



JOINT DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE: CAMBRIDGE FRINGES

Membership

Cambridge Council: Cllrs Blencowe (Vice-Chair), Dryden, Reid, Smart and Tucker, Price Alternates: Marchant-Daisley and Tunnacliffe

Cambridgeshire County Council: Cllrs Kenney, Orgee, Pegram and Shepherd, Alternates: Brooks-Gordon and Reynolds

South Cambridgeshire District Council: Cllrs Bard (Chair), Lacey, Corney, Kindersley, Nightingale and Shelton, Alternates: Scarr, Lockwood and Wotherspoon

Date: Thursday, 6 September 2012
Time: 10.00 am
Venue: Committee Room 1 & 2 - Guildhall
Contact: Martin Whelan **Direct Dial:** 01223 457013

AGENDA

1 APOLOGIES

To receive any apologies for absence.

2 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Members are asked to declare at this stage any interests that they may have in an item shown on this agenda. If any member of the Committee is unsure whether or not they should declare an interest on a particular matter, they should seek advice from the Head of Legal Services **before** the meeting.

3 MINUTES

To follow

Voting Rights of Members

South Cambridgeshire District Councillors will be unable to vote on the following application.

4 12/0890/REM - BELLS SCHOOL DEVELOPMENT SITE BABRAHAM ROAD CAMBRIDGE CAMBRIDGESHIRE CB2 0RA *(Pages 1 - 54)*

5 BRIEFING - BELL SCHOOL RESERVED MATTER RESIDENTIAL (HILLS RESIDENTIAL)

Voting Rights of Members

South Cambridgeshire District Councillors will be unable to vote on the following application:

6 12/0754/REM - PARCELS 16 AND PART 17 CLAY FARM DEVELOPMENT SITE, CAMBRIDGE *(Pages 55 - 90)*

Speaking at the Committee by Other Members of the Councils

A member of any of the councils who is not a member of the committee or a member of a parish council (in respect of applications relating to sites in their own parish) may speak at a meeting of the committee at the request or with the permission of that committee or of its Chair made or obtained before the meeting. Such request or permission shall specify the matters in respect of which the member shall be permitted to speak.

Information for the Public

Location The meeting is in the Guildhall on the Market Square (CB2 3QJ).

Between 9 a.m. and 5 p.m. the building is accessible via Peas Hill, Guildhall Street and the Market Square entrances.

After 5 p.m. access is via the Peas Hill entrance.

All the meeting rooms (Committee Room 1, Committee 2 and the Council Chamber) are on the first floor, and are accessible via lifts or stairs.

Public Participation Some meetings may have parts, which will be closed to the public, but the reasons for excluding the press and public will be given.

Members of the public who want to speak about an application on the agenda for this meeting may do so, if they have submitted a written representation within the consultation period relating to the application and notified the Committee Manager that they wish to speak by **12.00 noon on the day before the meeting**.

Public speakers will not be allowed to circulate any additional written information to their speaking notes or any other drawings or other visual material in support of their case that has not been verified by officers and that is not already on public file.

For further information on speaking at committee please contact Democratic Services on 01223 457013 or democratic.services@cambridge.gov.uk.

Further information about speaking at a City Council meeting can be found at;

<http://www.cambridge.gov.uk/public/docs/Having%20your%20say%20at%20meetings.pdf>

Cambridge City Council would value your assistance in improving the public speaking process of committee meetings. If you have any feedback please contact Democratic Services on 01223 457013 or democratic.services@cambridge.gov.uk.

Representations on Planning Applications Public representations on a planning application should be made in writing (by e-mail or letter, in both cases stating your full postal address), within the deadline set for comments on that application. You are therefore strongly urged to submit your representations within this deadline.

The submission of late information after the officer's report has been published is to be avoided.

A written representation submitted to the Environment Department by a member of the public after publication of the officer's report will only be considered if it is from someone who has already made written representations in time for inclusion within the officer's report. Any public representation received by the Department after 12 noon two business days before the relevant Committee meeting (e.g by 12.00 noon on Monday before a Wednesday meeting; by 12.00 noon on Tuesday before a Thursday meeting) will not be considered.

The same deadline will also apply to the receipt by the Department of additional information submitted by an applicant or an agent in connection with the relevant item on the Committee agenda (including letters, e-mails, reports, drawings and all other visual material), unless specifically requested by planning officers to help decision-making.

Filming, recording and photography The Council is committed to being open and transparent in the way it conducts its decision-making. Recording is permitted at council meetings, which are open to the public. The Council understands that some members of the public attending its meetings may not wish to be recorded. The Chair of the meeting will facilitate by ensuring that any such request not to be recorded is respected by those doing the recording.

Full details of the City Council's protocol on audio/visual recording and photography at meetings can be accessed via:

www.cambridge.gov.uk/democracy/ecSDDisplay.aspx?NAME=SD1057&ID=1057&RPID=33371389&sch=doc&cat=13203&path=13020%2c13203.

Fire Alarm In the event of the fire alarm sounding please follow the instructions of Cambridge City Council staff.

Facilities for disabled people Level access to the Guildhall is via Peas Hill.

A loop system is available in Committee Room 1, Committee Room 2 and the Council Chamber.

Accessible toilets are available on the ground and first floor.

Meeting papers are available in large print and other formats on request prior to the meeting.

For further assistance please contact Democratic Services on 01223 457013 or democratic.services@cambridge.gov.uk.

Queries on reports If you have a question or query regarding a committee report please contact the officer listed at the end of relevant report or Democratic Services on 01223 457013 or democratic.services@cambridge.gov.uk.

General Information Information regarding committees, councilors and the democratic process is available at www.cambridge.gov.uk/democracy.

This page is intentionally left blank

JOINT DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE

Report by: Head of Planning Services

Date: 6 September 2012

Application Number	12/0890/REM	Agenda Item	
Date Received	12/07/2012	Officer	Michael Ovenden
Target Date	6/09/2012		
Parishes/Wards	Queen Edith Ward		
Site	Bells School Development Site Babraham Road Cambridge Cambridgeshire CB2 0RA		
Proposal	Reserved matters application for proposed road junction of site access road with Babraham Road, and initial section of access road, including additional details required under condition 28 of the outline planning permission (06/0795/OUT).		
Applicant	The Bell School Educational Trust Ltd		
Recommendation	APPROVAL WITH CONDITIONS		
Application Type	Major	Departure:	No

The above application is reported to the Planning Committee for determination in accordance with the Scheme of Delegation for the Joint Development Control Committee for the Cambridge Fringes

INDEX

	Page
1 BACKGROUND	2
2 SITE DESCRIPTION/AREA CONTEXT	4
3 THE PROPOSAL	5
4 RELEVANT SITE HISTORY	5
5 PUBLICITY	6
6 POLICY	6
7 CONSULTATIONS	7
8 NEIGHBOUR REPRESENTATIONS	7
9 CONTEXT DEFINED BY THE APPEAL	8
Principle	9
Junction/access road design	9
Interaction between movements from and past the site	10
Highway capacity	11
Interaction between access and No6 and 6B Babraham Road	12
Other matters	13
10 ASSESSMENT OF THE CURRENT APPLICATION	13
Approval details under condition 28 – Submission of access details	15
11 CONCLUSION	16
12 RECOMMENDATION	16
13 PROPOSED CONDITIONS	16
14 REASONS FOR DECISION	16

APPENDICES

A INSPECTOR'S APPEAL DECISION LETTER (11/0918/REM)
B CONDITION 28 (06/0795/OUT)
C OUTLINE APPLICATION SITE PLAN – 8495.13.02 (06/0795/OUT)
D INDICATIVE MASTERPLAN – 425.1/101K (06/0795/OUT)
E PARAMETER PLAN – 425.1/15E (06/0795/OUT)
F APPROVED ACCESS AND CYCLE ROUTES PLAN – 425.1/22C (06/0795/OUT)
G CONSULTATION REPLIES
H SUMMARY OF NEIGHBOUR / THIRD PARTY COMMENTS
I SAFETY AUDIT

1. BACKGROUND

- 1.1 In 2006 the principle of developing the land, including providing its vehicular access from Babraham Road, was agreed by its allocation as one of the Southern Fringe sites in Cambridge Local Plan Policy 9/5. This policy was adopted following examination at the local plan inquiry. In June 2008 the Fringe Sites Joint Development Control Committee (JDCC) resolved to grant outline planning permission for the residential development of the Bell School site, with access shown from Babraham Road, subject to conditions and a S106 Agreement. The

outline permission allows up to 347 dwellings and 100 student units for use by Bell School. That application clearly indicated the vehicular access to the site to be from Babraham Road, in the location shown in the reserved matters application (see Appendices A).

- 1.2 In December 2010 the S106 agreement was completed and the outline planning permission issued. The outline permission approved the illustrative masterplan, parameter plans and access plan (see Appendices D, E & F). All those plans show the vehicular access to be in the location proposed in this application. As part of the S106 agreement improved pedestrian and cycling routes have been secured. These include the upgrading and widening of the permissive footpath to the south of the site and links to national cycle route 11.
- 1.3 In approving the outline application, the JDCC agreed the principle of the junction in the location shown on the access plan (Appendix F) with the exact design details to be considered as part of a reserved matters application. In addition a condition (condition 28) was applied to require details of the access (including cross sections, tree survey data, tree protection, planting, kerbs, shared use pathway/cycleway foundation design and construction, associated improvements and links to existing pathways/cycleways within the vicinity of the junction. The full wording of condition 28 is provided in Appendix B.
- 1.4 In January 2011 details were submitted to discharge condition 28 and officers considered that the submission should be determined with the reserved matters scheme for access design. Publicity was given to the discharge of conditions submission and a large number of objections received. City Council and Highways officers entered negotiations with the applicant to address matters of concern. These details were later withdrawn pending submission of a reserved matters application for the design of the access/junction.
- 1.5 In August 2011 a reserved matters application was submitted for the access. This submission followed months of discussion between City Council and Highways officers, near neighbours and the applicant. That proposal was for a two vehicle width access in the location approved by the outline permission. The access was proposed to be 5.5 metres wide increasing to 7.0 metres wide at the highway boundary. It was shown to have a 2.5 metre wide combined pavement and cycle

path along its northern edge and be a simple T-junction. There was no pavement proposed along its southern edge. In this area would have been a tapering verge along the site boundary narrowing at its eastern edge. No traffic lights or turning lane was proposed in Babraham Road.

1.6 The County Highways officer supported the proposal and a report recommending approval was taken to the JDCC in October 2011. The application was refused on the grounds that inadequate information had been submitted to demonstrate that the design was 'sufficiently safe'. The full wording of the reason for refusal is provided in paragraph 9.1 below. The refusal was subject to an appeal to the Secretary of State (Planning Inspectorate). The appeal was heard in January 2012 and the appeal decision was issued in May. The appeal was dismissed but the decision letter defines the context for considering this follow up application. The decision is assessed in section 9 'Context Defined by the Appeal' (below). A copy of the decision letter is attached as Appendix A.

2. SITE DESCRIPTION/AREA CONTEXT

2.1 The Bell School site lies on the southern edge of Cambridge near to Addenbrookes and covers an area of 7.78 hectares. Apart from the access, the development site has no direct frontage to Babraham Road (A1307).

2.2 The reserved matters application site is approximately 'T-shaped', covering a 94 metre stretch of the Babraham Road (including the carriageway, grass verges and shared cycle way/pavements) and the first 52 metres of the access into the site. The site is marginally lower level than the Babraham Road which lies to the east of the site.

2.3 The access land lies between 4A Babraham Road to the north and 6 and 6B to the south - the latter's driveway runs approximately parallel to the application access. Behind the pavement and verge the front boundary is defined by a metal agricultural type gate and an overgrown, gappy field type hedgerow in excess of two metres in height. This finger of land is laid to mown grass and has no other vegetation on it. A mix of fences, the side elevation of a garage and vegetation define its northern boundary. The southern boundary is defined by a boundary wall, closeboarded fencing of varying heights and vegetation towards the rear.

3. THE PROPOSAL

- 3.1 This reserved matters application provides the detailed design of the access - the location, principle and purpose of which is already approved under the outline permission and accepted before that in Policy 9/5 (item n) of the adopted Cambridge Local Plan (2006). Its design has been revised in accordance with the Inspector's comments. It remains in the location approved by the outline permission, retains the 2.5 metre wide combined pavement/cycleway along its northern edge and is still a simple priority T-junction. It is identical to the appeal proposal except in two linked respects – the carriageway maintains a width of 5.5 metres along its entire length (it does not widen as it approaches the highway) and as a result the position at which the pavement crosses the proposed access provides enhanced visibility. The access point at the Babraham Road is therefore narrower where pedestrians would have improved visibility along the access road. These changes are in response to the Inspector's comments. The merits of the revised scheme are assessed in section 10 below.
- 3.2 The application is accompanied by a submission to discharge Condition 28 of the outline permission showing details of the access (including cross sections, tree survey data, tree protection, planting, kerbs, shared use pathway/cycleway foundation design and construction, associated improvements and links to existing pathways/cycleways within the vicinity of the junction).

4. RELEVANT SITE HISTORY

- 4.1 The following applications are relevant.

Reference	Description	Outcome
06/0795/OUT	Residential development not exceeding 347 dwellings (houses, apartments, inc affordable and key worker housing), 100 bed student living accommodation for the Bell Language School, public open space, vehicular access from Babraham Road and associated roads, footpath/cycleways and drainage infrastructure.	Approved subject to conditions and S106 agreement
06/0959/FUL	Construction of 3m wide combined	

	footpath / cycleway and emergency access link from proposed residential development site at land off Babraham Road to the public highways in Greenlands.	
11/0918/REM	Reserved matters for access from Babraham Road to serve residential development (outline planning permission 06/0795/OUT).	Refused 2011 and dismissed on appeal 2012
11/1477/REM, 11/1478/REM & 11/1479/REM	Reserved matters for access from Babraham Road to serve residential development (outline planning permission 06/0795/OUT).	

These applications for the following different permutations of the access were held in abeyance pending receipt of the appeal decision.

11/1477/REM	Nearside (southbound passing bay)	All withdrawn by applicant in July 2012.
11/1478/REM	Traffic lights	
11/1479/REM	Right turn lane	

5. **PUBLICITY**

Advertisement:	Yes
Adjoining Owners:	Yes
Site Notices Displayed:	Yes

6. **POLICY**

Government and Regional Guidance and Advice

- 6.1 The main national planning policy document is the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). In comparison to previous planning policy, expressed in Planning Policy Guidance and Planning Policy Statements (PPGs and PPSs), it is a clearer, simpler and more coherent framework that is easier to understand. The document has a limited amount to say about detailed design of highway infrastructure that is relevant to this application although it does make reference to the provision of safe and secure layouts. The NPPF was published before the Inspector made his decision on the recent appeal.
- 6.2 In 2010 the coalition Government indicated its intention to abolish Regional Strategies – including the East of England Plan. Since then the Localism Act (2011)

has been enacted which gives the Secretary of State the power to repeal Regional Strategies. This is subject to the outcome of environmental assessments and will not be taken until the Secretary of State and Parliament have considered the findings of the assessments. This process has not been completed and at the time of drafting this report the Regional Strategy remains part of the Development Plan - but as advised by the Secretary of State it should be afforded limited weight. If the situation changes prior to the committee meeting this will be reported.

Relevant Structure Plan and Local Plan Policies

3/2	Setting of the City
3/4	Responding to Context
3/11	The Design of External Spaces
4/3	Safeguarding Features of Amenity or Nature Conservation Value
4/4	Trees
8/2	Transport impact
8/4	Walking and Cycling Accessibility
8/5	Pedestrian and Cycle Network
8/7	Public Transport Accessibility
8/11	New Roads
9/3	Development in the Urban Extensions
9/5	Southern Fringe

7 CONSULTATIONS

Highways Authority (Cambridgeshire County Council)

Summary

- 7.1 Following the investigation of various junction proposals for the access to the Bell School site, reviewing the comments of the Safety Auditors and taking note of the Planning Inspectors decision and accompanying report, the Highway Authority has considered the current application and considers that the present design is, subject to detailed design, acceptable and provides an appropriate balance in design between transport function and place making; an approach recommended in the Manual For Streets guidance documents.

See Appendix G for further detail

8 NEIGHBOUR REPRESENTATIONS

- 8.1 148 occupiers in the locality were notified of the application.

Summary

All representations received (currently 25) are objections to the proposal. The grounds of objection range between the differences between this proposal and the

appeal scheme, matters of principle and issues addressed in detail by the appeal inspector. See Appendix H for further detail

9 CONTEXT DEFINED BY THE APPEAL

9.1 This application is a revision of 11/0918/REM that was refused in October 2011. That application was refused for the following reason:

“Inadequate information has been provided to demonstrate to the Joint Development Control Committee’s satisfaction that the junction design is sufficiently safe at this location and therefore the proposal is compliant with policy 8/2 [Transport Impact] of the Cambridge City Council Local Plan (2006).”

9.2 In refusing the application for a single reason the committee indicated that the development was acceptable in every other respect. Although many of the representations received last time referred to the other issues – for example the principle of development, whether this is the right location for the access, the effect on congestion, displacement of vehicles elsewhere, effect on ambulances, how adjacent residents will exit their properties, the reliability of traffic data used in transport modelling, effect on cyclists, whether a signalised junction would be safer and whether a right turn lane is required - these were not referred to in the reason for refusal. These issues cannot be re-opened. The principle of developing the land and accessing it from Babraham Road is agreed in Cambridge Local Plan Policy 9/5. This policy was adopted following examination at the local plan inquiry. In turn the outline permission granted in December 2010 for dwellings, student accommodation, public open space and vehicular access (to Babraham Road in the position maintained in this application), roads, cycle, footways and drainage cemented this acceptance. All of these issues remain settled and this current application does not reopen them.

9.3 The refusal was appealed and an informal hearing was held in January 2012. The Inspector’s decision letter was issued in May 2012. It is attached as Appendix A to this report for ease of reference. The Inspector carried out a site visit as part of the appeal process and the position of the access was indicated on site. Recently the access has been marked out on site showing that the dimensions on the plans are correct and that it is feasible to physically construct the access arrangements as proposed within land controlled by the applicant.

Principle

- 9.4 The Inspector noted that the point of access was approved as part of the outline permission and commented: “*therefore that matter is not open to re-assessment. It is the design of the site access road with the Babraham Road and the initial section of the access road, submitted in pursuance of reserved matters conditions no. 3 [requirement for approval of reserved matters] which is the subject of the appeal application.*” This remains the case for this application. The combination of the decisions on the planning application and appeal constrains the issues for the applicant and local planning authority to focus on. The Inspector stated “*the main issue in this case is the effect of the proposal on the safety and convenience of highway users*”. This remains the case for this application.
- 9.5 Although a number of objections have been raised on the grounds of the principle of an access in this location, these are not considered to be sustainable for the above reasons.

Junction/access road design (Inspector’s letter paragraphs 7-10)

- 9.6 The appeal was dismissed for one reason – the layout of the access was judged to pose a risk to the safety and convenience of highway users. In the appeal proposal the access was 5.5 metres wide for about half of its length but started to widen from a point approximately 40 metres from highway land. At the point it met highway land it was to be approximately 7.0 m wide. The Inspector took the view that the wide access left inadequate space for pedestrians to look along the access clear of the carriageway to see whether vehicles were approaching the junction; possibly requiring them to pause in the highway if vehicles appeared, putting them at risk from vehicles turning into the site. He also believed that the excessive width would encourage higher vehicle speeds.
- 9.7 At the hearing the appellant tabled a revised plan showing a modified design of access. The Inspector’s comment suggests that he thought the revisions may overcome his concerns:
- “The appellant has also indicated that the carriageway width could be reduced, if required by the Highway Authority. This may in turn, as suggested by an interested party, allow the width of the southern verge to be increased close to*

the junction providing an improved western sightline for people crossing from the south.”

- 9.8 However he felt that the revision, that would modify the geometry of the junction would constitute a substantial change to the proposals, should not be considered at the appeal held in January 2012, as no consultation had been carried out on it. Nor did he consider that he could impose a condition requiring such details to be submitted for approval as part of his decision. He therefore made it clear that this change to the proposals would need to be considered as part of a new application to the local planning authority. The current application is this application.

Interaction between movements from and past the site (paragraph 11-21)

- 9.9 Having determined the main issue, the Inspector took the opportunity of addressing the other issues raised by third parties. He considered potential conflict between vehicles turning in and turning out of the junction and conflict between turning traffic and through traffic and reached the view that “... the risks would be likely to be low and would not be sufficient to justify withholding approval of the appeal application”. He considered the necessity of larger vehicles entering and leave the site to run outside their lane was common behaviour, likely to happen rarely and would be acceptable.
- 9.10 He was content that the other non vehicular accesses to the site mitigated the absence of a pavement along the southern side of the access road which would be of sufficient width. Whilst objections had been raised about the carriageway gradient approaching the junction and he noted that the proposal did not comply with the standard set out in ‘Local Transport Note 2/08-Cycle Infrastructure Design, October 2008’ he agreed with the Highways Authority that despite this, acceptable gradients could be achieved subject to a planning condition (addressed in condition 28). He had no concerns about the vertical alignment of the access. With regard to concerns about conflict with ambulances the Inspector considered that the Construction Method Statement attached to the outline permission would adequate deal with conflict during the construction period and raised no concerns on this issue in the post construction period.

9.11 Although a number of objections have reiterated previous objections relating to the above including the principle, location, interaction between those passing or entering/leaving the site, including ambulances and construction vehicles, given the Inspector's decision, there have been no material changes on circumstances or the proposals in this respect since the appeal decision was made in January 2012 that could justify a refusal on this basis.

Highway Capacity (paragraphs 22-29)

9.12 During the appeal a number of parties suggested that the traffic flow figures were not reliable. The Inspector considered that while the traffic study results should be treated with a degree of caution the developer had not relied on them but tempered them with knowledge of the area and its approach was sound. In summary he concluded that the junction would operate within capacity - and was content that projections of traffic flows (including those relating to Addenbrookes expansion) were adequate especially with provision of a 'keep clear' box.

9.13 Some of the representations made on the current application express concern about how the junction would operate in peak traffic hours or in combination with the traffic lights in the area. In both respects the Inspector considered that the development would be acceptable. Noting concerns expressed at the time, the Inspector carried out his site visit so that he was able to experience the area during the whole of the morning rush hour. His visit was made during term time during the working week. He saw how the area functioned during that time. *"I saw blocking back of northbound Babraham Road traffic which extended from the signal controlled junction to the north of the appeal site entrance to a point beyond the junction with Granham's Road, which which adjoins the western side of Babraham Road some distance to the south of the site entrance. Queuing traffic gave way on a courtesy basis to allow vehicles to turn into and out of Granham's Road in a relatively speedy manner. This would also be likely to occur at the proposed junction."*

9.14 *"The relatively close proximity of the signal control junction to the northwest would be likely to result in platooning of southbound traffic past the site from time to time. When passing the site those platoons would limit the ability of emerging vehicles to turn right onto Babraham Road. However, this restriction would be offset by the increased capacity for such manoeuvres during the*

periods when the traffic is held back by the signals. I have no compelling reason to dispute the view of the appellant's highway consultant that over the course of a peak hour any platooning affect due to the signals is unlikely to have an appreciable effect on the capacity of the proposed junction. I consider that the same is likely to be true with respect to the impact of the Toucan crossing, the future provision of which, some distance to the south of the appeal site access, was secured by a section 106 agreement in association with the grant of outline planning permission."

- 9.15 He considered that the access would operate properly even with the existing crossing to the north and the proposed Toucan crossing required by the S106 agreement linked to the outline permission. *"In my judgement, subject to condition, the proposed junction would be likely to operate within capacity"*.

Interaction between access and No 6 and 6B Babraham Road (paragraphs 30-34)

- 9.16 He specifically considered the potential for conflict between vehicles and those using the access to No 6 and 6B. He noted that the construction of the access would increase the likelihood of vehicles entering/leaving the site at the same time as movements associated with 6 or 6b were happening. However he considered that the traffic movements from those two properties to be low, that intervisibility would be good and that drivers would be aware of potential hazards and the risk of vehicles coming into conflict would be low. He noted that research reported in Manual for Streets shows very few accidents occur involving vehicles turning into or out of driveways. He considered that the potential works to provide alternative accesses to properties 6 and 6B were not agreed with third parties and were unnecessary. He concluded by judging that other works – such as widening the pedestrian route on opposite side of Babraham Road were unnecessary to make the scheme acceptable in planning terms so that it would be unreasonable to make approval conditional on the replacement of the existing entrances. In summary other than the width of the access (see paragraph 9.6 above) the Inspector considered that none of these other matters were unacceptable or required revision. Objections have been received on this basis concerning the current application but as there have been no material changes since appeal decision it would be unreasonable to re open this issue.

Other matters (paragraph 35)

- 9.17 The Inspector noted that walking and cycling routes had been secured by the S106 and said that he had seen no compelling evidence that other additional off site works were necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms.

Condition 28

- 9.18 The Inspector noted that the submission relating to condition 28 was not before him for consideration.

- 9.19 To conclude, in relation to the Inspector's decision in all matters other than excessive width of the access – its affect on pedestrian visibility and speed of vehicles - the Inspector found the proposal to be acceptable. In making his decision in May 2012 it post dated the publication of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and therefore took it into account.

10 ASSESSMENT OF THE CURRENT APPLICATION

- 10.1 The Inspector's decision letter defines the key issue to be highway safety. The applicant has taken the Inspector's decision letter as the starting point for redesigning the access. The design is very clearly an amendment of the appeal proposal. It follows the description in paragraph 10 of his decision letter (quoted in paragraph 9.7 above). It is still proposed to emerge onto Babraham Road at the point approved in the outline planning permission. It is still a simple priority T-junction with a 2.5 metre wide combined footway/cycleway along the northern side of the access road. No footway would be provided on its southern side, instead there would be a verge between the southern edge of the carriageway and the boundary enclosure of No. 6B Babraham Road. These aspects of the proposal were accepted by the Inspector and remain unaltered. However in contrast to the appeal proposal the access road would maintain a constant width of 5.5 metres from its western extremity to the point that it meets highway land. The verge along the common boundary with 6B would be wider than previously proposed. As a result at the approach to the junction the revised carriageway width would be 1.5 metres

narrower than proposed at appeal. The access design has been the subject of a Stage 1 Road Safety Audit by Cambridgeshire County Council which has identified no remaining concerns. A copy of this is appended as APPENDIX I.

10.2 By narrowing the carriageway as described by the Inspector the applicant has been able to improve the westward (into the site) visibility available to pedestrians crossing the access from south to north (towards the City centre). Consequently pedestrians would be able to see vehicles approaching the site exit before beginning to cross the access and therefore would not need to pause on the carriageway if a vehicle was then spotted leaving the site. The reduction in width also addresses his concern that the flaring of the access above 5.5 metres would encourage higher vehicle speeds in proximity to the junction thereby increasing the risk to people crossing the junction. Therefore the revised design addresses both the Inspector's concerns – inadequate visibility and a widening that encourages higher speeds.

10.3 In his decision letter the Inspector considered the merits of cross providing a 'keep clear' box on the northbound section of the Babraham Road. Objections to its inclusion are included in representations made on this current application. The Inspector however decided that it would be a positive element of the junction:

"I consider that through the provision of 'keep clear' road markings on the northbound lane of Babraham Road it would be possible to ensure that gaps are sufficiently wide to allow adequate visibility between those road users, thereby satisfactorily reducing the potential for collisions. The provision of appropriate road markings would be a positive and relatively minor change to the proposed junction design, which, in my view, could be secured through the imposition of a suitable condition.

13. There may be occasions when a vehicle waiting to turn right into the site from Babraham Road may give way to a vehicle turning right out of the site. Intervisibility between that emerging driver and southbound through traffic, such as cyclists, may be limited by the waiting traffic. However, under those circumstances the emerging vehicle would be joining, rather than crossing the flow of traffic, and so, to my mind, the risk of collision is reduced.

14. In relation to the identified scenarios of vehicles that are turning right into or out of the site coming into conflict with through traffic on Babraham Road, I consider that, subject to condition, the risks would be likely to be low and would not be sufficient to justify withholding approval of the appeal application."

10.4 A 20 metre long 'keep clear' box is shown on the application drawings. This can be secured through the imposition of a suitable condition. Given the Inspector's clear

support for the 'keep clear' box it would not be appropriate to object to its inclusion in this revised scheme.

- 10.5 The Inspector took the view *“that the other routes secured as part of the outline planning permission would adequately mitigate the absence of a footway along the southern side of the proposed access road.”* He considered the width of the pavement/cycleway along the northern side of the access to be acceptable and this remains unaltered. Various objectors have criticised the proposal on this basis but given the Inspectors acceptance of it and of the lack of a pavement on the southern side of the access it would not be reasonable to reopen this matter.
- 10.6 City Council and Highway officers consider that the revisions to the proposed access junction design successfully overcome the Inspectors concerns and are therefore acceptable.

Approval details under condition 28 – Submission of access details

- 10.7 Condition 28 of the outline permission requires the submission of engineering details of the access. The full wording is given in Appendix B. The details required by the condition were submitted at the same time as this application. The condition requires approval in writing and subsequent implementation of the approved scheme before any approved dwelling is served by the access. The details require cross sections, information on trees to be lost and trees to be retained, tree protection, details of the path/cycle.
- 10.8 The details show that the slight downhill slope into the site will be retained, all trees in the site are to be retained, it identifies the protection measures to be put in place. No planting is proposed within the site which is acceptable given that the access leaves no room for planting and existing boundaries are to be retained.
- 10.9 Officers have requested further details and an update will be given at the meeting.

11 CONCLUSION

- 11.1 The revised design of access follows the design outlined by the Inspector and overcomes his single concern in relation to the width of the access. There has been

no material change in circumstances since the appeal decision was made. The Localism Act was enacted prior to the Inspector making his decision and there have been no subsequent changes in policy since his decision. The amended design has been assessed in detail by County Highways officers and has been subject to a Stage 1 Safety Audit. It is considered to be acceptable and the Reserved Matters application is therefore recommended for approval subject to conditions.

11.2 The access details required under condition 28 are to be supplemented by further information which is expected to be acceptable.

12 **RECOMMENDATION**

1. APPROVE Reserved matters subject to condition
2. That following technical approval from the Highways Authority the discharge of condition 28 of outline planning permission 06/0795/OUT be APPROVED (subject to receipt of the further information requested by officers)

13 **PROPOSED CONDITIONS**

1. The access hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved drawings i.e. 10 174 REV A (A3), 14951 100 153, 14951 100 154, 14951 1100 1151, 14951 1200 1251 & 14951 700 751.

REASON: For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.

2. The vehicular access hereby permitted shall not be brought into first use until the cross hatched 'keep clear' marking shown on drawing 14951/1200/1251 has been provided in accordance with the approved drawings.

REASON: In the interests of the safety and convenience of highway users.

14 **REASONS FOR DECISION**

14.1 This development has been approved subject to conditions because subject to those requirements it is considered to generally conform to the Development Plan, particularly the following policies:

Cambridge Local Plan 2006: 8/2, 8/5, 8/11 and 9/5

14.2 The proposed development would have an acceptable impact on the capacity of Babraham Road and would provide a safe and appropriate access to the Bell School

development. The proposal takes into account the needs of pedestrians and cyclists and ensures that access for Emergency Vehicles along Babraham Road is maintained. The proposal is in accordance with guidance contained in Manual for Streets and Manual for Streets 2 which set out guidance on the design of urban streets. This states that a capacity will not always be the primary consideration in street design. The junction has been designed to minimise speed by reducing the number of approach lanes and providing a tight radii at the junction. This is in accordance with Manual for Streets 2 which states that keeping speeds lower has been demonstrated to have significant safety benefits. The decision has been made having had regard to all other material planning considerations, none of which was considered to have been of such significance as to justify doing other than grant planning permission. These reasons for approval can be a summary of the reasons for grant of planning permission.

This page is intentionally left blank



Appeal Decision

Hearing held on 24 January 2012

Site visit made on 25 January 2012

by I Jenkins BSc CEng MICE MCIWEM

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 15 May 2012

Appeal Ref: APP/Q0505/A/11/2163031

Bell School development site, Babraham Road, Cambridge

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant approval to details required by a condition of a planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by The Bell Educational Trust Ltd against the decision of Cambridge City Council.
 - The application Ref 11/0918/REM, dated 1 August 2011, sought approval of access details pursuant to condition no. 3 of a planning permission Ref. 06/0795/OUT, granted on 14 December 2010.
 - The application was refused by notice dated 11 October 2011.
 - The development proposed is residential development not exceeding 347 dwellings (comprising houses and apartments, including affordable and key worker housing), 100 bed student living accommodation for the Bell Language School and public open space, with vehicular access from Babraham Road and associated roads, footpath/cycleways and drainage infrastructure.
 - The details for which approval is sought are: proposed road junction of site access road with Babraham Road and initial section of access road (note other details of access to be submitted as part of the reserved matters applications relating to the layout of the development site which will be submitted by the selected developer).
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed and approval of the reserved matter is refused, namely: access details submitted in pursuance of condition no. 3 attached to planning permission Ref. 06/0795/OUT, dated 14 December 2010.

Procedural matters

2. Whilst the site address is given on the planning application form as '*land off Babraham Road, Cambridge*', I consider that the address given on the appeal form more accurately describes it as '*Bell School development site, Babraham Road, Cambridge*' and so I have used this in the summary information above.
3. The Council and appellant have confirmed that the point at which vehicles would access the site from Babraham Road was approved as part of the outline scheme for which planning permission has been granted, Ref. 06/0795/OUT. Therefore, that matter is not open to re-assessment. It is the design of the junction of the site access road with Babraham Road and the initial section of the access road, submitted in pursuance of reserved matters condition no. 3, which is the subject of the appeal application. A separate application has been submitted to the Council in relation to condition no. 28, which requires a detailed engineering scheme/plan for the access. This is not the subject of the

appeal, although some of the associated details have been provided as part of the appeal submissions for illustrative purposes.

Application for costs

4. At the Hearing an application for costs was made by the Bell Educational Trust Ltd against Cambridge City Council. This application is the subject of a separate Decision.

Main Issue

5. I consider that the main issue in this case is the effect of the proposal on the safety and convenience of highway users.

Reasons

6. An accessway leads from the western side of Babraham Road, between no. 4a to the north and nos. 6 and 6a to the south, to a large grassed area, which comprises the main section of the approved site. This site is allocated for residential development in the Cambridge City Council Local Plan 2006 (LP) (LP Policy 9/5-Southern fringe) and is located close to the Addenbrooke's Hospital site. In the vicinity of the appeal site, the speed limit along Babraham Road is 30 mph.

Junction/access road design

7. The proposed access road would have a width of 5.5 metres widening to approximately 7.0 metres towards the proposed simple priority T-junction with Babraham Road. There would be a 2.5 metre wide combined footway/cycleway along the north side of the access road. No footway provision would be made on its southern side, instead the verge between the southern edge of the carriageway and the boundary enclosure of No. 6B would taper down as the carriageway width increases.
8. The planning officer's report to committee recommended approval of the appeal scheme, which was also supported by the Highway Authority and Cambridgeshire County Council's Road Safety Engineering Team Leader. Nevertheless, the Council refused to approve the application and I share a number of the concerns raised by parties to the appeal.
9. I deal first with issues related to the width of the proposed access road. The western sightline available to people wishing to cross the proposed access road from south to north at the junction with Babraham Road would be restricted due to the close proximity of No. 6B's northern boundary enclosure to the southern edge of the proposed carriageway. As a result, it is likely that people would start to cross without having a good view along the site access road. This could bring them into conflict with emerging vehicles. Alternatively, if they pause on the carriageway to allow an emerging vehicle to pass, they may come into conflict with other vehicles entering the site from Babraham Road. Furthermore, the increased width of the access road over and above 5.5 metres, which is considered appropriate by the Council's highway consultant with reference to Manual for Streets (MfS1), would encourage higher speeds in the immediate vicinity of the junction. This would increase the risk to people crossing the access road at the junction. I consider that these features of the scheme pose a significant risk to the safety and convenience of highway users.

10. I give little weight to the appellant's suggestion that it may be possible to improve the western sightline by moving the crossing point to the east onto the curved section of the kerbing. This practice is discouraged by MfS1, as it would increase the crossing distance and would make it difficult for blind or partially sighted people to orientate themselves before crossing. The appellant has also indicated that the carriageway width could be reduced, if required by the Highway Authority. This may in turn, as suggested by an interested party, allow the width of the southern verge to be increased close to the junction providing an improved western sightline for people crossing from the south. However, this alternative did not form part of the application considered by the Council. In my judgement, such a modification to the geometry of the junction would amount to a substantial change, which those with an interest in the scheme, including a large number of local objectors who were not present at the Hearing, may wish to have the opportunity to formally comment upon. Circular 11/95 indicates that changes of this nature can not reasonably be secured by condition. Therefore, I give this suggestion little weight.
11. I turn now to the concerns raised with respect to scenarios involving drivers turning right into or out of the site potentially coming into conflict with through traffic on Babraham Road. At the Hearing the Council's highway consultant indicated that 'keep clear' road markings would need to be provided on the north bound carriageway of Babraham Road at the proposed junction. It explained that this would ensure that northbound queuing traffic would not block the path of vehicles turning right into the site, gaps would arise in the north bound queues facilitating turning movements out of the site and it would improve visibility. I understand that whilst the appellant would be willing to provide this facility, it has not been identified as necessary by the Highway Authority or Cambridgeshire County Council's Road Safety Engineering Team.
12. Although, in the absence of 'keep clear' road markings, queuing northbound traffic on Babraham Road may leave small gaps for vehicles to turn right into the site on a courtesy basis, it is possible that northbound cyclists may not see the turning vehicle, resulting in a collision as their paths cross. However, I consider that through the provision of 'keep clear' road markings on the northbound lane of Babraham Road it would be possible to ensure that gaps are sufficiently wide to allow adequate visibility between those road users, thereby satisfactorily reducing the potential for collisions. The provision of appropriate road markings would be a positive and relatively minor change to the proposed junction design, which, in my view, could be secured through the imposition of a suitable condition.
13. There may be occasions when a vehicle waiting to turn right into the site from Babraham Road may give way to a vehicle turning right out of the site. Intervisibility between that emerging driver and southbound through traffic, such as cyclists, may be limited by the waiting traffic. However, under those circumstances the emerging vehicle would be joining, rather than crossing the flow of traffic, and so, to my mind, the risk of collision is reduced.
14. In relation to the identified scenarios of vehicles that are turning right into or out of the site coming into conflict with through traffic on Babraham Road, I consider that, subject to condition, the risks would be likely to be low and would not be sufficient to justify withholding approval of the appeal application.
15. The swept path analysis indicates that when turning into and out of the proposed side road a large refuse vehicle would overrun adjacent running

- lanes. However, I agree with the appellant that this behaviour is common place and is accepted by MfS2¹ and, as the frequency of large vehicles accessing the primarily residential site is likely to be low, this would be acceptable.
16. In terms of providing non-vehicular access to and from the main section of the appeal site, I am satisfied that the other routes secured as part of the outline planning permission would adequately mitigate the absence of a footway along the southern side of the proposed access road. In addition to the footway/cycleway along the northern side of the road, these include the upgrading of an existing pedestrian route between the eastern corner of the main section of the approved site and a point on Babraham Road to the south of the proposed access road junction.
17. The width of the footway/cycleway along the northern side of the proposed access road would fall short of the standard set out in *Local Transport Note 2/08*². However, the guidance indicates that whilst this standard is generally regarded as a minimum, in areas with few cyclists or pedestrians a narrower route may suffice. The Council has indicated that there would be a number of alternative pedestrian/cycle links across the site, which are likely to be of greater importance for pedestrian/cycle movement connectivity. I have not been provided with any compelling evidence to show that in this case the volume of pedestrian/cycle traffic would render the limited width of the proposed footway/cycleway unacceptable. Neither the Council's Cycling and Walking Officer nor Sustrans raised any objections to this detail and, under the circumstances, I agree with the Highway Authority that the proposed width would be acceptable.
18. I have had regard to drawing no. 14951/100/102A, which has been provided for illustrative purposes. It shows suggested levels along the proposed highway, including a carriageway gradient approaching the junction which does not accord with the standard set out in TD41/95 of the DMRB³. Nonetheless, I agree with the view expressed by the Highway Authority at the Hearing that acceptable gradients could be achieved, notwithstanding that this may involve relatively steep gradients being associated with the footway and verge at the front of Nos. 6 and 6B. An appropriate scheme of levels could be secured by condition.
19. The vertical alignment of Babraham Road to the northwest of the proposed junction would reduce visibility from the proposed junction to a degree, but not, in my view, to an unacceptable extent. A view echoed in the Design and Access Statement.
20. Babraham Road is frequently used by ambulances and the proposal would maintain the existing environment insofar as vehicles would be able to pull to one side to allow ambulances to pass. I agree with the view expressed by the Council at the Hearing that potential problems related to construction traffic associated with the development of the appeal site could be adequately controlled through the Construction Method Statement condition attached to the outline planning permission.

¹ Manual for Streets 2: Wider Application of the Principles.

² Local Transport Note 2/08-Cycle Infrastructure Design, October 2008.

³ Design Manual for Roads and Bridges.

21. Nonetheless, I consider on balance that, with particular reference to the risks likely to be associated with crossing the access road, the proposed junction/access road design would cause unacceptable harm to the safety and convenience of highway users.

Junction capacity

22. The appellant has used the Transport Road Laboratory's (TRL) PICADY 4 program to model the performance of the proposed junction. A number of interested parties have suggested that the traffic flow figures used to model the operation of the proposed junction are not reliable. However, the Council has confirmed that the traffic flows used align with those used in the appellant's August 2006 Transport Assessment (TA), which was approved as part of the application for which outline planning permission Ref. 06/0795/OUT was granted in 2008. At the Hearing, the Council indicated that the TA flows included an allowance for planned increases, including the expansion of facilities associated with the nearby Addenbrooke's Hospital. Furthermore, since 2008 the Addenbrooke's access road and the Cambridge Guided Bus System have opened, both of which are expected to have the effect of reducing flows along Babraham Road. In addition, the financial crisis is likely to have depressed flows. The modelled flows agreed with the Highway Authority, in keeping with GTA⁴, are regarded as appropriate by the Council for the purposes of modelling the proposed junction. I have no compelling reason to take a different view.
23. The outputs of a PICADY model include the ratio of flow to capacity (RFC) for the streams of the modelled junction. A RFC of 0.85 is commonly considered to be representative of the robust practical capacity of a junction. The modelling results in this case indicate that the maximum RFC in the AM Peak would be 0.57 for vehicles exiting the site onto Babraham Road and 0.72 for vehicles turning right into the site from Babraham Road in the PM Peak. This would suggest that the junction would operate within capacity. Furthermore, the maximum queue length is identified as 7 vehicles on Babraham Road in the PM peak.
24. However, it is not uncommon for north bound traffic to queue along Babraham Road in the vicinity of the appeal site. This is likely to be due, at least in part, to the operation of the signal controlled junction to the northwest, at the intersection of Babraham Road, Hills Road and Worts Causeway, resulting in blocking back of vehicles. There is no dispute between the main parties that PICADY makes no allowance for the effects of blocking back. TRL advise that the PICADY program is intended for isolated junctions only and is not suitable for cases where interaction occurs between two junctions.
25. I consider that, under the circumstances, the PICADY results must be treated with a degree of caution. Nonetheless, the approach taken by the appellant's highway consultant has not been to rely solely on the PICADY output, rather the modelling results were used along with knowledge of local conditions and highway engineering expertise to form a view regarding the likely performance of the proposed junction. This is an approach that has been accepted by the Highway Authority and in my experience is not unique.

⁴ Departments for Communities and Local Government / Transport – Guidance on Transport Assessment.

26. The appellant takes the view that as vehicle speeds reduce on Babraham Road during times of congestion, through traffic is more likely to give way to those waiting to turn into or out of the site. Against this background, and in light of the PICADY results, the appellant's highway consultant and the Highway Authority consider that the proposed junction would be likely to operate within capacity. Furthermore, at the Hearing, the Council's highway consultant indicated that it would also be content that the proposed junction would operate within capacity provided 'keep clear' road markings were provided on the north bound carriageway of Babraham Road at the proposed junction.
27. Whilst blocking back has the potential to limit the availability of acceptable gaps and increase accidents due to competition between vehicles exiting or entering the site and through traffic along Babraham Road, I consider that this is unlikely to be the case in practice. The provision of 'keep clear' road markings at the proposed junction would encourage the provision of gaps. Furthermore, I observed traffic flows during the AM peak hour on 25 January 2012. I saw blocking back of northbound Babraham Road traffic which extended from the signal controlled junction to the north of the appeal site entrance to a point beyond the junction with Granham's Road, which adjoins the western side of Babraham Road some distance to the south of the site entrance. Queuing traffic gave way on a courtesy basis to allow vehicles to turn into and out of Granham's Road in a relatively speedy manner. This would also be likely to occur at the proposed junction.
28. The relatively close proximity of the signal control junction to the northwest would be likely to result in platooning of southbound traffic past the site from time to time. When passing the site those platoons would limit the ability of emerging vehicles to turn right onto Babraham Road. However, this restriction would be offset by the increased capacity for such manoeuvres during the periods when the traffic is held back by the signals. I have no compelling reason to dispute the view of the appellant's highway consultant that over the course of a peak hour any platooning affect due to the signals is unlikely to have an appreciable effect on the capacity of the proposed junction. I consider that the same is likely to be true with respect to the impact of the Toucan crossing, the future provision of which, some distance to the south of the appeal site access, was secured by a section 106 agreement in association with the grant of outline planning permission.
29. In my judgement, subject to condition, the proposed junction would be likely to operate within capacity.

Access to Nos. 6 and 6B

30. The southern edge of the proposed access road would be positioned a short distance to the north of the vehicular entrance to No. 6B, immediately to the south of which is the entrance to No. 6. A Road Safety Audit, concerning a previously considered signal controlled option for the appeal site/Babraham Road junction, raised concerns about vehicles from these properties entering uncontrolled into the middle of a controlled junction. However, similar concerns have not been raised by the County Council's Road Safety Engineering Team in relation to the appeal proposal. Emerging drivers would have to filter into an uncontrolled traffic flow as they do now.
31. The appeal scheme would increase the likelihood that vehicles would be waiting to turn right into the appeal site or emerge from it at the same time as

movements associated with Nos. 6 and 6B are taking place. Nonetheless, the numbers of movements associated with those existing dwellings are likely to be relatively low, drivers emerging from those properties are likely to be aware of the potential hazards and intervisibility between drivers would be good.

In my judgement, the risk of vehicles who are either emerging from or entering Nos. 6 and 6B coming into conflict with other vehicles would be low.

Furthermore, the Highway Authority considers that this arrangement would be acceptable. In addition, research reported in MfS1 found that very few accidents occur involving vehicles turning into or out of driveways, even on heavily trafficked roads. These matters add further weight to my finding.

32. I understand that, unlike No. 6, No. 6B does not have space for a vehicle to turn around. Consequently, having entered the driveway of No. 6B in a forward gear, drivers tend to reverse out onto the verge in order to turn around and join Babraham Road in a forward gear. I have had regard to the concerns raised that this manoeuvre may bring vehicles into conflict with people who are waiting on the southern corner of the proposed access road for an opportunity to cross to the north. However, in my judgement, those waiting there to cross would be likely to be clearly visible to the emerging driver who could reasonably be expected to wait for the area to clear, if the reversing manoeuvre, which would be likely to be in a southerly direction away from the junction, could not be completed safely. Whilst intervisibility between a vehicle reversing from No. 6B and people approaching from the north or south would be more limited, that is no different to the current situation. Furthermore, the provision of 'keep clear' road markings on the north bound carriageway of Babraham Road would also reduce the likelihood of vehicles that are turning right into the driveways of Nos. 6 and 6B having to cross the section of the footway where people may be waiting to cross the proposed access road from south to north.
33. The appeal scheme makes provision within the highway verge for alternative vehicular access points to Nos. 6 and 6B, which would be positioned further from the southern corner of the proposed junction than their existing highway entrances. However, under the following circumstances, I give this element of the scheme little weight. No formal agreement has been reached between the appellant and the owners of those properties to ensure that the new access points would be used and the existing entrances closed up. Furthermore, I agree with the Highway Authority that those works are not necessary in order to make the scheme acceptable in planning terms and so it would be unreasonable to make approval conditional on the replacement of the existing entrances.
34. Nonetheless, I conclude overall, due to junction/access road design, that the proposal would cause unacceptable harm to the safety and convenience of highway users and in this respect it would conflict with LP Policies 8/2 and 8/11. National Planning Policies have been considered, but in light of the facts in this case those Policies do not alter my conclusions.

Other matters

35. Walking and cycling routes have been secured through the outline planning permission and an associated section 106 agreement, in accordance with the aims of LP Policies 8/4 and 8/5. These include a number of off-site improvements. I have not been provided with any compelling evidence to show that other additional off-site works, such as widening of the

pedestrian/cycle route along the opposite side of Babraham Road, are necessary to make the scheme, of which the appeal proposal would form part, acceptable in planning terms. Neither these, nor any other matters raised are sufficient to outweigh the considerations which have led to my conclusions on the main issue.

Conclusions

36. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.
37. Had the planning balance been different, such that I was minded to allow the appeal, the relationship between condition nos. 3 and 28 would have been of concern. In my judgement, condition no. 3 must be read in the light of the planning permission as a whole. Condition no. 28 requires that *'prior to or concurrently with the first of the reserved matters applications for the site, a detailed engineering scheme/plan for the access onto Babraham Road, the vehicular access hereby permitted for this scheme, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority'*. The condition no. 28 details have not been approved and the application for approval of those details is not a matter before me. To my mind, under these circumstances, approval of the appeal scheme would conflict with the terms of the planning permission and this would have been a serious impediment to the allowing the appeal.

I Jenkins

INSPECTOR

APPEARANCES

FOR THE APPELLANT:

Mr G Bolton	SSR Planning.
Mr R Henry	Peter Brett Associates.
Mr J Turner	Turner-Morum.

FOR THE LOCAL PLANNING AUTHORITY:

Mrs H Durrant	Cambridge City Council.
Mr P Cosford	Hannah Reed and Associates.
Mr J Martin	Hannah Reed and Associates.

INTERESTED PERSONS:

Professor J Carroll	Worts Causeway petitioners.
Mr R Huntsman	Worts Causeway petitioners.
Dr N Silverston	Babraham Road Resident's Group (BRAG)- Chairperson.
Mr J Woodburn	Cambridge Cycling Campaign.
Councillor J Swanson	Local ward councillor.
Mr D Rutherford	Rutherfords Highway Planning Consultants- Instructed by BRAG.
Mrs D Sharples	Hewitsons Solicitors- Instructed by BRAG.
Mr I Dyer	Cambridgeshire County Council.
Mrs F Cullen	Local resident.

DOCUMENTS

- 1 Letters notifying interested parties of the appeal and the Hearing arrangements.
- 2 Responses to the appeal notifications.
- 3 Appendices 5, 6 & 7 of the Statement of Case on behalf of the appellant, December 2011.
- 4 Joint Development Control Committee (Cambridge Fringes) 11 June 2008 Pre-committee amendment sheet.
- 5 Technical Note Figure 11.
- 6 Extract Cambridge Local Plan 2006-Policies 3/7 and 3/8.
- 7 Technical Note-16 January 2012-Rebuttal summary statement in response to Cambridge City Council's appeal statement.
- 8 Hannah Reed comments on PBA's rebuttal statement.
- 9 Local Transport Note 2/08, October 2008-Cycle Infrastructure Design.
- 10 Cambridge City Council Babraham Road Park & Ride-proposed extension-have your say September 2011.
- 11 Wandlebury Country Park leaflet.
- 12 Deed pursuant to Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, dated 14 December 2010.
- 13 Planning permission Ref. 06/0796/OUT-description of development.
- 14 Suggested conditions.
- 15 Cost application on behalf of the appellant together with the Council's response.

This page is intentionally left blank

Appendix B: Condition 28

“Prior to or concurrently with the submission of the first of the reserved matters applications for the site, a detailed engineering scheme/plan for the access onto Babraham Road, the vehicular access hereby permitted for this scheme, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. No development shall commence until such time as the detailed engineering scheme/plan has been approved in writing by the local planning authority. No dwellings to be served from the Babraham Road access shall be occupied until that access has been fully laid out and implemented in accordance with the approved details. The scheme/plan shall include cross sections (existing/proposed), levels changes, accurate tree survey data in relation to tree loss, tree retention, tree protection, planting proposals, including large scale cross sections of the kerb and associated shared use pathway/cycleway foundation design and construction and all associated improvements and links to existing pathways/cycleways within the vicinity of the junction, including works to make improvements to the existing pathway that runs between the proposed toucan crossing to the south and the main access on the western side of Babraham road. The scheme shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: In order to safeguard highway safety and network capacity and to secure an appropriate means of access for users of the development (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/7, 8/2 and 8/11).”

This page is intentionally left blank

This page is intentionally left blank






Revision K - April 2008, cycle link to park and ride
 Revision J - March 2008, site plan
 Revision I - January 2008, graphic alterations
 Revision H - December 2007, Client Comments
 Revision G - November 2007, Client Comments

Based on Ordnance Survey mapping, with permission of Her Majesty's Stationery Office © Hanksion Duckett Associates, The Station, Hove, East Sussex, BN1 9RQ
 Hanksion Duckett Associates Ltd, 100, Hove Lane, Hove, East Sussex, BN1 9RQ

Hanksion Duckett Associates



CLIENT: Bell Education Trust
 PROJECT: Babraham Road
 TITLE: Indicative Masterplan
 SCALE: 1:1000 at A2
 DATE: January 2008
 425.1/101K

-  Site Boundary
-  Active frontage to address open spaces, streets, views and vistas
-  Gateway and Landmark buildings

Cycle/pedestrian link to National Cycle Route II

Cycle/pedestrian link to National Cycle Route II

This page is intentionally left blank



Bells Language
General Pavilion

Rev E: Revisions to key, April '08
 Rev D: Notation alteration, March '08
 Rev C: Minor alterations to graphics Jan '08
 Rev B: Red line/building storey heights, Jan '08
 Rev A: Revised as updated masterplan, Jan '08

Based on Ordnance Survey mapping, with permission of Her Majesty's Stationery Office. © Hanson Duckett Associates, The Stables, Howbery Park, Benson Lane, Watlington, Oxfordshire, OX10 2BA. License No. AR167372

Hanson Duckett Associates



CLIENT: Bell School of Languages
PROJECT: Babraham Road
TITLE: Scale Parameters
SCALE: 1:1000 at A2
DATE: January 2008
425-1/15E

KEY

	Min-Max Building Dimensions			
	Height	Width (Depth)	Length	
■	3.5 storey	12-13m	9-11m	20-32m
■	3 storey	10-13m	5-21m	13-61m
■	2.5 storey	8-11m	5-11m	15-58m
■	2 storey	9-10m	9-10m	5-12m

Notes:

1. Building heights are overall heights relative to ground level and assume a storey height of 2.7meters, plus roof space (whose height is calculated using a 40 degree roof pitch).
2. Storey refers to a floor of living accommodation and excludes any undercroft parking area (about 1 metre of which would be above ground level). Half storey refers to accommodation within the roof space.
3. 3 storey flats (5 No. blocks in central part of site) are to have a flat/very shallow roof pitch.
4. Building length refers to block size (excluding garage lines)

This page is intentionally left blank



KEY

	Site boundary
	Homezones
	Main vehicular movement route
	Main cycle routes
	Main footpaths
	Entrance points

Rev A: Graphic alterations Jan '08
 Rev B: Notational alteration March '08
 Rev C: Cycle link to park and ride April '08

Based on Ordnance Survey mapping, with permission of Her Majesty's Stationery Office © Hankinson Duckett Associates, The Sharnbrook, Hemel Hempstead, Herts. SG9 6JY
 Project No: HDA/08/001/01/02

Hankinson Duckett Associates

CLIENT: Bell Education Trust
 PROJECT: Babraham Road
 TITLE: Access Plan
 SCALE: 1:1000 at A2
 DATE: January 2008
 425-1/22C



Link to Regional Cycle Network

Link to National Cycle Network

This page is intentionally left blank

Appendix G: CONSULTATIONS

1. Highways Authority (Cambridgeshire County Council)

- 1.1 Following the investigation of various junction proposals for the access to the Bell School site, reviewing the comments of the Safety Auditors and taking note of the Planning Inspectors decision and accompanying report, the Highway Authority has considered the current application and considers that the present design is, subject to detailed design, acceptable and provides an appropriate balance in design between transport function and place making; an approach recommended in the Manual For Streets guidance documents.
- 1.2 The junction arrangements that were considered were priority junctions with and without a right turn lane and traffic signals.
- 1.3 The provision of a junction should now be considered in regard to the advice provided in Section 9 of Manual for Streets 2, which seeks to balance the issues of junction capacity with safety and place making.
- 1.4 For a signal controlled junction the land take and its impact upon the treeline on the east of Babraham Road, necessity for signal heads and other design features make this design solution less appropriate, and, in real terms the junction would offer little in advantage over the priority junction forms.
- 1.5 Variants of a priority junction design are therefore considered more appropriate, but each would have implications that were considered in assessing the most appropriate junction form.
- 1.6 A priority junction with a left turn lane requires more carriageway width, which would be disadvantageous for pedestrians crossing.
- 1.7 It would also provide slightly less visibility as the side road give way is set further back from the southbound running lane whilst increasing the distance in pulling out to accept a gap in southbound traffic.
- 1.8 The ghost island would, however, provide a facility for right turning vehicles to wait for an acceptable gap in northbound traffic to complete their manoeuvre.
- 1.9 A priority junction without the right turn lane would provide slightly increased visibility by bringing the give way line forwards on the bend and reduce the distance travelled by vehicles pulling out from the side road to join southbound traffic.
- 1.10 The absence of a ghost island would, however, result in a car turning right into the estate blocking other motor vehicles for a short period of time, resulting in queuing for traffic waiting to exit the City.
- 1.11 The priority junction with no ghost island right turn facility would, in the opinion of the Highway Authority and subject to detailed design, provide an acceptable balance between the competing aspirations for and constraints on the junction.

- 1.12 The recent Inspectors report highlighted one issue with the design previously submitted, in regard to visibility for pedestrians crossing the road from south to north across the junctions, and the possibility that car drivers may increase speed (albeit not on a conscious level) when approaching the junction, in response to the road flaring slightly.
- 1.13 In response to this the designer has maintained a constant width of carriageway on the approach to the junction, right up to the radii kerbs at the junction itself. The reduced carriageway width has been used to widen the southern verge, providing a vision splay for pedestrians crossing the road allowing them to see approaching vehicles over a greater distance.
- 1.14 This does result in a potential increase in vehicle conflicts when turning into the site with an HCV.
- 1.15 However the number of HCVs turning into such a residential street would be likely to be small; routinely only occasional deliveries and the regular refuse collection. Such situations occur at many locations throughout the highway network on similar roads without resulting in unacceptable risk, and drivers of such vehicles are experienced manoeuvring in such circumstances.
- 1.16 The operation of junctions in this manner is considered in Paragraphs 9.4.10 to 9.4.12, and, in that document, is considered acceptable in the urban environment.

2. Street And Open Space (Cambridge City Council)

- 2.1 Any comments received will be reported.

3. Urban Design (Cambridge City Council)

- 3.1 Any comments received will be reported.

4. Cycle & Walking Officer (Cambridge City Council)

- 4.1 Any comments received will be reported.

5. Landscape Architects (Cambridge City Council)

- 5.1 Comments that Root Protection Areas need to be marked on the drawings and has made suggestions about vegetation outside the site boundary.

6. Access officer (Cambridge City Council)

- 6.1 I would ask for as shallow gradients as possible on the dropped crossing points. They must fall within guidance.

Any further comments received will be reported.

APPENDIX H: SUMMARY OF NEIGHBOUR / THIRD PARTY COMMENTS

Author	Comment
Jean Swanson - Queen Edith's Ward Councillor	<p>I continue to have grave reservations that this is the right place for such a junction but given the planning inspector's comments will just raise a few points.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. The pavement on the west of Babraham Road is in poor condition and will not cope with the increased number of users who will head to Addenbrookes via the front route when the toucan crossing is built.2. While I see some merits in a boxed junction it will only really aid people turning right out of the estate or right into it in the morning rush hour. The chance of right turners holding up traffic out bound in the afternoon remains high with the risk of a rat run developing along Wort's Causeway in the afternoons. <p>These are both things that the County Council could alleviate the first by up grading that footpath and the second by raising the bollard on Worts Causeway for the afternoon as well as the morning rush hour. Having discussed this with a local resident it could cause considerable difficulty for cars returned to the Worts Causeway area from outside the city in the afternoons because of the no right turns at Wort's Causeway and Nightingale Avenue – though that is abused many times every day. If transponders were available to residents that could be of real benefit.</p>
Alderbrook Rd SOLIHULL	<p>The problems I foresee are – increased congestion on Babraham Road; danger from traffic turning right into Babraham Rd near to brow of hill. Would suggest traffic lights although two sets so close would be problematic. Suggest an access from Cranham Road.</p>
6b Babraham Road	<p>Comments are submitted in a personal capacity and as Chairman of Babraham Road Action Group (BRAG). The proposal is in the worst possible location. The Inspectors view was that an acceptable design was possible and the junction would operate within capacity. He was wrong. I know Babraham Road well and know the level of traffic. The keep clear box would add minimally to the safety of a dangerous design. Concerned that vehicles entering the box to turn south having to wait for a gap in southbound traffic will block the passage of northbound traffic. The box would put northbound traffic at a disadvantage. Turning southbound into the estate would cause significant delays. Disagrees with Inspector that there are sufficient appropriate routes for pedestrians and cyclists. Obstruction to free flow of ambulances. Concern over difficulty of existing property if the proposed access is constructed. The proposal is just as inadequate as all previous plans and would cause harm to the safety and convenience of highway users.</p>
Hewitson solicitors	<p>Owner of 6b Babraham Road claims ownership of hedge running along southern edge of site. He has maintained it since 1987. From examination of deeds it is concluded that our client owns the strip of land running alongside the fence adjacent to the access track. The drawings clearly show the application site encroaches onto our clients land. The ownership certificate submitted with the application is wrong and our client will not tolerate trespass on to his property, any interference or harm to his hedge.</p>

Officer comment: This was reported to the applicant's agent who

responded:

I have sought legal advice.

No need to change the ownership Certificate. Certificate A says that 21 days before the application was submitted, the applicant was the owner of the Property.

The applicant is the registered proprietor of the land albeit that it has notice that someone may seek to rectify the boundary. An application for rectification is a fairly drawn out process where the parties do not agree to the rectification and is likely to be referred to an adjudicator to determine the boundary. There is no guarantee that an application would succeed and unless and until this is resolved the applicant is the registered proprietor.

In any event, the purpose of the certificates is to ensure that all owners (insofar as they are known) are given notice of an application. Here, we know that Dr Silverston is aware of the application by the very fact that he has objected and therefore he cannot claim that he has been prejudiced or disadvantaged by not having notice specifically served on him.

11 Alwyne
Road

Object. This will cause much more congestion in an area where there are already considerable traffic problems most days. If the School actually needs extra accommodation it should utilise Red Cross Lane with left turn only traffic on exit with existing lights upgraded to control that access.

c/o 29
Greenlands

Objection. The 'KEEP CLEAR' box is dangerous. During rush hours the queue of traffic may well back over the box and there is likely to be confusion as some drivers attempt to exit the estate turning right whilst others coming from the city attempt to enter the estate also by turning right. Not only cars, but bicycles and other larger vehicles such as refuse vans will be attempting to manoeuvre through the box at the same time as pedestrians try to cross the access road. It is not clear who has to wait and who has priority here and confusion of this kind can lead to collisions.

The junction is liable to become blocked. As vehicles exit Cambridge in the evening they will need to wait for a gap in the northbound traffic. This may impede the progress of southbound vehicles who wish to continue along Babraham Road and lead to tailbacks and gridlock at the Addenbrookes roundabout.

Increased congestion will impede the progress of emergency vehicles. Congestion on Babraham Road is not now limited to rush hours. The number of ambulances using the road will increase when Papworth Hospital moves to the Addenbrookes site. The new car park being built for 1,200 vehicles at Addenbrookes and increased provision at the Park and Ride also will result in more vehicles using Babraham Road. In addition, I understand that the developers predict that 'there will be 800-900 vehicle movements a day' into and out of this estate.

The junction is sited at a very dangerous spot on Babraham Road and I hope the plans will be rejected, particularly because of safety issues.

9 Babraham Road	<p>Concerns about 'keep clear' box; evening congestion for southbound traffic extending to the Addenbrooke's roundabout or even to Long Road. Reference to traffic generated by Addenbrookes expansion and park and ride enlargement. There are no plans to improve the pathway on this side of the road nor to connect it to the new pedestrian crossing.</p>
4 Babraham Road	<p>The new plan shows a similar T-junction to the previous, but without the increase in width from 5.5 m to 7.0m at its junction with Babraham Road.</p> <p>Concern about competition between drivers exiting to turn right out of the estate, vehicles and cyclists turning right into the Estate, pedestrians and cyclists crossing the access road in both directions; evening southbound traffic will have to wait.</p> <p>Concern about passage of ambulances and traffic from future growth of Addenbrookes and park and ride expansion.</p> <p>Bell School could not have chosen such a worse or more dangerous position to site a junction on Babraham Road.</p>
347 Hills Road	<p>The access to such a large number of dwellings is in an inappropriate place. Concern about evening congestion causing traffic to rat run through adjacent housing areas. Traffic entering and leaving this development will cause further congestion and encourage more traffic to go through the adjacent housing estate.</p> <p>If it is decided that there must be a junction on Babraham Road, then it should be traffic light controlled or a mini roundabout. If there is not sufficient room for these options, then the access should be somewhere else.</p>
3 Babraham Road	<p>Babraham Road and it's traffic flow are unique to Cambridge in that it is a feeder road for the enormous complex that is Addenbrookes Hospital; emergency vehicles use this approach frequently and any junction here will hinder safe passage.</p> <p>Concern about extra traffic causing further delay.</p> <p>The sight of this proposed junction is the worst possible location for access to the development from the point of view of safety, and is a total trespass upon the amenity of the occupants of 6 and 6b.</p> <p>We therefore reject these plans and any form of access at this point vehemently.</p>
19 Stansgate Avenue	<p>The development of this junction will affect me considerably as I turn right on to the Babraham Rd from Red Cross Lane.</p> <p>Keep clear box may cause collisions. Exiting traffic would extend northbound queues. Concern about motor cyclists waiting to turn right into site. Concern about affect on ambulances.</p> <p>Concerned about condition of the pavements in the area, with the increase in traffic this development will cause, the pavements on many of the access routes are not fit for purpose.</p>

- 29 Greenlands, Objection to KEEP CLEAR box. Will impede the flow of traffic both northbound and southbound on that already busy road into Cambridge. Note that other local developments will be adding to traffic.
- Greenlands estate would suffer from greater use by pedestrians and cyclists of the footpath through our estate. Our gardens are open-plan; already the car-parking allowed often impedes easy access and egress to our homes and we suffer from careless fouling of the estate by individuals and animals who 'stray ' onto the estate with little respect for our privacy and property.
- I am surprised that after many applications for the proposed access road have been rejected, not least by the latest planning inspector, that it is yet again the subject of an appeal. Surely it must be apparent that the proposed positioning of such a road, onto a busy highway, is impossibly dangerous and should be rejected once and for all.
- 9 Greenlands The Bell School could not have chosen a more dangerous position on Babraham road to site their junction. The development will cause a large increase in traffic. Even now it is very difficult to get out of Red Cross Lane. I hope the Planning Committee realise that this is a deeply unpopular development locally due to the increase in danger& inconvenience.
- Grosvenor Lodge 6 Babraham Rd Near to brow of hill. Little warning of traffic; often travelling at speed. Narrowness makes it inadequate for construction traffic or large vehicles. Estates residents likely to be frustrated by congestion. Frustrated drivers may take risks. The gradient of the access would be potentially dangerous when wet or icy.
- The access would be same width as Red Cross Lane which serves many fewer dwellings. More cyclist and pedestrians are likely to use the western side of Babraham Road, immediately adjacent to private accesses. It does not incorporate a pedestrian crossing. If the junction is approved I request a dropped kerb and tarmac/paving to my boundary. Photographs depicting congestion are provided.
- 29 Worts Causeway The revised access arrangements will cause severe traffic congestion and potential safety issues. The morning traffic is already a problem and this new arrangement will exacerbate it.
- There appears to be serious flaws in the computer model being used:
- _ the input data seems to be out of date, there is no evidence that data takes account of future growth demanded by the '2020 vision' of Addenbrooke's Hospital. The CB1 and Tim Brinton development sites, with their high-density mix of residential and commercial properties which are yet to come on stream
 - _ it models only a single junction rather than the interacting complex of junctions and lights that are proposed
 - _ it models the same input regardless of whether there is a right turn lane or not it is clear that the addition of this junction will lead to serious congestion along the Babraham road due to its many junctions and pedestrian lights. The inevitable gridlock will spill into neighbouring streets in our community.
- It is essential that before any decision can be passed current traffic flow data be collected over a full working month (when all schools are in session) in winter, augmented by projections of future flows. More careful consideration must be given to the various interactions of

junctions and crossings in this area, paying particular attention to the Worts Causeway junction. The new narrowing of the entrance to the Bell site raises serious issues about safety and delays as well as being inappropriate for the new residents of that site.

10 Babraham Road

The 'keep clear' box would create even worse tailbacks and competition between those passing and exiting the site. In the evening southbound traffic could be blocked by cars queuing to enter site with tailbacks as far as Addenbrookes. Ambulances would be adversely affected and the footpaths are narrow and substandard.

343 & 351 Hills Road

It is very clear that the points we are making below are a repetition of the points made previously by ourselves and others.

We would also like to make a more general point that this latest application and the Council's requirement for letter of objection coincides with the main annual holiday period and as such I would like to put on public record that objectors to current and previous planning applications may be seriously disadvantaged in their public right to make their objections known.

Specifically our opposition to the latest plan is based on the following:

- The location of the proposed junction could not have sited at a more dangerous position on Babraham Road. The speed of vehicles travelling in an southerly direction, on the blind bend at the Worts Causeway junction, hitting stationery traffic awaiting to turn right into the new estate is an "accident black spot" in design
- The KEEP CLEAR BOX ("the box") will seriously disadvantage vehicles travelling on Babraham Road.
- In the evening "rush-hour(s)" we believe there will be total blockage at this junction site the result of this will be for drivers to try and avoid this blockage and "rat run" up the Hills Road slip road and along Worts Causeway in an "out of town" direction.
- traffic will hinder the free flow of emergency vehicles, particularly but not exclusively ambulances.
- Refers to other developments in the area and their contribution to traffic growth.

The proposed plans do not in any way address the issues of poor footpath and cycleway provision in the immediate area; issues for both existing residents and those that will live on the proposed estate.

Harestone, Red Cross Lane

Concerns about affect on the flow of ambulances. Cars turning right to the access road would be positioned and there is not enough space for fast manoeuvres to clear Babraham Road enabling an ambulance to pass. Reference to Addenbrookes expansion. The fact that there is no widening of the road proposed makes this new plan even more dangerous than the previously rejected plan.

KEEP CLEAR box will result in chaos on the road with the current (let

alone the increased volumes of traffic - vehicle, cycle and pedestrian). The potential for increase in collisions is enormous.

In the late afternoon cyclists and vehicles leaving Cambridge wanting to enter the estate would have to pause in the southbound carriageway for spaces in the northbound traffic flow. This means that the cars that are waiting will hold up those wishing to proceed out of Cambridge, it may also mean that more people head out up the Worts Causeway towards the Gogs, the left turn at the top there is already extremely dangerous with the speed of the traffic coming from Cherry Hinton hill towards the Gog Magog Golf Club round about, this will make another accident blackspot even more dangerous.

As far as I'm aware there are no plans to improve either pavements or cycleways on this side of the road.

The pedestrian access along Greenlands and Red Cross Lane is inappropriate due to extremely uneven pavements, narrow pathways and numbers of vehicles parked. This will only get more dangerous with increased footfall and cycle flow. The Bell School's new accommodation on site will lead to an increase in students coming and going from there.

The junction is in a totally inappropriate position. the revised proposal is more dangerous and poses more risk to road users than the previous (rejected) plan and would urge the committee to reject it again.

27
Greenlands

The local community is against it as they are aware of the traffic problems. The "keep clear" bow would cause tailbacks

13 Babraham
Road

As far as we can see, the only difference in the new plan is: a) the access road is narrower, b) there's a 'Keep Clear' yellow box at the junction.

We would like to express our disappointment at the proposal in its entirety and our astonishment that they are being suggested at all.

The yellow box will give an advantage to the traffic exiting from the new estate the ensuing tail-backing on Babraham road an inconvenience to all the traffic coming in.

In the afternoon peak hour, the southbound carriageway will get blocked up because of cars waiting to turn into the estate. We can only envisage the truly bad tailbacks backing up along Hills Road well beyond the Long road junction if this junction were to be put in place.

When there is a queue backed over the yellow box, we are at a loss to understand who will have priority.

Concern about affect on movement of ambulances.

Reference to increase in all forms of traffic due to other local developments.

The footpath provided for people who will come to live on the new estate to come out onto Babraham road seems dangerously narrow,

very similar to the narrow and almost unfit-for-purpose footpath along Red Cross Lane.

The proposed new pedestrian 'Toucan crossing' would be right outside our house. The houses of 13 and 15 are the only buildings set so very close to the road and it would be a tremendous additional burden of noise pollution that residents of these two houses will be called on to bear if a crossing were to be put right outside no.13. We would like to earnestly beg you to have the crossing put further down the road where the houses are set well away from the road, where the impact of this extra noise pollution will not be felt at all.

We would like to sum up by saying that the site chosen by Bell School is perhaps the most dangerous one. The consequences of supermarkets' HGV vehicles, petrol tankers and articulated lorries - some of which thunder over the blind bend at Wort's Causeway - suddenly being confronted by stationary vehicles waiting to turn into the new estate is unimaginable.

27
Greenlands

Yet another planning application by Bell School, as a Council Tax payer I would be interested to know the cost of this long process. The road junction on Babraham Road is proposed by Bell school is in a very dangerous position and should be abandoned. The local community are against the site as they are aware of the traffic problems, which the plan does not address.

The "keep clear" box would cause problems and tailbacks during the rush hour.

The poor footpath and cycleway along the access road will mean that more pedestrians will use the access via Greenlands.

Babraham Road will become more congested in the future as more building goes ahead at the hospital. Ambulances will not be able to negotiate the proposed junction when cars are in a queue during rush hours.

I hope the planning committee realise the consequences of its decision. There is no room for a "proper" junction i.e. like the one on Long Road and the new plan does not solve the problems.

18
Greenlands

I can only repeat previous concerns about volume of traffic on Babraham Road and the difficulty of the emergency exit: Greenlands/Red Cross Lane.

1 Babraham
Road

We object to this plan for the following reasons:

1. With increased numbers of pedestrians and cyclists from the expanded Park and Ride, the cycle path will not be sufficient to cope with such numbers. The council is actively encouraging the community to cycle and/or use public transport, so this plan seems counter-intuitive to that scheme and will increase the chance of accident or injury.
2. The levels of traffic in the morning and evening rush hours will

increase dramatically through stationary vehicles waiting for a gap. Even at the moment, it can sometimes take 5 or more minutes of waiting to exit our driveway into the flow of traffic. Gridlock. And then, bring an ambulance at high speed into the picture – chaos! The number of ambulances is bound to increase with the new hospital sites connected to Addenbrooke's 2020.

3. Re the Keep Clear box will produce a pinch point for all vehicles, cyclists and pedestrians, road rage and people seeking other routes.

Cambridge
Cycling
Campaign

Cambridge Cycling Campaign is one of Cambridge's largest community charities. Our current paid-up membership is more than 1,100 people. Our aim, as always, is to secure excellent facilities which will, because they are of the highest standard, encourage more people to cycle. They must be attractive and safe for all cyclists including children, the elderly and the less confident and not only for road-aware, confident cyclists in their early adult life. The facilities must also provide properly for pedestrians whose interests are so closely entwined with those who cycle. Pedestrians will include many who are very vulnerable - children, the elderly and those with various kinds of handicap including blindness.

1. The principle of having a junction and associated access road at this location has been approved by the local planning authorities provided that a satisfactory design for the junction and access road is produced. Our view is that now is the time when, at long last, it should be accepted that a safe and otherwise satisfactory design is not achievable at this location and we ask Councillors to maintain their objections and to reject the present application so that alternative access routes can be fully assessed.

2. We recognise that details of possible alternative new accesses to this development cannot be considered in the planning process related to the present application. All we ask is that, when Councillors assess the current application, they bear in mind the general environmental context and background. Part of this context is the fact that far safer and – in every respect better – access routes are readily available, including a new one which has become available since the Planning Inspector gave his ruling. If Councillors decide again to reject the current application – we hope they do – they will certainly not be rejecting the entire 364-dwelling development. The development could go ahead if the Bell School were willing to develop and seek approval for alternative routes.

The change in the situation since the Planning Inspector's report is, we understand, that the Bell School authorities are now taking possession of a property they own adjacent to their main buildings which, until recently, was leased by them to Wallace Cancer Care (No 7 Red Cross Lane). Good access to the 364-dwelling development could be practicable alongside this building with the possible demolition of garages/outbuildings.

3. The current Local Plan (2006) states very clearly and explicitly in paragraphs 8/4 and 8.11 that priority should be given to pedestrians and cyclists.

The current planning application, like previous planning applications relating to this junction, fails to do this in a number of different respects.

4. The access road has a pavement only along one side (the Northern – or city – side). This is unacceptable for a new development.

The sole pavement is shared-use for cyclists and pedestrians but its width fails to conform to government guidance (Local Transport Note 2/08, October 2008 –Cycle Infrastructure Design, paragraph 8.5). The Inspector rightly states (Appeal Decision, paragraph 17) that the width falls short of the minimum standard. This failure to conform to government guidance should be treated as even worse than sub-standard because of the important emphasis in the Local Plan on high priority and convenience for cyclists and pedestrians in the design of new developments.

The Inspector draws attention to the guidance point (on the width of shared-use paths) that “whilst this standard is generally regarded as a minimum, in areas with few cyclists or pedestrians a narrower route may suffice.” He goes on to say that “the Council has indicated that there would be a number of alternative pedestrian/cycle links across the site which are likely to be of greater importance for pedestrian cycle connectivity.”

We say that these other pedestrian/cycle link routes are valuable for many potential users. But we must stress that for many people living elsewhere on the new estate they would require awkward, inconvenient and unsafe diversions from their natural direct ‘desire line’ which would be along the proposed worse-than-substandard shared-use pavement alongside the access road that is the subject of the present application. It would be unreasonable to expect cyclists to use an awkward diverted route. When the shared-use pavement is their direct route, many cyclists would use it.

For those wishing to walk or cycle into the city or towards the city the diversions would take most of them along a long section of Red Cross Lane which has much criss-crossing and reversing traffic in peak hours or past Addenbrooke’s Hospital and through the dangerous roundabout in front where a doctor cycling to work in the hospital was killed by a lorry not long ago. Parts of Red Cross Lane also have very rough, narrow pavements much damaged by tree roots which make them practically unusable for those with wheelchairs, pushchairs or children’s bicycles. Those particularly affected by the diversions would be children and young people living in much of the new estate and walking or cycling to primary or secondary schools in the Queen Edith’s Way or Wulfstan Way areas using the direct route via Nightingale Avenue. Those attending the schools along Hills Road such as the Sixth Form College or the Perse would also be affected. More generally, all those living in much of the new estate who would like to walk or cycle into or towards the city or along Nightingale Avenue would be affected.

So we believe that the City Council planners and the Inspector may not have fully appreciated the situation. If this unsatisfactory junction and access route were to be approved by Councillors, many cyclists and pedestrians would use the worse-than-unsatisfactory pavement along the access road rather than the diversions. Other potential cyclists and pedestrians would be put off and go instead by car.

Conclusion

Cambridge has far more cyclists than anywhere else in the UK and plenty of potential for improving this number if provision is sufficiently attractive to encourage children, the elderly and the whole range of newly-arrived residents to use their bicycles rather than their cars for local journeys.

In the Netherlands, North Germany and Denmark, it has been shown time and time again that provision of attractive, safe routes greatly increases the number of people who cycle. New developments like the

Bell School development provide by far the best opportunity to achieve Dutch standards in Cambridge. We must not settle for worse-than-substandard provision which does not even meet the requirements of existing UK government guidance or the Cambridge Local Plan and is well below the Dutch standards which we believe could be achieved by a pedestrian, cycle and motor vehicle access route close to the Bell School buildings.

16 Babraham Road

Thank you for your letter of 19 July 2012 concerning the above. Having viewed the application documents and drawings we wish to record our strongest possible objections to the proposals as submitted and offer the following comments in support of these objections: -

The proposed access road has no footpath on it's south side because there is insufficient room. On a road intended to serve 347 dwellings and 100 units of student accommodation this is clearly inadequate and dangerous. Upgrading the present green belt permissive footpath some 200 metres further south (which leads nowhere) does not compensate for this and is in itself nonsense.

Concern about the need for large vehicles to turn outside the carriageway.

It contains no significant improvements over previous proposals, does not secure an appropriate access for users of the development. It is thus contrary to the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 Policies 3/7, 8/2 and 8/11.

1.3 There is a clear, obvious, safe and sensible route for an access road to the development site from the northern corner of the site running east to meet Babraham Road / Hills Road opposite the existing Worts Causeway junction to form a cross roads where traffic lights already exist. This would also provide pedestrian and cycle users of the development with ready access to a point on the main road nearest to the logical and shortest route to the City, the hospital, buses, schools, shops and doctors' surgery. In professional planning jargon this would comply with residents' 'desire lines'. In short, this should be regarded as the only acceptable solution. The proposed upgrading of the existing permissive footpath, together with it's related toucan crossing, would serve no purpose.

A petition has been signed by 49 people, it is noted that some of the signatures include more than one person from the same address. The first page lists the objections and is reproduced below.

Petition against Planning Proposal 12/0890/REM: Bell Development Site. August 11th 2012

We the undersigned on the attached sheets, request that Councillors and Planning Authorities reject this proposal, as they have on all previous occasions, on the grounds that the new plan suggesting a narrower entrance to the site will do nothing to alleviate the many concerns for which all previous plans were rejected. It will have a no less adverse effect on local traffic conditions, and while it may remove one danger it creates others. At the moment, south bound traffic builds up on Babraham Road and extends back past the critical Addenbrooke's roundabout to the Long Road traffic lights and beyond, especially on dark winter evenings. On these evenings, the Citi 1 bus can take 25-30 minutes to travel south on the short length of Hills Road. The proposed "Bell Access" would make this situation much worse. Seven supporting points are made below.

(1) The narrowing of the Bell site's access road with a new pedestrian crossing close by creates an arrangement similar to that at 'Red Cross Lane' on Hills Road. However unlike Red Cross Lane there is no equivalent of Nightingale Avenue to allow for safe undertaking past right-turning vehicles. The Bell site will moreover have over 4 times the number of dwellings, generating around 4 times the access and egress traffic. The Red Cross Lane/Worts Causeway complex already arrests traffic at the critical Addenbrooke's roundabout to cause severe queuing, on many evenings in the winter. Common sense suggests that this new junction will create even more vehicles backing down Babraham Road and quadrupling the frequency of gridlock at Addenbrooke's roundabout.

(2) The main text of the HIGHWAY DESIGN REPORT JULY 2012 states that traffic flows used are based on 'the future opening year'. This is seriously misleading. The PICADY computer model, in Appendix B to this report, on which it is based, clearly states that its figures are based on a four-year-old (2008) traffic flow, exactly as in the 2011 (11/0918/REM) submission. A previous PBA technical report suggested that this data derives from an even earlier six-year-old 2006 PBA Transport Assessment. The model may be new but the input data *appears* to be totally out of date. There is no evidence that the 2006/2008 figure has been augmented to take into account the future growth demanded by the '2020 Vision' of Addenbrooke's Hospital, the CB1 and Tim Brinton development sites, with their high-density mix of residential and commercial properties where resulting traffic is still to come on stream. It is essential that current traffic flow data be collected over a full school working month in winter, augmented by projections of future flows presented to Councillors.

(3) This underpinning PICADY model also fails to quantify the interactions with pedestrian crossings and nearby junctions. There will be a new Toucan crossing (between the Park and Ride and the Bell site), the P&R entrance, Granhams Road, Worts Causeway junction and lights along with Red Cross lane turn and its nearby pedestrian crossing. The proximity of Worts Causeway junction is particularly alarming because queues forming in the main southbound lane will affect this junction in a dangerous manner. Much more careful considerations of the *interactions of junctions and crossings* are required to show that traffic will not back up dangerously to the "Addenbrooke's" roundabout, threatening the safety of ambulance traffic and causing local chaos.

(4) The Planning Inspector advised narrowing the Bell site entrance to slow down cars in order to make it safer for cyclists. The Babraham P&R expansion by some 600 spaces will significantly increase numbers of cyclists and pedestrians. Both of these are largely ignored by the plan and PICADY model.

(5) The new narrow entrance to the Bell site raises very serious issues about safety and delays created by large construction traffic, maintenance traffic, and large delivery vehicles that will frequently need access, especially given the large number of dwellings proposed.

(6) The reduced access width will enhance the feeling that Bell site residents have been 'kettled in', and it will in all probability increase the number of accidents between traffic turning in and out of the site. Remember there are 4 times the number of dwellings here compared with Red Cross Lane, and thus (4x4 =) 16 times more potential collisions. The proposed developer is understood to have recently bought number 4A Babraham Road, and the Bell proposers need to discuss with the developer if additional land might lead to a more acceptable access.

(7) The junction envisaged in the report is a simple priority right turn. As with the Granhams-Babraham road junction, bollards on the left hand side may be required to prevent unsafe undertaking. However on one website of TRL who retail PICADY it states that "... when there is no actual right-turn lane ... PICADY always uses an 'effective' right-turn lane, whether one physically exists or not". From previous Bell submissions, now withdrawn, the same Appendix B with the same PICADY results were shown regardless of whether the design had 'no right turn lane', a 'right turn facility' or even 'a nearby passing bay'. How can one have any faith in critical computations of traffic flow when the computer turns out the same answer regardless of the real life input?

This page is intentionally left blank

CAMBRIDGESHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL

ROAD SAFETY ENGINEERING

**SAFETY AUDIT
STAGE 1b**

Scheme: Bell School/Babraham simple priority junction

Date of Report: 28th June 2012

Auditor(s): S Parsons
A Haslock

Information Supplied: Drawing 14951/100/152

Introduction

The Audit was carried out at the request of:

Name Ian Dyer
Job Title Lead Engineer Development Control
Organisation Cambridgeshire County Council

The terms of reference of the audit are as described in HD 19/03. The audit has examined and reported only on the road safety implications of the scheme as presented and has not examined or verified the compliance of the designs to any other criteria or design standards. Design standards are quoted only where those standards have road safety implications.

All comments and recommendations are referenced to the detailed design drawings specified above.

Notified Departures from Standard - None notified

Scheme outline: *Priority T – junction to access the new development.*

Daytime site visit: No visit on this occasion. Previous site visit 12 April 2012

Attending: _____

Conditions at Visit:
Weather: _____
Traffic: _____
Other: _____

Existing Injury Accident Details (Where applicable):

The accidents have been assessed over the last five years. There has been one slight injury accident to the south of the proposed junction. It occurred in slow moving traffic as a vehicle failed to stop when the vehicle in front braked.

There are no safety issues to raise at this time.

Audit Team Statement

We certify that we have examined the drawings and documents listed at the commencement of this report. The examination has been carried out with the sole purpose of identifying any features of the design that could be removed or modified in order to improve the safety of the scheme. The problems identified have been noted in this report together with associated safety improvement suggestions which we recommend should be studied for implementation. No one in the Audit Team has been involved with the scheme design.

S Parsons

Road Safety Engineering Team Signed
Economy, Transport and Environment Services -----
CC1309

Cambridgeshire County Council Date
Shire Hall -----
Cambridge
CB3 0AP

A Haslock

Road Safety Engineering Team Signed
Economy, Transport and Environment Services -----
CC1309

Cambridgeshire County Council Date
Shire Hall -----
Cambridge
CB3 0AP

Agenda Item 6

JOINT DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE

Report by: Head of Planning Services, Cambridge City Council

Date: 6 September 2012

Application Number	12/0754/REM	Agenda Item	
Date Received	08/06/2012	Officer	Elizabeth Rolph
Target Date	07/09/2012		
Parishes/Wards	Trumpington		
Site	Parcels 16 and part 17 Clay Farm Development Site, Cambridge		
Proposal	Reserved matters (access, appearance, landscaping, layout and scale) for 102 dwellings and associated landscaping including central open space pursuant to outline application 07/0620/OUT		
Applicant	Bovis Homes Ltd		
Recommendation	Approval		
Application Type	Reserved Matters	Departure:	No

The above application(s) have been reported to the Planning Committee for determination by Members in accordance with the Scheme of Delegation for the Joint Development Control Committee for the Cambridge Fringes

Contents

	Page
Introduction	3
Site Description/Area Context	4
The Proposal	4
Site History	6
Publicity	7
Policy	7
Internal and External Consultations	7
Neighbour Representations	8
Assessment	
Compliance with Parameter Plans and Design Code	8
Building Design and Layout	10
Streets, Connectivity and Access	11
Materials	12
Secured by Design	12
Car and Cycle Parking and Bin Storage	12
Landscaping, Ecology and Arboriculture	14
Play Provision	16
Public Art	16
Housing Mix and Typology	17
Sustainable Construction and Design	19
Drainage and Flood Risk	19
Noise and Contamination	20
Conclusion	21
Recommendation	22

APPENDICES

Ref	Title	Page
A	Site Plan and Masterplan	26
B	Government and Regional Guidance and Advice	27
C	Local Plan Policies	28
D	Supplementary Planning Documents and Material Considerations	28
E	Internal Consultations and Cambridgeshire County Council Response	29
F	Other External Consultations and Representations	31
G	Outline condition update	32
H	Design Code Compliance	33
I	Art and Play Framework Summary	36
J	Plan Pack	37

0.0 INTRODUCTION

- 0.1 This is a Reserved Matters application for 102 dwellings and the central open space north of Addenbrooke's Road (Royal Showground parcels 16 and part 17). The applicant is Bovis Homes, who have purchased the majority of the parcels north of the Addenbrooke's Road spur to Addenbrooke's, south of the CGB and east of the Spine Road (parcels 15 – 18 and 9A & B). The Design & Access Statement included with the application includes illustrative material showing the proposals for the remainder of their parcels.
- 0.2 In August 2010 outline approval was granted for the Clay Farm development of up to 2,300 homes, a local centre, schools and open space. This is the largest of a number of developments proposed in Cambridge Southern Fringe, creating an extension to Trumpington village. This approval followed an appeal decision on a duplicate application that upheld the Council's position that 40% affordable housing should be provided on this site. The decision notice was issued on completion of the Section 106 agreement, the majority of which had been agreed through the appeal process.
- 0.3 The outline permission approved 6 parameter plans with which all reserved matter applications must comply. These covered land use, access, density, building heights, landscaping and urban design principles. A full application for the construction of the spine road through the Clay Farm site from Long Road to the Addenbrooke's Road (AR) roundabout and site wide drainage infrastructure was approved at the same time.
- 0.3 Reserved matters approval was granted in July 2011 for 306 dwellings for Royal Showground Parcels 10,11,12b and 12c (Countryside Properties) and in October 2011 for 128 dwellings Royal Showground Parcels 19 and 20 (Skanska Residential). Applications have also been submitted for 231 dwellings on Long Road Parcels 1B, 2 & 5 (Countryside Properties) and 273 dwellings on Parcels 1A, 3 &4 (Skanska). A plan showing the location of these applications is included in Appendix J.
- 0.4 A number of strategic conditions attached to the outline permission have been discharged, as shown in Appendix G. All reserved matters applications must comply with the documents approved through these conditions, in particular the Design Code, which was approved at the 23rd Feb 2011 JDCC. The Design Code sets out a set of illustrated design rules and requirements that instruct and advise on the physical development of the site and area.
- 0.5 The application was received in June 2012. The site layout and details included within this application are in accordance with the outline approval and associated documents that have been put in place to ensure that a high quality scheme will be provided on this part of the Clay Farm site.

1.0 SITE DESCRIPTION/ AREA CONTEXT

- 1.1 The application site is located at the southern end of the Clay Farm site (see Appendix A) to the north of the Addenbrooke's Road and east of the spine road which runs from the Addenbrooke's Road Roundabout to Long Road. A short boundary on the south west corner adjoins parcel 12B of the wider Clay Farm site (RM approved July 2011). The site covers approximately 2.67 ha of previous open farmland. There are no protected species or habitat present on site. The site is relatively flat and low lying and has been cleared as part of the infrastructure works to serve the wider Clay Farm development. There are no adjacent residential properties. The application site area and the remainder of the masterplan area to be developed by Bovis Homes are also shown on the map in Appendix A.
- 1.2 The outline permission for Clay Farm will provide amenities and facilities for the site. These will include a local centre, community facilities and shops to be located central to the Clay Farm site. The community facilities, which include a health centre, will be delivered by the City Council, in partnership with the County Council and other key stakeholders, funded by contributions from across the Southern Fringe. The current aim for completion of these facilities is early 2015. There are existing shops and services in the centre of Trumpington and the Waitrose store to the south of the existing village centre.
- 1.3 A new primary school will be provided to the north west of this reserved matters application site. This will be constructed later in the Clay Farm site build out. Before this, children from this site on Clay Farm will be able to attend the new primary school at Trumpington Meadows, and then the existing Fawcett primary school, which will be extended.
- 1.4 The site is close to the now operational Cambridge Guided Bus (CGB) which will provide a service between the Trumpington Park and Ride site and the City Centre. There is a stop on this route located to serve the existing community, which is well positioned to also serve this part of the Clay Farm site and the proposed development.

2.0 THE PROPOSAL

- 2.1 The planning application seeks reserved matters approval (access, appearance, landscaping, layout and scale) for 102 dwellings and the central open space. The application site comprises parcel 16 and a small part of parcel 17 of the Clay Farm development as shown on the Site Plan and Masterplan map included in Appendix J.
- 2.2 There have been extensive pre-application discussions with Bovis Homes. There were significant concerns about early emerging proposals which related to all the parcels that Bovis will be developing. However, the proposals have developed positively during the pre-application process which included a presentation to JDCC on 21 March 2012. The current proposals relate to parcel 16 and part 17 only with a Masterplan for the

remainder of the parcels included within the Design & Access (D&A) Statement.

2.3 The relevant outline permission conditions with which this reserved matters application must comply, either through information provided within the application or discharge prior to development, are as follows:

7. Design Code (reserved matters)
8. Materials
10. Youth and Children's Play Strategy (details)
14. Landscaping (within the built up area)
16. Landscaping Maintenance and Management Plan
26. Affordable Housing Distribution and Mix
27. Lifetime Homes
31. Renewable Energy
33. Code for Sustainable Homes
39. Detailed Water Strategy Details
42. Ecological Conservation Management Plan Statement
51. Access to Fawcett school
52. Parking Provision
53. Visitor Parking for People with disabilities
54. Cycle Parking Details
55. Foul Water Drainage Details
56. Levels
57. Contamination
59. Detailed Construction Method Statement
60. Demolition, Construction noise and vibration impact report
61. Noise
65. Detailed Waste Management Plan
68. Waste and Recycling

2.4 The application as submitted was accompanied by the following documents and plans:

- Design and Access Statement
- Planning Statement
- Energy Strategy
- Code for Sustainable Homes Pre Assessment
- Environment and Sustainability Statement
- Energy Strategy
- Landscape Maintenance and Management Plan
- Nature Conservation Plan (Ecological Conservation Management Plan)
- Noise Assessment Report
- Surface Water Strategy
- Public Art Delivery Plan
- Tenure Distribution Plan
- Masterplan
- Floorplans and Elevations
- Street Elevations

- Site Sections
- Hardworks and Softworks Drawings
- Visibility Splay Diagrams
- Vehicle Tracking Diagrams

2.5 Since the original application was registered a number of amendments and additional information have been submitted, these include:

- Design and Access Statement Addendum
- Amended Landscape Maintenance and Management Plan.
- Landscape Specification
- Typical tree pit details
- RECAP Toolkit Assessment Statement
- Amended Floorplans and Elevations
- Boundary Treatment Plan
- Interface with parcel 12b
- Foul Water Strategy.

3.0 SITE HISTORY

Reference	Description	Decision
07/0620/OUT	Residential development of up to 2,300 new mixed-tenure dwellings and accompanying provision of community facilities; sports and recreation facilities and landscaped open spaces including 49ha. of public open space in the green corridor, retail (A1), food and drink uses (A3, A4, A5), financial and professional services (A2), non-residential institutions (D1), a nursery (D1), alternative health treatments (D1); provision for education facilities; and all related infrastructure including; all roads and associated infrastructure, alternative locations for Cambridgeshire Guided Bus stops, alternative location for CGB Landscape Ecological Mitigation Area, attenuation ponds including alternative location for Addenbrooke's Access Road pond, cycleways, footways and crossings of Hobson's Brook.	A/C
07/0621/OUT	Duplicate of above	Appeal Refused
09/0272/FUL	Spine Road through Clay Farm site, linking Long Road with the Addenbrooke's Access Road (including bus gate). New junction to Long Road; drainage works including formation of 4 balancing ponds (including wetland area for birds) and raising of levels; tree felling and tree planting including semi-mature trees along the road and all associated works.	A/C
10/1065/REM	Construction of foul pumping station with access road, compound and landscaping; thinning of trees in plantation together with replanting.	A/C
11/0161/REM	Landscaping of open space strip west of Hobson's Brook together with filling in of pond to the south of the Addenbrooke's Access Road and replacement with below ground attenuation tanks under southern section of landscaping strip pursuant to outline approval 07/0620/OUT	A/C

11/0319/REM	Landscaping of southern part of the Green Corridor east of Hobson's Brook, including details of allotments pursuant to outline approval 07/0620/OUT.	A/C
10/1296/REM	Reserved matters (access, appearance, landscaping, layout and scale) for 306 dwellings pursuant to outline application 07/0620/OUT (Countryside Properties)	A/C
11/0698/REM	Reserved matters (access, appearance, landscaping, layout and scale) for 128 dwellings pursuant to outline application 07/0620/OUT (Skanska Residential)	A/C
12/0754/REM	Reserved matters (access, appearance, landscaping, layout and scale) for 102 dwellings pursuant to outline application 07/0620/OUT (<i>this application</i>)	O/S
12/0794/REM	Reserved matters (access, appearance, landscaping, layout and scale) for 231 dwellings pursuant to outline application 07/0620/OUT (Countryside Properties)	O/S
12/0867/REM	Reserved matters (access, appearance, landscaping, layout and scale) for 373 dwellings pursuant to outline application 07/0620/OUT (Skanska)	O/S

4.0 PUBLICITY

- 4.1 Advertisement: Yes
 Adjoining Owners: Not applicable
 Site Notices Displayed: Yes
- 4.2 This application has been subject to consultation and publicity through consultation letters, statutory press notices and the display of site notices. Prior to submission, Bovis Homes had an exhibition of their proposal at the Southern Fringe Community Forum in January and May 2012.

5 POLICY

Government and Regional Guidance and Advice

See Appendix B

Local Plan Policies

See Appendix C

Supplementary Planning Documents and Material Considerations

See Appendix D

6.0 EXTERNAL AND INTERNAL CONSULTATIONS

Summary

- 6.1 A number of issues and requests for additional information were raised through the consultation process as set out in Appendix E and F. Amended plans were submitted in August 2012, which addressed most issues. Further internal consultation was carried out on this submission and a few further minor amendments were submitted. Cambridgeshire County Council were also consulted on the amendments.

6.2 The application now is supported by the City Council's landscaping, drainage, sustainability, waste, access, environmental, urban design, and ecology, pedestrian and walking, arboriculture and public art officers and the County Council. Conditions are attached to address the remaining issues.

7.0 NEIGHBOUR REPRESENTATIONS

7.1 There are no neighbours directly affected by the proposal. No representations from individual local residents have been received.

7.2 Trumpington Residents Association support the application and the design of this part of Clay farm. They welcome the layout of the area including the relationship to Addenbrooke's Road and the focus on a green central square and its surrounding buildings. They are pleased that the central square will be developed as part of Phase I.

8.0 ASSESSMENT

8.1 From the consultation responses and representations received and from inspection of the site and the surroundings, the assessment has been structured under the following headings:

1. Compliance with Parameter Plans and Design Code
2. Building Design and Layout
3. Streets, Connectivity and Access
4. Materials
5. Secured by Design
6. Car and Cycle Parking and Bin Storage
7. Landscaping and Ecology
8. Play Provision
9. Public Art
10. Housing Mix and Typology
11. Sustainable Construction and Design
12. Drainage and Flood Risk
13. Noise and Contamination

8.2 Compliance with Parameter Plans and Design Code

8.3 The parameter plans and associated statements, which were approved as part of the outline application, fix the key principles for the development. As detailed below, the proposals and proposed layout accords with the parameter plans apart from the landscaping as set out below.

8.4 PP 1 - Land use. As required within this parameter plan this proposal is predominantly residential. The main open space to serve the southern part of the Clay Farm site is included within this application.

- 8.5 PP 2 - Access. Access is provided via the secondary road running from the spine road to Addenbrooke's Road. Initially the application site will be served from the northern part of this only.
- 8.6 PP 3 - Landscaping. This RM includes the central open space. The area is slightly reduced from that shown on the Parameter Plan. However, this will be compensated for by the introduction of a linear park linking this open space to Hobson's Brook, as discussed in the landscape section below. This is supported.
- 8.7 PP 4 - Density. The density for the application site is 38.2 dwellings per hectare. This falls within the density parameter for this part of the site of 30-45 dph.
- 8.8 PP 5 - Building Heights. The application site falls within 2-4 storey zone. The proposed development comprises 2 to 3 storey houses and four storey flatted blocks along the Addenbrooke's Road and secondary road, and as such are compliant with this.
- 8.9 PP 6 - Urban Design. The urban design parameter plan sets out the key framework for the layout of the development. This shows the buildings which front Addenbrooke's Road, the secondary road and the central open space as primary frontages with rich architectural detailing and variety of materials, and buildings which assist movement and legibility and define built form to the north west of the open space. As discussed further below, this has been achieved and the overall layout is considered compliant.
- 8.10 Design Code. This sets out mandatory design solutions for certain features within the development, such as streets, public realm, landscaping building and building typologies. The site is located within the 'Royal Showground' character area. The specific site is located within the sub Character Area 'Addenbrooke's Avenue'.
- 8.11 The original application did not include a full Design Code compliant Statement as required by condition 7 of the Outline. This was submitted within the amendments and is included as Appendix H. Other issues relating to Design Code compliance were also addressed in the amendments.
- 8.12 The general layout of the proposed development as amended, including footpath and road widths, swales, parking bays and landscaping approach accords with the standards set out in the Design Code. Compliance with the Design Code is covered in more details in the various headings below.

Cambridgeshire Quality Panel

- 8.13 In June 2011 the Cambridgeshire Quality Panel reviewed an earlier scheme for the masterplan area. They raised a number of significant concerns. They considered the revised masterplan as part of the pre application process for this application on 23rd February 2012. The Quality Panel acknowledged the huge improvements that had been made

to the scheme. They considered there were a number of issues that still needed to be addressed. These included the Hobson's Brook edge, the design and extent of rear parking courts, and that the vision for Parcels 9A & B was missing. The work for these parcels has not progressed, and it has been noted on the plans in the D&A Statement that the plans for these parcels have no planning status. There will be further consideration of the details for the Hobson's Brook edge prior to the future Reserved Matters application being submitted.

8.14 Building Design and Layout

8.15 The layout for the application site needs to be considered in conjunction with the overall site Masterplan for Parcels 15 – 18 as shown in Appendix A. This is structured around three key elements:

- The new major public square, which will serve the masterplan area and also the remainder of the southern part of Clay Farm;
- A local 'spine' road running north south through the scheme (secondary road on the Parameter Plan); and
- A new visual and pedestrian link connecting the central square to the green corridor.

The road layout has been designed to create a series of relatively small blocks, with a clear road hierarchy. A series of green lanes are proposed parallel to the edge of the parcels along the Addenbrooke's Road and Hobson's Brook edge. A number of character areas are shown, comprising the central green and green links south and east, the north-south route, Addenbrooke's Road and Hobson's Brook edge.

8.16 The layout for this Reserved Matters application builds on this. The key design concepts are:

- The creation of the public square and its enclosure on two sides with a strong building form;
- Linking this site to the new development (Parcels 19 & 20) south of Addenbrooke's Road by creating a new pedestrian green route;
- The formation of a green buffer to screen the development from Addenbrooke's Road with an active frontage behind;
- Using larger buildings to form key gateways around the edge of the site and at the corners of the new square; and
- Creation of an active frontage towards the adjacent development on Parcel 12B.

8.17 The proposed layout features four storey apartment buildings fronting Addenbrooke's Road and the northern section of the north – south route. Three storey houses are used to help form a robust edge between the apartments and on the two sides of the central square. The remainder of the development comprises smaller houses. This is illustrated in the Aerial view and Building Heights diagram included within Appendix J.

8.18 The apartment blocks are all single stair blocks with parking courts, with a maximum of 16 flats. Ground floor flats each have their own street entrance and small rear gardens. Upper floor flats all have balconies.

8.19 A wide range of house types and layouts has been used with the application site. The larger family houses are located around the central square. They all have active street frontages and on plot parking. The approach to elevational treatment will result in a scheme which is tenure blind. The approach being taken to utilities, flues and serving is outlined in the Design and Access Statement, and is supported.

8.20 A number of minor issues were identified in the original submission. These have been satisfactorily addressed in the amendments. Overall the scheme is considered to be well designed and should deliver a high quality scheme in terms of architectural design and detailing. It is considered compliant with the approved Parameter Plans and Design Code.

8.21 Streets, Connectivity and Access

8.22 Initially the application site will be accessed only from the northern section of the north - south secondary route. There will also be links to the new road within the adjacent parcel 12B currently under construction. When complete this will form a secondary access. All streets proposed along the boundaries have been designed to create active street frontages with adjacent sites.

8.23 The application includes a clear hierarchy of vehicular routes and pedestrian linkages. Some of the detailing in terms of surface treatment was inappropriate in the original submission, but this has been addressed in the amendments. Tertiary streets have been provided running south north, with shared surface mews streets between these. The streets fronting the Central Square are shared surface, as is the green lane adjacent to Addenbrooke's Road. The link from the central open space to this road is pedestrian and cycle only.

8.24 As amended, the overall movement network, road hierarchy and details accords with the Design Code although the positioning of the secondary road has been moved slightly due to the resizing of the central square. The secondary road is designed to restrict speed to 20 mph and the remainder to 10mph.

8.25 The D & A Statement includes a diagram showing Movement and Hierarchy of Routes within the wider Clay Farm development. A number of errors in the original submission have been corrected in the amendments and Footpath 47 has been added. The link to the proposed road crossing to the adjacent parcels 19 and 20 has been shown on a new plan: Addenbrooke's Road Edge Treatment included within Appendix J.

8.26 Tracking has been assessed using a large refuse vehicle and a large family vehicle. In the amended scheme all areas of the development are capable of being accessed and serviced. For refuse vehicles this access is partly dependent on the completion of roadways within parcel 17. It is likely that this will be provided through the implementation of the Reserved Matters for this parcel in advance of the occupation of the relevant parts of

the development. If this is not possible, temporary turning areas will be provided.

8.27 Materials

8.28 All the houses and apartments will be built of brick. A lighter brick such as Bradgate Multi-cream will be used for the houses and key elements of the apartments such as recessed side panels. A darker brick will be used for the apartment buildings and feature elements of the houses. Pitch roofs will be clad in a high quality man-made slate. Flat roofs will be finished in felt with stone chippings. Window frames will be finished in charcoal grey, and external metalwork painted charcoal grey to match. Doors to core entrances, carports, refuse & cycle stores will be black stained timber. This is in keeping with the materials to be used on the adjacent parcels and in line with the Design Code. Through condition 8 attached to the outline permission, samples of all the materials will be submitted and approved prior to the commencement of building.

8.29 Secured by Design

8.30 All properties have been designed to provide maximum surveillance to the streets and open spaces. The Police Architectural Liaison Officer is supportive of the scheme in principle but had concerns in the original submission regarding the surveillance of parking courts and recessed doorways. The amended submission shows the boundary treatment of parking courts as 1.2 m brick wall with 0.6 m trellis and confirms that all ground floor unit and other accessible windows will be fitted with at least one pair of attack resistant glass. This is as recommended by the Liaison Officer. Details of the lighting for the parking courts will be approved under proposed condition 2.

8.31 Car and Cycle Parking and Bin Storage

Car parking

8.32 Condition 52 attached to the outline planning permission restricts the number of parking spaces on the entire Clay Farm site to 3,427 off-street spaces plus 575 on-street visitor parking spaces with no property having more than two spaces. The level of car parking provided is slightly below this; one parking space is provided for all 1 and 2 bedroom homes, and generally two spaces are provided for family homes. 32 visitor spaces are provided, which is slightly higher than the one space for 4 units allowed for in condition 51. However, some of these are on the eastern side of the secondary road which forms the boundary of the site with remainder of the Masterplan area. When the detailed proposals come forward for this parcel there will be less visitor parking provided within that site. The overall parking ratio is 1.7 cars / dwellings including visitor parking. This is below the maximum allowed, and overall the level of parking is considered acceptable.

8.33 15% of the residential parking spaces dedicated to flats are designed to wheelchair standards. Amendments have been received on this to ensure

they are appropriately located. 5% of parking spaces are to be designed to meet wheelchair standards. Two visitor spaces in the amended scheme are DDA compliant, in accordance with condition 53 of the outline permission.

- 8.34 Parking to houses is generally provided to the side of houses in semi-recessed carports. The only exception to this is houses facing the pedestrianised section of the green street. These have parking provided to the rear accessed through the parking court associated with the adjacent flats.
- 8.35 All parking for flat blocks is provided in parking courts associated with each block, as shown in Appendix J. The maximum size of a parking court is 16 spaces, and they have been designed with trees and planting to soften their visual impact, and are overlooked by flats in that block. Direct access is provided from the parking courts to the flat blocks, as well as on street access to the blocks. While the arrangements within some of the parking courts are not ideal, and better arrangements could have been achieved using undercroft parking, the proposal puts forward a parking scheme that meets the objectives set out in the Design Code. Significant improvements were achieved to the location and layout of the parking courts during pre-application discussions.

Cycle Parking

- 8.36 Provision is made for 1 cycle space per 1 bed flat, 2 spaces per 2 bed flat and 2 bed house, 3 spaces per 3 bed and 4 bed house. This meets the requirements of the Design Code and Cambridge Local Plan (2006) Policy 8/6.
- 8.37 All homes are provided with dedicated bicycle storage generally located to the rear of the carport to the side of the house. This often involves bicycle parking behind two parked cars. This is not ideal, but has been the subject of detailed discussions and it was not found possible in urban design terms to locate bicycle parking in front of the house. The houses facing the pedestrianised section of the green street have a covered area for bike storage at the front of the house and additional covered cycle storage at the rear.
- 8.38 All the apartment blocks have cycle storage within the apartment blocks, accessed from the street within 20m of the entrance of the building apart from Block C. This was difficult to achieve, so covered cycle parking has been included within the amenity area for the ground floor flats and for four bicycles within the parking court. Some of the racks are stacking 'high low' racks, but in the amended submission all blocks have some standard Sheffield stands. All the flat blocks have visitor cycle parking close to the main entrances.

Bin Storage

- 8.39 All houses have bin storage facilities at the rear of the car port or in an accessible location in the rear garden. Bins will be collected from the street at the front of the house apart from those facing the pedestrianised

section of the green street. The bins from these houses will be wheeled to a collection point near the entrance to their parking. The amended application includes all apartment buildings with adequate integral communal bin storage with direct access to the street, close to the main entrance.

- 8.40 The arrangements meet the policies 3/1 and 4/13 of the Cambridge Local Plan and the requirements of the Design Code and the Waste Officer is happy with the collection arrangements.

8.41 Landscape, Ecology and Arboriculture

Landscape

- 8.42 The masterplan is based on the Central Square and green routes linking this to the south with Addenbrooke's Road and to the east with the green corridor. During early pre-application discussions it was agreed that the central open space could be reduced slightly from that shown on the Parameter Plans to allow better distribution of open spaces, a strong link to the green corridor and better urban block sizes. The Central Square is the main public square to serve the southern part of Clay Farm. Care was taken when agreeing the reduction in size to ensure that the area was still of adequate size to meet this requirement. The change in size is not considered sufficient to require a formal amendment to the Parameter Plans.
- 8.43 The key landscape areas within this Reserved Matters site are the Central Square, Addenbrooke's Edge and the Green Street, which links the two. The Central Square includes formal play provision, a gently sunken kick about space and areas to relax and sit. Pedestrian and cycle routes follow desire lines across the open space, and it has a strong framework of trees with areas of more informal planting.
- 8.44 A new native woodland edge with some larger trees interspersed is proposed between the Addenbrooke's Road and the shared surface to serve the new homes. The density of planting will vary to allow glimpses through, and paths cut through the belt to link the new dwellings with the roadside verge. This belt will compliment the avenue of limes to be planted along the Addenbrooke's Road.
- 8.45 The Green Street will link the Central Square to the Addenbrooke's Road. The southern part of this will be pedestrian only and comprise areas of lawn, planting and seating with a small play area. The trafficked section to the north comprises a short tree lined section of road designed to keep speeds low.
- 8.46 The Central Square, woodland edge to Addenbrooke's Road and Green Street will all be commenced at the same time as road construction. They will be completed prior to the occupation of the dwellings.
- 8.47 The amended submission included a Landscape Softworks Specification. A detailed planting plan and details of the lighting and other utilities routes

are required to ensure they do not clash with tree positions through proposed conditions 2 and 3.

- 8.48 A mandatory requirement in the Design Code is the provision of accessible amenity space for all residents to enjoy. Open spaces within the Royal Showground Area are also required to range in character, being both formal to reinforce the built form and open and rural to provide context with the surrounding countryside. As far as possible within this smaller site the proposal provides this variety through the central green and the green street. The link with the rural edge in the remainder of the masterplan area will be more informal and reinforce the rural edge.

Ecology

- 8.49 The Nature Conservation Plan complies with the approved Site Wide Nature Conservation Management Plan. Natural England raises no objection to the proposal and supports the landscape proposals and recommendations of the ECMP in terms of mitigation and enhancement.
- 8.50 Site wide monitoring will ensure species enhancement and biodiversity continues to be protected and maintained. This complies with Cambridge Local Plan 2006 Policy 4/3.

Arboriculture

- 8.51 There are no existing trees on site or adjacent to it. The landscaping scheme includes the provision of planting native tree species throughout the site and is compliant with the Design Code. An avenue of non-aphid dripping Lime Trees is proposed along the secondary 'spine'. These will match the planting along the Addenbrooke's Road and within the other Clay Farm parcels. The main east- west roads will be planted mainly with Silver Birch and Ash and the tertiary streets with Rowan. This is compliant with the Design Code.

Management and Maintenance

- 8.52 A Landscaping Management and Maintenance Plan originally submitted did not clearly sets out all requirements for the management of the landscaping. The amendments received addressed this.
- 8.53 The amended document included a plan setting out management responsibilities. The responsibility for management and maintenance is as follows;

Area of open space and public realm	Responsibility
Central Square, Green Street open space and Addenbrooke's Edge planting, including play equipment, attenuation tank and swales (and associated inlet and outlet structures)	Offered for adoption to Cambridge City Council
All roadways, including Highway Drainage (gullies, kerb drains and connection pipes)	Offered for adoption to Cambridge County Council Highways
Main Drainage	Anglian Water Services
Parking Courts and associated drainage and landscaping	Management Company (Bovis or BPHA)

Maintenance rates have been agreed through the S106 process for the open space to be transferred to the City Council. However, these rates did not include attenuation tanks. An additional payment will be secured for this through the S106 clause. Payment will be made at the time of transfer. This will be after one year of maintenance by the developer, through the Remedy of Defects process.

8.54 Play Provision

8.55 The approach to play across Clay Farm site was agreed through the approval of the outline application, and further details approved through the Youth and Play Strategy. Play and open space requirements have been calculated as part of the wider outline proposals. A Neighbourhood Equipped Area for Play and Active Recreational Area will be provided at the northern end of the green corridor. In the southern part of Clay Farm a Super Local Equipped Area of Play (SLEAP) is shown central to the Masterplan parcels. Outdoor sports provision is to be provided through the Secondary School and will be available for community use. The Youth and Play Strategy states that each reserved matters area should include at least one Local Area for Play.

8.56 The Central Square includes a SLEAP as required. The play equipment is provided in two areas for age groups 2 – 6 and 4 – 12. A small Local Play Area is to be provided within the pedestrianised section of Green Street, located away from Addenbrooke's Road.

8.57 The play provision meet the required standards set out in the Design Code and Youth and Play Strategy. Further details with play equipment and their timing of provision will be secured by conditions 4 and 5. Under the outline S106 Agreement the play equipment will be adopted by the City Council after a year's maintenance by the developer.

8.58 Public Art

8.59 The site wide Clay Farm Public Art Strategy (PAS) was approved by the JDCC in December 2010. This includes four areas for public art across Clay Farm. One of there is Art and Play. A Framework document for this has recently been approved, a summary of which is included in Appendix I. £20,000 is allocated to parcels 15 – 18 (the masterplan area).

8.60 The Public Art Delivery Plan (PADP) details the approach for parcels 15 to 18. The artists appointed for the implementation of the Art and Play Framework have been working with Bovis Homes design team to explore and develop the key areas for embedded art projects in these parcels. This will be in the form of hard surface design and colour, bespoke play boulders and edge treatments, principally within the central green and green street. The budget will be used to add value to the public realm design. The PADP sets out the approval process for the detailed design, which will be by the City Council subsequent to consideration by the Clay Farm Public Art Steering Group.

8.61 The PADP complies with the approved site wide PAS and the City Council's Public Art Supplementary Planning Document. It is supported by the City Council's Public Art Officer.

8.62 Housing Mix and Typology

8.63 The site comprised 102 dwellings of which 50% are affordable. This is higher than the 40% required through the outline approval. This is supported, as it will allow early delivery of a substantial number of affordable units. As stated in paragraph 2.5, a masterplan has been prepared in consultation with the City Council for all the parcels to be developed by Bovis (the Masterplan). Overall 40% will be achieved on the parcels to be developed by Bovis Homes. This is in accordance with the outline permission S106 agreement, which states that 40% of all units across the site will be affordable. A number of plans relating to this are included within the D&A Statement. These include a tenure mix plan, which shows how 40% Affordable Housing will be achieved in the masterplan area, included in Appendix J. An informative is proposed to ensure that the Reserved Matters applications accord with this.

8.64 Cambridge Local Plan Policy 5/10 relates to housing mix and requires a good mix of size and type of dwellings to offer choice and promote inclusive communities. Under the S106 agreement, the affordable housing mix for any reserved matters site has to have regard to the Indicative Affordable Housing Mix included within the S106, and in particular the target that a minimum of 60% of all affordable units be houses. This Reserved Matters application includes only 53% of the affordable units as houses, partly due to the higher percentage of Affordable Housing. As is the case for the amount of Affordable Housing, the plans included in the D&A Statement show how 60% houses can be achieved in the masterplan area. It should be noted that there have been no detailed discussions about the development of parcels 9A & B (immediately south of the CGB). However, the masterplan drawings show 70% of Affordable units as houses in parcels 15 – 18. This is supported, and would allow a higher percentage of flats in parcels 9A & 9B.

8.65 The tables below sets out the proposed mix of both affordable and market dwellings on this Reserved Matters site and in the masterplan area compared to the indicative mix. This shows that the indicative mix can be achieved. The approach for this application and the future phases has the support of the City Council Housing Officer and BPHA. The proposed informative will ensure that the appropriate mix is achieved in the masterplan area.

Housing mix for the Reserved Matters Site

	Total	Private	Affordable	Affordable Mix	Indicative Mix
<u>Apartments</u>					
1 Bed	13	5	8	16%	10%
2 Bed	38	22	16	31%	30%
Total Apartments	51	27	24	47%	40%
<u>Houses</u>					
2 Bed	4	0	4	8%	21%
3 Bed	23	3	20	39%	32%
4 Bed	21	18	3	6%	7%
5 Bed	3	3	0	0%	
Total Houses	51	24	29	53%	60%
Total	102	51	51	100%	100%

Housing mix for the total Masterplan area (parcels 9A & B and 15 – 18)

	Total	Private	Affordable	Affordable Mix	Indicative Mix
<u>Apartments</u>					
1 Bed	33	15	18	10%	10%
2 Bed	149	94	55	31%	30%
Total Apartments					40%
<u>Houses</u>					
2 Bed	45	7	38	21%	21%
3 Bed	137	80	57	32%	32%
4 Bed	73	61	12	7%	7%
5 Bed	13	13			
Total Houses					60%
Total units	450	270 (60%)	180 (40%)	100%*	100%

* Total 101% due to rounding

Distribution of Affordable Housing

- 8.66 The Cambridge City Council affordable housing SPD (Jan 2008) sets out the criteria for the siting of affordable housing within any given development. The approach supported in this is the clustering, defined as the provision of affordable housing of between 6 and 25 dwellings in prominent parts of a site, depending on the size and design of the development.
- 8.67 The distribution of affordable units proposed is shown for this RM site and the masterplan area in Appendix J. Within the RM site the maximum no of units in any cluster is 18. Considering this site only, there could be concern that the majority on units fronting Addenbrooke's Road are affordable. However, this will be balanced in the remainder of the masterplan area. Both BPHA and the Council's Housing Officer support

the proposed distribution of affordable housing, which is in accordance with adopted policy, SPD guidance and outline conditions. The proposed informative will ensure that the appropriate distribution is achieved in the masterplan area.

- 8.68 Condition 27 attached to the outline permission requires all affordable housing and 15% of the market housing to be built to Lifetime Homes standards. The application meets this requirement. One house that is fully accessible to wheelchair users is included on a mews close to the central green. The layout to this has been amended following comments from the City Council's Disability Panel.

8.69 Sustainable Construction and Design

- 8.70 Condition 33 of the outline permission requires all reserved matters applications to provide market housing designed to a minimum of code for sustainable homes level 3 and all affordable housing to be designed to a minimum of code for sustainable homes level 4. The proposal exceeds this requirement, as all properties will achieve a minimum energy performance level in line with Level 4 of the Code for Sustainable Homes, This is welcomed.

- 8.71 The approach taken within the site in relation to carbon reduction is to look at fabric energy efficiency first which is how the construction of the building and also how it functions can reduce energy consumption. This approach will achieve around a 44% reduction in carbon emissions over the Part L of the 2006 Building Regulations. The site has already been registered to these Building Regulations, rather than the revisions introduced in 2010. This means that a different methodology is used. However, in this case it will not result in lower sustainability standards in view of the condition attached to the Outline.

- 8.72 The proposal meets Local Plan policy 8/16 Renewable energy in major new developments and condition 31 attached to the outline permission, as a 10% carbon reduction will be achieved through on-site renewables. This will be achieved through the fitting of photovoltaic panels to the apartment blocks and every house. Those located on the flat roofs will be positioned to achieve best orientation. Those on the pitched roofs will be integrated with the roof tiles.

8.73 Drainage and Flood Risk

- 8.74 The site wide Strategic Surface Water Strategy was approved by the JDCC in March 2011. This sets out the surface water run off rates to be achieved within each part of the site. In addition to these further details as to how these rates should be achieved are set out in the Design Code. The objectives set out in the surface water drainage strategy aim to replicate the existing natural runoff of a Greenfield site. The site wide Drainage Strategy sets out the acceptable discharge rates for each parcel. Water discharged from the site will be improved by filtration and infiltration,

piped to the balancing pond constructed in the green corridor and then flow into Hobson's Brook at a controlled rate.

8.75 In order to achieve acceptable discharge rates, a number of on site attenuation drainage features are necessary. These include:

- A large attenuation tank under the sunken lawn within the central square. The depression itself would also provide attenuation in the event of a 1 in 30 year flood;
- Rainwater gardens within green street;
- Porous paving to all private parking courts and private drives;
- Water butts to all properties; and
- Soakaway systems within private gardens to absorb roof water.

A maintenance schedule is included within the submission

8.76 Throughout the site all dwellings internal water consumption will be reduced in line with code level 4 through the use of low flow taps, dual flush toilets and low flow rate showers. The water butts will also provide water storage for domestic garden irrigation, reducing consumption of potable water.

8.77 The Reserved Matters Surface Water Strategy contained insufficient detail to show that the necessary discharge rate would be achieved. Also, during consideration of a draft submission, there was evidence that the ground water levels are higher than those on which the Strategic Surface Water Strategy is based. Since the Strategy for this site is based on infiltration of surface water through fill material, further details of the composition and stability of the fill material were needed.

8.78 A draft amended Surface Water Strategy was been received in July, but this did not take into account the higher ground water levels. In view of this, further information is required to show that the required run off rates can be achieved on this site. Condition 1 is therefore proposed to require submission and approval of a Detailed Surface Water Strategy prior to commencement of development. This will include ground water monitoring during construction. While not ideal, the City Council's Sustainable Drainage Engineer is confident that a satisfactory solution can be found. The process has illustrated the difficulty of achieving the required discharge rates, even for this site, which includes the central square. An informative is proposed to advise that this issue is considered at an early stage in the detailed design for the remainder of the masterplan area.

8.79 Noise and Contamination

8.80 Cambridge Local Plan policy 4/13 seeks only to permit development which does not lead to significant adverse effects on health, the environment and amenity from pollution or which can minimise any significant adverse effects through the use of appropriate reduction or mitigation measures. The Design Code (page 46) identifies a daytime 65db noise contour along AR based on the future use of the road under full capacity and recognises that mitigation measures must form an intrinsic part of the design solution to achieve acceptable internal noise levels and sufficient ventilation.

- 8.81 The acoustic data provided shows that noise is only an issue along Addenbrooke's Road (AR). The properties fronting the AR protect the properties behind. The AR properties are set back and do not fall within the Noise Exposure Category which would necessitate mechanical ventilation. Where habitable rooms face the AR they either have a window on the quieter façade that faces away from the AR, or the window opens onto a screened balcony. This applies to 15 apartments, the majority on the block closest to parcel 12B. Details of these are to be secured through proposed condition 6.
- 8.82 The overall approach to mitigate for noise on site is considered acceptable and the scheme will provide a satisfactory noise environment for future residents of the site.

Contamination

- 8.83 Issues of contamination were considered at outline stage with a condition being attached to the permission in relation to investigation for contaminated land. It has been agreed that this condition will be considered for each phase of the development. Further investigation is required for this part of the site. The details of this and any remedial works necessary will need to be submitted and approved prior to any works beginning on this development through condition 57 attached to the outline.

9.0 CONCLUSION

- 9.1 The proposed development accords with the Parameter Plans and Design Code approved for this development. The layout and design of the dwellings creates a legible and distinct character, focussed on the Central Square which is considered to be appropriate for this location. The work provides the basis for the development of the remainder of the parcels to be developed by Bovis Homes.
- 9.2 The streets have been designed to a low speed; this conforms to Manual for Streets by providing streets that create a high quality environment with good quality landscaping and architecture surrounding them. The simple but strong design of the houses and layout provides clear guidance for way finding within the development.
- 9.3 The outline planning application requires a number of details to be submitted with each reserved matters planning application or in advance of development commencing. The majority of these have been provided. Detailed Construction Method Statement are still outstanding to be submitted prior to the commencement of development on site, and details of materials prior to the development of a building.
- 9.4 The proposal complies with all the documents, which have been approved as part of the outline planning application, and so therefore complies with

Cambridge City planning policy. Overall it is consider that the proposal will result in a high quality living environment both visually and socially.

- 9.5 The D&A Statement includes a Masterplan for all the parcels to be developed by Bovis Homes. This will provide the basis for pre-application discussions for the future Reserved Matters application for parcel 15, 18 and the remainder of parcel 17. Members are therefore being asked to endorse it.

10.0 **RECOMMENDATIONS**

1. ENDORSE the principles for the development of parcels 15, 18 and the remainder of parcel 17 as set out in the Masterplan included within the Design & Access Statement; and

2. APPROVE 12/0754/REM subject to the following conditions:

1.	<p>Drainage Strategy Notwithstanding the submitted Surface Water Strategy dated April 2012, prior to the commencement of development a detailed surface water strategy shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. This should include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) An Earthworks Specification for General Excavation and Fill Areas; b) A scheme for surface water disposal; and c) Groundwater monitoring for the duration of construction that will inform the detailed design of any infiltration system. <p>Infiltration systems should only be used where it can be demonstrated that they will not pose a risk to groundwater quality. The scheme shall be implemented in accordance with approved details.</p> <p>Reason: In order to safeguard against the increased risk of flooding, to ensure adequate flood control and to ensure the quality of the water entering receiving watercourses is appropriate. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 4/16 and 9/3)</p>
2.	<p>Lighting Strategy and service routes Prior to the commencement of development apart from agreed enabling works, a lighting plan showing the location of all lighting including that relating to the parking courts and all utility and service routes shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. No apartment buildings facades shall be lit by up-lighting. The scheme shall be implemented in accordance with approved details.</p> <p>Reason: In the interests of visual amenity, to ensure the development will not result in unacceptable light pollution and to ensure the safeguarding of trees proposed to be planted (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/2, 3/4, 3/7, 3/8, 3/11, 3/12, 4/4, 4/13 and 4/15).</p>

<p>3.</p>	<p>Landscape details Prior to the commencement of a residential building, detailed planting plans shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall be implemented in accordance with approved details.</p> <p>Reason</p>
<p>4.</p>	<p>Play Equipment in Central Square Prior to commencement of any dwelling adjacent to Central Square details of the play equipment including mixed ability equipment shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority A. All play equipment shall be installed in accordance with approved details and available for use prior to first occupation of any dwelling adjacent to Central Square.</p> <p>Reason: To ensure appropriate equipment is provided within the area of play and In the interests of neighbouring amenity. (Cambridge Local Plan policies 3/8, 3/11, 3/12, 8/18)</p>
<p>5.</p>	<p>Play Equipment in Green Street Prior to commencement of any dwelling adjacent to the Green Street open space details of the play equipment including mixed ability equipment shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. All play equipment shall be installed in accordance with approved details and available for use prior to first occupation of any dwelling adjacent to Green Street open space.</p> <p>Reason: To ensure appropriate equipment is provided within the area of play and In the interests of neighbouring amenity. (Cambridge Local Plan policies 3/8, 3/11, 3/12, 8/18)</p>
<p>6.</p>	<p>Glazing Prior to the occupation of any apartments in Block A or C facing Addenbrooke’s Road, details of the screened balcony system as referred to in the “Noise Assessment Clay Farm Phase 1 of parcels 9, 9a and 15 to 18” by Environs, dated May 2012, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The balcony screens shall be installed in accordance with approved details and retained in situ thereafter.</p> <p>Reason: To ensure that the appropriate glazing with ventilation is provided and is appropriately located that it does not form a prominent feature within the design of the dwelling. (Cambridge Local Plan Policies 3/12, 4/13)</p>
<p>7.</p>	<p>Fire Hydrants A scheme for the provision of fire hydrants shall be submitted and approved in writing by the local planning authority prior to the commencement of the development hereby permitted. The approved scheme shall be fully operational prior to the first occupation of the development/phase, or as agreed in writing with the local planning authority. No development shall take place otherwise than in accordance with the approved scheme.</p> <p>Reason: To ensure the provision of adequate water supply infrastructure to protect the safe living and working environment for all users and visitors in accordance with the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 saved policies 3/7, 3/12, 8/18 and 9/3.</p>

8.	<p>Dropped Kerbs Dropped kerbs shall be provided on all areas of footway located in front of communal bin storage access points.</p> <p>Reason: To ensure appropriate and easy access for waste collection for all communal bin storage. (Cambridge Local Plan policy 3/12)</p>
9.	<p>Interim Parking Arrangements Prior to the occupation of any dwelling, details of the Interim Parking Management Arrangements (prior to any formal adoption) for the Highway shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The details shall include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) how parking within the development is to be managed and controlled so that it occurs within designated vehicular parking bays b) how the proposed measures are to be publicised to potential purchasers c) how the subsequent enforcement of parking that occurs outside designated vehicular parking bays is to be managed d) what transitional arrangement will be put in place and secured with the Highway Authority to ensure that such arrangements or similar continue. <p>Prior to the use of any highway for access to a residential property, the submitted Interim Parking Management Arrangements shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details.</p> <p>Reason: To avoid the proliferation of parking across the site that is uncontrolled and can limit the proper functioning of the site, to ensure that parking management of the site is consistent at an early stage in its development, in the interests of sustainable travel choice and to ensure that the site does not become a parking refuge for commuters (Cambridge Local Plan policies 3/1, 3/7, 8/2 and 8/11)</p>

Informatives

The applicant is advised that the Reserved Matters applications for the remainder of parcel 17, parcels 15 and 18 shall be in accordance with the masterplan drawings included within the Design & Access Statement, particularly in relation to Affordable Housing Provision, Housing Mix and the provision of open space.

The applicant is advised that the drainage strategies for Reserved Matters applications for the remainder of parcel 17, parcels 15 & 18 should be based on updated studies in relation to the ground water table, which is higher than that on which the approved Strategic Surface Water Drainage Strategy by Environs dated February 2011 is based. This will exacerbate the difficulties of achieving a successful drainage strategy, and increases the importance of involving a sustainable drainage engineer early in the design process.

Please note that all outstanding conditions attached to the outline permission will need to be addressed.

Reasons for Approval

1. This development has been approved subject to conditions because subject to those requirements it is considered to generally conform to the Development Plan, particularly the following policies:

Cambridge Local Plan 2006: 3/1, 3/2, 3/3, 3/4, 3/7, 3/11, 3/12, 5/9, 5/10, 8/2, 8/4, 8/5 8/6, 8/7, 8/10, 8/16, 8/17, 8/18, 9/3, 9/5

2. The application was submitted pursuant to outline application 07/0620/OUT and is compliant with the approved parameter plans and design code associated with this outline approval.

The decision has been made having had regard to all other material planning considerations, including those where objections were made. The location and height of the proposed dwellings are such that the impact on adjacent properties is considered to be acceptable, with sufficient distances provided between the properties. The layout and architectural detail of the site has created a legible and coherent site, which reflects the aspirations of the design code and will create a high quality environment for this site. The site is well connected in terms of pedestrian and cycle routes, with high quality links to the Guided Bus route.

It is considered that the proposal as amended adequately addresses all issues and objections. It is considered that none of the objections was to have been of such significance as to justify doing other than grant planning permission.

These reasons for approval can be a summary of the reasons for grant of planning permission only. For further detail on the decision please see the officer report.

APPENDIX A: SITE PLAN AND MASTERPLAN



Masterplan showing Phase 1 boundary

Clay Farm Parcels 9a, 9b, 15-18 : Phase 1 - June 2012

Levitt Bernstein

Appendix B: Government and Regional Guidance and Advice

National Planning Policy Framework 2012

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) sets out the Government's economic, environmental and social planning policies for England. These policies articulate the Government's vision of sustainable development, which should be interpreted and applied locally to meet local aspirations. The document was published on 27 March 2012 and immediately became a material consideration for planning applications. It replaces PPGs and PPSs, and other guidance. The document encourages positive, balanced decisions, emphasizes the primacy of the development plan and local decision making

Regional Guidance

Regional Planning Guidance for East Anglia to 2016

Regional Spatial Strategy for the East of England

Regional Economic Strategy for the East of England

The new Coalition Government is planning to rapidly abolish Regional Spatial Strategies (RSS), and this is already a material consideration in planning decisions (from May 2010). Until such time, the RSS remains part of the development plan but should not be afforded as much weight as previously, in the decision making process.

Appendix C: Cambridge Local Plan Policies

Cambridge Local Plan 2006

3/1	Sustainable Development
3/2	Setting of the City
3/3	Safeguarding Environmental Character
3/4	Responding to Context
3/7	Creating Successful Places
3/11	The Design of External Spaces
3/12	The Design of New Buildings
4/3	Safeguarding Features of Amenity or Nature Conservation Value
4/4	Trees
4/13	Pollution and Amenity
4/15	Lighting
5/9	Housing for People with Disabilities
5/10	Dwelling Mix
8/2	Transport impact
8/4	Walking and Cycling Accessibility
8/5	Pedestrian and Cycle Network
8/6	Cycle Parking
8/7	Public Transport Accessibility
8/10	Off-street car parking
8/11	New Roads
8/16	Renewable Energy in Major New Developments
8/17	Renewable Energy
8/18	Water, Sewerage and Drainage Infrastructure
9/3	Development in the Urban Extensions
9/5	Southern Fringe

APPENDIX D: SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING DOCUMENTS AND MATERIAL CONSIDERATIONS

Supplementary Planning Documents

Cambridge City Council (May 2007) – Sustainable Design and Construction
Cambridge City Council (January 2008) - Affordable Housing
Cambridge City Council (January 2010) – Public Art

Material Considerations

Cambridge Southern Fringe Area Development Framework (January 2006)

APPENDIX E: INTERNAL CONSULTATIONS AND CAMBRIDGESHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL

Consultee	Comment on Amendment (where appropriate)	Comment on Original submission
Urban Design		The approach is supported and has the potential to deliver a high quality and well-designed scheme. A number of amendments are required to the highways design and some of the house types, and provision of the design code compliance statement.
Housing		Supports Application. All affordable homes meet the Homes and Communities Design and Quality standards
Sustainability	Supports application. Welcomes clarification requested as to why the site is being assessed against 2006 Building Regulations.	Supports the overall approach to sustainable development, particularly the design of all units (market and affordable) as to achieve level 4 of the Code for Sustainable Home and the approach to on-site renewal energy generation.
Landscaping	Supportive subject to conditions	Overall supportive. Minor issues in relation to interface with adjacent parcel, planting proposals and Management Plan.
Sustainable Drainage	Draft detailed Drainage Strategy inadequate. Need to secure through condition.	Inadequate detail in Drainage Strategy to allow full assessment.
Ecology		Overall support. Details of locations of nest boxes need to be submitted / conditioned.
Cycling and Walking	All significant concerns addressed, although disappointed that much of cycle parking is behind 2 parked cars.	Concerns in relation to visitor cycle parking, location of cycle parking within Flat Block C and some house types.
Environmental Health		Design has ensured that noise is only an issue on the properties facing the Addenbrooke's Road. All habitable rooms meet requirements without need

		for mechanical ventilation. Details of balcony screening required.
Waste & Recycling	All concerns addressed	Generally supportive but minor amendments required relating to the location and access to some bins stores.
Access Officer and Disability Panel		Supportive of the proposals. Recommend revisions to layout of house for wheelchair users. Recommend inclusion of mixed ability play equipment.
Public Art		The PADP clearly relates to the approved Public Art Strategy and the City Councils SPD. Recommend approval.
Cambridgeshire County Council	All concerns addressed	The following details are unacceptable to the Highway Authority: Vehicle tracking details and some visibility splays; Footway and carriageway widths and materials; On street parking bays; Tree pits. There are also minor issues in relation to Rights of Way.

The above responses are a summary of the comments that have been received. Full details of the consultation responses can be inspected on the application file.

APPENDIX F: OTHER EXTERNAL CONSULTATIONS AND REPRESENTATIONS

Consultee	Comments
Cambridge Ramblers Group	The public rights of way footpaths 46 & 47 should appear in the documents showing access routes.
Highway Agency	No comments received
Environment Agency	No comments received
Anglian Water	No comments received
Natural England	No objection
Sustran	No comments received
Cambridge Cycling Campaign	No comments received
Cambridgeshire NHS	No comments received
Cambridge University Hospital NHS	No comments received
South Cambridgeshire District Council	No comments received
Fire and Rescue Services	No objection. Request condition in relation to the provision of fire hydrants
National Grid	No comments received
Architectural Liaison Officer	No objection, although is concerned about surveillance of the parking courts and recessed doorways.
Hobsons Conduit Trust	No comments received
Health and Safety Executive	No comments received
The Wildlife Trust	No comments received
Cambridge Water	No comments received
Transco	No comments received
RSPB	No comments received
Energy Networks	No comments received
Cambridge Past, Present and Future	No comments received
RSPB	No comments received

The above responses are a summary of the comments that have been received. Full details of the consultation responses can be inspected on the application file.

APPENDIX G: OUTLINE CONDITION UPDATE

NO DEVELOPMENT TO COMMENCE

Number	Condition	Decision Date
5	Phasing Plan approval	JDCC Jan 2011
6	Design Code approval	JDCC Feb 2011 Final discharge May 2011
11	Green corridor (Strategic) approval	JDCC Nov 2010
23	Allotments & Comm Gardens	JDCC Nov 2010
38	Strategic site surface water strategy approval	JDCC Mar 2011
40	Ground water	November 2010
41	Ecol Cons Man Plan approval	October 2010
57	Contaminated land assessment	January 2011
58	Strategic CEMP	September 2011
69	Archaeology	Fieldwork completed and Assessment Report approved

NO RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT TO COMMENCE

9	Youth Strategy approval	JDCC December 2011
51	Access to Fawcett	September 2010
67	Recycling	Outstanding. Details of recycling facilities for southern part agreed

APPENDIX H: DESIGN CODE COMPLIANCE

Statement of Design Code Compliance

This application has been developed in accordance with the parameters set out in The Clay Farm Design Code, produced by Countryside Properties Plc, in collaboration with Cambridge City Council, and approved by Cambridge City Council in May 2011. The design code bridges between the outline planning permission for Clay Farm and all reserved matters applications relating to it. As well as providing over-arching principles for the entire Clay Farm site, the design code defines character areas and sub-character areas with their own sets of parameters and principles to ensure that the development responds to the varying interfaces around and within the site, and accords with the urban design aspirations of the outline application.

The masterplan as outlined in this design and access statement sits within the 'Royal Showground' character area of the design code, which comprises of four sub character areas. Parcels 15 - 18 of the masterplan sit within sub character areas 'Addenbrooke's Avenue', at the centre of the 'Royal Showground' area, and 'Brookside' to the East. Parcels 9a and 9b form the 'Park Side' sub character area to the North. The Phase 1 development which forms this reserved matters application sits within the 'Addenbrooke's Avenue' sub character area, which includes the key space of the 'Southern Recreation Square'; defined as a formal amenity space for wider residents, with an emphasis on the importance of the massing and character of the surrounding development. Both the masterplan and Phase 1 proposals have been developed within the overall guidelines and character area parameters, with close consultation with Cambridge City Council.

The Phase 1 scheme accords with the site wide coding conceptual design guidance, the Royal Showground key parameters and Addenbrooke's Avenue aspirations as set out in the Clay Farm Design Code as follows:

Block Structure

The block structure of the masterplan follows the principles of the block structure diagram in the design code, and is reinforced by the Urban Design Framework Parameter Plan with more formal rigid blocks to the West of the spine road, higher flat blocks to create landmarks at key corners, and a clearly defined hierarchy of roads.

Movement and Streets

The scheme follows the general principles of the street network guidelines within the design code, with the secondary street running through the site, connecting the primary roads to the South and the North, and green lanes to the Addenbrooke's road edge. The road hierarchy strategy for the remaining streets has developed through consultation with Cambridge Urban design and Highways officers, resulting in shared space roads around the central square and mews streets running North-South to reduce vehicle speeds where necessary, enhance public amenity space and encourage pedestrian and cycle movement (refer to p4.7 of the D&A for further information on street hierarchy).

Car and Cycle Parking

In most cases, car parking for houses is provided on-plot within a carport or garage. For the three houses within Phase 1 where narrow frontage houses are advantageous, parking is incorporated to the rear of the property within a parking court. Apartment buildings also have parking to the rear within parking courts that are well connected to the buildings they serve and well overlooked wherever possible. Cycle parking to houses is also generally integrated within the car port, with the three narrow frontage houses incorporating one covered secure space to the front and two to the rear. Cycle parking for apartment buildings is always integrated at ground floor and located close to the core where possible. In addition, non-allocated visitor car parking and cycle parking is provided across the scheme.

Transitions in Style

Although building form and architectural treatment varies across the Phase 1 site to respond to the varying character areas, care has been taken to ensure that all the buildings read as part of one development and are harmonious with surrounding developments through the fenestration proportions, materials and scale.

Landscape, Open Spaces & Biodiversity

Landscape is a significant aspect of the 'Addenbrooke's Avenue' sub character area, with the southern recreation square forming an important amenity space and linking the new developments to the open space around Hobson's Brook and beyond. The size of the southern recreation square has been reduced from the size shown in the Design Code diagrams through discussion with CCC in order to suit the scale of the surrounding buildings. Additional usable green space has been provided along the green street thereby creating a green route running from the South, from the Addenbrooke's road, to the southern Recreation Space, and this is continued in further phases with a linear park from the Southern Recreation Space to Hobson's Brook. The planning and design of these spaces will serve to fulfil the aspirations of the design code that seeks to integrate the new developments and create green links through the development to the green corridor. Tree species and planting has been chosen to accord with the design code and guidance from Cambridge Landscape officers to suit the character area, to enhance biodiversity and to enhance streets and amenity spaces.

Density

The density range permitted for parcels 15 - 18 is 30 - 45 dph. The overall density for parcels 15 - 18 as shown in the masterplan (p3.8 of D&A) is 44.4 dph and the phase 1 area has a density of 38.2 dph (p4.10 of D&A).

Building Heights

The building heights permitted for the Phase 1 area are between 2 and 4 stories. The building heights are generally 3-storeys to create a robust edge to the central open space, the green street and along Addenbrooke's Rd. 2-storey houses are located on the mews street and the tertiary street running East-West to the North of the site. 4-storey apartment buildings are used at key corners to create marker building and along Addenbrooke's road to reinforce the robust edge. Other houses are 2.5 stories to break up the roof line whilst maintaining a strong street edge and a relationship with the adjacent higher blocks (refer p. 4.7 of D&A for further information on building heights).

Plot width

The standard house arrangement for phase 1 is terraced frontages and a narrow plot width of min. 8.2m including car port. The exception to these are the semi-detached houses on the mews street where a less formal edge is required, and the three houses along the Western edge of the green street where narrower frontages of min. 6m create a more active street scene and allow for restrictions to vehicle access to enhance the green street amenity space.

Building Mix

The overall mix for the masterplan provides 60% houses and 40% flats as required in the design code, with a cross-section of dwelling types ranging from 1 and 2-bed apartments and 2 to 5-bed houses located throughout the development. The larger family units are concentrated close to the key amenity spaces of the central square and the green corridor. The ratio of flats to houses is lower for Addenbrooke's Avenue and Brookside, and higher in the Park Side area to account for the higher density required in this sub character area and proximity to the hub of the community square. The ratio of flats to houses for Parcels 15 - 18 is 50:50.

Building Rhythm & Roofline

Building rhythm varies across the site to respond to the various spaces and interfaces. Along the Addenbrooke's Rd, continuous frontages with minimal gaps and a continuous roofline create a robust edge in response to the acoustic issues and location facing onto a public and busy road. The terraced houses feature protruding bays at regular intervals to add a sense of layering and privacy. Similarly, the three-storey houses around the central square form continuous frontages that respond to the scale of the open space. The roofline is modulated to increase the height of the buildings and

introduce a subtle rhythm whilst maintaining the integrity of the blocks. Along tertiary streets, castellated rooflines create a strong rhythm and a counterpoint to the more formal blocks. Mews streets feature semi-detached gable-fronted houses to increase the height of the two-storey houses and to create a strong composition. Pitched roofs are used on tertiary and mews streets to suit the character of the street. Flat roofs are used on houses elsewhere and all flat blocks.

Boundary treatments

Boundary treatments comprise of a combination of timber and brick. Generally, plot boundaries visible from the public realm are brick, with 260mm high brick walls to front gardens and 1.5m high brick walls to the rear with 300mm timber trellis on top to add privacy and encourage biodiversity. The use of brick will enhance the quality of the public spaces and will tie in with the building materials. Elsewhere, rear garden fences will be hit and miss timber fencing which will be 1.8m high close to the property, stepping down to 1.5m to maximise light levels for private amenity space.

Key Spaces & Frontages

Additional guidance is provided within the design code for the key grouping of the Southern Recreation Square. The guidelines have been met through careful landscaping of the square, definition of the street hierarchy around it and strong runs of formal terraced houses along the two edges of the square that fall within the Phase 1 application area. The apartment building, which forms an end to the terrace row to the North-West of the square, features a three-storey pop-out bay at the corner to define the corner and create a building that aids movement and legibility through the site (refer to street view 5 on p. 4.29 of the D&A).

APPENDIX I: PUBLIC ART FRAMEWORK: ART & PLAY

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The consultation, commissioning and approval process for the provision of public art on Clay Farm is set out in the Clay Farm Public Art Strategy (CFPAS), which was approved at Joint Development Control Committee (JDCC), in December 2010. This Public Art Framework describes the public art proposals for Zone 5 of the CFPAS, titled 'Art and Play'. This Framework has been developed from the approved CFPAS and to comply with the Cambridge City Council's Public Art Supplementary Planning Document.

The approved CFPAS outlines that public art in Zone 5: Art and Play should be developed to connect strongly to its four public art themes, 'Connectivity', 'Biodiversity', 'Innovation', and 'Sustainability' (CFPAS paragraphs 3.1 to 3.4) and. The Strategy (paragraph 4.0.3) includes the aim to 'reinforce Clay Farm as a unique sustainable community with a contemporary cultural identity through the integration of subtle and sensitive art interventions'.

The principle for the provision of public art within Zone 5: Art and Play of Clay Farm is 'the concept of informal play – play experiences less dominated by manufactured play equipment, but through structured landscape design and supported programmes of activities' (CFPAS, paragraph 4.5.1). The key opportunity for the Art and Play Lead Artist is 'to bring a broad interpretation of play to the design team, and look beyond the structured play provisions to explore incidental play opportunities on open space across the site, including the Green Corridor' (CFPAS, paragraph 4.5.2). These principles were developed to ensure that the Art and Play public art project would engage directly with the principles and aims of the Clay Farm Strategy for Youth Facilities and Children's Play Provision. Included as Appendix I is Countryside Properties plan for formal play provision across Clay Farm taken from that document, which has acted as one starting point for the development of this framework.

As detailed in the CFPAS, a Clay Farm Public Art Steering Group was formed and has met to examine and select Lead Artists for the 5 public art 'zones' on Clay Farm. The Steering Group comprises of local residents, arts advisors, Countryside Properties and their design team representative as appropriate, with the Local Planning Authority in attendance as observers. Through a longlisting and interview process culminating on March 25th 2011, the Steering Group selected Simon and Tom Bloor for the Art and Play Lead Artist commission and Countryside Properties appointed them in May 2011.

Simon and Tom Bloor are visual artists whose works and projects use a range of media to explore moments of utopian potential and flawed idealism. Crossing the boundaries between art, design and social history their projects often develop from research into a particular location or event, adapting existing material from a variety of sources and filtering and re-presenting this information to create shifts in context that encourage new readings. A sample of the Bloor's art previous projects is included as Appendix III. Further information on their practice can be found at: www.simonandtombloor.com

Since their appointment, Simon and Tom Bloor have been working closely with Countryside Properties and the Clay Farm Public Art Steering Group to develop this public art framework. Their aim is to create a cohesive and recognisable public art language in their interventions across Clay Farm that contributes to a stronger sense of place and orientation site-wide, and engages people with this new place at a playful human level. Their framework proposal is 3-fold:

1. Creating an overall artistic code for the Art and Play public art zone.
2. Creating proposals for interventions around Clay Farm's formal play area provision.
3. Creating proposals for interventions along key pedestrian routes across Clay Farm.

As proposed in the CFPAS, the site wide scope for the Art and Play zone directs Simon and Tom Bloor to engage with the developers and design teams on every parcel of land at Clay Farm, in order to explore and assess the extent to which there is opportunity for public art influence as part of that land parcels detailed design. Therefore, this Framework will be implemented through a range of detailed proposals by the artists being submitted for Local Planning Authority approval via Public Art Delivery Plan documents as integral parts of the each of the land parcels' detailed planning applications.

The total budget for the public art contribution for Clay Farm across each of the 5 'zones of influence' is £805,000. The Art and Play Public Art budget is £120,000.