

COMMENTS FROM SOUTH PETERSFIELD RESIDENTS ASSOCIATION**APPLICANT RESPONSE**

There remain concerns about the height and massing of B2 in relation to Devonshire Road, Devonshire Mews and the Mill Road Conservation Area. Residents of Devonshire Road do not feel that the changes made since the previous application adequately address the second reason for refusal:

By virtue of the scale, massing and footprint of building B2 in close proximity to Carter Bridge and in regard of views from Devonshire Road, the proposed building would appear visually cramped, overly prominent and detract from the character and appearance of the existing area and setting of the adjacent Mill Road Conservation Area. The proposal is therefore contrary to policies 55, 56, 57 and 61 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2018) and NPPF (February 2019) paragraphs 124 and 196.

The footprint of B2 still extends seven metres north beyond the footprint of the outline planning consent (see figure 8). The applicant accepted the need to reduce the height of F2 significantly at the Devonshire Road end to avoid creating an overbearing edifice. However, it has made only small concessions in relation to B2, pulling it back 4.5m and stepping the top floor back. The edifice of B2 seen from the corner of Devonshire Road (excluding the top floor and plant) is still 16m high, 6m higher than the edifice of F2 (see figure 9).

Has the applicant modelled wind tunnel and microclimate effects of B2 and F2 in the current built context?

Residents of Devonshire Road sorely miss the green screen separating the road from the car park, which has largely been lost, in particular the row of hornbeams that used to run alongside the cycle/footway into the car park

To address the reasons for refusal the proximity to Carter Bridge at its closest point has been increased from 3.3m to 6.8m. The entire northern façade has also been moved further south by 4.5m which has been achieved through the removal of a bank of rooms to all floors. In addition, the 5th floor is setback from the new building line by a further 5.2m, so in effect, the upper level have been set back 9.7m from the refused scheme. This is by any measure a very significant reduction over the refused scheme.

The principle of heights and building relationships between B2/F2/Ravensworth Gardens and Devonshire Road is set out through a series of steps from B2 roofline, stepping down from the setback floor and over to F2 and again to the houses of Ravensworth Gardens. Visual comparison studies of the proposed scheme have shown the massing experienced from Devonshire Road is less than of the refused application.

This has been discussed extensively with the Councils, Conservation and Planning officer in pre-application discussions who, in principle (and without prejudice to the determination of the application), raise no objection to the revised scheme and consider it an improvement over the refused

This was not one of the reasons for refusal. Modelling wind tunnelling and microclimate has not been a requirement of this application nor was it a requirement for application 1. The application was screened under the EIA Regulations for significant adverse environmental impacts and the LPA concluded that no EIA was required.

The City Council's Nature Conservation Team have confirmed that they are supportive of the proposals. We have provided the Defra Biodiversity Net

<p><i>(see figure 5), and the pine trees that used to grow alongside the Carter Bridge ramp (see figure 6). The net gain in biodiversity achieved by this development should be measured against the quantity and diversity of vegetation that existed prior to the CB1 works. To that end, more land should be allocated for reinstating trees and shrubs between Devonshire Road and the car park.</i></p>	<p>Gain calculations which demonstrate that the development is achieving in excess of the 10% target.</p>
<p><i>Request for a plan to show how the Multi-Storey Car Park can be partly or fully converted into cycle parking at a future date</i></p>	<p>We have provided plans (drawing number 6302 D700 -BD MSCP Cycle Conversion Plans Rev 00) showing how the multi-storey car park could be converted into cycle parking for the future for (2337) spaces predominantly provided via Sheffield stands.</p> <p>However, this plan is for information only and does not form part of the planning application and is not material to its determination.</p>
<p><i>The issue of over-ranking taxis has still not to been addressed. If CCLT taxis are unable to enter the taxi rank, they will block back to the entrance to the pick-up/drop-off area, causing congestion that will back up along Great Northern Rd and Tenison Rd, potentially to Station Rd, where any queue will disrupt bus services. The applicant has claimed it is not their responsibility to regulate the queuing of taxis. However, the long-established arrangement, where taxis queue through the car park, will be disrupted permanently by this application, and therefore, in our view, this should be treated as a transport impact of the development that needs to be mitigated. Could the County Council highway officers please provide clarity on whose responsibility this will be, and how it will be mitigated?</i></p>	<p>The issue of over-ranking taxis was not one of the reasons for refusal for application 1- it cannot reasonably be revisited as part of this planning submission.</p> <p>The use of the existing station car park for taxis to 'layover' is an informal arrangement between AEA and CCLT. It does not form part of the access strategy for the station area. It was never intended nor was it ever conditioned that this would be a permanent arrangement as it is self-evident from the CB1 masterplan and OPP which allowed for the redevelopment of this area</p> <p>There are two taxi ranks serving the station, the AEA Station Square taxi rank used by CCLT taxis and the Station Road taxi rank for all licenced taxis.</p> <p>AEA Station Square taxi rank has capacity for 20 taxis. Taxis are not allowed to 'over rank' in the Station Square as it blocks the circulation of vehicles in the drop off area. Access to Station Square is controlled by ANPR cameras managed by the train operation AEA.</p>

	<p>The Station Road taxi rank is located on the public highway (Station Road) and can be used by all licenced taxis. These two facilities are of sufficient size to deal with the peak demand for taxis at the Station.</p> <p>The station area and the CB1 estate is not a suitable area for taxis to 'layover' during quiet periods of the day when there is less demand for taxis.</p> <p>This is a matter for the taxi licensing authority and highway authority in discussion with AEA.</p>
<p><i>I can see only one car parking bay allocated to motorcycles. Could the applicant please confirm:</i></p> <p><i>a. the locations allocated for motorcycles;</i></p> <p><i>b. the capacity of those locations to accommodate motorcycles (avoiding any being blocked in);</i></p> <p><i>c. the maximum number of parked motorcycles observed under Carter Bridge (pre-COVID);</i></p> <p><i>d. the projected number of motorcycles expected to use the station car park, given</i></p> <p><i>e. expected trends, in particular in the use of electric mopeds.</i></p>	<p>Attached is an updated General Arrangement Plan (drawing number MMD-217382-C-DR-10-XX-5027 Rev P5) to include two additional spaces allocated for motorcycles.</p> <p>Responsibility for catering for future trends and provision is with Greater Anglia.</p>
<p><i>I discussed with the applicant the need to extend the footway from the east side of Devonshire Rd further into the station car park to better align with the pedestrian desire line, and reduce conflicts around the junction between the two cycleways and Devonshire Rd. There is an improvement here in the new plan, but we would like further consideration to be given to reconfiguring this space to:</i></p>	<p>The footway updates proposed as part of this planning application have been designed to reflect the discussions and agreed actions between Edward Leigh, on behalf of South Petersfield Residents Association and Cam Cycle. These points are in addition to those helpful discussions which can accommodate. The location of the crossing proposed provides a balance that includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ A new tree / planting to improve screening;

a. *Extend the footway to the bend in the cycleway, so that pedestrians cross the cycleway on their desire-line, reducing conflicts on the cycleway and with pedestrians using the steps onto Carter Bridge.*

b. *Move the proposed tree slightly to make way.*

c. *Allocate the bays alongside the cycleway for motorcycle/moped parking.*

d. *Reduce the depth of those bays to that needed for motorcycles.*

e. *Add a strip of planting between the cycleway and the reduced-depth parking bays to provide additional screening of the car park from the residential area.*

- An extended and widened footway to improve pedestrian movements;
- A crossing that is angled to recognise pedestrian desire lines while maintaining a short crossing distance at an appropriate angle across the cycle lane;
- Crossing points staggered on the footway to avoid conflicts between crossing pedestrians and pedestrians using the Carter Bridge stairs
- Increased width of pedestrian footway under Carter Bridge from 1.5m to 2.5m
- We are implementing part e as part of the amended proposals.

Any further amendments would make the scheme unviable. We therefore do not consider that any further changes are necessary.

I discussed with the applicant the possibility of reconfiguring the junction at the bottom of Great Northern Rd to allow the pedestrian crossing of the latter to better align with the footway in front of F2. Could the applicant please share their reasoning for not doing this.

The footway in front of F2 narrows to 2m opposite the existing loading bay. There is also a pinch-point in the footway on the east side between the loading bay and the hotel building. Could the applicant provide projections for pedestrian peak-flow volumes that demonstrate that reducing the width at this point to 2m will not create unnecessary conflicts?

The revised scheme includes new priority crossing points for pedestrians and cyclist on Great Northern Road and adjacent to cycle point, and a pedestrian priority crossing point further north near Carter Bridge. These new measures greatly improve the movement of pedestrians and cyclists in the area and give them priority over vehicles. These measures together with the existing traffic calming features in Great Northern Road (raised table and mini roundabout) provide a low speed vehicular environment, which is appropriate for an area which a significant number of pedestrian and cycle movements interacting with vehicles using the Station Square and station car park.

The mini roundabout is considered to be an important element on the overall traffic calming of the area and helps to regulate vehicular speeds and maintain the low vehicle speed environment.

As requested by Edward Leigh on behalf of South Petersfield Residents Association, we have looked at alternative junction arrangements for the eastern end of Great Northern Road. We have considered the option of changing the mini roundabout junction into a priority / give-way junction with

	<p>priority given to vehicles turning from Great Northern Road into Station Square and visa-versa, with vehicles exiting the station car park giving-way to opposing vehicles. Whilst this arrangement could be provided in this location and within the site constraints, we have significant concerns that this type of junction will lead to increased vehicular speeds particularly for vehicles travelling from Great Northern Road into the Station Square, where they can turn into Station Square ‘unopposed’.</p> <p>In terms of the location of the pedestrian crossing at the eastern end of Great Northern Road, it is considered to be on the desire line for pedestrians walking north / south from Station Square to Carter Bridge. We have looked at the possibility of converting the informal pedestrian crossing into a Zebra crossing in this location. However, siting a zebra crossing immediately on the exit arm of the mini roundabout will add an unfamiliar give way arrangement at the exist of the mini roundabout which could risk cars being less likely to see pedestrians at the crossing and give way. The location of the pedestrian crossing point is also constrained by the space available on the northern side of Great Northern Road due to the space required for the new cycleway and footway, and need for an adequate waiting area for pedestrians at the kerbside adjacent to the crossing.</p> <p>We have pulled the Ground Floor of F2 back a further 0.5m as shown on plan 6302 8100 Rev 007.</p>
<p><i>The pinch point in the footway on the east side is exacerbated by the positioning of a lamppost and bollards. Would the applicant consider re-locating this street light, either by affixing it to the building or moving it to the other side of the Northern Access Road?</i></p>	<p>It is not feasible to undertake this work as part of the application. The street lighting proposals will be developed at the next design stage.</p>
<p><i>Could the applicant please provide more detail on the temporary access arrangements while B2 is built? The text on the illustration provided is illegible. It is unclear what the routes to/from Cyclepoint will be, and how the new temporary junction on Great Northern Rd will function.</i></p>	<p>Enclosed is a clear legible illustration showing the temporary access detail. Please see:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • B2 Construction Phase Access • F2 Construction Phase Access

	We anticipate that details will be secured through a condition requiring CEMP
<i>There are still concerns about the height and massing of B2. Could you please confirm that the Design & Conservation Panel will be reviewing this application?</i>	This has been discussed at length with the planning and design officers who support the significantly scaled down proposal (on a without prejudice basis). The DCP had no objection to application 1 and we have dealt directly with the LPA on the smaller scheme as it was the members of the Planning Committee who raised design and heritage concerns, not members of the DCP.
<i>Some S106 money was allocated for traffic mitigation in South Petersfield, most of which was spent on improvements to Tenison Rd. There is (I believe) some money left to create a pedestrian-friendly feature at the corner of Devonshire Rd (principally a raised table). Could the planning and highway departments ensure this is co-ordinated with the development, and that the Section 106 agreement for this development makes good any shortfall in the fund remaining to cover the works. We also request that SoPRA be involved in the design of the feature.</i>	The S106 agreement for F2/B2 is in accordance with the agreed draw down for CB1. The applicant has offered an additional financial contribution of £30,000 for the construction of the Chisholm Trail (specifically that part of the route that crosses the Network Rail car park up to the application boundary under Carter Bridge). This will be secured via a S106 Agreement. This is in addition to the £966,000 already contributed to the Chisholm Trail.
<i>Could some Section 106 money be allocated to cleaning and repainting Carter Bridge?</i>	The applicant is willing to enter into an obligation to provide some public art on the underside of the stanchion of Carter Bridge to improve the public realm. It is not appropriate in terms of the CIL regulations to use S106 monies for maintenance of the Bridge.

COMMENTS FROM CAM CYCLE	APPLICANT RESPONSE
<p>Protecting the Chisholm Trail</p> <p><i>We are not satisfied that the Chisholm Trail will be adequately protected, as required by policy 80, if the land is used for car parking (as shown in Figure 3 of section 4.2 of appendix C of the Transport Assessment) for some period of time before the county finishes building the scheme. We believe that there will be resistance to losing the car parking spaces when the time comes. Therefore, it is much less likely to be a problem if the land intended for the future Chisholm Trail link is reserved at this time for that purpose. The land should not be used for car parking, or an explicit condition should be agreed that the land marked on a referenced plan will be made available for a cycle route on request by the County Council.</i></p>	<p>In terms of adequately protecting the Chisholm Trail for a future link, this can be conditioned, and the applicant would be content with this, subject to agreeing the condition wording with Cambridgeshire County Council and the LPA.</p> <p>Suggested condition wording: “ <i>subject to the County Council identifying the final route of the Chisholm Trail and securing all of the rights necessary for its implementation from the local authority and land owners and provided that the final route connects with the future proofed connection that the applicant has shown (plan reference MMD-217382-C-DR-10-XX-5027_P5) then the applicant agrees that the 5 No car parking spaces identified on plan MMD-217382-C-DR-10-XX-5027_P5 will be relocated.</i>”</p> <p>These works are in addition to the £966,000 already paid for the Chisholm Trail/Mill Road link.</p>
<p><i>Along the route of the proposed Chisholm Trail south of the site, as shown in drawing MMD-217382-C-DR-10-XX-5061, the bollards behind One the Square will need to be realigned because the gaps are narrower than 1.5m due to their oblique angle with respect to the Chisholm Trail. The gaps should be 1.5m when projected onto a plane that is perpendicular to the route of the Chisholm Trail, in accordance with LTN 1/20. This should be noted in the details of implementation. We would also like to be involved in the design of the ‘cycle friendly’ traffic calming measures on Mill Park Road (shown as ‘Mill Place’ on the diagram).</i></p>	<p>We have shown 1.5m gap with a pedestrian friendly bollard. Enclosed is an update General Arrangement Plan (drawing reference MMD-217382-C-DR-10-XX-5027 Rev P5). It will not be delivered as part of this application but as part of the CB1 management protocols.</p>
<p>Preparing for a future expansion of Cycle Parking</p> <p><i>The applicant has claimed the multi-storey car park could be (partly or wholly) converted into a cycle park in the future. We are very concerned that</i></p>	<p>We have included a plan to show a reasonable indication of how this conversion could take place and connect to the existing cycle park. See drawing (6302-D700-B2 MSCP Cycle Conversion Plans Rev 00). The</p>

the applicant has not left passive provision for this conversion nor for a connection to the existing cycle park. The design of the first floor of the car park, on page 30 of the latest Design and Access Statement, does not show any space where a future bridge connection could be put through. We object under the National Planning Policy Framework policies 7 and 104(c) as well as LTN 1/20.

NPPF 7. The purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development. At a very high level, the objective of sustainable development can be summarised as meeting the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs.

NPPF 104 (c). Planning policies 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

LTN 1/20: 11.3.4. Spare capacity should always be provided to cater for growth and turnover. The effect of new infrastructure should also be factored into any decisions about planned reserve capacity of cycle parking facilities.

To resolve this objection, details should be submitted showing a reasonable indication of how this conversion would take place, how it has been provided for, and how it would be connected to the existing cycle park. That connection should at least involve a bridge between the buildings to allow people to circulate more easily to find available cycle parking spaces.

Details of the Devonshire Road Cycleway link

Details of the access controls, including layout and dimensions, for the Devonshire Road cycleway link still need to be provided — we would like to ensure that this is carried out in accordance with LTN 1/20 and also in

overhead line access required by Network Rail militates against the First Floor connections therefore we have shown a Ground Floor connection.

Agree, please see updated General Arrangement Plan (drawing reference MMD-217382-C-DR-10-XX-5027 Rev P5).

<p><i>consultation with local stakeholders such as ourselves, in order to help minimise the risk of serious injury to cyclists trying to negotiate any bollards.</i></p>	
<p><i>Page 9 of the Landscape Report mentions a 'feature etched metal screen to conceal cars' that is shown adjacent to a bend in the Devonshire Road cycleway link. Not enough detail is shown about whether this metal screen affects the forward visibility or dynamic envelope of the cycleway. We would like to ensure that there is at least 0.5m buffer between the metal screen and the edge of the cycleway, as specified by LTN 1/20 Table 5-3 'Additional width at fixed objects'. This could be achieved by shifting the cycleway slightly south, if necessary.</i></p>	<p>The design for the proposed screen has been developed with consultation between the Landscape Architect and Cycleway Designer with consideration to LTN 1/20 Table 5-3. The proposed screen will be offset by a minimum of 250mm as required by Table 5.3 for vertical features 600mm or less. The screen will not exceed 600mm in height.</p> <p>Please see enclosed drawing 646.04 (RP) 001 Masterplan Rev P4 and 646.04 (SC) 012 – Feature Metal Etched Screen for further details.</p>
<p>Cycling in Station Square</p> <p><i>Notwithstanding the proposed route for the Chisholm Trail, running behind One the Square, we would like to ensure that the existing routes into Station Square serving the shops and the station itself will remain available for cycling for those who need them. These desire lines are not shown in the diagrams discussed by section 4.10 of appendix C of the Transport Assessment. Nevertheless, they will continue to be used for access, at the very least, because they are the most direct routes to those local destinations.</i></p>	<p>The application makes no changes to the access into the Station Square. These desire lines will remain as is.</p>
<p><i>To be clear: the diversion of the route of the Chisholm Trail around the back of One the Square does not comply with the directness principle of LTN 1/20. However, we have accepted it as a compromise given the constraints of the site as it is today, the dangers of the mini-roundabout, and the compliance with LTN 1/20 of the details of the proposed route apart from directness. We are disappointed that the site was not better planned from</i></p>	<p>Noted.</p>

<p><i>the beginning but would like to move forward with what is achievable under the current circumstances and see the aforementioned issues resolved.</i></p>	
<p>Cycle Parking for B2</p> <p><i>Design and Access Statement section 4.2.2 shows that 'guest cycle parking' for B2 is being off-loaded into the existing station cycle park, in a room currently used for staff cycle parking. We object under policy 82 that this is overloading an existing facility.</i></p>	<p>Notwithstanding that the Highway Authority raise no objection to this arrangement; all of the cycle parking is now within B2.</p> <p>Please see plan 6302 7100 Rev 06.</p>

COMMENTS FROM CAMBRIDGE CITY COUNCIL CYCLING OFFICER	APPLICANT RESPONSE
<p><i>We support the proposed new cycle route through from Devonshire Rd to Station Rd via a new crossing of the Great Northern Rd. We are still of the opinion, however, that improvements are needed to the Station Square in order to facilitate people cycling and walking to and across the space of whom there will continue to be a substantial number.</i></p>	<p>Not part of application. Cam Cycle have acknowledged this, see comments above.</p>
<p><i>There is a high demand for cycle parking in the Station area and it is important therefore that the cycle parking provided for new developments in this area are of high quality and easy access so that the staff for whom they are provided do not choose to use existing cycle parking intended for station users instead. The cycle parking proposed for F2 is in the basement with a stepped ramp that has a door at its end. The door is labelled as 'automatic', but it is not clear whether or not it needs the user to push a button or there is a sensor which opens the doors automatically in advance of the user getting to the bottom of the ramp. If the user has to wait for any time for the door to open there must be enough space to wait with their bike on level ground</i></p>	<p>This was not objected to in application 1.</p> <p>The automatic doors at the base of the cycle ramp would work on a sensor i.e. they open before needing to stop at the bottom of the ramp. The position of the door has been amended as part of the enclosed drawing pack for Building F2 (Drawing 6302 D8105 Rev 06).</p>

<p><i>which does not appear to be the case here so unless there is a sensor set back far enough for the user not to need to wait this is unacceptable.</i></p>	
<p><i>There is no information that I could find on the gradient of the stepped access. It must be no more than 1 in 4 as set out in the Local Plan cycle parking standards.</i></p> <p><i>There should be a ramp on both sides of the steps to allow people to pass each other and the corridor should be wider to allow two people to pass one another whilst wheeling bikes.</i></p>	<p>The length of the cycle ramps has been extended for 1:4 ratio and the automatic doors are relocated for easier access. See drawing 6302 D8105 Rev 06.</p>
<p><i>It is not clear what is proposed for the off gauge spaces at ground level but at least some of these should be of a design that deters those with standard bikes from using them (i.e. Locking rings set into the ground for locking bikes too rather than Sheffield stands) with a cargo bike marking and the area should also be signed to say it is for people who are unable to use the ramped access.</i></p>	<p>The off-gauge cycle spaces can be specified as 'locking rings' to deter those with standard bikes from using them. This can be conditioned, and the applicant would be content with this.</p>
<p><i>Cycle parking for the B2 hotel is to be located in the same space currently given to the B1 hotel staff. It is not clear that there will be sufficient space to increase the capacity in this area from 38 to 66 spaces without compromising usability.</i></p>	<p>Notwithstanding that the Highway Authority raise no objection to this arrangement; all of the cycle parking is now within B2.</p> <p>Please see plan 6302 7100 Rev 06.</p>
<p><i>Direction signage should be provided for people walking and cycling, particularly of the new route behind the station square. This signage should be approved by the cycling team.</i></p>	<p>The applicant is happy to agree to this and this should be conditioned.</p>
<p><i>At peak usage the Cycle Point is nearly full, and demand is likely to increase but there appears to be no acknowledgement of the future need for additional cycle parking for the station with this application.</i></p>	<p>Please see the enclosed plan (drawing reference 6302-D700-B2 MSCP Cycle Conversion Plans) which shows a reasonable indication of how the Multi Storey Car Park conversion could take place and connect to the existing cycle park.</p>

COMMENTS FROM DISABILITY PANEL/DISABILITY OFFICER	APPLICANT RESPONSE
<p><i>Loss of Blue Badge spaces is not acceptable, the spaces in square are already overused and to serve station. These spaces need to be retained or reallocated.</i></p> <p><i>In Underground parking Blue Badge spaces are in wrong place, they need to be nearest lift cores and marked out with hatching. I would suggest using the spaces against the western wall with hotel reception on other side. An entrance door to the reception at the southern side of these spaces would be good.</i></p>	<p>There is no loss of blue badge parking within the design the proposals. The point referencing this from the DAS was incorrect and from the previous application.</p> <p>Blue Badge parking on all levels of the Car Park has been repositioned closer to the lift cores with marked crossings introduced to provide safer movements.</p>
<p><i>The accessible rooms are too far from the lift cores for accessibility and safety.</i></p>	<p>The two furthest accessible rooms on all floors have been moved next to the lift core.</p>
<p><i>At least one room should be provided with a hoist.</i></p>	<p>One room has been provided with a lift hoist.</p>
<p><i>At least one accessible room should have an adjoining door to a standard room.</i></p>	<p>An accessible room on each floor has been provided with a door to the room adjacent.</p>
<p><i>Access to free long stay parking must be established.</i></p>	<p>Our understanding is the operator NCP on behalf of GA would manage the spaces in the same manner as they currently do.</p>

COMMENTS FROM LANDSCAPE OFFICER	APPLICANT RESPONSE
<p><i>On page 3 of the landscape report it states that ‘the scheme also includes enhancements (a wall mural) to the underpass of Carter Bridge , a private podium garden in the centre of Block B2, green roofs on both B2 and F2, and a planted sunken garden at the rear of Block F2’.</i></p>	<p>The enhancements to Carter Bridge will be dealt with as part of the S106 Agreement.</p>
<p><i>The details of the mural and the green (biodiverse) roofs can be conditioned, but no details of the podium courtyard for Block B2 or the sunken garden for F2 have been submitted. Other details such as the parking adjacent to landscaped areas between Devonshire Road and the site do not look practical. Details should be submitted prior to determination.</i></p>	<p>The Landscape Report was split into two parts due to the size of the document. Part 2 of the report provides details of the courtyard garden and sunken garden. Enclosed is Part 2 of the Landscape Report for completeness.</p>
<p><i>The description of the podium courtyard for Block B2 implies that the courtyard is accessible from the surrounding rooms. Please confirm whether it is and the measures taken to offer privacy to the rooms.</i></p> <p><i>There are concerns about the success of a deep and therefore dark sunken courtyard in the British climate. The approximate dimensions of the courtyard are 7.5 x 28m. It is located on the second floor above the car park and enclosed above by 4 floors plus roof level plant. This very shady and dank area will encourage etiolated plant growth due to a lack of light. Details must be submitted prior to determination including a shadow study which will show achievable light levels to the rooms as well as to the planting area, sections through the car park roof containing details for the drainage and growing medium for the proposed planting.</i></p>	<p>The rooms surrounding B2 courtyard are not accessible directly from the guest rooms but a single location on the north side of the courtyard to allow the operator to control access and time restrictions. The space is designed to maintain distance away from guest windows.</p> <p>Hotels are not normally subject to provide levels of daylight, however, we have provided generous windows to all rooms. The longer stay nature of the aparthotel means these are much larger than standard short stay hotels. The operator requires glazing of specific areas to be provided to Living/bedrooms and bedrooms which are of a very generous nature. The courtyard rooms are provided with large windows to all rooms to maximise light absorption whilst maintaining privacy through landscape design.</p> <p>The proposed planting has been selected to tolerate deep shade, using ferns and mostly evergreen herbaceous groundcovers (refer to page 38 of the submitted report 646.04 001 DAS REV P3 Landscape 2 of 2). These species and cultivars have an attractive appearance even if they will not flower in low light conditions. We have also specified a smaller cultivar of Birch, ‘Trinity College’ and Amelanchier, both of which will tolerate shade, but these could also be Cornus mas or Cercis or some other form of woodland tree. With the mounding, paths and low groundcovers, the garden would offer a green and</p>

	<p>textural contrast to the vertical walls of the building's structure and would contribute partly to screening from windows facing one another. The path comprises stone slabs in gravel, which could be specified with a mottled surface appearance and good slip resistance properties.</p> <p>We have submitted drawings including an illustrative section and a plant schedule, in 646.04(PP) 001 DAS_REV P3 Landscape 2 of 2, pp. 37-41. We have submitted detail appropriate at this level but could provide technical details of soil build-ups and drainage if required.</p>
<p><i>On page 4 of the landscape report it states that along the west side of Block F2 there is a sunken garden at the basement level proposed. Details of this long narrow area have not been submitted. Prior to determination details including dimensions, should be provided to give assurance the area is suitable for a garden amenity space.</i></p>	<p>The sunken garden provides some outdoor amenity space as well as fire escape from the basement level accommodation. Therefore the walking space remains free of obstacles and the walls are treated to provide a pleasant outlook for users.</p> <p>We have submitted drawings including an illustrative section and a plant schedule, in 646.04(PP) 001 DAS_REV P3 Landscape 2 of 2, pp. 42-44. We have submitted detail appropriate at this level but could provide more technical details if required.</p>
<p><i>On page 15 of the landscape report a rain garden is shown proposed between the segregated cycle route and the north/south vehicle route. The rain garden will require a minimum width of 2m to be specified/shown on the drawings. The minimum dimension is required to make the planting area between the kerbs and haunching a suitable width for successful planting and to discourage people crossing/trampling the planting. It might also be advisable to introduce two or three bridged access points across the rain garden. Details of the central fence can be conditioned.</i></p>	<p>The rain garden cannot be increased due to constraints of the cycleway and street dimensions. We will include additional crossing points.</p>
<p><i>On pages 17 and 18 of the landscape report a 1550mm high Mobilane green screen is shown proposed immediately adjacent to parallel parking bays which will not be possible to access without cars over-sailing the planting area and damaging the screen. Prior to determination please provide tracking diagrams of the bays to give assurance that the parking bays beside the planting area</i></p>	<p>The car parking layout is set out using the standard dimensions for car parking spaces (2.4m by 4.8m bay with a clear 6.0m aisle). This design standard is applied across the parking area to allow car access to each bay.</p>

are accessible. If they are not accessible, then the parking bays should be used for more meaningful planting than is possible at present.

The Green Screen will be relocated to the outer side of the planting bed, adjacent to the pavement on Devonshire Road, allowing full access to those car parking spaces.

On page 20 of the landscape report a metal screen is shown proposed immediately adjacent to perpendicular parking bays at the northern end of the cycle route from Devonshire Road. There is no means of preventing drivers bumping into the screen as they park. Prior to determination provide means of preventing the screen being struck by car bumpers.

The existing car parking spaces adjacent to the existing cycleway / footway have 'wheel stops' to prevent vehicles from overhanging the kerbs (and the footway /cycleway). These have proved to be effective at keeping cars within their bays. This arrangement is proposed for the car parking spaces adjacent to the landscape screen. The plans show substantial concrete wheel stops preventing a bumper over-run and damage to the screen.