vii. Felt there was sufficient infrastructure to provide walking links to Lilywhite Drive.
- viii. Stated local and national planning policies supported new walking links.
- ix. Had started a petition in favour of walking links.
- x. Stated that Cambridgeshire County Council also supports new walking links.
- xi. New links would provide option to bypass Mitchams Corner, enabling safer routes to nearby schools.
- xii. Stated properly designed footpaths would not increase the risk of crime.
- xiii. Stated similar links were already common in Cambridge.

### **Case Officer's Comments**

- i. Application was received 28 February 2024. Neighbours and consultees were notified on that date.
- ii. Several site notices were put up advertising the application on 08 March 2024.
- iii. The consultation was due to finish on 25 April 2024.
- iv. There were currently 70 representations. 53 in objection, 11 neutral and 4 in support.
- v. Current representations currently focus on connectivity and permeability.
- vi. Officers had worked with applicants through the pre-application process to explore improved connectivity through local planning policies.
- vii. Officers and applicants had come across roadblocks to delivering links, including land ownership issues. Were hoping some of these roadblocks would become unblocked.
- viii. The development had been designed to not prejudice links coming forward in the future.
- ix. The applicant team were open to delivering links within their control, secured via planning conditions or section 106 agreement.
- x. Had gone out to consultation and had received comments from Highways and Transport Assessment Team.

## Responses to Members' Questions

- i. Was not aware of any links from Victoria Road to Chesterton College. Would need to walk East or West to travel there.
- ii. There was a route down Garden Walk that could be used.
- iii. Currently many students and parents need to travel around Mitchams Corner to get to Milton Road Primary School.
- iv. The main points of petitioners in support was the gyratory, crime and safety.
- v. The objectors stated that the links would avoid Mitchams Corner area and make it safer for pedestrians.
- vi. The petitioner in support stated that the links to Corona Road was focused on as Gilbert Road link had issues regarding third party ownership.
- vii. There were crime and privacy concerns from residents of Lilywhite Drive.
- viii. Regarding managed access suggestion (key fobs, gate locking at a certain time), the petitioner in support stated that the fact that these options would be deemed necessary, proves that there were issues with the links. Stated safety concerns and crime risk would still be relevant. Does not believe that option would be positive for the broader community.
- ix. The applicant's representative stated there would be 24/7 CCTV at the site.
- x. Any accesses would be made safe for users.
- xi. Applicant's representative stated that FOB access would not be appropriate. The option would need to be a gate on a timer.
- xii. Petitioners in objection stated that Gilbert Road link access would enhance cycling commuters.
- xiii. Petitioners in objection stated that any safety concerns could be designed out.
- xiv. The Chair stated that the owners of Fellows House had said no to the links. He had asked Fellows House to re-examine that stance and was now being discussed.
- xv. The Planning Officer stated that they had not had a consultation response from the Access Officer yet. The Designing Out Crime Officer had commented that they agreed with comments from residents of Corona Road and that there were enough access points towards the school. There would not be a requirement to increase the risks for crimes to be committed with the introduction of an additional access route. Recommendation would be to not add any additional footpaths to the area.
- xvi. Applicant's representative stated they were engaging with Fellows House as well.
- xvii. Petitioners in objection stated that opinions of safety regarding the gyratory, did not think the links added an additional safety risk. Stated that the less walking and safety links added increased the use of vehicles.
- xviii. Petitioners in support stated that the safety risks were valid at the gyratory.

### **Summing up by the Applicant's Agent**

- i. Would take away what was heard today and continue to engage with Officers and local residents.

### **Summing up by the Petitioners Against**

- i. New connections would support local and national planning policies.
- ii. Stated Corona Road and Lilywhite Drive drives would improve routes to destinations in the South.
- iii. Link from Gilbert Road would improve access to Westbrook Centre, children's play area and local school.
- iv. Stated that now was the best time to create these links.

### **Summing up by the Petitioners in Support**

- i. Wanted to reiterate safety and crime concerns.
- ii. Current Mitchams Corner gyratory was not appropriate for additional links.

### **Final Comments of the Chair**

Notes of the Development Control Forum would be made available to relevant parties, published on the council's website and appended to the Planning Officers report.

The planning case officer should contact the applicants/agent after the meeting to discuss the outcome of the meeting and to follow up any further action that is necessary. The applicant will be encouraged to keep in direct contact with the petitioners and to seek their views on any proposed amendment/s.

The Council will follow its normal neighbour notification procedures on any amendments to the application.

Application to be considered at a future Planning Committee.

Along with other individuals who may have made representations on the application, the petitioners' representatives will be informed of the date of the meeting at which the application is to be considered by Committee and of their public speaking rights. The Committee report will be publicly available five clear days before the Committee meeting.