

SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

Minutes of a meeting of the Northstowe Joint Development Control Committee held on
Wednesday, 24 June 2015 at 10.00 a.m.

Councillors: Brian Burling (South Cambridgeshire District Council), Ed Cearns (Cambridgeshire County Council), Douglas de Lacey (South Cambridgeshire District Council), Lynda Harford (Cambridgeshire County Council), Peter Hudson (Cambridgeshire County Council), David Jenkins (Cambridgeshire County Council), Alex Riley (South Cambridgeshire District Council), Hazel Smith (South Cambridgeshire District Council), Tim Wotherspoon (South Cambridgeshire District Council) and Nick Wright (South Cambridgeshire District Council)

Officers in attendance for all or part of the meeting:

| | |
|-------------------|---|
| Ian Howes | Principal Urban Designer |
| Jo Mills | Planning and New Communities Director |
| Tam Parry | Northstowe Transport Planning Officer |
| Stephen Reid | Senior Planning Lawyer |
| Juliet Richardson | Business Manager (Growth and Development) |
| Ian Senior | Democratic Services Officer |
| Tanya Sheridan | Head of Growth and Economy |
| James Stone | Principal Planning Officer |

1. ELECTION OF CHAIRMAN

Councillor Nick Wright nominated Councillor Tim Wotherspoon as Chairman. This nomination was seconded by Councillor Alex Riley and, there being no other nominations, the Committee **resolved** that Councillor Tim Wotherspoon be elected Chairman of the Northstowe Joint Development Control Committee for the civic year 2015-16.

2. APPOINTMENT OF VICE-CHAIRMAN

Councillor Hazel Smith nominated Councillor Ed Cearns as Vice-Chairman. This nomination was seconded by Councillor David Jenkins.

Councillor Alex Riley nominated Councillor Peter Hudson as Vice-Chairman. This nomination was seconded by Councillor Nick Wright.

Councillor Cearns and Councillor Hudson withdrew from the Chamber (having handed their completed ballot papers to the Democratic Services Officer) and a paper ballot was undertaken.

Councillor Cearns and Councillor Hudson were invited back into the Chamber, and the Committee **resolved** that Councillor Peter Hudson be appointed Vice-Chairman of the Northstowe Joint Development Control Committee for the civic year 2015-16.

3. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

There were no Apologies for Absence.

4. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor Alex Riley reiterated that he had a Disclosable Pecuniary Interest by reason of the proximity of his domestic property to Northstowe, but that he had a dispensation

allowing him to speak and vote.

Councillor Tim Wotherspoon declared a Non-Pecuniary Interest because he had attended meetings of Oakington & Westwick Parish Council and Rampton Parish Council in order to provide factual information upon request. Councillor Wotherspoon is not an elected or co-opted member of either Parish Council and did not contribute to the debates.

Councillor Nick Wright declared a Disclosable Pecuniary Interest by virtue of owning land over which the A14 would be re-routed and which could therefore be the subject of a Compulsory Purchase Order. He declared a non-pecuniary interest as a Governor at Swavesey Village College.

Committee members reiterated that they were coming to this meeting afresh.

5. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

The Northstowe Joint Development Control Committee, by five votes to four with one abstention, authorised the Chairman to sign, as a correct record, the Minutes of the meeting held on 25 March 2015, subject to the following:

Minute 4 - Northstowe - Phase 2 Outline Planning Application

1. Replace

“Members raised the following:

Implications should the Committee reject the draft Conditions

Answer: there are 90 or so Conditions. It is for South Cambridgeshire District Council as Local Planning Authority to decide what form those Conditions should take. These are draft conditions and there is time between now and the issue of the final consent to amend them.

With

Members raised the following:

Implications should the Committee reject the draft Conditions

Answer: there are 90 or so Conditions. It is for the Northstowe Joint Development Control Committee to agree what form those Conditions should take, and for South Cambridgeshire District Council, as Local Planning Authority, to issue a Decision Notice subject to those Conditions, as agreed.”

2. At the first bullet pointed comment from Robin Heydon of the Cambridge Cycling Campaign, replace the word “fully” with the word “broadly” so that the comment now starts, “Broadly supports proposals within the new town...”

3. At the end of the text, add:

“[The following post-meeting note does not form part of the formal minutes, but is included by way of clarification.

While the Chairman purported to adjourn the meeting to 29 April, it became apparent that it would be extremely difficult to reconvene the meeting that month, with the same Committee members present, given the imminent local elections (and purdah period), and Members’ pre-arranged holidays. Subsequent advice was that because no vote had been taken on it the purported adjournment should be seen, instead, as an abandonment of the meeting. The 25 March meeting

having been deemed to have concluded, a new meeting would take place in due course.]”

Councillors Brian Burling, Lynda Harford, Peter Hudson, Alex Riley and Tim Wotherspoon voted to approve the Minutes. Councillors Ed Cearns, David Jenkins, Douglas de Lacey and Hazel Smith voted to reject the Minutes. Councillor Nick Wright abstained because he had not been a Northstowe Joint Development Control Committee member on 25 March 2015 and had not been present that day.

6. S/2011/14/OL - LONGSTANTON AND OAKINGTON & WESTWICK (LAND TO THE EAST OF LONGSTANTON AND WEST OF THE GUIDED BUSWAY OCCUPYING THE NORTHERN PART OF THE SITE USED BY THE FORMER OAKINGTON BARRACKS)

The Northstowe Joint Development Control Committee considered a “hybrid” application, seeking an outline planning permission for the development of Phase 2 on Land to the east of Longstanton and west of the guided busway occupying the northern part of the site used by the former Oakington barracks with details of appearance, landscaping, layout, scale and access reserved, and full planning permission for the Southern Access Road (West). For the purposes of the report the distinction was made between:

- A Development of the main Phase 2 development area for up to 3,500 dwellings, two primary schools, the secondary school, the town centre including employment uses, formal and informal recreational space and landscaped areas, the eastern sports hub, the remainder of the western sports hub (to complete the provision delivered at Phase 1), the busway, a primary road to link to the southern access, construction haul route, engineering and infrastructure works; and
- B Full planning permission for the construction of a highway link (Southern Access Road (West)) between the proposed new town of Northstowe and the B1050, improvements to the B1050, and associated landscaping and drainage.

The Principal Planner introduced the report, highlighting Northstowe’s significance in helping to meet South Cambridgeshire’s housing needs. He said that consideration, at different meetings, of the application and conditions, and Section 106 items and triggers followed the process adopted in determining the application for Phase 1. Subsequent details would be considered at the Reserved Matters stage. He referred Members to the two principal amendments since the committee’s last meeting, namely amended parameter plans and sports strategy. He also referred to a detailed letter sent to ARUP, agents for the Homes and Communities Agency (HCA), by Lois Bowser, the former Northstowe Joint Team Leader, immediately before the Northstowe Joint Development Control Committee meeting on 25 March 2015. The Principal Planner ended his opening presentation by mentioning several representations that had been received since publication of the agenda, referring in particular to a desk-top survey commissioned by the HCA into ground conditions suitable for location of a burial ground, which had been circulated to members in advance of the meeting.

The Chairman invited the following people to address the meeting:

- Alan Joyner – Executive Director, Gallagher Estates
- Councillor Keith Wilderspin - Swavesey Parish Council
- Councillor Gill Ashby – Chairman, Longstanton Parish Council
- Bridget Smith – in her capacity of Project Manager of the Gamlingay Eco-Hub
- Councillor Simon Edwards – South Cambridgeshire District Councillor for Cottenham, Oakington & Westwick and Rampton

Alan Joyner, whose Company had already secured planning permission in respect of Phase 1, lent his support to the HCA's application for up to 3,500 homes and associated infrastructure. He said it would provide certainty as Gallaghers proceeded with Phase 1. The Joint Promoters remained committed to working with South Cambridgeshire District Council and Cambridgeshire County Council. It was important to promote Northstowe in a positive manner. Central Government recognised the Northstowe project as important, and progress with improvements to the A14 was significant. Planning permission for Phase 2 would also provide an incentive to further investment, and contribute to the supply of housing land. Further benefits would be in securing additional funding for associated land drainage works, and enable preparatory work to begin in the delivery of the secondary school and other infrastructure. He commended Northstowe as a comprehensive development.

In response to questions from Committee members, Mr. Joyner said that the grant of planning permission for Phase 2 would provide some certainty for the development as a whole. In connection with the Webbs Hole pumping station, Phase 2 would deliver funding proportionate to the number of homes.

Councillor Keith Wilderspin summarised the concerns of Swavesey Parish Council as being:

1. A failure to put in place effective and binding arrangements making sure that the Land Drainage Solution for Swavesey Drain was delivered as promised to the community of Swavesey;
2. The Environment Agency had failed to deliver the Land Drainage Solution within the budget that they themselves set, which had revealed the inadequacies of the legal agreements that had been put in place;
3. South Cambridgeshire District Council and Environment Agency officers had decided not to accept the independent evidence submitted by Swavesey Parish Council that demonstrated, in its view, that the solutions now proposed were inadequate;
4. South Cambridgeshire District Council was continuing to rely on Environment Agency advice, despite that Agency having a clear conflict of interest in signing off a replacement down-graded scheme when it should be seeking delivery of the original scheme; and
5. Swavesey Parish Council hoped that the Northstowe Joint Development Control Committee would defer the current planning application until the drainage arrangements required to protect Swavesey had been delivered as promised.

In response to questions from Committee members, Mr. Wilderspin stressed the importance of the Mare Fen Bank works being put in place. Mr. Wilderspin undertook to draft some appropriate wording in consultation with the Internal Drainage Board as a proposed condition for the planning permission.

Councillor Gill Ashby said that it was essential for Northstowe to be an exemplar town that we could all be proud of. With regard to the revised parameter plans and sports strategy, there were enduring concerns about the distance of the new playing fields alongside Long Lane from the facilities of the western Sports Hub (in phase 1), and what about parking associated with their use?

Longstanton Parish Council had not had time to consider the applicants' responses to the

25 March letter from Lois Bowser, but Councillor Ashby posed about a dozen questions, which officers answered before lunch. These included:

- Why had so many points been left unaddressed or put into the Section 106 pot?
- Was the secondary school still scheduled for 2018? (The Business Manager (Growth and Development) said that, to keep pace with phase 1 housing occupations, this had now been put back to 2019.)
- The Town Park / town square seemed smaller than New Square in Cambridge.
- Would there actually be a swimming pool in phase 2 or just space waiting for one?
- Who would manage informal open spaces, such as the Longstanton heritage fields?
- Where would allotments be going?

Longstanton Parish Council had a duty of care towards residents of Northstowe, starting with those already in Rampton Drift. She was concerned that “best endeavours to ensure that Rampton Drift receives a similar level of service” did not give sufficient confidence of equal connectivity, for example.

In response to questions from Committee members, Councillor Ashby said that Longstanton wanted the first residents of Northstowe to feel part of its community, but that the village currently could only call upon an ageing Pavilion to provide community facilities. Longstanton had no permanent youth facilities at all, relying on the Connections Bus project once a month. She said something in the region of £1.5 million was needed to upgrade community facilities in Longstanton. The village did not receive any Section 106 money from the development of Home Farm, it going instead to providing a bypass for Longstanton. Councillor Ashby said that, in her view, Northstowe was not yet exemplar, and the Phase 2 application did nothing to allay Longstanton’s fears.

Bridget Smith, although a South Cambridgeshire District Councillor, addressed the Committee on behalf of the Cambridge Council for Voluntary Service and as Project Manager of the Gamlingay Eco Hub, owned by Gamlingay Parish Council but managed, on its behalf, by an independent Trust. Bridget Smith summarised the staffing and financial resources needed to successfully run a community building for a large variety of users. It had been important to get the design right so that it comprised a variety of flexible, multi-functional spaces but also allowed for expansion if and when required. In planning a civic centre for Northstowe, a robust business case would be essential in order to attract the right calibre of people to manage it and to ensure that it met the needs of the community for years to come.

In response to questions from Committee members, Bridget Smith said that an effective community hub should act as Northstowe’s “heart beat.” Multi-functionality was key and, if possible, a Board of Trustees should be in place before work started on building the Hub.

Councillor Simon Edwards highlighted a potential, and major, benefit of Northstowe Phase 2 to the communities of Oakington and Westwick. A scheme of flood mitigation for the two communities had first been proposed in 2003, but no provision had been made as part of Northstowe Phase 1. Councillor Edwards said it was very important that flood mitigation measures were provided as part of Northstowe Phase 2. Such measures could be achieved by providing a balancing pond at Oakington Brook parallel with Dry Drayton Road. It might be possible to co-ordinate efforts with Highways England and deposit spoil from digging the balancing pond in the borrow pit resulting from excavations required in progressing the A14 improvement works.

In response to questions from members of the Committee, Councillor Edwards said it was not possible to use the borrow pits themselves as balancing ponds because they were in

the wrong location. Councillor Edwards acknowledged that the idea would have to be subject to a feasibility study, and asked for Committee to agree the principle that these balancing ponds be brought forward as part of Phase 2, as a condition.

Councillor Edwards also said that Oakington had received funding towards a new pavilion and MUGA in order that these facilities could be used by early residents of Northstowe, with access from the cycleway alongside the Cambridgeshire Guided Busway.

The Chairman asked if the Committee wished to ask any questions of the Homes and Communities Agency and its sports consultant who were in attendance. In response to questions from the Chairman and other members of Committee:

Paul Kitson (Homes and Communities Agency) and **Jonathan Dickens** explained how three Synthetic Turf Pitches (STPs) would be distributed across Phases 1 and 2. Responding to a statement that there was high demand for a swimming pool and that such a facility would also serve those living in outlying villages, Mr. Kitson said the provision of a swimming pool remained an aspiration. Land for a swimming pool would be factored in as part of the education campus. He said that use of a Sustainable Urban Drainage System (SUDS) made it highly unlikely that the proposed artificial pitches would get flooded. He suggested that the reduced width of the Greenway did not in any way reduce its functionality for walking and cycling despite there being breaks in it because of the busway. Mr. Dickens assured the Committee that the dimensions of the football and cricket pitches met the requirements respectively of the Football Association (FA) and England and Wales Cricket Board (ECB). Mr. Kitson referred to the provision of allotments, and confirmed that these were not planned as part of the town park. There followed some brief exchanges about

- Sports membership statistics
- Existing and changing demographics
- Demand for a swimming pool from a wider catchment area centred on Northstowe
- While provision of outdoor sports grounds did not fully meet the policy requirement for area, the more intensive use afforded by STPs had persuaded Sport England to remove its objection.
- The need for Northstowe to be as good as it can be, setting the standard for future new communities

The debate began at this stage.

In response to a question, the Planning Lawyer told Members that the same process was being followed for Phase 2 as had been followed for Phase 1. Nobody had challenged that process. A Committee resolution about Phase 1 had been passed subject to satisfactory Conditions and Legal Agreement under Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, which were agreed at a later date. Only then was a formal Decision Notice issued. The Planning Lawyer confirmed that, until the Committee was satisfied that the Conditions provided sufficient safeguard, and that the Planning Obligations were sufficiently robust to make the planning application acceptable in planning terms, no Decision Notice would be issued. Member concern was expressed that Conditions were not quite secure because they could be overturned upon appeal. Member concern was also expressed at the approach adopted at Phase 1 because Section 106 negotiation had been delegated to officers with no involvement by Committee members. Therefore, in respect of Phase 2, there was some reservation about the recommendation that the Committee ratify the contents of the report from the Planning and New Communities Director to enable officers to negotiate the terms of the Section 106 Agreement and final planning Conditions. The Planning Lawyer responded that the financial sums and works in kind contained in the s106 Agreement for Phase 1 were entirely consistent with what the

committee approved, and the decision on Phase 2 will be for the Committee to make.

One Member expressed considerable dissatisfaction with how Phase 1 had been handled. He said that there was an urgent need to review the scheme of delegation to officers. In response, the Chairman gave an assurance that the Northstowe Joint Development Control Committee would retain 'sovereignty' over the consideration of Section 106 Planning Obligations. Another Member asked what would happen if the Committee did not approve the Section 106 report. The Planning and New Communities Director said that officers and, ultimately, Members had to work to an acceptable standard. The Planning Lawyer added that the Committee could withdraw its resolution to 'approve subject to' if it was irrevocably dissatisfied with Planning Obligations on offer. A Member reminded the Committee that its duty was to consider the application in front of it, not to try and 'redesign' it. She added that should the committee turn down a Section 106 package recommended by the officers, and the applicants were to appeal against refusal on those grounds, an inspector might deem the refusal of permission as unreasonable. Several members expressed concern about the last-minute circulation of the applicants' responses to the letter sent on 25 March by the former Northstowe Joint Team Leader, saying that 24 hours was not enough time to assimilate 23 pages of text combining the points raised by the councils and responses to them by Arup on behalf of the HCA. The Chairman took responsibility for the short notice, arguing that he felt it more important for members to receive the material before the meeting rather than after it.

The Committee proceeded to consider the parameter plans.

Landscape (Appendix G)

There was an extended discussion of the adequacy of 1.2ha for a combined town square and town park. Members referred to Appendix M to the report, highlighting that officers' original aspiration had been for a town park and town square amounting to a combined area of three hectares, and expressing scepticism that all the activities outlined there could be accommodated in just 1.2ha. There was some concern among Members about creating a town park by reducing the amount of green space elsewhere. However, the Principal Planner said that space for the town park had been taken from the 'commercial centre' of Northstowe rather than by reducing the amount of green open space elsewhere. He added that the park and square would consist of hard and soft landscaping, the relevant amounts of which would be determined at the Reserved Matters stage. Referring to the table in Appendix M, illustrating the sizes of parks and town squares elsewhere in the country, the Principal Planner said it was difficult to make any 'like for like' comparisons because of the water park and significant amount of informal green space planned for the centre of Northstowe. It was stated that the Longstanton Conservation Area would not count as part of the open space for the New Town. Nevertheless, there was disappointment at the size of the proposed town park and square, given the variety of potential uses and anticipated final population of 25,000 people. One member doubted that 1.2ha would be adequate for events such as music festivals, open air theatre, and for the community otherwise to thrive. The Principal Planner informed the Committee that, in terms of open space, the HCA was providing three times more than was required by planning policy. The town park / town square were only one aspect of cultural life.

The Chairman invited Paul Kitson of the HCA to address the Committee on this issue. Mr Kitson referred to a 38-page A3 document entitled 'Northstowe Town Park' dated 12 March 2015 which the HCA had presented to officers to stimulate debate about how the town park / town square might work, including a couple of concept sketches illustrating how 1.2ha might be shaped in a variety of arrangements within the "area of search" in the town centre. The applicants had retained the approach of identifying 1.2ha out of a zone of 1.52ha with a view to flexibility at the detailed design stage. Many members

complained strongly that this document had not been shared with them, adding that its contents might have helped them visualise how the proposed town park / town square might work.

The Chairman felt the applicants would not move on 1.2ha for town park / town square. Some members would have been persuaded that this was an appropriate provision. For others, it might be a factor weighing against others. He reminded the Committee that determining a planning application was not a matter of eliminating every conceivable imperfection, but reaching a balanced judgment bearing in mind national and local planning policies, all material considerations, and officers' advice."

Land Use (Appendix F)

A Member voiced dissatisfaction that the Committee was being asked to approve phase 2 without an adequate town centre strategy. He was particularly concerned with timing of services and facilities in the town centre. He felt the Committee could not have confidence that facilities would come forward in a timely fashion. The Principal Planning Officer explained that while a town centre strategy had been submitted as one of the documents supporting the application, a condition had been drafted to ensure that this document was expanded upon to provide a more detailed town centre strategy as Phase 2 developed, in particular to enable the early delivery of the town centre.

Another member felt it inappropriate to have to determine Phase 2, which included the town centre, in the absence of full understanding of how the other half of the town would relate to it. The Committee, in his view, needed confidence that Northstowe would work as a complete town. A strategic approach was needed. While stressing that the purpose of this meeting was to focus on the substantial work needed in taking forward Phase 2, **Paul Kitson** said that the HCA intended to commence pre-application discussions on Phase 3 in 2017.

Responding to a question about provision for Gypsies and Travellers, the Principal Planner referred to the Needs Assessment prepared for the submitted Local Plan. This indicated that there was no unmet demand at this stage. He added that, should evidence of need emerge, provision could be made in Phase 3.

Density (Appendix K)

The Chairman reminded the committee that, on the site visit, Members had specifically looked at the Administration Building site identified on the Parameter Plan as up to five storeys to provide flexibility for a landmark building at the end of the avenue of chestnut trees. It was felt by one member that, should some buildings in Northstowe be built higher than the proposed maximum of five storeys, this would make further space available elsewhere within the development for other uses. A cautionary note was sounded though as higher buildings could impinge on views through the town. However, a limited number of tall "landmark" buildings could possibly be accommodated. One Member considered that many of the issues discussed during the meeting were a result of constrained building heights. Another member expressed that the beauty of the site is the flat fenland landscape character and that tall buildings would allow people to see and appreciate that character.

Movement and Access (Appendix H)

A Member said more cycling should be encouraged, and that increased provision for cycle parking was an essential part of this. The Northstowe Transport Planning Officer referred Members to draft Condition 70.

There needed to be good cycle routes between Northstowe and Cambridge. Rampton Drift should be included in the existing routes. There should be more 'diagonal shortcuts'.

One member observed that while horse riding was regarded as a significant mode of transport, he was at a loss to see where one might be expected to keep one's horse.

Building Heights (appendix I)

There was no further comment beyond that made under 'Density' above.

Proposed Levels (Appendix J)

There was no discussion under this heading.

There was no further discussion of specific parameter plans.

The Chairman suggested that the Southern Access Road was not contentious. The Northstowe Transport Planning Officer did however update Members on arrangements being made to facilitate cycling between the town and the Business Park towards Bar Hill.

A Member voiced concern about the Drainage Conditions, and urged officers to be more assertive in securing the immediate and on-going maintenance of watercourses.

With regard to the Burial Ground, the Northstowe Area Action Plan had not envisaged Northstowe being built in Phases. A Member suggested that a two hectare site be delivered by the time of the occupation of the one thousandth home in Phase 2. The Planning and New Communities Director undertook to discuss this point with the HCA, and to report back to the Northstowe Joint Development Control Committee at its meeting on 29 July 2015.

One Member raised concern about a recent change in the law, which he understood had introduced the concept of 'deemed discharge of Conditions'. Members instructed officers to take extreme care in wording Conditions so as to protect the interests of the Local Planning Authority. In response to concern raised by a Member, officers undertook to make sure that a Condition had been drafted that would require the submission of details of materials for the off-site works associated with the dual carriageway connecting to, and continuing, the section of dual carriageway proposed north of the Bar Hill junction as part of the A14 Cambridge to Huntingdon Improvement Scheme.

The Committee moved on to discuss Affordable Housing. Requests were made for Members to be given sight of the viability study. The Member of Parliament for South Cambridgeshire had undertaken to discuss scheme viability with the HCA and the amount of Affordable Housing to be provided, and the Committee asked officers to find out whether this discussion had yet taken place. The question of Affordable Housing was seen as pivotal in enabling Members to signify their approval for granting planning permission for Northstowe Phase 2.

A Member expressed concern that the Northstowe development was now lacking some of the exemplar measures demanded by the Committee at the outset. Officers questioned this assertion citing, for example, the HCA's proposals for surface water management and open space. Furthermore, while there would be a condition requiring commercial buildings to achieve BREEAM 'Very good' the applicants were aspiring to achieve BREEAM 'Excellent'

Towards 5.00 pm, the Chairman called for a vote.

Councillor Alex Riley proposed, and was seconded by Councillor David Jenkins, that a decision regarding Phase 2 be deferred until the meeting on 29 July 2015 following consideration at that meeting of items and triggers for a Section 106 Agreement, Planning Conditions, drainage and the burial ground. The proposition to defer was lost by five votes to four, with one abstention.

The Chairman invited those Members minded to refuse the application to state their reasons for doing so.

Upon a show of hands, the Northstowe Joint Development Control Committee

1. **Resolved to Grant outline planning permission** for Phase 2 of Northstowe subject to each of the following (including the exchange of requisite documentation):
 - a. Prior completion of a Legal Agreement under Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, with appropriate trigger points; and
 - b. Finalised Conditions, a draft of which is contained in Appendix O to the report from the Planning and New Communities Director.

Five Members resolved to grant planning permission. They were Councillors Brian Burling, Lynda Harford, Hazel Smith, Tim Wotherspoon and Nick Wright. Two Members voted to refuse planning permission. They were Councillors Ed Cearns and Douglas de Lacey. Three Members abstained. They were Councillors Peter Hudson, David Jenkins and Alex Riley.

2. **Resolved to Grant full planning permission** (unanimously) for the Southern Access Road West, subject to finalised Conditions, a draft of which is contained in Appendix O to the report from the Planning and New Communities Director.

7. **DATE OF NEXT MEETING**

The next Northstowe Joint Development Control Committee meeting would take place on Wednesday 29 July 2015, starting at 10.00am.

Members joined the Chairman in acknowledging the contribution made by Lois Bowser, former Northstowe Joint Team Leader, in working with the Northstowe Joint Development Control Committee.

The Meeting ended at 5.15 p.m.
