

**Foxton Parish Council**  
**Draft Minutes of the Planning Committee Meeting held on Thursday 13 October 2022 at**  
**7.30pm at Foxton Village Hall**

Present: Pierre Redelinghuys, Caroline Ilott, Chris Herriot, Ian Francis (as members of the Planning Committee), Peter Tye and 2 members of the public. Colin Brown from Mission Street and Mission Street's architect, Richard Warwick, attended for the first part of the meeting to provide an update on their design and planning applications.

Pierre Redelinghuys was nominated for Chair of the committee by CI, seconded by IF. All agreed. Duly appointed Chair of the new Planning Committee.

1. **Apologies for absence** – Deborah Roberts
2. **Declarations of interest** – none
3. **Planning Applications to be considered:**
  - A) **Ref: 22/01823/FUL Full Application Site The Burlington Press 1 Station Road Foxton Cambridge Cambridgeshire CB22 6SA**  
 Proposal Extension and external alterations to the Press Building (Units 2, 3 and 7), landscaping and associated works.  
 Web Link <https://applications.greatercambridgeplanning.org/online-applications/PLAN/22/01823/FUL>
  - B) **Ref: 22/03826/**  
**Full Application Site Burlington Park Station Road Foxton Cambridgeshire**  
 Proposal Demolition of buildings and associated structures, erection of an office and research and development building for Use Class E(g)(i) and E(g)(ii) uses, refurbishment of existing buildings, parking and landscaping, and associated works  
 Web Link <https://applications.greatercambridgeplanning.org/online-applications/PLAN/22/03826/FUL>

Caroline Ilott had written a planning report with comments on both applications which had been circulated.

**Mission Street Presentation**

Mission Street gave a presentation on their plans for the refurbishment and redevelopment of the Burlington Press for the Life Science industry and amendments to their application. See Appendix 1.

Colin Brown explained that, since attending the Parish Council meeting on 6 June 2022, Mission Street had held youth engagement workshops in Foxton school and a very well-attended public consultation at the Burlington Press site. Planning applications had now been submitted to SCDC. Feedback on many aspects of the

proposals was positive. Concern was raised about construction disruption and traffic. Feedback had directly helped to shape the submitted application and any potential issue should be managed by the implementation of planning conditions. Mission Street would do everything within its power to keep disruption to a minimum. Colin further added that Mission Street wanted the development to contribute positively to the community, citing possible benefits beyond just creating jobs - economic, transport (lobbying bus company) and educational (visibility within the community/school involvement). Employees of life science tenants tended to be well educated and socially conscious. The fabric of the building needed a large investment in order to prevent the building from falling into disrepair and to meet regulations to allow it to be let.

Members of the public were invited to contact Mission Street by email or phone if they had any queries.

Richard Warwick, Mission Street's architect talked through the design of the buildings and site. Mission Street had conducted research into the history of the site and Colin would be meeting the great-granddaughter of William Briggs (who built the press and the cottages) to discuss their plans. The original buildings were built between 1906-1908 and then added to over time. Units 2, 3 and 7 formed parts of the original printing works. Refurbishment would include repairing damage, fixing water leaks, replacing glazing with double glazing, insulating the roofs and walls. The buildings would comprise laboratories and offices which would be let to life science businesses with a likely emissions containment level 2 (one step up from school labs). Mission Street felt that the life science tenants would provide a positive scientific contribution and the rental charges would fund the building refurbishment required. A fume hood would be needed for some experiments but any emissions/ air exchange would be highly regulated. The flue had been redesigned in the amended planning application with a more expensive strobic fans specification now detailed which were shorter and would have reduced visibility. They would be made with a curved, brushed stainless steel look that would reflect the sky and allow it to merge into its background. Other parts of the application had been amended further to a meeting with the conservation officer.

Richard noted the current aspect of the site had a defensive feel with metal railing, a lot of tarmac/ concrete structure and sheds. In the new design the aspect would be much more open and relandscaped with planting of native species. There would be a net bio-diversity gain of more than 10%. There would be a new entrance with cycle access and a public café at the centre of the development. Work would be undertaken to conceal the facade of the UKPN substation and soften the landscaping around it with planting to enhance the backdrop to the war memorial. There would be 220 car parking spaces and 210 cycle parking spaces, some with electric charging facilities. There would be a rain garden and green roofs which would allow water to stay on the roof (to feed plants and reduce pressure on the

sewage system). The site would be open to the public and there would be views through the site to the country site beyond. The design of the building would be simple, calm and contemporary with flexible working spaces inside, drawing inspiration from buildings in Foxton such as brick on the ground floor level and timber on top. The timber would be treated to speed up the weathering process to a softened, uniform grey colour within about 6 months. The café would hold approximately 50-100 covers with additional seating outside. There would be a cycle centre with showers and a cycle repair shop. Laboratories and offices were designed to allow people to see in and see science in practice. The building had been designed to be highly sustainable with lean/ light construction materials which would reduce construction time and disruption. Timber panels would be pre-made and brought to site.

### **Points and questions raised with Mission Street**

As the site was partly in a conservation area, it was hoped that SCDC would take care of the conservation aspect of the planning application. It was asked whether the brick wall by the war memorial would stay as this served a useful purpose in slowing traffic coming onto the High Street. It was confirmed that this wall would stay but the salt bucket would be moved. The area behind the wall would be landscaped so the planting may also help to slow traffic down.

A member of the public with a hobby in astronomy, asked for dark sky lighting. It was confirmed that external lighting would be low level lighting which would throw light downwards and there would be light sensors detecting daylight.

It was asked how many employees there would be. It was explained that tenants would have different occupation densities but occupation would probably be about 200-250 people calculating standard density per m<sup>2</sup> and assuming 80% occupation at any one time.

It was asked how construction traffic would be managed. It was confirmed that traffic would enter from one direction from the A10 and exit onto Station Road to avoid any traffic using the High Street. There would be a booking system for all site deliveries to manage traffic flow and to avoid standing traffic on public roads. There would be a 'look ahead' newsletter detailing any proposed/noisy works so that residents would be aware of and could plan around these works. There would be a site manager contact, a path of escalation via Mission Street and ultimately planning enforcement to deal with any issues. Traffic flow had been discussed with all tendering contractors and all trade vehicles would be parked on the site compound. A full construction traffic management plan would be required.

Concern was raised about emergency vehicles being delayed at the level crossing and how this might impact safety of construction workers and future users of the

site. It was asked if there would be any specific provision of emergency medical facilities/rooms during construction and on a permanent basis at the site. It was explained that the fire service was a statutory consultee and should raise any issues if there were any. Mission Street acknowledged that safety was paramount and they would do some more research into the impact of the level crossing.

It was queried whether the parking allocation was too high if sustainable travel was to be encouraged. It was explained that the parking ratio was 1 space per 40m<sup>2</sup> of gross floor area and the allocated car parking spaces were for the whole of the Burlington Press site, not just the new buildings. Colin would send the Parish Council Highways assessment information on this.

Concern was raised that there were not enough disabled parking bays and there should be 11 rather than 10 with 5% being best practice. All disabled workers must be given a disabled parking space. The size of the disabled parking bays should be checked. Access from the parking bays to the new building was not safe enough for wheelchair users. (It was noted that this issue had been raised by Highways). Further concern was raised about the danger of the route through the site with the proximity of cars, pedestrians, wheelchair users and parents with children/ pushchairs. Mission Street confirmed that they had talked to SCDC planning about this. The road through the site was meant to be a pedestrianised area that could be driven on and the majority of the vehicle movement would likely take place at a very slow speed at a time when the amenity provision was in lower use. The nature of the site posed restrictions on access and Highways had analysed the site.

Concern was raised about air and water emissions and it was asked whether there would be any restrictions on the type of laboratory work allowed on site. The architect noted that it was a highly regulated industry and tenants would have to comply with strict emissions regulations. Drain effluent would be periodically checked. The site and buildings would not lend themselves to the type of industry with higher level emissions and Mission Street would not wish other occupiers or their brand to be harmed in anyway.

It was asked whether a proper 'Changing Places' accessible toilet could be included in the café's accessible toilet facilities. It was noted that there were not enough disabled parking bays.

It was asked if the wall by the war memorial could be repointed and renovated.

It was confirmed that there would be screening around the substation, by Unit 7, using trellis and planting.

It was asked whether rainwater run-off would be utilised rather than being discharged to the sewers. The architect noted that most water would stay on the

green roofs for the plants and there would be rain water pipes to water the rain garden. Mission Street would look into possibilities of using grey water run-off.

It was asked whether traffic flow on the road behind the press cottages had been considered as this was used by residents to access properties. Mission Street confirmed that modelling had taken this into account and taking away the gate would make egress and access easier. Rising bollards would be used in the evening to secure the site.

It was asked whether strobic fans instead of flues had been considered for the new building. The architect noted that this had not been considered as it was felt that the flumes were more proportionate in size on the new building, would be visually lost in scale and would have a dull, reflective surface allowing them to blend into the background. Strobic flues were chunkier and therefore might not be a better solution.

It was asked whether Mission Street had addressed the conservation officer's concerns regarding the continuity of historic building design and materials used. The architect confirmed that the design had been simplified to address the conservation officer's concerns but not using brick and render materials. The extension had the form of the building next to it but would use more appropriate materials.

It was asked whether there was a flue in the design access statements 2,3 and 7. The architect confirmed that there was no exhaust flue but there would be an air handling unit for air into and out of the building. This would not be seen from the street.

It was confirmed that there would be electric charging points for cars and bicycles. Mission Street would like there to be some public access to EV points and were also looking into a car sharing scheme (although this was not something that could be evidenced in planning, the company was committed to this idea).

*Mission Street and one member of the public left the meeting.*

### **Parish Council discussion**

Concern was raised by a member of the public about the impact of the development on the aspect of Foxton House, noting that four years ago a proposal to build a science hub had been rejected on this basis. He questioned whether the development was appropriate for a group village and noted the conservation officer's critical report. He further raised concern about the size of the car park on the site and the impact of having a further 250 cars in the centre of Foxton, noting that there was currently no passing room on Station Road. It was noted that tenancy

space was already being advertised. Reference was made to the Neighbourhood Plan (Fox16) requirements regarding new employment in the village. It was assumed that SCDC planning officers would consider the requirements of Foxton's neighbourhood plan.

It was agreed that traffic flow and congestion was a concern, particularly at rush hour times (science parks working hours mostly being 9am-5pm) although the pandemic had led to more flexible working. It was asked whether the size of the car park could be justified when green travel should be encouraged. The Melbourn Greenway project in the future could pose an issue for large delivery loads. It was noted that if there were not enough parking spaces then cars would park elsewhere in the village.

It was raised that there was not enough emphasis on green travel and it was questioned whether employees would cycle a distance to work. A bus service would be integral to the project.

It was noted that (i) it would be better to have something on the site than let it fall into disrepair; (ii) there was concern about traffic congestion and emergency vehicle access at the level crossing; (iii) there was concern about air flow/ emissions; (iv) the project was liked and felt to be positive; (v) the development would only provide a specific line of employment which may only provide limited employment to Foxton itself; (vi) there would be economic benefit for the shop/ post office and pub and it could encourage other business/ service industry in Foxton; (vii) it could bring a breath of new life and younger people to the village; (viii) it could benefit the preschool and school; (ix) public benefit should outweigh any harm to the curtilage/ setting of Foxton House; (x) planning enforcement could be contacted if planning conditions were not met; (xi) SCDC officer Karen Pell-Coggins had confirmed that a commercial development outside the village framework would not set a precedent for further such development as commercial development was treated differently to residential development. It was also noted that there was currently a 6.5-year housing supply; (xii) to seek clarification on how effluent into sewers would be managed to avoid any issues to residents; (xiii) to seek clarification on any noise impact and time restrictions.

### **Resolution**

The Planning Committee agreed to support both planning applications from Mission Street, raising the points made in Caroline Illott's report and at the meeting, and subject to satisfactory answers from the planning officers at SCDC.

Pierre Redelinghuys would prepare the Parish Council's response for the clerk to submit to SCDC by 31 October 2022.

Meeting ended at 9.30pm

## **Appendix 1 – Mission Street presentation**

See separate pdf files:

- Burlington Park Mission Street Presentation October 2022
- Burlington Press Mission Street Presentation October 2022