

PLANNING COMMITTEE**15 OCTOBER 2008**

Application Number	08/0266/OUT	Agenda Item	4.1
Date Received	22nd February 2008	Officer	Mrs Sarah Dyer
Target Date	13th June 2008		
Ward	Trumpington		
Site	Redevelopment Station Area CB1 Station Road Cambridge Cambridgeshire		
Proposal	The comprehensive redevelopment of the Station Road area, comprising up to 331 residential units (inclusive of 40% affordable homes), 1,250 student units; 53,294 sq m of Class B1a (Office) floorspace; 5,255 sq m of Classes A1 /A3/A4 and/or A5 (retail) floorspace; a 7,645 sq.m polyclinic; 86 sq.m of D1 (art workshop) floorspace; 46 sq m D1 (community room); 1,753 sq m of D1 and/or D2 (gym, nursery, student/community facilities) floorspace; use of block G2 (854 sq.m) as either residential student or doctors surgery, and a 6,479 sq.m hotel; along with a new transport interchange and station square, including 28 taxi bays and 9 bus stops (2 of which are double stops providing 11 bays in total), a new multi storey cycle and car park including accommodation for c. 2,812 cycle spaces, 52 motorcycle spaces and 632 car parking spaces; highway works including improvements to the existing Hills Road / Brooklands Avenue junction and the Hills Road / Station Road junction and other highway improvements, along with an improved pedestrian / cyclist connection with the Carter Bridge; and works to create new and improved private and public spaces.		
Applicant	Ashwell CB1 Ltd C/O Agent		

INDEX

Section	Page	Paragraph	To	Paragraph
SITE DESCRIPTION/AREA CONTEXT	5	1.1		1.7
THE PROPOSAL	7	2.1		2.12
SITE HISTORY	14	3.1		3.1
PUBLICITY	14	4.1		4.4
POLICY	15	5.1		5.1
CONSULTATIONS	15	6.1		6.2
REPRESENTATIONS	16	7.1		7.8
ASSESSMENT:	17	8.1		8.553
Planning History	18	8.4		8.5
Planning policy context and the status of planning guidance	18	8.6		8.8
Principle of development	19	8.9		8.11
Land Use	20	8.12		8.78
Transport Issues – Access, Car Parking and Servicing, the Transport Interchange and Cycle Parking	37	8.79		8.167
Traffic Generation and Impact	59	8.168		8.192
Environmental impacts	66	8.193		8.216
Loss of Historic Fabric and Trees	71	8.217		8.249
Streets, Spaces and Buildings	79	8.250		8.350

Environmental Impact of the Scale of Development (Archaeology, Conservation Area, setting of Listed Buildings and BLIs and Views Analysis)	105	8.351		8.389
Sustainable Development	114	8.390		8.417
Impacts on Local Infrastructure	124	8.418		8.449
Impact on Existing Residential Amenity	131	8.450		8.491
Living Conditions for Future Residents	140	8.492		8.510
Scheme Viability and Planning Obligations	144	8.511		8.546
Other issues/outstanding representations and consultation responses	152	8.547		8.553
CONCLUSIONS	154	9.1		9.4
RECOMMENDATIONS	155			

APPENDICES

- A PARAMETER PLANS AND ACCOMMODATION SCHEDULE
- B PLANNING HISTORY OF THE SITE
- C PLANNING POLICY AND GUIDANCE
- D COMMENTS FROM STATUTORY AND NON-STATUTORY CONSULTEES (APPLICATION AS SUBMITTED)
- E COMMENTS FROM STATUTORY AND NON-STATUTORY CONSULTEES (APPLICATION AS REVISED)
- F DESIGN AND CONSERVATION PANEL MINUTES
- G ADDRESS LIST (HOUSEHOLDER) – APPLICATION AS SUBMITTED
- H ADDRESS LIST (HOUSEHOLDER) – REVISED APPLICATION
- I NEIGHBOURHOOD CONSULTATIONS REPORT (HOUSEHOLDER) – APPLICATION AS SUBMITTED
- J NEIGHBOURHOOD CONSULTATIONS REPORT (HOUSEHOLDER) – REVISED APPLICATION
- K NEIGHBOURHOOD CONSULTATIONS REPORT (NON-HOUSEHOLDER) – APPLICATION AS SUBMITTED
- L NEIGHBOURHOOD CONSULTATIONS REPORT (NON-HOUSEHOLDER) – REVISED APPLICATION
- M NEIGHBOURHOOD CONSULTATIONS REPORT (RESIDENTS ASSOCIATIONS) – APPLICATION AS SUBMITTED
- N NEIGHBOURHOOD CONSULTATIONS REPORT (RESIDENTS ASSOCIATIONS) – REVISED APPLICATION

- O RESPONSES FROM COUNCILLORS AND POLITICAL PARTIES
- P DCF MINUTES – 25.06.08
- Q REVISED APPLICATION PUBLIC FEEDBACK SESSION NOTES 07.08.08
- R DCF MINUTES – 03.09.08
- S CALCULATION OF OPEN SPACE PAYMENTS
- T CONFIDENTIAL APPENDIX – VIABILITY APPRAISAL BY PRICEWATERHOUSE COOPERS AND CARTER JONAS
- U DISABILITY CONSULTATIVE PANEL NOTES
- V COMPARISON WITH PREVIOUS SCHEME
- W PLANNING CONDITIONS

1.0 SITE DESCRIPTION/AREA CONTEXT

- 1.1 The application site extends from Devonshire Road and Ravensworth Gardens to the North, to the junction of Hills Road and Station Road to the West, to the junction of Hills Road and Brooklands Avenue to the South and to the Kings Lynn to London railway line to the East. It covers an area of 10.2 hectares.
- 1.2 The area currently accommodates a mix of uses including the railway station and associated uses such as car and cycle parking, vacant industrial/warehouse buildings in the form of the Rank Hovis MacDougal (RHM)/Spillers site, occupied and vacant office buildings fronting Station Road, retailing in the form of the Focus site and a Doctors Surgery.
- 1.3 Surrounding uses include educational uses on the North side of Station Road, existing residential development on Tenison Road, Devonshire Road and fronting Hills Road and residential development nearing completion on the Station Triangle site. The application site does not include the Earl of Derby PH which is opposite Unex House on Hills Road, Kett House which lies at the junction of Hills Road and Station Road nor the Red House site which is on the north side of Station Road approximately 40 metres from the junction with Tenison Road. The Red House site benefits from an extant planning permission for redevelopment to accommodate a hotel.
- 1.4 With the exception on the existing office buildings on the South side of Station Road, the majority of the application site is within an area of major change as allocated by the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 (Policy 9/9 Station Area).
- 1.5 The majority of the application site falls within Conservation Area No.1 – Central. Those areas that fall beyond the boundary of the Conservation Area are the southern tip of the site adjacent to Hills Road and land in the vicinity of and including the Focus site and the existing car park in the northern part of the site.

- 1.6 The Station Buildings are listed grade two. Sleeperz Hotel, the Mill and Silo, the Ceres statue, 32-38 Station Road and 125-127a Hills Road are Buildings of Local Interest (BLI). There are a number of trees that are protected by Tree Preservation Orders within the application site. Other trees that are within the Conservation Area benefit from a higher degree of control than normal.
- 1.7 The site falls within the controlled parking zone.

2.0 THE PROPOSAL

Application As Submitted

2.1 The application seeks outline planning permission for the following mix of uses:

- Refurbishment and modernisation of Cambridge Station.
- A new Station Square accommodating a transport interchange including 30 taxi bays, 9 bus stops (adjacent to the square) and 200 cycle parking spaces.
- A Multi Storey Car Park (MSCP) accommodating 2750 cycle spaces, 50 motorcycle spaces and 652 car parking spaces.
- 1250 student bed spaces for Anglia Ruskin University with ancillary facilities.
- 331 residential dwellings, including 40% affordable homes.
- Office floorspace (53,360 sq m)
- Other commercial uses including retail and food and drink related premises (5255 sq m)
- Polyclinic for Addenbrookes Hospital and Cambridgeshire PCT.
- A 120 bed hotel.
- An art workshop.
- Community uses including a gym, a nursery and shared facilities in association with the student housing.
- New roads, footpaths, public spaces, public and private open space.

2.2 The application is accompanied by the following supporting information:

- Parameter plans
- Planning Statement
- Design and Access Statement
- Sustainability Strategy and Checklist
- Transport Assessment and Green Travel Plan
- Landscape Strategy
- Arboricultural Report
- Retail Assessment Report
- Public Art Strategy
- Environmental Statement
- Draft Heads of Terms

2.3 The application is for outline planning permission with all matters with the exception of access reserved for future consideration as applications for reserved matters.

2.4 The application includes plans that identify the application site and the general highway layout.

2.5 The Parameter Plans set the maximum 'parameters' within which development could be carried out should outline planning permission be granted. With the exception of the parameter plans and the access plan submitted with the application all other plans and sketches are illustrative. They show what the development could look like.

2.6 The Parameter Plans, attached at Appendix A, show the following aspects of the development:

- PP1 Boundary Site Plan and Site Conditions 01 (Listed buildings, BLIs, buildings to be retained, buildings to be demolished and extant planning permissions)
- PP2 Boundary Site Plan and Site Conditions 02 (Tree Preservation Orders, trees to be retained and trees to be removed)
- PP3 Building Layout (+ maximum balcony/canopy overhang 1.5m)
- PP4 Building and Ground Conditions (building height (maximum height of occupied floorspace + maximum plant/lift motor rooms 2 m), building height above proposed ground level, proposed ground level (+/- 0.5m tolerance), existing ground level and proposed ground floor setback)
- PP5 Access and Circulation
- PP6 Public Realm and Open Space
- PP7 Residential and Non-Residential Parking.
- PP8 Proposed Uses – Ground Floor
- PP9 Proposed Uses – Typical Upper Levels
- Location Plan

The detail of the parameter plans will be addressed at the relevant section in my Assessment.

2.7 The Environmental Statement (ES) which has been submitted to support the application addresses a range of environmental issues, including socio economics, townscape and visual quality, built heritage and archaeology, transport, noise and vibration etc. For each matter the construction and operational phase impacts are considered. The non-technical summary of the ES summarises the residual impacts, on the basis of whether the development will have a beneficial or adverse impact. The applicant has concluded that the majority of assessments for the completed

development anticipate permanent beneficial impacts ranging from minor beneficial to substantial beneficial and that there are no long term substantial adverse impacts expected to be generated by the development. Where moderate and minor adverse impacts have been identified it is considered that there is scope for further improvement at the detailed design stage.

Post Submission Amendments

Revised Submission

- 2.8 Following an initial round of consultation the application was amended and a revised submission was made in July 2008. This resulted in the following changes to floorspace:

Use	Floorspace as submitted (sq m)	Floorspace as revised (sq m)
Office floorspace	53,560	53,414
Polyclinic	6658	6420
Potential doctors surgery in block G2	0	854
Hotel	7466	6581

- 2.9 The revised scheme also decreases the number of taxis accommodated in the Square from 30 to 28 and increases the number of cycle parking spaces from 2750 to 2812 spaces and the number of motorcycle spaces from 50 spaces to 52 spaces and decreases the number of car parking spaces from 652 to 632 in the MSCP.
- 2.10 The following table sets out the status of supporting documents following the revised submission

<p>Planning application forms – revised description of development as set out above.</p> <p>Planning Statement and appendices – not amended.</p> <p>Design and Access Statement – addendum provided.</p> <p>Statement of Community Engagement – not amended.</p> <p>Sustainability Strategy and Checklist – not amended, letter from consultants provided</p> <p>Transport Assessment and Green Travel Plan and appendices – revised.</p> <p>Landscape Strategy – revised.</p> <p>Aboriginal Report – not amended.</p> <p>Retail Assessment – not amended.</p>	<p>Public Art Strategy – not amended</p> <p>Planning application drawings – revised plans.</p> <p>Highway layout plan (SK 1020/P3) – revised plan.</p> <p>Phasing plans – revised.</p> <p>Environmental Statement Volume One – revised.</p> <p>Environmental Statement Volume Two Historic Environment Analysis – not amended.</p> <p>Environmental Statement Volume Three – Appendices – revised.</p> <p>Environmental Statement Non Technical Summary – revised.</p> <p>Additional Document – Response to Issues Raised from the CB1 Masterplan Submission (08/0266/OUT)</p> <p>Additional Documents – Additional Conservation Issues Reports</p>
--	---

2.11 All other detailed matters relating to the revised submission are addressed in the Assessment section below. In general the Assessment is based on the revised submission unless otherwise stated.

Further Pre-Committee Amendments (Second Revision)

2.12 Following the second round of consultation further revisions have been made to the Parameter Plans. The following changes were made during August/September 2008 and formally submitted on 29 September 2008; they are addressed in my report:

- Setting back of I1 and I2 building envelopes.
- Increase in top floor set backs to A1 and I1.
- Increase in height of A2.
- Inclusions setback to A2 at top floor level.
- Introduction of up to 710 sq m of Office floorspace in the MSCP (southern elevation).
- Re-alignment of G1 and G2 to allow for a 5 metre pedestrian /cycle route, a 7.5 metre carriageway and a minimum 0.5 metre verge to either side of the buildings.
- Relocation of student facilities floorspace from M4 to M6 (ground floor).
- Introduction of a community room in northern part of M6 (ground floor).
- Modification of parameter plan 6 (potential public realm and informal open space), in line with the City Council's interpretation of the areas that can be classed as informal open space.
- D1 shown as just residential rather than flexible use between student accommodation and residential.
- Footprint of 125 Hills Road shown on each base plan and marked as 'possible retention of 125 Hills Road, subject to further resolution of the detailed design'.
- Potential location for public toilets (southern end of MSCP, southern range of the Station and in northern end of M6).
- Reduction in the amount of office space to 53,294 sq m.
- Increase in the amount of floorspace for polyclinic to 7,645 sq m.

- Amendment to show a more curved cycle route to the north of I1, connecting directly with the cycle route in front of A1/A2.
- Amendment to the graphic used to illustrate 'building frontage/ active frontage's and thickness of the building footprints reduced to allow the graphic to be shown more clearly.
- Amendment to remove the suggestion that there would be office floorspace at ground floor level of the MSCP (with the exception of access to the first floor).

3.0 SITE HISTORY

3.1 The relevant planning history of the site is attached at Appendix B.

4.0 PUBLICITY

Application as submitted

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

4.2 In addition to the standard public consultation procedures the following processes were carried out:

- 5000 letters were delivered to properties in the vicinity of the application site, to cover an area extending to Mill Road to the north, Clarendon Road to the south, Trumpington Road to the east and Davy Road/Fanshawe Road to the west.
- 190 posters and 9000 leaflets were delivered to community centres, clubs etc
- Full details of the application were available on the applicant's website.

Post Submission Amendments

4.3 A press advertisement and site notices were displayed in relation to the revised scheme. A letter was sent to all those people who had made representations on the scheme as submitted, to all residents/occupiers of properties to the north of Station Road, south of Mill Road and east of Hills Road and to all Residents Associations in the City.

Full details of the revised application were available on the applicant's website.

A Revised Application Public Feedback Session was arranged on Thursday 7 August 2008.

The applicants provided a briefing on the revised application for City Members on 7 August 2008 and for County Members on 17 September 2008.

Second/Third Revisions

4.4 Due to the generally technical nature of the second/third revisions it was not considered necessary to carry out further public consultation.

5.0 POLICY

5.1 See Appendix C for a list of relevant Planning Policy and Guidance.

6.0 CONSULTATIONS

6.1 See Appendix D which sets out a summary of comments received from Statutory and Non-Statutory Consultees in response to the application as submitted and Appendix E which sets out a summary of responses in relation to the revised submission. In both cases the full response from consultees is available on the Planning File.

6.2 The minutes of meetings of the City Council Design and Conservation Panel are set out in Appendix F.

7.0 REPRESENTATIONS

- 7.1 See Appendices G and H which set out a list of addresses of residents who have made representations on the application as submitted and the revised submission respectively.
- 7.2 See Appendices I and J which summarise the responses received from residents on the application as submitted and the revised submission respectively.
- 7.3 See Appendices K and L which summarise the responses received from non-householders on the application as submitted and the revised submission respectively.
- 7.4 See Appendices M and N which summarise the responses received from Residents Associations on the application as submitted and the revised submission respectively.
- 7.5 See Appendix O which summarises the responses received from Members and Political Parties on the revised submission. No comments were received in relation to the application as submitted.
- 7.6 A Development Control Forum was convened to discuss the application as submitted on 25 June 2008. See Appendix P for the notes of the DCF.
- 7.7 A Revised Application Public Feedback Session was arranged on Thursday 7 August 2008. The notes of this meeting are attached at Appendix Q.
- 7.8 A Development Control Forum was convened to discuss the revised application on 3 September 2008. See Appendix R for the notes of the DCF.

8.0 ASSESSMENT

8.1 Section 54A of the Planning Act requires that the determination of planning applications be carried out in accordance with the policies contained in the Development Plan unless material considerations suggest otherwise.

8.2 From the consultation responses and representations received and from my inspection of the site and the surroundings, I consider that the main issues are:

- Planning History
- Planning policy context and the status of planning guidance
- Principle of development
- Land use
- Transport Issues – Access, Car Parking and Servicing, the Transport Interchange and Cycle Parking
- Traffic Generation and Impact
- Environmental impacts
- Loss of Historic Fabric and Trees (Listed Buildings and Buildings of Local Interest (BLIs))
- Streets, Spaces and Buildings
- Environmental Impact of the Scale of Development (Archaeology, Conservation Area, setting of Listed Buildings and BLIs and Views Analysis)
- Sustainable Development
- Impacts on Local Infrastructure
- Impact on Existing Residential Amenity
- Living Conditions for Future Residents

- Planning Obligations
 - Other issues/outstanding representations and consultation responses
- 8.3 I have structured my assessment through taking each of these key aspects of the development in turn and considering what is being proposed, the planning policy position, and third party representations. At the close of my assessment an overall conclusion brings together my conclusions and makes recommendations.

Planning History

- 8.4 The application site is the epitome of a city centre brownfield site in need of redevelopment as reflected in the planning history of the site and previous attempts to secure approval of a masterplan to secure its future development. Most recently, in 2006, an application was determined for virtually the same application site (Kett House is now excluded from the site). That application was not supported by officers and was subsequently refused by Planning Committee in April 2006.
- 8.5 Whilst the planning history of the application site, particularly the 2006 masterplan scheme, should be regarded as a material consideration in the determination of the current application, it is essential to assess the development afresh against prevailing Development Plan policy.

Planning policy context and the status of planning guidance

- 8.6 The relevant policies of the Development Plan and planning policy generally against which the application must be judged are set out in Appendix C.
- 8.7 The Station Area Development Framework (SADF) was key to the determination of the 2006 scheme. However this document no longer has the same status. At the time of determination of the 2006 scheme it constituted supplementary planning guidance therefore it constituted a

significant material consideration and any deviation from it required strong justification. Since the determination of the 2006 scheme and the adoption of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 the SADF no longer constitutes supplementary guidance and can now only be given weight as a material consideration. Given the time which has elapsed since the adoption of the SADF in April 2004 and the publication of new planning guidance in the form of PPS1 and PPS3, along with adoption of the new Local Plan, it is my view that it has now far less weight as a consideration in comparison with Development Plan policy. To some extent this is the reverse of the planning policy context that existed in April 2006.

The City Council's Local Development Scheme makes the following general comment about 'supplementary planning guidance'

'Existing Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) cannot form part of the LDF as there is no formal process for 'saving' these documents. Existing SPG which were linked to the 1996 Local Plan have now lost their status, as this plan has been replaced by the 2006 Local Plan. However most will continue to be material considerations as statements of council policy in the determination of planning applications because of their nature and content.'

- 8.8 It should be noted however that the supporting text to policy 9/9 of the CLP 2006 does expect that planning applications within the Station Area will be in accordance with the SADF. Careful consideration will therefore be needed of any matters that deviate from the SADF but the SADF should not be used as the basis of any refusal of planning permission.

Principle of development

- 8.9 Notwithstanding the poor quality of the existing transport interchange the development area is highly accessible. It is served by all forms of public transport and upon completion of Cambridge Guided Bus is likely to become even more accessible in the near future. The inclusion of the Murdoch House site provides the opportunity to achieve a high quality transport interchange through opening up a new square in front of the station buildings.

- 8.10 Planning policy for such highly accessible locations supports the principle of high density mixed use development of the type that is being proposed on the site. The reasoning behind this is that such development makes efficient use of land and provides opportunities for sustainable development, placing employment and residential uses side by side. In essence the principle of development is acceptable and accords with the broad principles of PPS1, PPS3, PPG4 and PPG13 and the Development Plan. However these guidance documents and detailed Development Plan policies set up highly complex set of requirements that the development must meet in order for the application for planning permission to be judged as being in accord with the Development Plan and other material considerations. These matters include such key issues as addressing traffic generation, the impact on air quality and securing a development that seeks to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Conservation Area.
- 8.11 Some comments have been made with regard to the fact that outline planning permission has been sought. This issue is partially addressed below with regard to the impacts on the Conservation Area. However setting that issue aside it is my view that an application of this type is appropriate for establishing a Masterplan for the redevelopment of the area. In particular it supports the aim of CLP 2006 policy 3/6 which seeks to ensure co-ordination of large-scale development.

Land Use

The Proposed Development

- 8.12 The application form sets out the proposed uses and their proposed floorspace. Parameter plans 8 and 9 show the disposition of uses across the application site at ground level and typical upper levels respectively. For the purposes of this assessment I have grouped the proposed uses as follows:
- Residential Units
 - Student Accommodation
 - Offices

- Commercial – retail shops, restaurants and cafes, drinking establishments and hot food takeaways
- Polyclinic and doctors surgery
- Hotel
- Other non-residential uses
- Multi Storey Car/Cycle Park (MSCP)

I will consider the extent and disposition of each of these uses as follows.

Residential Units

8.13 331 residential units are proposed within the application site. 40% of the dwellings are to be in the form of affordable housing. The proposed housing mix is set out below.

Units	Unit Size					Total	Total (%)
	Studio	1 bed	2 bed	3 bed			
Affordable	0	40	93	0		133	40
Private	30	79	69	20		198	60
Total	30	119	162	20		331	
% Affordable	0	30%	70%	0			
% Private	15%	40%	35%	10%			
Total (%)	9%	36%	49%	6%			

Source - Cb1 Cambridge Planning Statement

8.14 New housing will be located predominately within the northern element of the application site adjacent to the Ravensworth Gardens development and to the west of the principle area of open space adjacent to the Laing's Triangle/ Warren Close development. The former Foster's Mill is also to be converted to residential use (block K2).

8.15 The first revised submission detailed the disposition of private and affordable housing with the caveat that discussions are ongoing with officers regarding the location of the affordable housing. On the basis of the revised submission the private housing was to be located in blocks L1 to L4 adjacent to the open space and within the converted Mill building block K2. The affordable housing was to be located in blocks F1, F2 and potentially D1 adjacent to the Ravensworth Gardens development. The final revision to the application removed any reference the disposition of affordable housing, which will now be the subject of the Affordable Housing Scheme, which is secured via the Planning Obligation. Blocks C1 and C2 which lie to the south of the Northern Access Road have the potential to be either student accommodation or private housing and Block G2 which lies at the northern boundary of the site adjacent to Devonshire Road has the potential to be student accommodation, private housing or a non-residential use.

Student Accommodation

8.16 1250 student accommodation units are proposed for occupation by students at Anglia Ruskin University (ARU). The student blocks are to be located to the east and west side of the bus interchange area to the south of the Station and adjacent to the new bus only link road to Hills Road.

8.17 The revised submission differentiates between the student accommodation and other residential uses and shows student accommodation in blocks M1 to M6 which lie to the west of the bus interchange and to the north and south of the new bus only link road and in block H1 which is between the railway line and the bus interchange. There is also potential for student accommodation to be located within blocks C1 and C2 which lie to the south of the Northern Access Road and in block G2 adjacent Devonshire Road.

Offices

8.18 53,413 sq m of new office floorspace is proposed by the revised submission. The new office accommodation will mainly be located within seven new buildings fronting Station Road, including 100 Station Road on the junction with

Tenison Road, which already benefits from planning permission (blocks J1 to J4, I1, I2 and E1). It is also proposed to convert the existing Silo building to predominately office use (block K1). The proposed office accommodation replaces existing office accommodation on the site (Jupiter, Leda and Demeter Houses, Daedalus House, Great Eastern House and Murdoch House)

- 8.19 A further revision to the Masterplan has been submitted which facilitates office accommodation within the southern end of the MSCP/Block B1. This floorspace is not in addition to the overall office floorspace that is proposed and will mean that there will need to be a reduction in proposed floorspace within blocks J1 to J4, I1 or I2. Since block E1 (Great Eastern House/100 Station Road) already benefits from a resolution to approve full planning permission it is assumed that a reduction in the floorspace of this block will not be made.
- 8.20 In addition to the office accommodation described above it is also proposed that 1,040 sq m of office accommodation be located within block G1 which lies to the north of the Carter Bridge adjacent to the railway line. This space is likely to accommodate the British Transport Police who are required to be relocated from the station buildings.

Commercial Uses

- 8.21 A total of 5,255 sq m of commercial floorspace is proposed to accommodate a mixture of shops, restaurants and cafes, drinking establishments and hot food takeaways. There will be 1646 sq m of retail shop use, which will include a 604 sq m food store, and 3609 sq m of other commercial uses. The majority of the commercial uses will be located at ground floor level around the new Station Square (within blocks B1, A1, A2, K1 and I1) but there will also be retail uses in the ground floor of the office buildings to the east of Tenison Road and in the ground floor of the student accommodation alongside the railway/bus interchange and fronting Hills Road (within blocks I2, E1, H1, M5 and M6).

8.22 The revised scheme (PP8) defines the locations of the commercial uses more tightly so that they relate to ground floor active frontages around the Square, within the bus interchange and at the Hills Road junction. PP8 also states that the concentration of A1 Shops will be within the Square.

Polyclinic and doctors surgery

8.23 A total of 7.274 sq m of floorspace is allocated for health use within the site. The greatest proportion of this floorspace (7,645 sq m) will be accommodated in block A2 that fronts the west side of Station Square. The remaining floorspace will be accommodated in block G2 that lies at the northern boundary of the site adjacent to Devonshire Road. As detailed above block G2 has the potential to be one of three uses the other options being residential uses.

8.24 The Polyclinic has the potential to accommodate three doctor's surgeries, including the relocated Woodlands Surgery, which currently operates out of premises on Station Road that are due for redevelopment as part of the scheme. The polyclinic could also accommodate a dentist's surgery, pharmacy and other medical facilities subsidiary to Addenbrookes. Because of the uncertainty regarding the grouping of the three surgeries, Block G2 has the potential to accommodate the relocated Woodlands Surgery.

Hotel

8.25 Block A1 which fronts the west side of Station Square will accommodate a hotel (6,581 sq m). This floorspace would provide for a hotel with approximately 120 bedrooms. The application does not specifically refer to conference facilities but hotels of this scale would normally include such ancillary facilities.

Other Non-Residential Uses

8.26 In addition to the health uses a number of other 'non-residential institution' uses (Class D1 use - T & CP Use Classes Order). These are:

- An Art Workshop (86 sq m) within Block C1, which fronts the south side of the Northern Access Road (NAR).
- A gym and nursery (1474 sq m) to be accommodated within the ground floors of Blocks J3 and J4 which front the south side of Station Road.
- Student facilities floorspace (279 sq m) within the ground floor of block M6.
- A community room (46 sq m) within the ground floor of block M6.

8.27 It is anticipated that the student union facilities could include meeting rooms that could be made available for community groups and other organisations.

Multi Storey Car/Cycle Park (MSCP)

8.28 A multi storey car and cycle parking facility will be accommodated within Block B1, which fronts the north side of Station Square. 2,812 cycle parking spaces, 632 car parking spaces and 52 motorcycle parking spaces will be provided.

8.29 The policy position and recommendation for each of these uses is considered below. The merits of the blocks/buildings within which the uses are to be accommodated are discussed below in the section on Streets, Spaces and Development Blocks.

Planning Policy Position

Residential Units

Dwelling Numbers and Density

- 8.30 Policy 9/9 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 (CLP 2006) identifies housing as a principle land use within the Station Area. An indicative capacity of 650 dwellings is established and the supporting text to the policy states that ‘a high quality transport interchange... should be located within a mainly residential led scheme’.
- 8.31 In terms of floorspace the residential units amount to up to 28,843 sq m, assuming that the alternative uses of Blocks C1, C2, D1 and G2 all come forward as residential use. This equates to 18% of the overall floorspace. If the student accommodation is included then the proportion of ‘residential’ floorspace increases to 37%.
- 8.32 In terms of unit numbers the scheme would contribute 331 residential units towards the indicative capacity of 650 units. There are 183 residential units on the Warren Close/Laings Triangle development, which is included within the Area of Major Change. This brings the total of residential units to 514 units. It should be noted that the 650 figure is not a target but an indicative capacity for the Station Area. At the time of adoption of the CLP 2006 it was not anticipated that student accommodation would be included as part of the redevelopment.
- 8.33 It is my view that the proposed development achieves the aim of being a mainly residential led scheme. The Policy section has not raised any objection to the scheme in terms of the contribution that the site makes towards meeting the housing targets required by the East of England Plan 2008.
- 8.34 It is very difficult to calculate a density per hectare figure for a scheme of this type. By comparison the Warren Close development has a density of 122 dwellings per hectare. Given the dwelling mix I would suggest that the density would be comparable to this.

Dwelling Size and Mix

- 8.35 Policy 5/10 of the CLP 2006 requires that there be a mix of dwelling sizes and types on sites of this scale and reflects guidance provided by PPS 3 Housing. The supporting text for this policy accepts that the character of the area, site characteristics, the market and housing need will dictate different mixes on different sites across Cambridge. The proposed development includes a mix of dwelling sizes as set out in the table above. The scheme predominately comprises 1 and 2-bed accommodation but does include a number of 3 bed units.
- 8.36 The Housing Officer supports the mix of size of affordable housing that is being brought forward which reflects her desire that there should be a high proportion of 2 bed units (70%). The private mix shows a preponderance of one-bed units (55%). The Planning Policy section have reached the view that the proposed housing mix is appropriate for this central location being a mix of apartments with an emphasis on 2 bedroom units, but also incorporating 1 bedroom and 3 bedroom units. I tend to agree with this view.
- 8.37 Although there is no detail of the style of accommodation at this stage, from the information that is available it is highly likely that the accommodation will be in the form of apartments and not houses. There is therefore a limited range of type of dwelling on the site, notwithstanding that there is a mix of tenure as discussed below. It is my view, given the constraints of the site, that to limit the development to apartments as opposed to houses is acceptable.

Affordable Housing

- 8.38 Policy 5/5 of the CLP 2006 requires that a provision of 40% or more of affordable housing be made on site taking into account the viability of the scheme, any particular costs associated with the development and whether there are planning objectives which need to be given priority. The Affordable Housing SPD 2008 (AH SPD 2008) is also of relevance to the development. The AH SPD 2008 states that the City Council resolves 'to achieve 75% social rented housing on qualifying sites in accordance with the provisions

of the Cambridge Housing Strategy except as may otherwise be indicated by Annex 2 of this SPD' (Note: Relates to the Strategic Housing Market Assessment). This assessment confirms that the primary need remains in the social rented sector.

- 8.39 The current position of the applicant is that they will provide 40% affordable housing with tenure mix of 50% intermediate rent and 50% intermediate sale but that they will work with the Council to achieve 75% social rented housing through attracting Social Housing Grant. The experience of the Housing Officer is that 75% social rented housing is achievable with SHG and that without grant a 50% social rented/50% intermediate split also achievable.
- 8.40 The tenure mix of the affordable housing component of the scheme needs to be secured in the s106 Agreement. The precise level of grant that can be secured from the Housing Corporation throughout the implementation of the development cannot be guaranteed at this time. A cascade mechanism is proposed to vary the tenure mix of affordable housing provision should sufficient grant level to achieve the preferred mix not be secured. The proposed cascade clause within the Section 106 agreement will have a ceiling of 75% social rented and 25% intermediate housing/shared ownership and the floor of the cascade will be 50% social rented and 50% intermediate housing/shared ownership.
- 8.41 Issues relating to viability, development costs and the priority given to planning objectives are addressed in the section below on Planning Obligations.
- 8.42 The AH SPD 2008 also addresses the issue of siting and reflects Policy 3/7 of the CLP 2006 which states that one of the factors that needs to be taken into account in creating successful places is 'the integration of affordable and supported housing in ways that minimise social exclusion'. Two approaches are advocated in order to avoid the development of undesirable tenure monocultures, pepper potting which is the development of individual dwellings throughout the development and clustering which is the development of affordable housing in multiple groups

normally of between 6 and 25 dwellings. Clustering is the normal approach followed in Cambridge.

- 8.43 The revised proposals (second revision) have removed any reference to the location of affordable housing within the site. This allows a flexible approach to the disposition of affordable housing, which can be agreed as part of the Affordable Housing Scheme, which is a requirement of the s106 Agreement. The developers have said that they have not ruled out the potential for affordable housing to be located within the L blocks in addition to within the residential blocks in the northern part of the development. The Affordable Housing Scheme will be required to be in accordance with the Affordable Housing SPD.

Student Accommodation

- 8.44 Policy 9/9 of the CLP 2006 does not make reference to student accommodation as a principal land use within the Station Area. The inclusion of student accommodation is a key change between this application and the previous Masterplan proposals. However speculative student hostel accommodation is permitted by policy 7/10 of the CLP 2006 provided that a number of criteria are met. This policy and policy 7/9 which relates to allocated sites for student hostels for ARU recognise that there is a pressing need for student accommodation for ARU in particular. The CLP 2006 states that even given its current development programme ARU will have only 9.8% of its full time undergraduate students in ARU controlled hostels compared with the University which accommodates over 92% of undergraduates in college accommodation.
- 8.45 The contribution that the development of student hostels makes towards freeing up family houses also needs to be recognised. Although this outcome does not contribute towards housing targets it does assist in providing greater choice of owner occupied/private rented accommodation.
- 8.46 The criteria that are set out in Policy 7/10 address the following matters:

- Occupancy restrictions to ensure that the accommodation is only available to full time students attending ARU or the University of Cambridge
 - Management arrangements to ensure that students do not keep cars in Cambridge
 - Accessibility to the institution they serve.
 - Provision for students who are disabled
- 8.47 The Applicants have expressed a willingness to enter into a s106 Agreement which provides a cascade mechanism by which the student accommodation is occupied by ARU students as a first priority and if necessary by University of Cambridge students. The Agreement will not allow for the occupation of the accommodation by students at language schools.
- 8.48 Detailed information has not been forthcoming from the applicants with regard to who will occupy the accommodation during holiday periods. This will need to be controlled via the s106. In common with other new student accommodation within the City it would be appropriate for the accommodation to be used by conference delegates attending conferences arranged by ARU or the University of Cambridge.
- 8.49 ARU operates a system of proctorial control over their students bringing cars into Cambridge. This mechanism will control any parking by undergraduates with the exception of disabled students who require use of a disabled parking space. An alternative mechanism to prevent other occupiers of the accommodation from keeping cars in the City will have to be secured through the s106 Agreement if necessary.
- 8.50 The proposed student accommodation is located at some distance from ARU but it is within walking and cycling distance and will be a very accessible site for bus travel. The impact of additional cycling and walking upon surrounding streets is dealt with in the Traffic Generation and Impact on Existing Development sections below.

- 8.51 The Masterplan stage does not provide sufficient detail to judge whether proper provision is being made for disabled students, this is a matter for the reserved matters stage. What is evident at this stage is that there will be opportunities for ground level accommodation and disabled parking provision is made at each of the student blocks.
- 8.52 The text to policy 7/10 states that in determining applications for hostel accommodation the City Council will also consider policy 5/7 Supported Housing/Housing in Multiple Occupation. This policy requires consideration to be given to the impact of the development on residential amenity, the suitability of the site, including provision of bin storage, cycle and car parking and drying areas, and proximity of bus stops, pedestrian and cycle routes, shops and other local services. The impact of the student accommodation use on residential amenities is discussed below in the section on Impact on Existing Development. Detailed matters such as bin storage will be dealt with at the reserved matters stage. The site is very accessible and a wide range of local facilities will be available to students in addition to their own dedicated on site facilities.

Offices

- 8.53 Policy 9/9 of the CLP 2006 identifies B1(a) and B1(b) uses as some of the principal land uses in the Station Area. Since the adoption of the CLP 2006 the findings of the Employment Land Review would support specifically the further provision of B1a office uses and the quantum being proposed in this location. The application is for B1(a) office accommodation.
- 8.54 Policy 7/2 of the CLP 2006 supports employment development proposals subject to a number of criteria. In relation to B1(a) office development, the development must be providing an essential service for Cambridge as a local or sub-regional centre or exceptionally where there is a proven need for a regional function. This policy position is reflected in policy CSR2 of the more recently adopted East of England Plan 2008. The applicants have expressed a willingness to enter into a s106 Agreement that restricts occupancy of the office accommodation so that it accords with these policies.

- 8.55 With regard to the quantum of office floorspace, policy 9/9 of the CLP 2006 is silent on this point. However the SADF states that 'some increase in existing office (B1a) and research and development (B1b) space will be acceptable, subject to it having no significant adverse impact on peak hour traffic.
- 8.56 It is appropriate to consider a net existing floorspace for all B1, B2 and B8 uses across the site because a flexible approach to considering change of use with the B1, B2 and B8 classes was previously accepted by the SADF to reflect the sustainable location of the development. This is an exception and such flexibility would not be acceptable in other parts of the City under Local Plan policy.
- 8.57 The application involves the demolition of 22,752 sq m of B1a/B1b space; 11,222 sq m in B2 use; and 5,280 sq m in B8 use. Total existing B1-B8 is 39,254 sq m, which will be replaced with 53,560 sq m of B1a office. This constitutes a net growth of 14,306 sq m or 36% of commercial space. At the pre-application stage officers advised the applicants that an increase in the order of 14,686 sq m or 37% would be likely to be acceptable, subject to the caveat that this advisory figure related to the scale of floorspace only and not the impacts of such provision. Clearly the application accords with that guidance.
- 8.58 The proposed increase in office floorspace is significantly lower than that proposed in the previous Masterplan application, which proposed an 82% increase in commercial floorspace (using the same calculation as applied above).
- 8.59 The issue of impact of new office floorspace in terms of traffic generation is dealt with in the Traffic Generation section below

Commercial – retail shops, restaurants and cafes, drinking establishments and hot food takeaways

- 8.60 Policy 9/9 of the CLP 2006 states that a mix of A1, A2, A3, A4 and A5 uses should be included in the Station Area providing that they are of an appropriate nature and scale and would not have an adverse impact on the vitality and

viability of the City Centre or other defined shopping areas. This reflects the advice contained within the SADF although as a result of changes to the Use Classes Order the references to use classes A4 and A5 have been included in policy 9/9.

- 8.61 The impact of these commercial uses upon the character of the area is dealt with in the Traffic Generation and Impact on Existing Development sections below.
- 8.62 With respect to the quantum of development there is no reference to scale of provision of such commercial uses in policy 9/9. The application is accompanied by a Retail Impact Assessment that concludes that the amount of floorspace proposed will not have an adverse impact on existing shopping in the City. The City Council's Policy team shares this conclusion.
- 8.63 The disposition of commercial uses is also of importance and constituted a reason for refusal of the previous Masterplan proposals. The SADF was keen to promote the Station Square as a focal point for the new residential and business community. The application now shows a grouping of retail uses that gives appropriate priority to such uses in and around the Station Square. Retail uses within blocks A1, A2, I1, K1, B1 and H1 will be the first priority.

Polyclinic and doctors surgery

- 8.64 The CLP 2006 recognises community uses as those uses falling within Use Class D1, which includes health services. Policy 9/9 of the CLP 2006 supports the provision of community uses within the Station Area. Policy 5/12 of the CLP 2006 also supports the provision of new community facilities in the City generally but states that the development of citywide or sub-regional facilities will only be permitted in sustainable locations. The Planning Obligation Strategy requires that provision be made for community facilities to meet the demands imposed by increased populations.
- 8.65 Policy 5/11 of the CLP 2006 states that development leading to the loss of community facilities will only be permitted if it can be demonstrated that the facility can be replaced to at

least its existing level and quality within the development or relocated to another site with similar accessibility for its users or the facility is no longer required. There is no evidence to suggest that the Surgery is no longer required therefore it needs to be replaced or relocated. In this case the redevelopment proposals make provision for the replacement of the Surgery within the redevelopment either within the polyclinic (block A2) or in self contained accommodation (block G2). The replacement facilities can be secured through the s106 Agreement.

- 8.66 The contribution that the health facilities make towards the overall s106 package is discussed below in the section on Planning Obligations.

Hotel

- 8.67 Policy 9/9 identifies a hotel as an appropriate use within the Station Area. Planning permission has been granted on the Red House site on Station Road for a hotel but works have yet to commence on site. The applicant's Hotel Market Report looks at the demand for hotel accommodation in the City and concludes that there is strong demand for new hotels.
- 8.68 Despite the fact that the Hotel Market Report makes no mention of the Red House Hotel, presumably because it has yet to contribute towards supply of hotel accommodation, Planning Policy officers are satisfied that a further hotel as part of this proposal is acceptable. The hotel proposal is in accordance with the DCLG Good Practice Guide on Planning and Tourism (2006) that supports hotel accommodation in accessible locations.

Other non-residential uses

- 8.69 As stated above policies 5/12 and 9/9 of the CLP 2006 both support the principle of development of new community facilities falling under Class D1 of the Use Classes Order and the Planning Obligations Strategy requires that such provision be made for new residents.

- 8.70 The Art Workshop is a key element of the Public Art Strategy, which is discussed in more depth below in the section on Impacts on Local Infrastructure.
- 8.71 Policy 5/11 of the CLP 2006 recognises that not all community facilities fall into Class D1 and facilities such as those for the emergency services and public toilets also have an important role to play. As part of the redevelopment proposals the current premises of the British Transport Police (BTP) will be lost. In order to comply with policy 5/11 the replacement of these facilities must be secured within the site. It is understood that Block G1 has been assigned to the BTP. This replacement can be secured through the s106 Agreement.
- 8.72 The contribution non-residential uses make towards the overall s106 package is discussed below in the section on Planning Obligations.

Multi Storey Car/Cycle Park (MSCP)

- 8.73 Policy 9/9 of the CLP 2006 requires the provision of safe and secure cycle parking to serve the station. This policy does not make reference to the provision of a car park but the SADF supports the provision of 'Long stay car parking for railway users..... located in a multi storey car park in line with current numbers.' The number of cycle spaces is in excess of the 2000 spaces referred to in the SADF and recognises the need to cater for future growth. The number of car spaces is in line with current numbers.

Third Party Representations

- 8.74 The majority of comments regarding the general principles of the development relate to concerns about the impacts of the development; these are dealt with in detail below.
- 8.75 Some residents have questioned whether there is a need for the amount of office and retail space that is proposed. The commercial need for the development is not a material planning consideration however the impact of the development for example in terms of employment generation and on the vitality and viability of the City are relevant. I

have concluded that the amount of office and retail space is appropriate in this regard subject to a detailed assessment of traffic generation and other impacts.

- 8.76 Similarly the need for such a high number of student units has been questioned by both residents and consultees. Again evidence is provided via the CLP 2006 that there is a high demand for student accommodation of this type for ARU.
- 8.77 Residents and Residents Associations have called for more family housing to be included in the scheme. I can appreciate the arguments for including family housing in order to achieve a balanced community. However notwithstanding the other developments which are taking place, there will remain a high proportion of family housing in the area and in any event some of the accommodation, including the affordable housing is of a sufficient size to accommodate small families. There is no mechanism for controlling ownership of the private housing element of the development and therefore no way to ensure that commuters do not purchase these units. Nevertheless commuters will still contribute to the local economy and can form an active part of the local community. The affordable housing will be for local people, who may or may not commute to work. In my view there is no justification for the affordable housing to be dealt with through commuted off-site payments, therefore at least 40% of the housing on site will be occupied by people with local housing need.

Conclusion – Land Use

- 8.78 In conclusion it is my view that the proposed mix of land uses is appropriate for the site and accords with the Development Plan in particular the Spatial Strategy and policies 5/5, 5/10 and 5/12 of the CLP 2006. The development also represents a close fit to the mix of uses suggested by Policy 9/9 of the CLP 2006

Transport Issues – Access, Car Parking and Servicing, the Transport Interchange and Cycle Parking

The Proposed Development

Access

- 8.79 The application is supported by a plan that shows an engineering layout for access throughout the site; the General Highway Layout. These arrangements form part of the formal application. Within the Transport Assessment (TA) there are plans showing four options for alterations to the Carter Bridge ramp.
- 8.80 The General Highway Layout shows the following:
- Alterations to the Hills Road/Station Road junction to include relocation of the War Memorial and new pedestrian crossings.
 - Alterations to the Station Road/Tenison Road junction to provide a raised table and relocated pedestrian refuge.
 - Speed cushions and a 1.7 m wide advisory cycle lane on Station Road.
 - A new road to the north of and parallel with Station Road to serve the station square and northern housing area (Northern Access Road (NAR)).
 - Two new roads to the south of and approximately at right angles to Station Road to serve the proposed bus interchange and the southern housing area (Southern Access Road (SAR)).
 - A route for the guided bus through the bus interchange.
 - A new bus/cycle link road to form a fourth arm to the Brooklands Avenue/Hills Road junction.
- 8.81 It is proposed to introduce a gateway feature/rising bollards at the eastern end of Station Road to restrict access to buses

only in the bus interchange and to use rising bollards on the new bus/cycle link road from the Brooklands Avenue junction to restrict access to buses only from the Brooklands Avenue/Hills Road junction.

- 8.82 The access and circulation parameter plan (PP5) shows main routes through the site and access points for basement car parks.
- 8.83 The Transport Assessment also refers to temporary arrangements for vehicular access to the MSCP in advance of the construction of the NAR.

Car Parking and Servicing

- 8.84 The majority of car parking to serve the offices and residential units will be in the form of basement parking. There will be a total of 425 parking spaces to serve the offices that equates to a parking standard of 1/125 sq m and on the basis of a parking standard of 0.7/unit, there will be 232 parking spaces for the residential units.
- 8.85 30 car parking spaces are to be provided in association with the student accommodation on the basis of one space per block of the warden and two parking spaces for disabled students.
- 8.86 619 car parking spaces will be provided within the MSCP for Station users, which includes parking for disabled people and short-term parking. There will be a limited number of spaces within the Station Square for disabled people and for 'drop off'.

8.87 Provision of car parking spaces for other uses is set out below:

Proposed Use	Car Parking Provision
Hotel	34 spaces
Retail Units	22 spaces
Health Centre/Polyclinic	53 spaces
Police Station	6 spaces
Art Workshop	2 spaces
Student Union	No spaces
Gym	3 spaces
Nursery	3 spaces
Operational spaces for Railway	42 spaces (within MSCP)

8.88 A rear service road is proposed to serve office accommodation on the south side of Station Road and off the NAR to serve blocks A1 and A2. The NAR and SAR provide service access to the northern and southern residential areas. Service bays are shown with Station Square to serve retail and other uses within the Station Buildings.

Transport Interchange

8.89 The station square is to accommodate a drop off point, taxi rank, disabled parking spaces, commercial servicing facilities, and rail replacement bus services. The existing taxi rank on Station Road is removed. Nine bus stops are to be provided in the bus interchange area which lies immediately to the south of the Square; two of these stops are double stops, one inbound and one outbound. Of the remaining provision there are four inbound stops and three outbound stops.

8.90 Works are proposed to the Station that will open up new entrances into the main Station building. In the event that these are carried out the bus stops will be between 80 and 190 metres from the nearest Station entrance.

Cycle Parking

8.91 2812 cycle parking spaces are to be provided within the MSCP. Additional cycle spaces will be provided within the Square and brought forward as part of the reserved matters application for that part of the development. New buildings will be provided with cycle parking for occupant and visitors in line with the City Council's Parking Standards. Cycle parking for occupants of the buildings will be convenient, covered and secure.

Planning Policy Position

Access

8.92 Policy 9/9 of the CLP 2006 includes a section on Accessibility within the Station Area that picks up on the aims of the SADF and refers to the following outcomes:

- an integrated transport interchange to cater for rail, Cambridgeshire Guided Bus, buses, taxis, cycles and pedestrians will be included;
- a new road linking Station Road to Hills Road for buses, cycles and taxis will be provided;
- improved pedestrian and cycle routes will be required including a pedestrian and cycle ramp from the Carter Bridge towards the station and a new link from the station to Hills Road;
- development proposals must accommodate the requirement of the proposed Cambridgeshire Guided Bus and a safeguarded route to both the north and south will be sought;

- safe and secure cycle parking spaces will be provided to serve the station.
- 8.93 The scheme includes a new integrated transport interchange, the merits of which are discussed below in the section on the Transport Interchange.
- 8.94 A new link road has been provided to link the bus interchange to Hills Road. Buses approaching from the south will be able to turn right into the new link road and then proceed to the city centre via Station Road or turn left at the Station Road/Hills Road junction to return south. Buses approaching from the north will be able to access the bus interchange via Station Road and then turn left onto Hills Road to continue south. It will not be possible for buses to turn right out of the link road onto Hills Road, therefore any bus approaching from the north to serve the station only will not use Station Road but instead will turn left into the link road at the Hills Road/Brooklands Avenue junction. This will position the bus on the correct side of the bus interchange on an inbound stop.
- 8.95 The bus interchange area will not be accessible for taxis to ensure efficient operation of the interchange; therefore taxis will not be permitted on the bus only link road. Taxis will access the station via Station Road and the NAR.
- 8.96 Cyclists will be able to use the link road but there is a more direct and safe route for cyclists approaching from the south, which is likely to reduce the number of cyclists using the link road from that direction.
- 8.97 The application makes provision for alterations to the ramp access at the Carter Bridge. The applicants have explored a number of options and four options have been included in the Transport Assessment.
- 8.98 A number of options are available for cyclists wishing to access Hills Road from the station. Advisory cycle lanes are to be provided on Station Road to facilitate travel in that direction and the newly opened route through the Warren Close development provides a second alternative. The

proposed development offers two further options in the form of the bus interchange and the SAR. The Earl of Derby presents a constraint on how the cycle link can be formed on Hills Road because it is not in the ownership of the applicant, however the revised submission show link between the site boundary and block M4 by chamfering the corner off that block to provide a through route for cyclists at the end of the SAR and off the bus link road. This cycle link provides direct access to a proposed Toucan crossing at the northern end of Hills Road Bridge.

- 8.99 Parameter Plan 5 Access and Circulation also shows a number of other potential cycle and pedestrian routes over and above those described in the preceding paragraphs. These include an extension of the link adjacent to the Warren Close development between blocks K1 and I1 to access the Square and between blocks I1 and I2 and to the rear of blocks A1 and A2 to link with the NAR.
- 8.100 In terms of pedestrian access, the setting back of buildings off Station Road and the introduction of a linear park on the south side of the road will improve pedestrian access along Station Road. The alterations to the Station Road/Tenison Road junction and Hills Road/Station Road junction will also make it easier for pedestrians to cross these junctions.
- 8.101 The prohibition of cars and taxis accessing the Square from Station Road, which is facilitated by the provision of the NAR, is a very significant revision to the proposals in terms of pedestrian priority within the square. Although there will still be buses and cycles in the square, other vehicles will be constrained to the northern part of the square providing for a much improved pedestrian environment. Access for vehicles to the east of the Station Road/Tenison Road junction will effectively be limited to residents of the Warren Close development, users of the Southern Access Road and staff and residents of the hotel on the Red House site. This will improve the experience of pedestrians using this part of Station Road and allows pedestrianised space from the Red House site into the square.

- 8.102 The proposals do not incorporate improvements to pedestrian access to Cambridge Leisure, which was an aspiration of the SADF. However the layout of the blocks does facilitate a landing point for a bridge link to the MSCP on that development should such a proposal be brought forward.
- 8.103 A potential downside to the restriction of vehicles in the square is that some form of physical barrier is needed to prevent access. Such a facility and its associated signage can have a negative effect on the streetscene. This issue is addressed in more detail in the section on Streets, Spaces and Development Blocks below.
- 8.104 The route of the approved CGB approaches the site from the south under Hills Road bridge and continues through the bus interchange area where stops are provided. The CGB will then continue west along Station Road. There are no current proposals for a northern extension to the CGB, however the development proposals have been modified to allow for such an extension in the future. The revised plans introduce a colonnade at the ground and first floor of blocks A1 and A2 (PP4 Building and Ground Conditions) to allow sufficient flexibility within the layout of the Square to accommodate the CGB without requiring the Square to be remodelled. There is only one location where the CGB can be accommodated under the Carter Bridge; blocks B1, F1, G1 and G2 have been aligned to protect the route between the Square and this point.
- 8.105 Safe and secure parking for cycles is provided within the MSCP. This issue is dealt with in detail below in the section on the MSCP. The SADF also had the aspiration of enhancing cycle hire and repair facilities close to the station. This has been provided for as part of the MSCP.
- 8.106 It is accepted that, given the complexity of the project, temporary access arrangements may need to be provided as the site is developed. The temporary access to the MSCP is an example of this. The County Council have highlighted the need to agree details of this facility and to control its retention via a planning condition.

Car parking and servicing

8.107 The City Council's Parking Standards, which are incorporated in the CLP 2006, should be the starting point for any consideration of car parking.

8.108 The following table sets out the maximum car parking provision for each of the proposed uses and compares it with the proposed car parking provision.

Land use	Standard (inside CPZ)	Maximum	Proposal
Offices	1/100 sq m + disabled	524 + disabled*	425
Residential Units	1/unit + 1/4 visitor	414	232
Student Accommodation	1/10 bed spaces + 1/warden + 1/disabled room	155**	30
MSCP	No standard/5% disabled	n/a	619
Hotel	1/4 bedrooms + 1/resident staff = 1/disabled room + convenient coach pkg	30 + resident staff and disabled	34
Retail Units	A1 use – none A3, A4, A5 use – 1/proprietor resident	Proprietor residents only	22
Health Centre/Polyclinic	1/2 professional staff + 1/consulting room	Unknown	53
Police Station	As office use	10 + disabled	6

Art Workshop	No standard.	n/a	2
Student Union	No standard.	n/a	None
Gym	1/3 staff + disabled.	Unknown	3
Nursery	1/3 staff + disabled	Unknown	3
Operational spaces for Railway	No standard.	n/a	42

* Police Station removed from overall office floorspace to avoid double counting (53,413 sq m – 1,040 sq m = 52,373 sq m)

** Assumes 10 wardens and 20 disabled student rooms based on applicants TA.

8.109 It is difficult to fix the level of on-site car parking provision at this stage given the outline status of the application and consequent lack of detail about such issues as staff numbers etc. What is evident from the above table is that where significant levels of car parking are concerned the applicants are bringing forward a scheme which incorporates a parking provision appreciably less than the maximum standards afforded by the CLP 2006. It should also be noted that parking provision for the office accommodation is considerably less than that proposed in the previous masterplan not only as a result of the reduction in office floorspace compared with that scheme but also as a result of the application of a lower parking ratio.

8.110 The previous scheme proposed 1174 parking spaces to serve the commercial uses (office/shops etc.), which equates to a parking provision of 1 space/60 sq m. By comparison if a similar calculation is carried out for the current scheme i.e. adding together the office and retail space and dividing by proposed car parking space the ratio is 1 space/130 sq m.

8.111 The provision of an appropriate level of car parking in the MSCP and for rail users generally is not set out in current planning policy however the Spatial Strategy of the CLP 2006 from which local plan policy flows states that the quality of the transport interchange will be dramatically improved 'whilst consolidating but not increasing the amount of car parking for rail users'.

8.112 The SADF recommends as follows:

- Long stay parking for station users in line with current numbers within a MSCP
- 40 short stay parking for station users within the MSCP
- 20 motorcycle spaces within the MSCP
- 24 spaces within 50m of the station entrance for disabled persons

8.113 On the basis of the applicants submission there are currently 304 spaces in the long stay car park and 131 spaces for season ticket holders making a total of 435 long stay parking spaces.

8.114 The MSCP as proposed accommodates 512 long stay spaces, 40 short stay spaces, 25 disabled spaces and 52 motorcycle spaces for rail users. Additional parking spaces for disabled people will be located within the square. The MSCP also accommodates 42 car parking spaces for use by Network Rail and the Train Operating Company as 'operational spaces' and 13 car parking spaces for use by the office and retail uses that are accommodated within Block B. The total number of car parking spaces in the MSCP will be 632.

8.115 The development accords with the SADF with regard to long and short stay car parking spaces and exceeds the recommendations for parking for motorcycles. Of the total 619 spaces in the car park for rail users 4% are allocated for use by disabled people. If the parking spaces that are included in the square for disabled people are included this percentage will increase. However it is my view that given the requirements of the car parking standards we should secure at least 5% of the overall provision as parking space for disabled people. This would equate to approximately 31 spaces overall and can be secured by planning condition.

8.116 The detailed layout of the Station Square will be the subject of an application for reserved matters. It will be possible to locate parking for disabled people in the square well within the 50 metre access zone suggested by the SADF. Parking space for disabled people within the MSCP will be located as close as possible to the station entrance. Taking into account the retail uses at the southern end of the MSCP, the closest parking spaces for disabled people can be provided about 70 metres from the closest proposed station entrance.

8.117 Two servicing bays are shown within the square one adjacent to the MSCP and taxi/drop off area and one to the south of the main station building. The County Council have raised concerns about the use of the northern bay because of the potential for an adverse interaction between service vehicles and taxis/private cars at any time of the day or night. This matter will need to be resolved as part of the detailed proposals for the station square.

Transport Interchange

8.118 The dramatic improvement of the quality of the transport interchange, improvement of facilities for pedestrians, cyclists, buses, taxis and drop off is at the heart of the CLP 2006 Spatial Strategy. This aim is reflected in policy 9/9 of the CLP 2006, which states that the regeneration of the Station Area as an Area of Major Change should include an integrated transport interchange to cater for rail, CGB, buses, taxis, cycles and pedestrians.

The Steer Davis Gleeve Report

8.119 Since the consideration of the previous Masterplan, the County Council have published a report by their consultants, Steer Davis Gleeve (SDG), which is relevant to the consideration of the transport interchange provisions. The SDG study had two main objectives:

- To update the understanding of interchange requirements at the rail station in relation to transport policy and planning developments; and

- To comment on the existing Station Area Development Framework and planning application by Ashwell, and to offer recommendations for interchange facilities that should be provided

8.120 It should be noted that SDG were commissioned to consider the previous application submitted by Ashwell and not the current proposals.

8.121 The principle recommendations of the SDG report in relation to the interchange were

- Support for new northern and southern station entrances (southern entrance proposed as part of previous application) – current application proposes opening up central range.
- Support for general design, location and number (12) of bus stands.
- Precise configuration of bus stands to be agreed at detailed stage.
- Bus waiting and information facilities to be agreed at detailed stage.
- Recommend toilets are included in bus interchange.
- Driver rest room regarded as essential.
- Bus-only access to Hills Road / bus only access along front of station and removal of parking on Station Road regarded as essential.
- Assurance that northern route of the CGB can be accommodated.
- Rail station parking should not increase beyond today's levels.
- Suggest that short-stay parking and long-stay disabled parking should move into multi-storey facility.

- Proposed hotel parking should occur entirely within its site.
- Rent-a-Car should move into MSCP.
- Car club spaces should potentially be provided, if a Car Club develops.
- Taxi spaces should be maintained at current levels (>30), to be achieved by using a 'double-rank' as currently.
- Taxi drop off should occur next to boarding rank to minimise circulation conflicts with pedestrians / other users in front of the rail station.

The Station Area Development Framework

8.122 The provision of a greatly improved transport interchange was a key aim of the SADF. The following are identified as features of such a provision:

- All bus stops, taxi stands, cycle and disabled persons parking with easy and convenient reach of the station, ideally within 150 m of the station entrance.
- A high quality bus interchange with at least 10 bus stops, 2 guided bus stops and at least 6 spaces for bus layover.
- Maximised segregation of public transport from other vehicles.
- Waiting capacity for 30 taxis, improved pick up/set down facilities and free access.
- Convenient drop off point that will prevent interference with public transport.
- CCTV coverage.
- A visitor information centre.
- Scope for improvements for station operation and any island platforms.

Transport Interchange Assessment

- 8.123 The taxi rank, drop off facilities and disabled persons parking spaces within the square are well located for access via the existing station entrance or the new entrances that will be brought forward as part of the improvements to the Station.
- 8.124 Six of the proposed eleven bus stops lie within 150 metres of the existing entrance to the Station. This figure will increase to eight once the improvements to the Station have been completed. The CGB stops are included within the bus interchange area to reduce confusion and bus departure stands are destination based not service based. This should mean that buses use the closest bus stops to the Station as they become available. The location of bus stops is constrained to some degree by the need to enhance the setting of the Silo building as a Building of Local Interest (BLI) and to achieve the aim of creating a high quality urban space in the form of station square. This means that the bus stops cannot move any further north i.e. closer to the station.
- 8.125 Cycle parking is located principally within the MSCP. The majority of the cycle parking will be within a 150 m walk of the existing station entrance and this proportion will increase when the improvements to the Station have been completed.
- 8.126 The introduction of the NAR has a significant impact on convenience of cycle parking because it reduces the conflict between cyclists and motorists using the Square to a significant degree. Access to the Carter Cycle Bridge is dealt with in more detail below, however the principle of this improvement and the inclusion of a cycle access point at the northern end of the MSCP increase the convenience for cyclist approaching from the north. The location of the MSCP will still require cyclists to cross in front of the Station if approaching from the south and via the CGB route but the size and potential layout of the Square can accommodate such movements. The concept of having cycle parking in more than one location does not form part of the application.
- 8.127 The County Council support the proposed number of bus stops and consider that the bus interchange facility provides appropriately for the potential growth in use of public

transport. The provision of bus only access through the square and on the bus only link to Hills Road effectively segregates public transport from other vehicles. Service access will be provided via service bay to the south of the main Station building. Access to this space will be via the bus only route and is therefore capable of effective management to ensure that service access does not interfere with bus movements. All other vehicular access is via the Southern Access Road.

- 8.128 Setting down and picking up spaces for taxis are provided within the Square. The application as revised identifies 25 taxi spaces in the Square, including drop off spaces. This is slightly lower than the SADF figure but in the view of the applicants an adequate number to fulfil demand including future demand and meets the needs of Network Rail.
- 8.129 The facilitation of open access for taxis within the Square is not a matter over which the applicants have any control. Network Rail, as landowners are not willing to make provision for open access. The taxi rank will continue to be the subject of an agreement between the station operator and the Cambridge Licensed Taxi Owners Association. The Station Square will not be public highway post development and the applicants advise that the station operator considers that the current type of agreement is beneficial to station operation.
- 8.130 Drop off facilities for taxis and private cars are entirely separated from public transport thereby ensuring the use of such facilities will not interfere with free movement of buses.
- 8.131 The applicants propose to maintain control of the development site and to establish an estate management strategy, which will address a number of issues including CCTV. The City Council's CCTV section has confirmed that they would be able to link the Station Area provision to the existing City CCTV system. This provision is secured in the s106 Agreement.
- 8.132 A visitor information centre does not form part of the Masterplan application. However early iterations of the proposals for the Station Square show the potential for a

kiosk to be included for this function. There is also potential for improvements in facilities for visitors as part of the planned works for the Station. The revised application identifies the station buildings as a potential location for public toilets.

8.133 The detailed allocation of bus stops and facilities for bus layover are matters which will need to be resolved as part of the detailed proposals for the bus interchange.

8.134 Works to the Station itself and the provision of the island platforms do not form part of the Masterplan application. However early iterations of the plans for the Station have been discussed with officers and it is anticipated that an application will be submitted in the near future.

Cycle Parking

8.135 Policy 9/9 of the CLP 2006 requires that safe and secure cycle parking spaces be provided to serve the Station. The SADF seeks covered and secure cycle parking provision of at least 2000 spaces, 50% of which should be within 100m and the remainder within 150m of the station entrance. It is suggested that a proportion of the cycle parking could have enhanced security and facilities and could be subject to a small fee. Three potential locations for cycle parking facilities are identified in the SADF, two locations on the opposite side of the station square and one to the south of the station adjacent to the bus interchange. The MSCP is located to the north of the station within the SADF.

8.136 The SADF supports the view that some cycle parking should be provided next to the station entrance to cater for people buying tickets. However it goes on to state that this should be clearly designated as short stay parking with a time limit of, say, 4 hours and that overnight parking in this area will not be permitted.

8.137 The proposals that have been brought forward make provision for combined car and cycle parking within one building. The number of cycle spaces that will be provided is in excess of that stipulated in the SADF and it takes into account the potential for growth in demand for cycle parking at the station.

8.138 Both the proposals for the MSCP and the Station Square have been the subject of pre-application discussions with officers. Issues such as the design of cycle stands and the management of cycle parking in the square can be controlled by planning conditions as part of the detailed applications for those elements of the development. Similarly cycle parking provision can be strictly controlled for other uses as part of applications for reserved matters approval.

Third Party Representations

Access

8.139 A number of representations have been made about the potential conflicts that may arise from the mix of uses within the development and the high volume of movements by all modes using the transport interchange. The County Council as highway authority have reached the view that there is nothing inherently unsafe about the proposals that have been brought forward but it is accepted by all officers that a degree of conflict is likely and to some degree unavoidable.

8.140 Provision is made for a choice of pedestrian and cyclist routes through the development. Therefore it is not necessary for people to access the bus interchange, which should reduce potential conflicts in this area.

8.141 A high quality bus route to serve the station is essential for the delivery of the transport interchange and buses need to be given priority on this route including at the Hills Road/Brooklands Avenue junction. The Cycling Campaign has made representations on this point and seeks provision for cyclists accessing the area off this junction. Both the applicants and the County Council have spent a considerable amount of time analysing the proposed junction layout and the solution that has been brought forward is the

only workable one. The priority has been to achieve an unimpeded public transport route where the normal transport hierarchy of pedestrian/cyclist priority does not apply. There are technical reasons why the proposed junction cannot be used by cyclists, in relation to the fact that it operates via a detection device, and also land ownership constraints.

- 8.142 There are no proposals to accommodate additional car traffic at the Hills Road/Brooklands Avenue junction and cars cannot access the development from this junction. The new junction will be an early phase of the development because it is key to the provision of the fully integrated transport interchange.
- 8.143 Access to the Station by car will be less direct than the existing arrangements however this needs to be balanced by the significant improvements that will be made to facilities once car users arrive. The MSCP will be enclosed and easily accessible by lift to all floors. It will be accessed via a short walk under trees minimising the impact of inclement weather. There will be short-term drop off parking and parking for disabled people in the square as at present.
- 8.144 Pedestrian routes within the development will be of a much better quality than existing. One example is the 'linear park' that will be on the south side of Station Road. These routes will be safer for all ages and abilities. The detailed treatment of the Station Square will be the subject of an application for reserved matters approval. In my view a defined cycle route across the square is not necessary and would not serve to reduce pedestrian/cyclist conflict to any marked degree. I do not consider that pedestrians will be endangered while walking from the south side of Station Square to the Station.
- 8.145 An improvement to the Carter Bridge to facilitate easy access into the Station Area is a key requirement of the SADF. There are a number of mature trees beside the ramp, which were planted as part of an environmental enhancement scheme. These trees would be affected by some of the options that have been brought forward for the ramp. Naturally there is some concern about the removal of the trees and also about potential overlooking/loss of privacy issues arising from a new ramp opposite the houses on

Devonshire Road. The trees are not in the best of health and in my view should not form an in principle constraint on works to the ramp given the strategic importance of the new link. I am also convinced that potential adverse impacts on residential amenity can be addressed by careful design and the use of screening.

8.146 The Cycling Campaign suggests that an alternative would be to have a ramp and cycle access that diverts cycle traffic through the Ravensworth Gardens development. I do not support this alternative. Ravensworth Gardens is a quiet residential cul de sac and bringing cyclists through the development would have a significantly more damaging impact on residential amenity than the Devonshire Road access, which is already used by high volumes of cyclists. It is also understood that there are a number of ransom strips within the Ravensworth Gardens development that would have to be negotiated by the applicants before they were able to deliver such an alternative.

8.147 Works to the Station Road/Tenison Road junction will make this junction much easier to negotiate for pedestrians. Consideration has not been given to making Station Road one way as part of the development although new access routes have been proposed.

8.148 The County Council have not promoted the concept of making the Tenison Road area a homezone as part of their response to the application. In their view the NAR is a safe access to the highway. The traffic generation impacts on the Tenison Road area are addressed below. There has been a mixed response to the provision of the NAR by local residents but overall the response has been a positive one.

8.149 I do not agree with the view that paved areas indicating bus lanes are dangerous because pedestrians will not be expecting buses in the area. The detailed plans for the Square are likely to provide a defined route for buses and they will be of such a frequency that I think it unlikely that pedestrians will not expect buses in the Square. A one-way system for buses would not be the most efficient way for buses to access the transport interchange.

- 8.150 There will be service access to the rear of the Deities accessed off Station Road. It is not possible to share access with the Warren Close development as a result of land ownership constraints.
- 8.151 The detailed treatment of the public realm within the Station Square and the Park will be dealt with at the reserved matters stage. Officers are already acknowledging the route from the Square to the Park as a key pedestrian route.

Car Parking and Servicing

- 8.152 There are mixed views about the number of car parking spaces in the MSCP. However the CLP 2006 is quite specific in its requirement that there be no additional spaces over and above those existing for use by rail users. The number of spaces within the MSCP needs to be seen in the context of the transport interchange as a whole the improvements to which will encourage a switch to more sustainable modes and the operational needs of the Train Operating Company in serving their customers.
- 8.153 Car parking for commercial uses is much reduced in comparison with the earlier scheme and within the maximum permitted by the CLP 2006 Parking Standards. The MSCP will be for use by rail users only and visitors to the commercial space will not be permitted to park there. Students will be prevented from having cars through the s106 Agreement.
- 8.154 New service roads have been incorporated in the scheme to separate out servicing traffic from other traffic, principally buses. There is potential for conflict as a result of the use of the service bays in the Square and this will need to be carefully managed.

Transport Interchange

- 8.155 In common with the earlier scheme, representations have been made suggesting that the bus station should be relocated to the Station and that long distance coaches should use the Station instead of Parkers Piece. Neither City

Council Transport Officers nor County Council Officers have raised objections on the basis of the lack of these proposals and neither the CLP 2006 nor the SADF promote such relocations.

- 8.156 Detailed provision of shelters and other bus user facilities will be part of the detailed submission for the bus interchange. It is expected that this will be of a very high quality appropriate to its setting and strategic importance.
- 8.157 The bus interchange is located to achieve the optimum balance between keeping the Square as an open area with congregation space for all users, protecting the setting of historic buildings and being as convenient as possible for bus users. This has inevitably meant that there will be some level of inconvenience particularly for people with mobility problems using the bus.
- 8.158 Network Rail and the TOC are already working on the provision of an island platform at the Station. The scheme does not involve any new platform served from the east.
- 8.159 The CGB will access the Station Area where stops will be provided. As part of the s106 contributions there will be a Southern Corridor Area Transport Plan payment could be spent on improving public transport.
- 8.160 The revised scheme makes provision for the northern extension of the CGB and the associated cycle/footway (the 'Chisholm Trail').
- 8.161 Rail replacement buses are catered for through the provision of parking space in the Square and feeder parking spaces on Station Road. This is facilitated by the removal of parking on Station Road. As this will only be on a temporary basis my concerns about impact of the Square and setting of historic buildings are not so relevant.
- 8.162 A balance has also been struck in terms of the amount of space that is allocated within the square for taxis; pick up spaces and disabled parking. Although space is limited for drop off and there is no space for pick up, the MSCP is conveniently located as an alternative.

Cycle parking

- 8.163 The provision of cycle parking for station users in a single location has been the subject of much debate between officers and the applicants. Provision within a single building allows a much higher standard of management of the facility and also prevents confusion about where spaces are available. The facility will be well lit and secure and I am of the view that cyclists of all genders and ages will feel that it is a safe place to be.
- 8.164 There appears to be some confusion about the numbers of cycle parking spaces. In all there will be almost 3000 cycle spaces, which is something like double the existing number. The concerns of officers revolve around how spaces within the Square will be managed but it is acknowledged that some short stay space will be needed for example for people buying tickets.
- 8.165 The applicants have given a commitment that cycle parking will be free with the exception of a small proportion of valet style parking, which will be operated from the cycle shop. This is encouraged by the SADF.
- 8.166 The MSCP as a whole will be an early phase of the development not only because it is a vital part of the strategic transport interchange but also because it frees up land for redevelopment.

Conclusion – Transport Issues – Access, Car Parking and Servicing, Transport Interchange and Cycle Parking

- 8.167 In conclusion it is my view that the transport issues identified above have been appropriately addressed by the proposed development and accord with the Development Plan in particular the strategy for the Cambridge Sub Region set out within the East of England Plan 2008 and the Spatial Strategy and policies 8/4, 8/5, 8/6 and 8/7 of the CLP 2006. The development also closely addresses the accessibility issues raised by Policy 9/9 of the CLP 2006 and conforms to guidance provided by PPG13 Transport.

Traffic Generation and Impact

The Proposed Development

8.168 The application is supported by a Transport Assessment that addresses the following issues:

- Existing conditions including site information, assessments of public transport and walking and cycling opportunities, an assessment of the existing highway network and analysis of safety considerations and accidents.
- Proposed development including highway improvements, improvements to pedestrian and cycle infrastructure and public transport, provision for service and delivery vehicles and parking.
- Appraisal of the Impact of the Proposed Development.
- Trip Generation.
- Promotion of Smarter Choices via Travel Plans

8.169 In addition to the Transport Assessment the applicants have also presented the results of a micro simulation model (VISSIM) the aim of which was to identify, understand and replicate the current traffic problems and then to test the masterplan as a solution.

8.170 I have already addressed highway improvements, improvements to infrastructure, servicing and parking in the section above. The purpose of this part of my assessment is therefore to focus principally on trip generation and mitigation measures.

8.171 The assessment of trip generation has been the subject of detailed discussions between the applicants and the County Council on such subjects as trip rates and modelling.

8.172 The following tables set out the baseline trip generation and predicted trip generation for the development that have been agreed between the applicants and the County Council.

Baseline Trip Generation

Mode	AM Peak		PM Peak		Daily (24hrs)		
	Arrival	Departure	Arrival	Departure	Arrival	Departure	Total
Vehicular (inc. servicing)	313	48	85	277	1675	1537	3212
Cyclists	413	39	87	341	1686	1459	3145
Pedestrian	173	17	37	143	709	613	1322
Public Transport	277	26	58	229	1133	979	2112
TOTAL	1176	130	267	990	5203	4588	9791

Predicted Trip Generation for CB1

Mode	AM Peak		PM Peak		Daily (24hrs)		
	Arrival	Departure	Arrival	Departure	Arrival	Departure	Total
Vehicular	296	147	132	255	1874	1778	3652
HGV/servicing	4	1	0	0	41	56	97
Cyclists	917	369	377	797	4816	4383	9199
Pedestrian	529	701	509	545	4397	4269	8666
Public Transport	705	178	216	609	3057	2700	5757
TOTAL	2451	1396	1234	2199	14185	13186	27371

8.173 The TA promotes the following mitigating measures to address the impacts of the additional trips generated by the development:

- A Green Commuter Plan – a framework for a site travel plan is provided. The applicants will require tenants to prepare a travel plan as a condition of the tenancy agreement, including participation in Cambridgeshire Travel for Work Partnership.
- Reduced parking provision.
- Car sharing and car clubs.
- Public Transport subsidy through encouraging tenants to sign up to the 'Company Travel Wise' scheme.
- Encouraging additional bus patronage through provision of a new bus interchange.
- Provision of cycling and walking facilities including:
 - Cycle parking spaces.
 - Improved pedestrian and cycle access and connections including direct ramp from Carter Cycle Bridge.
 - Implementation of car free development for the proposed student accommodation.

Planning Policy Position

8.174 Policy 9/9 of the CLP 2006 does not make specific reference to the traffic generation impact of the development of the Station Area, however Policy 8/2 of the CLP 2006 requires that developments be permitted only where they do not have an unacceptable transport impact. The SADF also states that 'the road network in the station area is already operating beyond capacity at peak times and development will be constrained by the need to ensure that the existing highway network can accommodate vehicle movements from development in the Station Road area.'

8.175 Given the complexity of traffic generation modelling, the views of the County Council are key to the determination of whether or not the impacts of the development are satisfactory.

The County Council's View

Traffic Generation

8.176 County Council Officers are satisfied that the traffic generation modelling that has been carried out give an accurate picture of the impact of the development. They have concluded that the net change in trip generation by mode will be as set out below:

Mode	AM Peak		PM Peak		Daily (24hrs)		% Daily Change
	Arrival	Departure	Arrival	Departure	Arrival	Departure	
Vehicular	-13	100	47	-22	240	297	+16
Cyclists	504	330	290	456	3130	2924	+93
Pedestrian	356	684	472	402	3688	3656	+455
Public Transport	428	152	158	373	1924	1721	+73
TOTAL	1275	1266	967	1209	8563	8598	+79

8.177 The percentage change figure relating to pedestrian trip generation is much higher than the other changes. Whilst there will be more people attracted to CB1 and arising from CB1, there are also lots of movements between the wide variety of land uses e.g. office workers going to the leisure facilities or café/bars, residents going to the shops etc. Also, because of a lack of facilities on site at present these movements do not occur to such a scale currently.

Impact on the highway network

- 8.178 In terms of the development impact on the highway network, County Council officers have concluded that the impact on the Hills Road corridor and the Hills Road/Station Road junction to be acceptable subject to detailed design and mitigation measures that are set out below.
- 8.179 With regard to the Hills Road/Brooklands Avenue it is noted that the operation of the new junction for the bus link will have a minor disbenefit for car users but that this is outweighed by the significant advantages afforded to public transport.
- 8.180 An assessment of the operation of the revised Station Road/Tenison Road junction by the County Council concludes that it is likely that there will be additional queuing on Tenison Road. However this will be of very limited duration and is aggravated by the current problems arising from motorists rat-running to avoid Hills Road.
- 8.181 County Council Officers have also reached the view that the new junction of the NAR with Tenison Road will operate effectively.

Student Arrival/Departure Traffic Management Plan

- 8.182 Although the incorporation of a high proportion of student accommodation within the development has a positive effect on vehicular traffic impact for the majority of the time it does raise the issue of how the accommodation is accessed at the beginning and ends of term. The County Council have not raised an objection to this element of the scheme but they do recommend that a Traffic Management Plan be secured through the s106 Agreement.

Mitigation Measures and Conditions

- 8.183 The County Council have recommended that the following mitigation measures be secured to ensure that the development is as sustainable in traffic generation terms as possible:

- Contributions towards the Southern Corridor Area Transport Plan (SCATP) and the CGB.
- Bus Revenue support to assist in the expansion of bus services at peak periods.
- Commitment to Residential Travel Plans in addition to Commercial Travel Plans.
- A more detailed Travel Plan Framework that includes firm commitments.
- Early years revenue support to assist in the establishment of the car club.
- Contribution towards the Tenison Road Area Management Improvement Scheme.

8.184 I have addressed the quantum of the SCATP and CGB contributions and the contribution towards the Tenison Road Area Management Improvement Scheme in the section below on Planning Obligations. Planning conditions are also recommended in particular to secure the submission and approval of works to affected junctions.

Third Party Representations

8.185 There has been a great deal of concern amongst local residents regarding the impact of traffic generation and a keenness to see the comments of the County Council. To this end the County Council Transportation Team's comments were put on the City Council website as soon as they became available.

8.186 On the basis of the assessment that has been carried out I do not consider that the environmental consequences of an increase in vehicular traffic will be as serious as feared by some residents. The assessment also demonstrates that there is sufficient capacity in the network to cater for the additional traffic.

8.187 An aim of the development, as stated by the applicants, was for the traffic impact of the development to be as close as possible to nil detriment. Clearly 'nil detriment' has not been achieved; however the impact of the development is within acceptable limits.

8.188 I am confident in the assessment that has been carried out by the County Council. As has been stated at public meetings the role of the County Council is not to carry out an independent assessment of the traffic impact but to assess the information provided by the applicants. In this case a very thorough assessment has been made.

8.189 I am also confident that the TA as revised is adequate for the scale of development but accept that this was not the case in relation to the TA that was originally submitted.

8.190 The County Council have highlighted the need for traffic management within the Tenison Road area to particularly cater for the high volumes of pedestrians and cyclists accessing ARU. A contribution towards such provision will be secured via the s106 Agreement.

8.191 The case for bus revenue support and early years revenue support for the car club is discussed below in the section on Planning Obligations.

Conclusion - Traffic Generation and Impact

8.192 In my opinion the impacts for the development in terms of traffic generation have been properly assessed. Subject to the application of the mitigation measures suggested by the applicants and those recommended by the County Council, the proposed development accords with the Development Plan in particular policy 8/2 of the CLP 2006.

Environmental impacts

8.193 The application is supported by an Environmental Statement (ES) to ensure that the application conforms to the Environmental Impact Assessment Regulations. The ES addresses a wide range of issues, which I have assessed in some detail below, however the ES has also informed the rest of my assessment and the views expressed by consultees. There are two areas of environmental impact that are not addressed elsewhere in my assessment, Impact on Air Quality and Impact on Contaminated Land. I have addressed these matters in detail below.

The Proposed Development

Environmental Statement (ES)

8.194 The ES addresses the following environmental impacts both in terms of the construction and operational phases of the development:

- Socio Economics
- Townscape and Visual Quality
- Archaeology
- Transport
- Noise and Vibration
- Air Quality and Greenhouse Gases
- Daylight, Sunlight, Overshadowing, Solar Glare and Light Pollution
- Wind
- Ground Conditions
- Water Resources and Flood Risk
- Ecology

8.195 An assessment has been carried out of the impacts on all of these areas of interest and residual impacts have been identified over and above impacts that can be satisfactorily mitigated against. In general the applicants have concluded that the development will have a negligible residual effect at the operational stage and will have a beneficial impact at the operational phase. Residual adverse impacts are confined to the following:

- Effect on archaeological remains
- Noise impacts of the NAR at morning and evening peak
- Impact on Air Quality
- Soil and groundwater contaminants (office workers)

Archaeology

8.196 It is anticipated that archaeological remains will be dealt with by 'preservation by record' that is to say there are likely to be some impacts on archaeology in situ.

Noise Impact of the NAR

8.197 The introduction of the NAR will bring traffic closer to houses in Ravensworth Gardens, therefore there is potential for noise and disturbance at peak times. However this impact will be reduced by the buffering effect of Block D.

Impact on Air Quality

8.198 The maximum predicted change in annual mean NO₂ concentrations is a 5.1% increase. For particulate matter PM₁₀ concentrations the comparable figure is a 0.6% increase. CO₂ produced from construction traffic is 0.98% of the total CO₂ from existing traffic using a 2006 baseline.

Soil and Ground Water Contaminants (Office Workers)

8.199 Topsoil used in association with commercial development is not of the same quality as that used in association with public spaces and residential developments therefore a minor adverse impact could result.

Planning Policy Position

8.200 The Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) (England and Wales) Regulations 1999 require that certain types of major development proposals be supported by an Environmental Statement. The proposed development constitutes EIA development and in my view the information submitted with the revised submission, which

included a revised ES, is adequate to address the requirements of these Regulations.

8.201 With respect to the issues that have been identified as having some residual adverse impact I have concluded the following:

Archaeology

8.202 The archaeological impacts of the development are dealt with in the section on the Environmental Impact of the Scale of Development. The Archaeology Section of the County Council have not raised any concerns about the loss of archaeological remains subject to the imposition of a 'negative' condition requiring the submission and approval of a strategy of investigation.

Noise Impact of the NAR

8.203 The impact of use of the NAR is dealt with in the section on Living Conditions for Future Residents. The Environmental Health Officer not identified any significant noise impact arising from the use of the NAR.

8.204 The applicants have argued that any noise impact arising out of the use of the NAR is mitigated by the benefits delivered by the removal of traffic from Station Road. While I recognise that there is some weight to this argument I am more persuaded by the lack of concern from EHO and the potential for designing out potential impacts as part of the delivery of Block D.

Impact on Air Quality

8.205 The proposed development falls within an Air Quality Management Area (AQMA). Policy 4/14 of the CLP 2006 requires that new development within or adjacent to an AQMA be permitted only where it would have no adverse effect on air quality within the AQMA and that air quality levels within the AQMA would not have a significant adverse effect on the proposed use/users.

8.206 This means that the application must demonstrate that in terms of impact of any additional traffic and other impacts on air quality e.g. use of biomass boilers, it will not adversely affect air quality. Given that a mixed-use scheme is proposed which includes sensitive receptors such as residents, the application also has to demonstrate that the development will result in an appropriate living environment in terms of air quality.

8.207 The EHO has raised a number of concerns about the applicants approach to air quality modelling. Although the revised submission has gone some way to addressing these concerns the EHO is still of the view that the adverse impact identified in the ES is likely to be more widespread than anticipated by the applicant.

8.208 The EHO also notes that any increase in NO₂, PM₁₀ and CO₂ concentrations is in breach of policy 4/14 of the CLP 2006 and of national and local reduction targets.

8.209 Notwithstanding the concerns raised by the EHO, he does not recommend refusal of the development on the grounds of impact on air quality but takes a pragmatic approach in suggesting mitigation measures that would diminish the impact on air quality. Recommended mitigation measures, to be secured via planning condition/s106 include:

- Residential and Commercial Travel Plans, including internet support.
- Car Clubs (s106)
- Car Free Student accommodation
- Maximum car parking levels of 0.7 space/residential unit and 1space/125 sq m for office space.
- Agreement at reserved matters stage to a set of rigid air quality criteria for controlling phased parking provision at levels below 0.7 space/residential unit and 1space/125 sq m for office space, in particular for office development.
- Indirect emissions from buildings controlled via best practice advice on sustainable development.
- Cycling and walking facilities agreed.
- The provision of a continuous air quality monitoring station to monitor pre-development, construction and post construction

pollution from pre-demolition to 3 years post construction. The purpose of the monitoring station is to ensure compliance with air quality objectives and to inform car-parking levels at the later stages of development. (s106)

- Provision of funds to support and foster subsidised use of public transport by workers/residents for 5 years following occupation of a development. (s106)

8.210 I support the approach taken by EHO in terms of the need to secure effective mitigation measures as opposed to rejecting the application on the grounds of non-compliance with policy 4/14. This appears to me to be a pragmatic approach to moving the development forward and achieving the aim of providing a high quality transport interchange. I would expect the new interchange could itself result in a positive impact on air quality that would be derived from a modal shift towards public transport.

8.211 I have addressed the issue of bus revenue support in the section below on Planning Obligations.

Contaminated Land

8.212 Policy 4/13 of the CLP 2006 addresses pollution and amenity and imposes a requirement for proposals that are sensitive to pollution, including land contamination to make adequate provision for pollution mitigation measures.

8.213 EHO have not picked up on the specific issue identified by the applicants in their ES but have noted that given what is known about the likely contamination issues on the site a considerable amount of further investigation, risk assessment and remedial action will be required. They have recommended a negative condition and request that an independent contamination consultant is funded through the s106 to deal with the contaminated land issues.

8.214 The recommendations made by EHO reflect those made in respect of other sites such as the CUP site and in my view deal appropriately with the requirements of Policy 4/13 of the CLP 2006.

Third Party Representations

8.215 I have dealt with matters raised regarding environmental impacts above and elsewhere in my assessment.

Conclusion - Environmental impacts

8.216 I have considered the broad content of the ES and identified key outstanding residual impacts. I am of the view that impacts in terms of the impact on the AQMA and contaminated land are capable of being mitigated to an acceptable degree. The development accords with the Development Plan particularly policies 4/13 and 4/14 of the CLP 2006.

Loss of Historic Fabric and Trees

8.217 This section deals with the impacts that the development will have on historic fabric and trees. The merits of the development in terms of its response to the principles of good urban design are dealt with in the next section. The impact of the development on the Conservation Area, the setting of listed buildings and key views into the development are dealt with in the section on Impacts of the Scale of Development.

The Proposed Development

Loss of Historic Fabric

8.218 Parameter Plan 1 (PP1) relates to the Boundary Site Plan and Site Conditions. It identifies the Conservation Area, listed buildings and Buildings of Local Interest (BLIs) that are to be demolished or retained and other buildings that are to be demolished. It also identifies Great Eastern House and laboratory and other buildings on the former RHM site, which already benefit from consent for their demolition.

8.219 Conservation Area Consent (CAC) will be required for the demolition of any buildings within the Conservation Area and listed building consent will be required for the demolition of any part of the listed Station Buildings. Applications have yet to be made for these consents however the following documents have been submitted as part of the revised proposals:

- Additional Conservation Issues Report
- Planning and Heritage Statement – Proposed Works to Cambridge Railway Station
- Planning and Heritage Statement CAC for the demolition of Sleeperz and the Railway Offices, Station Forecourt
- Planning and Heritage Statement CAC for the demolition of 125, 127 and 127a Hills Road and the garden wall to the Earl of Derby PH

8.220 The Station Building is the only listed building within the application site. It is made up of a number of elements, the central station building, the north wing and British Transport Police (BTP) wing and the south wing and former Great Northern Railway (GNR) booking hall. It is listed grade II. The masterplan proposals retain most of the Station Building and discussions have been ongoing with officers, which I hope will lead to the submission of a comprehensive application to upgrade and improve the Station in the near future.

8.221 The masterplan proposals, which will need listed building consent and full planning permission before they can be implemented, include the removal of single storey extensions attached to the central station building and the front of the former GNR booking hall and most notably the removal of the BTP wing.

8.222 The masterplan proposals also include the relocation of the Statue of Ceres, which sits within in a niche in one of the laboratory buildings fronting Station Road. This relocation to a position to be agreed by the local planning authority is already secured as part of the approval for demolition of buildings on the former RHM site.

8.223 The BLIs that are to be demolished to facilitate the development are the Sleeperz Building which lies to the west of the Station building, 32 – 38 Station Road which is located on the south side of Station Road opposite the Red House site and 127 and 127a Hills Road. The Deity Buildings (Jupiter, Leda and Demeter Houses), which front the south side of Station Road, are also to be demolished. Although these buildings are not listed buildings or BLIs they are recognised as buildings of townscape value in the SADF Conservation Area Appraisal.

8.224 The Additional Conservation Issues Report includes a plan which seeks to demonstrate that the BTP wing and Sleeperz together with a number of other 'railway' associated buildings have to be removed in order to accommodate the new Station Square. The Applicants arguments in favour of the removal of the BTP wing in particular are set out below in the policy section.

8.225 32 – 38 Station Road sits in the site of Block I2 and 127 and 127a are to be removed to accommodate the new Hills Road/Brooklands Avenue junction.

8.226 There has been much debate about whether 125 Hills Road could be retained and incorporated into the new development. The second revision to the Parameter Plans includes a revision to PP1 that shows 127 and 127a as demolished but 125 Hills Road as retained. All other parameter plans for the new development have been amended to include a note stating 'possible retention of 125 Hills Road subject to further resolution of the detailed design.

Loss of Trees

8.227 Parameter Plan 2 (PP2) also relates to the Boundary Site Plan and Site Conditions. It identifies trees that benefit from Tree Preservation Orders (TPO) and other trees that are to be removed or retained as part of the development. There is an existing TPO tree on the Great Eastern House site on the corner of Station Road and Tenison Road. Consent has already been given for its removal as part of the approved redevelopment scheme for Block E1. There are also TPO trees between Demeter House and Daedalus House that are

to be removed. These trees are described as being in fair condition in the Applicants Arboricultural Report but are to be removed to facilitate the construction of blocks J1 and J2 and their associated underground car park.

8.228 No other trees within the development site benefit from TPOs and are to be removed with the exception of a group of trees that grow close to the bend in Devonshire Road beside the Carter Cycle Bridge. In total something in the order of 160 trees of varying size and quality are to be removed.

Planning Policy Position

Loss of historic fabric

8.229 The SADF requires the retention of the entire grade II listed Station buildings and the retention and reuse of the Mill and Silo. The Conservation Appraisal, which forms part of the SADF, also provides a detailed appraisal of buildings identified as of local interest. When the SADF was formulated there were no BLIs in the City. However it was recognised that those buildings that are now BLIs were of positive townscape value.

8.230 The SADF reflects the policy position established by PPG15 that is of as much relevance today. Since the publication of the SADF and the determination of the previous application, the CLP 2006 has introduced policies that also seek to protect listed buildings and BLIs from unjustified demolition and/or alteration in the form of policies 4/10 and 4/12.

8.231 The local authority also has duties under the T&CP (Listed Buildings) Act 1990 relating to Listed Buildings (s16 to 'have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses') and Conservation Areas (s72 "special attention shall be paid in the exercise of planning functions to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of a conservation area"). These duties are relevant both to the consideration of impact on historic fabric and on the Conservation Area in general, an issue which is addressed in more depth below.

The demolition of the BTP wing

- 8.232 It is important to note that should outline planning permission be granted this would not preclude the need for listed building consent for the demolition of the BTP wing that would need to be fully justified in the context of PPG15 guidance and planning policy. However given that the masterplan proposals cannot be implemented without the removal of the BTP wing it is appropriate to consider the loss of this part of the listed building at this stage.
- 8.233 Guidance provided by PPG15 accepts that while it is an objective of Government policy to secure the preservation of historic buildings there will very occasionally be cases where demolition is unavoidable. PPG15 goes on to state that listed building consent should not be given for the total or substantial demolition of any listed building without clear and convincing evidence that all reasonable efforts have been made to sustain existing uses or find viable new uses, and these efforts have failed; that preservation in some form of charitable or community ownership is not possible or suitable; or that redevelopment would produce substantial benefits for the community which would decisively outweigh the loss resulting from demolition.
- 8.234 I do not regard the demolition works to the listed station buildings as a 'substantial demolition' however PPG15 advises that the same criteria should be applied to proposals to extend or alter listed buildings. PPG15 sets out a number of considerations that may apply to demolition of listed buildings including that there may very exceptionally be cases where the proposed works would bring substantial benefits for the community which have to be weighed against the arguments in favour of preservation. However PPG15 advises that even here, it will often be feasible to incorporate listed buildings within new development, and this option should be carefully considered: the challenge presented by retaining listed buildings can be a stimulus to imaginative new design to accommodate them.

8.235 The Applicant's Additional Conservation Issues Report and Planning and Heritage Statement – Proposed Works to Cambridge Railway Station set out their case for the removal of the BTP wing. A plan is included which demonstrates that if it were to be retained the BTP wing would significantly impact upon the operation of the taxi drop off and pick up area at the northern end of the square. Concern is expressed that this would necessitate moving this vehicle dominated area to the south in front of the colonnaded element of the Station to the detriment of its setting and against the aim of providing a clear pedestrian space in front of the Station.

8.236 Essentially the arguments in favour of the demolition of the BTP wing are three fold. Firstly it is argued that this wing is a later addition to the Station and its removal will enable the original concept of the station building with central arcaded element and two wings to be re-introduced. Secondly the retention of the BTP wing would have an adverse impact on the function and appearance of the new Station Square as detailed above. Thirdly the removal of the BTP will enable the Station Square and the transport interchange generally to operate more effectively through providing a substantial car-free space in the centre of the square.

8.237 It is my view that given the substantial community benefit that will arise from the masterplan proposals and the proposed works to the Station the removal of the BTP wing is acceptable. I am convinced by the Applicants submission that demonstrates that proper consideration has been given to retaining the BTP wing and incorporating it into the scheme.

8.238 English Heritage has objected to the demolition of the BTP wing. I consider that I have addressed the issues that they have raised above.

Demolition of Buildings of Local Interest (BLIs)

8.239 The demolition of any building in the Conservation Area will need Conservation Area Consent. The fact that a building is a BLI does not afford it any additional protection in terms of further consents. However policy 4/12 of the CLP 2008 only permits the demolition of a BLI if the building is demonstrably

incapable of beneficial use or reuse or there are clear public benefits arising from the development.

8.240 Sleeperz is acknowledged in the SADF as the best surviving example of a non-listed station building. Like the BTP wing, the retention of Sleeperz would compromise the operation of the Station Square and I am convinced by the applicant's arguments in favour of its retention.

8.241 The applicant has not provided a full justification for the demolition of 32-38 Station Road that will be necessary when an application is made for Conservation Area Consent for its demolition. Clearly Block I2 cannot be developed without removing 32-38 Station Road. The pivotal role that I2 has in the scheme is considered more fully below but essentially I would conclude that the loss of 32-38 Station Road is justified by the need to increase the density of development across the site in order to achieve the aim of improving the transport interchange. 32-38 Station Road are not worthy of listing and in my view to seek to refuse the masterplan on the grounds that these buildings should be retained alone would be very difficult to substantiate at appeal.

8.242 The applicants initially attempted to justify the demolition of 125, 127 and 127a Hills Road through arguing that 127 and 127a are required to be removed to facilitate the new bus only access. In the light of this fact they also argued that 125 should also be demolished on the basis the buildings with which it has a strong historical association are to be lost and its retention would result in an odd relationship with other buildings. The second revision to the application has reconsidered this argument and 125 is shown as retained pending further consideration at the detailed design stage.

8.243 I believe the revised position to be the correct way forward. I am convinced by the applicant's argument that 127 and 127a must be demolished to facilitate the bus only access road without which the essential improvements to public transport cannot be realised. The retention of 125 as part of the new development does justify further scrutiny in my view.

Loss of trees

8.244 Policy 9/9 of the CLP2006 does not make any specific comments about the retention of existing trees within the development. However policy 4/4 is of direct relevance to the application. Policy 4/4 only justifies the removal of trees of amenity value if there are demonstrable public benefits accruing from the proposal that outweigh the current and future amenity value of the trees.

8.245 The SADF states that where possible existing trees should be retained to give a sense of maturity and establishment to the new development. While this aim remains relevant it should be noted that the SADF was formulated at a time when there was a need to draw together disparate ownerships across the Station Area and related to a smaller area than the application site now proposed. There is now a greater opportunity for a more comprehensive approach to be taken to tree removal, provision and management than was previously envisaged by the SADF.

8.246 The City Council's Arboricultural Officer has had in depth discussions with the applicant's consultants and has spent a great deal of time studying the tree survey and landscape strategy that have been submitted in support of the application. Her conclusion is that the approach that has been adopted by the applicant in terms of the removal and replacement of most of the trees on the site is sound. I support this view and also her request that there be a phased approach to tree removal. This can be secured by condition.

Third Party Representations

8.247 I can appreciate the suggestion that trees in Station Road should be retained because these trees have a very significant impact on the character of the area. However they are planted in planters and place a significant constraint on the development. The use of silva cell technology to allow new trees to be planted in natural ground should ensure the longevity of new trees.

8.248 There will be more new trees than the number of existing trees that are to be removed.

Conclusion – Loss of Historic Fabric and Trees

8.249 I am satisfied that the applicants have properly justified the loss of historic fabric and trees. There will be a further opportunity to consider the demolition of the BTP wing and BLIs as part of applications for listed building consent and Conservation Area Consent but in principle I have reached the view that the community and strategic benefits of the new development justify the loss of historic fabric. The application therefore accords with advice contained in PPG15 and with the Development Plan particularly policies 4/4, 4/10 and 4/12.

Streets, Spaces and Buildings

8.250 This section deals with the ways in which the development has responded to the key principles of good urban design. The impact of the development on the Conservation Area, the setting of listed buildings and key views into the development are dealt with in the next section.

The Proposed Development

Parameter Plans

8.251 Parameter plans have been submitted which show Building Layout (PP3), Building and Ground Conditions (PP4) and Potential Public Realm and Informal Open Spaces (PP6). If the application is approved these plans will form a formal part of the determination and any subsequent applications will have to come forward within the constraints that are set.

8.252 PP3 defines the edges of buildings and is accompanied by a note that states that any overhangs for balconies/canopies will not exceed 1.5 m beyond the building edge.

8.253 PP4 defines the proposed building height, building height above ground level, proposed and existing ground level and ground floor and top floor setbacks. It is accompanied by notes that state that:

- Storey height is 3 m floor to floor in residential and 3.7 m in commercial.

- 1.5 m set back to top floor on blocks L1, L2, L3, L4, J1, J2, J3 and J4.
- 3 m set back to top floor on blocks I1, A1 and A2.
- Ground floor set back to M4.
- 3 m set back to ground and first floor to blocks I1, A1 and A2.
- Any overhangs for balconies/canopies will not exceed 1.5 m beyond the maximum edge.
- Maximum edge of external building facade to parcel.
- All proposed ground levels are in metres AOD and have a tolerance of +/- 0.5 metres.
- All heights are in metres AOD and relate to maximum height of occupied floor level to roof level.
- General plant not to exceed 2 m high above height shown on plan (occupied floorspace to roof level) and set back from the principal edge of the building line shown on plan.
- Lift motor rooms and extract not to exceed 2 metres in height above occupied floor space to roof level.
- Layout to Station Square is indicative and subject to further resolution of the detailed design.
- Possible retention of 125 Hills Road, subject to further resolution of the detailed design.

8.254 The figures that I have used throughout this assessment are the maximum building heights (occupied floorspace to roof level) that are set out on PP4. In essence the parameter plans propose a building block or envelope within which detailed proposals will be brought forward.

8.255PP6 identifies the following categories of space:

- Publicly accessible green areas/links.
- Publicly accessible adjacent green areas.
- Publicly accessible hard landscape, informal activity/social areas.
- Green public realm.
- Potential home zone.
- Other public realm.
- Private open space.
- Building front/active frontage.

Streets and Spaces

8.256 The layout of the development is based on a series of existing and proposed 'streets' which are described in highways access terms in the section on Transport above and which form the base plan for all of the Parameter Plans. From an urban design point of view the proposed streets establish a hierarchy for the development, with Station Road and the bus routes to the Hills Road/Brooklands Avenue presenting itself as the principle route through the site with the Northern Access Road (NAR) and Southern Access Road (SAR) constituting secondary access to the uses within the development. Buildings predominately front these routes or the Station Square.

8.257 While most buildings have their active frontage/s to the road/Square, Blocks A1/A2 have an active frontage to the rear which faces open space behind buildings facing Station Road, Tenison Road and the NAR and Blocks I1, L1 and K1 have active frontages to all sides that face the hard landscaped spaces between the Park and the Square. Blocks M1 and M2 have active frontages to the bus interchange and the SAR.

- 8.258 The individual blocks are freestanding within the overall public and private realm as opposed to being positioned within a specified area. The application is supported by a comprehensive landscaping scheme that demonstrates that this approach should help to integrate the buildings and spaces together to the benefit of the public realm.
- 8.259 PP6 demonstrates that a wide variety of types of public and private realm are to be created. There are three areas of publicly accessible green space; the Park including space between blocks L2 to L4 (3237 sq m), the green space behind buildings facing Station Road, Tenison Road and the NAR (1531 sq m) and the green space abutting the Ravensworth Gardens play area (720 sq m). In total 5488 sq m of informal public open space is to be provided.
- 8.260 The open space, which is created by the setting back of blocks J1 to J4 on the south side of Station Road, is described as a linear park or green public realm. Private open space is identified to the rear of Blocks D1, F1, F2, H1 and M6 to serve residents and students and private space is provided for around the hinterland of blocks L2 to L4 for residents of those blocks. Private open space is also provided between blocks J1 and J2 and between blocks J3 and J4 to serve the office and other commercial uses in those blocks.
- 8.261 PP6 identifies publicly accessible hard landscaped areas as the Station Square, the square around block L1, land to the rear of blocks A1/A2 adjacent to the open space but serving as service provision for those blocks and at the junction of Station Road and Tenison Road around block E1.
- 8.262 The 'other public realm' that is identified on PP6 is predominately vehicular access and parking space, including the bus interchange.

Building Heights

Station Road

- 8.263 The tallest building on the site will occupy Block I2 that sits opposite the Red House site on the south side of Station

Road. The maximum building height will be 34.1 metres. The floorspace schedule for building I2 allow for only 75% of the block/building envelope to be developed i.e. 25% of the parameter envelope will be void to reduce the visual impact of the building and to ensure that a well articulated form is brought forward in the detailed plans for the site.

8.264 The proposed buildings on the south side of Station Road, which lie to the west of Block I2 are proposed to increase in height from west to east. J4 and J3 will be a maximum of 18.5 m high, J2 22.2 m high and J1 25.9 m high i.e. stepping up towards I2.

8.265 Block E1 sits at the junction of Station Road and Tenison Road on the north side of Station Road. It already benefits from a resolution to grant full planning permission. Block E1 has a maximum height of 25.6 m as calculated as a direct comparison with other proposed but as yet not approved buildings.

Station Square

8.266 The new Station Square will be formed by the juxtaposition of blocks B1, A1, A2, I1 and K1 with the fourth side being the existing Station Buildings.

8.267 The main range of the Station building has a parapet height of 8.4 m and roof ridge of 8.9 m. The north range is 6 m to parapet level and 7.8 m to ridge and the south range 7.3 m to eaves and 8.9 m to ridge level. Block B1 sits on the north side of the square and accommodates the multi storey cycle and car park. It will be a maximum of 18 m high.

8.268 Blocks A1 and A2 sit opposite the station buildings on the west side of the square. Block A1 which sits immediately to the north of Station Road will be a maximum of 23 m high and block A2 which sits at the eastern end of the NAR will also be a maximum of 23 m high. The maximum height of block A2 has been increased by one storey from 19.3 m to 23 m at the suggestion of the Design and Conservation Panel to provide for a unified parapet height around the new Station Square. This change formed part of the second revision to the application.

8.269 Block I1 also sits opposite the station buildings on the west side of the square but to the south side of Station Road. It has a maximum height of 23 m. Block K1 marks the south side of the square and accommodates the retained and extended Silo building. The maximum height of the Silo is shown as 31.2 m. The proposed extensions to the north and south sides of the Silo have a maximum height of 18.8 m.

Northern Residential Area and north of Carter Cycle Bridge

8.270 Blocks C1 and C2 lie to the south side of the Northern Access Road; they will have a maximum height of 15 m. Blocks D1 and F1 lie to the north side of the Northern Access Road and to the south of the Ravensworth Gardens development. Block D1 will be a maximum height of 12 m but incorporates a 'dog leg' adjacent to the proposed area of open space which is reduced in height to 3 m. Block F1 is an L-shaped block and will be a maximum height of 12 m.

8.271 Block F2 sits fronts the access road serving the MSCP. At its southern end it will be a maximum height of 15 m but this is reduced to its northern end, adjacent to the Ravensworth Gardens development to 9 m.

8.272 Blocks G1 and G2 both lie to the north of the Carter Cycle Bridge. Block G1 that sits close to the railway line will be a maximum of 12 m high. Block G2 that sits close to Devonshire Road will be a maximum of 9 m high.

Southern Residential Area

8.273 The Southern Residential area comprises the L blocks, the M blocks, Block H1 and Block K2.

8.274 Blocks L1 to L4 lie within the Park on the west side of the Southern Access Road. L1 that sits to the rear of the Mill and Silo will be a maximum of 21.7 m high. Blocks L2 to L4 will all be a maximum of 18 m high. Blocks M1 and M2 lie on the east side of the SAR and to the west of the bus interchange. They will be a maximum of 18 m high. Block K2 lies on at the northern end of the SAR and to the west of

the bus interchange; it accommodates existing Mill building which has a maximum height of 30.9 m.

8.275 Block H1 sits between the bus interchange to the west and the railway to the east. It has a maximum height of 18 m. Blocks M3, M4 and M5 sit to the south of the bus only link road and surround the Earl of Derby public house which falls beyond the application site boundary. They will have maximum heights of 18 m, 15 m and 12 m respectively.

8.276 Block M6 lies to the north of the new Hills Road/Brooklands Avenue junction and to the south of the terrace of houses fronting Hills Road and the flats on the Warren Close development. It will have a maximum height of 9 m.

Table of Maximum Building Heights

8.277 For ease of understanding the following table sets out maximum building heights across the development.

Zone	Block	Maximum Building Height (m)
Station Road	I2	34.1
	J1	25.9
	J2	22.2
	J3	18.5
	J4	18.5
	E1	25.6
Station Square	B1	18
	A1	23
	A2	23
	I1	23
	K1	31.2

Zone	Block	Maximum Building Height (m)
Northern Residential Area	C1	15
	C2	15
	D1	12
	F1	12
	F2	15/9
	G1	12
	G2	9

Zone	Block	Maximum Building Height (m)
Southern Residential Area	L1	21.7
	L2	18
	L3	18
	L4	18
	M1	18
	M2	18
	K2	30.9
	H1	18
	M3	18
	M4	15
	M5	12
	M6	9

Relationship of buildings to streets

8.278 Having considered the layout and purpose of streets and spaces and maximum building height it is essential to look at the interaction between buildings and streets and spaces. The parameter plans set out maximum building envelopes for each of the blocks. The worst-case scenario would be that when detailed designs are brought forward they are simple extrusions from the floorplan of the block. It is my view that such a simplistic approach is unlikely to be acceptable in the context of the constraints of the site.

8.279 To ensure that key elements of the design are secured at this stage, in addition to defining the maximum building envelope the notes to the parameter plans place further restrictions on the final building form. It is therefore important to consider the implications of the maximum building envelope as restricted by the notes on the parameter plans for each development zone.

Station Road

8.280 Block I2 is shown as being set back 5 m from the south side of Station Road on the revised parameter plans. Following the final meeting of the Design and Conservation Panel this dimension has been increased to 6 m. The parameter plans do not show any set backs on block I2 but as I have explained above only 75% of the blocks floorspace will be permitted to be developed due to the overall floorspace constraints. This would allow for significant set backs at the upper levels of the building to reduce its bulk and mass.

8.281 The parameter plans show the J blocks as being set back 14 m from the south side of Station Road. The top floors of these buildings are defined as set back a minimum of 1.5 m on all sides. This will reduce the parapet heights to Station Road to a maximum of 14.8 m (J4 and J3), 18.5 m (J2) and 22.2 m (J1) respectively.

8.282 Block E1 already benefits from planning permission but nevertheless forms part of the masterplan. The parameter plan shows that block E1 is set back 8 m from the frontage with Station Road and 6 m from the Tenison Road frontage. It also shows a set back at top floor level and the level below as 14 m and 6.5 m respectively on the Station Road frontage and 6 m and 4 m respectively on the Tenison Road frontage. This reduces parapet levels to Station Road and Tenison Road to 18.3 m.

Station Square

8.283 Block B sits directly on the square; there are no set backs on this building which will be 18 m high. Similarly Blocks A1 and A2 sit directly on the square, however the buildings on these blocks will have set backs at ground, first floor and roof

level. A 3 m deep colonnade will be provided at ground and first floor on the elevation facing the square. The revised parameter plan shows a set back at roof level of a minimum depth of 3 m at roof level on blocks A1 and A2 to the Station Road, NAR and square elevations which reduces the parapet level of the building to 19.3.

8.284 The revised parameter plans also show Block A1 as having a chamfered side to Station Road to ensure an alignment of buildings on Station Road to protect the view of the central section of the Station from Station Road.

8.285 In common with Block I2, Block I1 has been set back an additional metre from the Station Road frontage so that it will now sit 7 metres back from the road. Like Blocks A1 and A2, Block I1 incorporates a 3 metre deep colonnade at ground and first floor level on its elevations to the square and to the SAR and associated public space. Block I1 also incorporates a set back at roof level of a minimum of 3 m, increased from 1.5 m by the second revision to the application, to its elevations to Station Road, the SAR and the square. This will reduce the parapet level of the building to 19.3 m.

8.286 There are no set backs on the Silo/Block K1, however the proposed extensions to this building at 18.8 m are comparable with the parapet heights of other new development around the square and significantly lower than the highest part of the building.

8.287 The following table compares maximum building height with parapet height for buildings on Station Road and the square.

Zone	Block	Maximum Building Height (m)	Parapet Height (m)
Station Road	I2	34.1	Variable
	J1	25.9	22.2
	J2	22.2	18.5
	J3	18.5	14.8
	J4	18.5	14.8
	E1	25.6	18.3
Station Square	B1	18	18
	A1	23	19.3
	A2	23	19.3
	I1	23	19.3
	K1	31.2	18.8 (extensions)

Northern Residential Area and north of Carter Cycle Bridge

8.288 The NAR is a new road and will be 7 m wide. Blocks C1, C2 and D1 will be set back from the road by 4 metres and Block F1 by 6 metres. The access road serving the MSCP will be 8 m wide. Block F2 will be set off this access by 5 metres. Block G2 will be set off the Devonshire Road frontage by 4 m. None of the buildings within this development zone incorporate setbacks.

Southern Residential Area

- 8.289 The L blocks are set within the Park with minimal defensible space around them or to the SAR. They all incorporate a set back at roof level of a minimum depth of 1.5 m to all sides which will reduce parapet height to 18.7 m (L1) and 15 m (L2, L3 and L4).
- 8.290 Blocks M1 and M2 are set back 4 m from the SAR and 6 m from the bus interchange. They do not incorporate any setbacks. The Mill/K2 will be 3 m from the SAR at its closest point and between 5 and 8 m from the bus interchange. The parapet height of the Mill will sit just below the parapet height of the proposed extensions to the Silo. The highest part of the Mill is a tower, which is within 0.5 m of the highest point of the Silo.
- 8.291 Block H1 sits close to the site boundary with the railway and is set back from the bus interchange by a minimum of 3 m. There are no proposed set backs on this block.
- 8.292 Blocks M3, M5 and M6 are set back a minimum of 5 m from the bus only link road and do not incorporate any set backs at roof or lower levels. Blocks M5 and M6 are set back from the Hills Road frontage on the same alignment as the existing terraced houses. Block M4 is set back 11 m from the Hills Road frontage to accommodate the new cycle ramp. The northern corner of Block M4 is also chamfered at ground floor level to accommodate the cycle route to the Station.

Public Art

- 8.293 The application is supported by a Public Art Report, which sets out a high level strategy for public art within the development area. The methods by which the art strategy will be realised include:
- Major Public Art commissions
 - Design commissions to provide opportunities for embedded art or design interventions in the landscape and structural elements of the scheme.
 - Research bursaries.
 - Symposia and Publications.

- Community and Education links
- A Resource Centre to be accommodated within Block C1 as a base for public realm projects throughout the construction phase of the development.
- Festivals and Events
- Use of the public realm and vacant sites as venues for public art.

The strategy also includes a provisional budget for public art and options for management of public art as the project moves forward.

Planning Policy Position

Streets and Spaces

8.294 Policy 9/9 of the CLP 2008 requires that proposals for the Station Area include provision for greenspace and hard surfaced open space, possibly as a series of linked spaces from the Station through to Hills Road. Policy 3/7 of the CLP 2008, which deals with the creation of successful places, is also key to the determination of the application.

8.295 The SADF seeks to achieve the following aims in terms of streets and spaces:

- Development orientated to create and define a street network and public spaces.
- Vehicle routes wide enough for street trees.
- High quality materials used on principal pedestrian routes, to Station Square and around the Mill and Silo.
- Public Art integral to the overall design of streets and spaces.
- Buildings with active ground floor uses around the station square.
- A new clock, public art and tree planting in station square.

- The largest area of open space in the heart of the triangle behind Station Road and Hills Road.
- A hierarchy of other spaces from busy transport interchange to quieter private spaces associated with new housing developments.
- Clear distinction between public and private spaces.
- Buildings positioned to enable the sun to penetrate into proposed open spaces to help make best use of those spaces.

8.296 The development achieves the broad aim of making provision for greenspace and hard surfaced areas. The inclusion of the Murdoch House and Great Eastern House sites and the Deities which were not part of the SADF allow for a much more comprehensive redevelopment of the area to come forward and in particular provide for a much larger Station Square.

8.297 There is a logical hierarchy of routes which respond to their levels of use but which do not allow vehicular traffic to dominate. This has been particularly successful on the east end of Station Road where car access is severely restricted and within the square. The inclusion of the Deities within the scheme and the setting back of the buildings which will replace them will ensure that Station Road is wide enough to accommodate new trees and associated planting which will much improve the environment of its south side. Similarly all new access roads are sufficiently wide to accommodate street trees.

8.298 The application is in outline form therefore matters relating to the use of high quality materials on key routes will be matters to be addressed at the reserved matters stage. However pre-application discussions indicate that this aim will be fulfilled. Public art is dealt with in more detail below.

8.299 The issue of active frontage has been addressed well. Retail uses will be concentrated around the square and the design offers the possibility for these uses to spill out into the public realm to enliven the space without compromising its key

function as a transport interchange. The detailed proposals for the Station Square have yet to be brought forward and any indicative layout shown on the parameter plans has been specifically defined as subject to further consideration by the second revised plans. Early indications are that the square will include a new clock, public art and tree planting.

8.300 Buildings have been orientated to allow overlooking of open space and to promote natural surveillance.

8.301 The largest area of green open space is in the triangle behind Station Road and Hills Road. This space does not extend to the scale of space envisaged by the SADF and overall the amount of informal open space within the development equates to 16.4% (5488 sq m/33444 sq m) of the requirement generated by the application of the City Council's standards for informal public open space. The impact of open space as local infrastructure is dealt with below in the section on Impacts on Local Infrastructure and the issue of commuted sums to address the shortfall is dealt with below in the section on Planning Obligations.

8.302 The scale of the park has been a subject of much debate between officers and the applicants. I accept the argument that in order to maximise the use of this highly accessible site, arguably the most accessible in the City, it is necessary to reduce the level of on site provision of open space below the Council's standards and this approach has been accepted on other sites e.g. the Cambridge University Press site. Part of the rationale for providing this scale of park relates to the viability of the scheme. This is also discussed below but essentially to remove blocks from the scheme to increase the scale of the park would make it unviable.

8.303 The applicants have also argued that in addition to the informal public open space that they will provide which contributes towards the Council's standards they are also providing other green space which will make a positive contribution towards the public realm and the Station Square which is a very significant open area. While I accept the contrary argument that incidental landscaped areas and the Station Square will not be used in the same way as informal open space, I can see some merit in the applicant's

argument given the mixed use of the scheme and the needs of the non-resident population.

8.304 On balance I have reached the view that the scale of the open space is acceptable. Both on its own and in combination with the open space that derives from the Laings site the Park is the largest area of green open space, however the Station Square will be the largest open space within the scheme. It should be noted that the area of informal open space to the rear of blocks fronting Station Road and the NAR was not identified in the SADF. The development will make a very positive contribution towards an area wide improvement in the public realm.

8.305 There is a hierarchy of busy and quieter spaces within the scheme and a clear distinction has been made between public and private space. The orientation of development blocks does facilitate good sunlight penetration on the whole. Where adverse affects arise they tend to be between tightly located commercial blocks such as K1 and K2 that are in any event fixed. Block D1 has been revised to take account of potential overshadowing to the open space adjacent Ravensworth Gardens.

8.306 The shortfall in provision of informal open space and the need for commuted payments to address formal open space and play space provision are addressed below in the section on Planning Obligations.

Building Heights and Relationship of Buildings to Spaces

8.307 Policy 9/9 does not make any specific reference to the appropriate height of buildings within the Station Area. Policies 3/12 and 3/13 of the CLP 2006 are of direct relevance to the development in that they address the need for buildings to have a positive impact in terms of their height and upon the wider townscape and to ensure that tall buildings, i.e. those significantly taller than their neighbours, do not detract from their setting.

8.308 The SADF states that, in general, building heights should be compatible with the overall character of the area and with existing development. The following points are made in the

SADF in relation to building heights that remain of relevance and are of assistance in terms of assessing the scheme in the light of policies 3/12 and 3/13:

- The Mill and Silo should remain as the tallest buildings in the area to create local landmarks, with key views preserved.
- New buildings to Station Road should be no more than 18m high, equivalent to 5 commercial storeys.
- On the Triangle site to the south of Station Road the scale of development should fall from a maximum of 5/6 residential storeys fronting the open space to 2/3 storeys at the rear of Hills Road.
- To the north of Station Road building heights will step down from 5 commercial storeys on Station Road to 2/3 storeys where buildings adjoin Ravensworth Gardens.
- Where new development abuts neighbouring largely residential districts new development should respect their domestic scale and height.
- Roof plant should be incorporated into the overall design of buildings to preserve the appearance of the skyline.

The Mill and Silo

8.309 The Mill and Silo will not be the tallest buildings in the area however the applicants have sought to ensure that they will enjoy a prominence appropriate to their historic significance. This has been achieved through a radical review of the building heights strategy across the site and a significant reduction in maximum height of development blocks in comparison with the scheme that was previously rejected.

8.310 The maximum height of the Mill is 30.9 m and the Silo is 31.2 m. The only development block that exceeds this maximum is Block I2 which if permitted could be 34.1 m high. This block is separated from the Mill and Silo by blocks L1 and I1 and will be a minimum of 50 m from the rear of the Silo at the closest point between the three buildings.

- 8.311 In addition to the Silo the buildings that are immediately adjacent to the Mill are blocks L1, L2 and M1 that have maximum heights of 21.7 m, 18 m and 18 m respectively. These blocks will be significantly lower than the maximum height at the highest point on the Mill and will be compatible in height at parapet level with the eaves height of the Mill. They will leave the Mill tower exposed from all angles.
- 8.312 The buildings which are immediately adjacent the Silo are blocks LI and I1 which have maximum heights of 21.7 m and 23 m respectively. These blocks are significantly lower than the highest point of the Silo. Both blocks L1 and I1 incorporate set backs at roof level which result in their parapet heights being reduced to 18 m and 19.3 m respectfully which equate to the parapet heights of the proposed extensions to the Silo (18.8 m). The pitched roof feature, which forms the highest element of the Silo, will be visible form all angles.
- 8.313 Contrary to the previous scheme the blocks surrounding the Mill and Silo do not 'crowd them and once in the square the Silo will be very much the dominant feature. Views across the square towards the bus interchange will be framed against the backdrop of the Mill and Silo that provide the opportunity to radically improve the experience and sense of arrival at the City.
- 8.314 The relationship between the Mill and Silo and the other buildings on the square is also significantly improved by the setting back of the top floors of buildings on adjacent blocks to provide for a consistent parapet level around the square which allows the Mill and Silo to take precedence over what will be a standard rhythm.
- 8.315 The scale of I2 in respect of its relationship to the Mill and Silo is acceptable in my view. Were the proposed building on the site capable of being brought forward as a simple extruded form based on the floorplate and maximum height then it would undoubtedly have an adverse effect on the views and setting of the Mill and Silo. However the control on the floorspace of the building within Block I2, which will effectively mean that a maximum of only 75% of the block can be built, ensures a high level of flexibility that will enable

a fully detailed examination of impacts on views of the Mill and Silo to be carried out.

8.316 It should also be noted that like all other development blocks within the development to construct a building on Block I2, further approval in the form of an application for reserved matters approval will be required. Such an application could be refused on the grounds of its impact upon the Mill and Silo and would not necessarily achieve the maximum height and floorspace build out that would be permitted by the outline consent.

Station Road

8.317 The J blocks on the south side of Station Road will all exceed the SADF guidance level of 18 m high. Blocks J3 and J4 will be five commercial storeys but exceed the 18 m guidance at 18.3 m. Block J2 will be six storeys/22.2 m and J1 will be seven storeys/25.9 m. Block E, which already benefits from planning permission, also exceeds the SADF guidance at seven storeys/26.6 m.

8.318 Part of the reasoning behind allowing Block E to exceed the SADF guidance figure applies equally to the buildings on the South side of Station Road and this has been part of the argument put forward by the applicant. Block E has been articulated so that it incorporates two set backs at its upper levels resulting in a parapet height of 18.3 m to Station Road. A similar approach has been adopted for blocks J1 to J4 which all accommodate a set back at roof level. The parapet level of blocks J2 to J4 to Station Road varies between 14.8 m and 18.5 m. In so much as this general approach reflects that adopted for Block E1 I am satisfied that the height of blocks J2 to J4 accords with the SADF aspiration.

8.319 Block J1 has a parapet level at 22.2 m, which it could be argued is excessively high in comparison with the SADF level. However if building on Block I2 is acceptable then this block has an important role to play in mitigating between the heights of the J blocks and the tallest block on the development.

8.320 Neither the parapet height nor the overall height of the building that is to occupy Block I2 is known at present. As referred to above what we do know is that the full extent of I2 will not be built out. In my view it is unlikely that the building on I2 will have a parapet height of comparable height with others on Station Road and it will almost certainly exceed the SADF recommended height.

8.321 The principle of the location and height of Block I2 has been the subject of much debate by officers and the applicants and also at the Design and Conservation Panel. CABE have reached the view that a building height strategy which places the tallest buildings off the square as appropriate. The Panel remain concerned about the height of any building on Block I2 because it would contravene the SADF in terms of its impact on the Mill and Silo.

8.322 Part of the argument in favour of a tall building on Block I2 is that in order to fulfil the key aim of providing for a high quality transport interchange a certain level of development will need to be brought forward to fund such a facility. Insurmountable constraints in terms of the setting of the listed Station buildings, the Mill and Silo, the desire to create a civic space in front of the Station surrounded by buildings of an appropriate scale to the space with fixed parapet height and the proximity of development of a domestic scale at the edges of the site lead to the only conclusion that if a tall building is to go anywhere it can only be accommodated on the site of Block I2.

8.323 Blocks I1 and A1 both have frontages to Station Road and are therefore subject to the guidance on parapet height within the SADF. Both of these buildings have a parapet height of 19.3 m, which is in excess of the SADF guidance. However these buildings also have a relationship to the square and in my view a slight increase over the guidance is acceptable in order to maintain compatibility with the overall parapet height in the square.

Southern Residential Area

8.324 Residential development in the form of the L blocks adjacent the open space conform to the SADF guidance restricting residential blocks to 6 storeys. Although Block M6 is not to the rear of Hills Road, at 3 storeys it conforms to the aim of reduction in height as the development progresses towards Hills Road.

Northern Residential Area

8.325 The height of the new development does generally step down between Station Road and Ravensworth Gardens. Block D1 at four storeys is in excess of the SADF guidance of 2/3 storeys. The impact of this building on residential amenity is discussed below. In terms of its height alone I do not consider that it will look out of place in its setting notwithstanding the guidance in the SADF.

8.326 Block FI is also excess of the SADF guidance at four storeys, however again I am of the view that the height of this block is not inappropriate and will serve to contain the open space area. Block F2 at three storeys conforms to the SADF guidance.

8.327 I am of the view that where new development abuts neighbouring largely residential districts it does respect their domestic scale and height in terms of the principle of good urban design.

8.328 There is an additional allowance on the parameter plans for roof plant but given the nature of the application no details are known about its appearance. A careful approach will need to be adopted in relation to approval of reserved matters to ensure that the skyline is protected and roof plant appears as an integral part the building.

8.329 The sites of the proposed buildings to the north of the Carter Bridge were not included in the SADF. Notwithstanding any issues relating to impact on adjacent buildings, the scale of development is acceptable given the context of the railway line and the bridge itself.

8.330 The height of buildings is also no longer a point of contention in relation to the safe operation of Cambridge Airport. As an indicative guide the maximum height of structures should not exceed 50m above ordnance datum. This safeguarding height had not been exceeded although Block I2 is close to it at 49.4 m AOD.

Public Art

8.331 Policy 9/9 of the CLP 2006 requires, in supporting text, that public art be secured through a planning obligation and Policy 3/7 of the CLP 2006 highlights the part which public art has to play in relation to the creation of successful places.

8.332 The SADF states as follows:

‘Public art is integral to the overall design of streets and spaces. Developments will be expected to provide public art as an integral part of proposals and in line with the City Council’s adopted SPG ‘Provision of public art as part of new development schemes’ (July 2002). The relocation of ‘Ceres’ (the statue in front of the Rank Hovis building on Station Road) will be sought.’

8.333 In my view the Public Art Report is a good starting point and has the potential to ensure that public art is an integral part of the development. Although the SPG has less weight than when the SADF was formulated it remains relevant. The public art strategy accords with the Council’s aims and officers who are involved in the development are also involved in the production of the new SPD that will ensure continuity as the development progresses.

Third Party Representations

8.334 I have addressed most of the issues raised through representations above.

8.335 The application has to be assessed on its own merits and it is not possible to consider alternatives such as putting part of the MSCP underground.

8.336 Consideration has been given to whether a design code should be required as part of any recommendation to approve the application. The applicant has not offered such a code and officers are of the view that in this case we should not insist that a code be formulated. The reasoning behind this recommendation is that the parameter plans themselves place a number of constraints on any development that comes forward; a comprehensive landscape strategy has been brought forward which demonstrates that in terms of the public realm there is a willingness on the part of the applicant to use the landscape to pull disparate parts of the scheme together; and most importantly detailed planning applications are imminent for significant parts of the development which means that there is insufficient time to produce a worthwhile design code.

8.337 The perceived lack of quality on other sites in the area is not a relevant consideration in terms of the expectations of the proposed development.

8.338 There are no proposals to co-join open space adjacent to Ravensworth Gardens with existing open space. The concerns of existing residents are understood in this regard.

8.339 The public art report does make reference to the need to relocate the Ceres statue and includes the provision of a new station clock.

The City Council Conservation and Design Panel and comments from other consultees

8.340 The Conservation and Design Panel received an all-day presentation of the scheme by the applicants on 12th March 2008, including a guided tour of the site. The Panel considered the application as submitted and the first revision at meetings on 2 April 2008, 23 July 2008 and 20 August 2008.

8.341 The Panel spent a great deal of time considering each part of the proposal in detail. As part of their meetings they took a vote on composite parts of the scheme such as the I2 block, open space and the Station Square. The D & C Panel will continue to be involved in the project and a sub-panel is to be set up to assist the applicants in pre-application discussions on the reserved matters submissions.

8.342 At the final meeting of the Panel, the following conclusions were reached:

The Panel gave a verdict on five key areas and then on the scheme overall.

- Station Square – AMBER (unanimous)
- Height of I2 – AMBER (4), RED (1)
- Southern Gateway and the retention of No125 Hills Road – AMBER (unanimous)
- Student kick-about space – RED (unanimous)
- Green spaces (general) – GREEN (unanimous)
- OVERALL VERDICT – (LIGHT) AMBER (unanimous)

8.343 The Panel were satisfied with the overall approach to provision of green space. Reference to the student kick about space that was being mooted to the rear of M6 has been removed at the advice of officers.

8.344 The Station Square and the Southern Gateway will be the subject of detailed applications. The Panel will have the opportunity to contribute to the determination of those applications. In my view the detailed schemes should be able to address outstanding concerns.

8.345 The Parameter Plans have been amended to show the potential for the retention of 125 Hills Road. In my view this is an appropriate way forward in the absence of detailed plans for the buildings at this important gateway. Conservation Area Consent will also be required for the removal of 125 Hills Road; should the developers seek to pursue a scheme involving a new building on the site of 125 Hills Road, which the Panel and officers do not recommend,

and that scheme was not supported by officers then CAC would be withheld.

8.346 I can appreciate the Panel's continuing concern about the height of Block I2, which I have considered in detail above. I believe that the way forward is to grant permission for this block on the basis that there is scope for it to be heavily articulated at roof level and reduced in height where necessary to protect the setting and views of the Mill and Silo.

8.347 CABE has raised concerns about the obvious problems that arise from the outline application approach that is being adopted. However they do support the scale and massing of the development as proposed.

8.348 English Heritage share the concerns of the Panel with regard to the impact of the new junction on Hills Road. This issue can only be resolved in my view at the detailed design stage.

8.349 English Heritage also raise objection to the height of the proposed development and the location and size of the MSCP. These views are not shared by the Panel or by officers.

Conclusion – Streets, Spaces and Buildings

8.350 In conclusion it is my view that development has responded to the key principles of urban design established by the SADF and through current planning policy. The proposed development accords with the Development Plan in particular policies 3/7, 3/12 and 3/13 of the CLP 2006

Environmental Impact of the Scale of Development (Archaeology, Conservation Area, setting of Listed Buildings and BLIs and Views Analysis)

8.351 Having considered the proposals in the context of the loss of historic fabric and trees and from an urban design perspective, it is also appropriate to consider the impact of the development on Archaeology, the Conservation Area, the setting of Listed Buildings and Buildings of Local Interest (BLI) and Wider Views.

The Proposed Development

Archaeology

8.352 The application is supported by an Archaeological Assessment that fully addresses the impacts of the development on features on archaeological importance.

Conservation Area, setting of listed buildings and BLIs and Views Analysis

8.353 The application is supported by a Historic Environment Analysis which incorporates a Townscape and Views Assessment and which forms part of the Environmental Statement. It is a very extensive document and addresses the historic development of the Station Area, the landscape context, a views analysis, a study of the Station Area and a policy review.

8.354 The applicants have highlighted a number of pertinent issues that they consider to be of particular relevance to the designation of the area as a Conservation Area in 1993. These are:

- Much of the description of the CA relates to the housing area off Mill Road of which the Station Area is the southern edge.
- Landscape features are picked out for particular mention.
- The villas to the north side of Station Road are seen as important and the office blocks a modern incursion.

- The Focus site and much of the northern sidings were specifically excluded.
- The Station, the mill buildings and the open space on the now developed triangle site were seen as important.
- The area was, in part at least, designated to help control the redevelopment of the area around the station.

8.355 The applicants also note that a Conservation Area Appraisal for the Station Area forms part of the SADF. The Additional Conservation Issues Report, which was submitted as part of the revised submission, contains a section that goes into more depth on the issue of impacts of the development on the Conservation Area. The overall conclusion of the applicants is that they have submitted sufficient information to demonstrate the impact of the development upon the Conservation Area and that they would expect the detailed applications that are brought forward to undergo a very high level of scrutiny in relation to impact on the Conservation Area.

8.356 The Historic Environment Analysis includes a section on Buildings Contributing to the Character and Appearance of the Conservation Area. This addresses the impact of the development on listed buildings within and close to the site and the Botanic Gardens as a registered park and garden and also BLIs and buildings of poor townscape value such as Murdoch House.

8.357 The Views Analysis, which also forms part of the Historic Environment Analysis, uses a verified views methodology to consider the visual impact of the development from a series of viewpoints that were agreed by officers. These include five verified views and sixteen other wider views such as from Lime Kiln Hill and Grantchester Meadows and ten verified views and six other city views such as the Carter Bridge and Coleridge Recreation Ground.

Planning Policy Position

8.358 Policy 9/9 of the CLP does not make specific reference to the impact of the development upon Archaeological Interests, the Conservation Area, the setting of listed buildings and BLIs or key views of the site. However policies 4/9, 4/10, 4/11, 4/12, 3/3 and 3/13 of the CLP are of direct relevance to the determination of the application. Also as is noted above the T&CP (Listed Buildings) Act 1990 also places duties on the Council in respect of Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas and PPG15 is of great relevance in assessing the impacts of the development.

Archaeology

8.359 The Archaeology Team at the County Council have assessed the Archaeological Assessment and consider that the proposed mitigation strategy for archaeology meets their requirements. A negative condition will be needed. The development accords with Policy 4/9 of the CLP 2006.

Conservation Area

8.360 Policy 4/11 of the CLP states that outline applications will not be accepted in Conservation Areas. Clearly the application conflicts with this part of the policy and with PPG15, which reiterates this stance. However it would be unreasonable to expect a scheme of this magnitude to be brought forward to a fully detailed standard without some measure of support being offered for it. The SADF also acknowledges this approach in stating that for larger sites it may be appropriate to submit an outline application, but this would need to be accompanied by a master plan showing a high level of detail to enable the application to be assessed and the design quality of the scheme to be assured.

8.361 I am of the view that it is entirely appropriate for the application to be submitted as one that seeks outline approval only. As a result of the Environmental Impact Regulations a great deal of supporting information has been submitted with the application in the form of the Environmental Statement and other documents which has

enabled a full consideration to be made of the impact which the development will have on the Conservation Area.

8.362 Policy 4/11 also requires the retention of buildings, spaces etc that make a positive contribution to the Conservation Area, that new development preserves or enhances the character of the Conservation Area and that new development will not lead to traffic generation or other impacts which would adversely affect the Conservation Area.

8.363 These requirements reflect guidance provided by PPG15 and are also encapsulated in the SADF which requires the retention and reuse of the Mill and Silo; incorporates a Conservation Area Appraisal which highlights buildings of local interest; and which states that new buildings along Station Road should emulate the existing rhythm of separate individual buildings

8.364 PPG15 states that 'the design of new buildings intended to stand alongside historic buildings needs very careful consideration. In general it is better that old buildings are not set apart, but are woven into the fabric of the living and working community. This can be done, provided that the new buildings are carefully designed to respect their setting, follow fundamental architectural principles of scale, height, massing and alignment, and use appropriate materials. This does not mean that new buildings have to copy their older neighbours in detail: some of the most interesting streets in our towns and villages include a variety of building styles, materials, and forms of construction, of many different periods, but together forming a harmonious group.' In my opinion this advice is particularly relevant to the consideration of the proposals for the Station Square and Station Road.

8.365 I have made a detailed assessment of the scale and massing of buildings around the square in earlier sections of my report. The issue of the relationship between the low Station building and the significantly taller buildings that are proposed around the square has been raised by third parties and others. In my view the adoption of the unifying parapet height around the square goes some way to ensuring that these become a harmonious group of buildings. Similarly the

incorporation of a colonnade at ground and first floor helps these buildings to have a strong visual relationship with the Station buildings. The Station Square is of a substantial size measuring approximately 50 m in depth and 145 m in length. It will make a very significant impact on the character of this part of the Conservation Area and I agree with the applicants that substantial buildings are needed to contain the square.

8.366 There has been significant debate between officers and the applicants in respect of the relationship between building heights and mass and spaces between buildings on the south side of Station Road, which is acknowledged as making a significant contribution to the character of the Conservation Area. As part of this debate a comparison has been made between the rhythm of the villas on the north side of Station Road and the new office buildings. Officers are now satisfied that new buildings along Station Road do successfully emulate the existing rhythm of separate individual buildings.

8.367 The retention and conversion of the Mill and Silo will also make a very positive contribution to the character of this part of the Conservation Area and achieve the PPG15 aim of 'being woven into the fabric of the living and working community'. The potential of the retention of 125 Hills Road could also have a positive impact on the Conservation Area. I have dealt with the issue of removal of BLIs earlier in my report.

8.368 The nature of the application makes it difficult for a full assessment of the impact of the development on the Conservation Area to be carried out. However the material that has been presented by the applicants has convinced me that they have gone as far as possible in doing so within the confines of outline application. It is disappointing that applications have not already been submitted for the Station Square and the MSCP as had been originally planned when the Masterplan application was made.

8.369 I am of the opinion that the scale, massing and height of the buildings are likely to be capable of being brought forward within the development blocks will not detract from the visual amenities of the Conservation Area subject to a very

thorough assessment of the detailed applications when they are submitted.

Setting of Listed Buildings, BLIs and the Botanic Gardens

- 8.370 Policy 4/10 of the CLP 2006 protects both listed buildings and their settings. I have already dealt with the issue of impact on the listed station buildings above therefore this section considers the setting of listed buildings only. Although there is no policy in the CLP 2006 that relates directly to the Botanic Gardens they also benefit from safeguarding legislation as a registered park and garden.
- 8.371 Policy 4/12 of the CLP 2006 protects BLIs but does not specifically protect their settings. However in as much as BLIs make a significant contribution to the Conservation Area I will also consider the impact of the development on their settings.
- 8.372 The station buildings are listed grade II. There are no other listed buildings in the application site. However the war memorial at the junction of Hills Road and Station Road is listed grade II, the Botanic Gardens is a grade II* registered historic park/garden and the Royal Albert Almshouses and Highsett on Hills Road are listed grade II.
- 8.373 Within the application site there are a number of BLIs including Sleeperz Hotel, the Mill and Silo, the Ceres statue, 32-38 Station Road and 125-127a Hills Road. Beyond but close to the site boundary are BLIs in the form of the curved range of buildings at 55-59 Hills Road and 1-7 Station Road, the villas at 9-29 Station Road, Red House, the residential terrace 63-123 Hills Road and the Earl of Derby. I have addressed the proposals to demolish Sleeperz Hotel, 32-38 Station Road and 127 -127a Hills Road above in my section on Loss of Historic Fabric and Trees.
- 8.374 The setting of the listed station building includes the proposed Station Square, the buildings surrounding the square including the Mill and Silo and the vista along Station Road. Although the proposals for the Station Square have yet to come forward as a formal application they have been the subject of a significant degree of pre-application

discussion including a presentation to the Design and Conservation Panel. There has been an emphasis on attempting to keep as much of the Station Square as possible free of traffic. This has been facilitated by the provision of the NAR and reducing the taxi/drop off area to a minimum. The current draft proposals go a long way towards achieving this aim and have the potential to provide a suitable setting for the Station while at the same time producing an effective transport interchange.

- 8.375 The retention and conversion of the Mill and Silo will have a very positive impact on the setting of the Station.
- 8.376 The revision to Block A1, which formed part of the revised proposals, serves to afford a view along Station Road towards the Station that captures the colonnaded section of the Station and allows it to dominate the square despite the relative heights of adjacent buildings.
- 8.377 The new buildings around the square will have a profound impact on the existing setting of the listed station. I am of the view that given the size of the square and the dominance that the Station buildings will have along the full extent of its eastern side, the scale of new buildings is appropriate.
- 8.378 At the opposite end of Station Road lies the listed war memorial. This is to be relocated beside the entrance to the Botanic Gardens as part of the alterations to the Hills Road/Station Road junction. A scheme has previously been approved for the relocation and therefore I do not consider that the development will have an adverse impact on the setting of the war memorial.
- 8.379 In terms of impact on other listed buildings in the area it is my view that this will not be significant. Highsett is essentially an inward looking development and I do not consider its immediate setting will be affected. The Almshouses are shielded by both existing houses fronting Hills Road and the Laing's Triangle development.
- 8.380 The only building that may be visible from the Botanic Gardens is that which will occupy Block I2. However as I have set out in detail above, Block I2 is subject to a cap on

final floorspace, which only allows 75% of the building to be built out. This introduces a degree of flexibility in the overall design that should allow an appropriate skyline strategy to be developed to provide an appropriate degree of protection of views from the Botanic Gardens. In all other respects the development will not have any impact on the setting of the listed park and garden.

8.381 With regard to the setting of BLIs that fall beyond the site boundary I do not consider that the proposed development would affect these buildings to any greater degree than their location in an area undergoing rapid change already does. With the exception of the Red House, which has already been demolished, the closest BLI to the site is the Earl of Derby Public House. The Hills Road/Brooklands Avenue junction, Hills Road Bridge and the Signal Box, already dominates the setting of this building. Development on blocks M4 and M5 have the potential to improve the setting of the Earl of Derby.

Views Analysis

8.382 Policy 3/3 of the CLP 2006 seeks to safeguard the character of areas identified in the Cambridge Landscape Character Assessment that includes the long distance views of the City from these areas. Policy 3/13 deals with the impact of tall buildings on the skyline seeking to ensure that they do not detract from key vistas, the skyline and views within, over and from outside the city.

8.383 The views have been classified by level of importance and significance of impact. In most cases the significance of impact is considered to be negligible. This is because in many cases intervening buildings or planting obscures the view of the development. Iconic views of Cambridge such as along the Backs and across Parkers Piece will not be affected by the development.

8.384 Those views where the impact is described as beneficial such as from the Carter Bridge and Coleridge Recreation Ground are generally judged to be so because of the beneficial impact of the removal of the unsightly additions to

the Silo and the enhancement of the Mill and Silo as landmarks.

8.385 None of the proposed views are considered by the applicants to have a detrimental impact on the surrounding area. Whilst I can appreciate why the applicants have reached such a conclusion in the case of views in close proximity to the site and within the site, this will be dependent upon the quality of the architecture that is brought forward.

Third party representations

8.386 I have addressed most of the issues raised by third parties in my assessment.

8.387 In terms of long distance views the assessment has concluded that the development will have a negligible impact; it does not conclude that the development will not be visible from any long distance viewpoints.

8.388 I do not subscribe to the view that the Fenland landscape that surrounds the city should influence the height of buildings in the Station Area. In my view the height of the proposed buildings is not such that the setting of the City is compromised.

Conclusion – Environmental Impact of the Scale of Development (Archaeology, Conservation Area, setting of Listed Buildings and BLIs and Views Analysis)

8.389 I am satisfied that the impact of the development on Archaeology, the Conservation Area, the setting of Listed Buildings and Buildings of Local Interest (BLI) and key views within and without the City is acceptable. There will be an opportunity to closely analyse the impact of the development on these features of acknowledged importance as the detailed applications are brought forward in the context of the analysis that has already been carried out on the principle of development. In my view the application accords with advice contained in PPG15 and with the Development Plan particularly policies 4/9, 4/10, 4/11, 4/12, 3/3 and 3/13 of the CLP

Sustainable Development

The Proposed Development

- 8.390 The application is supported by a Sustainability Statement and Checklist. This includes a summary of policy, sustainability objectives and targets, a sustainability options assessment and strategy for CB1.
- 8.391 The applicants acknowledge that the Council's Sustainable Design and Construction SPD is the key policy document with regard to the sustainable credentials of the development.
- 8.392 Targets are set out for each of the sustainability objectives identified by the applicants, which are derived from the SPD and other guidance/policies. The following table sets out the objectives and targets for CB1.

Objective	CB1 Target
Transport – Reduce need to travel and maximise access to public transport	80% of development to be within 400 m of public transport node.
Transport – Prioritise walking and cycling.	100% of dwellings within 800 m of wide range of shops and services. Proposed cycle routes linked to existing. Safe and secure car and cycle parking.
SUDS – Reduce flooding.	Attenuation to achieve net reduction rates during storm conditions.
SUDS – Improve quality of ground and surface waters.	Attenuation to achieve and recreate Greenfield characteristics.

Energy Targets – Minimise energy use.	Use of district heating networks and gas CHP for student residential and hotel buildings. 15% carbon abatement from renewable energy systems.
---------------------------------------	--

Objective	CB1 Target
Energy Targets – Reduce CO ₂ emissions	To exceed BR Part L by 10%, initially by energy efficiency but as BR tightens via energy efficiency supply and renewable energy systems.
Recycling and Waste Facilities Targets – Minimise operational waste and increase recycling	To provide facilities to achieve improved recycling rates of greater than 40%.
Biodiversity – Enhancement of site and wider community	Minimum of 5 additional species per hectare guided by Ecology Strategy.
Pollution – Minimise occurrence and effects of light pollution	Ensuring security is provided but at the same time minimising pollution.
Pollution – Minimise and mitigate effects of noise and air emissions.	Noise, air quality and odours assessments carried out and mitigation measures implemented.
Climate Change Targets – Ensure adaptation and improvement to contribute to sustainable development throughout the lifecycle of the development.	Thermal massing, solar design etc. to be included in design to mitigate against climate change factors.

Water Targets – Reduce demand through efficient design and operation.	Internal water consumption should be less than 105 litres per person for residential buildings and 4.5 m ³ for other uses per year.
Materials and Construction Waste Targets – Materials with an inherently low environmental impact.	80% of building materials should be A rated.
Materials and Construction Waste Targets – Minimising and managing waste during construction.	Site waste management plan at detailed stage to follow procedures outlined by WRAP and Environwise.

Objective	CB1 Target
Health, Well-being and Quality of Life Targets – Providing a comfortable and safe environment.	Targets for crime reduction and safety to be in line with CAGE publication – Better Neighbourhoods – Making Higher Densities Work.
Health, Well-being and Quality of Life Targets – Ensuring quality of life of inhabitants and wider community.	Assessment by sociological survey techniques and ensure post-occupation Overall Liking Score is over 50%.
Community Engagement Targets – Include stakeholders and members of the public in the planning and design process.	To develop and implement a consultation plan in accordance with the Council’s Statement of Community Involvement.
Community Engagement Targets – Provision of community facilities and open space.	Provision of community facilities that are valued and utilised by the existing community. Compliance with Council’s open space standards.

Implementing Best Practice – Using CB1 as an exemplar for sustainable development in Cambridge.	All or part of the CB1 scheme to be submitted and short-listed for the Academy of Sustainable Communities (ASC) award scheme or equivalent.
Implementing Best Practice – Measuring and benchmarking the sustainability of CB1 during design, construction and operation phases.	To exceed the Code for Sustainable Homes ratings of 3 for residential development and BREEAM ratings of Excellent for all other development types.

8.393 The Sustainability Strategy then considers the options available to meet the CB1 targets and ranks them according to a feasibility assessment methodology. With the exception of the options for renewable energy I do not propose to go into further detail on the possible options as the range of options is very extensive and very few options, such as the use of a private water supply to reduce pressure on public water supplies, have been ruled out.

Renewable Energy

8.394 The applicants have reached the following conclusions:

- The installation of a district heating scheme served by gas fired CHP and boilers for the student residential and hotel buildings reduces renewable options to photovoltaics and biomass. Biomass is not appropriate in the area therefore the only match is roof mounted photovoltaic panels, the cost effectiveness of which is currently poor.
- District heating is not a good match for the private and affordable units due to high installation cost. The options are therefore solar hot water panels and photovoltaics. It is not possible to implement both options therefore a solar thermal hot water system is recommended as the carbon savings are higher and cost effectiveness is better.

- The commercial, retail, polyclinic and other non-residential buildings can be served by photovoltaics and ground source heat pumps. These two systems do not interact with each other so both can be selected. As ground source heat pumps are more cost effective it is recommended that the maximum extent be utilised and then where appropriate panels mounted on the roof and southern façade.
- Wind turbines are a possibility but have a big visual impact and are currently discounted.

8.395 The calculations performed during feasibility work have produced a predicted 17.2% carbon abatement from renewable energy systems. This may be subject to change in the light of detailed planning work and therefore a target of 15% is put forward as a level that the applicants are confident that they can achieve.

8.396 On the basis of the applicants options assessment the following recommendations have been made for the use of energy systems:

Student Residential Buildings	Gas CHP district heating.
Hotel	Gas CHP district heating
Commercial/Retail	Ground source heat pumps
Private/Affordable Residential	Solar Thermal Hot Water Panels
Other Buildings	Photovoltaics

Additional Information

8.397 Following comments from officers, in particular raising concerns that the approach to sustainability was based on targets as opposed to commitments, additional details have been submitted by the applicants.

8.398 The applicants have identified two strategies that they feel provide further assurances that the scheme will achieve best practice standards in sustainable development. CB1 has been put forward as a pilot project to the BRE emerging BREEAM Communities assessment tool. Discussions are ongoing with the Cambridge University's Centre for Sustainable Development to identify ongoing elements of the

proposals that could be used for research projects as a demonstration of education and skills transfer.

8.399 The applicants have also suggested that a number of conditions could be attached to the approval to address the following issues:

- Annual monitoring and review of the Sustainability Strategy to take account of changes to planning policies, best practice and viable emerging technologies.

The applicants do not consider that it would be appropriate to condition the achievement of the minimum standards set out in the Sustainability Strategy because in certain circumstances and dependent upon the content or scope of each reserved matters application it may not be possible to achieve the targets. Such a condition would in their view not pass the Circular 11/95 tests. As a demonstration of their commitment to sustainability they recommend the following detailed conditions:

- Submission of an individual Sustainability Statement with each application for reserved matters, which demonstrates compliance with the overall Strategy or justifies non-compliance.
- Achievement of a 15% carbon reduction (against approved benchmarks) through provision of renewable energy sources of supply, to include the submission of information at reserved matters stage to determine how the proposals contribute to achieving this standard.
- Achievement of minimum energy performance to exceed BR Part L by 10%, to include the submission of information at reserved matters stage to determine how the proposals contribute to achieving this standard.
- Achievement of a minimum recycling rate of 40%, to include the submission of information at reserved matters stage to determine how the proposals contribute to achieving this standard.

- Achievement of a minimum water performance of 105 litres per person per day for student and residential accommodation and 4.5 m³ for all other uses, as defined using BRE calculation methodology, to include the submission of information at reserved matters stage to determine how the proposals contribute to achieving this standard.
- Achievement of a minimum materials performance standard of 80% of construction materials to be A rated (as defined by Green Guide to Specification), to include the submission of information at reserved matters stage to determine how the proposals contribute to achieving this standard.
- Approval of a Site Waste Management Plan (SWMP) in accordance with Waste and Recycling Programme (WRAP) best practice to accompany all applications for reserved matters.
- Submission of a Sustainability Statement with all applications for reserved matters, which includes benchmarking against the relevant BREEAM or Code for Sustainable Homes standard and demonstration of how best practice standards have been met.

Planning Policy Position

8.400 The concept of the Station Area development set out in Policy 9/9 of the CLP 2006 is clearly one of a highly sustainable form of development promoting a mix of uses surrounding a high quality integrated transport interchange. The supporting text states that ‘throughout the site the aim is to achieve high quality architecture and design, high quality streets and spaces and best practice in sustainable development’.

8.401 One of the key objectives of the CLP 2006 is to ensure that the City develops in an integrated and sustainable manner; this is reflected in Policy 3/1 of the CLP 2006 that requires development to meet the principles of sustainability. The Sustainable Design and Construction SPD provides guidance to enable developers and decision makers to

assess the sustainable credentials of major new development.

8.402 Policy 8/16 of the CLP deals very specifically with Energy Resources and requires that at least 10% of a development's total predicted energy requirements should be provided from renewable energy sources.

8.403 It is very difficult to separate the assessment of the sustainability of the proposed development from other matters such as transport, building design and environmental impact. I have generally dealt with these issues elsewhere in my assessment and in concluding that the development is acceptable in regard to them have necessarily concluded that the development is a sustainable one.

8.404 One issue that does require specific mention in relation to the sustainability of the scheme is the design of the proposed office buildings. Concerns were initially raised by officers and by the Design and Conservation Panel that the large floor plans of the office buildings would not lend themselves to a sustainable built form. For example there was concern that the buildings would require high levels of cooling as a result of lack of natural ventilation.

8.405 As part of their Addendum to the Design and Access Statement submitted with the first revision the applicants provided further information on the sustainable credentials of deep plan blocks. They refer to Block E1 which already benefits from planning permission and which has a larger footprint than other proposed office blocks. This building achieves a BREEAM 'very good' rating. Future office development will be aiming to achieve a BREEAM 'excellent' rating.

8.406 The applicants also cite the example of another office development that they have been working on in Chiswick. In that example footprints varied between 45 m deep to 72 m deep but BREEAM 'very good' or 'excellent' ratings were achieved. By comparison Block I2 will be up to 45 m deep. It is the applicant's contention that this demonstrates that footprint size is not necessarily a factor to affect sustainability.

8.407 The Council's Sustainable Construction Coordinator (SCC) has assessed the submission made by the applicant, including the suggested conditions and information on footprints. The SCC does not agree with the conclusions of the applicants in relation to the process of ruling out some technologies nor does she support the conditions that they recommend.

Recommendations for Planning Conditions

8.408 On the basis of advice from the SCC I would recommend alternatives to the conditions recommended by the applicants to secure a commitment to achieving targets for sustainable development.

8.409 The conditions that I have recommended seek to achieve Code for Sustainable Homes – Code 4 for the residential elements of the scheme and BREEAM rating 'Excellent' for the non-residential buildings as a minimum. If a higher code or rating comes forward as part of the Local Development Framework (LDF) then this would be applied to any reserved matters submission received after the first 12 months of the outline consent.

8.410 The recommended conditions are stronger than those suggested by the applicants and have been used on the approvals for development within the Southern Fringe. The applicants have promoted the development as an exemplar scheme for sustainable development and therefore it seems to me that it is appropriate that they should be required to meet the targets imposed elsewhere in the City as a minimum.

8.411 The SCC also supports these conditions on the basis that they reflect national planning policy guidance in the form of PPS1, which discourages unnecessary detail or prescription.

8.412 With regard to the use of renewable energy, it is accepted that at an outline stage it is only possible to explore the options that may be appropriate subject to more detailed design. The applicants have been thorough in their assessment and logical recommendations have been made although I accept the view of the SCC that no technologies

should be ruled out at the outline stage. The applicants have stated that they can achieve 15% carbon reduction (against approved benchmarks) through provision of renewable energy sources of supply. The SCC supports the reference to carbon reduction and has confirmed that this accords with the requirements of CLP policy 8/16.

8.413 I have recommended a condition which requires that 15% of the developments energy needs is secured via renewal energy again with a proviso that any reserved matters application made after the first 12 months of the outline consent will be required to achieve any higher standard which is established under the LDF. Clearly the 15% requirement is above the 10% policy position but in the event that the applicants have brought forward this commitment it is appropriate to secure it by condition in my view.

8.414 The issues addressed by the conditions recommended by the applicant are capable of being addressed via the recommended conditions relating to the code for sustainable homes and BREEAM. The need for an annual review of the Sustainability Strategy is, in the opinion of officers, better addressed by the need for the sustainability of the development to keep pace with changes via the LDF process.

Sustainable Credentials of Large Building Footprints

8.415 The SCC is not entirely convinced about the merits of the applicant's arguments in relation to the sustainable credentials of large footprint office buildings. The achievement of a BREEAM 'excellent' rating will not ensure that an office building is designed to reduce energy consumption. This is a matter that can only be satisfactorily resolved at detailed planning stage. Notwithstanding the conditions imposed regarding BREEAM, any subsequent submission of reserved matters for the office buildings will be required to demonstrate that it is of an appropriate design, including its sustainability, which may mean that the maximum office floorspace cannot be delivered.

Third Party Representations

8.416 I have dealt with issues raised in representations above. In my view the conditions recommended by the applicants, as revised by officers, will serve to ensure that the sustainability of the scheme is realised and secured as the development is rolled out.

Conclusion - Sustainable Development

8.417 I am satisfied that the applicant's have provided sufficient information and assurances that the development will be a sustainable one. In particular they have demonstrated that in excess of 10% of energy needs are capable of being supplied from renewable energy sources. I consider that the conditions that have been supported by the Sustainable Construction Co-ordinator are appropriate to secure the fulfilment of targets. In my view the development accords with the Development Plan particularly policies 3/1 and 8/16 and conforms to guidance provided by the Sustainable Design and Construction SPD.

Impacts on Local Infrastructure

8.418 The proposed development will result in an increased number of people living and working in the station area. These people will generate an increased demand for local infrastructure such as health services, community facilities, schools, affordable housing and open space. Planning policies dictate that the additional burden imposed by these demands on existing services or the need for new services should be met by the developer

The Proposed Development

Health Services

8.419 The proposed development includes 6,420 sq m of floorspace within the proposed polyclinic and potentially a further 854 sq m of floorspace for the relocation of the existing Woodlands Surgery to a freestanding building. Ongoing discussions are taking place with the PCT to

determine the future of the Woodlands Surgery, including the potential for the amalgamation of three surgeries including Woodlands within the polyclinic.

8.420 32-38 Station Road, which currently accommodates the Woodlands Surgery, is programmed for demolition in early 2010. This will mean that the temporary relocation of the surgery will be needed until its permanent home is available in late 2012. The ES recognises that this may have a short-term minor socio economic impact of a local scale.

Other Community Facilities

8.421 In addition to the health facilities described above the application as submitted also includes an art workshop, a gym and nursery and student union facilities. The second revision to the application also introduces public toilets, community space in addition to the student union facilities and the potential for a local police station.

Education

8.422 The ES notes that there is no spare capacity within existing primary or secondary schools and that without mitigation, despite the phasing of the development, there will be a long term and minor adverse impact on education provision. The proposals do not make any provision for a new school within the development area and it is proposed that the lack of provision for school places be addressed through commuted sum payments.

The development does include a commercially run nursery.

Formal Open Space

8.423 The development does not include any form of formal open space provision e.g. bowling green, tennis court, MUGA. The applicants propose that this provision is made through commuted sum payments.

Informal Open Space

8.424 On site provision takes the form of a contribution towards the informal open space area identified in the SADF adjacent the Laing's development, a new area of open space within the northern residential area and a new area of open space adjacent to the Ravensworth Gardens play area. This amounts to 16.4% of the requirement for informal open space derived from application of the Council's standards. The applicants propose that any short fall be dealt with through commuted payments.

8.425 The Landscape Strategy that supports the application promotes a scheme for the laying out of the full extent of the informal open space within the southern residential area. This reflects the applicants desire to obtain control off this area that currently remains in the control of Laings but is to be transferred to the City Council under the s106 Agreement for the Warren Close development.

Play Space

8.426 There is no play space provided within the application site. However the Landscape Strategy plans for the informal open space within the southern residential area include a play area. The applicants propose that play space provision is dealt with by commuted sum payments.

Planning Policy Position

Health Services

8.427 Policy 9/9 of the CLP 2006 supports the provision of health services as community facilities. The SADF identifies a site adjacent to the Mill and Silo as a potential location for a medical practice and health centre. The proposed location of the polyclinic in Block A2, which looks the most likely location for the surgery/s, is also highly accessible and an appropriate site for health uses serving the resident population. The fall back location to the north of the Carter Bridge is not quite so accessible for residents of the southern residential quarter but is nevertheless appropriate.

8.428 Although the PCT have raised some concerns about their on-going negotiations with the developers this is to a large extent a matter for resolution between the two parties. The amount of floorspace proposed for health uses, as part of the development is adequate to accommodate the relocation of Woodlands and new facilities to serve the growing population.

Other Community Facilities

8.429 Policy 9/9 of the CLP 2006 supports the provision of community uses and community rooms as appropriate to the development. These uses include health facilities that I have addressed above and the community room, which now forms part of the development.

8.430 In addition to the community facilities that have been brought forward within the development the Head of Community Development has also requested that a contribution be sought towards the appointment of a Community Development Officer (£30,000/£10,000 p.a. for 3 years) and towards the work of The Junction, in the case of the latter on the basis that the development will generate a large young population which will place additional demands on that facility. The contribution towards The Junction has been calculated by comparing a no on-site community facility/wholly commuted sum scheme with the value of the community room plus the commuted payments for the CDO. The applicant has agreed to make these commuted payments.

8.431 The combination of commercially run facilities such as the gym, on site provision such as the community space and the police station and commuted payments towards the Community Development Officer and The Junction fulfil the requirements of policy 5/12 of the CLP 2006 in my view. In reaching this conclusion I am mindful of the fact that policy 5/12 now allows consideration to be given to health facilities as 'community facilities'.

Schools

- 8.432 There is to be no on-site provision for primary or secondary education. The applicants have agreed to make a commuted sum contribution in accordance with the City Council's Planning Obligations Strategy.
- 8.433 The inclusion of a commercially run nursery within the scheme is to be welcomed and is supported by the SADF. However this does not preclude the need for the applicant to make provision for pre-school education via commuted sum payments in accordance with the City Council's Planning Obligations Strategy. The applicants have agreed to make this payment.
- 8.434 A commuted payment towards Life Long Learning also falls due which the applicants have agreed to make.

Formal Open Space

- 8.435 Policy 9/9 of the CLP 2006 does not identify a need for formal open space to be provided as part of the development. The possibility of a MUGA has been discussed but informal advice from Environmental Health officers suggests that it may be difficult to accommodate such a facility without having a harmful impact on the amenity of existing and future residents. I tend to agree with this view that reflects one of the constraints of developing a high-density residential development of this type. I am satisfied that provision of formal open space through commuted payments is the most appropriate way forward.
- 8.436 With regard to the student population, commuted payments are not normally required if it can be demonstrated that the host university/college, in this case ARU, already has sufficient formal open space provision to cater for existing and new students. To date this evidence has not been provided and my current calculations are based on full off site provision by commuted payment.
- 8.437 I have set out my calculations for the formal open space payments in Appendix S; these sums are referred to in detail in the section on Planning Obligations.

Informal Open Space

- 8.438 Policy 9/9 of the CLP 2006 supports the provision of greenspace and hard surfaced open space within the Station Area, however it does not specify the amount of informal open space that should be provided on site. The proposed development seeks to strike a balance between accommodating a high density mixed use development around a highly accessible transport interchange and making proper provision for informal open space.
- 8.439 I have already set out my view that the amount of informal open space is acceptable in terms of its contribution to the creation of a successful place. The degree to which the level of informal open space meets the needs of future residents cannot not be wholly separated from this argument because the aim of creating a good environment for people to live and work in is as much about the quality of the space as it is about the quantum.
- 8.440 In comparison with the previous scheme the amount of informal open space has been significantly increased while the potential resident population has decreased even if the student population is included. Two new areas of informal open space have been introduced the rear of buildings fronting Station Road and the SAR and adjacent the Ravensworth Gardens play area. Although the latter was envisaged by the SADF, the former was not.
- 8.441 On balance it is my view that whilst the percentage of informal open space to be provided on site is not ideal the space to be provided, if laid out and managed well, will be sufficient to meet the demands of the resident population.
- 8.442 I have set out my calculations for informal open space payments in lieu of on site provision in Appendix S; these sums are referred to in detail in the section on Planning Obligations.

Play Space

8.443 With regard to play space and recognising that as a result of the type of accommodation the number of children may not be particularly high, I am of the view that some combination of on site provision within the Park and off site commuted payments is appropriate. At the time of the determination of the Laing's Triangle scheme it was envisaged that a childrens play space would be provided on the informal open space between the two developments and part of the commuted payment was 'ring-fenced' for this purpose. At this time it was also envisaged that the entire Park would come under the Council's ownership and control.

8.444 I have discussed the applicant's proposals for retaining control of 'their' element of the Park and seeking transfer of the Laing's land to them with my colleagues in Active Communities. Officers have no objections to this approach and I am also advised that it is legally possible. However the Council has yet to secure control of the Laing's land and therefore the only way forward at this time is to secure commuted sum payments for off site provision of play space.

8.445 I have set out my calculations for play space payments in Appendix S; these sums are referred to in detail in the section on Planning Obligations.

Third Party Representations

8.446 I do not agree with the argument that the development does not include sufficient community facilities. It would also be inappropriate for the Council to expect the developer to provide facilities to address an existing need.

8.447 The potential for shared use of the student union facilities by the community has been debated between officers and the applicants. Concerns have been raised about how such a facility could be managed and responsibilities apportioned between all parties. At present the decision has been made to provide separate facilities for students and residents.

8.448 I agree that the Botanic Gardens is a resource that is available to residents, but I have not included this in my consideration of access to green space because of potential adverse impacts resulting from the additional population using the Gardens.

Conclusion – Impacts on Local Infrastructure

8.449 I am satisfied that the impacts of the population generated by the development on health services and other community facilities, schools and open space/play space is acceptable or can be appropriately mitigated through off site commuted sum payments. In my view the application accords with the Development Plan particularly policies 3/8, 5/11, 5/12, 5/14 and 9/9 of the CLP 2006.

Impact on Existing Residential Amenity

8.450 This section deals with the impact of the development on the residential amenities currently enjoyed by existing residents. The residential amenity afforded to future residents of the development is dealt with below.

8.451 It should be noted that detailed buildings are not proposed at this stage. Therefore issues of overlooking and loss of privacy, the overbearing nature of a building and the impact of blank façades cannot be fully addressed. The purpose of my assessment is to highlight those areas where it will not be possible to design out significant impacts on residential amenity.

The Proposed Development

8.452 There are number of places where the proposed development will abut existing residential development namely:

- Block G2 and the alterations to the Carter Bridge ramp opposite and adjacent houses fronting Devonshire Road.
- Blocks D1, F1 and F2 adjacent to Ravensworth Gardens.

- Blocks J1 - J4 and Block I2 adjacent to the Laings/Warren Close development and houses fronting Hills Road.
- Block M6 adjacent to the Laings/Warren Close development and houses fronting Hills Road.

8.453 The development will also abut the following non-residential development:

- The villas that accommodate predominately education uses fronting the north side of Station Road.
- Kett House at the Hills Road/Station Road junction.
- The Red House site.
- The Earl of Derby Public House including the accommodation wing to the rear.

Planning Policy Position

8.453 The key policies against which an assessment of residential amenity impact should be made are Policy 3/4 of the CLP 2006, which relates to the need for new development to respond positively to its context and Policy 3/12 of the CLP, which requires new buildings to have a positive impact on their setting. These aims are reflected in guidance provided by PPS1 Delivering Sustainable Development.

8.454 The SADF also recommends that building heights be reduced for those blocks that are in close proximity to neighbouring residential development.

Devonshire Road impact

8.455 The building on Block G1 is to be three storeys high and currently has the potential to be either a residential use, student accommodation or a non-residential use such as a doctor's surgery. The building will be located a minimum of 8 m from the gable of the adjacent building to the north and 17 m from houses on the opposite side of Devonshire Road.

8.456 In terms of its use, bearing in mind that all vehicular access to the building will be via the NAR, I do not consider that any of the three potential uses will have a significant impact on the level of noise and disturbance already experienced. Given the proposed height of the building, which is compatible with the surrounding development and its siting in relation other buildings and the Carter Bridge, I think it unlikely that the development of Block G1 would have a significant impact in terms of being overbearing or resulting in loss of light. The proximity of the north façade of the building to private gardens will give rise to the need for careful consideration to be given to the height and elevational treatment of this element.

8.457 Given the relationship of Block G2 with the houses on the opposite side of Devonshire Road I do not consider that the occupiers of these houses will experience any significant impact.

8.458 Residents of Devonshire Road have raised concerns about the visual impact and impact on privacy of the proposed Carter Bridge link. The applicants are in the process of producing further information on this issue and if possible I will report further on the Amendment Sheet or at the meeting. I have recommended a condition to secure full details of the link including for the purpose of assessing the impact upon residential amenities.

Ravensworth Gardens Impact

8.459 The southern and western fringes of the Ravensworth Gardens development are predominately two storey with rooms in the roof or three storey. There are windows facing the application site.

8.460 The proposed blocks adjacent Ravensworth Gardens are all proposed for residential use; some may be affordable housing. Therefore in terms of use the new development is compatible with existing.

8.461 Block D1 is to be up to four storeys high. The majority of the block is located a minimum of 11 m from the site boundary and 19 m from the rear elevation of the nearest houses in

Ravensthorpe Gardens. A single storey element is proposed adjacent to the open space.

8.462 Block D1 lies to the south of the Ravensthorpe Gardens development and therefore presents the potential for overshadowing. The applicant's daylight, sunlight and overshadowing study that forms part of the ES acknowledges that there will be some adverse impact upon residential amenity in terms of overshadowing. Since the houses in this part of Ravensthorpe Gardens currently overlook the Focus car park this will undoubtedly be the case. However the proposed building will be at some distance from the boundary that will mitigate against any overshadowing and overbearing impact, overshadowing being mainly restricted to the garden areas serving Block D1.

8.463 At four storeys the building on Block D1 exceeds the SADF recommended height for a building in this location by one storey. It is my view that when an application for reserved matters approval is submitted for Block D1, very careful consideration will need to be given to the impact of its height. However at present I have no evidence to lead me to the conclusion that a four-storey building could not be accommodated on this site.

8.464 Block F1 is a reverse L shaped block and will be up to four storeys high. At its closest point it will be virtually on the site boundary and 7 m from the gable end of the nearest house on Ravensthorpe Gardens.

8.465 Block F1 lies to the south of the Ravensthorpe Gardens development and therefore has the potential to result in overshadowing. However in the current situation the Focus building dominates and significantly overshadows these houses and therefore the proposed development is likely to result in a change for the better.

8.466 Block F2 will be up to three storeys high and will be located to the east of the Ravensthorpe Gardens development. It will be positioned on the site boundary and will be a minimum of 12 m from the rear elevation of existing houses and 4 m from the closest gable end. Block F2 will impact upon the existing situation to some degree because it will be constructed on

what is currently a ground level car park. However given its orientation only eastern light will be affected and at three storeys there is some potential for mitigation of the impact. In common with Block D1 I am of the view that a significant level of justification will be needed when an application is made for reserved matters for Block F2 in terms of its height, mass and impact but at this stage I do not have sufficient evidence to support the view that a three storey building cannot be accommodated on the site.

Laing's Triangle/Warren Close Impact

- 8.467 The Warren Close development will be impacted on two sides by the proposed development, the third side being formed by the residential terrace fronting Hills Road.
- 8.468 The J blocks and Block I2 will be located to the north of the existing blocks of flats and therefore overshadowing will not be an issue. The new development will be separated from the existing by a service road and car parking space serving Warren Close and the proposed service road serving the J blocks and the SAR. At its closest point there will be 20 m between the rear elevations of the J blocks and Block I2 and the Warren Close development.
- 8.469 There are existing office blocks on the south side of Station Road which are closer to the boundary with the Warren Close development and which already impact upon the outlook from the rear of the existing flats. The proposed blocks will accommodate the same uses as the existing with the exception of the nursery and gym which are to be located in the blocks furthest from the flats. I do not think that any adverse impact will arise from the use of the new buildings. The proposed J blocks will be taller than the existing office buildings that will impact to some extent on the rear outlook from the flats. However the inter-relationship between existing and proposed blocks and the fact that the flats are orientated to face south will successfully mitigate against any significant adverse impact.

8.470 The relationship between Block I2 and the existing flats is more sensitive. Although there is a 20 m separation distance between the buildings this is significantly less than the current relationship where 32-38 Station Road is located more than 40 m from the rear of the flats. Block I2 will also be significantly taller than the flats. However again there is a degree of mitigation by virtue of the fact that the flats have habitable rooms which face south away from Block I2. A further mitigating factor is the significant improvement in the outlook from the flats that will be afforded by the redevelopment of the RHM site.

8.471 Block L1 to the east of the flats is to accommodate retail uses at ground level which could have an adverse impact on the amenity currently enjoyed by the residents to the Warren Close flats. However the upper floors of L1 which will be much closer to these uses will be in residential occupation and therefore it will be to the applicants benefit to ensure that any potential impacts are controlled for the benefit of new residents.

8.472 Block M6 to the south of the Warren Close development incorporates a gable end that is aligned with the gable end of the block of flats. This relationship and the layout of Block M6 generally is likely to result in a building which will not have any significant impact on residential amenity.

8.473 Subject to the rigorous assessment of detailed plans, I am confident that the impact on the amenities currently enjoyed by residents of Warren Close will be acceptable.

Hills Road Impact

8.474 Kett House and Jupiter House already dominate the rear outlook from properties fronting Hills Road. The closest affected buildings are the Centennial Hotel that occupies numbers 63 to 73 Hills Road. To the northern end of the range, closest to the Kett House site there is a yard area. Given the presence of the existing buildings and the non-permanent residential nature of the hotel occupancy, I am of the view that the impact of the new buildings will not be so significant as to justify refusal of planning permission.

8.475 At the opposite end of the Hills Road terrace adjacent the new bus link road junction, Block M6 has greater potential to impact on the amenities currently enjoyed by residents. The northern wing of Block M6 sits on the site of 125 Hills Road. It is possible that this building will be retained and incorporated into the scheme that would mitigate the impact of Block M6 on the southernmost house in the terrace. In the event that 125 Hills Road is not retained then I do not consider that Block M6 would have a significant impact on residential amenity, as it is limited to three storeys high and separated from the gable end of the adjacent house by 10 m at its closest point.

Station Road Impact

8.476 The villas to the north side of Station Road already experience some impact from existing office buildings to the south. However the distance between the villas and the offices reduces this impact across Station Road and the degree mature landscaping around the office buildings further softens the impact. The proposal to replace the office buildings with buildings of a greater height and mass has the potential to increase the impact on the villas. However given the set back of the J blocks off Station Road which contributes to a building to building distance across Station Road of approximately 40 metres and the non-residential nature of the uses accommodated in the villas I consider that any additional impact will be minimal.

8.477 Kett House no longer forms part of the redevelopment proposals. Block J4 will lie to the east of Kett House. At five storeys it will be comparable in height with the existing office building on the site. Notwithstanding the fact that Kett House is in a non-residential use, I do not consider that there will be any significant impact on the amenities currently enjoyed by its occupiers.

Impact on the Red House Site

8.478 The Red House site is currently cleared pending redevelopment as a hotel. It occupies a site that is to the north of the tallest building on the development that will occupy Block I2. There will undoubtedly be a degree of overshadowing resulting from the development of Block I2.

Given the fact that the hotel will be set back from Station Road, as will Block I2, I do not consider that Block I2 will be overbearing upon the Red House. My only concern is therefore overshadowing and loss of light. In this respect I am mindful of the fact that the hotel bedrooms will principally be used at night when sunlight is not an issue and that public facilities are to be located on the northern side of the hotel. Given the use of the hotel I do not consider significant overshadowing to be unobjectionable in this instance.

Impact on the Earl of Derby public house

8.479 The Earl of Derby is effectively surrounded by blocks M3, M4 and M5. Since the determination of the previous application a block of accommodation has been constructed in the car park of the public house along its northern boundary.

8.480 Block M5, a four-storey block, will lie to the north of the Earl of Derby. It will be separated from the public house by a service road that results in a minimum separation distance between buildings of 10 m. Block M3, which accommodates a six-storey building, lies to the east in the region of 30 m from the accommodation block. Block M4, a five-storey block lies to the south. A cycle lane separates it from the boundary with the public house and there will be a separation distance in excess of 20 m between buildings.

8.481 Block M4 has the greatest potential to impact on the amenities of the Earl of Derby particularly in terms of overshadowing. However given that this will be predominately to the public house car park I do not consider the impact will be so severe as to merit a refusal in principle. Again careful consideration will need to be given to the impacts on the amenities of the public house when the applications for reserved matters approval are submitted.

Third party representations

8.482 I have addressed the majority of issues raised by third parties in my assessment above.

8.483 A number of comments have been made about the impact of the student accommodation on residential amenities. In

response the applicants have stated that it is their intention to provide 24/7/364 security at the site. This will form part of their estate management strategy that is capable of being secured by planning condition. A management agreement is also being drawn up with ARU to establish clear lines of responsibility in respect to the behaviour of students.

8.484 I am sure that the concentration of this number of students in one part of the City will have some impact upon residential amenity, however it is not easy to quantify. The management arrangements provided by the applicants and ARU combined with the fact that there will be dedicated social facilities for students as part of their accommodation will go some way to containing any potential problems. The inclusion of facilities for the police within the scheme could also be regarded as of assistance in the integration of existing residents with students.

8.485 Some residents have also highlighted the likelihood that the large number of drinking establishments that are proposed will exacerbate impacts on residential amenity. Whilst there is some potential for this to be the case the scale of provision is intended to fulfil local needs and not to act as an attractor in the same way as for instance Cambridge Leisure operates.

8.486 The application site does not fall into the cumulative impact area for licensed premises.

8.487 I am not aware of any evidence to demonstrate the proposed tall buildings will affect the TV reception. There has been no evidence of such impact associated with other substantial buildings in the area.

8.488 The MSCP will be approximately 30 m from the boundary with Ravensworth Gardens and will be screened from existing houses by Block F2. The impact on outlook for future residents is addressed below.

Conclusion – Impact on Existing Residential Amenity

- 8.489 In assessing the impact on existing residential amenity I have placed significant emphasis on the need for a rigorous assessment to be carried out on the detailed proposals that will be brought forward for approval of reserved matters. This is because at this stage so much of the impact on issues such as overlooking and loss of privacy is reliant on information that is not currently available.
- 8.490 I appreciate that the outline status of the application has also made it difficult for existing residents to fully appreciate the impact that the development will have on their living conditions. I hope that the recommendation that a design workshop should be held involving residents of Ravensworth Gardens, which came out of the Development Control Forum, is pursued.
- 8.491 As a result of my assessment I have concluded that the impact of the development on residential amenity is acceptable in principle and that the application accords with the Development Plan in particular policies 3/4 and 3/12 of the CLP 2006 and with guidance provided by PPS1 Delivering Sustainable Development.

Living Conditions for Future Residents

- 8.492 In common with the preceding section, it should be noted that detailed buildings are not proposed at this stage and therefore issues of overlooking and loss of privacy, the overbearing nature of a building and the impact of blank façades, cannot be fully addressed. The purpose of my assessment is to highlight those areas where it will not be possible to design out significant impacts on residential amenity.
- 8.493 I have already dealt with the issue of air quality impact, which affects not only residents but also all users of the development, in the section on Environmental Impacts above.

The Proposed Development

Private Residential and Affordable Housing

8.494 Residential uses are clustered around the NAR and the SAR to the north and south of Station Road. Within the northern quarter they comprise Blocks D1, F1 and F2 and potentially blocks C1, C2 and G2. Within the southern quarter they comprise the L blocks and Block K2 (the Mill).

Student Accommodation

8.495 Student accommodation is predominately located adjacent to the bus interchange and bus only link road in the southern quarter in blocks H1 and M1 to M6. There is also potential for student accommodation within the northern quarter in Blocks C1, C2 and G2.

Planning Policy Position

8.496 Policy 9/9 of the CLP 2006 supports the provision of residential accommodation within a mixed-use scheme, which is a reflection of the SADF.

8.497 Policy 4/13 of the CLP 2006 addresses pollution and amenity and only permits development which is sensitive to pollution such as light, noise and vibration where adequate pollution mitigation measures are provided as part of the development package. In my view residential development and student accommodation both represent sensitive receptors to potential pollution impacts.

8.498 By its very nature mixed use development places residential development in close proximity to non-residential uses. In the case of the proposed development this is situation is further complicated by the high proportion of student units which accommodate a transient population with different expectation for their living conditions.

Private Residential and Affordable Housing

8.499 I do not foresee any significant issues for the development of blocks D1, F1, C1, C2 or G2 in terms of ability to provide for

a high standard of residential amenity for future occupants. These blocks are screened from the MSCP, the railway line and the Station Square by other proposed blocks. Although the use of the NAR will generate traffic serving the MSCP and the Station Square, I do not consider that the level of noise and disturbance to be any more significant than experienced by dwellings in the area which front public roads.

8.500 Similarly I do not envisage any significant amenity issues arising out of the development of the L blocks in the southern quarter. Again these blocks are screened from the bus interchange by other proposed development and have the added benefit of overlooking the Park.

8.501 The Mill building (Block K2) already benefits from planning permission for conversion to residential use. Although the use of the bus interchange and the SAR may have some adverse impact on residential amenity I do not consider that the impact will be of such a level to justify a refusal of planning permission.

8.502 In my view the most sensitive issues surrounding residential amenity are likely to arise in relation to the development of Block F2. This block is constrained by being adjacent to the Ravensworth Gardens that will place limitations on fenestration the rear. This will mean that its principle outlook will be towards the proposed MSCP. There is potential for noise and disturbance and light spillage from the MSCP to a degree to significantly impact upon the amenity of occupants of Block F2.

8.503 However in mitigation Block F2 will be located a minimum of 17 metres from the side elevation which is sufficient space to accommodate landscaping including trees of a significant size. Also the design of both F2 and the MSCP are both within the control of the applicants, which means that mitigation measures can be incorporated into the design of both buildings.

8.504 In my view it is possible to design a residential building on Block F2 that will afford its occupants a satisfactory degree of residential amenity.

Student Accommodation

- 8.505 The level of residential amenity expected by students is not as high as permanent residents but that should not mean that students experience poor living conditions.
- 8.506 I am of the view that despite the proximity of the bus interchange and the bus only link it will be possible to provide student accommodation of a satisfactory standard on Blocks M1 to M6. Part of the accommodation at ground level in blocks M5 and M6 will be non-residential including the student union and retail space. These uses will act as a buffer affording protection from ground floor activity but their incorporation into the building will need careful handling to address possible noise and odour impacts.
- 8.507 The development of Block H1 as student accommodation will present a significant challenge to the architect given its location between the railway line and the bus interchange. At its northern end ground floor retail uses will act as a buffer to the bus interchange and Station Square. Both the Design and Conservation Panel and Environmental Health officers have voiced doubts about how a satisfactory development could be brought forward, however neither have ruled out student accommodation in this location. The applicants have submitted further information in their revised submission that has convinced the EHO that noise and vibration impacts will be properly considered when the detailed application is brought forward.
- 8.508 I do not consider that there will be any significant residential amenity issues in relation to the development of Blocks C1, C2 and G2 particularly in the light of my conclusion that the development of these blocks would be suitable for permanent residential accommodation.

Third Party Representations

- 8.509 The only representation made regarding the amenity for future residents related to the issue of outlook. This is to some degree a matter for the detailed design stage, however I am convinced that the space around buildings and the high

quality buildings and public realm that are promised should create a positive outlook from the proposed flats.

Conclusion - Living Conditions for Future Residents

8.510 The development has the potential to provide high quality living conditions for future residents. The fulfilment of this aim will be highly dependent upon the detailed proposals that are brought forward, particularly in relation to Block F2 and Block H1. In my view the development accords with the Development Plan particularly policy 4/13 of the CLP 2006.

Scheme Viability and Planning Obligations

Introduction

8.511 I have referred to a number of matters that will need to be secured via a Planning Obligation. The purpose of this part of my report is to provide a comprehensive picture of the proposed heads of terms for the Agreement. The Agreement will be a very complex one and there a number matters that will need to be addressed by the detailed wording of the Agreement. For example at this stage I am not able to provide details of the trigger points for infrastructure provision which will be essential to secure timely provision of the transport interchange, informal open space etc.

8.512 At the time of writing, I am obtaining advice on possible procurement issues arising from the draft Heads of Terms for the S106 Agreement for this application. The advice received may influence the construction of the Agreement. If there is any more information about this matter by the time of the meeting, I will advise Members accordingly.

8.513 Given the complexity of the development and the amount of public infrastructure that it is being expected to support, scheme viability is an issue that the applicant has wished to be taken into account. In order to assist in the understanding of complex material relating to the viability of the scheme, the City and County Councils jointly appointed consultants to review Ashwell's financial and other information. Officers

have not been party to the detailed information that has been accessed by the consultants because the applicants were concerned about the issues of commercial confidentiality that would have arisen from such an approach.

8.514 A report has been produced by the consultants, Pricewaterhouse Coopers and Carter Jonas. This report contains commercially sensitive information and is therefore attached as an appendix (Appendix T) for 'Members Eyes Only'. The report concludes that taking into account the 'planning obligations package' that was brought forward as part of the application, the viability appraisal produced by the applicant is not unrealistic or based on inaccurate assumptions

Heads of Terms for Planning Obligation/s106 Agreement

Affordable Housing

8.515 The Agreement will require that an affordable housing scheme be submitted for approval. The affordable housing scheme will include details of the location and tenure of affordable housing within the site. The Agreement will also secure the cascade mechanism which is referred to in my assessment and which reflects the position that has been adopted at Southern Fringe.

8.516 It has only been possible to resolve the relationship between the provision of affordable housing of the scale and tenure that the City Council demands and the viability of the scheme through contributions that it is hoped will be forthcoming towards other infrastructure via the Housing Growth Fund and the Community Infrastructure Fund.

Transport Infrastructure

8.517 The provision of high quality sustainable transport infrastructure to support the development of the Station Area is a critical element the scheme that needs to be secured via the s106 Agreement.

8.518 The Applicants have agreed to provide the following transport infrastructure as direct provision either through their own development or via agreements for the County Council to carry out the work. In each case the County Council has verified the cost of direct provision.

- Provision of the transport interchange facilities, including the bus interchange.
- Re-modelling of the Station Road/Hills Road junction, including relocation of the war memorial.
- Pedestrian crossing at the junction of Station Road and Hills Road.
- Improvements to the cycling network in the Station Area including the Carter Bridge ramp.
- Improvements to the Station Forecourt, including improved facilities for taxis and drop-off.
- 3000 space cycle park.
- Link road from Station Forecourt to Hills Road.
- Other highway improvements including Tenison Road/Station Road junction, Hills Road/Brooklands Avenue junction and the NAR.

8.519 In addition to direct provision the applicants have also agreed to make the following payments towards transport infrastructure, which have been agreed by the County Council:

- Contribution towards the cost of provision of an area wide traffic management scheme within the Tenison Road Area - £250,000
- Contribution towards the CGB - £3,016,000
- SCATP contribution - £850,000 plus £500,000 via the Housing Growth Fund.

8.520 The s106 Agreement will also need to secure the appointment of a Green Travel Plan co-coordinator with associated commitments to Commercial and Residential Travel Plans for the development and a Student Arrival/Departure Traffic Management Plan.

Education

8.521 The following commuted payments have been agreed, in accordance with formulae set out in the Planning Obligations Strategy:

Pre-School	£147,420
Primary Education	£245,700
Secondary Education	£276,640
Life Long Learning	£52,960

Open Space and Recreation

Formal Open Space

8.522 The applicants have been unable to demonstrate that there is sufficient provision of formal open space facilities for students on the basis of existing facilities available to ARU students. Commuted sum payments therefore fall due in respect of formal open space provision for both the new residents and students as follows:

Residents of private and affordable residential units
£218,880

Students
£450,000

Informal Open Space

8.523 The Applicants intend to retain control of all areas of open space within the development; therefore there is no requirement for maintenance payments to the City Council for on-site informal open space.

8.524 Full on-site provision of informal open space is not being made. The commuted payment to make up this shortfall is £475,252.

Play Space

8.525 There is no provision for play space on site. The commuted payment for off-site provision is £153,216.

Community Facilities

8.526 The s106 Agreement needs to address the relocation of existing community facilities within the scheme and the provision of new facilities to meet the needs of the new population.

8.527 The accommodation currently available to the British Transport Police facilities and Woodlands Surgery will be lost as part of the re-development. In both cases it is intended to re-provide these facilities within the scheme. The s106 will need to secure the timing and quality of re-provision to ensure that there is no loss of community facilities.

8.528 The scheme includes provision of a community room. The s106 will need to secure the detailed provision of this facility including its specification, management arrangements in perpetuity and timing of delivery. At this stage there is no intention on the part of the applicant that the community space be managed by the City Council.

8.529 The following commuted payments have been agreed, in accordance with the formula set out in the Planning Obligations Strategy, including offsetting the loss in value of the scheme of the provision of the community space:

Contribution towards the cost of employing an additional Community Development Officer - £30,000 (£10,000 per annum)

Contribution towards The Junction - £92,435

8.530 The development includes a wide range of other community facilities such as the health centre and nursery. Since these are also commercial ventures it would not be appropriate to

seek to secure their provision via the s106 because they do not form part of the applicants 'community facilities package'.

8.531 Cambridgeshire Constabulary are in negotiations with the applicants in relation to the provision of a police station within the development. At the time of writing this report Cambridgeshire Constabulary has raised concerns that they have been unable to reach a satisfactory agreement with the applicants because the applicants are insisting that the deal be a commercial one with no subsidies available i.e. at full market rent. On this basis Cambridgeshire Constabulary have advised that they would not be able to provide a presence on site and have asked that the provision of police facilities form part of the Planning Obligations.

8.532 It is my view that given the advanced stage of the negotiations on the planning obligations provisions it is not possible to insist on the provision of police facilities at a subsidised rent. Also the community facilities package that has been agreed accords with planning policy. With regard to the potential crime that could result from a lack of police presence within the development, in my opinion this will be satisfactorily negated by the applicant's security presence and CCTV provision. However, Cambridge Constabulary do not agree with this argument, therefore I have taken the issue up with the applicants and will report further on this matter at the Committee Meeting.

Public Art

8.533 In the context of the overall viability of the scheme, the applicants have not been able to commit to spending the full 1% of construction costs budget on public art. Applying the policy guidance rigidly would have required a public art budget to be set aside of £2.65 million.

8.534 The offer made by the applicants' amounts to £1.5 million. It is anticipated that this budget will be used to fund permanent commissions, design commissions; artists research bursaries, temporary projects, public education facilities and relocation of historic works.

8.535 In addition to this the applicants are committed to the provision of an art workshop on site that they have estimated will represent a loss of revenue of £162,925. Together with their estimates for cost of provision of sculptured seating and feature lighting within the development this amounts to something in the order of £964,000 as additional 'art related' spending.

8.536 Given the approach that has been adopted in relation to other complex developments such as Addenbrookes 2020, I would recommend that the budget that will be set aside for public art is acceptable. The s106 should secure a Public Art Strategy based on a minimum budget of £1.5 million.

Public Realm Contributions

8.537 The applicant has provided evidence to demonstrate that they are making a significant investment in the public realm as part of the development. Officers have accepted this argument and therefore recommend that no public realm contributions be sought by way of commuted payments.

CCTV

8.538 The applicants have agreed to fund the link between their CCTV system and the City Council's system to a maximum cost of £25,000. The s106 will need to secure arrangements for this physical link and also how the responsibilities for CCTV surveillance are apportioned between the developer and the City Council.

Occupation of the Development

8.539 In order to accord with Development Plan policy it is necessary to secure the occupation of the office accommodation and the student accommodation via the s106 Agreement.

8.540 The office accommodation needs to be limited to accord with CLP 2006 policy 7/2 to occupiers providing an essential service for Cambridge as a local or sub regional centre.

8.541 The student accommodation needs to be limited to use by ARU or the University or by conference delegates attending courses organised by those institutions to ensure that the identified need for student accommodation is fulfilled and that occupiers are subject to controls over car ownership.

Contaminated Land

8.542 The s106 Agreement needs to secure commuted payments for the carrying out of an independent assessment of contaminated land remediation. The applicants have agreed to a maximum sum of £60,000 that is considered adequate.

Air Quality Mitigation

8.543 The applicants have agreed to make provision for a continuous ambient air quality monitoring station as part of the development to a maximum value of £140,000. This provision, its specification and timing needs to be secured via the s106 Agreement.

Matters that will not form part of the s106 Agreement

8.544 Both the City Council Environmental Health officers and the County Council transport officers sought contributions from the applicants in the form of revenue support for bus transport and, in the case of the County Officers, for revenue support for the car club. In both cases the response of the applicants has been that they are already providing extensive facilities for public transport and that space will be provided for the operation of the car club and that the scheme cannot bear these extra costs.

8.545 My recommendation is to accept this argument and therefore I have not included these revenue provisions in the heads of terms for the s106.

Conclusion

8.546 The satisfactory conclusion of the section 106 Agreement will ensure that the development accords with the Development Plan and specifically Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan policies 6/1 and 9/8 and Cambridge Local Plan policy 10/1.

Other issues/outstanding representations and consultation responses

8.547 In general I have addressed the issues raised by consultation responses and through representations received in my assessment. I have included planning conditions that have been recommended by consultees in my recommendations. There are two events that are worthy of particular attention before I conclude my report. These are the Disability Consultative Panel and the Development Control Forums.

Disability Consultative Panel

8.548 The applicants have made two presentations to the Panel, which have been well received on both occasions. The minutes of the meetings are attached at Appendix U. In general the points made by the Panel were predominately about the detailed layout and treatment of the Station Square. This will be a matter for the detailed application and the applicants have already expressed their willingness to continue to engage with the Panel at pre-application stage.

8.549 The Panel were keen to see the potential for publicly accessible toilets to be explored and this provision has been identified in principle on the revised Parameter Plans. The general view of the Panel was that there should be no cycling within the Square however this is not practical given the highly accessible nature of the area. The applicants are keen not to segregate space within the Square and are promoting the 'shared space' concept.

Development Control Forum

- 8.550 The application was the subject of two Development Control Forums. The minutes of the Panel meetings are attached at Appendices P and R. The first Forum, on 25 June 2008, principally concerned the need for advanced infrastructure provision and concerns about the design of the buildings, lack of communal facilities and existing infrastructure, traffic impact and the effect on the Conservation Area.
- 8.551 The application was amended following the first Forum. Some significant improvements were made including a stronger commitment to meeting sustainability targets and provision of on site community space. The timing of provision of new transport infrastructure in particular will be an important element of the Planning Obligation.
- 8.552 The second Forum, on 3 September 2008, principally related to traffic impacts, impact on the station buildings and the effect of the development on the amenities currently enjoyed by occupiers of Ravensworth Gardens.
- 8.553 Since the second Forum the transport assessment work has been finalised by the applicants and the County Council have been able to fully assess the impact of the development. The application has been amended so that only residential development is located adjacent to the boundary with Ravensworth Gardens to allay fears regarding proximity of student accommodation. The applicants have given a commitment to fully involve residents of Ravensworth Gardens in the detailed planning of the residential buildings that will lie adjacent to them.

9.0 CONCLUSIONS

- 9.1 The determination of this application must be carried out in accordance with policies in the Development Plan unless material considerations suggest otherwise. Throughout my assessment I have sought to judge the application submission against relevant planning policy and to consider whether material considerations lead me to the conclusion that my recommendation should be influenced by them.
- 9.2 Many of the policies contained in the Development Plan have presented the need to make a judgement about whether or not the development is policy compliant, for example, policies relating to the assessment of the impact of the scheme on the Conservation Area and to Urban Design. However, throughout my assessment I have endeavoured not to lose sight of the key aim of the scheme, which derives from the City Council's Spatial Strategy, which is the regeneration of the Station Area as a mixed use City district built around an enhanced transport interchange.
- 9.3 The masterplan proposals that have been brought forward by the applicants are more extensive than those envisaged by the SADF and present a real opportunity for a comprehensive approach to regeneration. The viability of the scheme is an important issue but officers and the applicants have worked proactively to bring forward not only the essential transport infrastructure needed to deliver a truly enhanced transport interchange but also community facilities and most critically affordable housing.
- 9.4 In reaching my conclusion that the application should be supported I am mindful of my previous recommendations in relation to the 2006 Masterplan proposals and to the subsequent refusal of planning permission. At Appendix V I have set out an overview of the ways in which the current scheme overcomes the previous objections. In my view this adds further weight to my overall conclusion that the application accords with the Development Plan and should be supported.

RECOMMENDATION

APPROVE, subject to the satisfactory completion of the section 106 Agreement as outlined above by 31 March 2009, and subject to the following conditions/informatives:

See Appendix W.