

**PLANNING**

3 September 2014

9.30 am - 12.30 pm

**Present:** Councillors Dryden (Chair), Blencowe (Vice-Chair), Hipkin, Gawthrope, Hart, Pippas, C. Smart and Tunnacliffe

**Officers Present:**

Head of Planning Services: Patsy Dell

Head of Joint Urban Design: Glen Richardson

City Development Officer: Sarah Dyer

Principal Planning Officer; Toby Williams

Senior Planning Officer: Catherine Linford

Senior Conservation & Design Officer: Jonathan Hurst

Planning Officer: Sav Patel

Legal Advisor: Victoria Watts

Legal Advisor: Cara De La Mare

Committee Manager: Claire Tunnicliffe

**FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE COUNCIL**

**14/42/PLAN Apologies**

No apologies were received.

**14/43/PLAN Declarations of Interest**

None were declared.

**14/44/PLAN Minutes**

The minutes of the meeting held on 6 August 2014 were approved and signed as correct record.

**14/45/PLAN Planning Applications**

**14/45/PLANa** 14/0492/OUT: Edinburgh Building, Shaftesbury Road  
*Committee Manager's note: Councillor Hart did not take part in the consideration of this application as she had arrived after the Case Officer's presentation.*

The Committee received an application for outline planning permission.

The application sought approval for the demolition of all buildings on the site and the erection of office development of up to 41,750 square metres (gross external area).

The Committee received a representation in objection to the application from Dr Woodburn, Mr Drew, Ms Sennitt and Mr Fisher.

The representations covered the following issues:

- i. Cambridge Cycling Campaign welcomed the applicant's discouragement of car use and the promotion of cycle and pedestrian access in this car-congested area.
- ii. Effective and attractive pedestrian and cycle access from the busway cycle path and from Shaftesbury Road must be constructed before first use of any of the buildings.
- iii. Open pedestrian/cycle access must be continuously maintained.
- iv. If building work necessitates closure of the usual access route, effective on-site diversionary routes from both directions needs be provided.
- v. The proposed development should not be a repeat of the neighbouring Kaleidoscope development, which is still not provided with pedestrian/cycle access to the busway, years after planning permission specifying busway access was granted.
- vi. Two obstructions hinder pedestrian/cycle access to Cambridge Assessment:
  - The University Press gate across Shaftesbury Road, should be moved about 100 metres further down Shaftesbury Road now that University Press operations have relocated further along the road.
  - The proposed gate at the busway entrance (which would be operated by smart-card) could reduce cycling and walking because visitors from the station, station buses and Trumpington Park and Ride would be denied access. It would be impracticable to issue all visitors with smart-cards in advance. There should be no gate.
- vii. The path linking the busway to Shaftesbury Road should be fenced off from the rest of the site to safeguard the security of Cambridge Assessment's offices.
- viii. This is a huge development, and requires fuller analysis, if it going to proper contribute to the city.
- ix. The transport assumptions are not credible.
- x. There has been no proper consideration of mitigation measures. Off-site mitigation measures are needed for such a huge development in a

- constrained location. The County Council Transport Authority have not required, or even encouraged any such analysis.
- xi. The Council must now insist on robust mitigation measures. Petitioners of the Development Control Forum presented various ideas. One of which was to have a dedicated guided bus stop. This is the solution being implemented near the Astra-Zeneca site, why not for this development? Where is the analysis?
  - xii. The Committee should not rely on the Planning Officer's report, and should require a proper EIA before the plan is considered again.
  - xiii. An office development for 3000 people cannot be absorbed with only the minimal infrastructure improvements proposed.
  - xiv. The need to take account of cumulative impacts is therefore crucial.
  - xv. The Committee does not have enough information to make a decision that will affect the city as a whole.
  - xvi. Improvements would be needed to the local infrastructure; it could not support the proposed development. There is already a considerable problem with congestion during peak hours.
  - xvii. The development would bring an increase in traffic and pollution.
  - xviii. Measures for mitigation are superficial, a bus stop on the guided busway should be considered.
  - xix. The development would have a significant impact on the ground water level.

Andrew Spendlove (Applicant) & Mr Brown (Agent) both addressed the Committee in support of the application.

Councillor Avery addressed the Committee as a Ward Councillor.

The representation covered the following issues:

- i. Queried if the conditions attached to any approval of the application would go as far as was possible to control the adverse transport impacts of the development.
- ii. Stated that the following conditions / work could be done before approval is considered:
  - A full appraisal of the feasibility of a dedicated stop on the guided busway with clear direction on where the funding for that stop will come from.
  - Improvements to the south side of Brooklands Avenue should extend to the junction with Trumpington Road, including the re-siting of the wall at Brooklands House.
  - Improvements to the north side of Brooklands Avenue.

- The applicant should provide assurances that it would not enter into arrangements with nearby land occupiers to secure overspill car parking.
  - Funding should be allocated now for the lighting of the guided busway.
  - It should be an express term of any contract entered into for demolition or construction work that all employees of contractors or sub-contractors park their vehicles either on site or at an agreed remote compound – and this should be enforced.
  - The site should be fully permeable to third party users
- iii. Reminded the Committee that all the reports stated that Brooklands Avenue was at capacity now in terms of traffic flow.
  - iv. Stated that if the principle approach roads to a development of this size were designed from scratch it would look nothing like Brooklands Avenue. Shaftesbury Avenue was not much better.
  - v. Highlighted the statics from the report on traffic movement:
    - During construction 226 vehicle movements each day (an average of 14 per hour).
    - Once open it is intended that near on 2,300 people will work there, rising to 3,000 under current plans.
  - vi. If the applicant was successful in their ambitions for their travel plan, in switching people to travel by bike and on foot there was a need to be prepared for that success and money allocated to improve Brooklands Avenue.
  - vii. Queried why a bus stop could not be built on the guided busway as the development sits within 10 metres of the guided busway and questioned if the applicant would be able to achieve the modal shift?
  - viii. Stated that the applicant's target of just 7.2% of employees travelling by car correlates to the number of car parking spaces on site. If there are no spaces available then people are forced to find other modes of travel. It would be more realistic is that if there are no spaces available people are forced to find other places to park. The nearest comparable that had actually been achieved in this area was 15%.
  - ix. Would like an assurance that the applicant won't undermine its own scheme by, directly or indirectly, procuring parking for its employees from other nearby land users.
  - x. At the moment the guided busway was only useful as a safe cycle and pedestrian route during daylight hours. Funding for lighting the busway had been held up for too long. Commitment from some of the developer contribution could resolve the problem now.
  - xi. Disappointed to note that it is not proposed to ensure permeability of the site for the public. The public has free access around the applicant's

current buildings on Hills Road so this makes little sense. It would be a real contribution to local connectivity if it was possible to access the guided busway from Brooklands Avenue without negotiating the Hills Road junction. The accident statistics for that junction should be justification enough.

The Committee:

**Resolved (6 Votes to 0, with 1 abstention)** to grant the application for outline planning permission in accordance with the Officer recommendation, for the reasons set out in the Officer report, subject to the completion of the s106 Agreement by 30 November 2014 subject to the conditions recommended by the Officer and the revised conditions.

Pre-Committee Amendments to Recommendation:

Amendment to condition 12 to remove reference to dwellings; revised condition to read:

No development shall commence until further details of the circulation route for refuse collection vehicles have been submitted to the local planning authority and approved in writing. The required details shall include a full construction specification for the route, and a plan defining the extent of the area to which that specification will be applied. No part of the development shall be occupied until the refuse vehicle circulation route has been laid out and constructed in accordance with the details thus approved, and thereafter the route shall be maintained in accordance with those details

Amendment to Condition 17 as follows:

Any foundation design, including piling (and investigation boreholes using penetrative methods), will only be permitted with the express written consent of the Local Planning Authority, which may be given for those parts of the site where it can be demonstrated that there is no resultant unacceptable risk to groundwater. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details

Condition 19 to be deleted.

Reason for Condition 21 amended as follows:

To prevent the increased risk of flooding, both on and off site. and to demonstrate that they will not pose a risk to vulnerable groundwaters.

(Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 4/13 and 8/18 and Supplementary Planning Document 'Sustainable Design & Construction' 2007)

**14/45/PLANb** 14/0790/FUL: Cambridge City Football Ground, Milton Road  
The Planning Officer requested that the application be deferred to allow further consideration of proposals for affordable housing.

The Committee:

**Resolved (unanimously)** to defer the application.

**14/45/PLANc** 14/0906/FUL: Ice Rink, Parkers Piece

*Committee Manager's note: Cara DeLa Mare, Lawyer, took the place of Victoria Watts, Solicitor, for this item.*

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval to install a temporary real-ice ice rink with associated skate hire marquee, viewing platform and back-of-house/plant area; a family entertainment area with children's rides & food concessions; and a Christmas market with stalls & concessions.

The event would run annually from the 1st November through until the 31st January, for three years running from 01/11/14 through until 31/01/2017 inclusive.

Richard Elmer (Applicant) addressed the Committee in support of the application.

The Committee:

**Resolved (7 votes to 1 vote )** to grant the application for full planning permission in accordance with the Officer recommendation, for the reasons set out in the Officer report, subject to the conditions recommended by the Officer.

**14/45/PLANd** 14/0907/ADV: Ice Rink, Parkers Piece

*Committee Manager's note: Cara DeLa Mare, Lawyer, took the place of Victoria Watts, Solicitor, for this item.*

The Committee received an application for advertising consent.

The application sought approval for the following:

- i. Two triangular fascia signs on either end of the skate hire marquee.
- ii. Fascia sign wrapping around three sides of the box office.
- iii. Four fascia signs on the barriers of the ice rink.
- iv. Banners on each of the four entrances to Parkers Piece.

Richard Elmer (Applicant) addressed the Committee in support of the application.

The Committee:

**Resolved (7 votes to 0, with 1 abstention )** to grant the application for advertising consent in accordance with the Officer recommendation, for the reasons set out in the Officer report, subject to the conditions recommended by the Officer.

**14/45/PLANe** 14/0591/FUL: North Cambridge Academy, Arbury Road  
The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval the demolition of the existing school buildings and erection of a new 2-storey school with associated parking and landscaping. The demolition works exclude the existing, more modern sports hall and buildings, including a tower, occupied by Bellerby's College.

Jeremy Butterworth (Agent) & Phil Houghton (Applicant) addressed the Committee in support of the application.

The Committee:

**Resolved (unanimously)** to grant the application for full planning permission in accordance with the Officer recommendation, for the reasons set out in the Officer report, subject to the conditions recommended by the Officer.

**14/46/PLAN** **General Items**

**14/46/PLANa** Committee Tour 2014

The Committee received a report from the City Development Manager.

The report sought approval for the following arrangements for the Planning Committee Tour 2014:

- i. That the date for the tour be agreed as 8 October 2014 (9.30am to 1pm).
- ii. That members of the Design and Conservation Panel and Public Art Panel be invited to attend the tour.
- iii. That the Committee suggest any sites which they would like to see included on the tour.

The Committee:

Councillor Smart informed the Committee that the proposed date fell on the last day of the Liberal Democratic Autumn Conference and proposed that the day be changed.

**Resolved (unanimously)** to change the date.

**Resolved (unanimously)** that the date for the tour be agreed as 22 October 2014 (9.30am to 1.00pm) and that members of the Design and Conservation Panel and Public Art Panel be invited to attend the tour.

**14/46/PLANb** New Adjourned Decision Protocol

The Committee received a report from the Head of Planning Services.

The report referred to the new convention known as the Adjourned Decision Protocol (ADP) which would apply to major planning applications and where there was a majority resolution to make a decision contrary to Officer advice.

The Head of Planning reminded the Committee that the new process came into the effect from September and that the agreed operating principles and flowchart would be available at each meeting for information.

The Committee:

**Resolved (unanimously)** to note the report with thanks.

**14/46/PLANC** Proposed Independent Review of the Marque scheme  
Cherry Hinton Road/Hills Road

The Committee received a report from the Head of Planning Services.



The report prompted the Committee that the Leader of the Council had asked the Head of Planning Services to commission an independent review of the Marke scheme. The scheme had a long and complex planning history and the quality of its final form and construction had been subject to criticism locally and nationally.

The report sought approval for an independent review subject to the any amendments by the Planning Committee and Officers procure the services of an appropriate consultant to undertake this work as soon as practicable.

A Member of the Committee asked what was the justification and motivation for this review and questioned if it would set a precedent for further independent reviews.

The Head of Planning Services advised that whilst independent review is not something the local planning authority does regularly, it could offer an objective assessment of a particular case where for a variety reasons use of an external reviewer would be beneficial. Due to the complex planning history with requests for changes and development of the original design concepts spanning a number of years, the request is an appropriate one to ensure that the lessons had been picked up and learnt from.

#### The Committee:

**Resolved (7 votes to 0, with 1 abstention)** that the draft brief for the independent review be approved subject to any amendments by the Planning Committee and officers procure the services of an appropriate consultant to undertake this work as soon as practicable.

The meeting ended at 12.30 pm

**CHAIR**

This page is intentionally left blank