

Application Number	18/1678/FUL	Agenda Item	
Date Received	23rd November 2018	Officer	Toby Williams

Target Date	22nd February 2019
Ward	Petersfield
Site	Station Area Redevelopment Blocks B2 And F2 Devonshire Road

Proposal

The proposed erection of two new buildings comprising 5,351sqm (GEA) of Class B1(a)/ Class B1(b) floorspace including ancillary accommodation/ facilities with associated plant, 162 cycle parking spaces, and 8 off-gauge cycle spaces for Block F2 and an Aparthotel (Class C1) comprising 125 suites, terrace, ancillary accommodation and facilities with multi-storey car park for Network Rail (total GEA 12,153sqm) comprising 206 car parking spaces and 34 cycle parking spaces 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

Addendum Report

- 0.0 This application was reported to the 17 June 2020 Planning Committee with an officer recommendation of approval.
- 0.1 During the consideration of the application, Members of the Planning Committee raised numerous concerns with the proposal and voted not to accept the officer recommendation. A decision on whether to approve or refuse the application was subsequently deferred following the implementation of the Adjourned Decision Protocol (ADP).

- 0.2 During the debate, the Planning Committee agreed a motion that they were minded to refuse the application for two reasons. These were as follows:
- 0.3 *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.*
- 0.4 *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.*
- 0.5 The Committee agreed, through the ADP process, that a further officer report should be brought back to the Planning Committee in relation to the minded to refusal reasons to inform its decision.
- 0.6 This report summarises officer advice regarding the merits of the minded to refusal reasons. It is given following further discussions with the applicants who, after the June Committee, sought to address the draft reasons for refusal through the submission of amendments and further supporting information. These amendments and further information have been subject to additional consultation with third parties and consultees over the summer period and comprise:
- a) A revised site location plan and description of development removing the proposed access from Station Road to Station Square. Members will recall that the Planning Committee expressed a clear preference to

support option B (removal of the new access from Station Road) as set out in the initial officer recommendation.

- b) Revisions to F2 and B2 footprints, including the widening of the pavements on the car park access road, the removal of a disabled parking space and changes to the surfacing treatment of a servicing layby on the car park access road adjacent to Block F2. The pavement widening includes an increase by 2.9m at the junction with Great Northern Road and 1.9m and 1m along the Northern Access Road. This is achieved by locally recessing the ground floor of F2. The loading bay demarcation is amended with the same paving treatment across the site to provide visual continuity of pedestrian priority. Members will recall that concerns were raised regarding the adequacy of pavement widths.
- c) Alterations to the multi storey car park entrance and exit arrangements so that the entrance is from the southern side of block B2 and exit on the northern side. The amendment is put forward to better integrate the flows of cycle and vehicular movements. Members will recall that concerns were raised regarding vehicular and cycle conflict at the point of the Devonshire Road / car park access road junction.
- d) The submission of a Design Document examining the reasons for refusal and the applicant's amendments / response including additional views of block B2 (the aparthotel) from Devonshire Road and an indicative link to the Chisholm Trail. The applicants set out that sufficient space is safeguarded to protect the future route of the Chisholm Trail. Brookgate have also committed not to build buildings G1 and G2 and have indicated that they are willing to agree to a suitably worded condition regarding the provision of future links for the Chisholm Trail.

Process and Approach

- 0.7 Some members may be concerned regarding the fact that amendments have been made to the planning application during the period of adjournment. However, the ADP process

does not prohibit amendments from being put forward by applicants to directly address concerns raised by the Planning Committee. In fact, such an outcome could be considered desirable to most parties as the effect of the ADP and the subsequent amendments could be either to remove the need for a refusal of planning permission and the need for any subsequent appeal or at the very least to narrow the issues and / or exhaust all reasonable opportunities for agreement before any refusal of planning permission is issued. Even if a refusal arises from the Planning Committee's further consideration of the application as amended, it is desirable that an improved amended scheme is put forward for any Inspector's consideration.

- 0.8 Paragraph 38 of the NPPF 2019 states: *'Local planning authorities should approach decisions on proposed development in a positive and creative way. They should use the full range of planning tools available, including brownfield registers and permission in principle, and work proactively with applicants to secure developments that will improve the economic, social and environmental conditions of the area. Decision-makers at every level should seek to approve applications for sustainable development where possible.'*
- 0.9 Amendments to planning applications are a commonplace tool to address concerns. Case law has established that a local planning authority has the power to determine an application for planning permission which has been amended prior to determination if the changes proposed to the application are not "substantial" and the development proposed is not so changed that it is "not in substance that which was originally applied for." It is not considered that the amendments made to the application are substantial or that they make the proposed development one which is not in substance the development for which permission was originally sought. This is because the key components of the scheme, the office block, aparthotel and multi-storey car park and access road, including their location and quantum of space sought, remain substantially the same as before.
- 0.10 As set out above, third parties and consultees have been consulted about the proposed changes. The amendments have been put forward to directly address the minded to reasons for

refusal of the Planning Committee and it would be contrary to the spirit of the NPPF and para. 38 for the Planning Committee to disregard them. Members should also be aware that the planning application has been lodged with the Council for a considerable time (since 2018) and has already been subject to multiple amendments to overcome issues. Officers are of the view that the site is a major remaining piece of the CB1 jigsaw, and it is entirely reasonable in the circumstances to allow for amendments to be considered, even at this late stage. It would therefore be unreasonable of the Planning Committee not to consider the amendments put forward by the applicants. Such an approach may attract an application for costs at any subsequent appeal if the application were to be refused.

Speaking Rights

- 0.11 The amendments are material to the minded to reasons for refusal and relate to some of the substantive third-party objections regarding the Chisholm Trail in particular. In the interests of fairness, given the circumstances of this case and because further third-party representations have been sought and received on the latest amendments (summarised above a-d), officers advise that third-party rights to address the Planning Committee are allowed.

Process

- 0.12 To ensure safe decision making, members of the Planning Committee absent from the previous discussion should not take part in the resumed debate. The purpose of the resumed debate is for Committee to determine if their original minded-to resolution is still appropriate, should be amended, or whether the original officer recommendation should be followed.
- 0.13 Further analysis is therefore required to understand the policy framework for the potential issues in relation to the minded to reasons for refusal, relevant appeals and any other guidance available to members to help inform a decision.

Consultations

Local Highways Authority

- 0.14 No Objection: The Highway Authority welcomes the removal of the proposed access to the Station Square from Station Road.
- 0.15 The redesigned exit from the car park including for the future route of the Chisholm Trail as shown on drawing P5000 02 Context Plan is a significant improvement on the original design and provides clear wayfinding messages for all users of the traffic routes.
- 0.16 On the indicative design elements, a number of minor issues (paving units) are raised. The width of the footway as it exits the site at the Devonshire Road could be widened at the expense of the cycle route. Not convinced the Chisholm Trail Route needs to be segregated and the use of a mini roundabout appears over designed. This route is likely to be strongly tidal during it periods of main flow as people access then exit the station, outside that the width appears to be sufficient to allow for easy mixing of directional use. None of the roads will be sought to be adopted. Suggests a condition in relation to management and maintenance of the streets (see appendix 1, proposed condition 12B).

Urban Design and Conservation Team

- 0.17 The Urban Design and Conservation Team have reviewed the amended drawings and supporting information submitted for application 18/1678/FUL.
- 0.18 The submitted amendments have been made to address draft reasons for refusal.

Changes to Block F2

- 0.19 The ground floor has been set back along the east elevation to achieve a wider footway of between 1.1m and 1.9m. The pinch point at the junction with Great Northern Road has been increased from 3.7m to 5.2m. The increases in width are acceptable in design terms.
- 0.20 In terms of the changes to the elevations and form to Block F2, the recessed section works well with the horizontal band

between ground and first floor and so is considered acceptable in design terms.

Changes to Block B2

- 0.21 The north-west corner of Building B2 has been chamfered to increase the footway width from 2.2m to 3.5m (at the maximum width). The design creates a concave curved recess to the corner that compliments the convex form above.
- 0.22 The horizontal metal section between ground and first floor has been extended to create a datum for the recess to extend up to. The change to the elevation is acceptable in design terms.
- 0.23 The circulation to the multi storey car park MSCP has been revised to relocate the entrance between Block B1 (Ibis/Cycle Point) and proposed Block B2. The change in circulation removes the need for vehicles to travel the length of the street to access the car park and so may go some way to relieving pressure on the northernmost section of the street where pedestrians and cyclists will be coming into the Station Area from Devonshire Road and the Carter Cycle Bridge.

Public Realm

- 0.24 The changes to the building footprints have allowed for footway widths to be increased at former 'pinch points'. The treatment of the loading bay allows it to be 'read' as part of the footway and so helps create additional capacity for pedestrians when not in use.
- 0.25 Adjustments to the proposed exit to the MSCP through the deletion of a car parking space also creates additional width by Block B2.
- 0.26 The proposed car entrance to the MSCP crosses the footway running along the east side of the access road. The footway should be detailed so as to prioritise pedestrian movements and run across the access level with the footway to the north and south.
- 0.27 The [indicative] proposed mini-roundabout for the cycle routes to the north of the development is unconvincing as a solution to

managing the different flows in the area. A 'give way' may be a better solution.

Massing Studies

- 0.28 A series of views have been submitted to illustrate the massing of the proposed scheme against that considered in the Outline. The scale and massing of the Block B2 in relation to the Carter Cycle Bridge is acceptable.
- 0.29 In the view of UD and Cons. officers, the proposed massing does not impact on the silhouette of the Carter Cycle Bridge stanchions or the ability to read them as local landmarks to any significant degree more than the consented Outline massing.

Station Square and Station Road

- 0.30 Zebra Crossings are proposed to aid pedestrian connectivity across the Station Square and Station Road. Concerned about the visual dominance of the Zebra Crossing.

Access Officer

- 0.31 Looking at the revised highway design at CB1, the officer is pleased that the footway is wider. The loss of the Blue Badge space in the parking lay-by is not a great loss because the layout of this does not provide convenient spaces for egress of disabled users and is mitigated by the blue badge spaces in the nearby car park. The space also does not serve shops, hotels etc where luggage, shopping, etc would need to be transported to/from.
- 0.32 The Access Officer queries who the car park would be run by. NCP charge for Blue Badge parking and this may encourage Blue Badge holders to park on yellow lines, which is legal but less convenient generally for the users of the area. It would be good if the loading bay gave extra time for Blue Badge holders and this information shown on the signage for the bay.

Further Third-party Representations

Camcycle

- 0.33 Objection: While some of the changes are positive steps forward, such as the principle of creating a segregated Chisholm Trail through the surface car park, there are a number of important details that must be fixed in the proposed design.
- 0.34 The application still does not address the safety problems further south at the Great Northern Road mini-roundabout, nor does it safeguard a suitable route for the Chisholm Trail through that part of the site, as required by Policy 80.
- 0.35 With the publication of Local Transport Note 1/20, the DfT's new Cycling Infrastructure Design guide, there is now a strong central government policy backing the creation of segregated cycleways that are protected from motor traffic and separate from pedestrian space.
- 0.36 With some relatively small changes to the ground floor of F2 it is possible to open up an inclusive and policy-compliant Chisholm Trail route all the way across the site, one which connects with a safe route running via the quiet Mill Park Road, and is suitable for all ages and abilities. Several further suggested amended designs and indicative alternative arrangements for the intersection and design of the Chisholm Trail route as it comes from Devonshire Road and along the car park access route are suggested by Camcycle to support their objection, including an indicative route for the Chisholm Trail cutting through part of the revised F2 footprint on the corner to allow for a connection with Great Northern Road (avoiding the existing mini-roundabout) and Mill Park Road.

South Petersfield Residents' Association (SOPRA)

- 0.37 Objection: Earlier concerns still stand. Additional observations on the amendments provided. SOPRA state that committee should refuse the application on the grounds that the applicant has not addressed the second draft reason for refusal; and that the amended footprint of F2 still blocks provision of a safe, protected cycle link in a strategically important north-south cycle route (the Chisholm Trail), and thereby obstructs the local authorities' duty to enable and promote cycling in accordance with local and national policies.

- 0.38 Footprint B2: The applicant has not addressed the second draft reason for refusal. It has justified the substantial extension of B2 beyond the outline plan towards Devonshire Rd on the basis that it will not now develop the building on the corner of Devonshire Rd (G1) given outline planning consent. The applicant has not undertaken to include a covenant in the freehold to forbid any future development of this land. Without that, the applicant's assurance is void since the freeholder (Network Rail) may bring forward an application to develop any of the remaining land north of Carter Bridge at any time.
- 0.39 Delivery Vehicles: The proposed design requires large vehicles to reverse across a busy pedestrian and cycle route without the assistance of a banks person. This is not a safe arrangement without greater segregation of pedestrians, cycles and motor vehicles. It appears that the only way for drivers to turn around safely is to reverse into and drive out of the multi-storey car park access lane. This will be a difficult manoeuvre to execute unassisted when there are large numbers of people walking and cycling along the Northern Access Rd, and cars accessing or leaving the car park.
- 0.40 Chisholm Trail: The developer has offered no solution to improve the inclusivity of this cycle route through the site. At present, there is no clear route that is safely navigable by an unaccompanied 12-year-old, yet alone 8–80 year olds, which is the design standard required in LTN 1/20. Cycling between the station car park and the Busway across Station Square requires a high level of road sense to navigate around pedestrians, other cycles and reversing cars. SOPRA suggest the footprint of F2 is pulled back further to allow for the suggested Smarter Cambridge Transport route (and that proposed by Camcycle) to be delivered.
- 0.41 Link to Devonshire Rd: The design of the cycleway and footway link between the Northern Access Road and Devonshire Rd is complicated and conflicted. It is too narrow for pedestrians and there is restricted visibility due to the Carter Bridge pillars.
- 0.42 SOPRA re-submit objections in relation to taxi-ranking and Greater Anglia's former franchise agreement to provide an additional 1,000 cycle parking spaces (now removed by the Department for Transport).

0.43 Further representations have been received from the following addresses:

- 81 Great Northern Road
- 116 Tenison Road

0.44 The representations can be summarised as follows:

- Pollution in the Great Northern Road and neighbouring streets
Great Northern Road is a narrow residential street and all the traffic should go to the station via Station Road.
- An entrance to Station Square from Station Road was the only slight positive in the entire scheme, and without that, many of the issues previously raised will be worse.
- None of the concerns mentioned in previous letters have been adequately addressed, and the needs of residents on Great Northern Road have been ignored.
- Piecemeal development.
- Increase in lorry traffic.
- Increase in pollution.
- No effective way to restrict deliveries or rubbish collection to daytime hours.
- There needs to be a way for the lorries to use Station Road.
- Greater concerns if the entrance to Station Square from Station Road is removed.
- Taxi parking should be on Station Road.
- The proposed traffic solutions inadequate, but the layout of building F2 is still likely to increase the noise and disruption to residents in building F1.
- The nearness of building F2 to F1 decreases the light and privacy available to residents and the courtyard and increases the chances of anti-social behaviour.
- This would be an ideal opportunity for the area to be considered as a whole, and for general improvements made to the entire site rather than compound mistakes.

The above responses are a summary of those received following the amendments. Full details of the responses can be inspected via the Council's website via public access.

Key Issues and Officer Advice

Minded to Reason for Refusal 1

- 0.45 *'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.'*
- 0.46 The amendments put forward deal directly with the issue of the access from Station Road to Station Square by removing it from the application. This was the subject of the previous and only objection from the County Council's Local Highways Engineer.
- 0.47 The amendments put forward to reduce the ground floor footprints of both blocks F2 and B2 allow for greater pavement widths. The County Council Local Highways Engineer and Urban Design Colleagues support these revisions. Officers consider the amendments a positive approach to improving pedestrian flow and permeability.
- 0.48 The change in the access arrangement to the car park is assessed by the Local Highways Engineer as a *'significant improvement on the original design and provides clear wayfinding messages for all users of the traffic routes'*.
- 0.49 In respect of this change also, the Urban Design officer states, *'the change in circulation removes the need for vehicles to travel the length of the street to access the car park and so may go some way to relieving pressure on the northernmost section of the street where pedestrians and cyclists will be coming into the Station Area from Devonshire Road and the Carter Cycle Bridge'*.
- 0.50 Officers are of the view that the change should be broadly welcomed as an attempt to reduce vehicular / cycle conflict and

thus helps address part of the reason for refusal. The change in access arrangements to the car park is supported.

- 0.51 The Access Officer has not raised an issue with the loss of the disabled parking bay on the car park access road nor is an issued raised regarding the surface treatment of the loading bay. This has been incorporated as a shared pavement space. There is sufficient disabled parking nearby in the car park of B2 or in Station Square itself.
- 0.52 A good deal of third-party concern relates to the Devonshire Road and Great Northern Road cycling and pedestrian connection points. Members are reminded that the developer has already contributed - from 50/60 Station Road and 30 Station Road - approximately £870,000 from respective S106 planning obligations combined towards the delivery of the Chisholm Trail. The applicants state that they do not seek permission for any works related to the Chisholm Trail itself, only to demonstrate that the route of the trail is not prejudiced by the development. To that extent an indicative connection to the Chisholm Trail is shown in the applicant's Design Document via a cycling mini-roundabout located underneath Carter Bridge connecting northwards through the surface grade station car park. The indicative plan indicates the removal of some car parking spaces in current use to allow the connection.
- 0.53 The indicative arrangement has drawn criticism from third parties, the Urban Design Officer and from the Local Highways Officer on numerous grounds (visibility, over-engineered design). However, the applicant's intention was not to put forward a finalised design. Camcycle have themselves put forward an alternative indicative arrangement for this part of the site to illustrate how a connection to the Chisholm Trail could work. The applicants have confirmed that they have no objection to the direction of travel with the Cam Cycle plan in respect of the Devonshire Road section of the connection.
- 0.54 In fact, none of the drawings for the Devonshire Road / Chisholm Trail connection put forward by either the applicants or the third parties have been subject to formal surveys or safety audits. Given the circumstances, officers recommend a condition is imposed upon any permission to secure the details of both a temporary connection from the car park access road

to Devonshire Road and a permanent Devonshire Road / Chisholm Trail linked connection at the appropriate point in time. This is secured via proposed condition 7 and can resolve many of the concerns raised including the timing of when the Chisholm Trail connects to the Devonshire Road link.

- 0.55 All of the indicative plans put forward indicate that there is space available to facilitate an appropriate connection to the Chisholm Trail in the northern part of the site. Subject to condition 7 being imposed, officers consider that the matter has been adequately addressed by the applicants and the provision of a link to the Chisholm Trail in the northern part of the site is not prejudiced.
- 0.56 The applicants do not propose an alternative treatment to the finish of the car park access road itself and neither do they agree to a further cut back of block F2 either along its eastern façade facing the car park access road or on the corner of Great Northern Road (GNR) to facilitate the Camcycle / SOPRA (Smarter Cambridge Transport) suggestion of providing a route for the Chisholm Trail west down the GNR, around the back of One Station Square (Sainsbury's) and connecting to Mill Park Road, thereby bypassing the GNR mini roundabout and Station Square.
- 0.57 The applicant's vision is for the public realm treatment for the car park access road to be similar to Station Square and for there to be no dedicated cycle lane, whereas third parties see this as a necessity and for a segregated cycle route to be enabled through the site and around the corner of F2 block. This would take up further floorspace from the F2 office block.
- 0.58 Policies 25 and 80 are key, together with the NPPF para 104 (c) which states in relation to planning policies that they should *'identify and protect, where there is robust evidence, sites and routes which could be critical in developing infrastructure to widen transport choice and realise opportunities for large scale development.'*
- 0.59 The reason for refusal would be stronger if the proposed route for the Chisholm Trail and its design (or its design standard) in this part of CB1 was identified either by the County Council or the Councils' delivery partners the Greater Cambridge

Partnership and / or the Combined Authority as sound reason to support a recommendation for refusal; none do. The design and exact route of the Chisholm Trail in this part of CB1 is not formalised and the route shown is merely indicative and high level.

0.60 The suggested route along GNR and behind One Station Square put forward by third parties is but one solution, is indicative, relies on the use of third party land, has not been costed, ratified by the Highway Authority or subjected to a safety audit. Because of this and because of the other improvements to the scheme that have been undertaken by the applicants, including the removal of the Station Square Access (which was the only objection raised by the Local Highways Engineer), it is not considered that there are sound planning reasons for refusing the application by reference to Minded to Reason for Refusal 1.

0.61 While the risk of an adverse costs award on appeal is not a material planning consideration and should not be taken into account by members of the Planning Committee in their decision, members will no doubt be aware of the availability of an appeal against any refusal of planning permission and the possibility that a developer may make an application for costs against the Council as part of such an appeal if the Council has engaged in unreasonable behaviour (which would include, for example, a failure to produce evidence to substantiate a reason for refusal on appeal).

Minded to Reason for Refusal 2

0.62 *‘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.’*

0.63 The applicants have not amended the scheme to address this minded to reason for refusal. Instead, they have provided a series of visualisations of block B2 and dimensioned drawings.

0.64 These visualisations show:

- a) An 8.1m gap between the Ibis/Cycle Point building and B2 (which would not have occurred if B1 had been delivered in totality) enabling light and space to penetrate between the buildings. This breaks up an otherwise monolithic building length frontage that would have come about from realising B1 in totality; and
- b) The 8.1m gap results in B2 moving 12.2m north towards Carter Bridge without any demonstrable harm to visual amenity.

0.65 The Design Document provides some useful comparative elevations demonstrating the differences in visual impact of one long B1 (outline) block compared to two B blocks (B1 & B2). In addition, 3D massing studies show the value of the cut-back in the detail of B2 providing relief to the façade. The applicants calculate that B1 as built *and* B2 as proposed provide for a 9% reduction in overall volume compared to what outline B1 could have delivered itself (70,465 m³, proposed: 76,091 m³ outline).

0.66 Visualisations within the Design Document along Devonshire Road show the 'A' frame of Carter Bridge as visually distinguishable against clear sky and little noticeable difference between the skylines of the outline B1 and proposed B2 from different vantage points.

0.67 The Council's Urban Design Team and Conservation Officers have further considered the visualisations and conclude that the scale and massing of block B2 in relation to the Carter Bridge to be acceptable and maintain their support of the proposal.

0.68 The applicants (Brookgate) confirm in their Design Document that buildings G1 and G2 will not be delivered if the proposed buildings B2 and F2 are constructed. As orally advised in the earlier Committee meeting, officers are of the view that limited weight can be given to this commitment as the local planning authority cannot prohibit future planning applications from being made. Any such application, should the applicants or Network Rail review their intentions for the use of the land where G1 and G2 are located, would have to be treated on its own merits given that the outline consent has lapsed.

- 0.69 Draft refusal reason 2's wording is such that the harm is confined to the relationship of the B2 building to Carter Bridge only and is therefore limited in scope. The volumetric cut out of the upper level of B2 and the gap between the Ibis Hotel / Cycle Point building are such that it is difficult to find fault with the applicant's approach to the design and footprint of the B2 building given the outline parameters.
- 0.70 Ultimately, whether the proposed design for the development is acceptable by reference to the relevant planning policies is a matter of judgment for members. Even if, however, members consider the proposed design to be unacceptable in the limited way described above so as to be in conflict with policies 55, 56 and 57 of the Local Plan, members will nonetheless have to consider whether, despite the conflict identified, the proposals accord with the Development Plan overall. Further, even if members consider that the proposals do not accord with the Development Plan overall, members will in any event have to weigh in the planning balance the benefits of the proposal as a whole - jobs, provision of visitor accommodation, provision of office floorspace, redevelopment of brownfield land of poor environmental quality and completion of the CB1 public realm and Devonshire Quarter - against the degree of visual harm which they consider may otherwise arise.

Other Matters

- 0.71 Third parties have raised concern regarding the danger of delivery lorries reversing into or out of the new car park access road without adequate visibility for pedestrians and cyclists. This is not a matter that the Highways Officer has raised and would largely arise as a problem if a driver were to accidentally turn into the car park access between the Ibis and the MSCP in forward gear. It is for delivery drivers to ensure they manoeuvre in a controlled and safe manner and appropriate signage could be put in place or delivery arrangements with the Hotel clarified if it becomes an issue. This could include the use of a banksman if so required.
- 0.72 Other objections have been raised by third parties but these are largely a reiteration of previous concerns including in relation to: taxi-ranking; Greater Anglia's former franchise agreement to provide an additional 1,000 cycle parking spaces; noise and

pollution; access from Station Square; delivery and collection times for servicing and refuse; piecemeal development; the impact of F2 on residential amenity; and intensification of the use of Great Northern Road. These matters were addressed within the original officer report attached as appendix 0 and were debated at length by members but did not contribute to the minded to refuse reasons.

Recommendation

0.73 Committee is invited to review the minded to reasons for refusal in the light of this Addendum report and **APPROVE** the application subject to:

- (1) the prior completion of a s106 Agreement under the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 to secure a planning obligation in the form of a financial contribution of £35,000 for cycle parking within the CB1 precinct; and
- (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 and Vice Chair of Committee.

Appendices

Appendix 0: Officer Report 17 June 2020

Appendix 1: Proposed conditions (revised for 16 Oct Committee)

Appendix 2: Appeal decision Great Northern Road

Appendix 3: D&C Panel Minutes 11 April 18

Appendix 4: Development Control Forum Minutes 16 January 2019

**APPENDIX 0
PLANNING COMMITTEE**

17th June 2020

Application Number	18/1678/FUL	Agenda Item	
Date Received	23rd November 2018	Officer	Toby Williams
Target Date	22nd February 2019		
Ward	Petersfield		
Site	Station Area Redevelopment Blocks B2 And F2 Devonshire Road		
Proposal	The proposed erection of two new buildings comprising 5,351sqm (GEA) of Class B1(a)/ Class B1(b) floorspace including ancillary accommodation/ facilities with associated plant, 162 cycle parking spaces, and 8 off-gauge cycle spaces for Block F2 and an Aparthotel (Class C1) comprising 125suites, terrace, ancillary accommodation and facilities with multi-storey car park for Network Rail (total GEA 12,153sqm) comprising 206 car parking spaces and 34 cycle parking spaces for Block B2 with associated plant, hard and soft landscaping, new alignment of access from Station Road into Station Square 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		

SUMMARY	<p>The proposal accords with the Development Plan for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">-The principle of the proposed office, aparthotel and car park uses are acceptable.-The scale, footprint and proximity of the F2 office building to its boundaries and its impact on residential amenity is acceptable.
----------------	---

	<p>-The scheme would deliver public realm improvements and the design of the buildings is high quality.</p> <p>-The proposed new access into Station Square does not arise as a requirement of the development of buildings B2 and F2. The officer recommendation in respect of this aspect of the proposal is neutral. The proposal is recommended for approval with or without the proposed new access.</p>
RECOMMENDATION	APPROVAL

1.0 SITE DESCRIPTION/AREA CONTEXT

- 1.1 The site comprises an irregular shaped parcel of land, which is mainly the existing surface level station car park and its access road. This is located to the north of the main station and immediately north and west of the six storey IBIS hotel and Cycle Point building and includes a section of land which extends to connect to the bend in Devonshire Road where pedestrians and cyclists are currently able to cut through to the station underneath Carter Bridge. The application site also incorporates a separate area of land that lies in-between Station Road and Station Square on its SW corner in front of Café Nero and is the proposed location of the new access.
- 1.2 The northern boundary of the site is defined by Devonshire Road and station car parking to the north of Carter Bridge. The eastern boundary of the site is defined by the railway line. The southern boundary of the main site is defined by the mini roundabout at the eastern end of Great Northern Road. The western boundary is defined by the gardens and properties of Ravensworth Gardens, a 2.5 storey red brick pitched terrace whose gardens face east towards the site and which are terminated by a close boarded fence onto the station car parking area. Immediately to the south of Ravensworth Gardens properties is an 'L' shaped 4 storey residential block known as F1 which fronts onto Great Northern Road. This block forms part of the CB1 development and includes apartments which

have rooms which face onto a private rear courtyard space defined by a brick wall which abuts the station car parking area.

- 1.3 The site is 0.7 hectares (ha) in size. The main part of the site lies outside any defined conservation area, but immediately to the north is the Mill Road Conservation Area, the boundary of which is defined by Devonshire Road. To the south is the New Town and Glisson Road Conservation Area which extends to include the grade II listed Station and Station Square in front.
- 1.4 The application site forms part of a wider site allocation for CB1 which is referred to as site M14 in the adopted LP appendix B proposals schedule. This allocation indicates capacity for mixed uses including residential, retail, office / R&D use classes and other amenities. The relevant LP policy is 21 (Station Areas West and Clifton Road Area of Major Change). The site falls within the controlled parking zone and is within the Air Quality Management Area (AQMA).

2.0 THE PROPOSAL

- 2.1 The description of proposed development is set out on the front page of this report. Two separate buildings are proposed which are known as B2 (an aparthotel and multi-storey car park) and F2 (offices) together with alterations to the public realm, including upgrading a stretch of the station car park access road which runs between the buildings. Full planning permission is sought. Multiple amendments have been made to the proposal since it was originally lodged, including amendments that have been submitted and reconsulted upon in January and February 2020.
- 2.2 The application is accompanied by the following documents:
 - Acoustics Report
 - Air Quality Assessment
 - Application Drawings and Forms
 - Archaeological Statement
 - BREEAM Assessment Report
 - Contamination Report
 - Daylight, Sunlight and Overshadowing Assessment and Review
 - Design and Access Statement

- Ecology Report
- EIA Compliance Covering Letter
- Energy Strategy
- Estate Management Strategy
- Heritage Statement
- Hotel Needs Assessment
- Landscape Plans, Management Plan and Report
- Operational Waste Management Report
- Planning Statement
- Surface and Foul Water Drainage Strategy (including rainwater and grey water feasibility studies)
- Sustainability Statement
- S106 Transport Mitigation Table
- Transport Assessment (including construction phase plans, zebra crossing plans, Road Safety Audit for new Station Road / Square Access, fire tender access plans and various TA technical notes)
- Travel Plan

2.3 The originally submitted plans and accompanying reports have been amended, updated or subject to addendums in Dec 18, April 19, June 19, Sept 19, Jan 20 and Feb 20 to respond to officer requests, consultee responses and third-party representations. The latest amendments in Jan 20 and Feb 20 have been subject to a further 14-day neighbour consultation and they include:

Block F2

- Introduction of a mansard roof in the mid-section facing Ravensworth Gardens to reduce the impact of the building on these residential properties;
- Removal of the fourth floor on the southern section of the building adjacent to F1 to lessen impact on these apartments; and
- Provision of a basement area, marginally increasing the overall floorspace for this building from 4,555sqm to 5,351sqm and increasing cycle parking provision accordingly;

Other Changes

- Minor revisions to the site and location plans;

- Revisions to the description of development, including the proposed removal of construction access from Devonshire Road;
- Further Surface Water and Foul Water Drainage Strategy Note to ensure compliance with LP policy 32 and further technical drainage information in Feb 20;
- Further Transport Assessment Addendum Note presenting revised traffic assessment scenarios with and without the proposed Station Square access proposal;
- Air Quality Assessment Update. This report provides an updated air quality assessment referencing the latest advice and data available. The assessment presents potential impacts on air pollution for an estimated opening year 2022. The potential air quality impacts are assessed both with and without the new access;
- Noise Assessment Technical Memo;
- Updated Hotel Needs Assessment for the aparthotel (Jan 20); and
- Sunlight and Daylight Report Review (Jan 20) and further technical note update (Feb 20).
- Commitment to the provision of 25% of spaces within the multi-storey car park to be provided as trickle charge EV charging spaces in line with Environmental Health Advice; and
- Alternative option for a contribution for the management of Station Square of £500,000 in the event that the proposed new Station Road Access is not supported.

Overview of Proposal

B

- 2.4 Block B2 lies to the north of the existing Ibis Hotel / Cycle Point building and to the east of the station car park access road. Permission is sought for a 6 storey building above ground plus basement. It includes a split-level multi-storey car park (MSCP) for 206 cars with a 125-suite aparthotel above totaling 12,153sqm (GEA). The number of car parking spaces provided within B2 is equal to the number of car parking spaces being taken up by the combined footprints of B2 and F2. There is no net increase in car parking from existing as result of the MSCP. The car park occupies basement, ground and first floor levels. The second to fifth floors contain the aparthotel bedrooms.

- 2.5 The building is approximately 19m to the top of the uppermost occupied storey and 21.2m to the top of its plant enclosure. It would appear equivalent in height to the Ibis / Cycle Point building. The footprint is rectangular with a curved NW corner and canted SE corner. It has a cut-out 'C' section at its upper levels to form a west facing courtyard for the aparthotel.
- 2.6 Guests to the aparthotel would access it by foot from the pavement of an upgraded station car park access road through a main lobby which is contained within a triple height glazed atrium space. The car park is thus hidden from view from the access road being located behind the atrium. The atrium rises upwards from street level to connect to a breakfast / lounge area and a west facing raised courtyard space for guests.
- 2.7 Vehicular access to the car park is on the north elevation of the building whilst the vehicular exit is to the south adjacent to the Ibis hotel within an 8.1m gap between the buildings. Main pedestrian access to the car park is on the south-western corner of the building i.e. at a point closest for pedestrians walking to or from the station.
- 2.8 The building would be mainly constructed from a buff brick interspersed with textured lighter brickwork panels, 3 storey glazing on the main frontage and a recessed roof formed of grey aluminium cladding with standing seams. A strong pre-cast white concrete band would wrap horizontally around the lower half of the building beneath which the car parking frontage on the northern, eastern and southern facades would be defined by bronze coloured perforated aluminium panels. A rectangular area of brickwork on the north western curved corner of the building is indicated to be retained for an art intervention. The building would incorporate a green roof.

F2

- 2.9 Block F2 lies to the west of the station car park access road and opposite the Ibis Hotel / Cycle Point building and B2. Permission is sought for the erection of a long rectangular office building (5,351sqm GEA) which would be adjacent to the existing apartment block F1 and the rear gardens of Ravensworth Garden properties. It would be a part three / four

storey building above ground plus basement below. The fourth storey would only be contained in its southern section and be equivalent in height and extent contiguous with the curtilage of the apartment block (F1) fronting Great Northern Road to the west.

- 2.10 The majority (2/3rds) of the F2 block is 3 storeys, stepping down to this height where adjacent to Ravensworth Garden properties. Its three storey height would be 9.6m, its four storey height would be 12.8m, aligning itself with the boundary of F1. The building would incorporate a green roof. The western edge of the 2nd storey would be set 15.9m away from the rear facade of Ravensworth Garden properties to the west as shown via cross-section B-B.
- 2.11 The rear of the building and its upper roof form is cut away from the common boundary by 4.4m metres providing a recess to Ravensworth Garden properties facing it. The latest amended plans of January 20 incorporate a mansard roof for the second floor. The top of the mansard is equivalent in height to the ridge of Ravensworth Gardens.
- 2.12 At ground floor level, the main access to F2 is shown to be from the south into an office space - anticipated to be for co-working - and is shown to incorporate a café / reception area. A separate office and access for the Train Operating Company (TOC) is shown in the northern section of the building close to Carter Bridge. The ground floor rear contains a refuse area adjacent to the side of the existing F1 block and secure cycle parking for 162 cycles which would be covered by a cantilevered roof. On top of the cantilevered roof would sit an integrated landscape planter bed facing Ravensworth Gardens. The cycle parking and bin storage would be securely accessed from Great Northern Road. Users would be able to access the rear of the building directly from the cycle parking area.
- 2.13 The eastern and southern public realm facing facades onto the station car park access road and Station Square would be articulated by a staggered corner façade and two vertically recessed sections onto the access road, breaking the form of the building down into three visually distinguishable blocks. The first (southern) and tallest of these sections addressing Station Square would have vertical floor-to-ceiling high windows and

would be constructed from a series of narrow buff brick columns terminating in a darker engineering brick base extending across most of the façade of all three sections of the building. A recessed and screened plant area would sit on top of the roof and would be set back from the building edge. The second (middle) section of the building is proposed to be constructed from a red brick and larger (wider) windows. The third (northern) section of the building, would be constructed from a buff brick and treated similarly to the southern section, with a recessed screened area for plant on top of the roof. The building would be framed by horizontal white concrete banding across its lower middle and across its brow forming a parapet for the roof.

- 2.14 The northern façade of the building would be curved, reflecting the proposed curved design of the aparthotel opposite, providing a gentle visual gateway from Devonshire Road for pedestrians and cyclists.
- 2.15 For windows directly facing Ravensworth Gardens, the Design and Access Statement and Computer-Generated Images (CGI's) show a series of fixed louvred windows only allowing views upwards over the ridge height of these properties in order to avoid overlooking. Other more obliquely positioned windows are proposed to be obscure glazed. The treatment of all windows facing westwards in block F2 is proposed to be secured by condition 48.

Public Realm

- 2.16 The red line for the planning application extends to include the existing access road to the station car park and the pathway / cycleway which connects to Devonshire Road. The treatment of the public realm proposes similar materials to those used within Station Square, with a combination of block paving, low kerbs, tree planters and vehicular bays located off the access. The cycle / pedestrian cut through from Devonshire Road would be resurfaced and demarcated by a series of bollards where it meets the station car park access road. A raised table is proposed at this point to slow down vehicular speeds.

Station Road / Station Square Access

- 2.17 The proposal seeks permission for a new access from Station Road into Station Square. The applicants seek for the new access to be used by taxis only and these would only be taxis that are licensed Hackney Carriages (HC's) who are allowed to use the designated Station Square taxi rank by Abellio Anglia Greater (AGA). Private hire vehicles would continue to use the public drop-off / pick-up area.
- 2.18 The proposal would remove the requirement for licensed HC taxis to utilise Great Northern Road to access the designated taxi rank. The proposed new access (as made clear by County Transport and Environmental Health colleagues) does not arise directly from the proposed office and aparthotel / MSCP buildings (F2 and B2) and their associated transport impacts. The access is proposed by the applicant as part of this application in order to seek to address wider concerns regarding the intensity of use of Great Northern Road (particularly at peak times) and the associated amenity issues this has caused for residents who live in this road.
- 2.19 The County Highways Engineer / Transport colleagues and the applicants are agreed that the installation of the new access into Station Square is not required to make the development acceptable. Neither is the new access required because of air quality concerns as confirmed by the Council's Environmental Health team. The County Highways Engineer has stated that he would withdraw his objection to the scheme if the new access is removed from the proposal. As such, the proposed access could be removed from the application without impacting on the overall acceptability of F2 and B2.
- 2.20 However, the Station Road access has been retained as part of the proposal to allow Members of the Planning Committee to reach a view on the material planning considerations for and against its inclusion. If the proposed access is not supported by Members, the applicants propose an alternative scenario, removing the new access from the description of development and a separate financial contribution of £500,000. The process for how such a financial contribution would work in practice is set out as part of the recommendation (Chapter 10) and is summarised below.

Option A (with new access)

2.21 Applicable where Committee wishes to secure delivery of the new access from Station Road as part of the development proposal.

APPROVE subject to:

- (1) a s106 Agreement
- (2) the planning conditions contained in Appendix 1 Option B (without new access)

2.22 Applicable where Committee does not wish to secure delivery of the new access from Station Road as part of the development proposal and in all other respects the Committee is minded to approve the application.

APPROVE subject to:

- (1) a s106 Agreement
- (2) all references to the proposed new access from Station Road being removed from the development proposal description; and
- (3) the planning conditions contained in Appendix 1 revised to take account of the removal of the access.

2.23 The alternative recommendation (Option B – without the access) is not dependent on the financial contribution of £500,000 being secured before the issuing of planning permission because the offered contribution does not meet the CIL regulations; it is not necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms, it is not directly related to the development and it is not fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development. The application of the CIL regulations and the offered contribution is discussed in more detail in paragraph 8.126 within this report. If the alternative recommendation (Option B) is accepted, this will simply grant planning permission without the new Station Road access. The financial contribution of £500,000 would be the subject of separate discussions between the applicant and relevant stakeholders and relies on the continuing goodwill of the developer to engage.

2.24 With regard to the alternative contribution of £500,000, in their letter of 6 Dec 2019, the applicants suggest that the alternative enhanced management of the Station Square could include:

- Expansion of the existing Automatic Number Plate Recognition (ANPR) to improve management of access into the Station Square;
- Better management of the ranking of taxis in the Station Square and enforce 'clear zones' at the rear of the taxi rank to stop 'over-ranking';
- Improved enforcement of ban on HGV's and delivery traffic access to the Station Square (except overnight deliveries);
- Using Traffic Marshalls at peak periods to manage traffic circulation issues, including over-ranking of taxis, extended stays in 'drop off' bays, misuse of 'accessible bays', blocking of circulation routes etc;
- Introduction of a low emissions zone for the Station Square area. This could include: Charging for all drop-offs and pick-ups by taxis and private hire vehicles (other than those complying with the City Council's Licensing definition of zero emissions vehicles); Charging for all drop-offs by private car; and Electric charging points in Station Square (induction loops or cable connections);
- Improvements in wayfinding signage and route marking for pedestrians, cyclist, taxis and private cars through the Station Square;
- Review of alternative routes for cyclists travelling north / south through the Station Square area;
- Opportunities for additional soft landscaping and seating; and
- Measures to manage and control visitor / short stay cycle parking.

2.25 It is not necessary to precisely define the acceptability or deliverability of the possible alternative solutions prior to the issuing of planning permission because the £500,000 contribution is not required to make the development acceptable in planning terms as it would not pass the CIL 122 (limitation on the use of planning obligations) regulations. The possible solutions and their merits would have to be assessed separately by the Planning Committee as part of a separate

officer report with any associated planning application following a stakeholder engagement process. Continuing engagement is within the gift of the developer as a willing partner. A summary analysis of the merits of some of the options is provided in the officer conclusion.

3.0 SITE HISTORY

- 3.1 There is no detailed planning application history relevant to the two plots associated with the former outline application for CB1 applicable to F2 and B2.

Reference	Description	Outcome
13/1034/REM	137 residential units, Blocks C1, C2, D1 and F1 (adjoining)	A/C
13/0860/REM	Development of Station Square	A/C
12/1622/FUL	Block B1, Hotel and Multi-Storey Car Park (2,850 cycle parking spaces) (opposite the site of F2)	A/C
12/1608/FUL	Office Building plus retail / café & restaurant (Blocks A1 / A2) One The Square (to the immediate south of plots F1 and F2)	A/C
08/0266/OUT	331 residential units, 1,250 student units; 53,294 sq m of Class B1a (Office); 5,255 sq m of Classes A1 /A3/A4 and/or A5 (retail); a 7,645 sq.m polyclinic; 86 sq.m of D1 (art workshop) floorspace; 46 sq m D1 (community room); 1,753 sq m of D1 and/or D2 (gym, nursery, student/community facilities) floorspace; use of block G2 (854 sq.m) as either residential	A/C Time period for submission of reserved matters has lapsed Granted 9 April 2010 with 7year period for submission

	student or doctors surgery, and a 6,479 sq.m hotel; along with a new transport interchange and station square, new multi storey cycle and car park including accommodation for c. 2,812 cycle spaces, private and public spaces etc.	of RM's.
--	--	----------

- 3.2 The application site for blocks B2 and F2 is within the outline application area associated with permission 08/0266/OUT. The time period for the submission of reserved matters in respect of the governing outline planning has lapsed. This means that there is not an automatic fall-back position in respect of either in-principle planning matters (land use etc) or planning parameters (heights, footprint etc) granted as part of the outline permission. This notwithstanding, the outline permission is still a relevant point of reference in terms of, for example, footprint and height and other site wide infrastructure which has been put in place across the wider CB1 area to anticipate the development of plots B2 and F2 coming forward.
- 3.3 Where material circumstances have not altered since the grant of the outline permission, it is a reasonable expectation of the applicants to expect a consistent approach from the Council in assessing the proposal. The outline permission is therefore a strong material consideration for members. The new Local Plan 2018, which has introduced a new suite of development management policies relevant to this application, is the starting point for the assessment of the application and planning decisions must be taken in accordance with the development plan unless there are material considerations that indicate otherwise (section 70(2) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and section 38[6] of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004).

Great Northern Road Balconies

- 3.4 A recent appeal has been allowed in relation to application 16/2012/S73 which was refused by the Council on 15 March 2018. The application sought planning permission for minor material amendments to outline planning permission reference

08/0266/OUT (the CB1 masterplan outline application) without complying with a condition (no. 33) attached to planning permission ref: 13/1041/S73, dated 13 January 2014.

3.5 Condition 33 related to noise attenuation for external residential areas associated with residential properties and namely in this case with those facing onto Great Northern Road granted reserved matters approval for 137 residential units under application 13/1034/REM on 10 January 2014 and now built and occupied. The details of the appeal decision are attached for reference at appendix 2 to this report.

3.6 Paragraphs 18 – 21 of the Inspector's report states:

'18. During my site visit I was able to sit on one of the upper floor balconies for a short period of time. Noise from the traffic in the street below was noticeable, particularly as the vehicles bumped over the speed tables. However, I do not accept the view that the balconies are unusable for relaxation. They provide a reasonable level of amenity for a central urban location near a busy railway station where a certain level of noise is to be expected. This is precisely one of those areas where the BS indicates that compromise is required.

19. Despite noise being above the stipulated levels, those units with balconies provide a better standard of living than those without. The development gives its occupiers the choice as to whether or not to use their external amenity space, but it also provides convenient access to public open space adjacent to the blocks as an alternative. Those areas provide seating for relaxation purposes and based on my experiences they are quieter than the street frontage. PPG2 advice is that noise impacts may be partially offset if residents have access to a relatively quiet, protected, external publicly accessible amenity space that is nearby.

20. The PPG also states that the impacts may be partly offset by giving residents access to a relatively quiet facade (containing windows to habitable rooms) as part of their dwelling; or a relatively quiet external amenity space for their sole use. A significant number of units within the scheme have windows, and in some cases balconies and terraces, to the rear. Notably, the Council raises no concerns regarding the

living conditions within the flats and I noted during my visit that double glazing is effective in suppressing external noise.

21. The Council concedes that it has adopted a more flexible condition wording in more recent cases involving balconies. In my view, the disputed condition is too onerous, and it is neither necessary nor reasonable to secure acceptable living conditions for occupiers of the flats. There are no practical measures that could be implemented within the scope of the condition, and not requiring planning permission in their own right, that would result in a noticeable reduction in noise levels on the balconies. Therefore, having given careful consideration to all material considerations, including representations from residents and elected members, I conclude that the disputed condition should be removed. Although the Council tabled an alternative condition wording for discussion purposes, this is insufficiently precise or enforceable, and does not pass the test of necessity'

- 3.7 It is also pertinent in relation to some of the third-party representations made in relation to this application for members to be aware of paragraph 22 of the appeal decision:

'22. At the hearing it was suggested that traffic should be removed from Great Northern Road and/or the public highway altered to delete the raised speed tables. However, the outline permission established the parameters for the Station Area Redevelopment scheme which included use of Great Northern Road as the primary means of access to the station. There is no evidence to suggest that the road has been constructed otherwise than in accordance with the approved details and therefore to require the developer to make alterations retrospectively as part of a noise attenuation scheme would be unreasonable'

4.0 PUBLICITY

- | | |
|------------------------|-----|
| 4.1 Advertisement: | Yes |
| Adjoining Owners: | Yes |
| Site Notice Displayed: | Yes |

5.0 POLICY

5.1 See Appendix 1 for full details of Central Government Guidance, Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policies, Supplementary Planning Documents and Material Considerations.

5.2 Relevant Development Plan policies

PLAN	POLICY NUMBER
Cambridge Local Plan 2018	1, 2, 5, 6, 21 (Station Areas West M14) 25 (Cambridge Railway Station, Hills Road Corridor to the City Centre Opportunity Area) 28, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 40, 42 55, 56, 57, 59, 60, 61 72, 77 (visitor accommodation) 80, 81, 82, 85

5.3 Relevant Central Government Guidance, Supplementary Planning Documents and Material Considerations

Central Government Guidance	National Planning Policy Framework 2019 National Planning Policy Framework – Planning Practice Guidance from 3 March 2014 onwards Circular 11/95 (Annex A)
Supplementary Planning Documents	Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Flood and Water

<p>Previous Supplementary Planning Documents</p>	<p>Sustainable Design and Construction (2020)</p> <p>Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Waste Partnership (RECAP): Waste Management Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (February 2012)</p> <p>Planning Obligation Strategy (March 2010)</p> <p>Public Art (January 2010)</p>
<p>Material Considerations</p>	<p><u>City Wide Guidance</u></p> <p>Air Quality in Cambridge – Developers Guide (2008)</p> <p>Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (November 2010)</p> <p>Cambridge City Council Draft Air Quality Action Plan 2018-2023</p> <p>Cambridge Walking and Cycling Strategy (2002)</p> <p>Cambridgeshire County Council Transport Assessment Guidelines (2017)</p> <p>Cambridgeshire Design Guide for Streets and Public Realm (2007)</p> <p>Protection and Funding of Routes for the Future Expansion of the City Cycle Network (2004)</p>

	<p><u>Area Guidelines</u></p> <p>Cambridge City Council (2002)–Southern Corridor Area Transport Plan:</p> <p>Mill Road Area Conservation Area Appraisal (2011)</p> <p>New Town and Glisson Road Conservation Area Appraisal (2012)</p> <p>Station Area Development Framework (2004) includes the Station Area Conservation Appraisal.</p>
--	---

6.0 CONSULTATIONS

Access Officer

- 6.1 No Objection: Asks for clarification regarding the location of the accessible rooms. Provides detailed advice regarding the internal layout of the hotel in relation to common areas and bedrooms. Advises that the applicants need to meet Part M Building Regulations and relevant British Standards.

Note, the applicants have subsequently identified the location of the accessible rooms on a plan for the Access Officer.

Anglian Water

Original Comments

- 6.2 Anglian Water are obligated to accept the foul flows from the development with the benefit of planning consent and would therefore take the necessary steps to ensure that there is sufficient treatment capacity should the Planning Authority grant planning permission.

The preferred method of surface water disposal would be to a sustainable drainage system (SuDS) with connection to a sewer

seen as the last option. The surface water strategy / flood risk assessment is unacceptable. The proposed surface discharge rate of 44.8l/s is too high for B2.

Recommends conditions in relation to:

- foul water
- surface water

(Officer note: Since Anglian Water's original comments were made, a revised drainage strategy has been received which has significantly reduced the surface water discharge rates. No further comment from Anglian Water has been received).

Cambridgeshire Constabulary (Architectural Liaison Officer)

- 6.3 No Objection: Asks the applicant to make contact to arrange a meeting to discuss security measures to help reduce the vulnerability to crime including building security, external environment and layout of block B2 (see last suggested informative).

Cambridgeshire County Council (Highways Development Management)

- 6.4 Objection: To the inclusion of the proposed new access onto Station Square.

User Hierarchy

The LHA officer raises issues concerning the free flow and movement of pedestrians and cyclists. Leaving aside potential accident risks, the predicted PM peak in 2022 is some 204 motor vehicles using the proposed new access or approximately one every seventeen seconds. This will undoubtedly impact negatively and severely in terms of non-motorised traffic using Station Road. This is an unacceptable inversion of the user hierarchy in an attempt to solve an issue created by too many motor vehicles being allowed to access the Station Square, an area of private ground over which a third party has full control.

It is understood that the installation of the proposed access onto Station Road is not required to make the development acceptable in transport terms and as such the proposed access could be removed from the application without impacting on the proposed development's overall acceptability.

The problems created within the Square could be resolved by better management of the space by the operator/owner (in relation to double banked taxis, misuse of drop-off / pick-up areas).

It would be useful to explore how improvements in managing the Square can be achieved within its existing context. The LHA officer would welcome some form of requirement within the S106 to ensure that such an investigation took place and that any recommendations of the same were implemented.

It is appreciated that the residents of Great Northern Road have concerns regarding the level of pollution that they are experiencing. It is understood that Cambridge City Council will be requiring that all taxis be zero emission vehicles by 2023. In relationship to managing the Square, it could perhaps be one of the criteria that all taxis that are permitted to use the Square be a zero-emission vehicle, ahead of the City Councils deadline. This could go some way to alleviate some of the concerns of the residents of Great Northern Road.

Highway Safety

The Road Safety Audit recognises an increased risk of collisions with pedestrians. Pedestrians may not wait to cross the proposed access as this would unnecessarily interrupt/impede their journey and this may not always happen creating additional risks for the most vulnerable highway users.

The further information in relation to swept paths and bollard positions reinforces concern that the proposed works would introduce an unacceptable hazard within the adopted public highway that does not exist at present and would, therefore, be a significant safety risk.

If the proposed access and any mention of the same is removed from the application, then the objection will have been overcome.

Other

The proposed zebra crossing locations shown on drawing number XX-DR-C-1021P1 are acceptable to the Highway Authority.

Bollard widths on the cut through from Devonshire Road should be placed no greater than 1.5m apart.

In the event that permission is given, recommends conditions in relation to:

- Construction Traffic Management Plan
- Delivery times for vehicles > 3.5 tonnes
- Cycle access provision from Devonshire Road

Informative: Residents parking permits

Cambridgeshire County Council (Transport)

Original Comments

6.5 No Objection: The Transport Assessment is acceptable.

Surveys of traffic flows are agreed. The collision analysis in the area surrounding the station is agreed. Office parking ratios within the CB1 development vary from one space per 146sqm to 280sqm. The existing two hotels in the area are car free. It is proposed that both blocks B2 and F2 will be car free. This is acceptable, given the highly accessible location. Rail replacement buses will in the future use the bus interchange area instead of the station car park.

Block F2 cycle parking is acceptable. Block B2 will have 34 cycle bays. This is acceptable.

Forecast Trip Generation and Distribution

The trip rate generation of the hotel will predominantly be from pedestrians in the AM and PM peaks. This will generate 98 trips in the AM peak and 63 in the PM peak, based on TRICS and is agreed.

The office trip generation is 85 trips in the AM peak of which 77 are inbound and 67 trips in the PM peak, of which 58 are outbound. This trip rate is agreed.

When compared to the CB1 masterplan the trips to B2 and F2 are 6 lower in the AM peak and 56 lower in the PM peak.

Station Road / Station Square Proposals

It is proposed to re-route taxis to and from Station Square via Station Road. All other vehicles would continue to use Great Northern Road as at present. With the expected growth of the station area the amount of vehicles using Great Northern Road in the current routing of vehicles would be expected to increase by up to 100 and 170 in the AM and PM peaks.

Redistributing taxis to Station Road results in a reduction of flow of 49 eastbound and 64 westbound taxi movements on Great Northern Road in the AM peak, and 157 eastbound and 146 westbound in the PM peak. These vehicle trips would be redistributed to the eastern section of Station Road.

This arrangement has been modelled using microsimulation including pedestrian movements. This shows that a good level of service is retained for pedestrians and vehicles using the area.

Bus Stops

There is a significant amount of interchange between bus and rail users at the railway station. The existing station interchange has bus stops that are located up to 210m away from the station entrance, and no turn around facility for buses at the station. Information as to what bus stop to use for each bus service is also very limited and poor. This is not convenient for regular commuters, but also visitors to the City, and delays buses turning at the station.

A single bus stop should be located to the south of the station access in each direction with bus stop locations as shown. Each bus passing the station should stop at these bus stops, and then wait for longer at the interchange, if buses need to stand for any length of time.

Access to the southern footway on Station Road and the City Centre bound bus stop should be via a pedestrian crossing located outside the station entrance. This should be clearly marked and could be a zebra type facility.

Comments of 26 Feb 20

No Objection: Sufficient detail has been presented to make a sound assessment.

Mitigation: Should the development go ahead the developer should be conditioned to:

- S106 payment of £35,000 towards a Brompton Bike Cycle Hub;
- Travel Plan (see proposed conditions 45 and 73);
- Provision of improved bus stops and interchange;
- Provision of pedestrian crossing outside station entrance;

Proposal Description:	Accepted
Study Area:	Accepted
Traffic Data:	Accepted
Trip Generation:	TRICS trip rates
accepted	
Distribution / Assignment:	Agreed
Assessment Scenarios and Traffic Growth:	Agreed
Junction Modelling:	Modelling is
agreed	
Mitigation:	To be agreed.

These comments are further to a Transport Assessment provided by Mott MacDonald Transport Consultants as part of an application for mixed use development of 5,351 sqm of B1 in block F2 with 136 cycle parking and 7 off gauge spaces.

The TA shows that the increase in trips on Great Northern Road resulting from the proposal is 1% of all trips of Great Northern Road. As a result of this negligible impact, the proposed access to Station Square from Station Road is not required to make the application acceptable in transport terms.

S106

Overall mitigation has been determined within CB1 in line with the outline planning consent. Should approval be given the applicants should make a payment of £35,000 towards the cost of a Brompton Bike Docking Station.

Conditions recommended in relation to:

- Travel Plan for each building (see conditions 45 and 73)
- Additional bus stop provision close to the station entrance (see condition 8)
- Provision of pedestrian crossing facility over Station Road close at the entrance (see condition 6)
- Cycle parking installation prior to upon occupation (condition 74).

Design and Conservation Panel (Meetings of 11 April 2018 and 13 Dec 2017)

6.6 The conclusions of the 2018 Panel meeting(s) were as follows:

'The effort made to respond to the Panel's comments from December, specifically in relation to east elevation of B2 and the vehicular movements in relation to the car park are appreciated. The Panel would however stress the need to maintain strong aspirations for the design expression of these two important contributory blocks as for many, they will be viewed as the 'front door' to the CB1 development.'

The minutes of the last 2018 D&C meeting is attached to this report at Appendix 3.

Development Control Forum (16 January 2019)

6.7 The minutes of the DC Forum meeting from January 2019 are attached at appendix 4 to this report.

The applicants responded to issues arising out of the DC Forum in a covering letter of 12 April 2019 and with revised plans. The revisions and the applicant's response are addressed as part of the officer assessment.

Disability Consultative Panel (Meetings of 26 February 19)

- 6.8 Concerned about the location of the accessible rooms and layout of the aparthotel. Provides detailed advice regarding the location of the accessible rooms, which should ideally be located close to lift cores in the hotel. Detailed advice is provided in relation to issues of fire management, hoist equipment, hearing help, room layout, hotel drop off and fire doors. The design of F2 (office building) was found to be acceptable.

Environment Agency

- 6.9 No Objection: Planning permission should be granted to the proposed development as submitted if the following planning conditions are included as set out below:

- Contaminated land analysis and remediation
- Unidentified contamination
- Surface water scheme
- Piling

Environmental Health

Original Comments

- 6.10 No Objection: A variety of conditions are recommended to protect existing residents and users of the development (for the construction and operational phases). The proposed development is located within the Air Quality Management Area (AQMA).

No provision for EV charge points has been made in the TA or elsewhere, which is disappointing given the increasing demand from residents of and visitors to Cambridge for these facilities.

Combustion Emissions

The Energy Strategy and Sustainability Statement confirm that energy provision for the supply of heating and hot water will be via a mix of air source heat pumps, CHP (hotel only) and gas condensing boilers.

Air Quality Assessment

The Air Quality Assessment assesses the impact of the development for two scenarios which model the access of taxis both along and away from Great Northern Road. For both scenarios there is a small increase at one or more receptors which is contrary to Local Plan Policy 36. Mitigation is therefore required.

We recognise that the MSCP is replacing an existing ground level car park however all new developments should install electric vehicle (EV) charge points in accordance with the principles of the NPPF, Local Plan Policy 82 and the requirement of Local Plan Policies 36(f) and the Air Quality Action Plan (2018).

Operational EV charge points should be installed in a minimum of 25% of the car parking spaces. Infrastructure for the remaining 75% of the car parking spaces should be installed to enable increased provision as demand rises. This can be secured by an appropriate planning condition.

Based on the information provided we have no objections on air quality grounds for the proposed development; although conditions to secure the use of low NOx boilers, limit emission levels from CHP and ensure that EV charge points are installed should be secured.

Amendment Comments of 14 Feb 20

A further submission has been received and Environmental Health re-consulted:

Station road / Station Square Access

Further details have been provided of the proposed Station Road / Station Square access which is proposed to allow taxi movements only to access the Station Square via Station Road.

Reducing traffic levels on Great Northern Road would be beneficial to existing residents and is discussed further within the air quality comments.

However, it is understood Cambridgeshire County Highways have objected to the proposed Station Road / Station Square access, predominantly due to pedestrian safety.

Air Quality

The development site represents an intensification of use within the air quality management area (AQMA). The application is for an Aparthotel, multi-story car park (MSCP) and office accommodation. The MSCP is the rationalisation of the existing station car park and will not lead to an increase in car park spaces therefore the vehicle movements associated with the MSCP will remain unchanged. The aparthotel and office accommodation are designed as being 'car free'. Vehicle access to the site is via Great Northern Road. Measured levels of nitrogen dioxide are currently below national air quality objective levels but continue to be monitored.

The following documents have been reviewed as part of this response which should be read in conjunction with earlier air quality comments.

- Letter from Bidwells to planning officer dated 6th December 2019 and titled 'Submission of Further Information and Change of Description of Development'.
- Transport Assessment Addendum (Ref:377606) produced by Mott Macdonald and dated 10th January 2019.
- Operational Air Quality Assessment Rev C produced by Mott MacDonald and dated 8th January 2020.

Transport Assessment Addendum

In parallel to the proposed development the applicant has submitted proposals for an alternative access option onto Station Square for taxis; to partially alleviate the congestion, noise and air quality issues on Great Northern Road. The Transport Assessment Addendum deals solely with these proposals. The report predicts an '*annual rail passenger growth*

of 5.7% per annum' which can be assumed will lead to a similar increase in traffic growth.

The Addendum report predicts that should the access to Station Square remain unchanged with access via Great Northern Road maintained as it is the proposed development will result in increases in AM and PM peak two ways flows of 2% and 1% respectively.

Should the proposed Station Square taxi access proposal be implemented redistributing taxis from Great Northern Road onto Station Road a reduction in AM and PM peak two ways flows of 17% and 33% respectively is predicted.

Given that the development site is located within the AQMA with its primary access along Great Northern Road where monitored levels of nitrogen dioxide are higher than was predicted in the original CB1 Master Plan, we welcome any proposal that shifts vehicle emissions away from sensitive residential receptors; redistributing to Station Road where monitored levels are lower, there is a wider streetscape to encourage better dispersion and fewer sensitive residential receptors.

Further to this we ask that consideration is given to where Taxis will wait when the taxi rank is full. It is our understanding that this is currently at the existing car park site. Once construction begins on site without consideration of this issue there is the potential for additional vehicles to be shifted onto surrounding streets which could impact on local air quality.

Air Quality Assessment

The Operational Air Quality Assessment considers air quality both with and without the proposed development at agreed receptor locations; considering both proposed access scenarios off Station Square. The methodology is considered acceptable.

Modelling predicts an increase of 0.1 $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ of nitrogen dioxide (28.8 $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ and 27.3 $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ respectively) and less than 0.1 $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ of PM_{10} (18.92 $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ and 18.67 $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$) at both receptor points (1 & 2) on Great Northern Road should all access to Station Square be maintained along Great Northern Road.

Should the option to redistribute some taxi movements onto Station Road; modelling predicts a maximum decrease of 2.9 $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ of nitrogen dioxide (annual mean concentration 25.8 $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$) and 0.6 $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ of PM_{10} (annual mean concentration of 18.3 $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$) at receptor point 1 on Great Northern Road. In parallel there is an increase of 0.7 $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ nitrogen dioxide (16.8 $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$) and 0.2 $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ of PM_{10} (16.8 $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$) at receptor point 5 which is adjacent to Station Square.

The report concludes that under both scenarios the proposed development will not lead to a breach in objective levels within the AQMA. We agree with this conclusion. However, the report will introduce increased vehicle movements within the AQMA therefore mitigation is required.

MSCP Electric Vehicle (EV) charge points

The Letter from Bidwells dated 6th December 2019 confirms that the provision of 25% active slow EV charge points will be provided in the MSCP. These should have a minimum power rating output of 3kW in line with guidance and best practice. The remaining car parking spaces will have passive provision in the form of 'ducts and service risers'. We agree that most car park users are commuters who will park their cars for longer period of times; therefore on this occasion the provision of 25% slow active EV charge points is considered acceptable.

Conclusion

We welcome the commitment from the applicant to deliver the 25% active slow EV charge points in the MSCP. Subject to the conditions above we have no objections on air quality grounds.

Conditions are recommended in relation to:

- Construction hours
- Collection hours during construction
- Construction/demolition noise/vibration & piling
- Dust
- Emergency or backup generator
- Contaminated land
- Acoustic compliance
- Plant noise insulation

- Delivery hours
- Waste compactor
- Artificial Lighting
- Kitchen extraction discharge
- Odour filtration / extraction
- Combustion Appliances – Low Emissions (CHP and Low NOx)
- EV Charge Points – Multi Storey Car Park

Informatives in relation to:

- Plant Noise
- Dust
- Emergency / back-up generator

Head of Policy

Latest Comments 18 Feb 20

6.11 No Objection: A revised National Planning Policy Framework was published February 2019. National policy in the NPPF includes the presumption in favour of sustainable development at the heart of the planning system. This sets a clear expectation on planning authorities to plan positively to promote development and create sustainable communities. Paragraph 80 outlines how planning decisions should help create the conditions in which businesses can invest, expand and adapt by placing significant weight on the need to support economic growth and productivity, taking into account both local business needs and wider opportunities for development.

The adopted Cambridge Local Plan 2018

The Council adopted the Cambridge Local Plan in October 2018.

Policy 2: 'Spatial strategy for the location of employment development' outlines the Council's aim to ensure there is sufficient land available to support the forecast of 22,100 new jobs in Cambridge by 2031, including some 8,800 in B-use class (offices and industry). To support this aim, a range of locations, types and sizes of employment land has been allocated in the Local Plan.

The application site is located within site allocation 'Station Area West (1) – Site M14', listed in Appendix B, which forms part of the Station Area West area in Policy 21: Station Areas West and Clifton Road Area of Major Change. Policy 21 supports the area's continued and complete regeneration listing a range of acceptable uses which include B1(a) and B1(b) employment and hotel uses.

Policy 77: 'Development and expansion of visitor accommodation' explains the locations where new visitor accommodation in Cambridge will be supported as part of mixed-use schemes. These include land around Cambridge Station. The policy also reflects the increasing number of potential proposals for alternative types of visitor accommodation and how they should be treated, i.e. apart-hotels and serviced accommodation.

Hotel Needs Assessment

The applicant has submitted a report supporting the need for the proposed use. This is based upon an assessment of the performance of the Cambridge hotel market including how the various consented proposals in recent years compare to the proposed aparthotel; a new midscale serviced aparthotel concept that does not currently exist in Cambridge. The report notes the site's proximity to the main railway station which should encourage guests to arrive by public transport who can then benefit from the extensive bus network that serves the station.

Hotel Need in Cambridge

The Cambridge Hotel Futures Study (2012) estimated the demand for visitor accommodation was split 35%-65% between leisure tourists and University & business visitors. The study identified a new generation of serviced accommodation that combines an element of self-catering with some hotel-style service is causing a blurring of the boundaries between uses in planning terms. These types of premises are generally intended to service extended stay corporate and university markets. They may, however, let units for shorter stays to business and leisure markets.

Since the Hotel Future Study was published, the number of visitors to Cambridge between 2010 & 2018 has doubled from 4 million visitors to 8.1 million visitors¹. The economic value of Cambridge's visitor economy is worth approximately £835 million accounting for 22% of employment in Cambridge². As noted in the applicant's Hotel Needs Assessment, the performance of Cambridge's hotel market has remained robust despite the recent arrival of new hotels.

While there is no specific published data relating to the performance of serviced apartments in Cambridge, there is national data available. UK (including London) reported occupancy levels achieved more than 76% compared to hotels at just over 73%. From this, it can be concluded that the use of aparthotels is a popular option with guests.

Accor is a national and internationally recognised brand with a dedicated reservation network; Adagio is Accor's aparthotel concept. At present, there are three sub-brands in operation: Adagio Premium (upscale) Adagio (midscale) and the economy Adagio Access. The proposed Adagio is a midscale aparthotel brand, as such, in terms of hotel quality rating standard it would be fair to assume it is the equivalent of a 3-star.

Summary

Policy 2 and policy 21 allocation Station Area West (1) – Site M14 support the need for new Class B1(a) and B1(b) floorspace use in this location.

The location for hotel/visitor accommodation use is also supported in policy 21(h) and policy 77(c), respectively. The quality of the proposed Aparthotel is the equivalent of a 3-star hotel which is one of the identified hotel-rating needs for Cambridge outlined in 2012 Study and the supporting text of Policy 77. The Aparthotel (Class C1) proposal is therefore considered acceptable from a policy perspective, assuming the maximum length of stay (typically 90 days) is conditioned.

Recommends the following condition:

¹ Only 12% of these visitors are currently exploring beyond Cambridge; Around 30% of these visitors are visiting friends and family locally.

² Economic Impact of Tourism - Cambridge Report 2017

- Maximum length of stay 90 days (see proposed condition 14).

Head of Streets and Open Spaces (Landscape Team)

6.12 *Original Comments*

Amendments Required: The landscape proposals are generally supported, but amendments are sought relating to the Devonshire Road boundary.

Amendment Comments

No Objection: The proposals for the Devonshire Road boundary are acceptable subject to conditions finalising the planting design. The area allocated for planting is acceptable.

Conditions are recommended in relation to:

- Hard and soft landscaping
- Landscape maintenance and management plan:
- Green Roof
- Roof planting irrigation system
- Tree Pits

Head of Streets and Open Spaces (Sustainable Drainage Officer)

6.13 *Original Comments*

Objection: The proposals do not reduce flow to pre-development rates. i.e. greenfield discharge rates and should do more in terms of water quality and infiltration. The proposal is not in accordance with policies 31 and 32 of the LP and would result in an increase in flood risk.

Amendment Comments

No Objection: The planning officer and drainage officer met with the applicants and the drainage strategy was revised in Jan 20

and further supporting technical information submitted in Feb 20. This shows flow rates improved for block B2.

The City Council drainage officer states that the proposals have demonstrated that the improved surface water drainage scheme for this particular urban and constrained area can be delivered. However, for further clarity a detailed plan should be secured by condition with the following information:

- The flow controls and flow rates should be clearly marked on the drainage network drawing of the network to demonstrate that the flows leaving Building B2 and Building F2 sites meet the 5 l/s run-off rate.
- The drainage network drawing shall include all of the SuDS proposed.
- Detailed drawing of the entire proposed surface water drainage system, including pipe reference numbers matching the Hydraulic model (Micro Drainage) pipe/chamber references
- The treatment train for each different area should be indicated on a plan.

Local Lead Flood Authority

Comments of 24 Feb 20

Holding Objection: Refers to policies 31 and 32 of the Local Plan. Seeks further information / clarification regarding: green roofs; re-use of water; SuDs; hard surface infiltration / water quality; discharge rates; connection points.

Amendment Comments of 10 March 20

No Objection: Met with the applicants and case officer on 2 March 2020 and has reviewed further supporting drainage information / drainage documents.

The applicant has demonstrated that surface water from the proposed development can be managed using green roofs, tree pits, and an area of permeable paving, restricting surface water discharge to 5l/s from each proposed building. The LLFA is supportive of the use of green / brown roofs, tree pits and

permeable paving as these features manage surface water runoff at the source.

Request a surface water drainage scheme condition based on SuDs principles. Suggests informatives regarding permeable paving and green roofs.

Senior Sustainability Officer (Design and Construction)

6.14 No Objection: These comments focus on the applicant's approach to sustainable design and construction in light of policies contained within the Cambridge Local Plan (2018), making reference to information contained within the Design and Access Statement, Sustainability Statement and Energy Strategy.

The Sustainability Statement outlines the approach that has been taken to integrating the principles of sustainable design and construction into the overall design of the scheme, including:

- Achievement of BREEAM 'excellent' for both buildings, with the hotel having a predicted score of 74.6% and the office 76.0%. This provides a reasonable buffer of credits against the minimum score required for BREEAM excellent;
- Proposals for green roofs on both the B2 and F2 buildings, which meets the requirement for all flat roofs to be green or brown roofs contained in policy 31 of the LP. The plans have been amended to show their precise location.
- Submission of a thermal comfort report which assesses the risk of overheating for both the hotel and the office space. Solar control glazing is proposed to help limit internal solar gains.
- Proposals for a hierarchical approach to reducing energy demand and associated carbon emissions, with the Energy Strategy highlighting that the scheme delivers a 31.5% reduction in carbon emissions over the Part L 2013 baseline. In terms of renewable and low carbon energy,

the strategy involves the use of gas fired CHP and air source heat pumps for the hotel and air source heat pumps for the office building. Further information has clarified that there is no conflict between the use of the two systems for the hotel. Emissions standards will need to be secured for the gas CHP.

- With regards to water efficiency, policy 28 of the LP requires that all non-residential schemes achieve maximum credits under Wat 01 of BREEAM. The proposed scheme achieves 3 out of a possible 5 credits under Wat 01, which equates to a 40% reduction in water use. The findings of the Rainwater and Greywater feasibility studies is noted and the proposal represents a significant improvement on baseline water use.

Recommends conditions in relation to:

- BREEAM Certification (Design Stage and Post Construction)
- Renewable and Low Carbon Implementation

Urban Design and Conservation Team

6.15 No Objection: This has been the subject of extensive pre-application discussions with the applicants & agents.

Block B2

The block is to be used as a car park and an aparthotel and the form and C-plan layout has been arrived at following lengthy discussions about the relationship with existing buildings.

The visual impact of the block when viewed from the CA should be mitigated partly by the screening effect of the bicycle bridge, partly by the curved NE corner and the set-back of the top floor. This building forms the 'gateway' into the CB1 development when approached from the North and provides the design transition between the modest scale of the residential areas of the CA and the more commercial scale of the new area around the railway station.

The elevations have been treated in a similar way to many of those in the rest of the development and reflect the job that they have to do in relation to the adjacent uses. The East elevation fronting the railway has the car parking elements at the lower level, screened in a similar way to that of the bicycle park. The rooms are arranged above that with the top floor is set back from the parapet. The South elevation backs onto the back of the bicycle park / hotel and forms a service space between the buildings. The corner at the front here is important as it has to 'read' as the pedestrian entrance to the car park.

The North elevation is relatively close to the Carter Bridge and provides the entrance to vehicles entering the car park. The detailed design and signage will be important to the success of this element. The West elevation, the main street frontage has to function as the main entrance to the 'Aparthotel' as well as having the two entrances to the car park on the corners. The double-height atrium, provided that it is well-detailed and in suitable materials, should allow users to see clearly how to approach & enter the building. The 'feature staircase' will also be important in giving the views into the atrium from the street some visual focal point. The important thing here is that the materials are well-chosen so that the building feels part of the overall development and has some shared characteristics but also has some distinction from others so that its wider function [the car park] is easily identified.

Block F2

Throughout the pre-app. period the use of this block changed several times. It is now submitted as offices. The design remains similar to those presented for other uses and generally follows the pattern of trying not to appear as one, very long, monolithic building. The corner block [facing into the Station Square] is very important in townscape terms but it should not dominate the streets leading from the mini roundabout. The recessed entrance seems to work reasonably well – subject to detail – but the floor-to-ceiling glazing is raised as a concern. How the flank of this building links to the adjacent blocks of housing on Great Northern Street will need to be properly detailed via a condition.

The 'family resemblance' proposed for the brick facades with artificial stone banding is acceptable as a concept but will need to be done well. The curved end at the 'gateway' into the development from the CA works in relation to the end of Block B2 opposite and helps to funnel pedestrians, cyclists and vehicles into the new street being created. The hard landscaping here will be crucial to the success of providing safe passage for all. The palette of materials here – provided that it is selected correctly – also should work well with the building opposite and with the corner block at the other end but, again, floor-to-ceiling glass is unacceptable; the screening shown looks inadequate for the job.

This building is intended for the train drivers and it would be a good thing to recognise this somehow in this part of the building and to emphasise the railway heritage somewhere. The central block of this frontage is of similar design but of a different brick – this will be acceptable as long as the types are chosen well. This also goes for the engineering brick plinth. The rear elevation design facing Ravensworth Gardens housing is now very straightforward compared to previous iterations which may give it rather less visual impact in terms of materials and articulation but might, alternatively, appear somewhat bland. Others will comment upon its appropriateness in terms of neighbourliness.

Recommended Conditions

Block B2

Recommends conditions in relation to:

- material samples
- glass types
- sample panels
- design of the atrium
- design of entrances
- car park security
- lighting
- rooftop plant
- ramp retaining walls
- top floor cladding
- service yard

- green roofs and gardens

Block F2

Recommends conditions in relation to:

- link construction
- special masonry
- main entrance
- windows & frames
- signage

The above responses are a summary of the comments that have been received. Full details of the consultation responses can be inspected on the application file.

7.0 REPRESENTATIONS

7.1 The owners/occupiers of the following addresses have made representations:

- CamCycle, 140 Cowley Road
- Gonville Hotel
- Great Northern Road Residents Association
- Meldreth, Shepreth and Foxton Rail User Group
- Rail Future, Cambridge
- Smarter Transport UK
- South Petersfield Residents' Association
- Ilex House, Barrington
- Rose Cottage, Bury St Edmunds
- The Hilton, 20 Downing Street

- 1 Edieham Cottages (Royston)
- 1 St Eligius Place
- 1 Lamor Drive
- 4 Pearce Close
- 5 Ramsden Square
- 6 Hertford Street
- 7 Caxton End (St Neots)
- 8 Holland Street
- 9 Devonshire Road
- 12 Saxon Road
- 13 The Beech Building, Rudduck Way

14 Harry Scott Court
14 Bead Road
15 Latham Road
15 Shelly Garden
17 Romsey Road
17 Lilywhite Drive
19 Ainsworth Place
19 Petersfield Mansions
20 Downing Street
21 Bowers Croft
21 North Lodge Park, Milton
22 Devonshire Road
22 Camside
25 Devonshire Road
26 Crathern Way
27 St Barnabas Road
27 Devonshire Road
30 Great Northern Road
31 Devonshire Road
31 Hinton Road, Fulbourn
33c Great Eastern Street
34 Great Northern Road
34 Emery Street
36 Ditton Walk
41 Raeburn House, Lapwing Avenue
41 Garden Walk
42 Owlstone Road
43 Ravensworth Gardens
43 Devonshire Road
45 Ravensworth Gardens
46 Devonshire Road
51 Scholars Walk
51 Ravensworth Gardens
52 Macaulay Avenue, Great Shelford
52 St Thomas' Square
54 Devonshire Road
57 Tenison Road
62 Devonshire Road
62 Great Northern Road
70 Devonshire Mews
72 Devonshire Mews
72 Hemingford Road
72 Ravensworth Gardens

74 Ravensworth Gardens
 74 Holbrook Road
 74 Foster Road
 79 DeFreville Avenue
 80b York Street
 81 Winfold Road (Waterbeach)
 81 Great Northern Road
 83 Great Northern Road
 85 Great Northern Road
 89 Great Northern Road
 91 Great Northern Road
 95 North End, Meldreth
 108 Great Northern Road
 113 Great Northern Road
 116 Tenison Road
 117 Great Northern Road
 140 Cowley Road
 176 Foster Road

A number of representations have been received from unknown addresses.

7.2 The representations can be summarised as follows:

Topic	Issue
Road and Highways	Impact of additional traffic and associated impacts on Great Northern Road, Tenison Road and Devonshire Road.
	Vehicular traffic will continue to be allowed to dominate Great Northern Road which is a residential street.
	Vehicular traffic will continue to cause conflict on Great Northern Road between pedestrians and cyclists.
	Narrowing of road to station car park unsafe.
	Great Northern Road should be closed to vehicular traffic except for residential use.
	The Tenison Road / Station Road junction should be signal controlled with safe crossings for pedestrians.
	Loss of zebra crossing at the corner of Station Road is not acceptable.
	The raised table crossing of Station Road

	south east of the Tenison Road junction is not acceptable.
	Plans for people to cross Station Road are insufficient
Transport Assessment	Transport Assessment figures are not reliable, there are discrepancies in traffic count data with Resident Association counts.
	24-hour traffic count data is incorrect (average hourly flows over 24 hours exceed measured peak hour flows).
	Growth in traffic (taxis, private hire, pick-up / drop-off) to and from the station at 5.7% per year will mean the 29% reduction in evening peak traffic will be eliminated in just five years.
	Traffic counts undertaken too long ago.
	The TA underplays traffic impact associated with servicing / deliveries to the proposed business uses.
New Access	The entire access arrangements to the Station Area should be re-examined.
	Moving only Hackney carriages onto the new access will not resolve issues on Great Northern Road.
	The new access would cut across a pedestrian through route used by large numbers of people (30,000 – 40,000 people enter / exit the station every day) and cause conflict and be unsafe.
	Pedestrian users should be put above the interests of car and taxi users. Pedestrians are disadvantaged. Hierarchy of use is broken.
	The new access would partially solve a problem on Great Northern Road but introduce a new problem elsewhere.
	Over-ranking will not occur.
	The access would not allow for mandatory cycle lanes to be provided down either side of Station Road.

	It will not be possible to separate cars and taxis using the new access.
	New access is supported, it will improve existing issues on Great North Road.
	The new access should allow for all traffic utilising the Station Square and allow for one-way routing up Great Northern Road and out onto Station Road.
Height, Massing, Siting	Blocks B2 and F2 are too tall and massive and would detract from the smaller scale houses on Devonshire Road.
	B2 is taller than the IBIS and the outline parameter.
	F2 is taller than envisaged in the outline parameter.
	B2 is closer to Carter bridge and Devonshire Mews than the outline parameter.
	Plant is too high.
	The development cannot be justified on the basis that there is no proposal coming forward on the northern side of Carter Bridge (G1, G2).
	Overdevelopment.
Masterplan, Design and Landscaping	Lacks character and craft for a gateway position.
	The vision for Station Square is broken by the proposal to include a new access point.
	Devonshire Road area should be re-landscaped.
	Lack of green space across CB1.
	A permanent emergency access from Devonshire Road will facilitate the permanent removal of TPO'd trees.
	Design of CB1 is becoming a 'concrete jungle'.
	The development does not improve the appearance of Station Square.
	Station Square is dominated by cars.
	The whole layout of Station Square should be

	reviewed.
	Station Square should be planned for the provision of a metro interchange.
	Lack of wayfinding in Station Square.
	All decisions should be postponed on CB1 until a new masterplan with car parking and an entrance on the eastern side of the railway line pursued as an option.
Car Park	The multi-storey car park encourages motor traffic into a congested area and is not sustainable contrary to policy 80 of the LP.
	Preserving car parking numbers does not align with encouraging modal shift away from driving and parking in the City.
	Parking capacity has already been reduced through the outline consent; why not reduce capacity further.
	Removing the car park would improve the appearance of B2.
	The Cambridge Leisure car park should be amalgamated with CB1.
	All car parking around the station should be removed and replaced on the Clifton Road side of the railway.
	The need for the car park appears only to be for the short term, this is not planning for the future.
	Parking provision only needs to be sufficient for deliveries and for disabled parking.
	Will lead to more anti-social behaviour.
	The car park should provide short-term car parking as provision in the area for existing residents is poor.
Pedestrian	There should be a zebra crossing on Great Northern Road.
	The footway around the multi-storey car park would be too narrow.
	The design of the shared space on the access road to the station car park would result in user conflict and be unsafe

	(particularly when the Chisholm Trail opens).
	Pedestrians need better protection from cyclists.
Cycle	Adjustments to Devonshire Road cycle route link and zebra crossing on Station Road are welcome.
	Bulk of cycling comments from DCF not addressed.
	Kerb-upstands on the cycle link will create accidents. They should be flush.
	Franchise obligation for Abellio / Greater Anglia for an extra 1,000 cycle parking spaces should be implemented in place of the carpark. There are currently no plans for where these would go. No plans have been forthcoming which show how the car park could be converted for cycles. Any additional cycle parking should be provided by way of an extension to the existing cycle park, as separate entrances would not be appropriate. The Station Area should be future proofed for increased and better cycle parking provision (2,850 + 1,000 will not be sufficient). Better cycle parking would include space for electric charging points, better provision for 'off gauge' cycles and better security.
	A solution should be provided to enable better cycle access across Station Square. The new access onto it does not resolve this issue.
	Cyclists travelling south – north would have to cross (turn right) into the new access. This would be a dangerous manoeuvre.
	A Bidirectional cycle lane should be pursued as per Smarter Cambridge sketch but this would interfere with the footprint of F2.
	Station area provision for cyclists, including access to Cycle Point is poor. Proper joined up cycle paths need to be provided for the Station Area, particularly given the proposed plans for the Chisholm Trail.
	Great Northern Road is unusable by cycle.

	The mini-roundabout at the top of Great North Road will become more unsafe.
Rail	The station requires a strategic masterplan ahead of any further expansion to better accommodate pedestrian and non-motorised users.
	Support an additional eastern entrance to the Station to mitigate overcrowding. There has been growth in the use of station by 25% between 2013 and 2018 and this will likely continue.
	New accesses to the station near platforms 3 and 6 should be provided.
Buses	Rail service replacement buses would be shifted to local bus stops in Station Place and disrupt those services.
	Bus services to the station should be improved.
	Bus stops around the station should be closer to the entrance than taxis.
Taxis	The taxi rank and pick-up drop-off area should be moved to where Murdoch House currently sits and the area re-landscaped.
	The existing taxi rank cover should be extended.
	Alternative solutions for dealing with unlicensed taxis should be explored.
	Taxis currently idle in the station car park.
	Taxis currently abuse the use of the drop-off / pick-up bays.
	There is no provision to stop taxis continuing to use Great Northern Road.
Amenity	Traffic increases will increase noise on Great Northern Road and will mainly be from 7.5 tonne diesel lorries. Deliveries are not currently managed and are often early in the morning and not enforced.
<i>Noise from Traffic</i>	Noise associated with the bin and bike store

	for F2 adjacent to residential boundary would cause harm.
	Great Northern Road properties are already exposed to noise levels that are in violation of planning conditions and European recommended levels
	This is an opportunity to revisit traffic routing and reduce further the use of Great Northern Road by vehicles.
	Noise from waste collection vehicles collecting from Great Northern Road.
<i>Noise from Hotel Users</i>	Users of the hotel will have no vested interest in the amenity of the existing area or its community. There will be increases in late night noise associated with the hotel use.
<i>Air Pollution</i>	Traffic increases from delivery vehicles (most polluting vehicles) will increase air pollution on Great Northern Road beyond already exceeded legal limits.
	Air pollution would be shifted to Station Road where queuing taxis would emit pollution affecting pedestrians and cyclists.
	Canyon effect of design amplifying noise and air pollution.
	Air pollution levels would return after 5 years on Great Northern Road due to background growth in traffic levels.
	Adding more car parking will not address pollution levels
	The car park should have EV charge points to allow it to comply with the Council's Air Quality Action Plan.
<i>Overshadowing</i>	Height of the corner element of F2 is above the outline parameter.
	Overshadowing and loss of daylight of rooms and the courtyard of F1.
	Overshadowing and loss of daylight of Ravensworth Gardens (gardens and properties).
<i>Privacy</i>	Privacy impact on residents of F1.
	Privacy impact on residents of Ravensworth Gardens.

<i>Enclosure</i>	Will loom over and dominate Devonshire Road properties.
<i>Quality of Life</i>	The development would reduce the quality of life of residents of Great Northern Road and users of the area.
Construction	Construction access from Devonshire Road is unacceptable and would be unsafe.
	Further construction vehicles visiting the area will generate highway safety issues.
	Construction work should only be allowed over the weekdays 8am – 6pm and not weekends.
	Construction phasing plans should be revised.
Hotel	No need for a further aparthotel use.
	The city is oversupplied with hotels.
	The hotel needs assessment is out of date and does not contain up-to-date information.
	Homestay (AirBnB) is not referred to in the hotel needs assessment
	Hotel investment in Cambridge is declining.
Other	Submitted plans need updating.
	The applicant is not giving an undertaking not to develop G1 and G2.
	Lost revenue from a multi-storey car park could be replaced with revenue from additional shops and services.
	Greed and profit have overruled the goal of a pleasant, efficient station square.
	The aparthotel should be replaced with social housing
	Consultation poor
	Emergency vehicle access will be made more difficult down Great North Road.
	Aldwyck Housing Group not consulted
	Missed opportunity
	Station Road to Station Square should be opened up to traffic prior to construction of B2 and F2.

	Devonshire Road parking route should be opened up prior to construction.
	Construction traffic must be limited to 9am – 5pm and not weekdays or bank holidays.
	All private hire vehicles (Hackney Carriages, Ubers and drop-off / pick-up) should be moved to Station Road.
	Deliveries to Station Square should be moved to Station Road.
	Residents needs have been ignored over the needs of businesses.
	Damage caused to sewers and road infrastructure.
	Existing issues in CB1 are not out of scope for discussion. The development would exacerbate site wide issues.
	Existing deliveries often take place too early (between 5am – 7am) despite complaints.
	Estate management by Brookgate is poor.
	Character of the area would change the balance of residential vs business/short-term let.
	Residents' parking should be introduced to Great Northern Road.
Amendments	Amendments to F2 are welcome but have not overcome issues of overlooking, overshadowing and overbearing on Ravensworth Gardens properties.
	F2 is not residential and should be considered entirely on its own merits and compliance with national and local policies.
	NPPF para 123 does not allow for flexibility for office development.
	The alternative commuted sum for a range of interventions for the Station Square is not a detailed proposal. The interventions have not been modelled or costed and the offer is irregular. A number of the proposed interventions would not work.
	None of the proposed interventions will be able to restrict the rate at which CCLT-

	licensed taxis return to the station.
	Amendments have not addressed the lack of a clear, safe, signed north-south cycle route between Devonshire Rd and the Busway to Addenbrooke's and to Cycle point. Segregated safe cycle access through the Station Area needs to be provided. The improvements should be costed.
	The proposal will create more conflicts between cars, cycles and pedestrians on Great Northern Rd, at the junction in front of the Ibis hotel and through the pick-up/drop-off area.
	DoT have agreed to derogate Greater Anglia's franchise for a further 1,000 cycle parking at the station. Peak demand will exceed current provision within a few years. It is irresponsible of Greater Anglia and Brookgate to prioritise commercial redevelopment of station land over enhanced and expanded provision for sustainable transport in light of growing passenger nos. at the Station.
	Welcome removal of Devonshire Road construction access.
	Amendments to F2 have not overcome concern regarding impact on Great Northern Road (GNR) properties in terms of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Natural daylight and sunlight entering bedrooms and study rooms and flowing through to other rooms will be significantly reduced and flats less warm with less overall amenity. -Enclosure and dominating outlook. -Enclosure and loss of daylight / sunlight to the external courtyard. -The proposal would worsen good aspects of amenity enjoyed by GNR residents which accord with national guidance. -The proposal is contrary to the BRE guidance (3 properties would fail the BRE guidelines).

	-Overlooking
	Amendments proposed have not been borne out of discussions with the residents or residents' associations.
	Increase in office floorspace unjustified. 20% increase in floorspace
	Amendments have not addressed traffic, pollution or noise and disturbance concerns. Deliveries times needs to be controlled and they are not currently enforced. The land uses will attract large vehicle deliveries. There are existing respiratory issues experienced by residents of GNR. Predicted air quality levels at outline are already being exceeded breaching legal limits. The proposal would exacerbate these.
	The Council is only concerned about profit.
	The basement for F2 will involve a greater degree of disturbance, with large nos. of construction traffic required for excavation.
	Unsure if the pedestrian crossing is still proposed across to Sainsbury's. Need a pedestrian crossing on the East side of the street.
	Supporting technical daylight and sunlight assessment not provided.
	F2 should be residential not offices as per the original outline consent to help foster a sense of community. The uses, the MSCP, will encourage anti-social behaviour.
	Traffic modelling is only to 2022
	Impact should improve not worsen the existing traffic issues
	Construction traffic should be limited to between 9am and 4pm.
	Delivery traffic should be limited to between 9am and 6pm
	Waste collections should be limited to those for deliveries and servicing
	The developer should demonstrate how the proposal will meet net zero carbon emissions

	over the lifetime of the development given the declared Climate Emergency.
	Amendments have not addressed the short-term parking needs of residents in the area.
	No need for the uses.
	The car parking spaces need to remain in order to preserve the openness of the area.
	The applicant's offer to review cycle routes through Station Square and to provide £500,000 to remedy problems. This is an admission that the design as implemented is defective.
	The offer of £500,000.00 is not sufficient to tackle existing issues.
	The MSCP will continue to attract cars into CB1
	The new access for CC licenced Hackney carriages will not control Ubers or SCDC licenced taxis from using GNR and neither does the taxi licencing policy introduced by Cambridge affect Ubers or SCDC licenced taxis or those from elsewhere. These vehicles would continue to pollute. Taxis could also be allowed to continue to use GNR.
	The existing environmental quality is poor, the proposal will only worsen this.
	The number of electric charge points should be increased and they should be arranged in hubs.

7.3 Cllr Robertson has made representations in relation to the application. These are summarised as follows:

- The outline consent for B2 and F2 was for both buildings to provide residential accommodation. Uses not acceptable.
- Need for hotel, given two existing Hotels in CB1.
- F2 would adversely affect the adjacent block of flats F2 causing loss of light.
- Ravensworth Gardens would be overshadowed and suffer loss of direct sunlight.

- The proposal for B2 to extend further north and with a taller building than approved at outline stage would lead to visual dominance and overbearing of houses on Devonshire Road.
- Plans for G1 and G2 should be withdrawn.
- Scheme should make better use of rainwater recycling for B2 (Hotel) as per policy 28.
- Risk of flooding contrary to local plan policies.
- PV panels should be provided on the southeast facing walls of B2.
- A minimum of 25% of parking spaces be provided with charging points and 100% be provided with infrastructure as part of the construction.
- The pedestrian crossings at the station end of Gt Northern Road, across the busway, and on Station Road near Tenison road, are welcomed.
- Bike lanes should be provided on Gt Northern Road which currently has a highway which is too narrow to allow for safe cycling.
- The development of the Chisholm Trail running north from the station through the car park will lead to ever increasing cycle movements along the road between blocks B2 and F2. It appears that there are no cycle lanes proposed on this road which would be a serious mistake.
- The franchise under which Govia run the station is a requirement for an additional 1000 bike parking spaces to be provided. These should be provided as close as possible to the station and the area to be built on by blocks B2 and F2 is the only remaining space available.
- The impact of redirecting all traffic to the station (apart from buses) via Gt Northern Road has been to create high levels of noise and air pollution. A requirement of any planning permission should be that the new access from Station Road to the Square be provided and that all hackney taxis and hire cars be allowed to use it.
- A requirement of any planning permission should be that servicing of B2 and F2 is restricted to appropriate hours and 8am to 8pm is suggested. This must include banning the

movement of these service vehicles on Gt Northern Road out of these hours.

- The alternative £500,000 should be detailed and the other options for mitigation and their feasibility set out.

7.4 The above representations are a summary of the comments that have been received. Full details of the representations can be inspected on the application file.

8.0 ASSESSMENT

8.1 From the consultation responses and representations received the main issues are as follows:

1. Principle of Development
2. New Access and Alternatives
3. Context of Site, Design, External Spaces and Heritage
4. Carbon Reduction and Sustainable Design
5. Integrated Water Management and Flood Risk
6. Residential Amenity
7. Environmental Impacts
8. Contaminated Land
9. Inclusive Access
10. Ecology
11. Cycle Parking
12. Third party representations
13. Planning Obligations (s106 Agreement)
14. Conclusion

Principle of Development

Background

8.2 The outline planning permission for CB1 was approved in April 2010 under ref: 08/0266/OUT for the following development:

The comprehensive redevelopment of the Station Road area, comprising up to 331 residential units (inclusive of 40% affordable homes), 1,250 student units; 53,294 sqm of Class B1a (Office) floorspace; 5,255 sqm of Classes A1/A3/A4 and/or A5 (retail) floorspace; a 7,645 sqm polyclinic; 86 sqm of D1 (art

workshop) floorspace; 46 sqm D1 (community room); 1,753 sqm of D1 and/or D2 (gym, nursery, student/community facilities) floorspace; use of block G2 (854 sqm) as either residential student or doctors surgery, and a 6,479 sqm hotel; along with a new transport interchange and station square, including 28 taxi bays and 9 bus stops (2 of which are double stops providing 11 bays in total), a new multi storey cycle and car park including accommodation for c. 2,812 cycle spaces, 52 motorcycle spaces and 632 car parking spaces; highway works including improvements to the existing Hills Road / Brooklands Avenue junction and the Hills Road/Station Road junction and other highway improvements, along with an improved pedestrian/cyclist connection with the Carter Bridge; and works to create new and improved private and public spaces

- 8.3 The outline permission was subject to a series of parameter plans setting maximum building heights, development areas and uses for plots across the station area.
- 8.4 For the land upon which the aparthotel and multi-storey car park is located, this was identified as Block B1 on the approved parameter plans. Block B1 was to be a single building accommodating retail at the ground floor fronting the square, offices and car and cycle parking. Block B1 has subsequently been divided and is being delivered in two phases, with the first phase already built. This comprises a 231 room IBIS hotel, food and beverage uses addressing the square and a multi-storey cycle park accommodating 2,850 bicycles. This block has been in full operational use since late summer 2016. Block B2 forms the majority of the second half of the B1 parameter plan plot which is the subject of this application.
- 8.5 Block F2 was envisaged for residential use. It is currently undeveloped and utilised for surface grade car parking.

Key Policies, Guidance and Approach to Decision Making

- 8.6 Planning decisions must be taken in accordance with the development plan unless there are material considerations that indicate otherwise (section 70(2) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and section 38[6] of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004).

- 8.7 Policies 1 and 2 of the 2018 LP set out the Council's aspirations for sustainable development and the spatial strategy for the location of employment development. The supporting text to policy 2, at para. 2.41 specifically refers to the Station Area in playing a key role in delivering the spatial strategy, stating:

'The local plan will support the continued growth of the nationally significant Cambridge Cluster. The plan seeks to deliver new employment land at six key locations in Cambridge. These are: the area around Cambridge Station, West Cambridge, Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrooke's), North West Cambridge (covered by the North West Cambridge Area Action Plan), Fulbourn Road and Cambridge Northern Fringe East. There are also likely to be a number of opportunities to redevelop and improve offices throughout Cambridge over the lifetime of the plan.'

- 8.8 The redevelopment of the station area through the outline consent and subsequent approvals / permissions has helped contribute towards the previous 2006 LP's vision to regenerate the station area as a mixed-use neighbourhood around an enhanced transport interchange (see policy 1 supporting para. 2.36). The delivered strategic transport infrastructure improvements which include Station Square, CyclePoint and additional new access points / integration with the guided busway set the context within which the proposed development of blocks B2 and F2 come forward. The redevelopment of these blocks is entirely consistent with strategic employment and transport policies 2 and 5 embedded into the LP. This is a highly sustainable urban location where the completion of the regeneration of the CB1 Devonshire Quarter is strongly supported by adopted policy.

- 8.9 LP policy 21 is directly applicable to the proposal, which identifies that the application site lies within proposal site M14 Station Area West (1). The text to the policy states:

'Development at the Station Areas West and Clifton Road Area of Major Change, as defined on the Policies Map and shown on Figure 3.7, will support the continued and complete regeneration of vibrant, mixed-use areas of the city, centred around and accessible to a high quality and improved transport interchange. The principal land uses will include:

- a. a major regenerated multi-modal transport interchange focused on the existing Cambridge Railway Station, which services Cambridge and its subregion;*
- b. residential use with an indicative capacity of 331 dwellings and 1,250 student units;*
- c. B1(a) and B1(b) employment;*
- d. a mix of uses in classes A1, A2, A3, A4 and A5;*
- e. improved cycling and walking routes and facilities;*
- f. open spaces, both hard surfaced and green;*
- g. community uses; and*
- h. hotel uses.'*

8.10 The policy does not seek to cap the B1(a) or B1(b) employment floorspace uses and neither does it seek to cap hotel provision. Both are principal land uses proposed as part of the application and are consistent with policy 21. The supporting text to policy 21 at para. 3.85 goes on to state:

'Development should be carried out in accordance with the masterplan and parameter plans established by the outline permission. However, it is recognised that some flexibility will be needed to respond to changes in planning policy and to ensure that the overall development continues to be capable of supporting the delivery of the transport infrastructure and improvements to the public realm.'

8.11 The supporting text is relevant because of the shift from those uses envisaged at outline for the application site to those now being proposed and the flexibility that is afforded. It is also relevant in relation to the approved parameter plans and the appropriateness of these in setting a baseline for development proposals; the text to the policy suggesting that the parameters established at the masterplan stage will continue to have relevance for development proposals. The inference is that it is reasonable for e.g. to assess the visual and amenity impacts of blocks B2 and F2, particularly in relation to residential amenity, against what was approved at outline stage.

Aparthotel

8.12 LP policy 77 (Development and expansion of visitor accommodation) states that proposals for high quality visitor

accommodation will be supported as part of mixed-use schemes at:

- a. Old Press/Mill Lane;
- b. key sites around Parker's Piece;
- c. land around Cambridge station and the proposed new station serving North East Cambridge; and
- d. any large windfall sites that come forward in the city centre during the plan period.

- 8.13 The application site meets criterion c). There is therefore a strong policy presumption to support the aparthotel proposal.
- 8.14 The supporting text to the policy at para 8.46 states that there is a projected requirement for *'around 1,500 new bedrooms over the next 20 years'*, and this is predicated on a study undertaken in 2012 entitled 'Cambridge Hotel Futures'.
- 8.15 The figure of 1,500 new hotel bedrooms is not a cap on overall provision. For it to be a cap it would have to be expressed as such within the text of the policy.
- 8.16 The NPPF sets out that policies for assessed need should be as a minimum, and this is consistent with the way in which policy 77 is worded.
- 8.17 The applicant has submitted a document prepared by Bridget Baker Consulting Ltd in September 2017 detailing the trends in the local hotel market and providing a statement of need for the proposed Adagio aparthotel.
- 8.18 This sets out that the 125-bed aparthotel is for the company Accor and is branded an Adagio mid-scale aparthotel. There are currently two hotels in the CB1 development – the Accor branded Ibis (231 beds) and the 155 room Clayton (formerly the Tamburlaine) - on CB1. The Adagio will take the number of hotels up to three in the immediate CB1 cluster.
- 8.19 It would comprise 90 studio apartments and 35 one-bedroom apartments, the latter would be able to sleep up to four people and the studios up to two people. The applicants state that the Cambridge hotel market is relatively well supplied in terms of budget, three-star and four-star provision, but currently there

are very limited options for those guests seeking an extended stay (Aparthotel, Serviced Apartment) product.

8.20 Adagio apart-hotels provide the following services:

Rooms come with an equipped kitchen;

- Free wi-fi & web corner;
- 24 hour reception;
- Breakfast/Grab & Go;
- Self-service laundry;
- Luggage room;
- Mini Market;
- Fitness Room; and
- Daily housekeeping at extra cost.

8.21 The pricing structure for the apart-hotels encourages longer stays, with average stays of 4.5 nights.

8.22 The planning application was received by the Council in November 2018. As such, officers asked for an updated hotel needs assessment. This was submitted in January 2020 and takes into account recent approved applications. The updated report provides a current overview of existing and proposed hotel supply in Cambridge, which is replicated in tables 2.1 and 2.2 below.

Table 2.1 Structure of Cambridge Hotel Market (2019)				
Category	No. Hotels	No. Rooms	Mix (%)	Av. Size
Ungraded	3	41	1.2	14
Hostel	1	32	0.9	32
Budget / Limited-Service	11	1,276	37.6	116
Three-Star	8	492	14.5	62
Four-Star	13	1,360	40.1	105
Serviced Apartments	5	192	5.7	38
Total	41	3,393	100.0	83
Source: Bridget Baker Consulting Research				

Table 2.2 Potential New Hotel Openings in the City Centre area				
Hotel Name	Location	No. rooms	Category	Planning Status
The Lion Yard	Behind Grand Arcade Shopping centre, opp. High St.	125	Tbc	Granted
Curio by Hilton	Mitcham's Corner, at the bottom of Milton Road	160	Upscale aparthotel	Granted
Premier Inn	Grafton Centre, Fitzroy Street, CB1 1PS	153	Budget	Granted sub. to S106
Wilde, StayCity Aparthotel	On Park St. Car Park, opp. Varsity Hotel	227	Upscale aparthotel	Granted
Easyhotel	Newmarket Rd., on the jct with Godestone Rd	90	Budget	Granted sub. To S106
The Hobson, Rogue City Hotels	Hobson House, St Andrews St.	57	Upscale Boutique	Granted
Total		812		
Source: Bridget Baker Consulting Research				

8.23 The update report on hotel need states that even with recent increases to the upscale hotel bedroom supply in the city centre there has been no impact on performance levels (vacancy rates or room rates). This shows that there is significant unmet accommodation demand.

The update report also assesses the nature of the existing and future proposed hotels in Cambridge and concludes that the

Adagio aparthotel product is not directly competitive. In particular, the 227 aparthotel at Park Street (Staycity Wilde) is described as a premium brand, whereas an Adagio is a midscale aparthotel brand and the update report from the applicant's hotel consultants concludes that these two aparthotels are competing in different markets.

- 8.24 The applicants have also considered other hotels in the pipeline outside the city centre, such as at Cambridge North (217 beds), Eddington (330 beds), and at the Science Park (153 beds) but conclude due to the strength of demand in the city and high occupancy levels and average room rates achieved, Cambridge continues to be a significant interest to hotel companies.
- 8.25 In officers' view, the evidence suggests that the proposed midscale aparthotel is needed and that it would fill a gap in the aparthotel market for Cambridge. Its location is ideally suited to visitors (business and tourist) arriving by train. Extended stays in the aparthotel will encourage more expenditure in the Cambridge economy, particularly in the evenings. There is no reason to disagree with the findings of the report and the recent addendum submitted by the applicant.
- 8.26 Policy 77 does not cap the provision of new visitor accommodation. The principle of the aparthotel use, being located in a highly sustainable location with excellent public transport links and within walking distance of thriving businesses, shops, services and attractions in the city centre, is acceptable. Conditions 13 and 14 seek to limit the maximum number of nights stay for any individual visitor (90 days in any 12 month period, with records kept) given the facilities provided within the aparthotel product in line with advice from colleagues in Policy.

Multi-Storey Car Park

- 8.27 The application site relates to the area of the CB1 Masterplan which was identified as part of Block B1 on the approved parameter plans. Block B1 was to comprise a multi-storey car park (MSCP) and a retail and office building addressing the new Station Square.

- 8.28 Third-party representations have questioned, in what is a highly sustainable location, the principle of replacing surface level parking with a MSCP. The existing road network at peak times within CB1 – particularly Great Northern Road and its feeder roads - struggles to cope with the volume of traffic attempting to access the Station. The levels of vehicular traffic are a cause for concern for third parties in relation to air quality, noise and disturbance and conflict with pedestrians and cyclists. The applicant proposes mitigation including the provision of EV charging points (25%) within the car park, a new access between Station Road from Station Square (not directly required as a result of B2 and F2 being proposed) and controls over delivery and servicing times. Even with these measures, it is understandable that third parties wish for the opportunity to be taken to reduce car parking levels overall.
- 8.29 However, in terms of principle, the proposal would not introduce any more car parking than at present, representing a re-provision of 206 car parking spaces within a split-level MSCP. The impact of the scheme in this respect is neutral. Policy 21 does not provide any specific guidance regarding car parking levels and there would be no in principle conflict with policy 82 'Parking management'. In fact, the distinct lack of car parking specifically for either the aparthotel or the office block is in the spirit of policies 80 and 82 which support car-free and car capped development where there is good, easily walkable and cyclable access to the city centre and where there is high public transport accessibility. Given the outline application envisaged a 632 multi-storey car park, the proposal for 206 spaces appears reasonable and could not be resisted under the current LP.
- 8.30 Whilst not material planning policy, the applicants have also indicated – as part of part of their amendments to the scheme in April 2019 in response to a Development Control Forum in Jan of that year - 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 applicant's confirm that car parking at the Station as 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. These are matters which are outside of the control of the local planning authority. However, this notwithstanding, the applicants have confirmed that the physical structure of the MSCP is capable of being converted into a cycle park albeit in no way does this potential conversion form part of the planning application before members.

Office and Research and Development (R&D) Uses for Building F2

- 8.31 The provision of an office / R&D block for block F2 aligns with the range of uses envisaged for the Station Area West under policy 21. Third party representations suggest that the block should be used for housing in order to help meet housing need and help build a community within CB1. However, the amount of office space across the Station Area West is not capped by policy 21 and the supporting text to the policy at para. 3.85 allows for flexibility. The applicants suggest that an office use is better suited to the location of block F2. Officers agree, privacy constraints posed by Ravensworth Gardens and F1 properties would mean that officers would not want to introduce residential windows overlooking the gardens and rooms of these properties. This would mean that any rooms from a residential block facing onto the access road would be likely to have to rely on this aspect as the main outlook where future occupants' privacy would be compromised. The view of officers is that a residential use here does pose considerably greater challenges in terms of land use planning and typology layout. An office use is a better fit in this location, providing a greater animation of the access road during the day and being equally compliant with policy 21.
- 8.32 Third party representations suggest that a residential use should attract greater support from the Council because it would help the Council continue to meet its housing needs. However, the office / R&D uses would also be compatible with the Council's employment strategy in this location and help strengthen the existing cluster of companies working within the CB1 masterplan area. Given that the Council has a five-year housing land supply, there is no additional weight that could be attributed to one use over another. Whilst the development of a

larger residential community in this part of the CB1 development is desirable for existing residents in Great Northern Road, this could not contribute towards a reason to resist the proposed office / R&D use.

- 8.33 The applicants recognise that the proposed commercial use for F2 is not compatible with the CB1 Masterplan residential allocation. However, in this respect it is noted that Ceres and the Mill, Vesta and I1 / K1 blocks (now under construction and which were originally commercial blocks earmarked for around 9,500sqm of space) together provide an additional 64 residential units above that allowed for by the outline. The overall amount of residential accommodation has therefore slightly increased over the original CB1 consent, with I1/K1 more than compensating for the loss of residential accommodation originally consented at outline for Block F2. See the below table for breakdown.

Outline Consent	Approvals
Up to 331 residential units	11/0633/REM Ceres and the Mill: 169 residential units
	13/1034/REM Vesta: 137 residential units
	15/1759/FUL I1 and K1: 89 residential units
	Total approved 395 dwellings (+64 above outline)

- 8.34 With the above factors in mind, there are no grounds to resist the B1a / B1b uses proposed for block F2.

Other Land Use Matters

- 8.35 Third-party representations state that the land subject to block B2 should be subject to increased cycle parking provision. A franchise obligation by the Department of Transport for Abellio / Greater Anglia for an extra 1,000 cycle parking spaces is quoted. Third parties suggest the extra cycle parking should be implemented in place of the MSCP in the absence of any other plans as to where these should go.
- 8.36 The franchise agreement is not planning policy. The existing cycle parking provision exceeds that envisaged as part of the outline (2,812 outline, 2,850 granted under 12/1622/FUL). From a recent inspection of Cycle Point, the upper level is underused

and has capacity for increased usage. South Petersfield RA suggests in any event that the franchise agreement has been derogated by the Department for Transport. Be that as it may, there is no adopted planning policy hook that can be utilised to resist the MSCP on the grounds that it should be provide additional cycle parking. Third parties also suggest that the car park should be designed to be converted for cycle parking. There is no policy basis to require a demonstration of this albeit the applicants have suggested that this would be possible and have issued an indicative plan to officers showing this.

- 8.37 Other matters raised by third parties include the lack of existing off-gauge cycle parking facilities and poor security arrangements within Cycle Point. These are existing issues not arising from the planning application before members. There are alternative means by which the Council can explore with Greater Anglia improvements to this facility and these are ongoing.

Conclusion

- 8.38 The mix of uses proposed is compatible with the range of uses permitted within the wider CB1, M14 West allocation area. The proposal would make the efficient re-use of previously developed urban land, concentrating development in an accessible location close the railway station and transport interchange consistent with the NPPF para. 102(b). The range of uses is entirely acceptable and accords with policies 1, 2, 5, 21, 77, 80 and 82 of the LP. The proposal would not be contrary to Station Area Development Framework (2004) which supports mixed use, high quality development with the provision of an increase in existing office (B1a) and which acknowledges that hotel uses (Class C1) within this area would be a complementary land use.

New Access and Alternatives

- 8.39 The proposal includes a new access from Station Road into Station Square. The access would be located in the south western corner of the square and would contain a raised table and central island feature with separate in and out lanes.
- 8.40 The impacts of the new access were assessed in section 9 of the Transport Assessment dated August 2018 and the capacity

of the access modelled for taxis. The applicant's modelling demonstrates that the access configuration would likely retain a good flow of pedestrians in and out of the station, whilst remaining within capacity for taxis, meaning that there is unlikely to be a queue of taxis on Station Road.

8.41 The applicants have undertaken a Road Safety Audit for the new access and this has led to a designer's response and subsequent amendments to the plans to address issues such as signage, monitoring and management of the access, positioning of bollards and the positioning of drainage gullies. The new access has also been subject to vehicle tracking.

8.42 The impact with and without the new access has also been assessed by the applicant's transport consultants. Their assessment has assumed a completion date of the scheme of 2022 and has assumed base-line traffic growth and growth of rail passenger numbers of 5.7% per annum. It assesses AM and PM peak period impacts in both scenarios.

8.43 The applicant's January 2020 TA addendum summarises:

'Without the Station Road taxi access in place, the distribution of taxis on the highway network would remain as existing, with taxis travelling via Great Northern Road to reach the Station drop-off/ pick-up. Block B2/F2 development is expected to result in a marginal increase in flows on Great Northern Road of 2% (10 two-way flows) and 1% (7 two-way flows) during the AM and PM Peaks respectively. The increases in traffic flows associated with the B2/F2 development are considered to be minimal and are comparable to daily variations in traffic flows within Cambridge.

With the proposed Station Road taxi access in place, taxis would redistribute via Station Road in order to access Station Square. This would lead to a 17% reduction in two-way flows on the Great Northern Road in the AM peak, and a 33% reduction in the PM peak¹. The introduction of the Station Road taxi access would result in an increase in traffic flows primarily on Station Road east of the junction with Tenison Road. This section of Station Road is currently only used by vehicles for access to the existing and proposed CB1 blocks and by buses using the bus interchange, and it should be recognised that

these are redistributed trips rather than new trips on the network.'

(Note 1: The applicants have clarified that this anticipated reduction relates to licenced Hackney Carriages authorised to use the designated taxi rank in Station Square by Abellio Greater Anglia).

- 8.44 The outcome of the TA and its associated addendum has been assessed and accepted by the County Council Transport Team. The safety of the proposed access has also been assessed by the County Council Highways Engineer. The advice is that the application be refused in its present format on the grounds of highway safety. The Highways Engineer states that at present, with no access, the flow of pedestrians is unhindered and reducing this, through the provision on the access, is an unacceptable impact on the most vulnerable highway user i.e. the pedestrian. The proposed new access is stated by the Highways Engineer as an unacceptable inversion of the Nationally agreed user hierarchy. The advice from the Highways Engineer is that the impacts of B2 and F2 on Great Northern Road do not necessitate the creation of the new access but is an attempt to resolve an existing problem.
- 8.45 Third party representations raise similar issues to the Highways Engineer, with many representations stating that with background vehicular growth, the benefits of the new access would be quickly cancelled out. There is no reason to disagree with such an assessment, there may be some short-term benefits to residents of Great Northern Road but assuming growth in CB1 rail passengers continues, the benefits of freeing up road-space is likely to only be short-lived. These wider trends and impacts are of course outside of the control of the applicant with the solutions for mitigation resting more squarely with the GCP, Combined Authority, County and City Councils.
- 8.46 The difficulty for members in reaching a decision on the access is that the need for it does not arise from the development of blocks B2 and F2. The application is car parking neutral and any additional vehicular movements generated by the aparthotel and office block are minimal and could not support a reason to refuse the proposal. The NPPF suggests at para. 109 that:

'development should only be prevented or refused on highways grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or the residual cumulative impacts on the road network would be severe'.

- 8.47 Access to blocks B2 and F2 was always envisaged as part of the outline application to be from Great Northern Road and a Planning Inspector would be likely to take a critical view - as per the appeal decision (Appendix 2) - if the Council sought to resist access from Great Northern Road entirely given that it is consistent with the outline consent.
- 8.48 The proposed access should be considered within this context and the officer view is that the environmental benefits - albeit potentially only short lived – could be considered sufficient to support the new access if Members so choose. This is a finely balanced issue. The control over the timing of delivery, final design, signage, ANPR monitoring and enforcement and on-going impact through a monitor and manage approach are set out as part of proposed conditions 6 (Phasing Plan) and 7 (Station Road Access).
- 8.49 The monitor and manage approach could include surveys before and after construction of the new access at key junctions / streets in and around the CB1 area which would be summarised within a technical report. The findings of the report could be reviewed by key stakeholders including the City Council and County Council and the management of the access altered to address issues / respond to opportunities. The monitor and manage approach could be secured so that such surveys are carried out yearly for a time limited period into the future.
- 8.50 Through a monitor and manage approach and in accepting an inversion of the user hierarchy, the Council would have the ability to consider the extent of control over the use and management of the access. The suggested approach is flexible. Officers recommendation on this aspect of the proposal is neutral because:
- there would clearly be benefits in reducing the % share of licenced HC taxis using Great Northern Road on residents of Great Northern Road in terms of noise and pollution;

- there is the ability to monitor, manage and review use of the new access;
- the removal of a % share of taxis using Great Northern Road would help reduce queuing on GNR and backing-up from the Square and conflict at the mini-roundabout which currently occurs.

8.51 It is left open for members to determine the most appropriate course of action balancing the potential benefits / disbenefits of the access against its non-provision.

8.52 In line with County Transport advice, a condition is also in respect of a feasibility study for the provision of additional bus stops on Station Road to help improve the travel distance for bus passengers (see condition 8). Travel plan conditions for each building (see 45 and 73) are also proposed. Subject to these conditions, the proposal accords with policy 81.

No New Access Alternatives

8.53 In the event that members wish to approve the proposal for B2 and F2 but consider the new access cannot be supported, the applicants suggest that a contribution of £500,000 is made towards the alternative enhanced management of the Station Square. A range of possible measures is proposed, and these are assessed below and in the concluding paragraphs of this report. The applicants have confirmed that in such a scenario the new access would be formally removed from the description of development.

8.54 A number of these solutions have been subject to criticism from third parties, such as the introduction of drop-off parking charges resulting in drop-offs occurring elsewhere on surrounding streets, that alternative solutions such as routes for cyclists have not been costed or that particular measures are beyond the control of the applicant.

8.55 Officers agree with many of the third-party concerns. Some of the possible alternative solutions would require separate planning permission and these would have to be justified just

like any other planning application. Such a process is dependent on the applicant's ongoing willingness to engage in finding solutions for Station Square, they do not arise directly through this application but through impacts generated from the outline permission and associated permissions which the Council has endorsed.

Context of Site, Design, External Spaces and Heritage

- 8.56 The proposed blocks B2 and F2 have the support of the Council's Urban Design and Conservation Team and have been subject to extensive discussion and revision prior to and during the application.
- 8.57 The design composition of both blocks relates to the wider CB1 family, and this is reflected in the elevational composition of the units and use of materials for e.g. artificial stone banding. In particular, the visual impact of the aparthotel block when viewed from the conservation area to the north would be set behind the Carter bridge and be lessened by its curved NE corner and set-back top floor. Together with the curved end to F2 opposite, as a pair, the buildings would provide a gateway into the CB1 development, with an improved appearance to the public realm from Devonshire Road. The applicants have amended the design of the public realm and landscaping interface with Devonshire Road (in their April 2019 submission following a DCF in Jan 19) to address landscaping and third-party concerns whilst also removing the proposed construction access from this point (see proposed condition 9).
- 8.58 Both buildings would have active frontages onto the access road, with vehicular access and egress into the MSCP positioned on the northern and southern sides of block B2. This arrangement has freed up the western elevation onto the access road to incorporate the glazed and activated atrium space. For F2, the façade is broken up with the use of different brick types and fenestration detailing. Both buildings deliver high quality designs.
- 8.59 B2 would be approximately 19m to the top of the uppermost occupied storey and 21m to the top of its plant enclosure. It would appear equivalent in height to the Ibis / Cycle Point building, which itself is marginally higher than the outline

parameter. The approved CB1 Masterplan allowed for a total height including plant for B1 of 20m. B2 is marginally closer to Carter bridge than allowed for through the outline consent because of the break in buildings between B1 and B2. The marginally extended footprint is of little / no consequence in terms of visual impact from Devonshire Road and is more than compensated for by the large upper level 'U' recess in its form and its separation from B1.

8.60 For F2 the majority (2/3rds) of this block is 3-storeys in height, stepping down to this height where adjacent to Ravensworth Garden properties. Its three-storey height would be 9.6m, its four-storey occupied height would be 12.8m aligning itself with the boundary and height of F1. The plant for F2 would bring the total height above ground level to 14.7m. Note this part of F2 has been amended since the application was registered to remove an upper floor on the corner facing Station Square. The approved CB1 Masterplan allowed for total heights including plant of 11m (adjacent to Ravensworth) and 17m (adjacent to F1).

8.61 As is shown in the table below, the proposed heights are consistent with those set at the outline stage. For F2, the heights are generally lower and, combined with a more recessive footprint, provide a betterment over the outline in terms of the outlook from and impact on Ravensworth Gardens and F1 properties (discussed later in the report). For B2, the maximum parameter plan height is breached by just over 1m, however, the areas of plant are substantially recessed from the front and sides of the building. The height of the building would align with B1 (Cycle Point) and would be significantly mitigated by the large 'U' shaped cut-out in its middle. The plant would not be readily visible from nearby.

Table 1

Building	Approved Outline Parameter			-Proposed Height (18/1678/FUL)
	Max Building Height	Max Plant Height	Total	
F2	-9m adjacent to Ravensworth Gardens	2m	11m	9.6m (no plant)
	-15m height	2m	17m	12.8m (14.8

	adjacent to F1			with plant)
B1 (B2)	-18m unbroken	2m	20m	18.9m (21.2 with plant)

8.62 The palette of materials for the new street compliments those used elsewhere in Station Square (conservation kerbs and paving setts, benches, tree planting, granite setts for ramps / crossings points, permeable paving) and will help visually connect the spaces. This is an entirely reasonable approach to take, rather than propose a segregated cycleway suggested by third parties. Mindful of the advice of the Design and Conservation Panel and that of colleagues in Urban Design and Conservation, officers recommended design conditions include for the design of the glazed atrium, perforated panels and planting for the raised garden of B2 (see proposed conditions 15 and 46).

Heritage

8.63 The application includes a Heritage Statement which sets out that the proposed Devonshire Quarter will form the northernmost section of the CB1 Masterplan area and will positively contribute to the character and the setting of the nearby Mill Road and New Town and Glisson Road Conservation Areas.

8.64 No heritage concerns have been raised by colleagues in relation to nearby heritage assets, including the setting of Mill Road Conservation Area to the north (defined by Devonshire Road), New Town and Glisson Road Conservation Area or the setting of the listed station building. Officers agree that the impact of the scheme would be positive. In particular, the existing public realm in the area of B2 and F2 is poor. A vast swathe of car parking is to be relocated within a purpose designed building, a new street created and animated by adjacent uses. The public realm will be landscaped and finished to tie into the existing Station Square design and appearance. The proposed scale of the buildings is appropriate and they both invite pedestrians and cyclists into the site through their curved facades facing towards and softening the appearance from Devonshire Road. Part of the curved wall facing Devonshire Road is proposed to accommodate public art.

Condition 16 seeks to secure a public art strategy for this building in accordance with LP policy 56 and the Public Art SPD 2010.

- 8.65 The application is accompanied by an Archaeological Assessment. This concludes that given the paucity of remains that have thus far been recovered throughout CB1's fieldwork-evaluation stages, the archaeological potential of both buildings B2 and F2 is low. The area occupied by B2 and F2 was extensively utilised for railway sidings and associated structures during the 19th and early 20th centuries. No further archaeological investigation is warranted.
- 8.66 Overall, the proposals will help provide a sense of completion to this part of the CB1 development and would improve the setting of adjacent conservation areas and heritage assets.
- 8.67 The proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2018) policies 55, 56, 57, 59, 60 and 61.

Carbon Reduction and Sustainable Design

- 8.68 Policy 28 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2018) requires:
- Submission of a Sustainability Statement
 - A requirement for new non-residential development to meet the BREEAM 'excellent' standard as a minimum; and
 - A requirement for maximum credits related to the Wat 01 (water consumption) to be achieved.
- 8.69 The Sustainability Statement submitted by the applicant outlines the approach that has been taken to integrating the principles of sustainable design and construction including:
- Achievement of BREEAM 'excellent' for both buildings, with the hotel having a predicted score of 74.6% and the office 76.0%. This provides a reasonable buffer of credits against the minimum score required for BREEAM excellent;
 - Proposals for green roofs on both the B2 and F2 buildings, which meets the requirement for all flat roofs to be green or

brown roofs contained in policy 31 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2018).

- Submission of a thermal comfort report which assesses the risk of overheating for both the hotel and the office space. Solar control glazing is proposed to help limit internal solar gains.
- Proposals for a hierarchical approach to reducing energy demand and associated carbon emissions, with the Energy Strategy highlighting that the scheme delivers a 31.5% reduction in carbon emissions over the Part L 2013 baseline. In terms of renewable and low carbon energy, the strategy involves the use of gas fired CHP and air source heat pumps for the hotel and air source heat pumps for the office building. Emissions standards are to be secured for the gas CHP to ensure that it does not impact on air quality (see condition 24).
- 3 out of a possible 5 credits under Wat 01, which equates to a 40% reduction in water use.

8.70 The Council's Sustainability Officer originally queried whether any of the spaces within the proposed MSCP would have electric vehicle charging infrastructure. The applicant's additional commitments in Jan 20 confirm the provision of 25% of spaces within the MSCP to be provided as EV charging spaces. The EV spaces to be secured would be 3kW 'trickle charge', which is considered to be an appropriate solution for a station car park. The remaining spaces are to be future proofed through the provision of ducts and service risers to allow the future installation of EV charging points to other spaces. This provision is secured through proposed condition 23 in line with EH advice.

8.71 The Council's Sustainability officer also requested further clarification as to whether it would be feasible and viable for maximum water efficiency credits to be achieved. The applicants subsequently submitted a Rainwater and Greywater feasibility study which concluded that further credits were not viable. For B2, rainwater harvesting and greywater systems were considered and rejected because of low yields associated with the proposed green roofs and higher building height

requirements. For F2, similar issues arise with a lower yield for greywater recycling (1% of annual demand) making this unviable. The Sustainability officer agrees with the findings of these reports and supports the proposal.

- 8.72 The approach to sustainability is supported by the Council Sustainability Officer. The applicants have suitably addressed the issue of sustainability and renewable energy and, subject to conditions (see conditions 42-44 and 70-72, the proposal accords with Cambridge Local Plan (2018) policy 28 and the Greater Cambridge Sustainable Design and Construction SPD Jan 2020.

Integrated Water Management and Flood Risk

- 8.73 There are no surface watercourses on site and the site is located in Flood Zone 1 (low probability of flooding). The site is currently hard surfaced and 100% impermeable. Existing water discharge is uncontrolled and untreated. The supporting Drainage Strategy confirms that, due to previous land uses and contamination, it is not feasible to drain surface water to the ground via infiltration. This is accepted by both the City Council's Sustainable Drainage Officer and the Local Lead Flood Authority.
- 8.74 Surface water from building F2 is proposed to drain to the Devonshire Quarter surface water drainage network and storage cells in the associated open spaces of CB1. Surface water from building B2 is proposed to drain to the Anglian Water public drainage network running through Station Square to Station Road.
- 8.75 A SUDS drainage strategy has been developed by the applicants and revised to accord with officer advice in January and February of this year. The proposal allows for significant betterment over the existing surface water drainage regime and flow rates. Both blocks F2 and B2 incorporate green roofs, taking up 30% and 20% of roof space respectively. The green roofs will help attenuate the rate of run off and peak flows, intercepting the first 5mm of rainwater, whilst also providing ecological and thermal benefits to the buildings. The scheme also includes permeable paving, impermeable paving draining to tree pits, geo-cellular attenuation tanks (located underneath B2), vortex flow control devices (controlling flow rates), a petrol

interceptor (helping treat the quality of the water) and below ground drainage infrastructure. Peak run-off rates are proposed to be reduced from 221 l/s (litres per second) from the existing site to 5 l/s for F2, 5 l/s for B2 and 15 l/s for the remaining car park to the north. These combine to reduce overall flows from 221 l/s to 25 l/s, almost a tenfold decrease in flow rates. This is a significant betterment given the existing brownfield site.

- 8.76 The drainage strategy is supported by both the City Council's Sustainable Drainage Officer and the Local Lead Flood Authority subject to conditions (see proposed conditions 19 and 50) securing its final design and details of the green roofs.
- 8.77 The applicants have suitably addressed the issues of water management and flood risk, and the proposal is in accordance with Cambridge Local Plan (2018) policies 28, 31 and 32.

Residential Amenity

Sunlight, Daylight, Overshadowing

- 8.78 The applicant's consultants Mott MacDonald submitted a revised sunlight, daylight and overshadowing report as part of their February 2020 submission following amendments to the design of building F2, which involved revisions to the roof structure of F2 to provide a mansard roof to the upper western side of the building and amendments which have removed the upper storey of F2 facing onto Station Square.
- 8.79 The report assesses the relative impact of the scheme - on the terrace of five Ravensworth Gardens houses (nos. 39-43 south to north) + those perpendicular to F2 (44-45 east to west) and all F1 apartments which adjoin the site. The report compares the parameters of a building allowed under the CB1 masterplan for the F2 block against the impact of the detailed scheme now proposed.
- 8.80 Occupiers of these properties have raised objections in terms of loss of daylight and sunlight into apartments and overshadowing of external gardens and courts.
- 8.81 As set out in table 1 (para. 8.62) above, for the outline permission, block F2 on the approved parameter plans showed

a height of 15m for a building contiguous with the boundary of F1, stepping down to 9m towards Carter Bridge adjacent to Ravensworth Garden properties. An additional 2m in height was also provided for plant enclosure, to be set back from the edge of the building. The approved parameter plans show the footprint and building edge for block F2 running parallel and close to the boundary of the gardens and private court of the adjacent residential properties, effectively enclosing the courtyard of F1 and enclosing the gardens and outlook from Ravensworth Gardens looking eastwards. The physical constraints which led to the parameters being set for the outline permission have not changed. The key material change is that F1 has been built and is occupied and other parts of CB1 have developed out. The occupation of F1 has meant that residents have become used to their existing amenity albeit many would have been aware, prior to occupation, that block F2 was allocated for development.

- 8.82 As set out in table 1 (para. 8.62), the proposed heights of F2 are lower than those that were allowed for under the outline permission. The proposed heights of 12.8m and 9.6m align with the existing heights of F1 and Ravensworth Gardens properties respectively. Furthermore, rather than the rear facade aligning directly with and adjacent to the backs of Ravensworth Gardens, the rear façade of F2 is cut back and away from the edge of these gardens by approximately 4.4m and is further mitigated with the inclusion of a mansard roof at its uppermost level and at a lower level with a planted cantilevered ground floor roof. The inclusion of the mansard formed part of the January 20 amendments.
- 8.83 Officers have visited properties within F1 and Ravensworth Gardens. The rear gardens to Ravensworth properties are approximately 11.5m long. These are accessed via patio doors from living room and dining room spaces. Bedrooms are located on the upper floors. The outlook from these properties is east facing and relatively open, mainly over the station car park but also with the Cycle Point / IBIS hotel building partially in view.
- 8.84 The apartments within F1 face onto a rectangular private courtyard space and are typically arranged with floor to ceiling glazed bedrooms and study rooms facing onto the courtyard. Within F1, main living room spaces and their associated

balconies face outwards towards Great Northern Road to the south or open space to the west and the living room spaces are largely unaffected by the proposal. The rear outlook is east and north facing for the occupiers of these properties towards the Cycle Point / IBIS hotel building or over the station car park towards Carter Bridge.

- 8.85 The daylight and sunlight assessment submitted by the applicants has been carried out in accordance with the BRE guidance. In terms of the overall impact, the study concludes:

'The impact assessment has indicated that the overall impact on daylight and sunlight availability of the proposed F2 development of the CB1 masterplan on the F1 building (Building C) and the adjacent potentially affected residential properties on Ravensworth Gardens (Buildings A and B) is not likely to be noticeable as compared to the impact of the massing of building F2 as it appeared on the Outline Planning Application (2008).'

In fact, it is deemed that the results obtained indicate that the currently proposed massing of Building F2 overall performs better with regards to the impact on the diffuse daylighting (total amount of skylight and daylighting distribution) and sunlight availability of the existing assessed residential receptors as compared to either the previous massing proposals or the outline planning application massing.'

- 8.86 In terms of the impact on sunlight to gardens and courtyards, the results of the daylight and sunlight assessment indicate that none of the studied gardens and open spaces are expected to suffer any loss of sunlight as compared to the 'outline planning scenario'. The study concludes that:

'In fact, results obtained indicate that the proposed massing of Block F2 will improve sunlight availability for the gardens of the Ravensworth Gardens studied residential properties as well as the block F1 ground floor courtyard, as compared to the massing of Building F2 as it appeared on the Outline Planning Application in 2008. This is due to the fact that from the 1st floor up the proposed massing of F2 is slightly recessed on the façade opposite the studied gardens as compared to the F2 massing as it appeared on the Outline Planning Application, allowing for greater access of sunlight to the adjacent directly

opposite gardens when the sun is at a higher position.’ (para 3.3).

8.87 The results of the study notwithstanding, the courtyard of F1 will receive a low percentage of direct sunlight for 2 hours on 21 March (1.1%). This is mainly because it would be enclosed on three of its sides and would be north facing (as envisaged by the outline application). In fact, none of the courtyard spaces or gardens of F1 or Ravensworth Garden properties which face east would receive above 50% of direct sunlight for 2 hours on the 21 March, either in the outline or the proposed scenario (see table 2). The proposed scheme and its outline counterpart both fail this part of the BRE guidelines.

Table 2

Property	Percentage of garden / courtyard receiving at least 2 hours of sunlight			
	Outline 21 March	Proposed 21 March	Outline 21 June	Proposed 21 June
F1 courtyard	0.9%	1.1%	65.0%	65.7%
Garden of no. 39	10.0%	13.1%	82.5%	88.1%
Garden of no. 40	13.5%	19.3%	80.0%	86.5%
Garden of no. 41	27.9%	31.6%	80.8%	87.0%
Garden of no. 42	28.1%	33.7%	80.7%	86.9%
Garden of no. 43	38.5%	43.4%	81.9%	87.9%

8.88 The results improve (as shown in table 2 above) as one might expect in the height of summer when associated gardens would be most in use with the 50% value exceeded in both the outline and proposed scenarios on 21 June.

8.89 As stated above, the daylight and sunlight study does not provide an assessment against existing levels of daylight and sunlight because it is measured against the outline permission

which provides the baseline for the assessment. Whilst no longer extant, the outline permission for CB1 and its associated parameters remains a strong material consideration and in officers' view it is reasonable to assess the impact of F2 against what was allowed for under the outline (see policy 21, supporting text para.3.85 '*Development should be carried out in accordance with the masterplan and parameters established by the outline permission*'). To do otherwise would be inconsistent of the Council in its approach to the assessment of the development in what is a sustainable location and where the physical constraints have not altered.

- 8.90 The concerns of existing residents in F1 are noted. Residents have become accustomed to their existing outlook and daylight / sunlight levels. This is, in part, due to the phasing of the scheme which has resulted in apartment block F1 being built prior to building F2. This has resulted in a greater perceived impact on residential amenity than what would have occurred if both F1 and F2 had been built out and occupied together. This notwithstanding, many of the existing residents of F1 should have been aware of the plans for CB1 and for an additional building to be constructed (F2). It is unrealistic to think that F2 would not come forward for development, particularly in such a sustainable urban location where the land has been earmarked for development under an historic outline permission and allocated for development under the current (2018) and previous (2016) Local Plans.

Enclosure

- 8.91 Officers have visited both properties within Ravensworth Gardens and F1. It is apparent that the outlook from windows in these properties and from their associated gardens and courtyard spaces would be significantly more enclosed than at present. For all properties, officers are of the view that the extent of enclosure is not as significant as it would have been had the outline parameters been followed. The amendments to F2 to cut back its upper floors, angle the roof and landscape a cantilevered (lower) roof have helped mitigate the visual impact of the building. The height of F2 aligns with the height of building F1 and steps down to align with the ridge height of the Ravensworth Gardens properties.

8.92 It is not unreasonable to conclude that a 3-storey building should be accommodated on the F2 plot given the outline parameters and because the site is allocated for development in the local plan. This is an urban location where building densities are expected to be high to make the most efficient use of brownfield land. Most adjacent residents will have been aware of the approved outline proposals and that the land is earmarked for development. As such, the extent of enclosure to the affected properties, whilst significant, is acceptable given the history and context of the site.

Privacy

8.93 The proposal includes office windows facing towards Ravensworth Gardens and F1. The submitted plans indicate that 19 of the windows would be treated with an internal fixed louvre to ensure that views out are directed upwards and do not infringe on residential privacy. Officers are of the view that it is necessary that marginally more windows in the western elevation either side of the indicated cluster on the plans should be treated in order to reduce oblique overlooking. Condition 48 is recommended accordingly.

Environmental Impacts

Air Quality

8.94 The development site represents an intensification of use within the air quality management area (AQMA) on a site which is allocated for development. The application is accompanied by an Air Quality Assessment which was updated in January 20 and which is the subject of the latest advice from Environmental Health.

8.95 As set out as part of the proposal, the application will not lead to an increase in car parking spaces on the site and average measured levels of nitrogen dioxide within the CB1 area are currently below national air quality objective levels. The Council's Environmental Health team indicate that additional vehicle servicing movements associated with the hotel and office uses do not alter their recommendations regarding air quality.

- 8.96 Environmental Health recognise that the alternative access option onto Station Square for taxis is to partially alleviate congestion, noise and air quality issues on Great Northern Road and that should the access to Station Square remain unchanged with access via Great Northern Road maintained as it is, the proposed development will result in increases in AM and PM peak two ways flows of 2% and 1% respectively. Conversely, should the proposed Station Square taxi access proposal be implemented, redistributing taxis from Great Northern Road onto Station Road, a reduction in AM and PM peak two ways flows of 17% and 33% respectively are predicted.
- 8.97 Shifting vehicle emissions away from sensitive residential receptors, such as Great Northern Road and redistributing these to Station Road - where monitored levels are lower – is supported by colleagues in Environmental Health. Station Road has a wider street to encourage better [pollution] dispersion and has fewer sensitive residential receptors.
- 8.98 The Air Quality Assessment concludes that under both scenarios (with and without the new access onto Station Road) the proposed development will not lead to a breach in objective levels within the AQMA. Environmental Health colleagues agree with this conclusion subject to mitigation in form of EV charge points within MSCP. A condition is also recommended in respect of the proposed combined heat and power (CHP) system for the hotel, to ensure that any gas fired appliances are low Nitrogen Oxide emission technology.
- 8.99 The applicants confirm the provision of 25% active slow EV charge points within the MSCP. These would have a minimum power rating output of 3kW in line with guidance and best practice. The remaining car parking spaces would have passive provision in the form of ducts and service risers. As most car park users would park their cars for longer periods of time in this car park, the provision of 25% slow active EV charge points is considered acceptable. This is secured by way of proposed condition 23. On this basis no objection on air quality grounds is raised by the Council's Environmental Health team.
- 8.100 Whilst officers are conscious of the third-party concerns regarding the perceived limited benefit of the new access

because of future continued growth (5.7% p/a) in passenger numbers using the station, vehicular background growth is beyond the control of the applicants. The provision of the new access from Station Road does not arise as a direct consequence of this proposal, yet it would be of benefit to residents of Great Northern Road, even if only felt in the short term. It is for the Councils and their delivery partners to devise and implement strategic sustainable transport solutions for travel to and from the Station, not the applicants. Whilst the concerns of the residents of Great Northern Road are understood, as highlighted by the Inspector in the recent appeal regarding noise attenuation to their balconies, the outline permission *'established the parameters for the Station Area Redevelopment scheme which included use of Great Northern Road as the primary means of access to the station'*. It would therefore be unreasonable to resist the application on the basis that access to the proposed hotel and new office space is from Great Northern Road.

- 8.101 Subject to the conditions recommended by Environmental Health, the proposal accords with Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policy 36; no adverse effect on air quality in the air quality management area would arise.

Taxi Waiting

- 8.102 Environmental Health and third parties have queried where Taxis would wait when the taxi rank 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 for the hotel. As a result of the proposal, there is therefore the potential for waiting taxis to be shifted onto surrounding streets. This could impact on local air quality. Whilst this issue has been raised with the applicant, no mitigation plans for this are put forward. The applicants state:

'there has been an informal arrangement in place for some time which has utilised the surface car park owned by National Rail adjacent to the station. It has always been part of the CB1 proposals since the original 2010 Outline Planning Permission to build on the majority of that surface car park which is precisely what we are doing now. The arrangement you refer to exists as we had an undeveloped phase of CB1 which

temporarily allowed for this informal arrangement – it was never intended nor was it ever conditioned that this would be a permanent arrangement.’

- 8.103 An informative (see penultimate informative) is recommended for the applicants to work with the Councils and taxi companies to see if a solution can be found.

Environmental Construction and Operational Impacts

- 8.104 The application is accompanied by an Acoustic Planning Report (Noise and Vibration Assessment) which has been assessed by Environmental Health. This sets noise levels for fixed plant and/or machinery.
- 8.105 Conditions 3, 4 and 5 are proposed to ensure construction and delivery hours, Separate conditions for each block are also proposed in respect of piling, plant noise levels, dust and control of the emergency back-up generators, the approval of a noise insulation scheme for plant and plant design and location for odour filtration. Condition 5, as suggested by the Highways Authority, specifically seeks to limit the times of construction and muck away lorries of 3.5 tonnes or greater to between 9.30am and 3.30am unless in specified circumstances.
- 8.106 Conditions are also recommended in respect of delivery hours for servicing and collections, a noise insulation scheme for a proposed waste compactor and an artificial lighting scheme.
- 8.107 The application originally included construction access from Devonshire Road. The applicants amended the application in April 2019 following a DCF to remove this from the scheme. Construction access is now proposed via Great Northern Road. Proposed condition 6 seeks to secure a phasing plan detailing the sequence of delivery of the key buildings, the location of temporary buildings / compounds for construction purposes and provisions for pedestrians and cyclists during construction. It is likely that building B2 is to be constructed first, followed by F2 and then the public realm completed and finished. Condition 6 seeks to secure the completion of the final approved public realm provisions no later than 50% occupation of F2.

- 8.108 The application is accompanied by an Operational Waste Management Strategy. Storage space for bins has been calculated according to anticipated demand for the uses and space set aside within the footprint of both buildings. For building B2, space is to be set aside adjacent to the access gap between the Cyclepoint / Ibis Hotel. Refuse vehicles would reverse into the access gap to collect the waste and this has been modelled and tracked. For F2, this building has a side access from a refuse storage area located in the SW corner of the building. Bins would be wheeled onto Great Northern Road and around to the front of the building to a delivery bay where refuse would be collected.
- 8.109 Third parties have asked for conditions to control the timing of collection of refuse from the F2 unit and have asked for the refuse area to be relocated so that refuse is moved internally through the building. Commercial waste collections for CB1 are currently provided by Cambridge City Council, Veolia and AmeyCespa amongst others. In the view of officers, requiring refuse to come through an office space or requiring specific amendments to the plans for this sole purpose is unreasonable. However, refuse collection times could be controlled to be within day-time hours. Condition 56 for building F2 is proposed accordingly.
- 8.110 The proposal adequately respects the residential amenity of its neighbours and the constraints of the site and is considered that it is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2018) policies 34, 35, 36, 55, 56 and 57.

Contaminated Land

- 8.111 The application is accompanied by a contaminated land Desk Study. Due to previous uses, the site is highly likely to be affected by both on-site contamination and off-site contamination, with a lengthy and complicated history of former industrial usage. The potential risk to controlled waters is described as high, which is why a surface water infiltration scheme is not achievable.
- 8.112 Further site investigation is to be undertaken. Further detailed information specific to the application site is required and this is

to be secured with the imposition of contaminated land conditions recommended by Environmental Health colleagues.

8.113 Subject to these conditions, the application is in accordance with Cambridge Local Plan policy 33.

Inclusive Access

8.114 The Disability Consultative Panel initially raised concerns about the location of the accessible rooms and layout of the aparthotel. The Councils' Access Officer raised similar issues and provided advice on the internal design of the aparthotel including, signage for the visually impaired, wayfinding, hearing loops at counters, reception desk and door design, fire evacuation lifts and accessible room layout and design. No issues were raised regarding the design of the office building F2.

8.115 The applicants subsequently clarified the location of the accessible rooms as part of amendments in April 2019 (following a Development Control Forum in Jan 2019) and confirmed that Part M of the Building Regulations and British Standards would be met. Five percent of the total number of rooms would be accessible rooms (125 Keys, 6 of which accessible) and the raised courtyard space would be provided with level access. Many of the other matters raised by the consultees are associated with the internal and detailed design of the buildings which are not for the local planning authority to approve. An informative is attached the permission reflecting the advice that has been received. In terms of the car parking within the MSCP, 14 of the 206 car parking spaces are disabled parking and these are located close to the station side entrance and served by a lift.

8.116 The proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2018) policies 56 and 57.

Ecology

8.117 The application is accompanied by an Ecology Report. This identifies the site as being of low ecological value, consisting of hard standing. There are no existing ecological constraints.

8.118 The Ecology Report states that the inclusion of native species planting on blocks F2 and B2 will result in a positive impact on the ecological value, and therefore biodiversity, on site and that the proposal responds to the wider Ecology Conservation Management Plan for the CB1 development by contributing to the habitat linkage, providing feeding, roosting and nesting space for urban bird and bat species and maintains ecological connectivity across the wider CB1 site for species such as bats. Proposed conditions 17 and 47 seek to implement a scheme for the provision of bird and bat boxes in accordance with the recommendations.

8.119 Subject to these conditions, the proposal accords with (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policy 69).

Cycle Parking

8.120 For B2, guest cycle parking for 26 cycles is located within a secure area within the ground floor of the B1 CyclePoint building adjacent to the access road. For staff, secure cycle parking for 8 cycles is provided within the southern side of the building between the B1 and B2 buildings. All of the spaces are to be provided by means of Sheffield hoops. The adopted standard for hotels requires 2 spaces for every 5 members of staff and 2 spaces for every 10 bedrooms. The cycle parking provision for B2 accords with the adopted standards.

8.121 For F2, cycle parking for 162 cycle spaces - comprising 154 spaces plus 8 (5%) off gauge, is proposed. Access would be through a secure access from Great Northern Road. Access to the building is provided through the rear of the building giving direct access to the staff showers and secondary entry to the offices.

8.122 The adopted standard for offices requires 1 space per 30 sqm of gross internal floor area (GIA). The revised floor area of F2 is 4,845sqm GIA requiring 161.5 spaces and thus the level of provision accords with the standard. Condition 74 is recommended to ensure that a detailed cycle parking layout is submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority prior to construction of this building.

8.123 Subject to this condition, the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2018) policy 82.

Third Party Representations

8.124 The main third-party representations have been dealt with in the body of this assessment. A summary response table is set out below.

Topic	Issue	Officer Response
Road and Highways	Impact of additional traffic and associated impacts on Great Northern Road (GNR), Tenison Road and Devonshire Road.	County Transport and Environmental Health consider the impacts acceptable.
	Vehicular traffic will continue to be allowed to dominate GNR which is a residential street.	The function of GNR accords with the outline permission. See appeal findings. The permission would not alter this.
	Vehicular traffic will continue to cause conflict on GNR between pedestrians and cyclists.	This is an existing issue. A zebra crossing is proposed on GNR.
	Narrowing of road to station car park unsafe.	Not raised as a highway safety issue.
	GNR should be closed to vehicular traffic except for residential use.	This would be contrary to the outline permission and is an unreasonable adjustment.
	The Tenison Road / Station Road junction should be signal controlled with safe crossings for pedestrians.	Not requested as direct mitigation by the County. The issue is existing.
	Loss of zebra crossing at the corner of Station Road is not acceptable.	This forms part of an approval plan for implementation.

	The raised table crossing of Station Road south east of the Tenison Road junction is not acceptable.	This is not part of the permission.
	Plans for people to cross Station Road are insufficient.	A zebra crossing forms part of an approval plan for implementation.
Transport Assessment	Transport Assessment figures are not reliable, there are discrepancies in traffic count data.	The applicants responded to these concerns in a technical response to residents on 28/02/2019. No further TA issues have been raised.
	24-hour traffic count data is incorrect.	As above
	Growth in traffic at 5.7% per year will mean the 29% reduction in evening peak traffic will be eliminated in five years.	Noted and covered in assessment. Background traffic growth will happen with or without the development.
	Traffic counts undertaken too long ago.	The TA is accepted by the County.
	The TA underplays traffic impact associated with servicing / deliveries to the proposed business uses.	County Transport has not objected to predicted servicing impacts. The timing is to be controlled via condition.
	The access would not allow for mandatory cycle lanes to be provided down either side of Station Road.	Noted. These do not form part of or arise as a result of the sought proposal.
	The development cannot be justified on the basis that there is no proposal coming forward on the northern side of Carter	The proposal is not justified on this basis. Any application for G1 and G2 would have to be justified on their own merits.

	Bridge (G1, G2).	
	Overdevelopment.	The development broadly complies with the outline parameters and is appropriate for such a central site.
	Lack of green space across CB1.	Existing issue not caused or exacerbated by the proposal.
	Emergency access from Devonshire Road will facilitate the removal of TPO'd trees.	The revised landscaping plans are accepted by landscape officers.
	All decisions should be postponed on CB1 until a new masterplan with car parking and an entrance on the eastern side of the railway line is pursued	Unreasonable requirement. Not related in scale and kind to the proposal.
Car Park (MSCP)	The MSCP encourages motor traffic into a congested area and is contrary to LP policy 80.	Agree. The issue is covered in the assessment. No additional car parking spaces are proposed.
	Preserving car parking nos. does not align with encouraging modal shift away from driving and parking in the City.	Agree.
	Parking capacity has been reduced through the outline; why not reduce capacity further?	The proposal preserves the status quo. No policy requirement for this.
	Removing the surface car park would improve the appearance of B2.	Agree.
	Cambridge Leisure car park should be amalgamated with	This may be desirable to some third parties, but it is not a requirement of policy

	CB1.	or of the application.
	All car parking in CB1 should be removed and replaced on the Clifton Road side of the railway.	Unreasonable requirement. Not supported by policy.
	The need for the car park appears only to be for the short term, this is not planning for the future.	The applicants have confirmed the MSCP is suitable for cycle parking use. If short term demand for the MSCP falls away this may be a future option for the TOC.
	Parking provision only needs to be sufficient for deliveries and for disabled parking.	Adopted policies do not require this. No parking is proposed for the office or aparthotel. Existing parking levels are maintained.
	Will lead to more anti-social behaviour.	Disagree. The access road will be better animated and overlooked. A management plan for the car park is proposed via condition 15 (f).
	The MSCP should provide short-term car parking for existing residents.	This is an existing issue for residents. It is unreasonable to expect the MSCP to cater for this.
Pedestrian	There should be a zebra crossing on Great Northern Road.	This is proposed.
	The footway around the multi-storey car park would be too narrow.	No objection from the Highways Officer. The width is sufficient.
	The access road shared space would result in user conflict and be unsafe (particularly when the Chisholm Trail opens).	No objection from the Highways Officer. Segregated pedestrian paths are proposed. A segregated cycle route would be contrary to the wider public realm design in the Station Area.

	Pedestrians need better protection from cyclists.	As above, segregated cycle routes across CB1 is an existing issue and cannot be resolved through this application.
Cycle	Adjustments to Devonshire Road cycle route link and zebra crossing on Station Road are welcome.	Noted.
	Bulk of cycling comments from DCF not addressed.	Noted.
	Kerb-upstands on the cycle link will create accidents. They should be flush.	No objection from the Highways Officer on highway safety has been provided.
	Franchise obligation for Abellio / Greater Anglia for an extra 1,000 cycle parking spaces should be implemented in place of the carpark.	See officer report. This is not planning policy. Officers are currently working with the TOC to improve the management and security of CyclePoint.
	A solution should be provided to enable better cycle access across Station Square. The new access onto it does not resolve this issue.	See officer report. This is an existing issue. Such a solution does not arise directly from the proposal and is not related in scale and kind. The alternative contribution suggested by the applicants could go towards a solution if it was deliverable but there are no plans before the Council.
	Cyclists travelling south – north would have to cross (turn right) into the new access. This would be a dangerous	The application is not supported by County Highways on the basis of increased conflict at the new access for pedestrians and cyclists.

	manoeuvre.	
	A bidirectional cycle lane should be pursued as per Smarter Cambridge sketch but this would interfere with the footprint of F2.	This is not a requirement arising from the application and is unreasonable in light of the land allocation.
	Station area provision for cyclists, including access to Cycle Point is poor. Proper joined up cycle paths need to be provided for the Station Area, particularly given the proposed plans for the Chisholm Trail.	Agreed, this is an existing problem that requires a strategic solution which does not arise directly from the application for B2 and F2.
	GNR is unusable by cycle. The mini-roundabout at the top of GNR will become more unsafe.	A zebra crossing is proposed at the top of GNR. The new access would shift licenced Hackney traffic away from GNR.
Rail	The station requires a strategic masterplan ahead of any further expansion	This is not a requirement arising from the application and would be disproportionate in scale and kind.
	Support an additional eastern entrance to the Station to mitigate overcrowding.	As above.
	New accesses to the station near platforms 3 and 6 should be provided.	This is not a requirement arising from the application and would be disproportionate in scale and kind.
Buses	Rail service replacement buses would be shifted to local bus stops in	This is an infrequent requirement and does not justify the retention of the land for this use.

	Station Place and disrupt those services.	
	Bus services to the station should be improved.	This is not a requirement arising from the application and would be disproportionate in scale and kind.
	Bus stops around the station should be closer to the entrance than taxis.	See County Council suggested S106 provision for this.
Taxis		
	The taxi rank and pick-up drop-off area should be moved to where Murdoch House currently sits and the area re-landscaped.	This land is proposed as an extension to Station Square. Use for taxis would erode the quality of the space. This is not a direct requirement arising from the application, is an existing issue and the works would be disproportionate in scale and kind.
	The existing taxi rank cover should be extended.	Noted, existing issue.
	Alternative solutions for dealing with unlicensed taxis should be explored.	Noted, this is within the gift of the TOC.
	Taxis currently idle in the station car park.	Noted, this is a private arrangement that is not within the control of the LPA.
	Taxis currently abuse the use of the drop-off / pick-up bays.	Agreed. This is an existing issue that is within the control of the TOC.
	There is no provision to stop taxis continuing to use GNR.	This could form part of a wider monitor and manage approach agreed with the TOC and is covered by proposed condition 7(c).
Amenity		
	Traffic increases will increase noise on GNR	The primary function of GNR is not changed by the

<i>Noise from Traffic</i>	and will mainly be from 7.5 tonne diesel lorries. Deliveries are not currently managed and are often early in the morning and not enforced.	proposal. Delivery times would be controlled by condition. Such provisions are enforceable.
	Noise associated with the bin and bike store for F2 adjacent to residential boundary would cause harm.	To be controlled via condition. The location is acceptable. Discussed in report.
	GNR properties are already exposed to noise levels that are in violation of planning conditions and European recommended levels	See appeal decision outcome and comments of Environmental Health officers. A refusal on this basis could not be justified.
	This is an opportunity to revisit traffic routing and reduce further the use of GNR by vehicles.	The nature of GNR and its function would continue as approved. The proposed new access does not arise as a direct consequence of the development of B2 and F2.
<i>Noise from Hotel Users</i>	Users of the hotel will have no vested interest in the amenity of the existing area or its community. There will be increases in late night noise associated with the hotel use.	This is a mixed-use scheme in a central area of the city. There will be more comings and goings from users of the buildings and some of these associated with the hotel would be later. The access road will be activated by users of F2 and B2 and better overlooked with an improved public realm. Significant harm would not arise.
<i>Air Pollution</i>	Traffic increases from delivery vehicles (most polluting vehicles) will	See Env. Health advice. The proposed mitigation is acceptable.

	increase air pollution on Great Northern Road beyond already exceeded legal limits.	
	Air pollution would be shifted to Station Road where queuing taxis would emit pollution affecting pedestrians and cyclists.	See Env. Health advice. The proposed mitigation is acceptable. Station Road is wider and more capable of dispersing pollutants.
	Canyon effect of design amplifying noise and air pollution.	The footprints and heights of the buildings are consistent with those granted outline pp. No objection is raised by EH on the canyoning effect.
	Air pollution levels would return after 5 years on GNR due to background growth in traffic levels.	This is beyond the control of the applicants and would occur with or without the development.
	Adding more car parking will not address pollution levels	Disagree, the MSCP includes 25% EV charging provision. There is no net increase in parking spaces proposed.
	The car park should have EV charge points.	As above.
<i>Overshadowing</i>	Height of the corner element of F2 is above the outline parameter.	This has been reduced as part of amendments.
	Overshadowing and loss of daylight of rooms and the courtyard of F1.	Discussed in report, paras. 8.79 – 8.94
	Overshadowing and loss of daylight of Ravensworth Gardens (gardens and properties).	Discussed in report, paras. 8.79 – 8.94
<i>Privacy</i>	Privacy impact on residents of F1.	Discussed in report, paras. 8.79 – 8.94
	Privacy impact on	Discussed in report, paras.

	residents of Ravensworth Gardens.	8.79 – 8.94
<i>Enclosure</i>	Will loom over and dominate Devonshire Road properties.	Discussed in report, paras. 8.79 – 8.94
<i>Quality of Life</i>	The development would reduce the quality of life of residents of GNR and users of the area.	Agreed in terms of existing residents. However, all residents of GNR would or should have been aware of the plans for CB1 in purchasing or renting here. The development of F2, its scale and proximity to existing residents should not be unexpected and has been well established for over a decade.
Construction	Construction access from Devonshire Road is unacceptable and would be unsafe.	Removed from plans and description of development as part of amendments.
	Further construction vehicles visiting the area will generate highway safety issues.	The application would be subject to restrictions of large vehicle size movements outside of peak hours.
	Construction work should only be allowed over the weekdays 8am – 6pm and not weekdays.	As above.
	Construction phasing plans should be revised.	Subject to condition
Hotel	No need for a further aparthotel use.	Disagree, the applicants have provided an updated Hotel Needs Assessment. Discussed in report.
	The city is oversupplied with hotels.	As above.

	The hotel needs assessment is out of date.	This has been updated in Jan 20.
	Homestay (AirBnB) is not referred to in the hotel needs assessment	There is no evidence this market would be impacted. The purpose of the planning system is not to hinder competition.
	Hotel investment in Cambridge is declining.	The updated Hotel Needs Assessments demonstrates a continuing market for the aparthotel.
Other	Submitted plans need updating.	This has been undertaken.
	The applicant is not giving an undertaking not to develop G1 and G2.	G1 and G2 are not proposed as part of this scheme. Any proposed for these blocks would have to be justified on their own merits.
	Lost revenue from a MSCP could be replaced with revenue from additional shops and services.	Noted, but this is not what is applied for and members must determine what is before them.
	Greed and profit has overruled the goal of a pleasant, efficient station square.	Not a material consideration.
	The aparthotel should be replaced with social housing	Members must determine what is proposed. The principle of the proposed uses are acceptable.
	Consultation poor	Noted.
	Emergency vehicle access will be made more difficult down GNR.	No objection is raised by Highways on this basis. Increased flows on GNR would be minimal.
	Aldwyck Housing Group not consulted	All owners / occupiers in F2 have been sent letters. Some occupiers have informed Aldwyck directly as per their consultation letter.

	Missed opportunity	Noted.
	Station Road to Station Square should be opened up to traffic prior to construction of B2 and F2.	Works are to be controlled via a phasing plan.
	Devonshire Road cycle and pedestrian route should be opened up prior to construction.	Works for the new access are to be controlled via a phasing plan. The final completed route would need to be finished following construction of B2 and F2 in order that it is not damaged. Temporary route realignment will be necessary. See condition 6 regarding timing of completion.
	Deliveries to Station Square should move to Station Road.	Existing issue not arising from the application.
	Residents needs have been ignored.	Noted.
	Damage caused to sewers and road infrastructure.	Civil matter.
	Existing issues in CB1 are not out of scope for discussion. The development would exacerbate site wide issues.	The need for strategic interventions to address wider existing issues is not a planning requirement arising out of F2 and B2.
	Existing deliveries often take place too early (between 5am – 7am) despite complaints.	Existing issues not arising from the application.
	Estate management by Brookgate is poor.	Noted.
	Character of the area would change the balance of residential vs business/short-term let.	Dealt with in the report under principal land uses. Not accepted.

	Residents' parking should be introduced to GNR.	Existing issue not arising from the application.
Amendments (additional to those above)	Amendments to F2 are welcome but have not overcome issues of overlooking, overshadowing and overbearing on Ravensworth Gardens properties and F1 apartments. .	Noted. Residential impacts are dealt with in the report, paras. 8.79 – 8.94.
	NPPF para 123 does not allow for flexibility for office development.	Para. 123 is not directly applicable. The impact of the building arises from its height & proximity to neighbours and this should be fairly judged against the outline parameters. Residential / office uses of the same scale would have the same physical impact. If F2 was proposed as residential, para.123 would be applicable but it is not and there is no evidence to suggest that F2 was permitted for residential use under the outline on the basis of para.123 or similar policy requirement.
	The alternative commuted sum for a range of interventions for the Station Square is not a detailed proposal. The interventions have not been modelled or costed and the offer is irregular. A number of the proposed	Agreed. Discussed in the committee report.

	interventions would not work.	
	DoT have agreed to derogate Greater Anglia's franchise for a further 1,000 cycle parking at the station. Peak demand will exceed current provision within a few years. It is irresponsible of Greater Anglia and Brookgate to prioritise commercial redevelopment of station land over enhanced and expanded provision for sustainable transport in light of growing passenger nos. at the Station.	Noted. The franchise agreement is not planning policy. There is no planning policy requirement for an expanded Cycle Point.
	Welcome removal of Devonshire Road construction access.	Noted.
	Amendments proposed have not been borne out of discussions with the residents or residents' associations.	Noted.
	Increase in office floorspace unjustified. 20% increase in floorspace	No permanent harm in an uplift in office floorspace has been identified through the provision of a basement.
	Amendments have not addressed traffic, pollution or noise and disturbance concerns. There are existing respiratory issues experienced by residents of GNR.	No objection is raised by Environmental Health. The proposed modelling and mitigation is accepted.

	The Council is only concerned about profit.	Not material and untrue.
	The basement for F2 will involve a greater degree of disturbance, with large nos. of construction traffic required for excavation.	Agreed. Impacts would be temporary and construction management conditions are proposed see conditions 18 and 49. Also see condition 5 re. control over larger construction vehicles >3.5 tonnes
	Supporting technical daylight and sunlight assessment not provided.	Addressed through further submission in Feb 20.
	The developer should demonstrate how the proposal will meet net zero carbon emissions over the lifetime of the development given the declared Climate Emergency.	This is not planning policy.
	The car parking spaces need to remain in order to preserve the openness of the area.	The land is allocated for development, it is not reasonable to suggest this.
	The applicant's offer to review cycle routes through Station Square and to provide £500,000 to remedy problems. This is an admission that the design as implemented is defective.	Noted. The design of Station Square and its use has been approved by the Council. The applicants are unilaterally seeking to help address existing issues through the application for a new access or the proposed alternative contribution.
	The offer of £500,000 is not sufficient to tackle existing issues.	This is likely to be the case. It is not the applicant's sole responsibility or a requirement of B2 and F2. Discussed in concluding paragraphs.
	The new access for CC licenced Hackney	Station Square is in private ownership. The new access

	carriages will not control Ubers or SCDC licenced taxis from using GNR and neither does the taxi licencing policy introduced by Cambridge affect Ubers or SCDC licenced taxis or those from elsewhere. These vehicles would continue to pollute. Taxis could also be allowed to continue to use GNR.	to it can form part of a monitor and manage approach which is reviewed with key stakeholders.
	The number of electric charge points should be increased and they should be arranged in hubs.	The quantum provided has been sought by Environmental Health and subsequently provided by the applicants as part of their Jan 2020 amendments.

Planning Obligations (s106 Agreement)

8.125 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. 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.

8.126 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, and the anticipated transport contribution from parcels F2, B2 and G2, amounting to £35,000. 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.

8.127 As discussed earlier in the report, the proposed new access does not directly arise as a requirement of constructing F2 and B2 buildings for their proposed uses and neither is the alternative contribution of £500,000 necessary in order to grant planning permission. The contribution is not directly related to the development or fairly or reasonably related in scale and kind. If the proposed new access is removed from the description of development because of highway safety concerns, there would be no planning reason to withhold the granting of planning permission if the new access is the only issue for Members. The alternative contribution would be within the developer's gift to offer through a S106 linked to other improvements in Station Square. If any of these other improvements required planning permission, they would have to be separately applied for and determined on their own merits.

8.128 It is officers' view that the planning obligation for £35,000 is proportionate and is necessary, directly related to the development and fair and reasonable in scale and kind and therefore passes the tests set by the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010.

9.0 CONCLUSION

9.1 Given the recommendation, it may be helpful for members to think of this proposal as two separate applications, one for the B2 and F2 buildings and another for the new access. As set out within the report, the development of blocks B2 and F2 does not necessitate the creation of a new access from Station Road. The access is proposed unilaterally by the applicants and its benefits, or by consequence the potential benefits of an alternative financial contribution as offered, should not have any

material bearing on the acceptability of the part of the application which seeks approval for the B2 and F2 buildings.

- 9.2 Whilst the access is not supported in highway safety terms, it would provide an opportunity to improve the residential amenity of those residents of Great Northern Road, both in terms of noise and disturbance but also air quality. These benefits may be short lived given the wider context of increased passenger numbers using the station and policy changes to implement an electric taxi fleet by 2023, but the proposed condition relating to the new access allows for flexibility in how it is to be used, monitored, enforced and reviewed with stakeholder engagement.
- 9.3 The proposed new access does not purport to represent a panacea for all perceived issues associated with the CB1 development. It is unreasonable to suggest there is a wider planning obligation incumbent on the developer and arising out of this development to resolve wider strategic issues perceived by third parties or indeed change Great Northern Road for tertiary residential use only; the function of this road was set by the outline permission and approved by the Council. Growth in passenger numbers using the station or in background traffic growth is not within the applicant's control. Neither are the applicants able to make strategic interventions themselves, these are promoted and led by the Combined Authority and the Greater Cambridge Partnership together with the Councils. It is inevitable that changes in taxi licencing policy to influence low or ultra-low emissions in a move towards an electric fleet will occur. There is also the prospect of the introduction of a clean air zone. Currently the Council is promoting the installation of rapid charge points for vehicles across the City and working with the GCP to reduce bus emissions / provision of electric buses. Wider strategic provisions, such as the completion of the Chisholm Trail, to which Brookgate have contributed £500,000, are in the process of being developed.
- 9.4 It is conceivable that a range of measures, as set out under paragraph 2.23 of this report, could by way of an alternative to the Station Road access, contribute towards the developer offer of £500,000. Yet many of the suggested alternative solutions are less tangible than the physical provision of the new access. Officers agree with third parties that the use of the contribution

towards the introduction of a low emissions zone for the Station Square area or charging for drop-offs and pick-ups (by specified vehicle type) may only shift existing issues into surrounding streets. Furthermore, the introduction of a low emissions zone is not within the control of the applicants.

- 9.5 A review of strategic cycling routes north – south and an implementation of this is likely to significantly exceed £500,000. It would require detailed stakeholder engagement and a costing exercise for different options to be undertaken together with relevant planning permissions gained. It would not be reasonable to withhold planning permission for F2 and B2 on such a basis.
- 9.6 Marshalling of traffic within Station Square would require the TOC consent and on-going revenue funding which a fixed contribution would not secure for the long term. Other suggested improvements in Station Square, such as in wayfinding signage and landscaping to better direct pedestrians to the southern side of Station Road, avoiding the new access, could be examined more closely. Such plans would have to be subject to a wider consultation exercise, have key stakeholder agreement and require separate planning permission. Again, any such works do not arise directly from the proposal for B2 and F2 and it would be unreasonable to withhold planning permission until this was agreed. The wayfinding and landscaping works would have to be pursued separately by the Councils with Brookgate as a willing partner.
- 9.7 Alternative solutions to the access, their rationale and delivery would need a separate planning report – likely in association with a separate planning application. It is for Members, particularly in considering the merits of the new access, to determine the best course of action and planning weight to be attributed to the scenarios as set out.
- 9.8 Turning to the B2 and F2 buildings, their individual designs and associated public realm improvements has involved extensive negotiations with officers. The applicants have made numerous amendments to the buildings to better meet the concerns of officers and third parties. The amendments have included improvements to the landscaping provisions in and around Devonshire Road, the removal of the temporary construction access from Devonshire Road, the reduction in the height of

building F2 on its southern corner and a redesign of its rear façade to improve the impact of the building on the residential amenity of those living in Ravensworth Gardens and on the adjacent F1 building. No formal consultees object to these buildings, either in terms of their design or their sustainability credentials.

9.9 Notwithstanding the evolution of the plans for B2 and F2, third party concerns remain regarding their construction and operational impacts. For F2, the issues arise from the close 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. These parameters are a strong material consideration notwithstanding that the Outline Planning Permission has lapsed.

9.10 Taking all of these factors into account and given that 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, 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.

10.0 RECOMMENDATION

10.1 Committee is invited to approve the application either with or without the new access road featuring as part of the development proposal. Accordingly, your officer's can recommend approval to grant planning permission by reference to only one of the following two options.

OPTION A (inclusion of new access from Station Road)

10.2 Applicable where Committee wishes to secure delivery of the new access from Station Road as part of the development proposal.

APPROVE subject to:

- (3) the prior completion of a s106 Agreement under the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 to secure a planning obligation in the form of a financial contribution of £35,000 for cycle parking within the CB1 precinct; and
- (4) 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 and Vice Chair of Committee.

OPTION B (removal of new access from Station Road)

10.3 Applicable where Committee does not wish to secure delivery of the new access from Station Road as part of the development proposal and in all other respects the Committee is minded to approve the application.

APPROVE subject to:

- (1) the prior completion of a s106 Agreement under the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 to secure a planning obligation in the form of a financial contribution of £35,000 for cycle parking within the CB1 precinct; and
- (2) all references to the proposed new access from Station Road being removed from the development proposal description; and
- (3) the planning conditions contained in Appendix 1 of this report save for the deletion and/or amendment of those conditions which relate to the new access from Station Road; 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 and Vice Chair of Committee; and

Officer Note Option B

If option B is chosen by members, officers would continue to negotiate with relevant parties and to settle the terms and conditions determining how the proposed alternative £500,000 financial contribution would be secured by an appropriate planning obligation providing for improvements to Station Square and its management arrangements. This process is to be carried out independently of the issuing of planning permission under option B.

Appendices

Appendix 1: Proposed conditions

Appendix 2: Appeal decision Great Northern Road

Appendix 3: D&C Panel Minutes 11 April 18

Appendix 4: Development Control Forum Minutes 16 January 2019