



## Joint Development Control Committee

**Date:** Wednesday, 17 March 2021

**Time:** 10.30 am

**Venue:** This a virtual meeting via Microsoft Teams

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

### Agenda

- 1 Apologies
- 2 Declarations of Interest
- 3 Minutes (PAGES 3 - 12)

### Miscellaneous Item

- 4 North East Cambridge Area - Interim Transport Approach (PAGES 13 - 28)

**All Committee members are welcome to attend the pre-application briefings**

- 5 Marleigh Phase 2
- 6 Eddington Lots S1/S2

**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](mailto:democratic.services@cambridge.gov.uk)
- Phone: 01223 457000

## 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 Tunnicliffe  
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

<b>FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE COUNCIL</b>
---

### **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 flume 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 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**

This page is intentionally left blank



17.03.2021

**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 notes the County Council Transport team's intended approach to the assessment and consideration of traffic and transport impacts associated with proposed development within the North East Cambridge (NEC) Area Action Plan (AAP) area.
2. The County's approach is informed by the emerging evidence base for the AAP, including the A10 Study, which establishes that Milton Road is already at capacity. The studies recommend the application of a vehicle trip budget in preference to providing additional highway capacity to accommodate new growth. The trip budget works by calculating the existing peak trips generated within the area and apportioning these to the individual sites.
3. In advocating this approach, the County will require new development proposals to demonstrate how they will comply with their vehicle trip budget allocation. The expectation is that developers will achieve their trip budget 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 may seek to apply should the trip budget go "off trajectory" once new development has been delivered.

4. The report is provided to update the Committee on the strategic approach that the highway authority has indicated that it will take to future proposals for development within the NEC AAP area. It is important to note that, although individual consultation responses from the Highways Authority will continue to represent a material consideration in the determination of applications, the position statement set out below has not been adopted by the Council in its capacity as local planning authority and the Committee should continue to address each application on a case by case basis in the usual way. In other words, it should continue to determine applications in accordance with the adopted development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

## Background

5. 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.
6. 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*



7. 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.
8. 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).
9. 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.
10. 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.
11. 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. The County Council Transport teams have been assisting the councils in the consideration of the potential transport impacts, including the commissioning of further transport evidence and conveying the findings and implications of this to interested parties.
12. Following consultation on a preferred option draft of the AAP from 27 July to 5 October 2020, the pre-submission document is being prepared for reporting to both authorities later in the year.
13. 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. Policies 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. Given the existing transport conditions and recent investigations as part of the A10, County Council Transport

teams consider it desirable to confirm their 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 cumulative effects, and manage them effectively.

## **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 Transport teams have set out 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 Highways Authority will not consider future development proposals to be acceptable unless they (i) present proposals as part of a clear area-wide transport strategy, (ii) address cumulative impacts, 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 transport evidence in support of the AAP has identified the importance of applying a vehicle ‘trip budget’ approach to enable growth, essentially restricting the total number of peak trips from the area and, therein the individual development sites. This precedent has been secured through the Waterbeach New Town development.
- 19. To achieve this, the transport evidence advocates new developments be subject to a strict trip budget which limits the number of external trips allowed to and from each site in the peak period. It is expected that 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 indicates that, irrespective of the level of development, the highway network serving NEC 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 current development proposals, the County Transport teams have advised that the trip budget will be proportioned amongst the sites within 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 Draft 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. The County Transport teams expect these measures to be included in, and enabled by, developer proposals for NEC. They view that the only way to do this effectively is to take a holistic view of the development area.

<b>Internal</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Sustainability focused master-planning / urban realm</li> <li>○ 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)</li> <li>○ Safe crossing points on the busway</li> <li>○ Access/egress controls to limit access from egress to the local Highway</li> <li>○ Intra-site shuttle system</li> <li>○ NEC parking strategy</li> <li>○ 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)</li> <li>○ Potential changes to development mix / quantum to reduce trip budget impact and increase internalisation levels</li> <li>○ Marketing support to attract residents to the area that are more likely to use alternative travel modes other than car</li> </ul>
<b>Local</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ New segregated public transport link from Milton Road P&amp;R to site avoiding interaction with Milton Road and including shared pedestrian / cycling facilities</li> <li>○ Additional P&amp;R spaces at key locations, recognising that demand for these might reduce in the longer term should demand responsive feeder services be provided</li> <li>○ Park and cycle opportunities at P&amp;R locations</li> <li>○ P&amp;R shuttle system</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Variable Message Signage (VMS) at key locations</li> </ul>
<b>Strategic</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Deliver a segregated mass transit link that also links to the Busway (HQPT and CAM)</li> <li>○ Implement Milton GCP Corridor</li> <li>○ Implement A10 Greenway and wider Greenway network</li> <li>○ Implement Chisholm Trail</li> <li>○ Rail frequency uplifts (NR – Ely Junction works required)</li> <li>○ 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)</li> <li>○ Delivery of already planned cycle improvements including the Waterbeach Greenway and the Chisholm Trail</li> <li>○ Plugging gaps in the wider cycle network to enhance routes to key residential areas</li> <li>○ Alignment with any demand management measures that might emerge via the GCP's consideration of wider measures for Greater Cambridge.</li> </ul>

24. To facilitate the ease of interchange between different transport modes, it is expected that consideration will also 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 to be submitted with development proposals 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 approach 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 should enable last green mile services.
29. Finally, the County expects the NEC road hierarchy and development layout within the existing and future development areas will 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 Highway Authority, in consultation with the councils, Highways England and other stakeholders, will consider methods of physically controlling site trips, including through signalling or highways works.

## **Developer Financial Obligations**

31. It is recognised that the growth within NEC 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. The County Council has indicated that it will expect all developers 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 County Transport teams have requested through the Landowners' Forum that those developers seeking to bring forward development in this area embrace the above approach. 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 by County Transport teams and developers 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 note the approach that the County Transport Team (as the Highways Authority) intends to take to the assessment and mitigation of transport effects from development proposals within the North East Cambridge Area Action Plan area until advised otherwise.

## **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: May 2020 (Revised February 2021)

### **Purpose**

To outline the approach to be taken by Cambridgeshire County Council (CCC), as the Highway Authority, in the consideration of planning applications on the A10 corridor between Stretham and Cambridge. 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:

- Future developments should (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 (iii) adopt an innovative approach to sustainable transport, parking and demand management, and (iv) - 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 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/m<sup>3</sup>. With the highest levels recorded alongside the A14, Nuffield Road and Milton Road. Should the NQO of 20µg/m<sup>3</sup> 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 our assessment of the transport implications future planning applications within the 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 Highway Authority.

For more information please contact the following:

Transport	David Allatt	<a href="mailto:david.allatt@cambridgeshire.gov.uk">david.allatt@cambridgeshire.gov.uk</a>
Noise Cambridge City	Greg Kearney	<a href="mailto:Greg.Kearney@cambridge.gov.uk">Greg.Kearney@cambridge.gov.uk</a>
Noise SCDC	Nick Atkins	<a href="mailto:Nick.atkins@scambs.gov.uk">Nick.atkins@scambs.gov.uk</a>
Air Quality Cambridge City	Adam Finch	<a href="mailto:Adam.Finch@cambridge.gov.uk">Adam.Finch@cambridge.gov.uk</a>
Air Quality SCDC	Soraya Hashemi	<a href="mailto:Soraya.hashemi@scambs.gov.uk">Soraya.hashemi@scambs.gov.uk</a>

This page is intentionally left blank