

CAMBRIDGE CITY COUNCIL

REPORT OF: Head of Planning Services

TO: Planning Committee

27/06/2012

WARDS: Abbey, Petersfield

Confirmation of previous resolution to grant planning permission for 75 residential apartments, including 30 affordable units, 174m² of commercial space at ground floor level to be used for A1, A2, B1(a) or D1 (in the alternative), and associated infrastructure, at 9-15 Harvest Way (application number 11/0219/FUL)

1 INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 This report concerns the above planning application. At its meeting of 16th November 2011, Planning Committee resolved to grant planning permission, subject to conditions and to a Section 106 agreement.
- 1.2 Completion of a Section 106 agreement, and issue of the decision notice have been deferred because of concerns which have arisen about the soundness of the transport advice from Cambridgeshire County Council which formed part of the background for Committee's decision. Updated advice from the County Council has now been received, and this has been assessed by independent consultants engaged by Cambridge City Council. In the light of this new advice, and the consultants' assessment of it, officers have brought the matter back to Planning Committee to seek confirmation of the earlier decision.

2. RECOMMENDATIONS

- 2.1 I recommend Planning Committee confirm the decision, made at the meeting of 16th November 2011, to grant planning permission for the proposal made under 11/0219/FUL, subject to conditions, and subject to the completion of a Section 106 agreement by 17th August 2012.

3. BACKGROUND

- 3.1 An application for 75 residential apartments, including 30 affordable units, 174m² of commercial space at ground floor level to be used for A1, A2, B1(a) or D1 (in the alternative), and associated infrastructure, was received on 28th February 2011. Officers submitted a report to Planning Committee of 16th November 2012, recommending approval of the application. Having considered the application at that meeting, Planning Committee decided to accept the case officer's recommendation, and resolved to grant permission, subject to conditions and the completion of a Section 106 agreement.

- 3.2 One of the principal issues raised in representations, both from individuals and from the local residents' associations, was the impact of the proposed development on traffic conditions on Newmarket Road and Coldhams Lane. In order to explore this issue fully, it was agreed that the applicants on this site and applicants at the nearby site of Intercell House would jointly support the cost of PARAMICS modelling to examine the likely impact of additional vehicle movements from each of the two proposals independently and from both proposals cumulatively. This modelling examined impacts at weekday peaks, but also on Saturdays.
- 3.3 Having received reports from the consultants, the County Council concluded that the proposed residential development at 9-15 Harvest Way would not have a significant detrimental impact on the transport network, and advised the City Council case officer accordingly.
- 3.4 At the November 2011 meeting of Planning Committee, this issue formed a significant part of the discussion. Ultimately, Planning Committee decided that neither transport impact nor any other issue provided a justification for refusing the application, and resolved to grant permission.
- 3.5 Subsequently, during discussions surrounding the assessment of another planning application (11/0338/FUL), at the nearby site of Intercell House (1 Coldham's Lane), doubt was cast over the soundness of the advice which had been given by the County Council with respect to future traffic flows. The doubt arose when it emerged that the traffic signals in the area were within a UTC SCOOT system in which the phasing of signals responds according to traffic conditions. This meant that the possible installation of a MOVA system in the future, which had been built into the modelling process as a factor which would reduce delays, would in fact have little or no impact. Because of this situation, the Intercell House application was removed from the Planning Committee agenda until updated advice could be obtained from the County Council
- 3.6 County Council advice about the application at 9-15 Harvest Way had been informed by the same modelling process, and consequently, officers considered it advisable to delay implementing the Committee resolution to grant permission on the Harvest Way site until updated advice was received.
- 3.7 Updated advice from Cambridgeshire County Council was received on 11th June 2012. This advice was given in respect of the application at Intercell House, 1 Coldhams Lane, but it makes reference to the present application site as well. The County Council's advice is that the cumulative transport impact of proposed developments on the three neighbouring sites at 9-15 Harvest Way (residential), 180-190 Newmarket Road (hotel), and 1 Coldhams Lane (hotel) would not be significant. The County Council's assessment is that during the Saturday afternoon peak hour (1500-1600) the proposed residential use would add 9 additional journeys to the existing traffic flow. This would represent a 0.12% increase over the base level (current flows + committed development). The percentage figure is unaltered if 14% growth to 2018 is assumed. The percentage increase figures for the three sites combined are 0.72% over base level and 0.76% over base+14% growth.
- 3.8 The Council's independent transport consultants, WSP, have agreed that this assessment is sound.

4.0 OPTIONS

- 4.1 Confirm the previous decision to grant permission.
- 4.2 Refuse planning permission for the application, citing planning reasons for the decision.
- 4.3 Require the application to be returned to a later meeting of Planning Committee for further discussion.

5.0 CONCLUSIONS

- 5.1 The officer view is that there are no reasons to come to a decision different from that previously agreed by Planning Committee, and that the decision to grant planning permission, subject to conditions and a Section 106 agreement, should be confirmed.

6.0 IMPLICATIONS

(a) Financial Implications:

- 6.1 A decision to refuse permission could lead to an appeal, with associated costs in officer time and the engagement of consultants and possibly Counsel.
- 6.2 A decision to defer could lead to an appeal against non-determination, which would entail the same costs as above.

(b) Staffing Implications: None

(c) Equal Opportunities Implications: None

(d) Environmental Implications: None

(e) Community Safety: None

BACKGROUND PAPERS: The following are the background papers that were used in the preparation of this report:

Planning application 11/0219/FUL and supporting documents
Cambridge Local Plan 2006
Case officer's report to Planning Committee 16th November 2011
De-briefing sheet and minutes of Planning Committee 16th November 2011
*Advice from the County Council transport officers 11th June 2012

The asterisked document is attached to the Committee agenda as Appendix A to the report on the application at Intercell House.

To inspect the other documents, contact Tony Collins on extension 7157, or use the City Council website: planning application documents are available via the Public Access system

The author and contact officer for queries on the report is Tony Collins on extension 7157

Report file:

Date originated: 19 June 2012
Date of last revision: 19 June 2012