

JOINT DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE20 March 2024
10.00 am - 3.52 pm

Present: Councillors Bradnam (Chair), S. Smith (Vice-Chair), Baigent, Flaubert, Levien, Porrer, Smart, Thornburrow, Cahn, Garive, Hawkins, J.Williams and R.Williams

Councillor Flaubert left after the vote on minute item 24/12/JDCC, 21/02957/COND29A & 21/03035/COND29. Councillor Levien attended as the alternate.

Officers Present:

Strategic Sites Manager: Philippa Kelly
Planning Consultant for Strategic Sites Team: Yole Medeiros,
Principal Planner, Strategic Sites: Mairead O'Sullivan,
Legal Adviser: Keith Barber
Committee Manager: Claire Tunnicliffe
Meeting Producer: James Goddard

Developer Representatives:

Bellway Latimer LLP, David Fletcher
Network Rail, Elliot Stamp

FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE COUNCIL**24/8/JDCC Apologies**

Apologies were received from Councillors Fane and Stobart with Councillors Garvie and John Williams attended as alternates.

24/9/JDCC Declarations of Interest

Item	Councillor	Interest
All	Baigent	Personal: Cambridge cycling campaign
All	Garvey	Personal: Cambridge cycling campaign

24/10/JDCC Minutes

The minutes of the meetings held on 12 December 2023 were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

The minutes of the meetings held on 24 January 2024 were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chair subject to the following amendment for agenda item 24/4/JDCC 23/00835/FUL – Taylor Vinters Merlin Place, 460 Milton Road, Cambridge:

The correction of a typographical error at point i of the Officer's response to Members questions and comments:

- i. The location of the crossing place at Carling Cowley Road was indicative and would be agreed at the detailed design stage.

The minutes of the meetings held on 12 February 2024 were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

24/11/JDCC 23/03347/REM - Land North of Cherry Hinton, Coldham's Lane, Cambridge

The application sought reserved matters approval for the appearance, landscaping, layout, and scale of 136 residential units with associated car parking, cycle parking and landscaping. The application included details for approval required by conditions on the outline consent, seeking to part discharge those conditions in relation to this parcel only.

The Planning Consultant for Strategic Sites Team, highlighted the following changes that were not on the Amendment Sheet:

- i. Discharge of condition 20 in relation to this parcel only.
- ii. Condition 30 would not be discharged in relation to RM44.

The Planning Consultant for Strategic Sites Team then updated their report by referring to the amendments contained within the Amendment Sheet as follows:

6.1 Active Travel England – No objection

6.2 Following clarifications, Active Travel England have updated their response to one of 'no objection'.

6.52 Waste Team, Greater Cambridge Shared Waste – No objection, following clarification regarding bin collection points, collection for Block 2C and reversing of collection vehicles.

15.8 Active Travel England was advised of this background on the matter and have no objection regarding the application.

15.10 The context of the hedgerow within neighbouring property has been relayed to Active Travel England and on this basis, they have no objection to the proposal.

17.1 The outline planning permissions secured a requirement that all homes would need to meet (or exceed) Nationally Described Space Standards (2015). All homes within this phase would meet or exceed the NDSS, ~~except for one private unit within block 2M. This is a 3-storey terraced house which would accommodate 3 bedrooms and 5 persons, proposed with a total gross internal area (GIA) of 93 square metres.~~

17.2 ~~The standard minimum GIA for this type and size of dwelling would be 99 square metres, a difference of 6 square metres and 6% of the minimum NDSS requirement. Other units within this same block will significantly exceed the spatial standards. On balance, Officers are of the view that the development would provide an acceptable level of amenity for future occupants in accordance with Policy 50 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2018).~~

17.6 A total of 22 units (16% of the total dwellings) within Blocks 2E, 2G, 2H and 2M would have approximately 15 metres back-to-back distance and would therefore be below the recommended distance. Notwithstanding the proximity of the units, the layout of the parcels and Blocks have been carefully designed and windows have been arranged so that those serving rear habitable rooms do not face windows at habitable rooms directly on neighbouring units. This allows that good street design is promoted and is in line with the approved Design Code. All proposed three storey properties exceed the minimum distances.

18.8 ~~Whilst we have not had any formally comments from the~~ Following clarifications by the applicant team, the Councils Waste team have confirmed the refuse plan is, officers consider the proposals to be acceptable and therefore Condition 64 can be partially discharged in relation to RMA4.

24 Planning Balance Conclusion

24.3 ~~Whilst one dwelling would fall short of the minimum GIA and for blocks would not meet the minimum back-to-back distances required by the Design Code, Officers are of the view that the proposed scheme would provide a high-quality living environment for future occupants.~~

24.5 For the reasons set out in this report, ~~on balance~~ the proposals are supported by Officers and the recommendation is to approve the application subject to conditions.

Amendments To Conditions:

Inclusion of time limit condition:

“The commencement of development of this reserved matters area pursuant to the outline planning permission shall begin no later than the expiration of two years from the date of this reserved matters approval.

Reason: In accordance with the requirements of Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended by Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004) and to prevent accumulation of unimplemented planning permissions.”

David Fletcher of Bellway Latimer LLP (applicant) addressed the Committee in support of the application.

The Planning Consultant for Strategic Sites Team, and the Strategic Sites Manager said the following in response to Members’ questions:

- i. It had been agreed in principle that the City Council would be responsible for the management of the large principal areas of open spaces and drainage, site wide - even for those sites which fell within South Cambridgeshire District’s administrative boundary.
- ii. Adopted highways would be the responsibility of the County Council.
- iii. A management company would be responsible for the private drives and small areas of open spaces; the charge for the management company would be minimal.
- iv. There had been a site wide EV charging strategy which had been approved; the details of the infrastructure were missing from the application but in terms of location, all units would be served with charging points.
- v. The reason that application had been brought forward to Committee was that the application was for reserved matters for 100 or more residential units.
- vi. The Design Code required that for two storey dwellings there should be a minimum of 18 metres back-to-back distances between the windows of rear habitable rooms.
- vii. There would be segregated cycle and pedestrian routes on site.
- viii. There would be space for cycling parking in the garages and designated cycle parking for the flats with designated visitor cycle spaces.
- ix. NDSS (referred to the nationally described space standard) - all units met with the minimum gross internal floor area of new dwellings.
- x. The delivery of affordable housing would be 39.71% for this parcel.
- xi. Noted the request for an addition to the informative regarding letter boxes in as much that they should be accessible from the street. However, the Design Code stated that ‘all letter boxes should be located

- in an appropriate secure location to ensure they are accessible and useable by all users, the height of letter boxes should be above 0.7meters'. Therefore, the suggested addition was not required.
- xii. Recommend that any changes to windows as part of the application were covered under permitted development. For new openings, planning permission would need to be sought but if the changes related only to the frame and type of window this would not be necessary.
 - xiii. Confirmed that the Coach Houses replaced 5% of the provision of M4(2) compliant units.
 - xiv. There was nothing in the submission that could guarantee green roofs being retrofitted. Originally green roofs had been ruled out due to the proximity of the airport.
 - xv. Noted the suggestion it was possible for streetlights to have EV charging points in them but was not aware of the infrastructure of the EV points. However, was sure the developer would note the comment.
 - xvi. Had recommended under reserved matters, more detail on street lighting on privately owned highways was required.
 - xvii. Noted the request that street lighting on privately owned highways should be allocated a number, making them easily identifiable.
 - xviii. Noted the request for a declaration of who the management company were, who for and which areas.
 - xix. The height of the rear wall to the custom-built houses had been reduced to 1.5m including a 30cm 'hit and miss' brick work in line with requirements of the Designing out of Crime officer and had now been deemed acceptable.
 - xx. Condition 61 (Artificial Lighting Design Scheme) was not recommended for approval as there was not enough information for this to be fully discharged in relation to RMA 4 (second phase of residential development); a further condition regarding artificial lighting had been recommended.
 - xxi. There were no waste bins specified on the drawings but there were benches in the neighbourhood park and along the 'green finger'. The Public and Open Spaces Team and Landscape Officer had seen the street furniture specification and agreed this as acceptable.
 - xxii. Noted the comment that benches should be placed in the shade where possible.
 - xxiii. There were no specific delivery points for this application, but the comment would be noted when developing the wider area.
 - xxiv. Noted the comment that dark timber cladding attracted heat. With summers becoming hotter each year, alternative materials should be

- considered. The orientation of the finishes could also be considered such as those materials only used on north facing properties only.
- xxv. There was a specific condition regarding overheating which was recommended for discharge.
 - xxvi. A large amount of work had been undertaken between Officers, developers, and the Urban Design Team regarding the custom-built houses to understand what could be customised and how and where in the process; there was a condition on this subject matter.
 - xxvii. Blocks 2E, 2G, 2H and 2M had approximately 15 metres back-to-back distance, the blank walls in these properties would be as part of 'non-habitable rooms'. New windows would require planning permission to avoid any issue of overlooking but technically there was no reason why opaque windows could not be installed, when they were not serving habitable rooms.
 - xxviii. The detail for bus stops had been a requirement of the outline planning permission. The information had already been submitted for discharge. The Highways Authority would have been consulted regarding the detail of locations. The information would be circulated to the Committee.
 - xxix. There were ongoing discussions regarding the connectivity of the site covering a range of issues including the junction on Coldham's Lane, the Sainsbury's roundabout.

The Committee:

Resolved (11 votes to 1) to approve planning permission of reserved matters application reference 23/03347/REM, subject to:

- i. the conditions and informatives set in the Officer's report and the updated condition on the Amendment Sheet (condition 1); and
- ii. with authority delegated to Officers to carry through minor amendments to those conditions and informatives (and include others considered appropriate and necessary) prior to the issuing of the planning permission.

Resolved unanimously to approve planning permission for reserved matters application reference 23/03347/REM, viz:

- i. Approve / refuse partial discharge of the following outline planning conditions (including the two updates in the Officer's presentation) associated to reference 18/0481/OUT as varied by planning permission reference 22/01967/S73 in relation to the RMA4 reserved matters application according to the recommendations for each condition set out in the table below:

Condition Submitted	Recommendation
Condition 10 – Design Code Statement	Approve
Condition 11 – Housing Mix	Approve
Condition 12 - Internal Residential Space Standards	Approve
Condition 13 – Accessible and Adaptable Dwellings	Approve
Condition 14 – Wheelchair User Dwellings	Approve
Condition 17 – Sustainability Statement	Approve
Condition 18 – Sustainability - Water Efficiency	Approve
Condition 19 – Sustainability - Energy Statement	Approve
Condition 20 – Over Heating Analyse	Approve
Condition 24 – Drainage: Surface Water Strategy	Approve
Condition 26 – Drainage: Foul Water Drainage Details	Approve
Condition 29 – Biodiversity: Biodiversity Survey and Assessment	Approve
Condition 30 – Wildlife Hazard Management Plan	Approve Not approve
Condition 36 – Open Space Details	Approve
Condition 37 – Hard and Soft Landscape Details	Approve
Condition 38 – Tree Survey and Arboriculture Implications Assessment)	Approve
Condition 40 – Installation of Services: Details of Excavation Trenches	Approve
Condition 44 – Highways - Cycle Parking	Approve
Condition 45 – Highways - Car Parking	Approve
Condition 55 – Site Wide Electric Vehicle (EV) Charging Point Provision and Infrastructure Scheme Strategy Delivery	Approve
Condition 59 – Noise Impact Assessment - Residential and Noise Sensitive Issues	Approve
Condition 61 – Artificial Lighting Design Scheme	Not approve
Condition 64 – Waste - Waste Storage Details	Approve

24/12/JDCC 21/02957/COND29A & 21/03035/COND29 - West Anglia Main Line Land Adjacent to Cambridge Biomedical Campus

The application sought submission of details required by condition 29 (Hard and Soft Landscape) of the deemed planning consent associated with the Network Rail (Cambridge South Infrastructure Enhancements) Order 2022 (Local Planning Authority Reference 21/03035/TWA & 21/02957/TWA).

The Principal Planner updated their report by a verbal update to ensure that the recommendation referenced the deemed planning permission as this detail had been omitted from the report.

Elliot Stamp, Network Rail, (Applicant) addressed the Committee in support of the application.

The Principal Planner and the Strategic Sites Manager said the following in response to Members' questions and comments:

- i. The Landscape Officer had originally suggested a galvanised mesh could be used behind the Corten railing to prevent litter accumulating. However, the applicant explained the maintenance and litter picking standards were such that this would not be required which the Landscape Officer agreed.
- ii. The applicant had confirmed that they would not be providing a space for electric scooter parking as part of the development because space was at a premium. There was also concern that the batteries were flammable.
- iii. The curved access arrangement from the guided busway bridge to the eastern forecourt had been reviewed by the County Council's highway engineer who found the access arrangement to be acceptable. The gradient coming down off the busway conformed with Building Regulations and the Government's cycling design guidance LTN 120.
- iv. Members requested 'go slow' signage to be provided on the curved access to the station as part of the submission to discharge this condition.
- v. The ticket machines on both sides of the station were under the canopy which would provide shelter. There would be lighting in the area.
- vi. Green screen on the AstraZeneca side of the station would be covered by the five-year replacement requirement; if unsuccessful Officers should be able to request an alternative boundary treatment.
- vii. Was not aware of how steep the ground levels were in Hobson Park, but work had been undertaken to ensure that these was wheelchair accessible which the Landscape Officer had deemed acceptable.
- viii. The wayfinding strategy was very detailed particularly close to the station as that was where the applicant could put the signage. There were totems proposed which would have wider way finding information.
- ix. The applicant had a legal agreement with the Biomedical Campus which would ensure wayfinding through this part of the site. The applicant was also engaging with the County Council regarding signage in the wider area, the outside of the site edged red as shown in the plans.
- x. Was unsure what the term 'river units' referred to in terms of biodiversity but there was an element of Hobson Conduit which run through the site, that may be related.

- xi. Cycle parking would be covered by CCTV and there was good level of natural surveillance which was different to closed environment at Cambridge North Station. Cycle parking details were previously approved by JDCC in August 2023.
- xii. Noted the comments with regards to future tree conditions should not include the text replacement of planting except through an Act of God or vandalism. Many trees / plants had to be replaced due to vandalism or an Act of God.
- xiii. Noted the ongoing concerns regarding how the station would fit with the wider transport strategy for the Biomedical Campus. Would take away the request to arrange a briefing with all relevant external organisations on the emerging plans for the Biomedical campus to provide an overview of a master plan, including the strategic transport approach.
- xiv. In Hobson's Park there was no ban to stop cyclists using the pedestrian paths, the park was predominantly used by pedestrians.
- xv. Concerns had been raised by Trumpington Resident's' Association regarding cyclists using the Park to access the station. They had agreed with the applicant for several no cycling signs to be placed around the Park to discourage cyclists from using these routes. These would encourage cyclists to use the segregated path running from the guided busway alongside the Park to the station.

With the extension of the electric scooter scheme running in Cambridge (Voi Scooters), Members advised the applicant that as the site came within the Voi zone the matter of parking should be a priority, Mr Stamp said the following:

- i. The station would be handed over to Greater Anglia to manage and operate. They would have appropriate management strategies to deal with evolving technologies and changes to the station environment.
- ii. As part of these changes believed that the issue of scooter parking would be picked up directly with the scooter company and other external organisations.
- iii. Noted the comment that Voi had designated parking zones in and around the city without reference to the landowner and would engage with the necessary parties as soon as was possible.

The Committee:

Resolved unanimously to approve the discharge of condition 29 in respect of deemed planning permission reference 21/02957/TWA pursuant to application 21/02957/COND29A with delegated authority to Officers to carry through minor amendments.

Resolved unanimously to approve the discharge of condition 29 in respect of deemed planning permission reference 21/03035/TWA pursuant to application 21/03035/COND29 with delegated authority to officers to carry through minor amendments.

24/13/JDCC 210 - 240 Cambridge Science Park

The Committee received a briefing/presentation from developer representatives.

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. What provision had been made for the open spaces to be accessible in the winter and how would the space be useable all throughout the year?
- ii. How much shading would there be to the green outdoor space which ran through the centre of the site particularly in the winter months?
- iii. Would the changing places toilet be publicly accessible?
- iv. What segregation, traffic calming measures, would be added to the main street for pedestrians and cyclists. It needed to made clear the car was not the owner of that space but a shared space.
- v. Asked what why the number of vehicles had not been reduced on such a highly sustainable site, as was near to a park and ride site and bus route in and out of the city.
- vi. How many cargo bikes spaces were on site?
- vii. Had provision been made for delivery drop off points on site; people would arrange for packages to be delivered to their work.
- viii. Requested further information regarding the glazing, this could add to the heat of the building. Was there a heat management plan for the application.
- ix. Sceptical about green walls, which could become brown walls. When the application came to Committee, would be beneficial to include detail on how these would be maintained.
- x. When looking at the indicative views of the building from the A14/A10 fly over, the massing was substantial and suggested softening of the building with greenery.
- xi. Requested further detail on the height of the building and its relationship to surrounding structures.

- xii. How many employees were currently on site and how many would be on site in the future?
- xiii. What was the rationale for reducing the height from the original design which would reduce the office / lab space?
- xiv. Car parking should not be permitted on site.
- xv. Questioned how long the buildings would last. At a previous meeting (September 2023), the Committee had considered an application for the 440 Unit at the Cambridge Science Park which had a forecast of a 100-year life; would hope the application would match if not exceed this.
- xvi. How well integrated were the landscaping plans with neighbouring applications, such as Unit 440.
- xvii. How practical and deliverable was the modal shift figures quoted from vehicles to cycles on site? Further detail should be included to advise on how this would be achieved.
- xviii. Would like to know the number of cycle parking on site.

24/14/JDCC The B2 land, land north of Newmarket Road, Cambridge

The Committee received a briefing/presentation from developer representatives.

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. What was the intention for the site fronting onto Newmarket Road?
- ii. What type of application would be brought forward for the Committee's consideration?
- iii. How would customers approach the building and park from Austin Road, including vehicles that required servicing?
- iv. Important to ensure there was cargo bike parking on site.
- v. Further detail on how the green wall would be maintained should be presented to Committee when the application came forward for consideration.
- vi. Why would the height of the stairwell exceed the parameter plans for the multistorey car park?
- vii. What was the other side of the multistorey car park; was this residential housing?

24/15/JDCC Cambridge Biomedical Campus Phase 2

The Committee received a briefing/presentation from developer representatives.

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. Would all the buildings be in private ownership, or would there be any NHS involvement?
- ii. How would the green meadow be maintained above the arched bike store as this would only be sitting on a thin layer of soil?
- iii. Important to take into consideration the safety of staff when entering the bike store at night; this should not become a bunker.
- iv. Needed to consider the sustainability and durability of the type of grass used for the amphitheatre style seating; consider the climate and the number of people walking and sitting on the grass.
- v. Should re-evaluate the use of a glass frontage to the gym studio.
- vi. Needed to be clear segregation between cycle and vehicles on the highway which could be demonstrated when the application came to Committee.
- vii. Should consider the colour of materials on the buildings - dark colours absorbed heat.
- viii. Why was a multistorey carpark required and was there a plan for future use of the carpark when not required?
- ix. Should consider allocating a location for e-scooter parking.
- x. There was no public transport from Cambridge South Station direct to the site.
- xi. There appeared to be a lack of childcare facilities across the campus.
- xii. What was the life expectancy of the building?
- xiii. Was the market demand for wet lab spaces greater than what was being supplied; could the planning authority be doing more?

The meeting ended at 3.52 pm

CHAIR