

**Application Number** 21/00264/FUL **Agenda Item**  
**Date Received** 26 January 2021 **Officer** Toby Williams

**Target Date** 29 July 2021  
**Ward** Petersfield  
**Site** Station Area Redevelopment Blocks B2 And F2  
 Devonshire Road

**Proposal** Erection of two new buildings comprising Class E(g)i/E(g)ii floorspace including ancillary accommodation/ facilities with associated plant and cycle parking for Block F2 and an Aparthotel (Class C1) with multi-storey car park for Network Rail, including car and cycle parking, for Block B2 with associated plant, hard and soft landscaping and permanent access from Devonshire Road to the Cambridge Station Car Park, utilising the existing pedestrian and cycle access, restricted to emergency access to the railway only.

**Applicant** c/o Agent

<p><b>SUMMARY</b></p>	<p>The proposal accords with the Development Plan for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-The principle of the proposed office, aparthotel and car park uses is acceptable.</li> <li>-A physically separated and safe cycle route would be provided through the site overcoming previous reason for refusal 1.</li> <li>-The aparthotel and multi-storey carpark Block B2 is of an improved design and is further away from Carter Bridge overcoming previous reason for refusal 2.</li> </ul>
-----------------------	---

## Background

- 0.0 An application to develop Blocks B2 and F2 within the CB1 Devonshire Quarter (18/1678/FUL) was refused by the City Council Planning Committee at its meeting of 16 October 2020. The committee report for 18/1678/FUL (which recommended planning approval), the associated decision notice and amendment sheet are attached at appendices 2, 3 and 6. Given the similarities between the refused and submitted schemes, in the interests of brevity, this committee report relies partly on the analysis and conclusions drawn by officers on 18/1678/FUL . It focuses on the differences between the two schemes and how the reasons for refusal have been overcome.
- 0.1 The reasons for refusal were twofold:
1. A failure to provide high quality cycling infrastructure in the form of a physically segregated and protected cycle route to link to the Chisholm Trail within the site.
  2. Building B2 (aparthotel and multi-storey car park) would have appeared visually cramped and overly prominent in relation to Carter Bridge, detracting from the character and appearance of the existing area and setting of the adjacent Mill Road Conservation Area.
- 0.2 The proposed land uses (office, car park and aparthotel), the arrangement of the blocks and the site constraints between the schemes remain largely the same. As such, whilst Members are not bound to consider only whether the reasons for refusal have been overcome, in the interests of consistency and fairness, officers advise that this is where the focus of the debate should rest.
- 0.3 The time-period for lodging an appeal on the refused scheme has now passed.

## 1.0 SITE DESCRIPTION/AREA CONTEXT

1.1 This is as set out in section 1 of the original planning report (Appendix 2). The red-line of the application site has been extended to include part of Great Northern Road and an area of land to the north of Carter Bridge.

## **2.0 THE PROPOSAL**

2.1 This is as set out generally in section 2 of the original planning report. The application is accompanied by a similar array of supporting planning documents including but not limited to: Planning, Design Access, Sustainability and Energy Statements; Overshadowing, Hotel Needs, Heritage, Transport, Ecology and Air Quality Assessments; and a Grey Water Feasibility Study.

- For Block B2, the aparthotel proposes 141 suites and the MSCP would have 201 car parking spaces (25% EV, remaining all passive provided)
- For Block F2, the office accommodation would be 3,227 sqm (Net Internal Area) with 124 cycle parking spaces

2.2 The key design changes between the refused scheme and the new scheme are as follows:

- The ground floor of the office Block F2 (western side of the access) has been recessed by 1m along its length to help provide a 3m two-way cycle lane from Carter Bridge to Great Northern Road.
- To facilitate the cycle lane, the disabled parking bays and loading bay previously proposed adjacent to Block F2 have been removed. The scheme remains compliant with disabled policy requirements with ample disabled parking in Station Square and more than 5% disabled parking in the MSCP.
- Pedestrian refuge spaces have been included in the design which protect the existing pedestrian crossings/desire lines.
- A 2.5m wide footway is proposed along the façade of F2. A clear separation between the cycle lane and pedestrian

spaces is proposed through contrasting block paving delineated by low upstand kerbs of light colour.

- The distance between Carter Bridge and north elevation of B2 has been increased by 4.5m (removing a wing of accommodation) to reduce the impact of B2 on the proximity to Carter Bridge and the adjacent Conservation Area. The upper floor has been set back even further.

2.3 Two sets of amendments (5 May 21 and 2 July 21) have been submitted to the Council following the original submission, both of which have sought to address concerns raised by third parties, consultees and participants of the Development Control Forum (DCF) meeting of 16 June 2021 (see minutes at appendix 5). The July amendments were submitted specifically in response to the DCF. The amendments have included the following:

- Enlarged site location plan
- Revised B2 and F2 drawings for approval. For B2 the revisions demonstrate the possible future conversion of the car park to a cycle park
- Landscape Masterplan, relating to revisions to pathways and cycleway interfaces in the northern part of the site
- Highways General Arrangement, revision to include improvements to the cycle and pedestrian path alignments, design and a proposed zebra crossing to the west of the mini roundabout
- Cycle and Footway - Design Widths Technical Memo including note on capacity
- Accessibility Note
- Secured-by-Design Technical Note

*and*

- Proposed Cycleway Option General Arrangement (indicative)
- B2 Multi-Storey Car Park Conversion Study to cycle park (indicative)
- Refuse Strategy (indicative relating to the Vesta Scheme)

- 2.4 For Block B2, the MSCP re-provides the surface car parking lost through the development of the site and would be for rail commuters. No car parking spaces are allocated to either the office uses in F2 or the aparthotel. There is no net gain in car parking on the site. Whilst not part of this application, the applicants have sought to demonstrate through the amendments and Car Park Conversion Study that should the MSCP not be required in the future, the building could be retrofitted to become a cycle park.
- 2.5 All of the amendments have been subject to further consultation.

### **3.0 SITE HISTORY**

- 3.1 This is as set out in section 3 of the original planning report. It is of note that 18/1678/FUL was submitted to the Council in November 2018. The proposals were amended on multiple occasions, presented to the Council's Development Control Forum in January 2019 and to the Council's Conservation and Design Panel on two occasions. 18/1678/FUL was initially considered at the June 2020 Planning Committee with an officer recommendation for approval. Members of the Planning Committee were minded to refuse the application, thereby initiating the Adjourned Decision Protocol (ADP).
- 3.2 The application was considered again at the Council's Planning Committee meeting of 16 October 2020 with the ADP report. It was recommended for approval. The Committee disagreed with the officer recommendation and the application was refused on 29 October 2020 (see appendix 3).

### **4.0 PUBLICITY, POLICY, EIA SCREENING**

- 4.1 The application has been subject to all appropriate publicity in accordance with planning regulations. A member briefing by the applicants took place on 10 December 2020.
- 4.2 The full range of applicable adopted policies and national guidance are those as set out in section 5 of the original officer report to 18/1678/FUL. Pertinent also is Local Transport Note 1/20 (referenced in the reason for refusal), which provides

guidance to local authorities on delivering high quality, cycle infrastructure.

- 4.3 The current proposal was subject to a request for a screening opinion (21/00350/SCRE) on 26 January 21. The Council determined that the proposed development did not give rise to the need for an Environmental Impact Assessment on 19 March 21, concluding that any environmental impacts arising from the proposal were unlikely to be significant, complex or widespread. A copy of the decision is on the public file.

## 5.0 CONSULTATIONS

- 5.1 These are summarised in the table below. Full details of the consultation responses can be inspected on the public file.

Urban Design	<b>No Objection</b>  Revisions to B2 supported, including pulling away from Carter Bridge, stepping of form and activation of corner. Revisions to F2 acceptable.  Conditions and informatives sought.
Environmental Health	<b>No Objection</b> , including on grounds of air quality, noise, contamination, construction and odour  Conditions and informatives sought including in relation to 25% provision of electric vehicle charging points.
Access Officer	<b>No Objection</b>  Amendments to the scheme have overcome concerns of the Access Officer and the Disability Panel.

Drainage	<p><b>No Objection</b></p> <p>Conditions sought.</p>
Nature Conservation Officer	<p><b>No Objection</b></p> <p>Scheme would provide for at least 10% net gain in biodiversity.</p> <p>Conditions recommended.</p>
Landscaping Officer	<p><b>No Objection</b></p> <p>Welcomes changes to footpath from Dev. Rd and removal of parking.</p> <p>Amenity landscape for users of B2 and F2 remains poor, concern raised regarding rain gardens and overrun from parking bays on Dev. Rd</p> <p>Recommends conditions.</p>
Sustainability Officer	<p><b>No Objection</b></p> <p>Both buildings designed to achieve BREEAM excellent. 57% reduction in carbon emissions over the Part L 2013 baseline for the hotel and a 35% reduction for the office. Strategy focuses on air source heat pumps for both the hotel and office. All electric approach is welcomed. 40% reduction in water use. Grey water recycling proposed for hotel.</p>
County Local Highways	<p><b>No Objection</b></p>

	<p>Pedestrian and cycle routes meet the requirements of LTN 1/20</p> <p>Conditions and informatives sought.</p>
County Local Lead Flood Authority	<p><b>No Objection</b></p> <p>Conditions sought.</p>
County Transport	<p><b>No Objection</b></p> <p>Require S106 mitigation including: Brompton cycle hub; Travel plan; new bus stops Station Rd interchange; and new ped. crossing outside station as part of conditions.</p>
County Cycling Officer	<p><b>No Objection</b></p> <p>New cycle route supported. Improvements to cycling provision in Station Square required. Ramp to F2 cycle park: clarification required on gradient and access detail (note: provided as part of amendments).</p>
Cambridgeshire Fire and Rescue	<p><b>No Objection</b></p> <p>Conditions and informatives sought.</p>
Cambridgeshire Police (Designing out Crime)	<p><b>No Objection</b></p>
Anglian Water	<p><b>No Objection</b></p> <p>Advise obligated to take foul water and increase capacity.</p>

	Surface water details acceptable.  Conditions and informatives sought.
Environment Agency	<b>No Objection</b>  Conditions and informatives sought.
Greater Anglia	<b>No Objection</b>  Over-ranking of Taxis: No formal agreement with taxi drivers. The station forecourt is the only area defined as the 'rank' that the drivers pay for a permit to use.
Network Rail	<b>No Objection</b>

## 6.0 REPRESENTATIONS

- 6.1 At the time of writing this report, the Council was in receipt of approximately 43 objections. Many of the objections raise issues which have been addressed in the original officer report, including in section 7 (summary of objections) and at para. 8.124 (tabulated response). Impacts on residential amenity were assessed specifically between paras. 8.78 to 8.93, air quality paras 8.94 to 8.101 and taxi waiting paras 8.102 to 8.110.
- 6.2 Primary third-party representations can be summarised as follows:

Transport	Lack of plan for car park conversion to cycling  Taxi over-ranking  Zebra crossing on GNR ( <i>Officer note, this has been addressed in</i>
-----------	---

	<i>the 2 July amendments, see condition 11)</i>
B2 Aparthotel	<p>Impact of B2 (scale, massing, design) on the Conservation Area and Devonshire Road properties.</p> <p>B2 is anywhere architecture.</p>
Chisholm Trail and Cycle parking	<p>Welcome changes to provide for the Chisholm Trail on site.</p> <p>Raises issues over Chisholm Trail and parking spaces off-site in northern car park and landscaping and link to trail (<i>Officer note addressed in the 2 July amendments and see condition 8)</i></p> <p>Require bridge connection between MSCP and Cycle Point allowing for future conversion of MSCP for cycling.</p>
Other	<p>Congestion, air pollution, heritage impacts, highway safety, bin collection, amenity impacts on F1, Ravensworth Gardens properties and Devonshire Road.</p> <p>Wind tunnel and microclimate effects of B2 and F2 in the current built context</p> <p>Food banks</p> <p>Loss of trees, car parking and refuse collection on GNR. Need more green space and landscaping, not buildings.</p> <p>Need for uses, especially since Covid</p>

	Scheme needs to go to D&C Panel
--	---------------------------------

6.3 The applicants have provided a detailed summary response to consultee and third-party representations. This is set out in appendix 4 to this report. Full details of the third-party responses can be inspected on the public file.

## 7.0 Assessment

7.1 Matters relating to the principle of development, hotel need, primary access to the site (including members vote not to create a new vehicular access from Station Square to Station Road), flood risk, residential amenity, environmental impacts (save for wind), contaminated land and ecology, remain settled as topics which did not give rise reasons for refusal previously and which give no further rise to issues from this proposal. Officers rely on the substance of the original officer assessment, the array of reports submitted with this application which have been assessed and the fact that no objections from consultees on these matters have been raised. On these specific topics, officers conclude that the proposal conforms with the applicable range of adopted Local Plan policies and guidance.

7.2 Due to the passage of time, the revised scheme includes improvements to the sustainability credentials of the proposed buildings relating to carbon reduction, water management and inclusive access. These matters are dealt with below together with alterations to cycle storage, the issue of taxi over-ranking and the indicative plans for the conversion of the MSCP to a cycle park. Firstly though, the report focuses on how the revised scheme has addressed the previous reasons for refusal.

### **Reason for Refusal 1 (Cycle Infrastructure)**

7.3 The applicants have sought to directly address reason for refusal 1 by providing a dedicated 2-way cycle lane of 3m width along the access road. This has been achieved by recessing the ground floor of F2 by 1m, recessing the corner of F2 and removing a service bay and parking on the western side of the access road proposed as part of the refused scheme.

- 7.4 A raised table near the Cycle Point entrance would link to the segregated cycle path. To the north, the design provides a connection to Devonshire Road and facilitates a future Chisholm Trail connection through the retained station car park. To the south and west, the cycle path turns down Great Northern Road (GNR) involving the removal of parking bays and some trees and crosses GNR to run around the back of One Station Square.
- 7.5 The approach to the public realm proposes the use of the established materials palette from the wider CB1 development and so will maintain consistency with the Landscape and Public Realm Strategy approved with the CB1 Outline.
- 7.6 The design of the cycle and pedestrian paths has been revised to respond to concerns raised by South Petersfield Residents' Association (SOPRA) and CamCycle.
- 7.7 The revisions have included: increases to pavement widths including underneath Carter Bridge; realignment of the pedestrian and cycle routes as a result of the removal of parking bays including the provision of an angled desire line pedestrian crossing over the northern part of the access road; the provision of allocated motorcycle spaces; and following the DCF, a proposed zebra crossing to the west of the mini roundabout at the top of Great Northern Road (subject to a safety audit). The revisions have been welcomed and demonstrate a positive outcome of the DCF.
- 7.8 In relation to the scheme, the County Council Highways Engineer advises:
- 7.9 *'Following extensive pre-application discussions with the applicant in connection with the internal/private pedestrian and cycle routes and the elements of these that fall within the existing adopted public highway and proposed adopted public highway it is my considered opinion that given the constraints of the site that these elements meets the requirements of LTN 1/20.'*
- 7.10 Overall, officers consider the design of the public realm would be attractive and safe to use. It is acceptable in urban design, landscape and highways terms. The proposal would provide

high quality cycling infrastructure commensurate with Cambridge as the leading cycling city through a physically segregated and protected cycle route, safeguarding the safety and prioritisation of pedestrians and cycling in the area, including the Chisholm Trail. The proposal is therefore compliant with policies 25, 56, 57, 59 and 80 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2018), the NPPF and Local Transport Note 1/20, Cycle Infrastructure Design (DfT).

### **Reason for Refusal 2 (Block B2)**

- 7.11 The main changes to the scheme to address refusal reason 2 are that the northern elevation of B2 has been pulled away from Carter Bridge, the fifth floor has been set back from the main façade to reduce the impact from Devonshire Road and the corner articulated. The proximity to Carter Bridge at its closest point has thus been increased from the refused 3.3m to 6.8m, the entire northern façade has been moved further south by 4.5m (which has been achieved through the removal of a bank of rooms to all floors) and the 5th floor is setback from the new building line by a further 5.2m. These are significant changes in the spatial relationship of B2 with Carter Bridge and the Conservation Area.
- 7.12 The Council's Urban Design and Conservation Team has assessed the revised proposal. They support the overall scheme. In respect of B2 they state:
- 7.13 *'The CB1 Outline (08/0266/OUT) identified a longer 'B1' building block that includes the site of the Ibis and Cycle Point and part of the area B2 is proposed to occupy. The B2 footprint extends further north towards the Carter Cycle Bridge than the Outline proposed. This additional massing/volume has been the subject of extensive discussion as design of the previous application (18/1678/FUL) was developed. Whilst we felt that the overall massing approach was acceptable, in terms of views from Devonshire Road and the relationship with the Carter Cycle Bridge, the refusal, in part, on massing and proximity grounds, has demanded a re-evaluation of the approach for B2.'*
- 7.14 *A series of views have been submitted along with line comparisons between the Outline volume, refused volume and this proposed volume. It is clear from both these images and the*

*submitted footprint that the building still extends further north than the Outline. However, when compared to the refused application massing, the revised footprint of B2, that pulls the building further away from the Carter Bridge and provides further modelling and setback to the upper floors, significantly improves the relationship to the bridge and does not impact on the prominence of the bridge stanchion and so maintains its role as a local landmark.*

*7.15 The changes made to the massing of B2 and particularly to the north-west section of the building, have created an improved relationship with the Carter Cycle Bridge with an increased distance over that proposed through the refused application. On the key approaches to CB1 from Devonshire Road, the building now reads as a lower and more modelled form that does continue along and behind the existing houses on the east side of Devonshire Road when viewed from street level. In combination with the existing and proposed planting, bridge structure and more articulated elevational treatment, our view is that the building is acceptable in terms of scale and massing.*

*7.16 The curved section of the building effectively ‘turns the corner’ with active uses at ground floor to improve the level of surveillance at street level. The curved form also ties in with the approach taken to the northern end of Block F2, which although lower, works as part of a family of buildings to define the northern approach to CB1. In that way, these proposals effectively resolve the transition from the Conservation Area and Devonshire Road in urban design terms.’*

7.17 As such, officers are of the view that reason for refusal 2 has been overcome. The scale, massing and footprint of B2 in proximity to Carter Bridge has been suitably modified and views from Devonshire Road would not result in a visually cramped or overly prominent building in terms of the setting of the adjacent Mill Road Conservation Area. Urban Design advice is also that the design of F2 is acceptable. Officers do not consider the scheme should be re-presented to the Design and Conservation Panel. It has been twice already in earlier forms. No harm to the setting of the Conservation Area arises. The proposal complies with policies 55, 56, 57 and 61 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2018) and the NPPF paragraph 124.

## Taxi Over-Ranking

- 7.18 This was an issue which was previously raised by objectors and discussed in detail by the Planning Committee. It did not form a reason for refusal. An informative was proposed to deal with the matter. It was covered from para. 8.102 of the original officer report. The issue has been raised again by many third parties, citing existing issues with taxis parking outside houses in the area with engines left running and fears that the development will only make this situation worse. In the interests of consistency of decision making, Members of the Planning Committee are advised to approach this issue with caution and fair-mindedness.
- 7.19 The issue concerns where taxis would wait when the taxi rank in Station Square is full. Currently, if the station taxi rank is full, some taxis wait in the existing surface car park which is the site of the B2 building, others park / wait in local streets. Third parties have submitted photographs of taxis waiting in this area and queuing along Great Northern Road. As a result of the proposal, there is therefore the potential for waiting taxis to be shifted onto surrounding streets. The concerns are that without an alternative over-ranking zone, this could impact on local air quality and congestion.
- 7.20 In response, the applicants state the following:
- 7.21 *'The use of the existing station car park for taxis to 'layover' is an informal arrangement between AEA and CCLT. It does not form part of the access strategy for the station area. It was never intended nor was it ever conditioned that this would be a permanent arrangement as it is self-evident from the CB1 masterplan and outline permission which allowed for the redevelopment of this area.'*
- 7.22 *... there are two taxi ranks serving the station, the AEA Station Square taxi rank used by CCLT taxis and the Station Road taxi rank for all licenced taxis. The AEA Station Square taxi rank has capacity for 20 taxis. Taxis are not allowed to 'over rank' in the Station Square as it blocks the circulation of vehicles in the drop off area. Access to Station Square is controlled by ANPR cameras managed by the train operation AEA.'*

7.23 *The Station Road taxi rank is located on the public highway (Station Road) and can be used by all licenced taxis. These two facilities are of sufficient size to deal with the peak demand for taxis at the Station. The station area and the CB1 estate is not a suitable area for taxis to 'layover' during quiet periods of the day when there is less demand for taxis. This is a matter for the taxi licensing authority and highway authority in discussion with AEA.*

7.24 The applicant's response is mirrored by Greater Anglia's representation of 11 June 21 to the application. They state:

7.25 *'...There is no formal agreement in place with the drivers for use of the car park area, the arrangement was agreed at a local level some years ago, contractually the designated area on the station forecourt is the only area defined as the 'rank' that the drivers pay for a permit to use. The design of the square was advanced collaboratively by Brookgate in discussion with AEA & Network Rail and designed accordingly so that the use of the Square by Taxis is not reliant on any additional ranking.'*

7.26 Officers are of the view that this issue should not form a reason for refusal. The applicants do not exercise control over the use of the adopted highway or land outside the immediate CB1 area. It would not be reasonable to impose a condition requiring mitigation of the issue given that a solution has not been identified and any such solution would likely to rest with third party agreement. In the circumstances, as before, an informative is proposed encouraging the applicants to engage with the Council and the Train Operating Company to seek to provide alternative arrangements for the taxi feeder rank that will be removed as a result of building B2.

### **Carbon Reduction and Sustainable Design and Water Management**

7.27 The submitted Sustainability Statement and Energy Strategy includes:

- BREEAM 'excellent' for both buildings.
- Green roofs for both buildings.

- Submission of a thermal comfort report which assesses the risk of overheating for both the hotel and the office space using both current and future climate scenarios. Solar control glazing is proposed.
- A 57% reduction in carbon emissions over the Part L 2013 baseline for the hotel and a 35% reduction for the office.
- The use air source heat pumps for both the hotel and office.
- A 40% reduction in water use.
- For the aparthotel, the use of a greywater recycling system to meet 100% of the requirements for toilet flushing.

7.28 The Sustainability Statement and Energy Strategy are supported by the Councils Sustainability Officer. The revised approach to greywater recycling is welcomed by officers. The proposal is compliant with policy 28 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2018 and Sustainable Design and Construction SPD 2020.

### **Accessibility and Inclusive Access**

7.29 One of the issues that arose from the DCF was around accessibility and inclusive access. In response the applicant has submitted an Accessibility Note and a Cycleway and Footway Design Widths Note.

7.30 The Accessibility Note confirms the following:

- The revised scheme has increased the combined width of the pavement and cycle route. This is between 5.6m and 8.3m. This has been achieved by the removal of the loading bay to the front of F2 and setting back its façade to allow for betterment of cycling and pavement widths.
- The access and egress to the MSCP have been reversed to address conflict with the proposed cycle route as it turns towards Devonshire Road.
- The B2 footprint has been reduced by 4.5m from Carter Bridge to allow for additional pavement width.
- The Devonshire Road pedestrian link has been widened with the removal of car parking bays.

- For the aparthotel and MSCP, 9% of the suites are accessible, all floors are served by two lifts, level access is provided to the central courtyard space.
- 14 of the 201 car parking spaces are disabled parking bays which are located to the station side entrance close to service cores. This is above the 5% policy requirement. Any hotel guests and office staff who require disabled blue badge parking will be able to use the disabled parking spaces in the MSCP in Block B2. Alternatively, there are 9 accessible parking spaces located within Station Square, which is located within 100m from the proposed site.
- All entrances to F2 and B2 blocks are covered by entrance canopies or recessed canopies.
- Following the Access Officer's comments, accessible rooms in the aparthotel have been relocated so that they are closer to the cores and connecting rooms have been provided. The accessible rooms will contain fully accessible bathrooms, height adjustable kitchens and accessible wardrobes. Accessible rooms account for 9% of all rooms. One room has been provided with a lift hoist.

7.31 The Council's Access Officer has assessed the revised plans and accompanying Accessibility Note and has confirmed that his objection has been overcome.

7.32 The Cycleway and Footway Design Widths Note sets out the following:

- The cycleway will be a bi-directional 3m width facility. This has reduced carriageway widths to 5.5m and thus increased the available space for pedestrian and cyclists.
- Survey data indicates that existing the peak hour two-way cycle movements through the site (recorded 2018 below the Carter Bridge) total approximately 550 movements.
- For peak hour cycle movements of between 300 and 1000 the proposed cycleway width of 3.0m is well positioned within the range recommended in LTN 1/20 Table 5-2.

- Footway widths are proposed to be generally a minimum width of 2.5m with some localised narrowing to an absolute minimum width of 2.0m.
- The footway widths align with other local examples of well used pedestrian routes such as Station Road which features footway widths of approximately 2.6m and 2.2m and Devonshire Road / Carter Bridge which both feature 1.7m with footways.

7.33 The layout and dimensions of the pavements and cycle lane are detailed on the general arrangement plan attached to Appendix 7 of this report, which will form part of any approval. The plan also indicates the possible future connection point to the Chisholm Trail through the retained station car park to the north, which is covered by condition 8 and which is subject to a proposed commuted sum payment of £30,000 captured in the S106 Heads of Terms.

7.34 As such, officers are of the view that the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2018) policies 56 and 57.

### **Cycle Parking**

7.35 Changes to the configuration of Block F2 from the refused scheme include cycle parking provision mainly within a basement area.

7.36 A total of 124 cycle parking spaces are proposed for F2. 104 of these spaces are in the basement. This is to be accessed via a secure fob entry at the southern end of the building via a ramp.

7.37 The cycle parking mix comprises Sheffield stands, double stackers and 4 off-gauge cycle spaces located on the ground floor. The off-gauge cycle spaces are to be 'locking rings' to deter those with standard bikes from using them. This is proposed to be conditioned (see condition 80)

7.38 The applicants have confirmed that the automatic doors at the base of the cycle ramp would work on a sensor i.e. they open before needing to stop at the bottom of the ramp. The position of the door has been amended to improve access and the length of the cycle ramps has been extended to a 1:4 ratio.

- 7.39 For Block B2, revisions to the scheme include the provision of all cycle parking for the aparthotel within its footprint. This can be accessed from the hotel lobby and car park. The main cycle storage space would accommodate 28 Sheffield stand spaces for guests, with a separate secure space for staff cycle storage of 6 spaces.
- 7.40 The overall levels and distribution of cycle parking comply with policies 80, 81, and 82 of Cambridge Local Plan (2018)

### **Multi-Storey Car Park (MSCP) Conversion**

- 7.41 Planning land use matters concerning the provision of the MSCP and its suggested conversion to a cycle park were covered in paras. 8.27 - 8.30 of the original officer report. Para. 8.30 stated that the income from the station car parking and the ability to grow this income is an important commercial factor for the Train Operating Company (TOC) being able to meet its franchise commitments. The franchise process also penalises TOC's financially if it is unable to meet its franchise service commitments and the provision of parking is part of that commitment. The applicants confirm that car parking at the Station is an important part of the offer to passengers to trains and that there is no realistic prospect that the Rail Industry would commit to the closure or even reduction of the car parking at Cambridge Station during the life of the current franchise which runs to 2025.
- 7.42 Officers advise that these are matters which are outside of the control of the local planning authority and there is no policy remit to require the MSCP to be converted to a cycle park at some point in the future or for the applicants to provide a functional bridged link from it to CyclePoint.
- 7.43 Nonetheless, as part of the current application, the applicants have revised the design of building B2 to show that it is capable of future conversion to a cycle park. The revisions include:
- Glazed vision panels provided in stairwells
  - A ramp design which allows for future adaptation to incorporate steps and rails. The gradient of the ramps are at 1:6, which matches the gradients in CyclePoint, and

1:12, which is an improvement when compared to CyclePoint;

- Soft spots in the structure to allow for future lifts and stairs to be installed; and
- A knock-out panel in the façade at ground level to allow future access.

7.44 In addition, a revised Multi-Storey Car Park Conversion Study has been prepared following further liaison with stakeholders. This information is indicative only and does not form any part of the application or drawings for approval. It includes:

- CCTV coverage, in stairwells and across parking area;
- New lifts and an open staircase;
- Video screen at entrances showing free spaces;
- Cycle only accesses.

7.45 The applicant has confirmed that they are committed to continuing to work with stakeholders, for example through a workshop, to discuss and further explore how a potential conversion could successfully be delivered at some point in the future. Officers are of the view that the objections have been satisfactorily addressed.

### **Planning Obligations (s106 Agreement)**

7.46 The Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Regulations 2010 have introduced the requirement for all local authorities to make an assessment of any planning obligation in relation to three tests.

7.47 Each planning obligation needs to pass three statutory tests to make sure that it is (a) necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms; (b) directly related to the development; and (c) fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development.

7.48 The County Council Transport Team has asked that a contribution of £35,000 is secured towards the provision of storage facilities for Brompton bicycles. The level of contribution arises proportionately in relation to what was secured from the CB1 development as a whole - £2.3m - towards transport infrastructure provisions, including for the guided busway, the

Southern Transport Corridor and the Chisholm Trail. A total of £944,000 has been paid towards the provision of the Chisholm Trail as part of this S106 package. Of the £2.3m, the anticipated transport contribution from parcels F2, B2 and G2 amounts to £35,000.

7.49 Whilst this is a full planning application, the level of contribution sought is proportionate and is agreed by the applicants. The provision for Brompton bicycles could cater for secure and bespoke storage demand arising from the use of the offices and aparthotel and passes the tests set by the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010.

7.50 Notwithstanding the previous application and the nature of contributions offered, the applicant also now offers an additional financial contribution of £30,000 towards the construction of the Chisholm Trail (specifically that part of the route that crosses the station car park up to the application boundary). Provided the contribution is only triggered once confirmation is provided of this route, officers consider it passes the tests set by the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010.

7.51 Third parties have requested additional contributions from the applicant towards the upkeep (repair, cleaning, repainting) of Carter Bridge. The request is unreasonable and relates to an existing problem. SOPRA also request that existing unspent contributions from CB1 (which have mainly been utilised on improvements to Tenison Road) are used towards the creation of a raised table at the corner of Devonshire Road. If this application is endorsed for approval, officers will liaise with the County Council to investigate the possibility of the improvement being delivered.

### **Other Matters**

7.52 Arising from the DCF are several matters not specifically addressed above. These include concerns regarding a wind tunnel effect, the implication of the cycle path route behind One Station Square for food parks and community events and the loss of trees, loss of parking and refuse collection impacts on GNR residents.

7.53 The applicants have responded to these points and confirmed the following:

#### Wind Tunnel

7.54 During the DCF the applicants stated that independent wind testing had confirmed the access road would meet all the laws and safety requirements. This was demonstrated as part of the applicant's presentation to the DCF including that the proposed tree planting on the access road would be beneficial in helping dissipate wind.

#### Food Parks

7.55 The applicants have submitted an indicative drawing to show the proposed continuation of the cycle route to the rear of One Station Square. The proposed route falls on land that is public realm and is within the management of the CB1 management company. The events that take place in this area are varied, including screening of live sports events and food markets. Demonstrations are not fixed. Officers propose that a compliance condition is imposed to ensure that a safe and uninterrupted cycling route is maintained through this space.

#### GNR Loss of Trees, Parking and Refuse Collection

7.56 Seven trees are proposed to be lost on GNR as part of the proposed delivery of the new cycle path. These are to be replaced with seven new trees including a mix of Field Maple and Robin Hill. Two paid for car parking spaces outside F1 on GNR would be lost to the new cycle path which residents of F1 are concerned about because of the loss of servicing space for the flats. The planning balance suggests that the loss of the trees and car parking is outweighed by the benefit of the provision of the cycle path. The applicants have confirmed the cycle path would not affect the approved refuse strategy for F1 (Vesta) and have submitted an indicative plan to demonstrate this. The application is also accompanied by sufficient landscaping provision within the public realm, including tree planting along the access road.

### **Planning Conditions**

7.57 A range of planning conditions are proposed for both B2 and F2. These are set out in full at Appendix 1. Members attention is drawn to following:

<b>Condition no.</b>	<b>Detail</b>
1	Start date
3 and 4	Construction and delivery hours
6	Phasing plan and temporary provisions
8	Chisholm Trail link
9	Cycle path temporary events One Station Square
12	Feasibility study Station Road bus stops
14 and 15	Hard and soft landscaping
19 and 20	Apart Hotel Max Stay 90 days
21 and 53	Materials
22	Public art
23 and 54	Bird and bat boxes
24 and 56	Traffic management
27 and 59	Green roofs
28	Parking 25% Active EV, remaining passive
47, 48, 76 and 77	BREEAM
49 and 78	Renewable and low carbon
50	Greywater harvesting
51 and 79	Travel Plans
55	Privacy treatment (obscurity) of windows facing westwards in Block F2
80	Cycle parking F2

## **Conclusion**

7.58 Objections remain from third parties in relation to the scheme. For F2 these relate to land use and a strong desire for it to be residential and to its impacts on properties in F1 block adjacent and Ravensworth Gardens. The main issues are enclosure, loss of light, privacy and outlook. These objections were raised previously, considered by officers and did not form reasons for refusal. The issues arise from the proximity of the building to its residential boundaries, yet the scheme before members represents an improvement in terms of scale and footprint for

surrounding residents over the parameters agreed under the Outline Planning Permission.

- 7.59 Objections to B2 also remain in relation to its height, mass and relationship to Devonshire Road. However, officers consider the revised B2 design to be appropriate, with no harm arising to the setting of the Conservation Area or from the proximity of B2 to Carter Bridge.
- 7.60 Other objections seek for Great Northern Road (GNR) to change to tertiary residential use only and for changes to be made to Station Square to address existing issues. However, the function of GNR was set by the outline permission, approved by the Council and the refused application which proposed a new access from Station Road into the Square for taxis was rejected by members of the Planning Committee.
- 7.61 Turning to the B2 and F2 buildings and the public realm, the scheme has been submitted to respond directly to the two reasons for refusal. A high-quality segregated cycle path is proposed. Its general arrangement / design - following revisions - has been welcomed by third parties. Consultee advice is that the cycle path design accords with LTN 1/20.
- 7.62 The land for F2 and B2 is allocated for development, is supported by policy 21 of the Local Plan and the parameters for buildings on these blocks are well established. The principle of the land uses proposed are supported by adopted policy. The application could not reasonably be refused on the basis of need or a wider desire that the site becomes partly or wholly a landscaped open space which would address open space deficiencies locally.
- 7.63 It should not go unnoticed that the site at present is used as surface level car parking and appears run down. The application presents an opportunity to develop at high density in a highly sustainable brownfield location.
- 7.64 It is officers' view that the proposed buildings and associated public realm improvements should be supported. They will facilitate the completion of the Devonshire Quarter and help unify the CB1 development.

## **8.0 Recommendation**

8.1 Committee is invited to **APPROVE** the application subject to:

- (1) the prior completion of a s106 Agreement under the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 to secure planning obligations in the form of a financial contribution of £35,000 for cycle parking within the CB1 precinct; and £30,000 towards the enablement of the Chisholm Trail link through the Station car park
  
- (2) the planning conditions contained in Appendix 1 of this report including the delegated authority to officers (i) independently to settle any minor non-significant amendments to those conditions and/or (ii) in the case of any significant amendment or the introduction of additional conditions to do so in consultation with the Chair, Vice Chair and Spokes of Committee.

## **Appendices**

Appendix 1: Proposed conditions

Appendix 2: 18/1678/FUL Committee Report with ADP

Appendix 3: 18/1678/FUL Decision Notice

Appendix 4: Applicant response schedule V8

Appendix 5: Development Control Forum Minutes

Appendix 6: 18/1678/FUL Amendment sheet

Appendix 7: Cycle and paths general arrangement