

CAMBRIDGE CITY COUNCIL
Record of Executive Decision

CAMBRIDGE SOUTH STATION CONSULTATION RESPONSE
--

Decision of: **Councillor Thornburrow, Executive Councillor, Planning Policy and Transport**
Councillor Collis, Executive Councillor for Open Spaces, Sustainable Food and Community Wellbeing

Reference: 21/URGENCY/P&T_E&C/17

Date of decision: 23/12/21 **Published:** 12/01/22

Decision Type: Non-Key

Matter for Decision: The purpose of this decision is to confirm and approve the Council's representation to the Public Inquiry on the application by Network Rail made under the Transport and Works Act 1992 for the Cambridge South Infrastructure Enhancements scheme (including the new Cambridge South Station) submitted to the Secretary of State for Transport.

The matter for decision is to confirm the Council's Statement of Case and to approve the Proof of Evidence reports prepared by three witnesses to appear at the Public Inquiry on behalf of the Council (see documents attached). The decision is also to give delegated authority to the Joint Director of Planning and Economic Development to agree a Statement of Common Ground and to agree any planning conditions to be attached to the development with the applicant before or during the course of the Public Inquiry.

The Statement of Case presents the full case for the Council building on the issues raised in the Council's initial response to the public consultation, and confirming the Council's position as supporting the scheme in principle, but objecting to matters relating to the use of Hobson's Park and the proposed exchange land, the impact on trees, the proposals for biodiversity net gain, and other matters requiring submission of further information.

The Proof of Evidence reports have been prepared by the Council's witnesses and expand on the objections raised in the Council's Statement of Case which have not been resolved through discussions with Network Rail. The Statement of Common Ground is envisaged to agree the policy context, the site description and draft planning conditions that have been discussed with officers, and other matters as appropriate.

Why the decision had to be made (and any alternative options):

The submission of Proof of Evidence documents is required by 7 January and the Statement of Common Ground should be agreed asap and preferably before the Public Inquiry opens on 1 February.

All documents referenced can be viewed at the link below:

<https://democracy.cambridge.gov.uk/ecCatDisplay.aspx?sch=doc&cat=13492>

The Executive Councillor's decision(s):

1. To confirm and approve the following documents, namely: the Statement of Case representing the City Council's representations to the Public Inquiry examination of the above proposal and the Proofs of Evidence of Charlotte Burton, Alistair Wilson and Guy Belcher with delegated authority to the Joint Director of Planning and Economic Development to secure any non-substantive amendments to the Proofs of Evidence which are considered to be appropriate and necessary.
2. To delegate to the Joint Director of Planning and Economic Development: (i) authority to agree the Council's case with respect to the proposals at the forthcoming examination and to facilitate the delivery of that case, including but not limited to agreeing and settling the Statement of Common Ground; (ii) settle the draft planning conditions to be included in the planning permission; (iii) negotiate and settle the heads of terms for any necessary planning obligations under s106 (or any modification under s106A in respect of any existing planning obligation) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990; and (iv) to complete any deed settled under 2(iii).

Reasons for the decision:

To ensure that Cambridge City Council's interests are effectively represented at the Examination

Scrutiny consideration:

The Chair and Spokespersons of Planning and Transport Scrutiny Committee and the Chair and Spokespersons of the Environment and Community Scrutiny Committee were consulted on this matter.

Report:

Statement of Case and Proof of Evidence reports (3).

Conflicts of interest:

None known.

Comments:

Comments were received from Councillor Bick Lib Dem Spokes who had requested the points below were considered.

- We feel that the BNG of 10% is really insufficient in this situation especially because some of what is proposed is not on/near site and experienceable by those using the area and other is proposed as via green roofing/walls which few believe is durable over time. Can the submissions be flexed to incorporate this aspiration?
- There is dissatisfaction with the intended layout of the station itself whereby taxi ranking and car drop-off is positioned far closer to the terminal building and more obviously than bus stops and bike parking. We think it is inevitable that the station will not only be used for the CBC as a destination, but by others who live in or want to

access a much wider area of the city and beyond. For this reason, it does not seem so obvious that the design should assume the hierarchy that it does. Can the council's objection be broadened to include this point?

- Given the desire to constrain incremental vehicle space at the station, can a marker be put down in these representations which might facilitate a requirement for developer contributions to resident parking schemes in surrounding areas?

The Joint Director of Planning and Economic Development responded direct to Councillor Bick.

No further comments were made.