

JOINT DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE

21 October 2020
10.35 am - 1.15 pm

Present: Councillors Baigent, Bradnam (Vice-Chair), Bygott, Chamberlain, Daunton, Hawkins, Hunt Matthews, Sargeant (Chair), Smart, Thornburrow, Tunnacliffe.

Officers Present:

Assistant Director Delivery, Cambridge City and South Cambridgeshire District Councils: Sharon Brown
Delivery Manager (Strategic): Chris Carter
Principal Planner: Philippa Kelly
Interim Management Support Officer: Fiona Bradley
Legal Adviser: Keith Barber
Committee Manager: Sarah Steed
Committee Producer: Liam Martin

Developer Representatives:

Network Rail: Mike Blissett
Network Rail: Sophie Moeng
Arcadis: Ben Hilder
Fereday Pollard Architects Limited: Jan Kroes

FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE COUNCIL**20/7/JDCC Apologies**

No apologies were received.

20/8/JDCC Declarations of Interest

Name		Item	Interest
City Councillor	Baigent	All	Personal: Member of CamCycle and Extinction Rebellion
SCDC Councillor	Bradnam	20/11/JDCC	Personal: Member of SCDC and the application had been submitted by SCDC.
SCDC Councillor	Bygott	20/12/JDCC	Personal: Member of Rail Future

20/9/JDCC Minutes

The minutes of the meeting held on 4 August 2020 were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chair subject to the following amendments (deleted text ~~struck through~~ and additional text underlined):

On page 9 of the agenda, 4th bullet point, 3rd line ‘vantage points such as the back ~~for~~ of the Rec; these images had not been presented.’

On page 9 of the agenda, 5th bullet point ‘The applications made comparison with Orchard Park, 120 metres away, five storey buildings with no buildings in-between’.

20/10/JDCC Update report on JDCC Standing Orders and Scheme of Delegation

The Committee received an update report on the JDCC Standing Orders and Scheme of Delegation, following a report brought to the 4 August 2020 JDCC meeting. The minor changes were detailed in paragraph 3 of the officer’s report on p22 of the agenda. These were also shown by tracked changes in Appendix A.

Since the publication of the report there was an update to the tracked changed arrangements shown on p28 of the agenda dealing with the appointment of the Chair and Vice-Chair.

The amendments proposed:

- i. The deletion of the tracked changed additional wording so that paragraph 1.1 would read: “The Committee shall, at its first meeting, and as a minimum annually thereafter, elect a Chair and Vice Chair. The Chair and Vice Chair shall be drawn alternately from each of the two Councils comprising the Committee.”

The reason for the deletion of the tracked changed wording was that the reference to Lead members was erroneous and dated back to when the JDCC was a tri-authority committee where one of the three Lead members would not hold the Chair or the Vice-Chair position.

- ii. Delete paragraph 2 ‘Appointment of Spokespersons’ entirely.

The reason for the deletion of paragraph 2 in its entirety was that there was no requirement for a spokesperson which again dated back to when the JDCC was a tri-authority committee.

Councillor Bradnam asked for two further amendments to the Standing Orders (deleted text struck through and additional text underlined) as follows:

- i. At paragraph 11.2, third line on p31 of the agenda asking that this was changed from 'that the member named do leave the meeting' to 'that the member named must leave the meeting' and
- ii. In Appendix B 'Development Control Forums' section 3 (c) and asked that this was changed from 'Liaise with the Planning case officer and Chair and spokespersons about the date of the Development Control Forum and fix a date, time and venue. So far as practical at least 10 days (not working days) notice should be given to all those attending under (d). For the avoidance of doubt dates for possible Development Control Forum meetings may be programmed in advance of receipt of petitions.' To read (c) 'Liaise with the Planning case officer and Chair and spokespersons about the date of the Development Control Forum and fix a date, time and venue. So far as practical at least 10 days (including weekends) notice should be given to all those attending under (d). For the avoidance of doubt dates for possible Development Control Forum meetings may be programmed in advance of receipt of petitions.

The Committee:

Resolved (unanimously) to accept the officer recommendation to approve the JDCC Standing Orders and Scheme of Delegation subject to:

- i. The amendment of paragraph 1.1 (Appointment of Chair and Vice-Chair) of the Standing Orders to read: "The Committee shall, at its first meeting, and as a minimum annually thereafter, elect a Chair and Vice Chair. The Chair and Vice Chair shall be drawn alternately from each of the two Councils comprising the Committee.
- ii. The deletion of paragraph 2 of the Standing Orders (Appointment of Spokespersons).
- iii. The amendment of paragraph 11.2 of the Standing Orders to read: 'If the member named continues his/her misconduct after a motion under the foregoing Rule has been carried, the Chair shall either move "that the member named must leave the meeting" (in which case the motion shall be put and determined without seconding or discussion); or

adjourn the meeting of the Council or committee for such period as s/he is in his/her discretion shall consider expedient’.

- iv. The amendment in Appendix B ‘Development Control Forums’ section 3(c) to read: ‘Liaise with the Planning case officer and Chair and spokespersons about the date of the Development Control Forum and fix a date, time and venue. So far as practical at least 10 days (including weekends) notice should be given to all those attending under (d). For the avoidance of doubt dates for possible Development Control Forum meetings may be programmed in advance of receipt of petitions.

20/11/JDCC 270 Cambridge Science Park, Milton - 20/03590/FUL

The Committee received an application for full planning permission for external refurbishment works to the existing office building and minor development within the application site to bring the building up to a lettable standard.

The Committee noted the following amendments presented in the Amendment Sheet:

- The application was a Regulation 3 application under the Town and Country Planning General Regulations 1992 as a consequence of South Cambridgeshire District Council being the applicant and owner of the site.
- The recommendation covering an additional condition 4 in the following terms: Prior to occupation of the building, details of facilities for the covered, secure parking of bicycles at the front of the site for use in connection with the development hereby permitted shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority in writing. The approved facilities shall be provided in accordance with the details before the use commences. Reason: To ensure satisfactory provision for the secure storage of bicycles. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 8/6)
- An additional Informative: The applicant is advised to ensure appropriate signage is displayed directing site users to the covered, secure cycle parking provision within the multi-storey parking building.

David Ousby (Applicant’s Agent) addressed the Committee in support of the application.

The Committee made the following comments in response to the report.

- i. Questioned whether the JDCC should be determining the application.

- ii. Queried whether the cycle parking was for this building and not the rest of the area and whether the cycle parking could include Sheffield stands.
- iii. Queried whether the location of the cycle parking would deter people from using it.
- iv. Asked if one of the disabled parking spaces could include EV charging provision.
- v. Asked if the EV charging provision could be more flexibility located.
- vi. Asked for more detail regarding landscaping.
- vii. The application proposed 2 EV charging points out of the 125 car parking spaces and commented that 10% of the spaces should be EV charging enabled.
- viii. Asked for an informative to be added if the application was approved to ensure that people could access the cycle parking comfortably.

In response to Members' questions the Assistant Director Delivery and the Interim Management Support Officer said the following:

- i. The JDCC's Scheme of Delegation permitted officers to exercise discretion to refer applications to the JDCC for determination. The application had been brought to the JDCC in this particular case because South Cambridgeshire District Council was the applicant. This will be reviewed as to whether it is appropriate for similar future applications.
- ii. There were some Sheffield cycle parking stands in the parking area on the left-hand side. An informative regarding Sheffield cycle parking stands could be included if the application was approved.
- iii. The building had an allocation of 208 cycle parking spaces. The cycle parking provision had to be provided in accordance with the 2016 planning application. The door which served the cycle parking was 65m from the rear access door to the building itself. The existing cycle parking was around 25m-45m to the building.
- iv. The application was for 2 EV charging points. A condition could not be imposed as it would not be reasonable nor in accordance with the NPPF.
- v. The picnic tables were currently not located in the nicest part of the site and this location was much more appropriate for the location of bins.
- vi. The rear of the site was almost all hard landscaping. There was a large grassed area with mature trees at the front of the building where the picnic tables would be relocated.
- vii. An informative regarding Sheffield cycle parking stands could be included if the application was approved.

The Committee:

Resolved (unanimously) to grant the application for planning permission in accordance with the Officer recommendation, for the reasons set out in the Officer's report, and subject to:

- i. the conditions contained in the Officer's report.
- ii. the following additional condition 4: Prior to occupation of the building, details of facilities for the covered, secure parking of bicycles at the front of the site for use in connection with the development hereby permitted shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority in writing. The approved facilities shall be provided in accordance with the details before the use commences. Reason: To ensure satisfactory provision for the secure storage of bicycles. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 8/6)
- iii. informatives included on the planning permission in respect of:
 - a. The applicant is advised to ensure appropriate signage is displayed directing site users to the covered, secure cycle parking provision within the multi-storey parking building.
 - b. The applicant is advised to secure the installation of additional Sheffield stands within the covered cycle parking area in the multi-storey parking building, close to the entrance from the car park of building 270, to encourage the use of the parking provision through enabling easier use of the cycle parking stands.

20/12/JDCC Cambridge South Station proposals led by Network Rail

The Committee received a presentation from Network Rail representatives on Cambridge South train station proposals.

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. Expressed concerns about Hobsons Park becoming a major cycle route and asked whether consideration had been given to incorporating the station structure into the cycle route.
2. Expressed concerns about vehicular access to the station excluding access by taxis or disabled vehicular access.
3. Queried lift access to the station compared with other train station lift access.

4. Questioned if there was enough space under the existing busway bridge to accommodate the extra tracks.
5. Asked if Network Rail had been in contact with the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority to ensure proposals could link into the CAM (Cambridge Autonomous Metro) project.
6. Queried why the presentation had not mentioned the Chisholm Trail as it was one of the major cycle routes within the City.
7. Questioned if the closure of the existing cycle route was necessary and if so, how long this would be for.
8. Questioned how outpatients were meant to get from the train station to the hospital.
9. Asked if there would be a taxi rank at the train station.
10. Questioned if the spoil dug up as part of the development should be left on the site.
11. Asked if there were only 5 disabled parking spaces, how people could be confident that they would be able to access a disabled parking space when they arrived at the station.
12. Expressed concerns as to whether there was sufficient room on site to accommodate taxi pick up and drops off and the impact that this could have on the neighbouring streets.
13. Questioned where the surplus soil would be located.

The meeting ended at 1.15 pm

CHAIR

This page is intentionally left blank