

# Public Document Pack

Joint Development Control CommitteeJDC/1

Wednesday, 16 August 2023

## JOINT DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE

16 August 2023

10.00 am

**Present:** Councillors Bradnam (Chair), Baigent, Porrer, Smart, Fane, Hawkins, Stobart, Levien and Garvie

### **Officers Present:**

Strategic Sites Manager: Philippa Kelly

Principal Planner: Mairead O'Sullivan

Legal Adviser: Keith Barber

Committee Manager: Claire Tunnicliffe

Meeting Producer: Sarah Steed

### **Developer Representatives:**

Emma Smith, Network Rail (Applicant)

Elliot Stamp, Network Rail (Applicant)

## FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE COUNCIL

### **22/32/JDCC Apologies**

South Cambridgeshire District Councillor (SCDC) Cahn sent apologies with Councillor Garvie attending as an alternate. SCDC Councillor R Williams also sent apologies.

Apologies were received from City Councillors S Smith, Thornburrow and Flaubert. Councillor Levien attended as an alternate for Cllr Flaubert.

As Councillor S Smith (Vice Chair) was not present, Councillor Porrer proposed Councillor Smart as Vice Chair for the purpose of the meeting, Councillor Levin seconded the nomination approved by all without the need for vote.

### **22/33/JDCC Declarations of Interest**

<b>Item</b>	<b>Councillor</b>	<b>Reason</b>
23/35&36/JDCC	Baigent	Personal: Member of Cambridge Cycling Campaign.
23/35&36/JDCC	Stobart	Personal: Member of Cambridge Cycling Campaign.
23/35&36/JDCC	Smart	Personal: Employed by Addenbrookes Hospital.

---

**22/34/JDCC      Minutes**

Minutes of June 21<sup>st</sup> and July 19<sup>th</sup> were approved and signed by the Chair.

**22/35/JDCC      Re-Ordering of the Agenda**

Under paragraph 4.2.1 of the Council Procedure Rules, the Chair used their discretion to alter the order of the agenda items. However, for ease of the reader, these minutes will follow the order of the published agenda.

**22/36/JDCC      21/02957/COND17 - West Anglia Main Line Land, Adjacent to Cambridge Biomedical Campus**

The application sought approval of the details required to discharge condition 17 of the deemed planning permission linked to the Network Rail (Cambridge South Infrastructure Enhancements) Order. The Transport Works Act Order (TWAO) application and the deemed planning permission granted by the Secretary of State in December 2022 related to a cross boundary scheme which had one permission crossing both Cambridge City and South Cambridgeshire District Council. Condition 17 fell wholly within the Cambridge City Council administrative area.

The Principal Planning Officer updated their report by referring to the Amendment Sheet highlighting the following:

- i. Minor change to officer report to explain that the secondary means of escape (SME) bridge falls within parameter plans.
- ii. Clarification of reason for partial discharge.

Emma Smith, of Network Rail (Applicant) spoke in favour of the application.

The Chair asked Emma Smith to clarify the following points.

- i. What would the travel route be from side of the station to the other if cycle parking were not available on one side?
- ii. Could the applicant confirm that the materials used on site would allow full mobile phone access and will not block mobile phone signals?
- iii. There would be a risk of the sedum dying in very dry weather. Was there a mechanism in place which would allow the roof being watered in such circumstances?
- iv. Would Network Rail share the data on the monitoring of the grey water scheme on how the green and blue roofs were working and the transport movements taking place through the station?

The response given was as follows:

- i. If there was no space on one side of the station, rather than entering the station, would advise to use the road, rather than through the ticket gates, which would be the easiest way.
- ii. Believed that the designers would have looked at the operability, materials, and the usage, as the station would not have a ticket office. There would be a reliance on traveller use of mobile phones and other devices. Would take away the specific details concerning the steel to investigate this further.
- iii. Could not comment on the irrigation of the sedum roof. As part of the station design it would had been investigated how the station would be maintained, so it should have been considered.
- iv. Confirmed that data requested would be provided to officers.

In response to Member's questions and comments the Principal Planning Officer and the Strategic Sites Manager said the following:

- i. The toilets inside of the station would be publicly accessible, although only from inside of the barriers. Did not have the details of the access arrangements for this matter.
- ii. The glass on the over bridge was slighted textured but would allow views from either side.
- iii. It was the intention the hard and soft landscaping condition would be dealt with under officer delegated powers as with all other conditions relating to the station.
- iv. If Members felt that particular conditions would be of interest to the Committee then they could deploy their call-in powers under the JDCC's Terms of Reference, giving the reason and the planning grounds upon which, that request was based.
- v. The station roof entrance was described as a bull nose end, the roof profile was thick due to its functionality, the top element would protrude slightly further out casting a shadow making the roof line appear slenderer.
- vi. Suggested an informative for directional signage on the station building to highlight accessible public toilets at the station.
- vii. There was a separate condition to deal with lighting (considering light spillage). Draft information on this matter had been reviewed and shared with environmental health and ecology.
- viii. Had no detailed plans on the installation of the cycle rails inside of the station. These could be provided as part of a later submission due to this application being for a partial discharge.

- ix. The SME bridge was substantially smaller than the bespoke structure proposed under the TWAO. While it was disappointing that it was an 'off the shelf product', work had been undertaken with the Council's 'urban design team to ensure the materials would respond to the materials throughout the rest of the station building. Satisfied that impact was acceptable.
- x. There would be a real sense of space when inside the station, the frame of the building would be visible. The curved concrete stairs would be covered in an orange material for visual impact.
- xi. Officers were currently working on discharge of the public art condition.
- xii. The applicant had appointed a public art consultation, but an artist had not yet been appointed. No public art projects had been identified yet.
- xiii. There would be one toilet on the Hobson Park side of the station, with the changing places toilet and four further toilets on the eastern side.
- xiv. The main roof of the station would be a sedum roof due to the curved design and proximity to the railway for lower maintenance requirements.
- xv. The canopies were blue and green roofs with railings for access, with drainage which could hold water in cartons; these roofs would be covered in biodiverse planting. The planting would come forward as part of the landscape condition.
- xvi. Could not confirm the type of steel used. The station building would be a timber structure. Would assume that mobile phones would be able to be used inside the building and that the materials used in the construction would not interfere with telephone signals.
- xvii. Security of access would be considered under the landscaping condition.
- xviii. Could confirm that the use of bollards had been proposed around the eastern forecourt to prevent vehicular access. Security had been considered by the applicant as a separate requirement.
- xix. The provision of a bus service from the station to the hospital fell outside the scope of the Committee. There had been discussions with Addenbrookes hospital about the provision of shuttle buses, but it was unlikely that this would occur.

### The Committee:

- i. **Unanimously resolved** to approve and partially discharge condition 17 of 21/02957/TWA with delegated authority to officers in consultation with the Chair and Vice Chair to settle the wording of an appropriate informative covering the following the engagement of appropriate directional signage for users of the toilet facilities and appropriate placement of such signage around the building.

## **22/37/JDCC 21/02957/COND22 - West Anglia Main Line Land, Adjacent to Cambridge Biomedical Campus**

The Committee received a submission of details required by condition 22 (Cycle Parking: Cambridge South Station) for phase 4 of the development of the deemed planning consent associated with the Network Rail (Cambridge South Infrastructure Enhancements) Order 2022 (Local Planning Authority Reference 21/02957/TWA)

The Principal Planner presented their report, highlighting the following amendments:

- i. Two late representations had been received
- ii. Amended plans submitted to rectify issue with scale and mislabelling on the plans.
- iii. Clarification of reason for partial discharge
- iv. Error on par 8.1 (third bullet point) which should have read – “Request that the number of spaces provide on the eastern side is increased above 500 as their will likely be more demand on the eastern side from CBC staff”.

The Committee received a representation in objection to the application from a local resident on behalf of a Trumpington Residents Association (TRA).

The representation covered the following issues:

- i. Supported the station as a destination station for the Cambridge Biomedical Campus. It would help to reduce traffic on the roads as the Campus developed.
- ii. Hobson’s Park (the Park), which is in the Green Belt, on the western side of the station was a “tranquil place” in a busy area; confirmed by the Planning Inspector. Tried to limit the station’s impact on the Park and to get the Cambridge Biomedical Campus to live up to its responsibilities in delivering the station.
- iii. A 20- to 30-metre-wide strip was effectively being taken out of the Park from the Guided Busway to the station on the western side of the railway, this being the gap between the new shared use path to the station and the shared use path to the Campus alongside the Guided Busway. The largest of the construction compounds would be in the Park until 2025.
- iv. Objected at the Public Inquiry to Network Rail’s proposal for cycle parking spaces, not only because it took space out of the Park, but to the

hundreds of cycle movements each day through the Park on the new shared use path which threatened the very tranquillity.

- v. Questioned why is it was proposed to have so many spaces on the western side forcing cyclists to leave the station and cross Addenbrooke's Bridge on an already very busy shared use path to get to their destination in the Campus? This did not make sense.
- vi. Network Rail had not made their case for 1,000 spaces evenly split between the east and the west. This was not a product of the Transport Assessment that Network Rail referred to, but an assumption made in that assessment. Also, the trip destination information which the Transport Assessment did contain supported a 30/70 split west / east, not 50/50.
- vii. The application also conflicted with the recommendation made by the Planning Inspector following the Public Inquiry, which cast doubt on the need for 1,000 spaces in total, particularly the 500 proposed on the western side. It also conflicted with the Secretary of State's decision which followed the Inspector's recommendation.
- viii. Network Rail undertook at the Public Inquiry to carry out further studies to inform the decision about the number of spaces at the station and their east/west split, a fact recorded in their Closing Statement and in the Inspector's Report. Yet the application made no mention of these further studies or their findings. Therefore, the application was incomplete.
- ix. It was for these reasons that the TRA objected to this application and asked the Committee not to agree it in the form proposed but to place a limit of no more than 300 cycle parking spaces in the western station building.
- x. If, in the event, a total of 1,000 spaces proved to be necessary, the Cambridge Biomedical Campus should provide the land necessary to allow additional spaces on the eastern side of the station. Did not support the argument that there is not sufficient land.
- xi. Anyone looking down on the station site from Addenbrooke's busway bridge could see the amount of undeveloped land within the Campus immediately adjacent to the station and nearby. The owners of that land should be pressed to provide the land necessary for 200 extra spaces. It was after all in their interests, the station was being provided primarily for their benefit.
- xii. Network Rail sought to bring in arguments on the proposed design of the station in aid of its cycle parking application. Yet it was Network Rail that had chosen to base its design on 500 spaces in the western station building which the Planning Inspector made clear was probably an over-

estimate as was the 1,000 spaces total. A conclusion with which the Secretary of State agreed.

Elliot Stamp, Network Rail (Applicant) spoke in support of the application.

In response to Members' questions the Principal Planning Officer said the following:

- i. It was possible to include an informative that a suitable locking arrangement on the two-tier stands be added to the discharge of condition approval.
- ii. Half height Sheffield stands referenced in the report were suitable for parking cargo and larger bikes. They offered floor anchor points providing alternative locking options.
- iii. CCTV would cover all cycle parking; stores were close to the entrance of the building. Details in the management plan would provide information on how people obtain access to CCTV records, if their cycle should be stolen, and should get in touch with the operator of the station.
- iv. Noted the concerns raised regarding public access to CCTV. It was yet to be determined how this could be accessed, whether a key fob, code, or an app but this will come forward as part of a future application.
- v. Cycle parking was covered by a canopy which would continue to the entrance.
- vi. Within Local Plan policy there was no standard minimum requirement for larger cycles parking on site, but officers believed that the 7% parking supplied was adequate. Cycle parking would be on a first come first served basis.
- vii. The embankment shown on the plans was the existing embankment part of the guided bus way bridge.
- viii. The trip budget was undertaken as part of the transport assessment, through this the number of cycle spaces was agreed with Cambridgeshire County Council. This had set out there would be a greater need for cycle parking on the western side rather than the eastern side. People using the eastern side would leave their cycles at their destination rather than at the station.
- ix. The eastern side of the station had vehicular access, providing taxi drop offs, blue badge parking leaving no capacity for further cycle parking. The length of the canopy of the eastern side was getting up to where the maximum envelope ended.
- x. The parameter plan showed the maximum land area which Network Rail were permitted to build over under the TWAO and the deemed planning permission. This did not take up all the area of the Park: the canopy was

- narrower than it could have been. The applicant had managed to provide all the spaces with the minimal take up of land.
- x. Confirmed there was a guard rail on both the east and west side of the roof.
  - xi. There were access routes for the cyclists in Trumpington, along the guided bus route. There would be a new trail for cyclists and pedestrians providing access as part of the landscaping condition. On the opposite side to Trumpington, there would be access across the guided busway bridge, the biomedical campus with access off Francis Crick Avenue.
  - xii. No provisions had been made for scooters.
  - xiii. The Transport Assessment stated that 95% of users would access the station using sustainable transport means. Approximately 790 daily cycle trips by 2031.
  - xiv. The secure public parking would be open to the public but how that would work was yet to be determined.
  - xv. Noted the comment that signage needed to be in place before the site opened and the need for signage regarding cargo bikes parking spaces.
  - xvi. Acknowledged the comment it was likely that payment would be required for the secure parking which should not be excessive and would only be accessible to those who could afford it.
  - xvii. It was possible to bring a cycle through the station from one side to the other, all the stairs had a cycle rail. The lifts could hold two people with two large bikes.
  - xviii. The size of the green roof would not change if there were fewer cycling spaces on site, this would be an empty canopy, as all cycling parking was under the canopy; this was the best use of space.
  - xix. Signage was part of the wayfinding strategy which in turn was part of the landscape condition.

Councillor Bradnam proposed the following informative following Member debate:

- i. Requiring certain locking arrangement for the two-tier bikes
- ii. Procedure was put into place for the public to access CTTV quickly and effectively.

The Committee:

- i. **Unanimously resolved** to approve and partially discharge planning condition 22 of 21/02957/TWA with delegated authority to officers in



consultation with the Chair and Vice Chair to settle the wording of an appropriate informative covering the following:

- The Cycle Parking Management Strategy submitted for the local planning authority's approval to provide clarification on the security details relating to timely accessibility of CCTV records; the secure cycle storage facility (including how this accessed/secured); the method of operation and accessible locking devices on the two-tier racks.

Signage to be dealt with through the wayfinding strategy and for cargo bikes, to be in place before it becomes operational.

The meeting ended at 12.42pm

**CHAIR**

This page is intentionally left blank