

**DEVELOPMENT CONTROL FORUM**16 June 2021  
10.00 am - 12.00 pm**Present:** Councillors D. Baigent, Dryden, Flaubert, Gawthrope Wood and Porrer

Councillor Robertson (Ward Councillor)

**Officers:**Planning Delivery Manager; Nigel Blazeby  
Area Development Manager: Toby Williams  
Committee Manager: Claire Tunnicliffe  
Meeting Producer: James Goddard**For Applicant:**Mike Derbyshire: Bidwells (Planning Consultant)  
Andrew Rawlings: Mott MacDonald  
Robert Myers: Robert Myers Associates (Director)**For Petitioners:**Chair of South Petersfield Residents Association  
Representative of Great Northern Road Resident Association.  
Executive Director of Cambridge Cycle Campaign**FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE COUNCIL****21/5/DCF Declarations of Interest**

<b>Name</b>	<b>Reason</b>
Councillor Baigent	Personal: Cambridge Cycle Campaign

**21/6/DCF Application and Petition Details (21/00264/FUL / Blocks B2 & F2, Devonshire Quarter Devonshire Road Cambridge Cambridgeshire)****21/6/DCF Application and Petition Details (21/00264/FUL / Blocks B2 & F2, Devonshire Quarter Devonshire Road Cambridge Cambridgeshire)**Application and Petition Details (21/00264/FUL /  
Blocks B2 & F2, Devonshire Quarter Devonshire

Road Cambridge Cambridgeshire)

Application No: 21/00264/FUL

Site Address: Blocks B2 & F2, Devonshire Quarter Devonshire

Road Cambridge Cambridgeshire

Description: Erection of two new buildings comprising Class

E(g)i/E(g)ii floorspace including ancillary

accommodation/ facilities with associated plant and cycle parking for Block F2 and an Aparthotel (Class C1) with multi-storey car park for Network Rail, including car and cycle parking, for Block B2 with associated plant, hard and soft landscaping and permanent access from Devonshire Road to the Cambridge Station Car Park, utilising the existing pedestrian and cycle access, restricted to

emergency access to the railway only.

Applicant: C/O Agent

Agent: Bidwells, Emma Thompson

Address: Bidwells Bidwell House Trumpington Road

Cambridge CB2 9LD

Lead Petitioner: South Petersfield Residents Association

Case Officer: Toby Williams

Text of Petition:

We, the undersigned, request a Development Control Forum on the above planning application to address matters that the applicant believes have been adequately addressed or are immaterial considerations, but which we believe are of critical importance to the long-term success of this development:

- 1) Block B2 height and mass.
- 2) Future-proof of B2, including ability to convert the multi-storey car park into cycle parking, partially or wholly in phases, preserving at least disabled parking bays, and ensuring safe access and egress for people using cycles.
- 3) Accommodation of over-ranked CCLT taxis.
- 4) Reinstatement of more green planting between Devonshire Rd and the surface car park.
- 5) Great Northern Rd: mini-roundabout, parking bays and replacement of trees.
- 6) Impacts on food parks and community events behind One Station Square.
- 7) Wind tunnel effects along the Northern Access Road

**Case by Applicant**

- i. Since the planning permission had been refused in October 2020, correspondence had taken place with petitioners and other interested parties.
- ii. The issues raised by the petitioner had not been the issues for refusal.
- iii. Several significant changes had been made to the application since the refusal. This was now a much better scheme with considerable changes to the F2 scheme segregated footpath and cycle path.
- iv. Massing of the hotel scheme (B2) has been pushed back 6.8m from Carter Bridge and 5.2m from the top floor. The profile of the roof was significantly smaller reducing the impact in a conservation area.
- v. Was able to demonstrate the retro fit of a future potential cycle park conversion if required on site (not part of the application).
- vi. Introduction of tree planting between the carpark and Devonshire Road created a green dense boundary and a green gateway from the north.
- vii. New pedestrian footpath on the east side of the cycle route framed by a new planning scheme, creating separation between the footpath and cycle path and car park on the other side.
- viii. The swale on the west side created separation to the cycle path.
- ix. The pattern of tree planting had been changed along the north side of Great Northern Road to accommodate the cycle path.
- x. There would be no reduction in the number of trees along the Great Northern Road, but the new pattern of the trees would be used to guide the cyclist through.
- xi. Planting would create filtered views to the development.
- xii. The proposed planting of the trees and shrubs on Devonshire Road was in response to comments at a Development Control Forum in 2008; planting was denser with an increase in the number of trees and plans being used.
- xiii. Station Square was designed collaboratively with Network Rail, Brookgate and the train operator.
- xiv. The rank itself was not reliant in its operation on any additional ranking. The use of the existing station surface carpark for the use of over ranking was an informal arrangement between the taxis and the train operator at that time.
- xv. The station forecourt was the only area defined as a rank.
- xvi. Proposed a taxi management plan for the transition of the start of the decommissioning of the surface carpark and construction of the B2 and F2 schemes.
- xvii. The plan would detail the number of marshals in place and the length of time they would be employed on site. It would also look at the level of

- enforcement required to deal with over ranking on Station Square and taxis waiting on the surrounding streets in the CB1 area.
- xviii. Stakeholders to agree the initial powers of the marshals and how the monitoring of the arrangement would continue.
  - xix. One of the key aspects of the application was to provide pedestrian and cyclists propriety; three priority crossings on Great Northern Road and two between B2 and F2.
  - xx. The crossing point directly to the west of the mini roundabout was now a zebra crossing.
  - xxi. Independent wind testing had confirmed the access road would meet all the laws and safety requirements.
  - xxii. This application was now under the 2018 BREEAM requirements.

### **Case by Petitioners**

- i. Petition was supported by South Petersfield Resident Association, Great Northern Road Residents Association and CamCyle.
- ii. Block B2 height and mass: appreciated the changes that the applicant has made but residents feel the scale and mass is still inappropriate for its location. The relative scale of B2 to F2 creates an unbalanced and overwhelming impression on the residential area on Devonshire Road.
- iii. Design had no heritage connection as a gateway from the Mill Road Conservation Area.
- iv. Futureproofing of B2; believed this was a material consideration. The National Planning Policy Framework (February 2019) and the Local Plan have clear policies to meet future demand of sustainable and public transport. 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.
- v. Future proofing to provide secure, conveniently located cycle parking. B2 car park should be designed as a cycle park (which will be its function for most of its working life) and initially “retrofitted” as a car park.
- vi. Staircases (for the car park and future cycle park) must be designed for personal safety and to minimise anti-social behaviour: open, with clear sight lines.
- vii. Asked if the inter-floor ramps be adapted to a shallower gradient.
- viii. Challenged the use of the surface car park for over-ranking taxis as a contractual arrangement.
- ix. The taxi management plan would only apply in the construction period, but the issues would continue after this period.
- x. Taxi’s waiting in the CB1 area was a wider problem to the one presented.

- i. Resident Association representatives should be included in any stakeholder's consultation.
- ii. Welcomed the changes to the access to Devonshire Road but would question if the kink in the cycleway was necessary. Required clarity on level and surface transitions at pedestrian crossing and planning condition for the Chisholm Trail branch to ensure it was protected
- iii. Pleased to note the proposed zebra crossing on the Great Northern Road mini roundabout. However, it would be better to move the crossing away from the corner of Sainsburys and for it be raised. Alternatively, create a conventional side-road crossing arrangement.
- iv. Tighter controls and timings were required on the bin collections from F1 and F2 across pavements and cycle path: questioned if collection be co-ordinated.
- v. Two parking bays would be lost on Great Northern Road, could not accommodate visitors or deliveries,
- vi. Replanting of the trees on Great Northern Road would take five years or more to start maturing, the current trees were just starting to develop shielding noise and pollution which would be lost when replaced.
- vii. Needed to ensure no conflict on the cycle route behind Station Square when food trucks were setting up or events taking place.

### **Ward Councillor Comments**

- i. The height and mass of the B2 was still too great which would dominate the Devonshire Road area.
- ii. A link was required between the B2 (cycle park) accessible from the first and second level to the existing cycle park building.
- iii. The gradient of the cycle ramps needed to be changed as there were too steep.
- iv. The railway company may have an informal arrangement concerning the taxi rank, but the reality was different. This had been taking place for several years with the introduction of a CCTV system to enable queuing taxis to see when the rank was clear.
- v. Queried if the proposed zebra crossing was on an adopted road; where did the adoption finish and where did it become part of the Station estate.
- vi. Asked if there would be belisha beacons on the proposed zebra crossing. There were no on the crossing outside the railway station to station road and therefore had no legal status.
- vii. Expressed concern at the loss of landscaping originally proposed on the corner of the Great Northern Road into the car park.
- viii. Loss of blue badge parking needed to be rectified and replaced.

- ix. Agreed the community area behind the square needed to clearly distinguish between public space and the cycle route.
- x. Asked how extensive the grey water storage was in in B2.

### **Case Officer Comments**

- i. Provided a timeline to the application:
  - a) 18/1678/FUL submitted Nov 2028 following extensive pre-app of 12 months.
  - b) 18/1678/FUL Planning Committee refused planning permission (two reasons, B2 – Aparthotel, multi-storey car park and cycling infrastructure).
  - c) Pre-application in November, December, January, including member briefing (10 December 2020)
  - d) Revised application submitted 21 January 2021
  - e) Amendments submitted on 5 May 2021 to address concerns raised.
  - f) Applicant confirmed they will not appeal the refused application.
  - g) Development Control Forum held on 16 June 2021 with further revisions shown and expect them to be submitted formally. Further consultation will then be required particularly with County Council Highway Officers.
- ii. Several Consultees responses had been received and was summarised as follows:
  - a) Urban Design: No objections
  - b) Environmental Heath: No objections, proposed a condition and informative to include 25% provision of electric vehicle charging points.
  - c) Access Officer: Originally objected. These objections have been addressed with the revisions. Awaiting response from the officer.
  - d) Drainage: No objection.
  - e) Nature Conservation Officer: No objection.
  - f) Landscaping Officer: No objections but has raised minor details of the landscape design, including external gardens to B2 AND F2 which had been addressed with the revisions. Awaiting response from the officer.
  - g) Sustainability Officer: No objections, noted both building designed to achieve BREEAM excellent and Grey water recycling proposed for the hotel.
  - h) County Local Highways: No objections.
  - i) County Transport: No objections.
  - j) County Local Lead Flood Authority: No objections.
  - k) County Cycling Officer: No objections.

- l) Cambridgeshire Fire and Rescue: No objections.
  - m) Cambridgeshire Police: No objection.
  - n) Anglia Water: No objection
  - o) Environment Agency: No objection.
  - p) Greater Anglia: No objection
  - q) Network Rail: No objection, had confirmed the taxi ranking on the surface carpark was an informal agreement.
- iii. Approximately 43 separate objections had been received, many of the themes have been presented at the Development Control Forum; these have been received from the following:
- a) South Petersfield Residents:
  - b) Cambridge Past, Present and Future: Object to the impact of B2 on the Conservation area and anywhere architecture. Requested to go back to the Design and Conservation Panel.
  - c) CamCycle
  - d) Other third parties representations.

### **Member Questions and Comments**

- i. Under LTN 1/20 cyclist should have priority; it also referred to the disability act and therefore important to ensure that people could enter and go through the buildings with ease and access to all the spaces.
- ii. Reiterated that the loss of Blue Badge parking spaces needed to be replaced.
- iii. Suggested that the height and mass of the B2 should be further reduced.
- iv. The Applicant needed to consider the request to change the gradient on the cycle ramps.
- v. Vehicles should not be permitted to use 'rat runs' to the Station.
- vi. Station Square required redesigning.
- vii. Agreed the application was a great improvement.
- viii. There were problems with the existing cycle park and any new cycle park should learn from these issues.
- ix. Questioned if the applicant had considered the sustainability of the buildings.
- x. Noted the landscaping was greatly improved but would urge the applicant to take this further and look not just at ground level but what could be done at other levels.
- xi. Planting should not be included that would need to be taken up when work to the Chisolm Trail started.
- xii. Needed to consider the effect of the increase in cyclists using the Chisolm Trail, arriving via the guided bus route or the cycle route to Babraham.

- xiii. It was important to note there would also be an increase in pedestrians arriving from the east west or South Cambridge Station.
- xiv. Asked if the application should go to the Design and Conservation Panel.
- xv. Queried how the Taxi Management Plan would be enforced after construction had been completed.
- xvi. Asked how many charging points would be in the car park.
- xvii. Enquired if it was possible to have a traffic survey completed before the application went before the Planning Committee.

**In response the Applicant / Agenda said the following:**

- i. Had worked on the quality of the glazing and the relationship between the glazing and non-glazing areas.
- ii. Had up graded the UV rating to meet the BREEAM standard which would ensure no overheating of the building; the fabric of the building had also been upgraded which would result in a comfortable building for everyone that used it.
- iii. The applicant had recommended the access route be installed straight down Station Road but City Council Officers or the Highway Authority did not want this.
- iv. An access route had been presented to the Planning Committee from Station Road into Station Square, but the Committee took a decision not to pursue that option.
- v. Under LTN 1/20 the application highlighted pedestrian and cyclist priorities. There was a short stretch of road with four crossing points. From north to the south through the whole development, the application had provided a high quality cyclist route from Cater Bridge, Chisolm Trail, Devonshire Road, crossing Station Road, Hills Road Bridge to Addenbrookes which linked the Station entrance.
- vi. The cycle routes on the application had been a collaborative effort between City and County Officers, Cam Cycle, and the Chair of South Petersfield Residents Association.
- vii. The applicant would add a further £30,000 to the £944,000 already contributed to the Chisolm Trail.
- viii. B2 was well designed compact building close to a brownfield site close which the application utilised. It was a simple and elegant building against major infrastructure (Carter Bridge) next to the railway and was suitable to its environment. The building was not in a conservation area.
- ix. There had been so many changes to the application that officers were happy with and believed it was not necessary to go back to the Design and Conservation Panel.
- x. It was always envisaged that there would be buildings on the surface carpark, as stated in the CB1 Masterplan. The CCTV was introduced as

- a part of the S106 agreement for Station Square and the hotel. The use of the existing station surface carpark for over ranking had always been an informal arrangement
- xi. Greater Anglia had written to the Case Officer to advise the use of the existing station surface carpark for the use of over ranking was always an informal arrangement.
  - xii. A traffic survey been undertaken, and a summary would be sent to the Case Officer.
  - xiii. Would provide the litre storage for the grey water to Councillor Robertson outside of the meeting as did not have the figures. The building had been redesigned to meet the BREEAM standard which was why grey water could now be included.
  - xiv. Would ensure that the food vans and those who used the area behind Station Square were aware that a clear passage had to be left for cyclists; would agree for a condition to be placed on this space if necessary.
  - xv. The proposed zebra crossing would be on the highway under private ownership of Greater Anglia and the Train Operator.
  - xvi. The car park would start with 25% passive charging and within five years was likely to be 100%.

**In response to Member's comments the Case Officer said the following:**

- i. Supported the applicant's comments regarding the Design and Conservation Panel.
- ii. Was not sure how much the Panel could add to or influence the design as application had gone before the Panel three times previously.
- iii. There was a possibility that a condition could be placed on the Chisholm Trail on the northern side of the access road into the carpark.
- iv. Unfortunate that the Chisolm Trail plans had not developed sufficiently so that the application could be linked into it.
- v. Would speak with the applicant outside of the meeting regarding planting across an area where these plants would need to be removed when the construction of Chisolm Trail started.
- vi. There was not yet a resolution as to who would be responsible to manage those taxis who could not park on the rank.
- vii. The application was for a multi-storey car park and not for a cycle park.

**Summing up by the Applicant's Agent**

- i. Thanked the petitioners.
- ii. Agreed that LTN 1/20 had changed the application.
- iii. The application sat on a complex part of the city.
- iv. The site needed a building of quality.

- v. Offered a transition management plan to assist with the change of the site.
- vi. Fully understood the comments regarding the longevity of some of the plants.
- vii. F2 was not part of the refusal so had not been amended apart but the route through to the north, crossing over the Great Norther Road had been improved.
- viii. If the Safety audit permitted moving the proposed zebra crossing as proposed by the petitioner (moving the crossing away from the corner of Sainsburys and closer to the desire line) this would be done.
- ix. The proposed zebra crossing would be designed to be all safety standards and requirements.
- x. Would speak with the petitioners regarding refuse collection outside of this meeting/
- xi. The developer was keen to continue working with residents

### **Summing up by the Petitioners**

- i. Thanked the applicant for their engagement.
- ii. Had expressed their opinion on B2 but it would be the Planning Committee to determine whether the scale or mass was suitable or not.
- iii. More detail on the taxi management plan was required, it had to be determined who had long term responsibility.
- iv. More detail was needed on the design of the car park and clarity of on the future proofing.
- v. Design of the stairways should be improved to negate anti-social behaviour and ensure user safety.
- vi. Design of the proposed crossing needed to be improved
- vii. Need to ensure a clear path for cyclists behind Station Square.

### **Final Comments of the Chair**

- i. Summarised the main issues discussed.
- ii. Notes of the Development Control Forum would be made available to the relevant parties and published on the City Council website.
- iii. A copy of the minutes would be attached to the Planning Officer's report when the application would be considered at a future Planning Committee.
- iv. The Case Officer would contact the applicant/ agent after the meeting to discuss the outcome of the meeting and follow up any actions, as necessary.
- v. The applicant would be encouraged to keep in contact with the petitioners and seek their views on any proposed amendments.

The meeting ended at 12.00 pm

**CHAIR**