

JOINT DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE

21 June 2023
10.00 am - 12.35 pm

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

Officers Present:

Strategic Sites Manager: Philippa Kelly
Principal Planner: Michael Sexton
Principal Planning Policy Officer: Terry De Sousa
Legal Adviser: Richard Pitt
Committee Manager: Sarah Steed
Meeting Producer: James Goddard

Developer Representatives for:

- Cambridge International Technology Park
- Cambridge Biomedical Campus

FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE COUNCIL

23/22/JDCC Election of Chair and Vice-Chair for Municipal Year 2023/24

The Strategic Sites Manager for the Greater Cambridge Shared Planning Service took the Chair whilst the Joint Development Control Committee elected a Chair.

Councillor Fane proposed, and Councillor Cahn seconded, the nomination of Councillor Bradnam as Chair.

Resolved (unanimously) that Councillor Bradnam be elected as Chair for the ensuing year.

Councillor Bradnam took over as Chair of the meeting and called for nominations for Vice-Chair of the Joint Development Control Committee.

Councillor Thornburrow proposed, and Councillor Porrer seconded, the nomination of Councillor S Smith as Vice-Chair.

Resolved (unanimously) that Councillor S Smith be elected as Vice-Chair for the ensuing year.

23/23/JDCC Apologies

Apologies were received from South Cambs Councillor Stobart with South Cambs Councillor Garvie attending as alternate. Apologies were also received from City Councillor Flaubert and City Councillor Levien attended as alternate.

23/24/JDCC Declarations of Interest

Member	Item	Interest
Councillor Baigent	All	Personal: Member of Cambridge Cycling Campaign
Councillor R.Williams	23/26/JDCC	Personal: Employed by the University of Cambridge
Councillor Cahn	23/27/JDCC	Personal: Son is completing his Masters working on the Cambridge Biomedical Campus. Discretion unfettered.

23/25/JDCC Minutes

The minutes of the meetings held on 15 March 2023 and 5 April 2023 were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

23/26/JDCC Cambridge International Technology Park

Members raised comments/questions as listed below. External presenters gave answers and added comments. 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. Queried the purpose of the briefing.

- ii. Commented that the proposed changes to the scheme could be considered as an entirely different design; should this be considered as new application.
- iii. Requested further information on the term 'local employment scheme'; how would this application create employment for local people.
- iv. Asked what the applicant considered the 'local vernacular' to be.
- v. Asked for further information on the application site.
- vi. Asked for clarification of the term 'accessible cycle space'.
- vii. Enquired if recycled water would be used when watering the plants on site.
- viii. Would the landscaping allow skate boarders to use the space.
- ix. Asked if there would be a shared car service on site.
- x. Needed to consider the number of EV charging points on the site.
- xi. Questioned if the community building would be for wider community use (outside of the Technology Park community) how people would know about it.
- xii. Highlighted that double stacked cycle parking was not accessible to those who had mobility issues and could not easily lift their bikes.
- xiii. Commented that it was important to conserve and recycle water; wet labs would increase the water usage on site.
- xiv. Asked if consideration could be given for the ability of the multi-storey car park to be converted in the future if more cycle parking was required especially for cargo bikes and / or similar.
- xv. Recommended that the travel plan should also focus on sustainable travel for those travelling to the site from the north and south as the greenways shown seemed to only consider those travelling from the east and west.
- xvi. Asked what consideration had been given to passive cooling in relation to heat pumps and other options.
- xvii. Stated that cycle theft was a serious issue in Cambridge, excellent CCTV and / or additional security was required.
- xviii. Asked if the multi-storey car park would be chargeable.
- xix. Noted examples of passive charging points on other application sites and asked if this could this be considered.
- xx. Asked if there were further changes to the 'use-classes' on the site, what would the impact be on parking spaces per person. Asked if there would be a reduction in car parking spaces proportionately to the forecast employment density.

- xxi. Asked if an environmental impact assessment be undertaken on the change of use from office space to lab space given the increase in water usage.
- xxii. Was not sure if the building responded to the context of the local area.

23/27/JDCC Cambridge Biomedical Campus

Members raised comments/questions as listed below. Officers gave answers and added comments. 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. Asked if there would be any retail provision on site to meet the needs of those who lived and worked there.
- ii. Queried when the Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) would be prepared; how would this tie in with the emerging Local Plan.
- iii. Queried if there would be any value in preparing an SPD if it did not address infrastructure and transport issues.
- iv. Asked what value an SPD held in planning law compared to supporting documents; how useful would the document be.
- v. Asked when the original Master Plan was adopted.
- vi. Would like a clearer understanding of the Master Plan for the site. It was important that applications were not brought to Committee 'piecemeal'.
- vii. The site lacked sufficient planning for transport, public navigation around the site and infrastructure for utilities which would enable a coherent and cohesive planning and build strategy.
- viii. Stated an SPD was required immediately and asked why it had to wait for the Master Plan.
- ix. Queried which were the live applications shown on the presentation, which would not be discussed, but required for context.
- x. Questioned if a net zero aspiration would be reflected into the Master Plan.

The meeting ended at 12.35 pm

CHAIR