

JOINT DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE

23 June 2021

10.30 am - 1.48 pm – 1.48pm

Present: Councillors D. Baigent, Page-Croft, Porrer, S. Smith, Thornburrow, Gawthorpe Wood, Bradnam (Chair), Chamberlain, Daunton, Hawkins and J. Williams

Officers Present:

Joint Director of Planning: Stephen Kelly
Delivery Manager (Strategic): Chris Carter
Principal Planner: Charlotte Burton
Legal Adviser: Keith Barber
Committee Manager: Sarah Steed

Developer Representatives:

Head of Planning Barratt David Wilson Homes (Eastern Counties), Ray Houghton
Associate Carter Jonas, James Stone
Director, Programme Management & Programme Controls, Marshall - Graham Cunningham:
Director, Logika Consultants - Toby Gibbs:
Director, Vantage Planning - Rob Matthews:

FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE COUNCIL**21/27/JDCC Election of Chair and Vice-Chair**

The Joint Director of Planning took the Chair whilst the Joint Development Control Committee elected a Chair.

Councillor Thornburrow proposed, and Councillor Daunton seconded, the nomination of Councillor Bradnam as Chair.

Resolved (unanimously) that Councillor Bradnam be elected as Chair for the ensuing year.

Councillor Bradnam took over as Chair of the meeting and called for nominations for Vice-Chair of the Joint Development Control Committee.

Councillor Simon Smith proposed, and Councillor Bradnam seconded, the nomination of Councillor Smart as Vice Chair.

Resolved (unanimously) that Councillor Smart be elected as Vice Chair for the ensuing year.

21/28/JDCC Apologies

Apologies were received from SCDC Councillor Hunt, SCDC Councillor J. Williams attended as an alternate, SCDC Councillor Bygott and City Councillor Smart, City Councillor Gawthorpe Wood attended as alternate.

21/29/JDCC Declarations of Interest

Member	Item	Interest
Councillor Thornburrow	All	Personal: Member of CamDEAG
Councillor Baigent	All	Personal: Member of Cambridge Cycling Campaign

21/30/JDCC Minutes

The minutes of the meeting held on 17 March 2021 were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chair subject to the following amendments:

Minute reference 21/17/JDCC page 7 of the agenda pack, deleted text ~~struck through~~ and additional text was underlined:

The Joint Director for Planning and Economic Development said the following:
i. As part of the new Joint Local Plan parking on new developments was being looked at, for example discreet parking on the ~~parameter~~ perimeter of the site and the reduction of ~~on plot road space for~~ parking. Residents would therefore have to walk either to their car as ~~they would~~ or to the nearest to the bus stop. This would help ~~to~~ even up the modal share penalty by reducing the difference in convenience between public transport create a modal change and private car usage as the car would not be parked outside the property and there would be a walk to access the vehicle.

The minutes of the meeting held on 14 April 2021 were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

21/31/JDCC 20/05027/REM - AstraZeneca South Plot, Cambridge Biomedical Campus

The Committee received a reserved matters application pursuant to outline approval 06/0796/OUT (amended by Section 73 approval 17/2258/S73) for a South Office Building of 13,502 sqm; a Hive of 3,593 sqm; associated car, motorbike and cycle parking including a Travel Hub of 2,970 sqm; a temporary Multi Use Games Area; hard and soft landscaping; and internal roads, supporting facilities and ancillary infrastructure. Includes partial discharge of conditions 13, 16, 18, 23, 24, 25, 45, 47, 48, 49, 56, 57, 58 and 59 pursuant to Section 73 approval 17/2258/S73.

The Committee noted the amendments detailed in the Amendment Sheet.

In response to Members' questions the Principal Planning Officer and Joint Director of Planning said the following:

- i. The proposed scheme was compliant with outline consent parameter plans and the maximum building heights set out in those plans, which were assessed at the outline application stage.
- ii. Connections to public transport was highlighted in the officer presentation; reference was made to the connectivity with the Cambridge Guided Busway and also the initial plans for the Cambridge South East transport scheme.
- iii. The site was considered to be well connected for the proposed use.
- iv. Although Network Rail had submitted an application for a Transport and Works Order for the Cambridge South train station, those proposals carried no weight as the scheme had not been approved. It was noted that the applicant was working closely with Network Rail.
- v. The scheme provided high quality cycle parking provision.
- vi. The Sustainability Officer had been heavily involved with the application and discussions on overheating.
- vii. Accessible car parking spaces were provided in the Travel Hub and on the surface car park. Fifteen accessible parking spaces were provided in the west car park and sixteen on the north car park. The applicant had conducted a thorough accessibility review, which was included within the Design and Access Statement and are confident this would address accessible lifts within the Travel Hub. The applicant would manage the

- car parks through a parking app, which would form part of the Travel Plan and be monitored by the County Council.
- viii. Considered the provision of 20 cargo bike parking spaces was sufficient for the development but an informative could be added to explore other options for further cargo bike parking provision.
 - ix. The future use of the Travel Hub to provide more cycle parking and less car parking would be a matter for the applicant to keep under review.
 - x. The Drainage Engineer had been fully involved in the application and was satisfied the site would connect into the existing drainage system. Grey water was to be re-used.
 - xi. The Council could not require facilities to come forward on a site-wide basis, however where facilities are brought forward by individual occupiers such as AstraZeneca, then these could be supported through the outline consent. Council officers were working with the Cambridge University Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust in the early stages of a site-wide review of the Addenbrooke's campus as part of a longer-term masterplan, which should identify unaddressed needs across the campus.
 - xii. The Ecology Officer (in consultation with the Drainage Officer) has confirmed that the underground attenuation tanks would only receive water in certain sized storm events. Water within the tanks would drain down under gravity and would not stay in the tanks for longer than 48 hours. There would not be a scenario where water is held in the tanks for extended periods. The Ecology Officer has confirmed that 'the controlled discharge from the tanks should not pose a pollution risk to Hobson's Conduit'.
 - xiii. FalcoCam stands were ground level and a photograph of the stands was included in the officer presentation.
 - xiv. The mix of cycle parking was a balance between providing plenty of spaces and providing stands that would meet the needs of their users. AstraZeneca would be managing the cycle parking and would be able to change the stands if feedback was received that the proportion of two-tier stands was proving unsuitable. Cycle parking spaces would be bookable in advance so that users could choose a suitable space, including 20 wide-spaced Sheffield stand spaces.

- xv. CamCycle were consulted on the application but did not provide any response.
- xvi. The recommended condition 5 relating to gas boilers was a recommendation from the Environmental Health Team in the event that gas boilers were installed on the site. The development is served by the Energy Centre and renewable energy strategy.

Councillor Simon Smith proposed an amendment to the officer's recommendation that condition 5 should be removed as being un-necessary.

This amendment was carried unanimously.

The Committee:

Resolved (unanimously) to grant the application for planning permission in accordance with the Officer recommendation (as amended by the Amendment Sheet), for the reasons set out in the Officer's report, and subject to the conditions recommended by the Officer subject to the following:

- i. Additional informative to recommend reviewing the provision of cycle parking spaces for cargo bikes:

INFORMATIVE: Cargo bikes

The provision of cycle parking spaces suitable for cargo bikes should be kept under review by AstraZeneca to ensure that the number and location of such spaces meets the needs of users, in particular users of the creche hereby approved.

- ii. Delete recommended condition 5 (LOW NOx (Nitrous Oxides) Boilers) from the decision notice.

21/32/JDCC Darwin Green 1 BDW5 and BDW6 proposal (amended proposal)

The Committee received a presentation on Darwin Green 1 BDW5 and BDW6 (amended proposal).

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.

1. Asked for clarification regarding e-charging points.
2. Was pleased about the drainage proposals, queried whether there would be any limitation imposed regarding water consumption.
3. Asked if future occupiers would be advised about the future proofing of energy saving facilities which were to be installed.
4. Asked in relation to EV charging points whether, residents would be able to use these at their home or whether they would be located in parking courts.
5. Noted reference to hydrogen boilers, did not believe there was a 100% hydrogen boiler available but thought it would be a mix of hydrogen and gas boilers.
6. Pleased about the inclusion of informal open space areas but concerned there was not more. Asked about hedgehog holes in fences.

21/33/JDCC Cambridge Airport - relocation of radar

The Committee received a presentation from on the proposed relocation of radar at Cambridge Airport.

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.

1. Welcomed the consultative approach taken by the Airport.
2. Asked if there would be any negative impact on businesses near H16.
3. Asked if H16 could be removed immediately.
4. Asked what noise the radar equipment made.
5. Asked if the radar would be operational 24 hours a day.

6. Asked if the noise made by the radar would be constant.
7. Asked for clarification regarding the impact of shadow flicker.

21/34/JDCC JDCC Dates 2021/22

It was agreed that the Committee Manager would liaise with the Chair and Committee Members to look for alternative dates in July and September 2021 and February 2022.

The meeting ended at 1.48 pm

CHAIR