
Member and Resident Update Meeting

West Cambridge Masterplan Review – 16/1134/OUT

Summary Note

Thursday 16 February 2017

15:30 – 16:30

Council Chamber, Guildhall

1.0 Apologies

Councillor Marie-Louise Holland.

2.0 Declarations of Interest

None.

3.0 Purpose of Briefing

- To update Members and residents on the current progress of the outline planning application **16/1134/OUT**.
- To explain how key issues identified at consultation stage are being addressed. The issues are:
 - o Landscape and Urban Design – Setting of the City
 - o Highway Issues
 - o Tree Issues
 - o Drainage
 - o Environmental Health Issues
 - o Sustainability
 - o Amenities Delivery

- Provide an update on the programme and next steps.

4.0 Application Site

- 4.1 The outline planning application is for a new masterplan for the West Cambridge Campus, at Land south of Madingley Road.

- 4.2 The existing site is a major new development for the University of Cambridge for academic and commercial research totalling 66 ha in area. The proposed densified West Cambridge would have a total floorspace of **500,280 sq m** (by 2031). Phase 1 (2021) would provide **284,310 sq m**, composed of **167,159 sq m** of academic floorspace and **92,386 sq m** of commercial floorspace.
- 4.3 The extant 1999 masterplan has been partially implemented. This related to a scheme of **235,437 sq m** floorspace in total. The principal roads through the site have been implemented along with numerous key buildings and the East and West Forums.

5.0 Policy Context

- 5.1 The site area is wholly within proposals site 7.06 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 and site M13 of the emerging Local Plan.
- 5.2 The Council has identified an overall strategic need for future employment growth across the city, including making more efficient use of existing employment sites. The University's application submission sets out a long term vision and strategy for the comprehensive development of the whole West Cambridge Site.
- 5.3 The emerging Cambridge Local Plan supports densification of the site in principle, subject to provision of a revised site wide masterplan that takes an 'integrated and comprehensive approach to development'. This places importance on ensuring that the amount of floor space can be successfully accommodated in environmental terms. This includes design, impact on the green belt and setting of the City, amenity and transport impact.

6.0 Key Points from Officer Update

- **Original application submission** was in June 2016.
- **Documents considered** – included 5 parameter plans, Design and Access Statement, Design Guide, Environment Statement and various supporting technical studies.
- **Key officer concerns** – were set out to the developer team following the consultation period. The key Issues are:
- **Transport-** the transport assessment as submitted was not a complete assessment. Principles of phased approach explained and the latest update on modelling work which is being carried out.

- **Landscape and visual impact** – potential visual impact of the proposals, particularly from key views from the south and west. Indicative revised images were introduced showing reduced height in key areas.
- **Trees** – full consideration and survey of existing trees and development buffers has been necessary. The relationship of this work with the Design Guide and consideration of reserved matters was explained.
- **Drainage** – surface water drainage strategy revisions.
- **Environmental Health Issues** – in particular noise, air quality and potential impact from artificial lighting.
- **Sustainability** – wider strategic issues with grid capacity and revised hierarchical approach to energy on the site.
- **Amenities delivery** – Shared facilities hub, phasing and strategies to improve sense of place on the campus.

7.0 Member/Resident Questions/Comments

Can the application for Civil Engineering (16/1811/FUL) be considered separately in the context of an unresolved outline application?

- 7.1 The reason it is being brought forward ahead of the outline is because the Civil Engineering Building (CEB) has secured funding for its delivery. The terms of this funding requires the planning outcome secured at the start of 2017. For this reason, the CEB application will need to be assessed ahead of the outline permission which is currently under determination. Provided there is full scrutiny prior to determination, the CEB scheme will not in the view of officers prejudice determination of the masterplan.

How does the visual impact assessment for Civil Engineering (16/1811/FUL) relate to the revised visual impact assessment for the outline application?

- 7.2 The proposed CEB building will not in the view of officer's result in significant visual harm from longer views of the site from the south or east. Whilst the proposed CEB application sits below the submitted outline heights, the wider visual impact and graded profile of views from the east for the outline are still under review. Approval of CEB does not prejudice that wider assessment.

The proposed multi storey car park (MSCP) should be located off Clerk Maxwell Road should be revised, ideally positioned at the western end of the site closer to the M11.

- 7.3 The amenity and traffic related issues relating to the MSCP are currently being considered through the transport work stream.

How will connections with the North West Cambridge Development (NWCD) be improved?

- 7.4 The transport strategy in the draft TA proposes an adaptive phased approach to assessing the impact of the development through the development period. This is because of the infrastructure uncertainties in the wider area which will be brought forward in the future. The cycling and walking improvements with the NWCD associated with key phase one of the development have not yet been agreed. Later phases of development to 2031 will provide mitigation through an overall transport CAP. The CAP itself will be based on an indicative, costed assessment of likely mitigation, which at this stage has not been submitted.

What is the data set informing the transport assessment work?

- 7.5 The starting point is observed primary survey data carried out by the applicant's consultants Peter Brett Associates.

The colours and tone of the revised visual impact studies are inconsistent and difficult to compare with the original submission.

- 7.6 Officers note the inconsistent use of colour across the revised visuals and will be bringing this to the applicant's attention. This notwithstanding, the revised images and methodology are starting to show an improved visual image, particularly from medium length views from the south and east.

Will all growth in the City be included in the transport modelling?

- 7.7 Officers have agreed with the applicant's consultants the background growth which informs the transport model work. It includes all committed background growth as identified in the Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire emerging Local Plan which is currently under examination.

How will key cycle flows be addressed in the submission, including the increased demand on Garret Hostel Lane?

- 7.8 The University currently intends to reduce reliance on Garret Hostel Lane because of its limited capacity to accommodate further cycle movements. A new cycle street is proposed to take cycles along Sedgwick Avenue. The University considers this will provide an alternative route into the City Centre. This part of the cycle strategy is still under review in the transport work stream.

How does the application manage movements on and off the site during peak times each day? Given the nature of the uses proposed, these trips will be all at the same time during rush hour(s).

- 7.10 The transport assessment work tests the network peak relative to the development peak.

There are unfulfilled obligations associated with the extant 1999 planning permission. This includes the Rifle Range cycle route into the City. How will the new application address these unfulfilled commitments?

- 7.11 The S106 negotiations and transport work will audit all existing unfilled obligations associated with the 1990 extant permission. Any outstanding obligations still consider necessary will be captured in the new S106 Agreement. The University does not consider the previously proposed Rifle Range cycle route to be deliverable. Alternative strategies will be proposed to mitigate these trip movements.

Does the application address localised flooding, in particular the issue of siltation to existing watercourses.

- 7.12 The revised drainage work consists of further information regarding management and maintenance of water courses, in particular siltation. Flooding off site will generally be reduced by the restriction of discharge rates and provision of onsite attenuation measures that will be managed and inspected.

Will there be a period of reconsultation?

- 7.13 There will be full comprehensive period of re consultation following receipt of the developer teams package of amendments late March.

Summary

- 7.14 Officers explained that the key issues reflected the current situation and were still under review.
- 7.15 A package of amendments will be provided for full reconsultation in late March. The application is expected to be brought before Committee in the summer 2017.
- 7.16 Officers advised that a further member briefing, particularly focusing on transport matters, will be provided before the application is brought before Committee. A further resident's update will be available at West Central Committee on 9 March.