

APPENDIX 5: SUMMARY OF CONSULTATION RESPONSES

Fen Ditton Parish Council – Objection

Submitted proposals

The proposal results in over-development of the site by virtue of height and massing, poor quality architecture will have an unacceptable impact on the surrounds, parish of Fen Ditton, including the Conservation Area and listed buildings. Height and massing do not make a positive contribution to the local context, they do not preserve or enhance the character of the area. The parish objected to the hotel application, this proposal will have a significantly greater unacceptable impact. Large, uniform blocks that are monolithic with little variation. Lack of amenity space for residents, puts further pressure on Milton Country Park.

Milton Parish Council – No recommendation

Submitted proposals

Comment: Overdevelopment of site. Concerns over density/height of the development and lack of amenities: e.g., recreational and informal spaces.

Amended proposals

No comments on amendments.

Access Officer – Comments

Submitted proposals

The application is lacking. There is a shortage of blue badge spaces and short stay visitor spaces (needed as disabled people rely on visits from health professionals, services etc). Buildings should have changing places toilets/change rooms, toilet doors should open outwards.

Amended proposals

Comments remained the same.

Anglian Water – No objection

Submitted proposals

The foul drainage from this development is in the catchment of Cambridge Water Recycling Centre which currently does not have capacity to treat the flows the

development site. 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.

Amended proposals

Comments remained the same.

Air Quality Officer – No objection

Submitted proposals

Recommend conditions relating to the provision of Electric Vehicle Charging Points and Emission Ratings (for gas fired Boilers and Combined Heat and Power System).

Cadent Gas – No objection

Submitted proposals

Recommend an informative relating to Cadent Gas Ltd / gas infrastructure.

Camcycle – Objection

Submitted proposals

Multiple parts of the submission do not comply with Policy TI/2 of the Local Plan; the cycling infrastructure both within the buildings and public realm have fundamental issues that need to be addressed including:

One Milton Avenue

Access to secure cycle parking is difficult, a clear route between the cycle track and cycle entrance should be provided.

1 & 3 Station Row

Entrance via cycle is at the rear of the building on the opposite side to the main cycle path on Station Row making cycle access difficult. Inadequate visitor cycle parking.

The Triangle Site

Although S8 and S9 are outline only, indicative floor plans show poor cycle parking layout and location.

Mobility Hub (S05)

Development parcel S05 is not a mobility hub and serves only to the benefit of people driving.

Residential Sites (S05)

Entrances to cycle parking should be directly off the cycle routes, no detail is provided as to the location of the bike storage within the building.

Chesterton Way and Station Road Drawings

The plans indicate that Chesterton Way will begin to provide vehicular access, which will degrade the public transport provision and should not be allowed.

Significant additional cycle flows onto the shared surface along Chesterton Way will create additional conflict.

The 3-metre wide bidirectional cycle track on Station Road is probably insufficient for bidirectional use.

Cycle Infrastructure Capacity Issues

The cycle routes that surround the site are congested; the new development is only going to make the issue worse.

Wider Connectivity Issues

The lack of a footpath down the majority of Cowley Road has not been addressed and there is a lack of planning regarding bus services that go to Cambridge North.

Cambridge Airport – Comments

Submitted proposals

The proposed development has been examined from an aerodrome safeguarding perspective and could conflict with safeguarding criteria unless any full planning permission or outline planning permission is granted subject to conditions.

Recommend conditions relating to a Bird Hazard Management Plan (with associated informative), Height Limitation on Buildings and Structures.

The introduction of PV panels may affect the operations at Cambridge Airport and therefore a glint and glare assessment is required. Landscaping must be designed to minimise its attractiveness to hazardous species of birds. Attention is drawn to the British Standard Code of Practice for the safe use of Cranes.

Cambridge County Council (Minerals and Waste Planning Authority) – Objection

Submitted proposals

The applicant should prepare a statement, and assessments where necessary, to address the requirements of both policy 16 of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Local Plan (2021) and the 'agent of change' as set out in para. 187 of the NPPF.

Amended proposals

The MWPA is broadly content with the conclusion of the dust and odour reports. The noise report does not address the interaction between the proposed Use Class E uses and the Aggregates Railhead therefore the objection remains.

Cambridge Fire and Rescue – Comments

Submitted proposals

A condition should be applied to ensure the position of fire hydrants, the cost of hydrants should be recovered from the developer.

Cambridge Past, Present & Future - Objection

Submitted proposals

Object to the height, scale and design of proposals as it will create a giant wall of development. Object to the visual impact of the mass and bulk of buildings on the surrounding landscape, especially when viewed from the River Cam towpath and Fen Ditton Meadows. The development needs to include articulation of roof heights to the application, it impacts on the skyline of Cambridge. The proposals lack a nature corridor.

Amended proposals

Objection to the visual impact of S6 and S7 on the eastern edge is maintained. The view points submitted demonstrate how visible the proposals, how bulky they are, little contrast in height, the impact doesn't diminish after 15 years of vegetation growth.

Heights exceed that in the ASAP. Buildings S6 and S7 – the articulation is limited (1.2m) and is not considered to be successful in positively contributing to the skyline, overall impression is that of a solid wall of development.

The greening proposed does not address the fundamental issue of height and bulk.

Tree planting is welcomed on the eastern edge but not sufficiently set back from the railway line to be successfully accommodated.

Wild Park - Disappointing this will not be retained in perpetuity.

Residential development - Objection is maintained, there is insufficient greenspace.

Contaminated Land Officer – Comments

Submitted proposals

Agrees with the assessment and conclusions in the ES Chapter 16. The standard contaminated land conditions should be attached to any permission.

County Education – No objection

Submitted proposals

Financial contributions sought for:

- Early Years - off-site facility or on-site;
- Secondary School - towards an extension to North Cambridge Academy; and
- Special Educational Needs and Disabilities –towards the Martin Bacon Academy, the area special school at Northstowe.

No contribution is sought for primary provision as there is sufficient capacity.

Designing Out Crime Officer – Comments

Submitted proposals

Being an early phase of the Cambridge Northern Fringe East development this is an ideal opportunity for this office to commence consultations with the developers to discuss Crime Prevention through Environmental Design (CPTED). Expect to see Secured by Design applications submitted for residential and commercial aspects of the development.

Drainage Engineer – Objection

Submitted proposals

Surface Water Drainage

Overall there are a number of deficiencies which need to be addressed by the applicant to ensure the development is policy compliant.

First Public Drain

It must be shown at application stage that the discharge point is suitable by undertaking a condition survey of the downstream network or that there is an alternative viable discharge point. The 90 degree bends proposed will likely impact on culvert capacity and increase the risk of blockage as well as likely speed up the rate of degradation to the existing culvert by introducing additional turbulence in the culvert under the railway line.

Climate change allowances

Commercial use buildings are now entering the 2070 climate change period (from 2061 onwards) and should use the relevant climate change allowances, there is not a scenario where it will be appropriate to use the lower 20% or 25% climate change allowance for modelling the 1% or 3.3% annual exceedance events. Additionally, the 3.3% annual exceedance event must be incorporated into the surface water drainage scheme.

Discharge rates

This is acceptable and in line with current policy.

SuDS

The design of the SuDS do not go far enough, this is a high density development therefore there should be a big emphasis on using interception storage wherever possible close to where rain falls.

Amended proposals

The applicant is only using the 40% climate change allowance on the 1 in 100 year storm for a proportion of the development. The expected lifetime of this development in terms of the impermeable area created will be in excess of 100 years and therefore we do not support the use of the lower climate change allowances for the commercial and retail aspects of the proposal.

Ecology Officer – Insufficient information

Submitted proposals

There is insufficient ecological information to determine this application.

Further analysis of the submitted reports cannot be undertaken as the underlying basis of protected species analysis has not been fully explained. The Survey Report has not acknowledged that the area to the northeast has not been surveyed for bats, reptiles, or breeding birds, and no explanation for the reasons why has been provided within the report. There is a discrepancy between the information regarding the application site area provided in section 1.2.3 of the Survey Report and that of both vegetation surveys and invertebrate surveys in later sections.

The BNG calculations are also very confusing with major discrepancies between areas that are assessed as baseline and areas that are delivered. This needs to be amended to show clearly where each of these created and enhanced habitats are to be delivered, whether onsite or offsite, and with clear plans of all on and offsite delivery.

Amended proposals

There remains insufficient ecological information to determine this application.

According to the Red Line Plan B1 appears to be within the Full application zone of the Hybrid application; however, no plan of the surveyed buildings has been included within the Ecology Survey Report Update. Therefore, the report should be amended to include the locations of the surveyed buildings and confirm if B1 is in the "Full" application zone. The report states that two emergence surveys must be undertaken between May and August, and that hibernation surveys should be undertaken between December and February. No such surveys have been submitted in support of the application; these are required.

Clarification should be sought that the Biodiversity Net Gain Calculator (Urban Tree Helper) has been accurately populated based on the Tree Strategy, and that (for example) 85 large trees are intended to be planted as part of that strategy. Given that the urban tree planting represents approximately half of the 66% net gain in biodiversity, and that the intention is to "bank" biodiversity units for future possible development this is a significant part of the plan.

The conclusions within the ES Chapter 9 should be updated once other sections of the chapter are amended.

Environment Agency – Objection

Submitted proposals (June 2022)

No objection however we believe the Water Recycling Centre has limited capacity.

Interim advice (November 2022)

Evidence in the emerging Integrated Water Management Study for the Greater Cambridge Local Plan indicates that groundwater abstraction to meet current needs is already causing ecological damage to Water Framework Directive (WFD) designated waterbodies (including chalk streams) or there is a risk of causing deterioration in the ecology if groundwater abstraction increases. The area also hosts several chalk streams which are internationally recognised habitats, sensitive to the availability of groundwater baseflow and vulnerable to low flows. This development has the potential to increase abstraction from groundwater sources. At the present time we are unable to advise with confidence that further development will not harm the water environment, until it can be shown sustainable water supplies can be provided.

Should the development be permitted, we would expect you to ensure that the new residential buildings meet the highest levels of water efficiency standards, as per the policies in the adopted local plan. Non-residential development of 1000sqm gross floor area or more should meet the BREEAM 'excellent' standards for water consumption.

Revised advice (February 2023)

The proposed development, through the additional demand for potable water use, increase abstraction and risk deterioration to water bodies in the Greater Cambridge area. Currently the application does not demonstrate the risk posed by the development has been sufficiently assessed or mitigated accounting for the impact of the licence capping on water supply.

The objection will be maintained until evidence is provided to demonstrate that an adequate and sustainable water supply can be provided, or that site-specific and/or off-site measures show that the risks posed by the development can be mitigated or removed, in the context of the evidence.

Environmental Health Officer (City) – No objection

Submitted proposals

Recommend conditions relating to air quality mitigation measures (compliance with the submitted Transport Assessment), a detailed Construction Environmental Management Plan and an Artificial Lighting Scheme.

Environmental Health Officer (SCDC) – No objection

Submitted proposals

Recommend conditions relating to a site wide Construction Environmental Management Plan, Noise Mitigation Measures (compliance with the submitted Environmental Statement), Noise Assessments, Collection and Delivery Hours (for non-residential units) and an Artificial Lighting Scheme.

Health Development Officer – Comments

Submitted proposals

The HIA Review Package checklist submitted was assessed and the outcome of that assessment is that the Health Impact Assessment as submitted has been assessed as grade B. Grade B meets the required standard of the HIA SPD policy (only HIA's graded A or B are acceptable).

Details of engagement can't be found in the submitted documents. Engagement with vulnerable groups is required. Demolition and constructions impacts on the residents within the Sunningdale Caravan Site must be considered and appropriate mitigation put in place.

The agent is referred to the County's Active Travel strategy which is out for consultation. The CEMP should ensure delivery times to the site by HGVs are outside commuter times to ease congestion and improve the safety of cyclists and pedestrians.

Jobs should be advertised exclusively locally for an initial period. Suggestions are made to ensure healthy eating is promoted during construction and operation of the site.

Historic Buildings Officer – Objection

Submitted proposals

The effects on Fen Ditton and Riverside & Stourbridge Common Conservation Areas would be on the important riverside setting of these conservation areas. The proposals would generate increased visibility and presence of urbanising elements of development within of the conservation areas and would affect the experience of their rural character. The intensification of development would affect the riverside setting which is a fundamental characteristic of the Conservation Areas and sensitive to change. Therefore, additional negative impact ought to be assigned considerable weight.

This leads to the view that the proposals result in more than a very minor detrimental alteration to the rural setting of the Fen Ditton and Riverside & Stourbridge Common Conservation Areas which affects their significance because

the appreciation of the relationship between these areas and the river corridor, open space and views of meadows and fenland is affected. Whilst this is considered to result in “less than substantial harm”, it is considered to be at a moderate level i.e. a higher level of harm than the “very lowest end of this scale” suggested with the application.

It is considered that the proposals do not “sustain and enhance” nor “respond to local heritage character” as required by Policy NH/4 of the local plan and the paragraph 202 of the NPPF applies i.e. that the development proposal will lead to “less than substantial harm” at a moderate level of this scale, to the significance of designated heritage assets / their settings (and this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal).

Historic England – Objection

The scale and massing of the proposed development would result in profound changes to the wider setting of designated heritage assets, most notably the riverside conservation areas which make a positive contribution to the visual quality and historic character of the city.

The application has underplayed both the contribution that the riverside conservation areas make to the local distinctiveness and character of the city, and also the effect that the development would have upon that character.

The interruption of the development in wider views from across the river would have a negative effect upon the way that it is experienced and appreciated. The proposed development would result in an overall moderate level of less than substantial harm to the significance of Fen Ditton, Baits Bite Lock and Riverside and Stourbridge Common Conservation areas.

Landscape Officer – Objection

Submitted and amended proposals

The proposal under provides on formal open space. A number of issues with the open spaces are raised in particular:

Wild Park - It is unclear what purpose the park provides to the overall development. The proposals are for the creation of Open Mosaic Habitat across a large area as well as the introduction of a wetland/pond. We question then, the appropriateness of also layering children's play into the area at this point. There is concern over the lack of overlooking of the area and the poor accessibility from the residential development.

Chesterton Gardens – Overall the proposed external spaces associated with the residential development are acceptable in design terms, however, the previous comments on Open Space consider that there is not enough space for the size development.

Cowley Road circus – Concerns regarding the design of the road and pedestrian and cycling routes.

Chesterton Square – it is considered that this space is struggling to find its identity while flanked by two very differently styled buildings of differing design and materiality. It is felt the space needs more detailed design review and tissue studies comparing its size and scale with other similar sized open spaces in the area would be helpful in assessing whether it is large enough or small enough to serve the potential future residential and commercial users.

Station Row and Station Row Piazza – Overall the swale and its presence is supported. It is considered however that the Piazza space could work harder as a public space. South-facing, it could be a nice suntrap for the colder months. In its current form there is a sense that it is only a place where routes converge rather than a place of its own.

Lab Pocket Parks – These spaces have always been constrained by their width (lack of) or the imposing size of the buildings to either size. They are urban and due to their orientation will be shadowed much of the time.

Design of streets and their hierarchy is questioned.

A number of other issues are raised in relation to cycle storage, use of planter, meanwhile uses.

The LVIA assessment proposed that ‘the Proposed Development does not result in any significant effects. [...] a proposal that appropriately responds to its context.’ The Landscape team considers that this assessment is unfairly concluded. It is considered that the hotel and office building do not set a precedent for development in the area but form the focus of a tall development cluster at the North Station, while the areas within the Proposed Development must be seen to be subservient and respectful to the existing development around it and the sensitive receptors discussed.

Historic Environment Team (County Archaeology) – No objection

Lead Local Flood Authority – Objection

Submitted proposals

In accordance with the latest climate change peak rainfall intensity allowances, a climate change allowance should be incorporated into the surface water management scheme for the 3.3% annual exceedance probability rainfall event. The allowance used should be based on the lifetime of the development.

The applicant proposes to discharge into the First Public Drain overflow culvert. It is not clear what the state of the downstream network is and whether this has capacity in the current state to receive these flows. Until it is clear that there is capacity in the downstream network to receive these flows, we are unable to support this application.

Amended proposals

Objection maintained in respect of the climate change allowance which should be based on the lifetime of the development.

Local Highways Authority – No objection

Submitted proposals

Objection, Road Safety Audit 1 is required.

Amended proposals

RSA 1 submitted and assessed. No objection subject to condition regarding detailed design.

Ministry of Defence (Cambridge Airport) – No objection

Submitted proposals

No objection subject to the comments and conditions provided by Cambridge City Airport Safeguarding are adhered to as part of any permission granted.

Natural England – Further information required

The LPA should consider whether water resources to meet the needs of the proposed development alone, and in combination with other proposed development, can currently be supplied sustainably and without adverse impact to statutorily designated sites and wider ecology.

The LPA should ensure the local Water Recycling Centre has sufficient capacity to accept foul drainage from the proposed development.

National Highways – Support subject to conditions / S106

Submitted proposals

A holding objection was issued pending a review of the Transport Assessment and Travel Plan.

Amended proposals

National Highways is concerned in relation to this application in regard to the Milton interchange and the effect on the A14. The network in this vicinity is extremely saturated, on both the local highway network and strategic road network. The principle of a monitor and manage approach is agreed, including a steering group to allow ongoing monitoring of trip generation in the event of exceedance of the trip budget to provide a forum to agree appropriate measure to remedy any breaches. The holding objection is lifted providing a scheme to ensure the method for the monitor and manage approach, together with details of the steering group, is submitted and agreed. A condition requiring the development to keep within its trip budget is also requested.

Network Rail – Support

Submitted proposals

Network Rail is one of the key landowners and partners in the Chesterton partnership developing a new masterplan in Cambridge North and fully supports the proposals.

Due to the close proximity of the proposed works to Network Rail's land and the operational railway, Network Rail requests the applicant / developer engages Network Rail's Asset Protection and Optimisation (ASPRO) team prior to works commencing.

NHS Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Integrated Care System – Comments

The developments sits within the catchment for the Nuffield Road Medical Centre which does not have the capacity to support the new residents. planning obligation to mitigate the impact of this new growth of £298, 003 is sought.

Sport England – Support

Sport England support the proposals subject to securing a financial contribution in the sum of £299,762 consisting of sports hall provision (£149,485) and swimming pool provision (£150,277).

Strategic Housing Team – Support

Submitted proposals

The provision of 40% of the market housing for affordable housing is policy compliant, this would be covered by a S106 agreement along with the tenure split of 70% affordable rent and 30% shared ownership. The affordable housing should be spread between blocks and the unit mix should be varied. In terms of accessible and adaptable dwellings, the applicant has confirmed compliance with M4(2) for all properties and 5% built to M4(3).

20% of the BTR element will be affordable private rent which will be discounted by 20% of the open market value. BTR controls such as tenancies, allocations, covenant would be covered in a S106 agreement.

Amended proposals

The Housing Team's comments were amended to consider the Market Report submitted with the application which was considered acceptable.

Sustainable Communities and Wellbeing Team – Comments

Submitted proposals

The proposed Northeast Cambridge Area Action Plan (AAP) suggests a population multiplier of 1.95 for the purposes of calculating facility and service provision. An estimated population of 678 people equates to a population multiplier of circa 1.60 people per home. This is less than the proposed AAP and significantly less than either of the respective local plans. This does not result in an under provision of open space and outdoor sports facilities but will result in an under provision of formal and informal children's play space as well as allotments and community orchards.

Developer contributions required for commuted maintenance payments, off-site outdoor sport, indoor sport, burial space, faith space (if not on site), small grants scheme and a community support contribution.

Governance Strategy, Management and Maintenance Strategy, Allotments Strategy and Community Development Strategy required.

Sustainability Officer – Comments

Submitted proposals

The general approach to sustainable design and construction is welcomed, albeit there are some inconsistencies between documents, and it is considered that in some areas the Sustainability Strategy is lacking in tangible metrics and targets, an issue that was raised by Cambridgeshire Quality Panel. In addition to the areas considered above, a further area is in relation to energy targets, where there is inconsistency between documents.

It must be highlighted that the proposals do exceed the requirements of current policy CC/3 set out in the 2018 South Cambridgeshire Local Plan, which is welcomed. Those policies are now out of step with the approach needed to respond to net zero carbon, and as such there is an expectation that all development proposals will go beyond these requirements.

While there is much to commend in terms of sustainability, for officers to be able to make an informed decision and to have certainty as to the standards to which the proposals will conform, it is considered that inconsistencies between strategies need to be rectified and, in some areas, clearer targets are needed. Concerns about the potential risk of overheating for those residential units that will not benefit from cross ventilation and there is a need for the outline application to commit to maximise cross ventilation to minimise this risk.

Amended proposals

The Sustainability Strategy and Energy Strategy Addendums clarified the previous concerns as follows:

- The addendums set clear energy consumption targets for the scheme of 60 kWh/m².year with an aspiration to reduce this to 55 kWh/m².year. This approach, which is in keeping with the metrics used in the emerging North East Cambridge Area Action Plan (AAP). It should be noted that the targets, while in line with those for non-residential development in the emerging AAP, are still a way off the target set out in the AAP for residential development, where energy consumption of no more than 35 kWh/m².year is sought. Accordingly, the Sustainability Officer recommended that the aspirational target be split into one for commercial floorspace, set at 55 kWh/m².year and then a target for residential floorspace set at 35 kWh/m².year.
- Development of a Circular Economy Strategy for the scheme.
- The applicant has confirmed that a minimum WELL Gold standard would be achieved for all commercial floorspace.
- In terms of overheating assessment, the applicant has agreed to undertake dynamic thermal modelling using the high emissions scenario.
- Rainwater harvesting is to be installed to ensure that total irrigation demand will be met by non-potable water.

- Clarification was provided on the energy approach for the Mobility Hub, which would be all-electric with no heating or cooling. LED lighting is to be utilised throughout and where ventilation is required, energy efficient systems will be used.

With regards to the issue of overheating, and being mindful of the commitment to undertake dynamic thermal modelling assessments for the residential units in order to achieve Part O compliance, clarity has now been provided on the number of single aspect units. A condition limiting the amount of single aspect units and ensuring non are north facing is recommended.

All commercial car parking should have EV or passive EV points.

Transport Assessment Team – No objection subject to mitigation

Submitted proposals

Insufficient detail has been presented to make a sound assessment. The Transport Assessment does not contain sufficient information for the Transport Assessment Team to identify the nature and level of intervention(s) that would be required to mitigate the impacts of the proposal to a satisfactory and acceptable level.

Issues raised are summarised as follows:

Existing Local Transport Network

Walking and Cycling Routes: The applicant has not made direct reference between the routes provided in the masterplan and the routes within the spatial framework plan and the movement and connectivity plan for the wider area as set out in the North East Cambridge Area Action Plan.

Car Parking

The applicant proposes a mobility hub with 725 parking spaces, of which 622 are to be provided for rail users, 20 for the Novotel, and the remaining 83 for the commercial development. This will provide the existing surface car park, as well as the expected additional parking required for the railway station. The total amount of parking expected for the railway station was noted to be 600 in the Transport Assessment for the railway station. The current provision of 20 spaces for the Novotel is also not clear. The applicant has not detailed the basis of the request from the rail industry, and for the larger car park of 622 spaces. Therefore, the additional spaces are not justified.

Further to the clarification requested on the floor areas of the development, should this be different to 65,000sqm then the parking analysis may require updating.

The applicant has not detailed how a tenant or someone purchasing a home would be prevented from owning a car in this development, and how it can be maintained as car free. Detail on this is required at this stage of the application, to enable the accuracy of this assumption to be known. It is unclear how any potential 'overspill' of parking to other areas will be managed. This is key given that in some areas around the site there are currently no parking restrictions.

Forecast Trip Generation and Distribution

The Transport Assessment does not refer to what the potential additional vehicle trip generation to the wider area could be.

The applicant has not compared the car driver mode share used with those used in the High Level Transport Strategy for the NEC AAP area, to assess whether they are consistent with the mode shares used from CB1.

The applicant has not undertaken further analysis to demonstrate that non-car driver mode shares in table 5.2 would be representative of the area.

The applicant has not considered where people currently live, where they might live in the future when this development is built and whether any of the existing passenger transport routes will serve as viable options to travel to and from the site. The applicant has not detailed whether any of the residents living in the new dwellings work in the surrounding area.

The applicant has not detailed how many employees might work in the buildings and what the approximate number of employees could be living in each part of the surrounding area could be.

The applicant has not considered where the future strategic transport is to be implemented, and therefore what proportion of the future trips to the area will be able to benefit from these measures.

The Travel Plan does not consider in detail how travel enhancements and demand management measures, and future monitoring for this area will help the site to be able to adhere to its strict trip budget.

Capacity Assessment

Should the further analysis within the trip generation show that the trip budget for the site could be exceeded, then junction modelling may be required.

Proposed mitigation and Accessibility

The Transport Assessment identifies several measures that could benefit the site and would enable the site to achieve its high non car mode share. However, the applicant has not gone into detail as to exactly how the suggested measures would operate or directly benefit the site and further detail is required in this respect. Further discussion is required with the Local Planning Authority to ascertain the level of the infrastructure contribution.

Amended proposals

Car parking

CCC is not convinced that the railway station will require the additional 194 spaces, due to the likely future switch away from the car for trips in the Cambridge area. A method of control will be needed in the S106 to ensure that the 194 spaces are not permanently used for the commercial developments and can be given over to rail uses as and when required.

A method will be required within the leases, tenancy agreements or contracts for the 425 dwellings to ensure that residents are not able to bring a car to the site, unless permitted by the managing body. A method will also be needed to ensure that a controlled parking zone in the surrounding area can be implemented if required.

Cycle parking

A total of 2191 cycle parking spaces are provided, with the amount set at the cycle parking standards of one space per 30sqm of commercial development. This is with a mixture of provision of 20% Sheffield stands, 10% for non-standard cycles and 5% at street level. This is recommended to be agreed.

Forecast Trip Generation and Distribution

The trip budget has been accepted by the applicant.

The applicant has undertaken some more detailed work on the potential for mode shift and has projected that the eventual mode shares will be broadly similar to the mode shares at CB1 adjacent to Cambridge Station. This supports the assertion by the applicant that CB1 can be used as a guide for this location.

If parking in the surrounding residential areas remains uncontrolled, there could be the potential for employees to drive to the surrounding area and park, and then walk into the site. The heads of terms allow for a contribution towards a Controlled Parking Zone in this area should it be required.

Reducing car driver mode share can be made subject to the successful delivery of the appropriate transport infrastructure, and the corresponding changes in behavioural patterns. This strategic transport includes measures to improve bus services as part of the making connections, the new busways to Cambourne and Waterbeach, as well as the dozen greenway cycle routes, completion of the Chisholm Trail and other improvements to cycle routes within Cambridge City.

There will need to be ongoing monitoring of the trip budget to ensure that vehicle trips to and from this development do not exceed the trip budget for this site. The Monitoring Strategy and the Travel Plan that supports the application will need to consider how travel enhancements and demand management measures can be used to assist the site to meet its trip budget, and what measures may be needed if there is an exceedance in the trip budget.

Mitigation

CCC supports development as long as the transport infrastructure that supports it is in place to enable the very low car drive mode share. It would therefore seek the following measures contributions to be made by the applicant in order to mitigate the impact of the development related trips on the surrounding transport network.

Trees Officer – No objection

Submitted proposals

The information submitted is sufficient. A detailed Tree protection plan would be required if the application is approved.

Urban Design – Objection

Submitted and revised proposals

Outline application:

One Chesterton Square

Points raised include: height; extent of basement and its limitations of landscaping in Chesterton Square; scale and bulk; design/appearance in relation to Station Row; re-think required regarding entrances and location of café; issues with the wedge-shaped design; design and colours proposed.

Two Milton Avenue

Points raised include: height; extent of basement and its limitations of landscaping in Chesterton Square; design/appearance in relation to Station Row; lack of compatibility of tapered and rounded design with other buildings.

Residential quarter

Points raised include: height; symmetrical, rounded design of the northern corner of blocks (S19-20) is not supported; entrances to cycle stores are not well aligned with cycle tracks.

Landscape

Points raised include: concerns about route hierarchy and relationship of Station Row to Milton Avenue; Station Row is now a “thoroughfare” whereas its role as a dwell and green space is less obvious; concern about the design and layout of the space I Chesterton Square; there is a sense that the Piazza doesn’t realise the space’s potential an attractive dwell space; Cowley Circus should be seen as a “place”; design for Chesterton Gardens is attractive however there are some queries relating to the detailed design and how it will function in relation to the residential use; there is a sense that the lab pocket parks are quite “confused” spaces – part vista, part service yard, part passageway and part dwell space.

Eastern edge

The architectural design of the lab-office buildings has some merit, it does not overcome the concerns raised in terms of the eastern edge and does create a relatively hard, urban edge to the development. This is exacerbated by the buildings proposed on the Triangle Site which will rise above the lab-buildings and, at a distance, appear relatively indistinguishable from them, thus creating a large and solid mass of development on the horizon that has a significant impact on views towards the city.

Buildings in full application

Mobility hub

The height is acceptable. Additional floor to floor heights to allow for conversion into alternative uses is supported. The introduction of commercial floor space at the ground floor facing Station Row is supported. The addition of an external and visually interesting staircase is supported. The elevation design and colour and materials strategy are well-considered and supported.

1 and 3 Station Row

Some concern about the height and bulk of the buildings and the impact of this on the eastern edge however they are well designed. The bays are well proportioned and successful in reducing apparent massing from the street level; elevation design successfully integrates the rooftop plant; varied materials palette serves to further emphasise the articulation of the blocks.

One Milton Avenue

There is a sense that the existing building form results from a process of “sculpting back” an initial block volume that was too large for its location. This has resulted in a rather awkward built form, at odds with the other buildings in the application which have a more confident and positive look and feel. The intent of setbacks, cut backs and cut throughs is supported, however the proportions of the resulting (visually) separate elements feel unbalanced.