



Joint Development Control Committee

Date: Wednesday, 17 February 2021

Time: 10.30 am

Venue: This is a virtual meeting and therefore there is no physical location for this meeting.

Contact: democratic.services@cambridge.gov.uk, tel 01223 457000

Agenda

- 1 Apologies
- 2 Declarations of Interest
- 3 Minutes (PAGES 3 - 20)

Application

- 4 Deed of Variation relating to Section 106 Agreement Land at Plots 1-21 at Cambridge Science Park, Cambridge (PAGES 21 - 26)

Miscellaneous Report

- 5 North East Cambridge Area Action Plan Interim Transport Approach (PAGES 27 - 42)
- 6 Meeting Dates 2021/22 (PAGES 43 - 44)

Joint Development Control Committee Members:

Cambridge City Council: Cllrs Baigent, Matthews, Sargeant (Chair), Smart, Thornburrow and Tunnacliffe, Alternates: McQueen, Moore, Page-Croft and Porrer

South Cambridgeshire District Council: Cllrs Bradnam (Vice-Chair), Bygott, Chamberlain, Daunton, Hawkins and Hunt, Alternates: Cone, Fane, Howell and J.Williams

Information for the public

Details how to observe the Committee meeting will be published no later than 24 hours before the meeting.

Members of the public are welcome to view the live stream of this meeting, except during the consideration of exempt or confidential items, by following the link to be published on the Council's website.

Any person who participates in the meeting in accordance with the Council's public speaking time, is deemed to have consented to being recorded and to the use of those images (where participating via video conference) and/or sound recordings for webcast purposes. When speaking, members of the public should not disclose any personal information of any individual as this might infringe the rights of that individual and breach the Data Protection Act.

If members of the public wish to address the committee please contact Democratic Services by 12 noon two working days before the meeting.

For full information about committee meetings, committee reports, councillors and the democratic process:

- Website: <http://democracy.cambridge.gov.uk>
- Email: democratic.services@cambridge.gov.uk
- Phone: 01223 457000

JOINT DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE

16 December 2020
10.30 am - 4.48 pm

Present: Councillors Baigent, Sargeant (Chair), Smart, Thornburrow, Porrer, Bradnam (Vice-Chair), Chamberlain, Daunton, Hawkins, Hunt and Howell

Officers Present:

Assistant Director Delivery, Cambridge City and South Cambridgeshire District Councils: Sharon Brown

Delivery Manager (Strategic): Chris Carter

Principal Planner: Charlotte Burton

Legal Adviser: Keith Barber

Committee Manager: Sarah Steed

Meeting Producer: Liam Martin

Other Officers Present:

County Highway Engineer: Jon Finney

FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE COUNCIL

20/19/JDCC Apologies

Apologies were received from City Councillor Matthews and SCDC Councillor Bygott, City Councillor Porrer and SCDC Councillor Howell attended as alternates.

20/20/JDCC Declarations of Interest

Item	Councillor	Interest
20/21/JDCC	Baigent	Personal: Member of Cambridge Cycling Campaign and Extinction Rebellion.

20/21/JDCC 07/0003/NMA1 - Non-material amendment to Darwin Green outline consent and 19/1056/REM - Reserved Matters application for Darwin Green BDW2

The Committee received an application (07/0003/NMA1) for a non-material amendment to the Darwin Green outline consent and a reserved matters

application (19/1056/REM) for the Darwin Green 1 development for parcel 'BDW2'.

The Committee noted the amendments presented in the Amendment Sheet.

The Committee received representations in objection to the application from two local residents.

The first representation covered the following issues:

- i. Asked the Committee to note that almost all the residents of Woodlark Road opposed the application.
- ii. Did not resist development but this site would be over developed. 40% of homes did not meet the National Space Standards and 33.8% of the affordable homes did not meet this standard.
- iii. The density of homes was higher than authorized by the outline planning permission.
- iv. The application did not meet condition 8 of the outline planning permission.
- v. The case officer had stated the average length of a garden for a Barrett David Wilson (BDW) home would be 9.5m, however in many cases gardens would be only 6 to 7m.
- vi. The reduced garden length would impact Grosvenor Court and 1 Hoadly Road.
- vii. The developer had stated publicly the buildings would be 18m away from Grosvenor Court, but there was a distance 15.5m for one of the buildings which would have a significant impact on residential amenity. Requested the Committee considered a condition to ensure a distance of 18m.
- viii. Because the side elevation to 1 Hoadly Road was 9m the Committee were asked to ensure similar condition of 18m be applied to this plot there would be a significant impact on daylight / sunlight.
- ix. Requested that permitted development rights be removed for those buildings boarding Woodlark Road.

The second representation covered the following issues:

- i. Residents who adjoined the site would have their local amenity significantly impacted by the scheme due to its proximity.
- ii. Throughout the planning process residents' expectations had been poorly managed by the developer. The current plans differed considerably to the

- outline planning artist's impressions and answers given at public meetings with the goal posts moving.
- iii. In the outline planning approval, there was room for 20m gardens but now had been advised it was not possible. No good reason had been given for this change.
 - iv. The pavilion was going to be a residential unit and a focal point of the development, but it had now been put up for sale.
 - v. A new hedge is to be planted alongside the Woodlark Road boundary. The plans now show only repairs to the existing Woodlark Road hedge, in the case of Grosvenor Court it would be in the BDW2 gardens and in other areas there would be gaps. This did nothing to increase this important wildlife corridor and was not supportive of the Council's policy of increasing biodiversity.
 - vi. Requested the Committee protect the Council's biodiversity policy and safeguard residents from the risk of flooding by making the following points are the subject of conditions of any planning approval.
 1. Work on the hedge, ditch and service pathway should be completed before work began on the site.
 2. The new boundary hedge needed planting on the developer's land along the entire boundary and without any gaps.
 3. A scale plan drawing is produced showing the exact:
 - Location and width of the hedge.
 - Width of the ditch.
 - Width of the service path/ roadway
 - The hedge height is specified at a minimum of 3m in the maintenance agreement.
 - vii. The loss of the residential units at the Old Pavilion and the developer miscalculating the Woodlark Road ditch could be filled in, this loss of available land had contributed significantly to the site being over-developed. This had led to the reduction in the size of gardens and hedges and houses being built closer to the boundaries with over 40% of the total houses not meeting the Council's policy for adequate floor space.

Alan Davies (Applicant) addressed the Committee in support of the application.

A written statement was read out on behalf of City Councillor Payne (Ward Councillor for Castle) raising the following points:

- i. The County Council Flood Authority had carried out detailed work to survey the risk of flooding to Woodlark Road.

- ii. Sought clarification about the order of works to the ditch, hedge and service corridor between Woodlark Road and this application (BDW2).
- iii. The renewal and ongoing maintenance of the hedge and maintenance of the ditch were critical to protecting all Woodlark Road from flooding. Asked if this work would be completed before further activity took place on site to ensure the existing properties were protected.
- iv. Commented that the officer report was not accurate in stating, on page 49, that plots 71-73, adjacent to 1 Hoadly Road, follow the same pattern as those backing onto Woodlark Road. The proposal was for these plots to sit between 6 and 9 metres from the boundary of 1 Hoadly Road, whilst the plots behind Woodlark Road all were at least 18 metres from the property boundaries. This was considerably closer to 1 Hoadly Road than to the other impacted properties along Woodlark Road. This would have a huge impact on the privacy of all residents; it should be reconsidered to bring the distance in line with the Woodlark Road properties.
- v. The developers and their agents had publicly committed, twice, to ensure there would be a distance of 18m from the new dwellings and Grosvenor Court. This was not reflected in the plans with new dwelling on plot 134 being 15.5m from Grosvenor Court. The position of plot 134 should be reconsidered. Asked the Committee to consider removing permitted development rights for rear extensions to those dwellings on plots 131-134.
- vi. Reinforced the Environmental Quality & Growth team's comment on page 5 of the officer report that the noise impacts and hours of use should be considered for the Pavilion when it was taken on by new developers in the future. Highlighted that neighbouring residents on Huntingdon Road were concerned that the building had been allowed to fall into disrepair. Commented that residents might get some reassurance if this building could be maintained in the interim period before it is taken into new ownership.

SCDC Councillor de Lacey (Ward Councillor for Dry Drayton, Girton and Madingley) addressed the Committee about the application.

- i. Shared the concerns which had been raised by the objectors regarding the significant changes which had been made to this development particularly with non-compliance.
- ii. Primary concern was about sustainability.

- iii. Noted gas boilers were due to be installed and hoped the developers might look again at air source heat pumps.
- iv. Queried the 3 pin plug for EV charging referred to on p57 of the officer's report and whether informative 3 on p68 was sufficient to ensure the EV charging provision would provide what users wanted rather than the minimum type of EV charging provision the developer could install.

Members Questions

Principle of Development / housing delivery / amenity of future occupiers.

The Committee made the following comments in response to the officer's report.

- i. Asked how many dwellings fell below the national space standards, where the dwellings were located and sought to know why they fell below. Expressed concerns given more people were working from home following the Covid-19 pandemic.
- ii. Queried paragraph 133 of the officer's report which summarised Counsel's advice as to whether internal space standards could be taken into consideration by the Committee in determining the application. Asked for the date of the caselaw referred to.
- iii. Queried how many homes would be built to M42 / M43 accessibility standards and whether this requirement could be conditioned.
- iv. Noted the Amber units were 18sqm under national space standards, Opal units were 13sqm under, NS4 was 6sqm under. Looked to the external amenity space nothing the gardens for the Amber and Opal units were 4-5m, which were very small. Noted the 4-bed houses were not policy compliant for cycle parking. Felt the amenity space would be affected.
- v. Asked if the application could be deferred to look at the issue of space within the homes and asked for the date of the Counsel's advice.
- vi. Highlighted paragraph 137 of the officers' report which reported a 2-bedroom house with a floor space of 51.5 square metres which was 18.48 square metres (200 square feet) below space standards. A great deficit for a loss of space for a dwelling which could house up to four people. The matter of space standards needed to be addressed before the application progressed further.

- vii. Stated that both the Combined Authority and Homes England would not approve grants for homes which were below 85% of the National Space Standard. One of the units was below 75% of national space standards which was too low.
- viii. Stated that the space standards should not be referenced and that the individual house types which fell below the space standards should be reviewed and assessed as family homes and consideration should be given as to whether the buildings were fit for purpose. Asked how bicycles could access the garden.
- ix. Requested the case officer clarify the external space referenced in the officer report.
- x. Expressed concerns for the developer's reasons of why clustering exceeded the guidance in the Council's Supplementary Planning Document - further justification was needed.
- xi. Asked to see the plans which showed the NS4 units and for confirmation these plots had a 5sqm garden. Asked where the storage space was within the units.
- xii. Referred to p41 and paragraph 151 of the officer's report which talked about play spaces. Focussed on the T-park and the pocket park and questioned how the T-park could contribute to open space and also be a local area of play as it appeared to be a semi pedestrianised street with extra planting and elsewhere in the report it referred to this area as being a through route for cyclists.
- xiii. The NS4 3 storey units had a fire door break at the bottom of the stairs which did not meet building regulations. On the 2-bed house there was no fire break door between ground floor and first floor. Noted officer comments that the 2 bed units provided an opportunity for people to afford a house rather than a flat but noted that the floor space for the 2 bed unit was equivalent to the space standards for a flat which were only 1 storey.
- xiv. The pocket park was very small and just a patch of flower beds to stop through traffic. The only open space for play appeared to be the pavilion green. It was a high density development which did not have sufficient intermediate open spaces. The school playing fields would be enclosed; more usable open space was required.
- xv. Thought there was provision for a lift in some of the units and asked when Counsel's advice had been provided.
- xvi. Noted that the outline permission gave permission for 1593 dwellings and asked whether the reserved matters application could be refused if

Members felt the site was not suitable to build 328 houses as per the reserved matters application.

In response to Members' questions the Principal Planner, the Assistant Director and the Legal Officer said the following:

- i. A breakdown of the houses which did not meet space standards was included in the officer's report at paragraph 135. The locations of the Amber, Opal, NS4 and SH39 house types discussed in the report were shown to Members on the proposed site plan. Officers had encouraged the applicant to meet the space standards. The units had been designed in response to the particular locations.
- ii. The issue with internal space standards arose because the outline permission was granted under the 2006 Local Plan. The reserved matters application is limited to those matters which could be considered under a reserved matters application namely appearance, scale, layout and landscaping. Counsel's advice stated that space standards did not fall within the definition of 'reserved matters' and as the outline application did not require compliance with space standards or future space standards as a condition, national space standards could not be applied. However the residential amenity of future occupiers still remains a material consideration and floor space standards could be used as a guide to determine whether what was proposed was acceptable in conjunction with external amenity space and public open space.
- iii. Policies requiring M42 / M43 standards in the City Council's current Local Plan 2018 do not apply to the outline permission or the reserved matters. The outline permission secured lifetime homes.
- iv. Referred to paragraph 138 of the officer's report which stated that smaller Amber and Opal homes might be an alternative housing model which may be a more affordable home and of comparable floorspace to a flat but with a private external amenity space.
- v. It would not be appropriate to defer the application to look at the issue of space within the homes as this would have a significant impact on the site layout; a new application would be required. Counsel's advice was obtained in 2019.
- vi. Counsel's advice had been summarised in the officer report, which was standard procedure as the advice had been provided on a confidential basis and included reference to other sites.

- vii. The Amber homes referred to in paragraphs 136-137 of the officer's report, was the house type referred to as being 18sqm under the space standards and was located around the pedestrianised T-park. Bicycle access would be from the parking areas through a gate into the back gardens.
- viii. The Opal homes will be 13sqm under the space standards; external space made a different contribution to residential amenity than internal space and couldn't fully compensate for a lack of internal space and needed to be weighed in the overall balance of residential amenity.
- ix. The affordable housing mix had been agreed with the affordable housing officer. Higher density areas in the middle of the site and the lower density areas towards the periphery determined a certain arrangement of house types. The development had evolved from the illustrative masterplan in the design code. The applicant had sought to create pedestrian friendly environments and this was where mews streets had emerged. The applicant had tried to mitigate clusters by mixing the tenure of the affordable housing within the clusters. More information on the management of the areas had been requested from the applicant. Reference was made to the applicant's affordable housing statement in paragraph 127 of officer's report.
- x. The gardens of the NS4 units were amended during the application process. Bin stores were brought into the front garden area where possible. Confirmed which of the NS4 units had a 5sqm garden area. Stated that the red dotted lines shown on the plans showed the lifetime home requirements.
- xi. Legal advice confirmed that a condition would have been required in the outline planning permission for space standards to be enforced. The quality of the development in terms of accommodation and garden sizes and the future occupier amenity could be considered by Members.
- xii. Open space needed to be considered by looking across the site. There was a large park in close proximity to this particular parcel (BDW2). The pavilion green and allotments were key pieces of open space to be delivered as part of this parcel. The T-park and mews areas provided additional informal space. Confirmed that the T-park was a multi-functional space. There were small areas of open space at key road junctions.

- xiii. Counsel's advice regarding space standards topic was provided in 2019.
- xiv. Asked Members to exercise caution in considering the application based on a certain number of houses being built. They should focus on issues such as the quality of development, the levels of amenity offered by the development, the quality of the accommodation and garden spaces / external amenity.

Movement / access / response to character

The Committee made the following comments in response to the officer report:

- i. Asked how people would access the allotments and how many bike stores there were.
- ii. Queried the phasing of the development as originally the next stage of the phasing was meant to begin at Histon Road.
- iii. Queried whether the development was in accordance with the transport plan as the outline permission provided for public transport to go through the site.
- iv. Questioned the rationale / objective for including the orbital cycling route.
- v. Asked if the cycleways would be segregated.

In response to Members' questions the Principal Planner, the Assistant Director and the County Highway Engineer said the following:

- i. Allotments would be accessed by the vehicular access from Falmouth Avenue. There were 12 cycle parking spaces for the allotments.
- ii. In terms of phasing of the development, BDW2 was coming forward in advance of other parcels which were closer to Histon Road due to road works currently being undertaken by the Greater Cambridge Partnership. The primary route through the site was due to be delivered concurrently or before the delivery of this parcel. Delivery of bus stops was not expected until the 500th occupation.
- iii. The orbital cycling route was from Huntingdon Road to Histon Road, cycling access into BDW2 was a secondary connection.
- iv. Suspected the cycle route through Windsor Road might be used more heavily than Huntingdon Road. Internal infrastructure carriageways were now in place so there was a vehicular link between Huntingdon Road and Histon Road but it wasn't open to the public yet as was being used for construction traffic. Plans were in place for construction traffic to have

access differently as the site was developed. A Toucan crossing would be triggered by the development of this parcel.

- v. The primary cycling routes would be segregated (except at the market square where it was a shared use facility). The secondary cycling routes would not be segregated.

Environmental issues (sustainability and drainage)

The Committee made the following comments in response to the officer report:

- i. Queried EV charging provision. Noted that 3 pin plugs referred to on p57 of the officer's report were insufficient to charge an electric vehicle but also noted reference on p68 of the officer's report to 7kw charge points which were suitable.
- ii. Queried how future proof the houses were in terms of air source heat pumps rather than gas boilers.
- iii. Asked why the development was working towards Code Level 4 for sustainability.
- iv. Asked if the ditch drainage works could be conditioned to start on site before the rest of the works. Also asked if there was running water for hand washing and toilets available at the allotments.
- v. Asked which local plan should be referred to: the current local plan (2018) or the local plan (2006) in place at the time that the outline permission was granted.
- vi. Asked if there were any conditions relating to insulation standards.
- vii. Asked who the community could turn to if the maintenance work (ditch drainage) was not done when it should be.
- viii. Queried broadband provision.
- ix. Queried arrangements for the maintenance of the open spaces.

In response to Members' questions the Principal Planner, the Assistant Director said the following:

- i. With a reserved matters application a local planning authority is limited to aspects which could only be considered through a reserved matters application for example: access, layout, scale and landscaping, current local plan policies could be applied to those aspects. The more technical aspects such as EV charging do not relate to 'reserved matters' and therefore new local plan policies could not be applied unless there were specific conditions on the outline permission which required compliance

- of those details. The applicant had committed to providing a 3 pin charging point for each of the dwellings in the communal parking areas. It would not be reasonable to require a 3 pin or 7kw charging point by condition therefore an informative was proposed. The infrastructure for EV charging points could be included within the informative.
- ii. The sustainability standard of Code Level 4 was secured on the outline permission, referred to para 239 of the officer's report. The Sustainability Officer was assessing the application on this basis and was confident that the applicant was on track to deliver this.
 - iii. Concerns regarding the maintenance of the ditch to rear of Woodlark Road related to concerns the applicant was not maintaining this ditch as they should be. The condition sought a maintenance agreement and had to be complied with before the commencement of works. The Lead Local Flood Authority also had other statutory powers it could rely upon requiring the maintenance of the ditch.
 - iv. The City Council would be adopting the allotments and there were still details which needed to be worked through.
 - v. There was no specific condition relating to insulation but this may fall under the Code Level 4 requirements.
 - vi. Enforcement of the ditch maintenance could be by the Lead Local Flood Authority or alternatively by enforcement of the relevant planning condition. The condition could be looked at to see if it could be strengthened.
 - vii. Future proofing of the development could be included within a relevant informative.
 - viii. Broadband was covered by paragraph 255 of the officer's report and condition 15 of the outline permission and the condition had been fully discharged.
 - ix. Some of the open space would be adopted by the City Council and some would be maintained by a private management company and in the case of the latter residents would have to pay a private management charge. The adoption plan was still to be agreed.

Residential amenity on neighbours

The Committee made the following comments in response to the officer report:

- i. Asked the officer to take Members through the discrepancies in distances which had been raised by objectors.
- ii. Asked what weight should be given to the Design Code.

- iii. Queried heights of buildings proposed to be built behind 1 Hoadly Road.
- iv. Queried separation distances behind Grosvenor Court and that originally in the outline permission which was 18m and now proposed to be 15.5m.
- v. Queried if properties proposed behind and to the north-west of 1 Hoadly Road would have windows at the first floor and expressed concerns regarding the residential amenity of future occupiers.
- vi. The outline permission provided that 15 % of the houses were meant to be accessible but the reserved matters application only provided for 5% of homes to be accessible under M43.
- vii. Asked how many houses would have permitted development rights (PDRs) removed and also asked that any houses which were undersized according to the City's Local Plan should have their PDRs removed. Queried if the number of occupants in a house could be controlled.
- viii. Asked that where there was on-site private parking, that PDRs were removed to prevent infill development as this would push cars on to the roads.
- ix. Asked for the roof terraces to have PDRs removed.
- x. Queried the number of houses which could be built under the outline permission.

In response to Members' questions the Principal Planner and the Assistant Director said the following:

- i. Comments had been made regarding compliance with the Design Code in the lower density areas on the edge of the development. The Design Code included a section referred to by objectors which indicated gardens should be of a comparable length to the Woodlark Road properties. The Design Code stated that this should be 'where possible'.
- ii. The Design Code was a discharge of condition and a material consideration. There were mandatory and non-mandatory parts of the Design Code. The length of gardens did not appear to fall within the mandatory element of the Design Code.
- iii. There was about a 10m gap between the proposed new properties and the Woodlark Road properties. The 10m was comprised of the width and length of the ditch and the width and length of the Woodlark Road gardens. There were some exceptions and the officer referred to page 47, paragraph 215 of the officer's report in relation to Hoadly Road. The impact on residential amenity and character should be taken into consideration.

- iv. Confirmed the properties to the north-west of 1 Hoadly Road would be 2 storeys and not 2.5 storeys.
- v. The officer had assessed the impact of the closer distance from plot 134 to Grosvenor Court in the report.
- vi. The dwellings proposed to the north-west of 1 Hoadly Road would have windows on the side elevation but not on the rear elevation looking towards 1 Hoadly Road. A condition had been proposed to remove PDRs from these properties to remove any overlooking.
- vii. The access officer was referring to the current local plan in terms of 5% of the houses complying with M43 standards. The condition on the outline permission was referring to Lifetime homes and 15% of the houses would need to meet this standard.
- viii. The removal of PDRs was controlled under recommended condition 10 and applied to plots 71, 72 and 73 (plots to rear of 1 Hoadly Road) and 131, 132, 133 and 134 (plots to rear of Grosvenor Court). Planning reasons would need to be given for PDRs to be removed from other units and assessment of the impact on surrounding properties would need to be undertaken before such a condition could be imposed. Members would have to provide parameters for officers to undertake a review of each unit. Planning powers could not be used to control the number of occupants in a house.
- ix. Agreed that units which had on-plot parking spaces could have PDRs removed.
- x. Opal units which had a roof terrace could have PDRs removed because of residential amenity concerns.
- xi. The outline permission granted permission for a maximum of 1593 homes. The phasing plan approved under the outline permission divided the site up into parcels of land for development. There had been changes to the phasing. The application was within the limit set out within the outline permission. There could be some changes between the number of houses in each parcel.

Members took a minded to agree vote to include an additional condition regarding the removal of PDRs concerning for extensions from Amber, Opal and NS4 dwellings which would only attach to the reserved matters permission if the officer's recommendation was agreed. Inclusion of the condition was carried by 7 votes to 4.

Members took a minded to agree vote to include an additional condition regarding the removal of PDRs for those dwellings which had an on-site parking space which would only attach to the reserved matters permission if the officer's recommendation was agreed. Inclusion of the condition was carried by 9 votes to 2.

The Committee:

Resolved (by 7 votes to 4) to approve the non-material amendment application reference 07/0003/NMA1 detailed in paragraph 275 of the officer's report.

Members took a 'minded to agree' vote on the officer's recommendation (paragraph 274 of the officer's report) to approve the reserved matters application reference 19/1056/REM. Members indicated unanimously that they were minded to reject the officer's recommendation.

Members provided officers with a list of 'minded to refuse' reasons to refuse the reserved matters application reference 19/1056/REM. There was a short adjournment whilst officers drafted the reasons for refusal. On return from adjournment Members then voted on each of the draft reasons as follows:

Members unanimously supported the following text as a reason why they were minded to refuse the application.

1. The proposed development would fail to provide an acceptable level of residential amenity for the future occupants. This is by virtue of the small internal floor space of the Amber, Opal and NS4 house types which would provide a poor quality internal living accommodation, failing to provide convenient accessible housing for the future occupants and the inadequate external amenity spaces for these and other dwellings. Also by virtue of the inconvenient and inaccessible provision of public open space. As such the proposal would fail to comply with Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policies 56 and 57, and the National Planning Policy Framework 2019.

Members unanimously supported the following text as a reason why they were minded to refuse the application.

2. The proposal would fail to provide acceptable supporting infrastructure for the future occupants in terms of the provision high quality and accessible public open space, play areas and inadequate cycle parking provision. As such the proposal is contrary to Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policies 55, 56, 57 and 59, and the National Planning Policy Framework 2019.

Members supported the following text by 10 votes to 1 as a reason why they were minded to refuse the application.

3. The proposal would have an unacceptable impact on the residential amenity of neighbouring properties. This is by virtue of the proximity of the proposed dwellings to the site boundary with properties at Grosvenor Court and Hoadly Road. The proposed dwellings would have an unacceptable overbearing and overlooking impact on the properties at Grosvenor Court and Hoadly Road. As such the proposal fails to comply with Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policies 55, 56 and 57, and the National Planning Policy Framework 2019.

Members unanimously supported the following text as a reason why they were minded to refuse the application.

4. The proposed development would fail to provide sustainable and cohesive communities. This is by virtue of the clustering of affordable homes in groups of between 18-42 dwellings contrary to the guidance within the Cambridge City Council Affordable Housing Supplementary Planning Document 2008. As such the proposal would fail to comply with Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policies 45 and 56.

The Committee resolved unanimously to reject the Officer recommendation to approve the application.

Resolved (unanimously) to

- A. (i) refuse the application reference **19/1056/REM** for the following reasons and
(ii) with delegated authority to officers (in consultation with the Chair and Vice-Chair) to make any minor text changes to the wording of the reasons:

1. The proposed development would fail to provide an acceptable level of residential amenity for the future occupants. This is by virtue of the small internal floor space of the Amber, Opal and NS4 house types which would provide a poor quality internal living accommodation, failing to provide convenient accessible housing for the future occupants and the inadequate external amenity spaces for these and other dwellings. Also by virtue of the inconvenient and inaccessible provision of public open space. As such the proposal would fail to comply with Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policies 56 and 57, and the National Planning Policy Framework 2019.
 2. The proposal would fail to provide acceptable supporting infrastructure for the future occupants in terms of the provision high quality and accessible public open space, play areas and inadequate cycle parking provision. As such the proposal is contrary to Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policies 55, 56, 57 and 59, and the National Planning Policy Framework 2019.
 3. The proposal would have an unacceptable impact on the residential amenity of neighbouring properties. This is by virtue of the proximity of the proposed dwellings to the site boundary with properties at Grosvenor Court and Hoadly Road. The proposed dwellings would have an unacceptable overbearing and overlooking impact on the properties at Grosvenor Court and Hoadly Road. As such the proposal fails to comply with Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policies 55, 56 and 57, and the National Planning Policy Framework 2019.
 4. The proposed development would fail to provide sustainable and cohesive communities. This is by virtue of the clustering of affordable homes in groups of between 18-42 dwellings contrary to the guidance within the Cambridge City Council Affordable Housing Supplementary Planning Document 2008. As such the proposal would fail to comply with Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policies 45 and 56.
- B. delegated authority to officers to determine by way of approval or refusal (as appropriate and in the light of part A of this resolution) for discharge

of condition applications for those conditions set out in the table within paragraph 276 of the officer's report.

20/22/JDCC NIAB site

The Committee ran out of time to consider the pre-application developer briefing and it was anticipated that the briefing would be deferred until the January 2021 meeting.

The meeting ended at 4.48 pm

CHAIR

This page is intentionally left blank



Report to: Joint Development Control Committee 17 February 2021

Lead Officer: Joint Director of Planning and Economic Development

Milton Parish

(Land at Plots 1-21 at Cambridge Science Park, Cambridge)

Subject: Deed of Variation relating to Section 106 Agreement dated 17th August 2018 between South Cambridgeshire District Council, Cambridge City Council, Cambridgeshire County Council, The Master Fellows and Scholars of Trinity College Cambridge (First Owner) and Mace Developments (Cambridge) Limited as supplemented by the supplemental agreement entered into under sections 106 and 106A of the 1990 Act on 26 February 2020 between the Councils and the First Owner for Land at Plots 1-21 at Cambridge Science Park (planning permissions reference numbers: S/2436/17/FL with the District Council, reference number 17/1193/FUL with the City Council and/or under reference number S/1997/19/VC with the District Council and 19/0787/S73 with the City Council).

Address: Land at Plots 1-21 at Cambridge Science Park, Cambridge.

Applicant: The Master Fellows and Scholars of Trinity College Cambridge

Approved Scheme: Demolition of existing buildings and erection of two four storey buildings for B1 use and a multi-storey car park, including access and landscaping

Decision due by: N/A

Application brought to Committee because: There is no delegation for officers to deal with amendments to Section 106 Agreements.

Presenting Officer: Fiona Bradley, Interim Team Leader

Executive Summary

1. The development site is affected by a Section 106 Agreement. Under this agreement, the Applicant is obliged “Not to Occupy the Development until the Milton Road Works have been constructed and completed in accordance with a Highways Agreement and to the written satisfaction of the County Council”.
2. The reason for seeking the Deed of Variation is due to the length of time it has taken to agree the detailed specification for the works by way of a Section 278 agreement under the Highways Act 1990 and when the agreed road works can take place. The delay was beyond the control of the applicant.
3. The County Council, also party to the S106 agreement, has agreed to the proposed variation.
4. Overall, it is considered the proposed changes are acceptable and allow the S278 agreement to be approved prior to occupation of the development and works to take place subsequently.

Relevant Planning History

5.

Planning Reference	Description	Outcome
SCDC ref: S/2436/17/FL and Cambridge City: 17/1193/FUL (duplicate applications submitted to each authority)	Demolition of existing buildings and erection of two four storey buildings for B1 use and a multi-storey car park, including access and landscaping.	24 th August 2018
Cambridge City Council application 19/0787/S73	Section 73 application to vary condition 2 (approved drawings) of permission 17/1193/FUL (Demolition of existing buildings and erection of two four storey buildings for B1 use and a multi-storey car park, including access and landscaping) to allow amendments to cycle parking and car deck footprint, removal of external stair, amendments to bin	3 rd March 2020

	stores, relocation of phase 1 access road and additional landscaping.	
S/1997/19/VC	The application seeks to vary condition 2 (Approved Plans), Condition 3 (Materials), Condition 4 (External Surfaces), 6 (BREEAM), Condition 8 (Public Art) pursuant to planning permission S/2436/17/FL for the demolition of the existing buildings and erection of two four storey buildings for B1 use and multi-storey car park, including access and landscaping.	4 th March 2020

Planning Policies

National Guidance

6. National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2019
National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG)

South Cambridgeshire Local Plan (SCLP) 2018

7. S/2 Objectives of the Local Plan
S/3 Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development
S/5 Provision of Jobs and Homes
S/6 The Development Strategy to 2031
SS/4 Cambridge Northern Fringe East and land surrounding the proposed Cambridge Science Park Station
TI/2 Planning for Sustainable Travel
TI/8 Infrastructure and New Development

Cambridge City Local Plan (2018)

8. Policy 15: Cambridge Northern Fringe East and new railway Station Area of Major Change
Policy 80: Supporting sustainable access to development
Policy 81: Mitigating the transport impact of development

Greater Cambridge Supplementary Planning Documents (SPD)

9. Draft North East Cambridge Area Action Plan (NEC AAP), Regulation 18 Consultation, (July 2020)

Publicity

10. Advertisement N/A
 Adjoining Owners: N/A
 Site Notice Displayed: N/A

Consultation

11. County Council Local Highway Authority:

Agrees with the proposed changes to the S106 agreement.

Background

12. The site comprises approximately 2.5 hectares of land located to the south eastern edge of the Science Park, to the north of the guided Busway and to the west of Milton Road. The site straddles the South Cambridgeshire District Council and Cambridge City Council boundary and as such joint applications have previously been submitted for the development of the site.
13. Planning permissions were granted by both authorities for the demolition of existing buildings and erection of two four storey buildings for B1 use and a multi-storey car park, including access and landscaping. The applications were subject to a Section 106 agreement which secured a car parking reduction strategy, Milton road works, Travel Plan Plus Contribution, Travel Plan and conditions. Subsequent Section 73 applications were also granted by both authorities to vary conditions attached to the original applications. A Supplemental S106 Agreement was agreed when the Section 73 applications were considered.
14. The development is well underway and is due for completion shortly.
15. Section 106A of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 provides for the modification of planning obligations through a deed of variation. The proposed Deed of Variation satisfies the requirements set out in S106A of the Act.

The Proposal

16. A request has been made by letter dated 13th October 2020 to amend the Section 106 Agreement with regard to the timing of the obligation for the Milton Road Works. The Deed of Variation seeks to change the timing of delivery of the works of the junction works at the entrance to the Science Park. The applicant has requested that the S278 works are agreed with the County Council prior to occupation, rather than the current wording which requires the S278 works are

agreed and constructed prior to occupation. This is due to issues that are outside the control of the applicant that have delayed the construction of the works.

17. The amendments are as follows:

Clause	Title	Amendments
1.1	Interpretation	In clause 1.1 at the end of the definition of "Milton Road Works" insert the following: "or such other improvement works as may be agreed in writing between the First Owner and the County Council"
Schedule 1, paragraph 2.1	Milton Road Works	Delete paragraph 2.1 and replace with the following paragraph: "2.1 Unless otherwise agreed in writing between the First Owner and the Councils not to Occupy the Development until a Highways Agreement has been completed in connection with the carrying out of works in the highway in order to implement the Milton Road Works."
Schedule 1, paragraph 2.2	Milton Road Works	Delete paragraph 2.2

Consideration

18. The Schedule 1, Part 2 obligation is not to occupy the development until the 'Milton Road Works', as defined in the S106, have been completed. The reason for seeking the DoV is due to the length of time it has taken to agree the detailed specification for the works with the County and when the agreed road works can take place.

23. The applicant submitted the S278 application, pursuant to the S106 road works drawing, in October 2019 to advance the request for formal approval to the Milton Road Works. Communication between the County Council and the applicant have been ongoing with amendments to the scheme requested and submitted. The County Council has advised that they support the proposed variation and state that the delay in agreeing the S278 agreement and therefore undertaking any agreed works fall outside the control of the applicant.

25. Overall, it is considered the proposed changes are acceptable and allow the S278 agreement to be approved prior to occupation of the development and works to take place subsequently. The S278 agreement adequately secures the implementation of the agreed works.

Recommendation

26. Approve the Deed of Variation as below:

In clause 1.1 at the end of the definition of "Milton Road Works" insert the following:

"or such other improvement works as may be agreed in writing between the First Owner and the County Council"

Delete paragraph 2.1 of Schedule 1 and replace with the following paragraph:

"2.1 Unless otherwise agreed in writing between the First Owner and the Councils not to Occupy the Development until a Highways Agreement has been completed in connection with the carrying out of works in the highway in order to implement the Milton Road Works."

Delete paragraph 2.2 of Schedule 1.

Report Author:

Name: Fiona Bradley, Interim Team Leader

Telephone: 07704 018 408



17.02.2021

Report to:

Joint Development Control
Committee

Joint Director of Planning and Economic Development

Lead Officer:

North East Cambridge Area – Interim Transport Approach

Executive Summary

1. This report asks the Committee to endorse the intended approach to the assessment and consideration of traffic and transport impacts associated with development being undertaken across the North East Cambridge (NEC) Area Action Plan (AAP) area.
2. The approach has been developed jointly by the Shared Planning Service and County Council Transport teams. It is informed by the emerging evidence base for the AAP, including the A10 Study, which establishes that Milton Road is already at capacity. For the proper planning of the area, it is not appropriate to continue the approach of providing additional highway capacity to accommodate growth. Rather, new development must ensure there is no net increase in vehicle numbers on the surrounding road network. This is to be achieved through application of a vehicle trip budget, where the existing peak trips generated within the area are calculated and apportioned to the individual development sites.
3. The approach requires new development proposals to demonstrate how they will comply with their vehicle trip budget allocation. This will be through enabling significant public transport investment alongside delivery of measures to enable a shift to sustainable modes of transport, alongside other measures to deter car use. The approach also covers a range of measures the councils will seek to

apply should the trip budget go “off trajectory” once new development has been delivered.

Background

4. South Cambridgeshire District Council (SCDC) and Cambridge City Council (CCC) are jointly preparing an Area Action Plan (AAP) for North East Cambridge (NEC), which will form part of the statutory development plan.
5. The area proposed to be covered by the AAP is shown below. It includes land to the east of Milton Road – the area bounded by the A14, the railway and extending south to the Nuffield Road industrial area - and the west of Milton Road, including Cambridge Science Park (CSP) and Cambridge Regional College (CRC).

NEC Spatial Framework



6. The area east of Milton Road is one of the last remaining significant brownfield sites in Greater Cambridge, extending to almost a square kilometre. It has long been an ambition of the local councils to take advantage of the opportunity this site affords to regenerate this part of the city and to support the continued economic success of the local economy.
7. Policy 15 of the Cambridge Local Plan, and Policy SS/4 of the South Cambs Local Plan, allocate the area for high quality mixed-use development, primarily for employment uses such as B1, B2 and B8, as well as a range of supporting

commercial, retail, leisure and residential uses (subject to acceptable environmental conditions).

8. The local plans do not specify the amount of development, site capacities, or timescales for development, deferring such matters to the preparation of the joint AAP. This is because the planning of the area is affected by uncertainty over the future of the Anglian Water Waste Water Treatment Plant (WWTP), which covers a significant part of the area and is a significant constraint on development of adjoining land.
9. Since the local plans were adopted the City Council has secured funding, through the Housing Infrastructure Fund (HIF), to assist with the relocation of the WWTP off site. The vacated WWTP site together with land around Cambridge North station, Cambridge Business Park, St John's Innovation Park, Cambridge Science Park and other land, will, in accordance with development plan policy, provide the opportunity for the creation of a new city district which can make a significant contribution to the future housing and employment needs of Greater Cambridge.
10. To recognise this opportunity, the councils have been preparing a joint AAP to guide the type, mix and location of development, ensuring this is coordinated, manages transport requirements, and delivers on a shared future vision of the place.
11. Following consultation on a preferred option draft of the AAP from a 27 July to 5 October 2020, the pre-submission document is being prepared for reporting to both authorities later in the year.
12. In the meantime, however, proposals are being promoted through planning applications by some landowners for expansion, intensification, and consolidation of some of the sites across the NEC area. Responses to the AAP consultation from communities, have already raised concerns about the transport implications arising from the AAP vision. These emerging proposals are in some cases, significant in scale and have the potential to impact upon the already challenging traffic conditions in the area. These proposals, if treated in a piecemeal way, will harm the delivery of the AAP vision and objectives. Policy 15 and SS/4 of the Cambridge City Council and SCDC Local Plans respectively, seek to ensure a coordinated approach to development of the area, and given the existing transport conditions and recent investigations as part of the A10, officers consider that it would be desirable to confirm an approach to such applications, in recognition of the ambition to not "sterilize" the AAP area from development, whilst satisfying Local Plan and community objectives to identify transport impacts, including the cumulative effects on transport and manage them effectively.
13. The councils wish to see early delivery at NEC but, the councils consider that the future development context of NEC must be plan-led and not determined through planning applications for individual sites ahead of the AAP. Officers accordingly are seeking the Committees endorsement of the approach being set out, which has been developed by County Highway and Planning Officers, with input from the development in an effort to offer re-assurance about the management of the

cumulative effects of development likely to come before the committee in the next couple of years.

Transport Issues

14. The NEC area is complex with a variety of developer interests, all with aspirations for developing their sites. The Ely-Cambridge Transport Study Preliminary Strategic Outline Business Case, which concluded in January 2018 specifically considered this area and made a number of recommendations which included:
- Providing a form and mix of development that enables access to many services and facilities by residents, workers, and visitors to be made locally or without the need to travel by car;
 - Provision of significantly lower levels of car parking than has been traditionally provided, particularly for employment;
 - A policy of demand and parking management for developments in the area;
 - A move away from the traditional approach of predicting the level of unrestrained trip generation and then providing highway capacity mitigation to accommodate the predicted level of trip making; and
 - A move towards a vehicular trip budget for the A10 Corridor and NEC area which will help to control the number of vehicular trips accessing the sites.
15. These recommendations have been investigated further through work to provide a specific transport evidence base to support the AAP (the North East Cambridge Area Action Plan Transport Evidence Base (September 2019)).

Transport Principles

16. The County Council and Shared Planning Services have established their position in a NEC Transport Position Statement. This was reviewed and revised in February 2021 and is attached at Appendix A. Its purpose is to ensure that development proposals within the above area, that come ahead of the NEC AAP submission, do not prejudice or frustrate the delivery of the strategic transport solution or wider development aspirations of the NEC AAP area.
17. Fundamentally the position highlights that the authorities will not consider future development proposals unless they (i) present proposals as part of a clear area-wide transport strategy, (ii) address cumulative impacts (transport, noise, air quality), and (iii) accord with the following key transport principles:
- A) Future growth will need to be delivered in a way that does not add additional car trips to the network. This will require developments to come forward with significant sustainable travel enhancements, demand management measures and adherence to a strict 'trip budget' for an area. If an area shows no signs of being able to meet its trip budget, then development within an area will halt until this is resolved.
 - B) Applications within the area must seek to reduce or at worst equal current peak hour vehicle trip generation and should include measures to further reduce this over time.

- C) Applications in the area must have a significantly reduced parking allocation / ratio for employment and housing. Guidance on parking ratios is provided within the Transport Evidence Base report.
- D) Developers for an area should submit a NEC or sub area-wide Transport Strategy that demonstrates how their individual application fits into the wider masterplan for the sub area or NEC area as a whole (including reductions in overall parking provision as necessary). This approach has been used successfully in Broad Concept Masterplan areas, which require a masterplan and Transport Assessment for the whole area before individual elements can come forward.
- E) Each proposal within the AAP area should consider the impacts of cumulative development and provide effective mitigation. Development within the NEC area is required to make financial contributions towards strategic infrastructure. The total strategic contribution from the AAP developers is forecast to be circa £110 million. The final amount, and its apportionment will be determined by the development quantum proposed.
- F) Proposed development must not lead to unacceptable air quality.
- G) Developments should indicate how they will engage with and support the promotion of walking and cycling to and from key nodes – and within the area
- H) Proposals will be expected to provide for future “area wide” travel planning initiatives as part of the AAP which would seek to ensure a coordinated approach to travel planning across the whole of the site, rather than rely solely on site specific travel plans.

Controlling Development Trips

18. The authorities have identified the importance of a vehicle ‘trip budget’ approach to the growth, essentially restricting the total number of peak trips from the development. This precedent has been secured through the Waterbeach New Town development.
19. To achieve this, new developments will be subject to a strict trip budget which will limit the number of external trips allowed to and from each site in the peak period. Development would not normally be supported if proposals exceed the trip budget, and exceedance of the trip budget would halt development.
20. The Transport Evidence Base indicates that, irrespective of the level of development, the highway network could only support cumulative AM peak hour vehicle movements of 3,900 two-way trips (3,000 PM) from sites in the AAP area. This essentially equates to a ‘no net increase’.
21. Through the pre-application and transport assessment scoping stages of the application a trip budget will be proportioned amongst the NEC area in

accordance with the total anticipated size of each area (current and future) in accordance with the total quantum of development identified within the AAP.

22. With this level of vehicle trips, only minor changes to Milton Road accesses would be required – with no other significant off-site highway mitigation. The bulk of the mitigation would be the measures that improve the attractiveness and connectivity of other sustainable modes of travel to achieve the trip budget.

Sustainable Travel Enhancements

23. The significant sustainable travel enhancements required are set out below. These measures have been identified through the NEC Transport evidence base, although further measures to meet the trip budget will also be considered. These measures will be expected to be included in, and enabled by, developer proposals. The only way to do this effectively is to take a holistic view of the development area.

Internal	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Sustainability focused master-planning / urban realm ○ Segregated high quality and safe crossing point(s) on Milton Road (could take the form of a green bridge connecting the NEC on both sides of the road, a tunnel under the roadway, and/or other grade separated solutions) ○ Safe crossing points on the busway ○ Access/egress controls to limit access from egress to the local Highway ○ Intra-site shuttle system ○ NEC parking strategy ○ Travel Plan Measures and Travel Monitoring (including e-bikes / e-scooters, incentive programmes, transport subsidies, smartphone apps / information messaging, car sharing, home working / hot-desking culture) ○ Potential changes to development mix / quantum to reduce trip budget impact and increase internalisation levels ○ Marketing support to attract residents to the area that are more likely to use alternative travel modes other than car
Local	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ New segregated public transport link from Milton Road P&R to site avoiding interaction with Milton Road and including shared pedestrian / cycling facilities ○ Additional P&R spaces at key locations, recognising that demand for these might reduce in the longer term should demand responsive feeder services be provided ○ Park and cycle opportunities at P&R locations ○ P&R shuttle system ○ Variable Message Signage (VMS) at key locations
Strategic	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Deliver a segregated mass transit link that also links to the Busway (HQPT and CAM) ○ Implement Milton GCP Corridor ○ Implement A10 Greenway and wider Greenway network

- Implement Chisholm Trail
- Rail frequency uplifts (NR – Ely Junction works required)
- Additional public transport services (including buses and rail but, in the medium term, taking advantage of the benefits that future forms of mobility and rapid transport will bring)
- Delivery of already planned cycle improvements including the Waterbeach Greenway and the Chisholm Trail
- Plugging gaps in the wider cycle network to enhance routes to key residential areas
- Alignment with any demand management measures that might emerge via the GCP's consideration of wider measures for Greater Cambridge.

24. To facilitate the ease of interchange between different transport modes, consideration will need to be given to provision of well-designed mobility hubs.

Car Parking Management

25. Restrictive car parking will be key. A comparative exercise shows that new development needs to (and can) achieve significantly different parking ratios to the approved Local Plan in order to enable proposals to fall within the trip budget methodology:

- 1 space per 84-128 sqm of employment floorspace (or even lower where possible)
- 0.5 spaces per dwelling (or even lower where possible, maximising opportunities for car-free dwellings)

26. For sites that already have substantial car parking provision, the approach is to require a phased reduction in parking spaces as sites are intensified and area-wide sustainable transport accessibility is achieved. To support the delivery of low parking levels, developers should also support the provision of car clubs, pool vehicles, and subsidised travel, including bike purchase schemes. Such provision will need to be set out in the area-wide and site-specific Travel Plans and the provisions therein secured by way of S106 Agreement.

27. To avoid displaced parking developers/authorities would need to monitor surrounding area (Chesterton East, West and South, and the King's Hedges areas to the south and Milton to the north), with measures to identify and eliminate informal parking (e.g. through contributions towards the consultation and implementation of Controlled Parking Zones).

28. Where people accessing NEC do not currently have the ability to do so using sustainable modes of travel, the strategy seeks to intercept these trips on route or at the boundary of the AAP area. This includes exploring the opportunities for increasing patronage of Park & Ride sites and enhanced facilities such as cycle parking and variable messaging on the A14 and A10 approaches. For deliveries, parcel hubs will enable last green mile services.

29. Finally, we expect the NEC road hierarchy and development layout within the existing and future development areas to enforce behavioural change, through exploring the development and use of car barns to service areas rather than on-plot or on-street parking or large areas of surface car parks. Likewise, no-through routes for non-essential vehicles and lower speed limits, priority for walking and cycling, and innovative use of landscape will also improve the quality of travel experience for non-car users and reduce the attractiveness of on plot car parking compared to more sustainable alternatives.

Physical Controls

30. If necessary, the authorities will consider methods of physically controlling site trips, including through signalling or highways works.

Developer Financial Obligations

31. It is recognised that the growth cannot be delivered unless the area achieves a behavioural transformation. As set out above, this will be impossible without significant investment in on and off-site transport infrastructure. Developer funding will be essential to enable this.

32. Current estimates assume a sustainable area-wide package requiring circa £110 million of developer funding, subject to further modelling and the final details of the package of measures.

33. All developers will be required to contribute towards this package. As with other sites along a corridor, a formula approach will be applied to ensure costs are apportioned equitably. The inputs to the formula will inevitably need to be refined as detailed transport evidence is provided, and further details are known about the package costs.

Further Engagement

34. The authorities have requested that those developers seeking to bring forward development in this area embrace the above approach and engage meaningfully in further refinement of the approach alongside preparation of the final draft of the AAP. All of the developers have provided a high-level indication of their growth aspiration/profile and the potential transport measures they see as being required to support the development and its phasing. This will allow all interested parties (including GCP and the Combined Authority) to fully understand and input to the specific and cumulative transport implications of the proposals and to share the collective responsibility for the early realisation of the vision for the area.

35. These measures will be the subject of further modelling and sensitivity testing to ensure the range of internal, local, and strategic measures are capable of achieving the residential vehicle mode share targets of 19%, and employment targets of 29%. The objective of the work is also to understand where pressures lie with the vehicle trip budget or parking budget, and to work through this with developers. This is also key to avoiding piecemeal proposals.

Recommendation

36. That the Committee endorse the intended approach to the assessment and mitigation of transport effects from developments taking place within the North East Cambridge Area Action Plan area, and in particular, the key development principles (A-H) at paragraph 16, and the revised Transport Position Statement at Appendix A, as a material considerations for all major development coming forward for determination ahead of the Area Action Plan.

Background Papers

[The Ely-Cambridge Transport Study Preliminary Strategic Outline Business Case \(January 2018\)](#)

[North East Cambridge Area Action Plan Transport Evidence Base \(September 2019\)](#)
[Draft North East Cambridge Area Action Plan 2020](#)

Appendices

Appendix A: Cambridge County Council revised NEC Transport Position Statement, February 2021

Report Author:

Matthew Paterson, Greater Cambridge Shared Planning Service
David Allatt, Transport Assessment Manager, Cambridgeshire County Council

APPENDIX A – Transport Position Statement

Transport Position Statement:

Approach to planning applications on the A10 northern corridor

DATE: February 2021

Purpose

To outline the approach to be taken by Cambridgeshire County Council (CCC) as the Highway Authority and the Greater Cambridge Shared Planning as the Local Planning Authority (LPA) in the consideration of planning applications on the A10 corridor between Stretham and Cambridge. (Whilst a shared planning service, the two authorities have their own planning responsibilities). This relates particularly to the North East Cambridge (NEC) area ahead of the adoption of an Area Action Plan (AAP). This area includes Cambridge Science Park and the area between Milton Road and the River Cam to the east.

CCC has established its position to ensure that development proposals within the above area, that come ahead of the NEC AAP submission, do not prejudice or frustrate the delivery of the strategic transport solution or wider development aspirations of the NEC AAP area. Fundamentally the position highlights that:

- The authorities will not consider future development proposals unless they (i) present proposals as part of a clear area-wide transport strategy, and (ii) accord with the key development principles set out at the end of this statement.
- Future developments will need to (i) adopt an innovative approach to sustainable transport, parking and demand management, and (ii) - will be subject to a clearly defined trip budget. These matters will be informed by the AAP transport evidence and are summarised below.
- Applications that do not satisfy the above requirements will not be supported by the LPA or Highways Authority.

Background

North East Cambridge is one of the last remaining major brownfield sites in Greater Cambridge and it has long been an ambition of the local councils to take advantage of the opportunity this site affords to regenerate this part of the city and to support the continued economic success of the local economy. The Government announced in March 2019 the allocation of £227M from the Housing Infrastructure Fund for the relocation of the Water Recycling Centre.

The NEC area continues to make an important contribution to the Cambridge cluster of research and high-tech. The A10 corridor is to the north of Cambridge and suffers from peak time congestion between Ely and Cambridge. Towards Cambridge the A10 is at capacity between the A14 interchange and the Kings Hedges Road junction. This can

have an impact on the surrounding network in both peaks and leads to congestion exiting the Science Park in the PM peak.

In terms of noise from the A14, an assessment that includes noise mitigation along the A14 stretching beyond the River Cam has concluded that daytime decibel levels of between 50-55dB are achieved and are acceptable for an edge of urban area in close proximity to the A14.

The on-going air quality modelling assessment indicates that traffic related air pollution is not a significant constraint to the development based on the current National Air Quality Objectives, however it is recommended that sensitive development / relevant receptors are not introduced to areas that are shown to (or are forecast to) exceed the NAQO's. Such receptors include residential dwellings, schools, hospitals and external amenity space. Average modelled concentrations range between 18-25µg/m³. With the highest levels recorded alongside the A14, Nuffield Road and Milton Road. Should the NQO of 20µg/m³ be introduced as the recently enacted Environment Bill, parts of the study area may be unsuitable for sensitive developments. The areas that are forecast to be impacted by this are as follows:

- Cambridge Science Park and area of Cambridge Regional College (in its' entirety)
- St John's Innovation Park (a portion of St John's Innovation Centre) and
- A strip of land in the southwest of the NEC area close to the Milton Road carriageway

Cambridge Guided Busway services are frequent but are overcrowded at peak times, and serve only the Northstowe to St Ives corridor. Since the opening of Cambridge North railway station in May 2017 the number of passengers using the new station has risen substantially, with half a million passengers using the station in the first year of opening. In 2018/19 this has increased to 813,000 entries and exits. The introduction of 8 carriage trains in 2020 will significantly increase rail capacity on the London to Kings Lynn corridor.

Barriers to easy pedestrian and cycle connectivity to this area include the mile distance between Cambridge North railway station and much of the Science Park, the severance impact of Milton Road, Cambridge Guided Busway, inward facing and fenced off business parks, the A14, the railway and River Cam. These will be only partly addressed through the completion of the Greater Cambridge Partnership (GCP) Milton Road corridor cycle and bus improvements, and the Chisholm Trail cycle route connection to central Cambridge, and the Waterbeach Greenway to Waterbeach.

Overall the 2011 census details that the mode share for the NEC is 71% by private car with half of employees having no viable public transport option, (90% of these people travel to the site by car). The Cambridge Science Park has made significant progress in reducing the car mode share since the 2011 census, however, the abundance of parking with few demand controls in place strengthens the link between parking and car use.

NEC Planning policy

The North East Cambridge area is mostly made up of land to the east of Milton Road and the Cambridge Science Park to the west. The planning policies for NEC are set out in both Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Local Plans (2018) as a high quality mixed use employment-led development with a range of supporting uses. The Local Plans state that appropriate proposals for employment development and redevelopment on

Cambridge Science Park will be supported, where they enable the continued development of the Cambridge Cluster of high technology research and development companies. Proposed development within NEC will also be required to reflect guidance set out in the Sustainable Design and Construction SPD 2020.

The boundary of the new NEC area, along with the amount of development, site capacity, viability, time scales and phasing of development will be established through the preparation of an Area Action Plan (AAP) for the area.

SCDC and Cambridge City Council have approved a Greater Cambridge Local Development Scheme (LDS) setting out a programme for the development of an Area Action Plan (AAP) that covers NEC. It is envisaged the preparation of the Proposed Submission AAP will be completed by summer/autumn 2021 but consultation would be delayed until the successful completion of the Development Consent Order (DCO) process into the relocation of the Anglian Water Waste Water Treatment Plant (WWTP), because of the need at Examination to be able to demonstrate that the development proposed on the site could be delivered. The Proposed Submission AAP is likely to be published in Autumn/Winter 2023, and then be Submitted for Examination in Spring 2024.

It is worth noting Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Mineral and Waste Local Plan contains a number of policies that concern parts of NEC. These include the safeguarding of two rail heads for the transportation of materials into the county. Both the rail heads and the HGV movements onto Milton Road to access the wider highway network, need to be accommodated as part of future development of the site. Development adjoining or near to the rail heads needs to be suitable so not to prejudice this land use. (Note, The Minerals and Waste Local Plan is currently being updated. The rail heads are proposed to be retained.)

Transport issues

The NEC area is complex with a variety of developer interests, all with aspirations for developing their sites. The Ely-Cambridge Transport Study Preliminary Strategic Outline Business Case, which concluded in January 2018 specifically considered this area and made a number of recommendations which included:

- Providing a form and mix of development that enables access to many services and facilities by residents, workers and visitors to be made locally or without the need to travel by car.
- Provision of significantly lower levels of car parking than has been traditionally provided, particularly for employment;
- A policy of demand and parking management for developments in the area;
- A move away from the traditional approach of predicting the level of unrestrained trip generation and then providing highway capacity mitigation to accommodate the predicted level of trip making; and
- A move towards a vehicular trip budget for the A10 Corridor and NEC area which will help to control the number of vehicular trips accessing the sites.

These recommendations have been investigated further through work to provide a specific transport evidence base to support the AAP. This report is titled North East

Cambridge Area Action Plan Transport Evidence Base (September 2019). This report examined several future growth scenarios which are summarised in the table below.

	Existing	HIF Scenario	Option1	Option 2	Option3	Option 4
Jobs	12,000	18,900	18,200	23,200	27,000	23,200
Dwellings	n/a	9,200	5,500	6,650	7,600	8,700

Trip Generation and Trip Budget

It is clear that the only way that the comprehensive and sustainable delivery of the AAP can be achieved is if sites **significantly reduce their vehicle trip generation, below current levels.**

To achieve this, developers will be subject to a strict trip budget which will limit the number of external trips allowed to and from each site. Development will not be permitted if proposals exceed the trip budget, and exceedance of the trip budget would halt development. **This trip budget accords with baseline movements to ensure that new development does not produce a net-vehicle increase.**

The vehicle trip budget for the NEC area, to ensure a no-net increase on the baseline is:

- **AM Peak: 3,900 two-way trips**
- **PM Peak: 3,000 two-way trips**

Of the AM budget the inbound employment based trips are 2,882 with most of these inbound and 1,018 residential with most of these outbound.

The trip budget will be proportioned amongst the NEC area in accordance with the total anticipated size of each area (current and future). Vehicle flows will require monitoring for each area against the trip budget.

With the exception of relatively minor highway works at Milton Road accesses the scenario above does not require major highway mitigation. To achieve the above there will need to be significant investment in enhancing the sustainable travel options.

Parking

As the transport evidence shows, this significant new urban quarter cannot be sustained with a ‘traditional’ approach to trip generation and parking. We have therefore adopted an innovative approach to accommodate the scale of development desired by the landowners. This will require a significantly restrictive and carefully managed approach to car parking.

The Evidence Base report indicates that, in order to comply with the trip budget, when fully built out the area should not provide total employment parking in excess of 4,185 spaces (or **4,800** spaces when accounting for the 85% utilisation rate).

The total parking budget will be proportioned amongst the NEC area in accordance with the total anticipated size of each area (current and future).

The Evidence Base report includes an overall parking standard for the area as a range, which is dependent upon the growth scenarios. **It is essential that (i) each of the existing areas significantly reduce their existing parking allocation / occupancy and (ii) areas of growth take a restrictive approach to car parking, in order to achieve the AAP growth objectives.**

Cumulative Development

Each area within the AAP should demonstrate how it will fulfil the wider ambition of the AAP masterplan in terms of movement and connectivity. This will need to be demonstrated through masterplans of each development area, to enable the wider masterplan for the AAP area.

The NEC AAP Transport Evidence Base report of September 2019 details a comprehensive list of internal, local, and strategic transport interventions. These are presented in Table 55 of this report and have been identified as they would help to support the delivery of the ambitious mixes of development under consideration for the area. Development within the NEC area is required to make financial contributions towards this infrastructure.

The total strategic contribution from the AAP developers is forecast to be £110 million. The final amount will be dependent upon the transport schemes and costs as they are progressed. The apportionment will be determined by the development quantum proposed.

Development Principles

The following development principles will guide future applications and ensure that the piecemeal development of the area does not prejudice the future development of neighbouring sites or frustrate the delivery of the development aspirations for the wider NEC AAP area.

- **1:** Highway capacity is 'maxed-out', so any future growth will need to be delivered in a way that does not add additional car trips to the network. This will require developments to come forward with significant sustainable travel enhancements, demand management measures and adherence to a strict 'trip budget' for an area. If an area shows no signs of being able to meet its trip budget then development within an area will halt until this is resolved.
- **2:** Applications within the area must seek to reduce or at worst equal current peak hour vehicle trip generation, and should include measures to further reduce this over time.
- **3:** Applications in the area must have a significantly reduced parking allocation / ratio for employment and housing. Guidance on parking ratios is provided within the Transport Evidence Base report.
- **4:** Developers for an area should submit a NEC or sub area-wide Transport Strategy that demonstrates how their individual application fits into the wider masterplan for the sub area or NEC area as a whole (including reductions in overall parking provision as necessary). This approach has been used successfully in Broad Concept Masterplan areas, which require a masterplan and

Transport Assessment for the whole area before individual elements can come forward.

- Each proposal within the AAP area should consider the impacts of **cumulative development** and provide effective mitigation. Development within the NEC area is required to make **financial contributions** towards strategic infrastructure.
 - The total strategic contribution from the AAP developers is forecast to be **£110 million**. The final amount, and its apportionment will be determined by the development quantum proposed.

- **5: Proposed development must not lead to unacceptable air quality**

Proposals that fail to comply with the above principles will not be supported by the LPA or Highway Authority.

The LPA and Highway Authority will not support proposals that fail to consider principles outlined in the Planning Policy Position Statement and Environmental Position Statement.

For more information please contact the following:

Transport	David Allatt	david.allatt@cambridgeshire.gov.uk
Noise Cambridge City	Greg Kearney	Greg.Kearney@cambridge.gov.uk
Noise SCDC	Nick Atkins	Nick.atkins@scambs.gov.uk
Air Quality Cambridge City	Adam Finch	Adam.Finch@cambridge.gov.uk
Air Quality SCDC	Soraya Hashemi	Soraya.hashemi@scambs.gov.uk

This page is intentionally left blank

Committee Dates – 2021/22

The proposed dates are:

2021/22	Committee Meeting	Development Forum	Control
June	23	As required	
July	21	As required	
August	18	As required	
September	15	As required	
October	20	As required	
November	17	As required	
December	15	As required	
January	26	As required	
February	16	As required	
March	16	As required	
April	6	As required	

Members are requested to contact the Committee Manager in advance of the meeting if they have any comments regarding the above dates.

This page is intentionally left blank