

**DEVELOPMENT CONTROL FORUM**

4 July 2012  
9.30 - 11.10 am

**Members of the Planning Committee**

Councillors: Blencowe, Dryden, Hipkin and Saunders

**Officers**

Toby Williams (Principal Planning Officer - Chair), Sarah Dyer (City Development Manager) and James Goddard (Committee Manager)

**For Applicant**

Neven Sidor (Architect), Dr Jon Burgess (Heritage Consultant), Mike Derbyshire (Agent), Derek Ford (Brookgate – Applicant), Rob Myers (Landscape Architect), Anna Rogers (Agent), Sven Topel (Brookgate - Applicant) and Colin Young (Mott Macdonald – Transport Consultant)

**For Petitioners**

Michael Chisholm, Roger Crabtree and Frank Gawthrop (on behalf of Glisson Road and Tenison Road Area Residents Association, plus the Residents Associations in Highsett, Brooklands Avenue and Rustat Road)

**FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE COUNCIL**

**12/9/DCF Declarations of Interest**

No declarations of interest were made.

**12/10/DCF Application and Petition Details 12/0502/FUL & 12/0496/CAC  
32 - 38 Station Road**

**Application and Petition Details for (12/0502/FUL & 12/0496/CAC) (32 - 38  
Station Road)**

Committee: Planning Committee  
Date: 4 July 2012  
Application No: 12/0502/FUL  
Site Address: 32 - 38 Station Road, Cambridge, Cambridgeshire, CB1 2JH  
Description: The demolition of 32-38 Station Road and the construction of two new office buildings comprising 7806 sq.m. office

floorspace (class B1) for 50 Station Road and 8621 sq.m. office floorspace (class B1) and 271 sq.m. of retail/cafe and restaurant floorspace (class A1/A3) for 60 Station Road as a phased development, including ancillary accommodation/facilities with an additional single level basement to both buildings and up to 61 car parking spaces, with associated plant; along with the re-alignment of the northern section of the southern access road; 432 external cycle parking spaces; and hard and soft landscape (including additional public realm and landscaping over the cycle storage area and basement entrance)

Applicant: Brookgate CB1 Limited  
Agent: Mrs Anna Rogers  
Application No: 12/0496/CAC  
Site Address: 32 - 38 Station Road, Cambridge, Cambridgeshire, CB1 2JH  
Description: Demolition of 32-38 Station Road  
Applicant: Mr Sven Topel  
Agent: Dr Jon Burgess  
Lead Petitioner: Mr Frank Gawthrop (on behalf of Glisson Road and Tenison Road Area Residents Association, plus the Residents Associations in Highsett, Brooklands Avenue and Rustat Road)  
Case Officer: Mrs Sarah Dyer  
Text of Petition: Following discussion with members of Residents Associations close to Cambridge Railway Station it was agreed to submit a petition to the City Council regarding the proposed construction of twin office towers on Station Road (in relation to planning applications 12/0502/FUL and 12/0496/CAC). One tower has eight floors, the other nine. The development consists of approximately 16,000 sq. m of floor space with estimated staff numbers of over 1,200 and just 61 parking spaces.

Petitioners wished to express concern regarding the increase in office space, the insufficient on site car parking, the environmental impact on the neighbourhood and the demolition of 32 -38 Station Road, which are fine Victorian buildings listed as buildings of local interest. Petitioners wished to discuss a reduction in the scale of the development.

Petitioners wished to ensure that the development makes a full financial contribution (including deferred payments) to the Cambridge guided bus.

### **Opening Remarks by Chair**

The Chair outlined the role and purpose of the Development Control Forum. He stated no decisions would be taken at the meeting.

### **Case by Applicant**

Mr Derbyshire made the following points:

- 1) Referred to Petitioner's concerns set out on the agenda.
- 2) The aim was to create a successful Master Plan in accordance with CABE guidance.
- 3) The design complies with the Master Plan. The 2008 Master Plan aimed to deliver key pieces of infrastructure in different economic conditions.
- 4) Each application should be considered on its own merits under planning policy.
- 5) The scheme does not require a full Environmental Impact Assessment.
- 6) It is understood that City Officers were satisfied with bike and car parking provision.
- 7) The design would expand commercial office space compared to current provision, but others would be reduced accordingly.
- 8) The County Council was satisfied with s106 contributions for SCAT and the Guided Bus.

Dr Burgess made the following points:

- 9) Wilton Terrace buildings have been in the Conservation Area since 1993. However their heritage status has not changed since the Master Plan was approved. Wilton Terrace are buildings of local interest, they are not listed buildings.
- 10) The use of Wilton Terrace buildings has changed from residential to other uses.
- 11) The context around Wilton Terrace buildings has changed since the adoption of the Master Plan; they are now in an area of redevelopment. The Master Plan design has been discussed with City Officers and English Heritage, who acknowledged the public benefit of the design.
- 12) Mr Sidor summarised the Master Plan details concerning building design and layout and presented the scheme.

### Case by Petitioners

Mr Crabtree spoke on behalf of local residents. He made the following points:

- 13) Concerns of Local Residents:
  - The Master Plan infrastructure was consistently being eroded in favour of more offices.
  - Car parking provision was inadequate for staff and visitors. People would not be discouraged from traveling to work by car through lack of parking provision on-site; they would use local roads in residential areas. This would exacerbate existing parking issues.
  - Brookgate were requested to investigate a pedestrian/cycle link from the application site to the adjoining leisure centre multistorey car park. This may ease Hills Road traffic issues.

Professor Chisholm spoke on behalf of local residents. He made the following points:

- 14) The (full planning) application design was materially different to that given outline consent. This may lead to s106 triggers being missed and so defer payment of monies.
- 15) It was suggested the Master Plan should be revised to reflect the current application, and s106 agreement be revised to prevent payment deferral if triggers were missed in the absence of a new Master Plan.

Mr Gawthrop spoke on behalf of local residents. He made the following points:

- 16) A concrete office block was not a suitable replacement for Victorian buildings.
- 17) The City Council undertook an assessment of Station Road in 2004, which listed Wilton Terrace as buildings of local interest. Beacon Planning again highlighted Wilton Terrace as buildings of local interest in 2012, in their role as Planning Consultants for the City Council. Mr Gawthrop expressed concern that Beacon Planning was now acting as Consultants for this application, and queried if this led to a conflict of interest.
- 18) Suggested that Wilton Terrace should be incorporated into the application design, not demolished to make way for it. Demolition was not part of the Master Plan.
- 19) Referred to a letter in objection to the application from David Campbell-Bannerman (MEP).
- 20) Referred to local resident and Victorian Society representations concerning Wilton Terrace.

**Case Officer's Comments:**

- 21) Details concerning the application were sent to neighbouring properties.
- 22) Subsequent to this, representations were received from local residents requesting a Development Control Forum.
- 23) Policy consultations have been undertaken with statutory consultees:
  - Cambridgeshire County Council (Engineering) - No objections have been raised, subject to conditions.
  - Head of Environmental Services - No objections have been raised, subject to conditions.
  - Cambridgeshire County Council (Transport) – Satisfied with contributions.
  - Urban Design and Conservation Team - No objections have been raised, subject to conditions.
  - Senior Sustainability Officer (Design and Construction) – Some concerns to be addressed.
  - Access Officer – Some concerns to be addressed, but generally no objections raised.
  - Head of Streets and Open Spaces (Landscape Team) – Some concerns to be addressed, but generally no objections raised.
  - Head of Streets and Open Spaces (Walking and Cycling Officer) – Some concerns to be addressed, but generally no objections raised.
  - Head of Streets and Open Spaces (Sustainable Drainage Officer) - No objections have been raised, subject to conditions.
  - Head of Streets and Open Spaces (Nature Conservation Officer) - No objections have been raised, subject to conditions.
  - English Heritage - No objections have been raised, subject to conditions.
  - Victorian Society – Some concerns to be addressed
  - Natural England - No objections have been raised, subject to conditions.
  - Environment Agency - No objections have been raised, subject to conditions.
  - Anglian Water - No objections have been raised, subject to conditions.
  - Cambridgeshire Constabulary (Architectural Liaison Officer) - No objections have been raised, subject to conditions.
  - Design and Conservation Panel (Meeting of 14 March 2012) – The Panel offered an overall Green verdict.

**Members' Questions and Comments:**

The City Development Manager answered as follows in response to Members' questions and comments:

- 24) An application for a non-material amendment to the Southern Access Road would be considered by Planning Committee 25 July 2012.
- 25) The full planning application was independent of the Master Plan. The Master Plan has no status as planning guidance, but the Outline consent is a significant material consideration.
- 26) Wilton Terrace is in a Conservation Area.
- 27) A link bridge between the application site and the adjoining leisure centre multistorey car park was not required under s106 Agreement.
- 28) The application was not bound by the outline permission. It will have its own s106 agreement that would be separate to the 2010 s106 agreement that covered the entire CB1 site. The 2010 s106 agreement links individual parcels of land to infrastructure provision as they come forward. The City Council received information 3 July 2012 from the County Council regarding on-going s106 discussions. The contributions have just been agreed with the County Council, so information was not in the public domain before the DCF occurred.
- 29) The Design & Conservation Panel met in March 2012 pre-submission of this application.

Mr Derbyshire answered as follows in response to Members' questions and comments:

- 30) The Applicant was fully committed to paying SCATP and CGB full s106 contributions. The Applicant would pay an equivalent proportion of the overall CB1 site s106 contribution set in 2008 for this application covering part of the site. This would be paid on commencement of building construction.
- 31) The application met City Council parking provision standards as agreed with Officers. The application sought to provide the minimum parking provision to discourage car use as the site was accessible by other forms of transport.
- 32) Brookgate were liaising with the Surgery concerning relocation, but they had made their own arrangements.

Mr Sidor answered as follows in response to Members' questions and comments:

- 33) The design of the building aimed to reflect other Cambridge facades. It was hard to define what an 'iconic building' looks like. However, it

reflected Master Plan criteria and could be called a distinctive and exemplar building that reflected user and neighbour's needs.

### **Summing up by the Applicant's Agent**

34) Re-iterated:

- The Master Plan had been worked on for 4 years, the planning application derived from this.
- City Council Officers had been consulted regarding the application design.
- The design deliberately discouraged car parking on-site.
- Car parking and s106 obligations would be met, as agreed with Officers.
- The demolition of Wilton Terrace was included in the Master Plan, the application was in an area of significant change and the Terrace no longer suits this context.
- The Applicant/Applicant's Agents were willing to liaise with residents outside of the meeting to address any concerns.

### **Summing up by the Petitioners**

35) Reiterated local resident's felt the design was bland in appearance, it should be smaller to be more in-keeping with other Cambridge building styles, and to reflect resident's needs.

36) Reiterated concerns previously raised with regards to:

- A lack of on-site car parking provision would have a knock on effect in neighbouring residential areas.
- The design does not comply with the Master Plan criteria.
- Concern that Wilton Terrace could be demolished instead of being kept as part of the design.

### **Final Comments of the Chair**

37) The Chair observed the following:

- Notes of the Development Control Forum would be made available to relevant parties.
- Application to be considered at a future Planning Committee.

The meeting ended at 11.10 am

**CHAIR**