

JOINT DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE

20 January 2021
10.30 am - 2.00 pm

Present: Councillors Baigent, Sargeant (Chair), Thornburrow, Tunnacliffe, McQueen, Bradnam (Vice-Chair), Bygott, Chamberlain, Daunton, Hunt and Fane

Assistant Director Delivery, Cambridge City and South Cambridgeshire District Councils: Sharon Brown
Strategic Sites Manager: Chris Carter
Interim Team Leader :Fiona Bradley
Principal Planner: Kate Poyser
Legal Adviser: Keith Barber
Committee Manager: Claire Tunncliffe
Meeting Producer: Liam Martin

Other Officers Present:

Local Highways Engineer, Cambridgeshire County Council: Jon Finney
Transport Assessment Manager, Cambridgeshire County Council: David Allatt

Developer Representatives:

Carter Jonas: Peter McKeown
Carter Jonas: Colin Brown
JTP Architects: Eric Holding
Paul Harney Associates: Paul Harney
Bidwells: Guy Kaddish
Abstract Securities: Floyd Carroll
Liz Lake Associates (Landscape Architects): Sean Vessey
Scott Brownrigg Architects: Ed Hayden
Bryan G Hall: Martin Crabtree

| |
|---|
| FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE COUNCIL |
|---|

21/1/JDCC Apologies

Apologies were received from SCDC Councillor Hawkins and City Councillors Matthews and Smart. SCDC Councillor Fane and City Councillor McQueen attended as alternates.

21/2/JDCC Declarations of Interest

| Item | Councillor | Interest |
|--------------------|------------|---|
| Councillor Baigent | All | Personal: Member of CamCycle |
| Councillor Fane | 21/4/2021 | Son works at Abcam Discretion unfettered. |

21/3/JDCC Minutes

The minutes of the meetings held on 18 November were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

21/4/JDCC 1000 Discovery Drive, Cambridge Biomedical Campus

The Committee received a reserved matters application for the erection of a five-storey mixed use laboratory and office building and associated plant, internal roads, car parking, cycle parking, landscaping and public open space, including access, appearance, landscaping, layout and scale.

The Committee noted the Amendment Sheet as listed below which could also be viewed at the following link:
<https://democracy.cambridge.gov.uk/mgChooseDocPack.aspx?ID=3941>

1. The application address does not actually include the wording “1000 Discovery Drive”, so the officer report is amended accordingly. The address should, therefore, read, “Cambridge Biomedical Campus, Dame Mary Archer Way, Cambridge.”
2. There is an up-date regarding the Phasing Plan, referred to in the officer report in paragraph 44 (page 10). The contents of the Phasing Plan, as mentioned in the officer report, have now been agreed and the relevant condition of the outline planning permission (Condition 6) has now been part discharged.
3. There are slight changes to wording of the recommended Condition 5. These are:

Point 2, after “Prior to occupation”, insert “of the building”. After point 4, in the final sentence, change the word “programme” for “scheme”.

Condition 5 should, therefore, read as follows:

“Prior to the installation of any electrical services, an electric vehicle charge point scheme demonstrating the provision of allocated car parking spaces with dedicated electric vehicle charging, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall include:

1. Five active fast electric vehicle charge points with a minimum power rating output of 22kW to be installed prior to occupation
2. Prior to occupation of the building, provision shall be made for 23 passive electric vehicle spaces to have the necessary infrastructure and capacity in the connection to the local electricity distribution network and electricity distribution board, in order to facilitate and enable the future installation and activation of additional active slow electric vehicle charge points as required.
3. The electric vehicle charge points shall be designed and installed in accordance with BS EN 61851 or as superseded
4. In the event that either no construction work on Plot 3 (of Phase 2 of the Cambridge Biomedical Campus) or construction of the Multi-Storey Car Park has commenced within five years of the date of this decision notice, an additional 31 active slow electric vehicle charge points with a minimum power rating output of 7kW shall be provided. The additional 31 active slow electric vehicle charge points shall be provided within 6 months after the expiry of the five years from the date of this decision.

The electric vehicle charge point scheme as approved shall be fully installed in accordance with the approved scheme and maintained and retained thereafter.

Reason: In the interests of encouraging more sustainable modes and forms of transport and to reduce the impact of development on local air quality, in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) paragraph 105, 110, 170 and 181, Policy 36 - Air Quality, Odour and Dust of the Cambridge Local Plan (2018) and with Cambridge City Council’s adopted Air Quality Action Plan (2018).”

Andrew Blevins of Liberty Property Trust (Applicant) addressed the Committee in support of the application.

In response to Members' questions the Principal Planning Officer said the following:

- i. In answer to the representation made by residents of Warburton House:
 - The property was approximately 280m away from the site; believed the concerns raised regarding overshadowing were unjustified due to the distance.
 - Outlined planning permission parameter plans had been set with regards to the height of the building. The building would fall within those parameters.
 - Regarding the concern expressed to the open space to the north of the building rather than to the south. This was part of the staggered arrangement agreed with the outline planning permission.
- ii. The forecourts of the property were large enough for sufficient sunlight and daylight.
- iii. The application proposed a temporary carpark on plot 3. There was a trigger point within the outline planning permission when the multi-storey would be built to coincide with plot 3 being developed.
- iv. Condition 14 under the outline planning permission required 3% of spaces for EV charging points at construction with a provision for a further 15% within the infrastructure.
- v. Amended condition 5 (5.4) included an additional 31 active slow electric vehicle charge points if the temporary car park was still on site in five years' time.
- vi. The Environment Agency had expressed concern at ground contamination and what might enter the water environment below ground. Their standard informative requested no open drainage to prevent pollution underground.
- vii. The reason for the location of the refuse bay (north forecourt) was due to availability of space; it could not be relocated from the front as there was not enough room to the east of the building. This would be hidden in a small pavilion building with a green roof and climbing plants around it.

- viii. Regarding overheating of the building and the materials used, the south elevation of the building had less glass and more brick than the north which was a deliberate design to avoid overheating by sunlight.
- ix. The proposed building was higher than the Abcam building but comparable with other buildings in the area, some of which were higher.
- x. The overall layout of the site had been agreed under the outline planning permission with the plots divided and staggered north to south to allow large landscaped areas. The application had a large landscaped area to the north of the building.
- xi. Noted the concern expressed regarding the access road going in front of the building.
- xii. The access road had to go across the north as to gain vehicle access to the site without having to reverse back out on Discovery Drive the only practical option was to loop through the site in front of the building. The Quality Design Panel did look at the possibility of drop off spaces being provided on Discovery Drive but this was not conducive to good landscape design.
- xiii. Environmental Health officers had made no adverse comments regarding the 22kw EV charging points.
- xiv. On the roof of the proposed building there would be a whole section of plant specifically for cooling the building. In addition, the stairwells on the east and west side had the space for additional plant for cooling if required.
- xv. Confirmed there was a parameter plan that dealt with the flue height of the cooling plant, the scheme was within that parameter.
- xvi. The quantity of parking spaces would be controlled by condition 33 of the outline planning permission of 1 parking space per 80sqm .
- xvii. The estimation for the number of staff on site was 562 with 80% of staff occupying the building at any one time.
- xviii. As part of the outline planning permission a site wide travel plan was required and a plot specific travel plan to promote modes of transport other than the private car.
- xix. Two bus stops had been installed by the applicant on Dame Mary Archer Way. Two new cycle and pedestrian crossings had been installed, one on the roundabout on Addenbrookes Road and Francis Crick Avenue, the other on Dame Mary Archer Way on the former Bell School site.

- xx. Noted the comment regarding the high level of car parking for phase 2.
- xxi. Had been advised that the electric bike batteries could be taken off and brought into the office to charge.
- xxii. The louvres at the side of the building could be adapted subject to the requirements of the occupants; the ventilation may be required dependent on what chemicals or matters were being used in the building.

The Delivery Manager for Strategic Sites responded with the following:

- i. Highlighted to the Committee that the sustainability officer said the following: 'Cooling hierarchy would be applied to reduce internal solar gains with consideration of glazing proportions and the passive shading for the building as being features which has been incorporated in the design to help minimise the heating impact'.
- ii. Thermal analysis would be undertaken by the applicant considering future and current climate scenarios reviewing potential heating issues as the development progressed.

The Assistant Director (Delivery) said the following:

- i. The S106 Agreement attached to the original outline had rigorous requirements in relation to the Phase 2 travel plan, which needed to be addressed prior to occupation. This included the appointment of a travel plan coordinator and setting up a travel plan coordination group. This would address wider strategic issues in relation to parking, travel patterns and the development moving forward.

Councillor Sargeant proposed an additional informative which was as follows:
That electric bikes could be charged on site.

This informative was carried unanimously.

The Committee:

Resolved unanimously to approve:

- i. Planning permission of reserved matters application reference 20/02950/REM, subject to the conditions and informative set out from page 32 of the agenda pack and with authority delegated to officers to undertake appropriate minor amendments of those conditions prior to issue of the planning permission

- ii. Amended condition 5 as above.
- iii. Additional informative – Charging electric bikes on site.

21/5/JDCC NIAB

The Committee received a presentation on the indicative proposals for the NIAB, Huntingdon Road development.

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.

- i. Queried what were the plans for the 1920's NIAB building as there had been no reference to this in the presentation; was this being developed by another developer and was this in progress.
- ii. Asked if BREEAM 2018 standard would be used for energy efficiency use.
- iii. Welcomed the change to move the path to the side of the water garden space and not through the middle.
- iv. Highlighted the new country park as part of the Darwin Green development which residents would also have access to.
- v. Embraced the ideas of residents sharing more as this was an important part of sustainability; asked if shared laundry and drying spaces had been thought about.
- vi. Suggested a space for a workshop and shared bike tools for residents.
- vii. Applauded the open spaces which had been created; asked if there would be a space for mobile food vehicles or fruit and vegetable stalls.
- viii. Pleased the developer was aware of the importance of ecology on the site; recommended hedgehog doorways could be installed through the fencing throughout the development.
- ix. Recommended visiting the Eddington development which had exemplar edible parks.
- x. Queried if the development would consider the aftereffects of COVID-19. More people were likely to spend more time working from home, the interior was just as important. Suggested possible shared meeting spaces with an opportunity to work outside
- xi. Asked if the development would be a place that would welcome older people who wanted to downsize into rental.
- xii. Noted the trouble that had been taken to respect the heritage of the site.

- xiii. Inquired if there could be more scope to make the roofscape more interesting on the rest of the development in respect of those immediately around the NIAB building.
- xiv. Hoped the depth of the water in the water features would enhance the site and not become a hazard.
- xv. Asked if there was any intention to the make the development a gated area.
- xvi. Requested information on children's play areas and how many would be on site.
- xvii. Enquired what level of affordable housing would be on site.
- xviii. Requested confirmation that national space standards would be met.
- xix. Asked what studies had been undertaken to determine the need for the aparthotel on site.

21/6/JDCC Marleigh Phase 2, Land North of Newmarket Road, Cambridge

This pre-application developer presentation was deferred to the February JDCC meeting.

21/7/JDCC Allocation E/3, Fulbourn Road, Cambridge

The Committee received a presentation on the indicative proposals for Allocation E/3, Fulbourn Road, Cambridge site, Cambridge International Technology Park.

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.

- i. Sought clarification on the height of the building.
- ii. Requested further comment on the Landscaping mitigating the effect on the greenbelt on the area further up towards Fulbourn, on the eastern corner.
- iii. Asked what steps had been taken on the southside of the site to stop the runoff going into the buildings.
- iv. Stated it was difficult to see the actual scale of the development from the presentation.
- v. Questioned if there was the right kind of density to maintain the Cambridge phenomenon in terms of people working together.

- vi. Enquired how many businesses were anticipated, would the buildings be shared. There was no indication of a central meeting point such as a café.
- vii. Expressed surprise at the size of the roundabout (larger than expected).
- viii. Asked if future proofing was in place for companies on site who wanted to achieve net carbon zero.

The meeting ended at 2.00 pm

CHAIR