

DEVELOPMENT CONTROL FORUM

18 January 2012
1.30 - 3.15 pm

Present:**Members of the Planning Committee**

Councillors: Blencowe, Brown, Dryden, Saunders, Stuart and Tunnacliffe

Officers

Sarah Dyer (City Development Manager - Chair), James Goddard (Committee Manager), Sophie Pain (Planning Officer) and Clare Rankin (Cycling & Walking Officer)

Also Present

Patrick Joyce (County Cycling Officer)

For ApplicantRepresentatives

Chris Abel ((Applicant) Explore Living), Mark Cooper ((Trees) MCA), Matt Lee ((POS) Liz Lake Associates) and Mark Mann (Planning – Savills)

Also Present

Stuart Bailey ((Applicant) Explore Living), Ian French ((Noise) Hodgson Group), Heini van Niekerk ((Architect) Grafik) and Tim Smith ((Highways, Contamination, Flood Risk) Structa)

For Petitioners

Jim Chisholm (Cambridge Cycling Campaign), Frank Gawthrop (local resident) and Edward Lee (local resident)

FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE COUNCIL

12/3/DCF Declarations of Interest

Name	Interest
Councillor Saunders	Personal – Member of Cambridge Cycling Campaign

12/4/DCF Application and Petition Details (11/1294/FUL and 11/1295/FUL Travis Perkins Trading Co Ltd, Devonshire Road

Committee: Planning Committee
Date: 18 January 2012
Application No: 11/1294/FUL and 11/1295/FUL
Site Address: Travis Perkins Trading Co Ltd, Devonshire Road, Cambridge, CB1 2BJ
Description: Demolition of existing depot building and redevelopment of site to provide: remodelled Travis Perkins depot including the erection of a new depot building and reconfiguration yard area and landscaping.
Applicant: Mr C Abel
Agent: Mr M Mann
Address: Savills L & P Ltd, Unex House, 132-134 Hills Road, Cambridge, CB2 8PA
Lead Petitioners: Mr J Chisholm
Address: C/O Cambridge Cycling Campaign, PO Box 204, Cambridge, CB4 3FN
Lead Petitioners: Mr Frank Gawthrop and Ms Barbara Bell
Address: C/O Glisson Road and Tenison Road Area Residents Association, Cambridge
Case Officer: Miss Sophie Pain
Text of Cambridge Cycling Campaign Petition:
Concern that these applications take little or no account of the cycle routes detailed in the Cambridge Local Plan see: <http://www.cambridge.gov.uk/ccm/content/transport-and-streets/cycling-and-walking/cycle-planning-and-policy.en> (section 5.5, page 11)

Petitioners consider it a requirement of the Local Plan that this route is facilitated rather than obstructed, as do the current plans, by these developments.

Network Rail and the developers need to be engaged so as to provide a high quality route for both those walking and cycling from the rail station through to the spare arch on the west side of Mill Road bridge.

Text of GTARA Petition:

1. Consideration should be given to moving Travis Perkins in their entirety and the City Council should actively help in this regard.
2. Sufficient open space should be provided on site to the Council standard.
3. The best existing trees should remain and the tree screen facing Devonshire Road be enhanced with new planting.
4. The Council should consider the impact of the development on the proposed cycle route along side the railway (the Chisholm Trail) and ensure that sufficient land is allocated to allow this proceed.

Opening Remarks by Chair

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

Case by Applicant

Mr Mann made the following points:

- 1) Referred to issues raised by petitioners:
 - The Council should consider assisting Travis Perkins to moving in their entirety to another site.
 - The Council should consider the impact of the development on the Chisholm Trail, and ensure sufficient land is provided for it to proceed.
 - Sufficient open space should be provided on the development site.
 - The best existing trees should remain in the tree screen facing Devonshire Road and be enhanced with new planting.
- 2) Summarised the history of Travis Perkins on the Devonshire Road site, and how the application intended to develop this.
- 3) No objections were raised in January 2010 to the proposal of providing the Chisholm Trail through the site.
- 4) Options to move Travis Perkins in its entirety had been considered and discounted due to a lack of appropriate sites that could accommodate combined commercial and residential use.

Mr Lee made the following points:

- 5) The proposed pocket park public open space was fully compliant with national guidelines and best practice with regards to its size, and in the way that play provision would be provided.
- 6) A high quality communal open space would be provided for site occupiers and residents of Petersfield Ward.

- 7) The commuted sum that could come forward with regard to the shortfall of public open space (in relation to City Council standards) on the Travis Perkins Site could be used to improve the quality and usability of some of the existing areas of public open space, which were currently perceived not to be achieving their full potential.

Mr Cooper made the following points:

- 8) A tree survey was carried out to help inform the design. This identified many of the existing trees were of poor quality.
- 9) The Agents met the Council Arboricultural Officer in January 2011. The Officer agreed the most appropriate option was to replace the trees as retaining them would impact on the design of the application. For example, precluding the proposed extra wide pavement.
- 10) This led to two options:
 - One keeping trees (previous iteration).
 - One replacing trees (current iteration).

Case by Petitioners

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

- 11) Residents welcomed the development of Devonshire Road in principle, but had concerns regarding this specific application.
- 12) Supported Travis Perkins moving to another site for its depot location.
- 13) Concerns of Local Residents:
 - Loss of mature trees.
 - The area has existing traffic flow and parking issues, which the development would exacerbate.
 - Endorsed County Council Lead Engineer Development Control's comments regarding a s106 requirement for parking permits.
 - Quality of architecture, this was not visually interesting or in keeping with the character of the area.
 - Lack of provision of public open space for use by site occupiers and neighbours.

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

- 14) Referred to tree survey document from the planning application.
- 15) The Devonshire Road tree planting and fencing was undertaken by the City Council as a planned scheme.
- 16) The Arboricultural Officer recommended a tree survey to assess the impact of the development on the trees.

- 17) Tree work to thin out, but not remove/replace the trees was welcomed as they made an important visual contribution to the local area.
- 18) Acknowledge trees were not in a Conservation Area, but felt they should be protected regardless.
- 19) Mr Chisholm spoke on behalf of the Cambridge Cycling Campaign. He made the following points:
 - The Travis Perkins re-development must not block the Chisholm Trail route as it is defined in the Local Plan. This may require liaison with Network Rail as the nearby land owners.
 - It was only a small corner of the site that was critical to the trail provision.
 - Better integration of site commercial and residential aspects required.
 - Queried if the proposed route would be available from day one.

Case Officer's Comments:

- 20) Details concerning the application were sent to neighbouring properties.
- 21) Subsequent to this, representations were received from local residents requesting a Development Control Forum.
- 22) Consultations have been undertaken with statutory consultees.
 - The Environment Agency, Ministry of Defence, Sustainable Drainage Officer, County Archeology, Anglia Water and the Air Quality Officer raised no objections, subject to the imposition of conditions.
 - Objections have been raised from the following (generally due to a lack of information):
 - Sustainability Officer.
 - Landscape Officer.
 - Urban Design & Conservation Officer.
 - Comments from Policy, Refuse and Waste, Housing, Environmental Health, New Communities and Highways have greater concerns.

Members' Questions and Comments:

Ms Rankin and Mr Joyce answered as follows in response to Member's questions and comments:

- 23) Officers had discussed the inclusion of the Chisholm Trail on site. The intention was to reserve land for the trail. Network Rail were not obliged to engage with Officers concerning this, but the City Council was looking to work with them and the developer to implement the access route.

- 24) Officers acknowledged the trail was an important access route for Cambridge.

Mr Abel and Mr Mann answered as follows in response to Member's questions and comments:

- 25) The current development design proposed to replace low quality trees, but retain ones that were acceptable. The previous iteration of the design proposed to retain the trees, but the applicant would have to consider the implications of returning to a previous design. The site layout would be unaffected in either case.
- 26) The Agent undertook to liaise with Network Rail (if possible) to bring the Chisholm Trail on site.
- 27) The Agent acknowledged comments regarding the need to provide appropriate open space, bike storage and access to these. Also resident's concern regarding loss of trees.
- 28) Options to move Travis Perkins in its entirety had been considered and discounted. Currently two sites in the north and south of the City were being considered.
- 29) The developers were discussing with the Highways Authority the possibility of getting the access road adopted. An alternative would be to bring in a private management company.

Summing up by the Applicant's Agent

30) Re-iterated:

- The scheme proposed an appropriate design to develop the site.
- Would review the impact of the depot on the Chisholm Trail.
- The provision of appropriate open space had been discussed with City Council Officers, and no objections raised. Some would be provided on and off site. The Council's Open Space Strategy requirements were noted.
- The removal of housing to provide additional open space on site would affect the trigger points for open space provision, and could lessen the amount required.
- Trees on site were protected by Tree Protection Orders, but the Developer suggested some could be replaced due to the impact on construction and site design. The Agents will discuss amending the scheme with the Applicant to retain the trees.

Summing up by the Petitioners

- 31) Devonshire Road could be uplifted by a high quality development that improved the quality of the area.
- 32) Stakeholders needed to work together so all views were taken into account to develop the site and provide appropriate access.
- 33) Reiterated local residents welcomed the retention of trees on site.
- 34) Reiterated local residents would support Travis Perkins moving in its entirety to another location.
- 35) Reiterated concerns previously raised with regards to:
 - Quality and provision of open space.
 - The application proposed to overdevelop the site.

Final Comments of the Chair

- 36) 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 3.15 pm

CHAIR