

**Joint Development Control Committee  
Cambridge Fringes**26 January 2010  
10.00am to 11.45am**Present:****Cambridge City Council:** Cllrs Baker (Chair), Blair, Blencowe, Dryden, Reid and Smart**South Cambridgeshire District Council:** Cllrs Bard and Heazell**Cambridgeshire County Council:** Cllrs Kenny and Harrison**FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE COUNCILS****10/JDC/01 Apologies**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors de Lacey, Orgee (South Cambridgeshire District Council) and Clarke (Cambridgeshire County Council).

**10/JDC/02 Declarations of Interest**

<b>Councillor</b>	<b>Item</b>	<b>Interest</b>
Baker	10/JDC/03	As a Member of Cambridge University
Reid	10/JDC/03	Husband is a consultant to Cambridge University Estates

**10/JDC/03 Pre-application Presentation by AECOM followed by Q+A session: NW Cambridge proposals (University Site)**

The Chair opened the session and explained the structure of the meeting. He emphasised that it was important that Councillors who might ultimately be making the determining decision on any subsequent planning application should not feel unduly constrained by what they could ask. However, they should avoid expressing views that might give any appearance that they were approaching the proposal with a closed mind at this stage, in advance of a full

professional assessment of any subsequent planning application. He pointed out that Members should ask questions and not make definitive statements. The discussion should not be used for negotiations with the developer. These should take place with officers separately from the meeting.

The Joint Director of Planning introduced the item and explained that the presentation would be made in the context of the recently adopted Joint Area Action Plan (AAP). The University had conducted a full and comprehensive consultation and the final report was now available on their website.

It was hoped that the outline application would be submitted in July 2010 with full consultation taking place in early autumn. The application would then be brought to committee towards the end of 2010 or early 2011.

The Joint Director of Planning informed the committee that, as a result of this meeting, he would be writing a letter to the University highlighting any areas of concerns that needed further work and ongoing discussions.

Task groups, comprising representatives of the University and the Council, had been set up to discuss key elements of the development.

The University's Development Director and Architect introduced their project team and covered the following points during their presentation:

- The NW Cambridge Project would be a natural extension to the City and aim to meet the needs of Cambridge University for future years.
- The site would include:
  - Key worker housing
  - Market housing
  - A Neighbourhood Centre
  - 100,000sqm of academic and commercial research facilities
  - Open space and recreational facilities
- The site would provide major new landscapes, whilst maintaining and improving existing green spaces.
- There would be linked landscape space, reinforcing and working alongside existing characteristics.
- The site would protect and enhance existing wildlife areas.
- Key 'accent' buildings may be used on the western edge of the site.

- The site would consist of three distinct neighbourhoods:

#### Local Centre

- Residential housing
- Food store and retail units
- Civic square

#### Storeys Field

- Residential and mixed housing around the large central open space
- Academic and commercial uses

#### Ridgeway

- Mixed residential housing
- Academic and commercial uses

- Also included on the site would be:

- Community Hall
- PCT building and doctors surgery
- Police Centre
- School
- Possible hotel

- All residential dwellings would only be 10 minutes walk or 5 minutes cycle from a neighbourhood centre.
- The landscape and open space would be integrated with the cycle network in the City and be highly accessible.
- A key objective is the orbital route for traffic.
- There would be a non-vehicular route through the Ridgeway.
- Girton Gap would consist of formal and informal open play space.
- The western edge would consist of habitat restoration and informal open space that would act as a buffer to the site.
- The main objective was to achieve a balanced and integrated community
- Key elements of the phasing would be:

#### First 5-year period

- Orbital connection
- Key worker and market housing commenced
- Maturing landscapes, early planting and open space useable
- Local centre

#### 2020/21

- Storeys Field fully developed
- Ridgeway and western edge landscape maturing
- Key worker and market housing continues to be developed, some student units also

2025 onwards

- Final student accommodation built
- Commercial and Academic uses built
- Remaining transport infrastructure completed

Members asked the following questions (answers were supplied but as this was a pre-application presentation none of the answers were to be regarded as binding and so are not recorded here)

**1) Will the suggested supermarket cater for just the need of the new community or take into account existing neighbourhoods?**

**2) When will the Design Guide be shared?**

**3) I have issues and concerns regarding vehicle access and the nature of the link road between Huntingdon and Maddingly Road.**

**4) Will the key working housing be just for University staff, or will it cater for others such as the retail staff?**

**5) How will you achieve an integrated and balanced community when there is 50% key worker housing. The allocation criterion needs to cover all aspects of the University's workforce in order to be well integrated and balanced.**

**6) Councillor Harrison stated that she would be putting her detailed questions in writing and forwarding to the Development Director. The questions would cover the following:**

- Key worker housing
- Forecast traffic flows
- Amenity space
- Implications for the orbital route if the radial route is not in place
- Model for detached housing
- Bus route provision
- Design standards for the school

**7) Storeys Field would be similar to 'The Meadows' in Edinburgh. How will you cater for potential visitors that may want to access and use this site for recreation?**

**8) Will there be a through route across the site that people can use to access the park and ride?**

**9) Key worker accommodation needs to cater for all aspects of university staff (i.e gardeners, maintenance) not just the lecturers and professors. This is essential if you are to achieve a balanced community.**

**10) What provision is there for allotments?**

**11) The nurseries seem to be a long way from the neighbourhood centre.**

**12) Would you be considering all weather, flood lit facilities for the open space?**

**13) Will there be any water space included in the design – such as ponds and lakes etc.**

The Joint Director of Planning thanked AECOM for the presentation and made the following points:

- The questions and concerns raised would be taken back and worked through with the task groups.
- The proposed size of the supermarket had not yet been agreed-AAP Policy states that a small supermarket is appropriate for a Local Centre
- The proposed hotel did not form part of the AAP and would need further discussion.
- The road network would be designed for low speed (20mph), with its main aim being to service the new development.
- Further work required on the universities accommodation needs, and how this would affect key worker housing allocation, mix and clustering
- A fair allocations policy would be essential.
- A three-form entry school would meet the needs of the development as the present data from the University shows, this will need to be considered over the course of the build out period for the site
- The AAP states that affordable and market housing should be mixed and issues around 'clustering' considered, further work to be carried out in the task groups
- A balanced and mixed community is a key element of the new development.
- The allocations policy would need to be set in the S106.
- Clarity was needed on the residential accommodation at the north end of the site and discussions were ongoing with the University. Concerns continue over the suitability of residential in this area
- The Master Plan was on the whole progressing well and moving forward positively, with some key areas where further work and details will need to be discussed over the forthcoming months

The Chair thanked all those in attendance and was assured that all the issues and concerns would be taken back for further discussions as the application progressed.

The meeting ended at 11.45am

**Chair**