

JOINT DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE

14 April 2021
10.33 am - 1.58 pm

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

Officers Present:

Assistant Director Delivery, Cambridge City and South Cambridgeshire District Councils: Sharon Brown

Delivery Manager (Strategic): Chris Carter

Interim Management Support Officer: Fiona Bradley

Legal Adviser: Keith Barber

Committee Manager: Sarah Steed

Meeting Producer: Liam Martin

Other Officers Present:

Transport Assessment Manager: David Allatt

Transport Officer (Tam Parry)

Developer Representatives:

Planning Manager, BDW Cambridgeshire, Alan Davies

Development Director BDW Cambridgeshire, Asa Chittock

Operations Director BDW Cambridgeshire, Adrian Jarman

Head of Planning Barratt David Wilson Homes (Eastern Counties) Ray Houghton

Design Manager Barratt David Wilson Homes (Eastern Counties) Graeme Smith

Tate Hindle Sarrah El-Bushra

FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE COUNCIL**21/20/JDCC Apologies**

No apologies were received.

21/21/JDCC Declarations of Interest

Councillor	Item	Interest
Baigent	All	Personal: Member

		of Cambridge Cycling Campaign
Chamberlain	21/24/JDCC	Personal: Was Sole Director of a Company which owned two commercial units on Milton Industrial Estate.

21/22/JDCC Minutes

The minutes of the meeting held on 17 February 2021 were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

21/23/JDCC 127-136 Cambridge Science Park

The Committee received an application for full planning permission for the erection of a building for Office / Research & Development use following demolition of existing buildings, and associated infrastructure and works.

The Committee noted the amended conditions detailed in the Amendment Sheet. The Interim Management Support Officer also tabled an amendment to condition 9, with additional wording underlined:

‘Prior to first occupation of the building a Travel Plan shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The Travel Plan shall specify the methods to be used to discourage the use of the private motor vehicle and the arrangements to encourage use of alternative sustainable travel arrangements such as public transport, car sharing, cycling and walking. The Travel Plan shall include membership to the Cambridge Science Park Travel Plan Plus. The Travel Plan shall be implemented as approved upon the occupation of the development and monitored in accordance with details to be agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority’.

Matt Hare (Applicant’s Agent) addressed the Committee in support of the application.

In response to Members’ questions the Transport Assessment Manager and Transport Officer, Assistant Director (Delivery), Interim Management Support Officer said the following:

- i. The Applicants had sought to meet the goals and objectives of the County Council's Transport Position Statement and they felt that the applicants did meet the objectives. The increase in trips on the highway network by this development were minimal, therefore no trip budget approach was required. The mode share for car drivers proposed had been achieved on the Addenbrooke's site and is achievable on the Cambridge Science Park (CSP).
- ii. The people who worked at the CSP were projected to benefit from the Chisholm Trail, the improvements to Milton Road and the enhanced public transport system in Cambridge which were being delivered by the Greater Cambridge Partnership (GCP).
- iii. The Applicant would be making a financial contribution to these strategic infrastructure projects.
- iv. The Applicant was not increasing the number of car parking spaces on the site which was in accordance with the County Council's Transport Position Statement.
- v. The £5000 contribution referred to for parking controls could be used by the County Council to install yellow lines (either single or double yellow lines) in surrounding residential areas to curb unwanted parking if the need arose.
- vi. Explained that there were two types of parking enforcement; either controlled parking zones (CPZs), which were also known as residents parking zones or double yellow lines. The GCP had a programme for developing CPZs. The £5000 contribution would only be put towards the cost of a traffic regulation order to permit the installation of double yellow lines. This would not allow for the introduction of controlled parking zones, therefore there would be no disadvantageous impact on residents who were not able to afford the cost of a resident parking permit within a CPZ.
- vii. The owners of the CSP currently operates a shuttle bus for occupiers of the CSP to Cambridge North train station. It was therefore reasonable to assume that employees would use a shuttle bus.
- viii. The Applicant had given an assurance that they would operate a travel management plan which would be available for all their tenants.
- ix. The City Council had decriminalized their parking enforcement which meant that parking wardens patrolled the City and could issue fines to

those parking on double yellow lines. South Cambridgeshire District Council (SCDC) had not decriminalized their parking enforcement which means that SCDC relied on the Police to undertake enforcement for people parking on double yellow lines. Highway Officers were aware that SCDC and the GCP were in discussions about parking enforcement.

- x. Seeking a contribution for additional double yellow lines was a 'fall-back position' because there was a good travel plan in place.
- xi. The amendment to condition 5 had been proposed so that further consideration could be given to landscaping in relation to the car park layout which over looked the drain. The applicant was happy to accept this amended condition.
- xii. Confirmed there were no height limitations or restrictions in SCDC's Local Plan however officers had taken into consideration heights of neighbouring sites including the heights of buildings which had been given consent near Cambridge North train station when assessing the application.
- xiii. Confirmed that the construction method would be part of the approved documentation, therefore any changes to the construction method would necessitate a variation application. The Committee could state as part of their decision that any subsequent s73 application should come back to Committee for determination rather than be determined under the officer scheme of delegation..
- xiv. The public drain wasn't included within the application site, however an Informative could be added to condition 5 so that any opportunity to increase biodiversity should be taken. Officers did not advise that this should be added as a condition as the application was policy compliant.
- xv. Noted a Member's query regarding rainwater, however the Sustainability Officer had not raised an objection on the site.
- xvi. Condition 4 required a public art strategy.

The Committee:

Resolved (by 11 votes to 1) to grant the application for planning permission in accordance with the Officer recommendation, for the reasons set out in the Officer's report, subject to:

- i. the prior completion of a Section 106 Agreement under the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 with delegated authority to officers to

- negotiate, secure and complete such an Agreement on the terms set out within section 94 this report and any others considered appropriate and necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms; and
- ii. the planning conditions set out in the Officer's report detailed in Appendix 1, including amendments to conditions 5 and 12 as detailed on the Amendment Sheet and the amendment to condition 9 tabled at Committee in the following terms - 'Prior to first occupation of the building a Travel Plan shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The Travel Plan shall specify the methods to be used to discourage the use of the private motor vehicle and the arrangements to encourage use of alternative sustainable travel arrangements such as public transport, car sharing, cycling and walking. The Travel Plan shall include membership to the Cambridge Science Park Travel Plan Plus. The Travel Plan shall be implemented as approved upon the occupation of the development and monitored in accordance with details to be agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority' with delegated authority to officers to include any minor drafting changes; and
 - iii. The relevant Informatives as set out in Appendix 1 of the officers report to be included at the discretion of officers including the following additional Informatives regarding
 - a. in relation to condition 5 to consider further improvements to biodiversity.
 - b. in the event of a s73 application concerning design materials that this would come back to Committee for determination.

21/24/JDCC Planning Advisory Service Review of Joint Development Control Committee

The Committee received a presentation from the Assistant Director (Delivery). regarding the Planning Advisory Service (PAS) review of the Joint Development Control Committee (JDCC).

In response to Members' questions the Assistant Director (Delivery) said the following:

- i. Having more regular briefings on the 5-year housing land supply was an issue picked by the PAS review but this was more in relation to the City

Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council's Planning Committees; it was a more general observation for the JDCC.

- ii. The PAS noted that the JDCC considered strategic sites which contributed to the 5-year housing land supply on a significant basis.
- iii. PAS had observed JDCC meetings earlier on in the process and had watched the meeting which considered the Land North of Cherry Hinton planning application.
- iv. The JDCC's Scheme of Delegation had not been reviewed since 2013 and was in need of review to ensure it was fit for purpose. A discussion paper would be brought to the JDCC.
- v. The definition of 'strategic sites' was set out in the JDCC's Terms of Reference and covered the areas set out in the maps attached to it.
- vi. Noted Members concerns querying why certain planning applications had been brought to the JDCC for decision. There was some ambiguity in the Scheme of Delegation and applications were brought to the JDCC for transparency reasons. Officers also had discretion to refer applications to the JDCC if there was a wider public interest in the JDCC determining the application.

The Committee resolved unanimously to:

- i) Note the content and recommendations set out in the Planning Advisory Service report.
- ii) Endorse the implementation of Recommendations R4, R5 and R8 of the Planning Advisory Service Review report with respect to the Joint Development Control Committee as highlighted in paragraph 3.5 of the committee report.

21/25/JDCC Darwin Green 1 BDW2 revised proposals

The Committee received a presentation from BDW Cambridgeshire on revised Darwin Green BDW2 proposals.

Members raised comments/questions as listed below. Answers and comments were supplied, 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. Was pleased to note that the Committee's concerns had been taken on board. Noted that 87% of the units were proposed to be National Described Space Standards (NDSS) compliant but queried why the remaining 13% were not NDSS compliant.
2. Queried the proposed clustering of the affordable housing units on the revised drawings towards the eastern side of the site and noted there was only one market dwelling which was surrounded by affordable housing.
3. Queried why the application was proposed to be split into two applications.
4. Felt the affordable housing was inappropriately clustered.
5. Asked if there was going to be a pocket park.
6. Noted the Developer stated that the proposed scheme was going to be 87% policy compliant which meant that the scheme was still not fully compliant with NDSS.
7. Queried how many units would be below NDSS.
8. Noted that it looked like the kitchen on the ground floor had been extended just to meet NDSS.

21/26/JDCC Darwin Green 1 BDW5 and BDW6 proposal

The Committee received a presentation from representatives on behalf of BDW Eastern Counties and Tate Hindle on Darwin Green parcels BDW5 and 6.

Members raised comments/questions as listed below. Answers and comments were supplied, 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. Queried accessibility and how the Developer would make sure that residents did not resort to using their cars to drive to places.
2. Asked what EV charging provision there would be and how secure it would

be.

3. Noted that 90% of the units would be built to National Described Space Standards, which meant that some of the units would not be policy compliant.

4. Thought that the pocket park looked like a front garden.

5. Thought that the permeability of the site enabled new residents to be able to access other facilities for example Brierley Walk.

6. Thought that the pocket park looked like a wide verge and wanted to see a place for children to play. Asked if the Developer had considered building fewer houses on the site so that better public open space provision could be provided.

The meeting ended at 1.58 pm

CHAIR