

Planning Committee



MAJOR APPLICATIONS

CB1, F2 and B2 (18/1678/FUL)

- Last presented to Planning Committee on 7 June 2020
- Adjourned Decision Protocol (ADP) engaged
- Two minded-to draft reasons for refusal
- Scheme revised and re-consulted upon
- Following extract slides from applicant's Design Document illustrating revisions and comparisons

Draft Reason for Refusal 1


The proposed development would fail to prioritise the movement and safety of pedestrians and cyclists within the CB1 area introducing conflict at Station Square and Station Road and further conflict along the car park access road connecting to Devonshire Road. In addition, the footprint of B2 would reduce the flexibility of development coming forward within this quarter of CB1 to adequately respond and provide for high quality cycling (including the Chisholm Trail) and pedestrian routes that should have priority over vehicular traffic. The proposal is therefore contrary to policies 25, 56, 57, 59 and policy 80 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2018) and NPPF (Feb 2019) paragraphs 104 and 109.

Draft Reason for Refusal 2

By virtue of the scale, massing and footprint of building B2 in close proximity to Carter Bridge, the proposed building would appear visually cramped, overly prominent and detract from the character and appearance of the existing area. The proposal is therefore contrary to policies 55, 56 and 57 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2018) and NPPF (Feb 2019) paragraph 124.

Site Location Plan

Access
from
Station
Square
Removed



Key Revisions from Applicant's Design Document

1. Increase the pavement width along block F2 to 5.2m and 5.8m

An increase by 2.9m at the junction with Great Northern Road and 1.9m and 1m along the Northern Access Road eases pedestrian movements along F2 and increases the streetscape physically and visually.

This is achieved by locally recessing the ground floor of F2.

2. Loading bay adjacent to F2

Loading bay demarcation amended with the same paving treatment across the application to provide visual continuity of pedestrian priority.

3. Remove the blue badge parking bay on the pavement adjacent to F2

Scheme is policy compliant on the disabled parking requirement and ample disabled parking is provided located in the Station Square in immediate proximity. This can be **conditioned** if members require inclusion within the application.

4. Access and egress to the MSCP reversed to address potential conflicts

The MSCP is now proposed to be accessed from the southern entrance with cars exiting north of the building.

This will better integrate the flows of cycle and vehicular movements.

5. Recess the north-western corner of block B2 to widen the pavement to 3.5m


This will improve the pedestrian flow along the building and removal of the parking bay increases the usability and safety travelling north for pedestrians.

6. Protected Future Route for the Chisholm Trail indicated


This would deliver a safe route integrated with the existing cycle flow to and from Devonshire Road.

Brookgate have committed not to build buildings G1 and G2. This further increases flexibility for the final route of the Chisholm Trail.


Streetscape and Ground Floor of B2 and F2 as presented to Committee




Suggested Modifications to Address Draft Reason for Refusal 1



Increased Pavement Widths (close up)



B2 Cut-back




Protected Future Route for the Chisholm Trail Access to the Northern Access Road

This application does not seek permission for any works related to the Chisholm Trail. Policy 80 is clear in its requirements that the route of the trail should not be prejudiced by development, the route around the Station and toward Devonshire Road is indicative and the County and other stakeholders have a number of legal and practical hurdles to overcome to deliver it. Brookgate have no control over that.

What our indicative plan shows is that the route is not prejudiced in any way, we are therefore policy compliant. The proposal protects the future inclusion of the Chisholm Trail.

It is also material that contributions from CB1 towards the trail now total £800,000, CB1 is therefore a positive contributor to the ultimate delivery of this route.



Before



Before



After




After



Comparison of the Consented and Proposed Footprint of Building B2


The below diagram compares the consented with the proposed footprint of building B2.

- An 8.1m gap between the Ibis and B2 enables light between the buildings, breaks up the length of the frontage and provides an outlook for the upper floor rooms
- This results in the proposed moving of the building north
- The proposed combined footprint is 17 sqm smaller than the consented footprint (consented: 4,227 sqm, proposed: 4,210 sqm)




These drawings compare the consented and proposed length and height of Building B2. Whilst the building is closer to Carter Bridge it should be emphasised that:

1. The facade benefits from a significantly greater amount of animation than the consented car park facade would have delivered
2. The proposed active frontage delivers a significantly safer and more animated street scene than the blank car park facade would have delivered
3. The break between B1 and B2 permits views and light between the two buildings compared to the 110m long facade of the consented car park
4. The building height steps down towards Carter Bridge and the atrium opens up the street to light and views



Diagrammatic elevation of the outline consented MSCP



Comparison of outline consent and proposed

Comparison of the Consented Buildings B1/2 with the Proposed Building Looking East along Devonshire Road

These pages compare the visual impact of the proposed building B2 on the existing area with the consented volume - with and without consented block G2.



Consented volume



Proposed volume



Comparison consented and proposed volume

Summary

This comparison illustrates that the repositioned block B2 has no negative impact on the view east along Devonshire Road:

- the A-frame structure of Carter Bridge is clearly visible against clear sky
- the proposed building does not detract from the legibility of the bridge
- the useability of the bridge is in no way impacted by the proposed building
- the kinetic views east along Devonshire Road are not materially altered

Comparison of the Consented Building B1 only with the Proposed Building B2 Looking South along Devonshire Road



Consented volume



Proposed volume



Comparison consented and proposed volume


Summary

This comparison illustrates that the repositioned block B2 has no negative impact on the view south along Devonshire Road:

- The reduction of visible sky and horizon due to the proposed relocation of B2 is negligible


Proposed

- Proposed Block B2 is **48.5m** from the closest property on Devonshire Road: **4.7m** closer than consented.
- Proposed Block F2 is **32.9m** from the closest property on Devonshire Road: **1m** further away than consented.



18/0887/FUL - 73-75 Newmarket Road


Site Location Plan




Proposed Ground Floor Plan



Proposed First Floor Plan




Proposed Second Floor Plan



Proposed front elevation




Proposed rear elevation



Proposed west elevation




19/1770/FUL - 32 St Andrews Street Site Location Plan




[illegible]

Proposed First Floor



Proposed Second Floor



Proposed Elevations- St Andrews Street




Proposed Elevation to St Andrews Street

Proposed Elevations- Downing Street




20/02876/FUL - 78 Grantchester Meadows

Site Location Plan




Proposed Ground Floor Plan




Ground Floor Plan

Proposed First Floor Plan



First Floor Plan

Proposed Second Floor Plan



Proposed Front Elevation



Front Elevation

Proposed Rear Elevation




20/01033/FUL - 12 Gilmour Road

Site Location Plan




Existing and proposed ground floor plans




Existing and proposed roof plans



Existing and proposed rear elevation




2 Rear elevation - Shared Garden
Scale: 1:50




5 Rear elevation - Proposed
Scale: 1:50

Existing section



6 Section A-A
Scale: 1:50


Proposed section



2

Section B-B
Scale: 1/50

Proposed section



Existing front elevation

