

## PLANNING

2 October 2019  
10.05 am - 6.10 pm

### Present:

**Planning Committee Members:** Councillors Smart (Chair), Sargeant (Vice-Chair), Lord, McQueen, Page-Croft, Thornburrow and Tunnacliffe

Councillors McQueen left after the vote on item 19/0902/FUL.

### Officers:

Assistant Director Delivery: Sharon Brown  
Principal Planner: Charlotte Burton  
Principal Planner: Ganesh Gnanamoorthy  
Principal Planner: Lewis Tomlinson  
Principal Planner: Rebecca Ward  
Senior Planner: Mairead O'Sullivan  
Senior Planner: Alice Young  
Planning Enforcement Officer: John Shuttlewood  
Planner: Mary Collins  
Planner: Nick MacDermott  
Legal Adviser: Keith Barber  
Committee Manager: James Goddard  
Committee Manager: Sarah Steed

## FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE COUNCIL

### 19/54/Plan Apologies

Apologies were received from Councillors Green and Baigent. Councillor Thornburrow attended as the Alternate.

### 19/55/Plan Declarations of Interest

Name	Item	Interest
Councillor Sargeant	19/58/Plan	Personal: Member of Camcycle and Cambridge Area Bus Users Group.
Councillor Smart	19/60/Plan	Personal: Used to work for Disability Cambridge and

		knows the people who live next to the development but no representations had been made to him.
Councillor Thornburrow	19/63/Plan	Personal: Would speak as a Ward Councillor and not as a Committee Member.

### **19/56/Plan Minutes**

The minutes of the meeting held on 7 August 2019 were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

### **19/57/Plan 19/0340/FUL - John Banks Honda 444 Newmarket Road**

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for erection of student accommodation with 154 student rooms (following demolition of existing buildings). Together with ancillary accommodation comprising common/study rooms, laundry room, management office, plant room, bin and bicycle enclosures, landscaping and associated infrastructure including a Sub-Station.

The Principal Planner updated his report by referring to amended conditions on the Amendment Sheet. Details had been changed in response to comments from consultees that had been received close to the committee date.

The Committee received a representation in objection to the application from a Camcycle Representative.

- i. This application was not truly sustainable.
- ii. People would have difficulty accessing the site by bicycle.
- iii. It would be difficult to access the Chisholm Trail.
- iv. If the application were to be approved, the following might be appropriate to secure by condition:
  - a. Power assisted cycle storage facilities.
  - b. A toucan crossing near the site.

The Committee received a representation in objection to the application from a Cambridge Past, Present and Future Representative.

- i. CPPF did not object to the application of itself.
- ii. Expressed concern that modern flats were being installed behind the Leper Chapel. This would cause harm to the setting of the chapel, as referenced in the Urban Design Team's comments (P38 of the agenda pack).
- iii. The city was growing, this development could impact on its character. Any harm done to the historic character needed to be mitigated in some way.
- iv. If this application were approved some form of compensation was required to mitigate its appearance in the setting of the Leper Chapel, plus the local distinctiveness provided by Barnwell Lake and the adjoining meadows.

Mr Pittock (Applicant's Agent) addressed the Committee in support of the application.

Councillor Sargeant proposed an amendment to the Officer's recommendation to remove reference to "local" in "local resident streets" in the student management plan to mitigate parking across the city.

The amendment was **carried unanimously**.

Councillor Thornburrow proposed an amendment to the Officer's recommendation that the drainage management scheme should be in place prior to commencement.

This amendment was **carried unanimously**.

#### The Committee:

**Resolved (by 6 votes to 1)** to grant the application for planning permission in accordance with the officer recommendation, for the reasons set out in the officer's report, subject to:

- i. The conditions recommended by the Officers.
- ii. The prior completion of a S106 Agreement to secure:
  - a. The financial contributions specified in paragraphs 8.32 – 8.34 with delegated authority for officers to negotiate an appropriate financial contribution for a toucan crossing (if required) as described in paragraph 8.35; and
  - b. A planning obligation which secures the planning objectives in the

Cambridge Local Plan 2018 Policy 46 and its supporting text (For the avoidance of doubt these objectives are: the securement of a formal agreement and appropriate controls, to ensure the development is solely occupied by the identified institution, Anglia Ruskin University, during term time and to ensure Proctorial control over the ownership of cars by students occupying the development.); and

iii. The following additional conditions:

### **Environmental Health conditions**

#### Plant noise condition

Prior to the installation of plant, a scheme for the insulation of the plant in order to minimise the level of noise emanating from the said plant shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority and the scheme as approved shall be fully implemented before the use hereby permitted is commenced.

#### Acoustic assessment compliance

The noise insulation scheme and mitigation requirements as stated within the Cass Allen “noise assessment” revision 2 dated 4<sup>th</sup> March 2019 (RP01-18774) shall be fully implemented, maintained and not altered.

#### Artificial Lighting

Prior to the installation of any artificial lighting, an artificial lighting scheme shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The scheme shall include details of any artificial lighting of the site and an artificial lighting impact assessment with predicted lighting levels at proposed and existing residential properties shall be undertaken. Artificial lighting on and off site must meet the Obtrusive Light Limitations for Exterior Lighting Installations contained within the Institute of Lighting Professionals Guidance Notes for the Reduction of Obtrusive Light - GN01:2011 (or as superseded).

The approved lighting scheme shall be installed, maintained and operated in accordance with the approved details / measures.

#### Alternative ventilation scheme

Prior to the commencement of development/construction, details of an alternative ventilation scheme for the accommodation units to negate / replace the need to open windows, in order to protect future occupiers from external traffic noise shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning

authority. Full details are also required of the operating noise level of the alternative ventilation system.

The scheme shall be installed before the use hereby permitted is commenced and shall be fully retained thereafter.

## **Drainage Conditions**

### Surface water drainage scheme

No development, apart from above ground works and demolition, hereby permitted shall be commenced until a surface water drainage scheme for the site, based on sustainable drainage principles and in accordance with Cambridge City Council local plan policies, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The scheme shall subsequently be implemented in accordance with the approved details before the development is occupied.

The scheme shall be based upon the principles within the agreed Flood risk and drainage strategy prepared by Richard Jackson (ref: 48949) dated March 2019 and shall also include:

- a) Details of the existing surface water drainage arrangements including runoff rates for the QBAR, 3.3% Annual Exceedance Probability (AEP) (1 in 30) and 1% AEP (1 in 100) storm events;
- b) Full results of the proposed drainage system modelling in the above-referenced storm events (as well as 1% AEP plus climate change) , inclusive of all collection, conveyance, storage, flow control and disposal elements and including an allowance for urban creep, together with a schematic of how the system has been represented within the hydraulic model;
- c) Detailed drawings of the entire proposed surface water drainage system, including levels, gradients, dimensions, pipe reference numbers, green roof, permeable paving and rain gardens;
- d) A plan of the drained site area and which part of the proposed drainage system these will drain to;
- e) Full details of the proposed attenuation and flow control measures;
- f) Site Investigation and test results to confirm infiltration rates;
- g) Temporary storage facilities if the development is to be phased;
- h) A timetable for implementation if the development is to be phased;
- i) Details of overland flood flow routes in the event of system exceedance, with demonstration that such flows can be appropriately managed on site without increasing flood risk to occupants;

- j) Full details of the maintenance/adoption of the surface water drainage system;
- k) Measures taken to prevent pollution of the receiving groundwater and/or surface water
- l) Formal agreement from a third party if discharging into their system is proposed, including confirmation (and evidence where appropriate) that sufficient capacity is available.
- m) The drainage scheme must adhere to the hierarchy of drainage options as outlined in the NPPF PPG.

#### Reason

To ensure that the proposed development can be adequately drained and to ensure that there is no increased flood risk on or off site resulting from the proposed development.

#### Management and Maintenance

No development, apart from above ground works and demolition, hereby permitted shall be commenced until details for the long-term maintenance arrangements for the surface water drainage system (including all SuDS features) to be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The submitted details should identify runoff sub-catchments, SuDS components, control structures, flow routes and outfalls. In addition, the plan must clarify the access that is required to each surface water management component for maintenance purposes. The maintenance plan shall be carried out in full thereafter.

#### Reason

To ensure the satisfactory maintenance of drainage systems that are not publically adopted, in accordance with the requirements of paragraphs 163 and 165 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

#### Foul Drainage

No building hereby permitted shall be occupied until foul water drainage works have been implemented in accordance with details that have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority.

#### Reason

To ensure that the proposed development can be adequately drained and to ensure that there is no increased flood risk on or off site resulting from the proposed development

#### Green Roof Policy

Notwithstanding the approved plans, all flat roofed elements within the development shall be green or brown roofs. No development above ground level, other than demolition, shall commence until full details of these green or brown roofs have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority and these works shall be carried out as approved. The details shall include details of build-ups, make up of substrates, planting plans for biodiverse roofs, methodologies for translocation strategy and drainage details where applicable. The green roofs shall be installed in accordance with the approved details and shall be maintained thereafter.

Reason: In the interests of responding suitably to climate change and water management (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policy 31)

#### Management Condition

The development shall be occupied and managed only in accordance with a Student Housing Management Plan that shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority prior to commencement of occupation of the development and shall prohibit students from owning cars within the city.

Reason: In the interests of residential amenity and impact on the local highway network (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policies 46 and 81).

### **19/58/Plan 17/0869/FUL - 19-21 Godesdone Road**

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for the erection of a residential development containing five units (one 2xbed flats, three 1xbed flats and one studio unit) following demolition of the existing buildings on site.

The Principal Planner made reference to amendments contained in the amendment sheet.

Peter McKeown (Applicant's Agent) addressed the Committee in support of the application.

#### The Committee:

**Resolved (by 4 votes to 2)** to reject the officer recommendation to approve the application.

**Resolved (unanimously)** to refuse the application contrary to the officer recommendation for the following reasons:

- i. The proposal by virtue of the lack of external amenity space for flats 3, 4 and 5 fails to provide an acceptable level of residential amenity for future occupants of these units. As such, the proposal fails to comply with Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policy 50 and the National Planning Policy Framework (2019).
- ii. The proposal harms the character of the Riverside and Stourbridge Common Conservation Area by virtue of the scale and bulk of the proposal which would be out of proportion with the traditional forms of this part of the Conservation Area. The eaves and ridge height would interrupt the predominant roofline and would be unduly visually dominant. The presence of dormer windows on the front elevation would be out of character with Godesdone Road which forms part of the Conservation Area. As such, the proposal fails to comply with Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policies 55, 57 and 61 and the National Planning Policy Framework (2019).

### **19/59/Plan 18/1661/FUL - 44 George Street**

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for the demolition of the existing house and replacement with two new dwellings (1 one-bedroom house and 1 two-bedroom house).

The Planning Officer referred to further letters of objection. Details of the properties and a summary of the objections was contained in the amendment sheet.

The Committee received a representation in objection to the application from a local resident on behalf of themselves and a neighbour.

The representation covered the following issues:

- i. This was the third planning application on this site.
- ii. Overlooking into rear garden was cited as a reason to reject an earlier planning application in respect of the property.
- iii. Impact on the amenity of the neighbour's garden.
- iv. Obscure glass was not sufficient to prevent overlooking.
- v. The developer had not meaningfully consulted with neighbouring residents.



- vi. Net loss of 2 parking spaces, which would add pressure to on-street parking where 100% of spaces were occupied overnight.
- vii. Overdevelopment of the site.
- viii. The development did not meet the Lifetime Homes requirement.
- ix. The development would remove a 3 bed house and replace it with a 2 bed house and a 1 bed unit.
- x. Disagreed with the case officer's summary report, it did not accurately reflect the significant overlooking of the Objector's house.

Dan Brown (Applicant) addressed the Committee in support of the application.

Councillor Dalzell (West Chesterton Ward Councillor) addressed the Committee about the application:

- i. Residents had raised concerns with him.
- ii. Noted the Applicant's comments and acknowledged that he had attended a resident's meeting and wanted him to continue to work pro-actively.
- iii. Overlooking.
- iv. Overdevelopment of the site.
- v. Referred to unit 2, which included a fourth level as a basement, noting that no planning use had been specified for it.
- vi. Referred to paragraph 8.6 of the Officer's report which dealt with space standards.
- vii. Commented that unit 2 could be advertised and sold as a 2 bed property, whilst permission would be for a 1 bed property.
- viii. Noted there was no ensuite in unit 2, which might be expected in a 1 bed property, but instead the bathroom and toilet are shown separate.

#### The Committee:

**Resolved (by 6 votes to 0)** to grant the application for planning permission in accordance with the officer recommendation, for the reasons set out in the officer report, and subject to the conditions recommended by the officers.

#### **19/60/Plan 19/0902/FUL - 23A Hooper Street**

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for the change of use from existing automobile repair shop (vacant unit) to a mixed use Class B2 (microbrewery)

and Class A4 (drinking establishment) and installation of cycle storage facilities.

The Planning Officer referred to amendments contained in the amendment sheet.

The Committee received a representation in objection to the application from a local resident.

The representation covered the following issues:

- i. The primary issue was noise concerns from large numbers of people drinking outside and inside where there was poor insulation.
- ii. Authorities were aware of noise issues as complaints had been made.
- iii. Questioned if anyone would like a drinking establishment at the back of their garden.
- iv. Referred to Environmental Health Officer comments in paragraph 6.4 of the report.
- v. Commented that current provider did not stop customers drinking on the street when the weather was fine, so gates / fences were required.
- vi. Commented on a discrepancy in the hours of operation between paragraphs 8.18 and 10.5 of the officers report.

Sam Calverley (Applicant) addressed the Committee in support of the application.

The Principal Planning Officer explained the discrepancy in the hours of operation and confirmed (with reference to the Environmental Health team's comments) that the hours conditioned were correct.

#### The Committee:

**Unanimously resolved** to grant the application for planning permission in accordance with the officer recommendation, for the reasons set out in the officer report, and subject to the conditions recommended by the officers including the verbal update to correct a typographical error on condition 11 be amended to read:

11. The premises shall be operated and used for the purposes as details/defined within the Planning Statement; Ref: Calverleys Brewery, 23a Hooper Street, Cambridge (prepared by Maidenhead Planning and dated 4th June 2019) and for no other purpose (including any other purposes in Class A4 or B2 of the schedule to the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes)

Order 1987, or in any provision equivalent to the Class in any statutory instrument revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification) without the granting of a specific planning permission.

Reason: To protect the amenity of the adjoining properties. (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policy 35).

Councillor McQueen left the meeting after the consideration of this item and did not return.

### **19/61/Plan 18/1828/FUL - 80 Chesterton Road**

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for the erection of a new two storey dwelling.

Councillor Tunnacliffe proposed and Councillor Thornburrow seconded an additional landscaping condition to restrict car parking.

The amendment was **carried unanimously**.

#### The Committee:

**Unanimously resolved (by all present)** to grant the application for planning permission in accordance with the officer recommendation, for the reasons set out in the officer report, and subject to the conditions recommended by the officers with three additional conditions:

17. Prior to the occupation of the development, a landscape scheme to prevent off-street car parking outside the new dwelling, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved landscape scheme shall be installed prior to occupation of the new dwelling. The landscape scheme shall be retained in perpetuity.

Reason: in the interest of visual amenity (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policies 55 and 61)

18. Prior to occupation of the development, a plan indicating the positions, design, materials and type of boundary treatments to be erected shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Boundary treatments to adjoining gardens should include sufficient gaps (150mm X 150mm) to allow access for hedgehogs. The boundary

treatment shall be completed in accordance with the approved details prior to the first occupation or the bringing into use of the development (or other timetable agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority) and retained as approved thereafter.

Reason: To ensure an appropriate boundary treatment is implemented in the interests of visual amenity and privacy and to ensure it allows movement of hedgehogs (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policies 55, 57, 59 and 70).

- 19 Prior to the occupation of the dwelling, a plan shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority detailing the proposed specification, number and locations of internal and / or external bird boxes on the new building. The bird boxes shall be installed prior to the occupation of the new dwelling and subsequently maintained in accordance with the approved plans.

Reason: to provide ecological enhancements for protected species on the site (Cambridge Local Plan (2018) policy 70).

#### **19/62/Plan 19/0212/FUL - Oakley Lodge, 627-631 Newmarket Road**

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for change of use from Hotel (C1 Use) to House in Multiple Occupation (HMO) (sui-generis).

The Senior Planning Officer referred to the amendment contained in the amendment sheet.

John Dadge (Applicant's Agent) addressed the Committee in support of the application.

The Committee:

**Resolved (by 4 votes to 1)** to refuse the application for planning permission in accordance with the officer recommendation, for the reasons set out in the officer report.

#### **19/63/Plan 19/0511/FUL - 10 Chaucer Road**

Councillor Thornburrow left the Committee table for the determination of this item taking no part in it other than to address the Committee as a Ward Councillor. She moved to the public seating area.

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for the demolition of existing indoor swimming pool and linking conservatory, and demolition of single storey garage and storage shed. Internal alterations to York House, including replacement of windows. Erection of 2 storey side extension containing private swimming pool and fitness room. Erection of detached single storey, oak framed garage and detached outbuildings.

The Planning Officer referred to amendments contained in the amendment sheet.

The Committee received a representation in objection to the application from a local resident.

The representation covered the following issues:

- i. Circulated an additional site plan.
- ii. The property was a Building of Local Interest.
- iii. A private leisure facility was proposed to be built.
- iv. The proposal was a large addition, over 29 metres long, over 2 floors.
- v. The position of the development along the boundary was troublesome.
- vi. Referred to impacts detailed on the shadow diagrams during the month of March.
- vii. Height, length and position of development would create shadowing.
- viii. Questioned if the development was fair or reasonable.
- ix. Referred to pumps / boilers being positioned on the boundary and the potential for vibrations and noxious gas from these structures.
- x. Development was contrary to the Southacre Conservation Area plan.

Alison Wilkinson (Applicant's Agent) addressed the Committee in support of the application.

Councillor Thornburrow (Trumpington Ward Councillor) addressed the Committee about the application.

The representation covered the following issues:

- i. Referred to Local Plan policies 55 and 58 and context of development.

- ii. The development was within the Southacre Conservation Area.
- iii. Development should preserve or enhance existing conservation Area.  
There were no public benefits which outweighed the harm proposed in this development to the neighbours of the Southacre Conservation Area.
- iv. The scale of the development was large and would double the footprint of the existing building.
- v. Increasing plot density.
- vi. Chaucer Road had a discreet character area.
- vii. Both properties were examples of Edwardian Arts and Craft buildings.
- viii. Questioned whether the development preserved the setting of both of the historical buildings.
- ix. Referred to policy 197 of the NPPF.

The Committee took a vote on the officer's recommendation and this was lost by 2 votes to 3.

The Committee:

**Resolved (by 3 votes to 2)** to reject the officer recommendation to approve the application.

**Resolved (by 3 votes to 2)** to refuse the application contrary to the officer recommendation for the following reasons:

- i. The proposal, by virtue of its bulk, scale, mass, proximity to 12 Chaucer Road, including the introduction of three boiler flues to the common boundary, would result in an un-neighbourly form of development, causing an unacceptable and overbearing impact, overshadowing and consequent loss of amenity to the occupiers of 12 Chaucer Road, contrary to policies 55 and 58 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2018) and the National Planning Policy Framework (2019).
- ii. The proposed development, by virtue of its bulk, scale and massing would have a harmful impact on the character and appearance of the South Acre conservation area, contrary to policies 55, 58 and 61 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2018) and the National Planning Policy Framework (2019).

**19/64/Plan 19/0469/FUL - 101 Perse Way**

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for the change of use to an 8 bed (10 person) HMO (sui generis), together with erection of two-storey side and rear extension, single-storey front and rear extensions, rear roof extension, and detached cycle store in rear garden.

The Planning Officer referred to an amendment contained in the amendment sheet.

The Committee received a representation in objection to the application from a local resident.

The representation covered the following issues:

- i. Did not object to people extending their properties but this development was solely for profit.
- ii. There could potentially be 10 vehicles at the property, so parking could be an issue. Questioned where the vehicles would be park.
- iii. Commented that plans did not show the children's play area and noted that existing resident's parked on a public footpath.

The Committee:

**Resolved (by 5 votes to 0)** to grant the application for planning permission in accordance with the officer recommendation, for the reasons set out in the officer report, and subject to the conditions recommended by the officers.

### **19/65/Plan 18/1552/S73 - 8 Seymour Street**

Determination of this application was deferred to allow for the provision of further supporting information and plans to clarify the impact of the development on adjoining residential windows.

### **19/66/Plan 19/0169/FUL - XX Eltisley Avenue**

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought retrospective planning permission for a single storey rear extension and decking.

The Committee received a representation in objection to the application from a local resident.

The representation covered the following issues:

- i. No consultation had taken place.
- ii. Assumed work would be minor and similar to other work which had been completed elsewhere on the street.
- iii. Had approached planning enforcement who confirmed that a retrospective planning application was required.
- iv. Had lost the chance to be involved in the development of the application due to delays.
- v. The scale of the glazing was visually dominant at the rear and side of the house.
- vi. The decking increased the overlooking.
- vii. Disagreed with the officer's statement that the extension did not significantly adversely impact on neighbour's amenity.
- viii. Suggested as a compromise the glazing was replaced.

The Applicant addressed the Committee in support of the application.

Councillor Cantrill (Newnham Ward Councillor) addressed the Committee about the application.

The representation covered the following issues:

- i. The main issue to be considered was privacy between two terraced properties in a Conservation Area.
- ii. Applicant believed they were able to undertake the development under permitted development rights following advice from the planning department, however was subsequently advised by officers that the development was not permitted development and that a retrospective application would need to be submitted.
- iii. Noted that the properties were late 19<sup>th</sup> / early 20<sup>th</sup> century and may require some updating for modern living.
- iv. Referred to Cambridge Local Plan policy 58 and paragraphs b) and e); which dealt with use of materials and the impact on the surrounding area and neighbouring properties and amenity value. He thought this was a balanced judgement. He noted that one Ward Councillor took a different view but his view was that the application did not meet requirements contained in policy 58.

The Committee:



**Unanimously resolved (by all present)** to grant the application for retrospective planning permission in accordance with the officer recommendation, for the reasons set out in the officer report.

### **19/67/Plan 19/0992/FUL - 2 Green End Road**

The Committee agreed by a majority vote to defer determination of this application, applying the 6pm Committee cut off.

### **19/68/Plan Cambridge Science Park**

The proposal seeks to provide a framework through a s106 Agreement which will manage car parking on the Cambridge Science Park and encourage a modal shift away from single car use. A Member Briefing on the proposal was delivered to the Cambridge City Council Planning Committee in September 2019. If the proposal was agreed the framework would be a material planning consideration on planning applications for providing a car parking cap for any future schemes on the Science Park.

The Committee received a report from the Principal Planning Officer.

A member of the public made the following comments:

- i. Their aim was to reduce pollution.
- ii. The report stated that car parking would increase.
- iii. The Principal Planning Officer referred to a Member Briefing which members of the public were not able to attend.
- iv. Commented that the report stated it would take 8 years to restore car parking levels to that pre-development.
- v. There was no mechanism for reporting back to the Committee.
- vi. There was no mention of a s106 Agreement in the report and this only appeared in the recommendation.
- vii. Noted that the application would link into work being undertaken by the Greater Cambridge Partnership in relation to transport provision.
- viii. Questioned how the matter would be enforced.
- ix. Asked the committee to reject the recommendation.

Guy Kaddish (Applicant's Agent) addressed the Committee in support of the application.

The Committee made the following comments in response to the Officer's report:

- i. The report did not take into account the Climate Emergency which the Council had declared.
- ii. Increased car parking may encourage members of the public to use their cars.
- iii. The s106 Agreement was a way to change policy so that the number of parking spaces could be reduced without putting the applicants in breach of planning conditions.
- iv. Understood only half of the car parking spaces on the Cambridge Science Park were utilised.
- v. Questioned parking controls on the site.
- vi. Questioned if there were any limits on the number of car parking spaces on the Cambridge Science Park.

The Principal Planning Officer responded to Members' questions:

- i. The proposed s106 Agreement (to be executed by Cambridge City Council, South Cambridgeshire District Council, Cambridgeshire County Council and the landowner) would form a material consideration in the determination of any future planning applications within the red line of the Science Park .
- ii. The North East Cambridge Area Action Plan should include transport guidelines for future development.
- iii. The s106 Agreement seeks to limit the number of car parking spaces going forward.
- iv. South Cambridgeshire District Council had a policy requirement to provide 1 parking space per 30sqm, Cambridge City Council had a requirement to provide 1 parking space per 40sqm, the Hub had a requirement for the provision of 1 parking space per 45sqm.

The Committee:

**Resolved (by 4 votes to 0)** to delegate authority to officers to negotiate, secure and complete, the S106 Agreement for car park management on the Cambridge Science Park.

The meeting ended at 6.10 pm

**CHAIR**