

JOINT DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE

21 August 2024
10.00 am - 12.15 pm

Present: Councillors Bradnam (Vice-Chair), Baigent, Flaubert, Porrer, Smart, Fane, Hawkins, Stobart and R.Williams

Councillors R Williams left after item 24/33/JDCC

Officers Present:

Strategic Sites Manager: Philippa Kelly

Principal Planner: Mairead O'Sullivan:

Legal Adviser: Keith Barber

Democratic Services Officer: Laurence Damary-Homan

Committee Manager: Claire Tunnicliffe

Committee Manager: James Goddard

Other Officers Present:

Transport Assessment Manager: Jez Tuttle (Cambridgeshire County Council)

Developer Representative:

Sphere25 Planning Consultancy, Emma Woods (Applicant's representative)

FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE COUNCIL**24/30/JDCC Apologies**

Apologies were received from Councillor Cahn, Councillor Garvie attend as the alternate. Councillor Thornburrow and Councillor S Smith also gave apologies.

24/31/JDCC Declarations of Interest

Item	Member	Interest
All	Baigent	Personal: Member of Cam Cycle Campaign
All	Stobart	Personal: Member of Cam Cycle Campaign
All	Garvie	Personal: Member of Cam Cycle Campaign
Item 5	R Williams	Pecuniary: Employee is Trinity College (applicant).
Item 5	Bradnam	Personal: Member of Milton Parish Council but had not been involved in any discussions for this application.

24/32/JDCC Minutes

The minutes of the meeting held on 17 July were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

24/33/JDCC Planning Committee Review

The Committee received a report on the Planning Committee Review.

The report referred to the Greater Cambridge Shared Planning Service (GCSP) which supported the three Planning Committees, Cambridge City Council, South Cambridgeshire District Council, and the Joint Development Committee.

The GCSP had carried out a review of all three committees to improve and produce a unified approach to planning. The purpose of the review was to review those recommendations made as part of the Planning Advisory Service (PAS) review and develop a transformation plan.

Members made the following points in relation to the Officer's report:

- i. It was disappointing that the report author had not been able to attend any of the relevant committee meetings to present the report in person.
- ii. Inconsistencies in the Draft Members' Code of Conduct, final paragraph 3.10 (p23 of the agenda pack): Members could remain in the Chamber if they had a pecuniary interest but must sit in the public gallery until the item had been determined. However, further in the document it stated that Members may not sit in the meeting even as a member of the public.
- iii. Under Declarations of Interests (p38 of the agenda pack), referenced a prejudicial interest; a prejudicial interest had not been defined anywhere in the document.
- iv. The document was not clear whether it was being directed to a Member in their ordinary role as a local Ward Councillor or as a Member of the Planning Committee.
- v. Would like it to be made clear in the Case Officer's presentation to Committee, if any questions from Members were received after publication of the agenda, and what those responses are. (Recommendation R5, paragraph 4.1.1 of the report).
- vi. Welcomed the inclusion of Ward and Parish Councillors in the documentation but needed to ensure there was engagement with the Parish Councillors to understand the process.

- vii. Changes should be actioned straight away and not left as pending. The PAS report had been completed four years ago and no changes had yet been made.
- viii. Officers needed to make Members aware of the changes as soon as they been made, so they were aware of the protocol for each application at the time of consideration.
- ix. Asked if there was an end date for completion and implementation of the recommendations as there was no fixed date shown on the timeline of works.
- x. Questioned if any of the recommendations in the report would be referred to City Council's Planning and Transport Scrutiny Committee for approval.

The Chair thanked the Democratic Services Officer for presenting the report.

24/34/JDCC 24/01079/FUL - 440 Cambridge Science Park, Milton, Cambridge, South Cambridgeshire

The Committee received an application for the erection of a Research and Development / Office building (Use Class E) and associated landscaping, car and cycle parking, infrastructure works and plant.

The Principal Planner referred to details on the Amendment Sheet:

Strategic Transport

22.5 The Transport Assessment Team requests a contribution for strategic infrastructure to mitigate the transport impact of the development. The calculation is based on the methodology used to calculate strategic transport contributions in other sites recently approved in the Northeast Cambridge area. This would be allocated to the Chisholm Trail and Milton Road corridor improvement schemes. The cost of the improved cycleway which is being provided as part of the development as shown in drawing KMC 23006/002 Rev B (condition 34 cycleway completion) would be deducted from the strategic infrastructure contribution as the cycleway will also benefit other users. The cost of the cycleway will be agreed with Cambridgeshire County Council. This route can be deducted from the overall contribution because it is considered to be a local infrastructure improvement which will be of benefit to other users of the area not just the buildings occupants.

An estimate of the cost of providing the cycleway has been provided as part of the planning application showing it would cost approximately £878,000 meaning that it is likely that no off-site contribution will be provided. This

estimate has been considered reasonable and the approach has been agreed with the Transport Assessment Team at Cambridgeshire County Council. Should the cycleway cost be less than estimated, the remaining money will be allocated to strategic infrastructure. The mechanism for doing this will be included within the S106 agreement.

Amendments To Conditions:

Amendment to Condition 17 to remove the reference to off-site provision for clarity.

17. Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG)

No development shall commence, apart from below ground works and demolition, until a Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) Scheme, which shall include details of purchase and monitoring of the offsite biodiversity units, a biodiversity metric for the site, costings and appropriate legal agreements to guarantee third party delivery of ongoing habitat management requirements has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Emma Woods (Applicant's Representative) addressed the Committee in support of the application.

In response to Members' questions the Principal Planner, Cambridgeshire County Council's Transport Assessment Manager and Strategic Sites Manager said the following:

- i. The details of the building fins, including their maintenance and management would be secured by a planning condition, noting that it would be in the best interests of the applicant to ensure the longevity of these features. As part of the sustainability exercise, consideration had been given to how the fins could be removed, repaired and maintained over the building's life cycle.
- ii. Was not possible to secure outdoor gym equipment but there was a significant green area which the site looked out on to which would allow workers to exercise on. There was a gym elsewhere on the Science Park.
- iii. Noted the comments that the Changing Places toilet was welcomed. It would be beneficial to the Committee to be invited to view the building, once completed and ready for occupation to learn from its exemplar standard.

- iv. The height of the building would be 27 metres to the top of the plant enclosure plus an additional 3.7 metres which was the height of the flues.
- v. The application had been assessed by Officers on its own merits and not against the proposals of the Northeast Cambridge Area Action Plan which at the moment carry only limited weight.
- vi. Moveable planters in the in the roof terrace would allow maximum flexibility of the use of this space.
- vii. Six disabled parking bays would be located near to the building's entrance. The number of spaces was considered adequate. If there was a requirement to have further spaces this could be done through the parking management plan, as the building would be a managed facility.
- viii. Most comments from the Disability Panel related to internal changes, lighting and desks so would not be considered as part of the planning application process. However, the applicant had the information to assist with their internal fit out of the building.
- ix. Officers had been in discussion with the applicant regarding accessible benches around the outside space. This would come forward through the hard and soft landscaping condition details.
- x. There would be more than sixty car parking spaces provided by three surrounding car parks to the application. The applicant was required to provide an additional sixty spaces which they would have to demonstrate through the parking management plan, which had been conditioned.
- xi. The overall strategy for the site was to provide high quality public transport and cycle routes to Cambridge North Station, a key transport interchange, accessible via the Guided Busway.
- xii. Presently the cycle way proposed that run southwards from the site would link into the Guided Busway which provides access to the station.
- xiii. The Guided busway would be two stops to the station.
- xiv. There were current links available from the site to the station, as the area progressed those links would gradually improve. This would encourage more people to use public transport or cycle.
- xv. As part of the area wide strategy there was a proposal for shuttle buses to take people from the station to various units on the Science Park but this does not form part of the current application.
- xvi. The building had been designed to be very flexible for future use; the layout of lab to office space could be modified for other uses.
- xvii. The recommendation was one of approval subject to the conditions and informatives. This was not an on-balance decision and there were no outstanding issues.
- xviii. A wayfinding strategy had been conditioned.

- xix. Allocated parking spaces for Voi scooters could not be conditioned.
- xx. There were no proposals for a public café on site but those on site could access facilities nearby at the Bradfield Centre.
- xxi. It would be unreasonable to place additional restrictions on condition 36 (water monitoring) to share water monitoring data through the planning condition process. However, the applicant's representatives were present and may choose to voluntarily share that information.
- xxii. Noted the comments that the height of the building could set a precedent for other applications which could impact the surrounding views and environ and was not of the highest BREEAM standard.
- xxiii. The Landscape Officer had recommended the tree species shown in the application and agreed these should be conditioned. The Officer was satisfied that there was enough space for the trees to thrive.
- xxiv. Could not say how long it would take for the trees to mature. The trees would not hide the building but soften views from the Mere Way.

Councillor Flaubert proposed the following:

- i. an amendment to Condition 30 (Parking Management Plan) to include specific reference to disabled parking provision.

The amendment to Condition 30 was carried **unanimously**.

Councillor Flaubert proposed the following:

- ii. an amendment to Condition 23 (Hard and Soft Landscaping) - criteria (d) (which relates to street furniture) to ensure regard to provision for people with disabilities.

The amendment to Condition 23 was carried **unanimously**.

Councillor Flaubert proposed the following:

- iii. to include an informative which would have regard to the recommendations of the Disability Consultative Panel.

The informative was carried **unanimously**.

Councillor Bradnam proposed the following informative:

- i. an advisory informative to actively encourage the building operator to make the water consumption data publicly available.

The informative was carried by **votes 8 to 1**.

A separate vote was taken on the following amendment as shown on the Amendment Sheet:

- i. With amendment to Condition 17 (Biodiversity Net Gain) as set out in the amendment sheet.

The amendment to Condition 17 was carried **unanimously**.

The Committee

Unanimously resolved to grant application 24/01079/FUL for planning permission in accordance with the Officer recommendation set out in paragraph 25 of the Officer's report, for the reasons set out therein and subject to:

- i. The conditions and informatives as detailed in section 26 of the Officer's report, with delegated authority to officers to carry through minor amendments to those conditions and informatives (and to include others considered as appropriate and necessary) prior to the issuing of the planning permission;
 1. With amendment to Condition 17 (Biodiversity Net Gain) as set out in the amendment sheet.
- i. The additional conditions and informative as agreed in the meeting which are as follows
 1. an amendment to Condition 30 (Parking Management Plan) to include specific reference to disabled parking provision.
 2. an amendment to Condition 23 (Hard and Soft Landscaping) - criteria (d) (which relates to street furniture) to ensure regard to provision for people with disabilities.
 3. to include an informative which would have regard to the recommendations of the Disability Consultative Panel.
 4. an advisory informative to actively encourage the building operator to make the water consumption data publicly available
- ii. The prior completion of a Section 106 Agreement under the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 with delegated authority to officers to negotiate, settle and complete such an Agreement as referenced in the Heads of Terms within this report including any other planning obligations considered appropriate and necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms.

The meeting ended at 12.15 pm

CHAIR