The following is a summary of the comments that have been received from statutory and non-statutory consultees in relation to the **revised application.**

Full details of the consultation responses can be inspected on the application file.

Cambridgeshire County Council – Composite Response

Transport

Comments have been provided by the Transport team (see below) The revised TA has resolved these issues and for the most part the transportation impacts of the development and the shape/form of the movement network have been set out to the satisfaction of the County Council.

I would confirm that further discussion needs to take place with regard to phasing to avoid disruption to the project management for the guided busway. The completion of the easement for the Guided Busway between Network Rail and the County Council is outstanding at the present time; the route should be safeguarded by condition.

Accessibility

Previous comments still stand.

Archaeology

No further comments.

Demographics and matters relating to Education

Comments awaited.

Surface Water Drainage

No further comments.

Environment Policy and Projects

Climate Change

Whilst there is a commitment by the developers to delivering high quality sustainable development, it is considered that previous comments regarding targets, the overarching climate change objective and for the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions should have been given more weight in the revised plans.

It is not clear how/ if the phasing of the buildings will take into account pending changes in legislation and policy.

It would be expected that a holistic approach to energy efficiency for domestic and commercial elements should be integral to layout and internal/external specifications.

Water, Travel, Open Space, Retail element, Biodiversity

As previous comments.

Cambridgeshire County Council - Strategic Planning

Incorporated in composite response.

Cambridgeshire County Council – Transport

A copy of the comments received from the County Council's Transport team are attached at Appendix One to this report. The County commissioned consultants, Atkins, to provide technical advice on the revised application.

The total person trip generation for the CB1 development is 27,371 trips. The baseline trip generation for the area is 8201. Therefore 19,170 new trips will be generated by the CB1 development.

The most significant increases are for the more sustainable modes. There is only a modest increase in vehicular traffic, and

this is largely due to the restricted opportunities for car parking within the CB1 development, particularly for the non-residential elements of the scheme.

A VISSIM micro-simulation model has been produced by the applicants to accompany the TA. A full validation process has now been carried completed and the model provides a reasonably robust visualisation of the CB1 master plan.

Development Impacts

Highway Network

Hills Road Corridor – the operation of the Hills Road corridor is considered to be within acceptable limits but this does not remove the requirement for the applicant to implement measures to further reduce the quantum of private vehicular trips associated with CB1.

Hills Road/Brooklands Avenue/Bus Only Road – An analysis of the operation of the proposed junction shows that in 2017, with committed developments and a fully occupied CB1, the revised junction would operate slightly over its theoretical capacity. The junction's level of operation in 2017 is not significantly worse than is currently experienced on a typical day, without CB1. Whilst the operation of the junction will have a minor dis-benefit for the private motor car it does offer significant benefits for buses. There are no fundamental problems with the layout of the junction but there are matters that will need to be resolved at the detailed design stage.

Hills Road/Station Road – The proposals to alter the configuration of this junction will be beneficial in terms of safety and permeability. There is potential to provide a bus lane in front of blocks J1 to J4 to allow for a bus priority arrangement on Station Road.

Station Road/Tenison Road – Subject to detailed design, the changes are acceptable. As a result of the NAR, this junction will experience an increase in movements however there will a slight

decrease in movements from vehicles that currently access the car park and station from the Tenison Road Area. Modelling has been carried out which demonstrates that there will be queuing at this junction and that the maximum queue length extends to 20 m beyond the traffic signals at Tenison Road/Devonshire Road. This peak within a peak only lasts for approximately 15 minutes and builds and recedes very rapidly. The majority of problems currently occurring at this junction are as a result of motorists seeking to avoid the Catholic Church junction and Hills Road, removal or dissuasion of this movement will significantly reduce the attractiveness of these routes to through traffic.

Northern Access Road – the layout of this proposed junction is acceptable subject to detailed design. Modelling demonstrates that when CB1 is fully operational the Tenison Road/NAR junction will operate effectively.

Pedestrian and Cycle Network

There will be an increased demand for pedestrian and cycle movements from all directions but in particular through the Tenison Road/Devonshire Road area with the strong desire line of students accessing ARU. The CB1 masterplan puts forward a network of routes.

The proposed works to Station Road will significantly improve the environment for pedestrians and cyclists. Cycle access from the south is provided by a new toucan crossing on the northern ramp of Hills Road bridge and connects with a new cycle route.

Public Transport Network

Concerns have previously been raised by officers in respect of the capacity of public transport to accommodate anticipated increases in demand resulting from the development and other sites, including Southern Fringe.

Buses

Discussions have taken place with Stagecoach, who will expand their services to meet higher demand. The demand for bus travel associated with CB1 is counter to the pattern of demand associated with the Station. There is some capacity in existing services to meet demand generated by CB1.

Rail

The increased demand for rail travel has been factored into the modelling work.

Interface with CGB

The CGB team are satisfied with the layout of the transport interchange however their previous comments still stand:

A condition is recommended to control facing materials, openings and maintenance of building elevations within 5 metres of the CGB and full details of the design and construction methodology.

The development must be carried out in accordance with the 'CGB Operations Policy and Guidance for Developers'.

The route of the CGB through the development has not been finalised. The completion of a relevant easement should be secured by condition.

Drainage measures put in place as part of the CGB must be maintained or modifications agreed with CGB.

Northern Access Road

The revision of the application to include the NAR is welcomed. It should be provided as early as is practically possible.

<u>Transport Interchange</u>

Taxi Kiss and Ride

The layout of the kiss and ride and taxi rank will be the subject of a detailed application. The County Council is concerned that sufficient space be provided for all manoeuvres at busy times and this must be demonstrated at the detailed stage.

Bus Interchange

The principle of the bus interchange, layout and stop numbers is acceptable. The allocation of stops will need to be agreed at the detailed planning stage.

Rail Replacement Bus

The square and bus interchange can accommodate up to 16 rail replacement buses, which is acceptable.

Servicing Vehicles

The County Council has serious concerns about the proposal to service the Station from the northern service area even at night. All servicing should be carried out via the southern service area outside peak hours. Late evening/night time deliveries could impact adversely upon residential amenities.

<u>Management Strategy – Transportation</u>

Access Rights over Station Square

The station square will remain within private ownership. The County Council is concerned that access may be restricted in the future to certain Bus Operating Companies and this risk must be removed by the through the Management Strategy or s106.

Student Arrival/Departure Traffic Management Plan

To manage peak periods of demand a Traffic Management Plan for student arrival and departure periods should be agreed with assistance from the County Council. This should be secured through the Management Strategy or s106.

Carter Cycle Bridge

Four options have been presented to the County Council for the Carter Bridge Link. Two have been ruled out and two remain for consideration. The County Council prefer the applicants Option 2 which provides greater lane width and separation for pedestrians. However both options are deliverable and would operate satisfactorily.

Mitigation Measures/s106 Requirements

SCATP

The development is eligible for a contribution to SCATP.

Cambrigeshire Guided Busway – Capital Contribution

The direct link to the CGB system is a key transportation benefit for the site and as such a contribution should be made.

Bus Revenue Support

A contribution should be secured towards revenue support for bus services that might require expanding as a result of increased demand from CB1. The revenue support should be used to provide additional capacity prior to the occupation of each phase of the development to ensure sufficient capacity is available for the new occupants.

Framework Travel Plan

It is not clear from the Framework Travel Plan which is part of the TA is to extend to the residential elements of the scheme; these should be included.

A more detailed Travel Plan Framework that includes more commitment to mitigation measures and short, medium and long term targets along with a monitoring and review strategy is

required as part of the s106 Agreement. In particularly a Travel Plan Co-Ordinator should be appointed.

Car Club

There is concern that in the early years of the development there will not be sufficient use or resident population to provide a scheme from an early stage. Consideration should be given to provision of early years revenue support.

Tenison Road Area Management and Improvement Scheme

In order to mitigate the vehicular impact, discourage through traffic and to create a more pleasant and safe environment for pedestrians, cyclists and residents a contribution towards a scheme to provide traffic management measures should be secured as part of the s106.

Conclusion

The County Council does not offer an objection to the revised outline planning application for the redevelopment subject to the securing of mitigation measures as above and conditions to address:

1. Submission and approval of detailed schemes for the following:

    - Changes to the Carter Bridge.

    - Alterations to the Station Road/Hills Road junction, to be implemented prior to occupation of the development.

    - Alterations to the Tenison Road/Station Road junction, to be implemented prior to occupation of the development.

- Alterations to the Hills Road/Brooklands Avenue junction and creation of a fourth arm, to be implemented prior to occupation of the development.

- The junction of the NAR with Tenison Road, to be implemented prior to occupation of Phase 3.

- The junction of the SAR with Station Road, to be implemented prior to the occupation of blocks I1 & 2, L1 – L4 and M1 & 2.

2. Submission and approval of a detailed scheme for the temporary NAR, including the junction onto Station Road and details of taxi queuing, to be implemented prior to the construction of the MSCP and retained until the NAR is in place.

3. On completion and opening of the MSCP, the temporary car park shall cease operation and close.

4. Submission and approval of a Student Departure and Arrival Traffic Management Strategy.

5. Submission and approval of the detailed design of the bus interchange.

6. Submission and approval of a Construction Traffic Management Plan.

7. Submission and approval of details of the temporary bus interchange facilities.

Cambridgeshire County Council – Archaeology

No further comments

Cambridgeshire County Council – Education

Incorporated in composite response.

Cambridgeshire County Council – Highways

Incorporated in comments from CCC Transport.

City Council – Arboriculture

No further comments

City Council – Policy and Projects Composite Response

Generally the application is welcomed as it proposes significant regeneration and improvement of the Station Road area and will deliver a number of public benefits, including a new public square and improved public transport facilities.

Land Use

Student Housing

Officers support the amendments to the plans, which now provide for the majority of the student accommodation within one area of the site. This should allow for easier management of the student accommodation and the Council welcomes the provision of accommodation within the student blocks for wardens.

Provision of entrances on the sides of buildings that face away from private residential blocks and existing residences and other management methods will need to ensure that residents in the surrounding areas are not impacted upon by what may be perceived as anti-social behaviour.

Management of the student accommodation should also ensure that parking spaces are reserved for disabled students and disabled visitors to the student accommodation rather than being used to supplement site wide provision for disabled parking.

The applicant has made reference to the use of an appropriately worded planning condition to deal with the management arrangements for students at drop off/pick up times at the start and end of term. While this is considered to be an adequate approach for the outline application, more detail will need to be provided at the submission of reserved matters.

The Policy Team would wish to see occupation exclusively given to ARU students in the first instance with a cut off date beyond which other full time students from the University of Cambridge would be eligible to occupy rooms within the development. The need for the applicant to ensure commercial viability is recognised. However, it is felt that given the recognised need of ARU for additional student hostel accommodation for full time undergraduates, the use and workings of this cascade mechanism would need to be explicitly referenced through a S106 agreement to ensure the maximum availability of accommodation to full time students of ARU.

It would not be appropriate for accommodation to be offered to students attending language schools. In addition, the S106 agreement should also ensure that there is no opportunity for units to be leased to non-students in the future, as if this were to be the case, then we would require the application to have provided more affordable housing relative to the amount of private housing provision.

Housing

The Strategic Housing Market Assessment published in June 2008 confirms an ongoing need for small dwellings looking out to 2021, together with a significant need for family housing of more than 2 bedrooms. In this highly accessible central location where the scale of development being proposed is significant, it is accepted that provision by way of apartments is appropriate. Recent planning permissions for the urban extensions on the outskirts of the City have in comparison, provided a high proportion of larger family housing.

The Affordable Housing Supplementary Planning Document (2008), calls for the provision of 75% social rented and 25% intermediate housing to best meet housing needs. This mix should be secured through the application subject to considerations of viability.

Employment Use

A separate detailed application has been pursued in parallel with this outline application for the erection of 9,540 sqm at Great Eastern House and forms part of the application site. The applicant has confirmed that this floorspace is included within the overall outline floorspace for CB1.

No details are yet supplied on prospective tenants, but a broad analysis is supplied of the types of tenants. Up to 16-17% of the floorspace proposed is envisaged as being let to existing tenants displaced by the current proposals over the next five years. A further 40-42% is anticipated being let to current Cambridge firms, who it is claimed are professional companies providing essential services to the Sub- region and who will need space in the next five years. The S106 agreement proposed by the Council will require the applicant to provide documentary evidence on these firms functions to test if they provide essential services or an administrative facility for Cambridge as a local and sub-regional centre or evidence that they have been in the Cambridge area already for five years.

This application provides a unique opportunity to provide this kind of floorspace, which the City needs at the present time, in a highly sustainable location, and that this will accord with the provisions of the RSS and Local Plan.

Retail

The Policy Team is concerned that the proportion of food and drink establishments is more than twice that of the retail units, as Local Plan policies aim to maintain A1 uses as the predominant uses in the City Centre, District and Local Centres. However, this centre is

quite unusual in the transient nature of most of the users, and the mix proposed is typical of that found around stations. This will need to be addressed in detailed planning applications, to ensure an appropriate mix and to avoid any amenity problems from A3 – A5 uses to the residential parts of the scheme.

Since the previous comments, we have received a draft final copy of the Cambridge Sub-Region Retail Study, which was commissioned by the City Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council. As the study took into account the proposed retail development at the station (albeit only the A1 elements), there are no real implications of this study to the proposed development.

Open Space

The Policy Team remains concerned that appropriate levels of open space and recreation resources are provided by the applicants for all occupiers of the site either by means of on-site provision or financial contributions towards off-site open space and recreation resources.

Anglia Ruskin University's (ARU) sports provision is extremely low and is not considered to be adequate for the existing student body or for the university's anticipated growth. The Policy Team would therefore advise that commuted sums are required to cover the open space and recreation standards and needs for the 1,250 units of student accommodation in addition to the 331 residential units.

Transport

In physical design terms, the amended submission is much better in meeting the sustainable transport hierarchy of access needs (i.e. pedestrians, cyclists and public transport as the top three priorities). The earlier form of access (via Station Road and through the Station Square) was not in accordance with this hierarchy. The inclusion of a Northern Access Road is extremely welcome in overcoming many of the transport deficiencies of the earlier submission.

Transport - Support for amendments:

- Car club parking spaces
- Conditions for pedestrians and cyclists
- Block A1 / A2 amendment - additional threshold space
- Cycle link adjacent to block M4
- Cycle link between blocks I1 andK1
- Carter Bridge Cycle link - The principle of changing the cycle bridge to give better access to the station is supported but, as indicated in section 4.4.2 of the TA, there are differences of opinion about the best arrangement. The City transport view, supported by the Cycling Liaison Group, is that Option 3 is the preferred arrangement
- Bus stops on east side of interchange – the movement of stops northwards
- Alighting bays for bus stops
- Allocation of bus stops to be dealt with by condition
- Hills Road bus only link
- Updating of VISSIM model, including taking account of future growth in rail traffic
- Updating Transport Assessment
- Green travel Plan Co-ordinator
- Cycle parking in Station Square, reduction in numbers.

Transport - Areas of continuing concern:

Conditions for pedestrians and cyclists –detailed provision in the Station Square will need to be finalised through the detailed planning application for the Square.

Block A1/A2 amendment –provision for cycling needs to be further considered through the detailed planning application for the Square.

Cycle link adjacent to block M4 - the set back to block M4 and the link to the Toucan crossing on Hills Road needs to be worked up in

more detail to ensure that a satisfactory cycling and pedestrian environment is created.

Cycle link between blocks I1 andK1 - the detailed provision for cycling needs to be further considered through the detailed planning application for the Square.

Use of Southern Access Road by cyclists - As it is not proposed that the southern access road will be a main cycle route, cyclists from the south (including students occupying block H1) will have to use the route between the M/K and H blocks. This will mean large numbers of cyclists having to mix with buses, or to cycle on footway, conflicting with pedestrians. This remains an area of concern which will require careful design to resolve conflicts, including positioning of bus stops and consideration as part of the detailed planning application for the Square.

Bus stops/interchange – it is crucial that the development enhances bus interchange provision and allows efficient operation of the high volume of bus movement planned. The submitted drawings contain little detail of the physical bus stopping arrangements, but the proposed arrangements are set out in a table 4.7 of the TA. This seems to indicate that sufficient bus stop capacity is being provided but the detail needs to be more fully considered, including the bus operators in any discussions. In particular, there is a need to consider bus shelter and information provision and to secure this through a S106 agreement.

Bus priority at Hills Road / Station Road - it is unfortunate not to be able to provide some additional bus priority at this critical junction.

Updating of VISSIM validation will be needed prior to determination of the application.

Updating of Transport Assessment - TA acceptable to the County Council will be needed prior to determination of the application

Travel Plan - apart from the commitment to a Travel Plan co-ordinator, there are no clear actions proposed for putting into

practice the principles described in the TA. The creation and implementation of a Travel Plan should be a condition of tenancy on all new buildings to ensure the Travel Plan is put on a more formal basis. To help with this, occupiers should be encouraged to become members of the Cambridgeshire Travel for Work Partnership.

Cycle parking in Station Square - the management of cycle parking within the square needs to be addressed. This should form part of the management strategy for the Square and be subject to a planning condition.

Cycling and Walking

Tenison Rd Junction:

We would suggest that the refuge island be shortened and moved further south to provide a wider crossing whereby those who need to use the tactile paving can do so away from the private access but the majority of users will be able to follow the natural desire line.

The advisory cycle lane must be continued across the junction, as it does now, in order to highlight the presence of cyclists. An approach lane on Tenison Rd, set back at least as far as the first access, should be provided to allow cyclists to get past queuing traffic

Station Road

Cycle lanes are welcomed but should continue east on both sides of the road as far as the shared space area

Station Square

The transition from on-road to shared space must be treated carefully in order to indicate that cyclists are not expected to stay on the bus route and not give the impression that cyclists are

cycling on the ‘pavement’. This will need to be considered through the detailed planning application for the square.

Southern Access Road

Careful consideration is needed for the detailed design for this area which will cater for these commuting cyclists.

Brooklands Avenue/ Hills Road Junction

It is disappointing that an east-west cycle route from Brooklands Avenue to the station is not provided.

Given that the proposed fourth arm will be for buses and cyclists only it is suggested that a wide uncontrolled crossing would be much more user-friendly, and therefore preferable, to a staggered two-stage controlled crossing

Guided Bus Route North

Need to safeguard sufficient space between blocks G1 & G2

Devonshire Road Link

We would recommend that the link provide segregation between pedestrians and cyclists in the form of a level difference with 3m for cyclists and 2m for pedestrians. This will be particularly important if a cycle ramp is provided to reduce conflict as cyclists come off the ramp. The transition between on and off-road as cyclists join and leave the route in front of the car park to access this link must be considered carefully.

Carter Bridge Options

Whilst we would recommend that the potential of the Ravensworth Gardens route be further explored, some detailed elevation and 3D drawings of proposed options 2 & 3 are needed to assess their environmental impact on the surrounding area to better inform the ongoing decision process.

Urban Design

Maximum Building Heights

In the absence of any specific guidance for the ‘skyline’ or ‘incident’ part of Building I2 it will be important that the analysis work contained on pages 12-13 of the Addendum are factored into how the top of the building is articulated. In particular the top 3 floors should not occupy the total floorplate of the building. In that way a more refined and vertical element could be introduced which punctuates the skyline vertically rather than the horizontal forms illustrated on pages 16-17 of the Addendum and so accord more fully with the vertical nature of incidents which punctuate the Cambridge skyline.

Height of Block I2

Additional information provides an acceptable explanation of how the maximum building envelope being established through the parameter plans will be broken down. We would suggest that there should be further investigation into whether the maximum build out of the envelope could be reduced through the removal of floorspace from I2 (with reallocation elsewhere on the site eg: office sleeve on the MSCP) thus allowing an even greater degree of articulation.

Rhythm along Station Road

The D&C Panel have recommended that a consistent parapet level is introduced to help reinforce the group value of the I and J Buildings. The introduction of the parapet level would go some way to alleviating our previous concerns about how the J Buildings will read as a well-considered group along Station Road.

Alignment of BlockA2 (south face)

The application is now acceptable in this regard

Provision of Informal Open Space

Urban Design Team feel that the three areas of informal open space indicated on the masterplan represent the best balance in terms of physical space, the requirements of the area as a transport interchange and the amount of developable area

Hills Road – retention of the BLI

In terms of the justification for its removal a plan with an option showing the retention of 125 would help in making an informed decision. This view is supported by the D&C panel. We would therefore recommend that a further drawing is produced to illustrate this option

Length of Block H1

Design and Conservation Panel were also concerned about the design of Building H1 due to the location of this building between the railway line and the bus link. We share this concern but feel that the principle of development in this location is acceptable. However considerable skill will be needed to ensure that the proposals for this part of the site create high quality living accommodation and an acceptable gateway to Cambridge when viewed from the railway but these matters can be pursued through the reserved matters or detailed application stage.

A1 and A2 to move south to create perimeter block

PP4 has been amended to introduce a colonnade on the east side of blocks A1 and A2. The application is now acceptable in this regard.

Northern Residential Area – served from the Northern Access Road

The application is now acceptable in this regard.

Relationship between Blocks F1 & F2 and Ravensworth Gardens

The consensus of opinion was that residents would be unhappy with a connecting route, despite the potential benefits and so the break was discounted in this regard. In terms of the scale and massing issues it was felt that the detailed design of this part of the site at the reserved matters stage would be the best forum for examining this issue in detail. The outline application is therefore felt to be acceptable in this regard.

Block F2 and MSCP

As it stands the additional information provided by the applicant has resolved our concerns and the outline application is acceptable in this regard.

D1 and Ravensworth Gardens and Proximity of G2 to Devonshire Road

The applicant has reduced the 'return' on the Building D1 to scale it down from 3 to 2 and then to 1 storey before the existing 2-storey block of the Ravensworth Gardens. The applicant has also revised Parameter Plan 4 to reflect this change. These changes have made the application acceptable in this regard. Concerns with Building G2 have been adequately resolved.

Public Art

We are not completely satisfied with the Public Art Strategy submitted with the application. However our view is that a condition can be attached to any outline approval that could allow for the agreement of a site wide Public Art Strategy (not statement) and agreement of the precise S106 contributions.

Daylight and Shading – vertical and Daylight and Shading – ground level

We accept the recommendations of the ES and feel that the outline application is acceptable in this regard. However

considerable care will be needed for the detailed design of proposals at the reserved matters stage.

Fronts and backs definition L1-L4 and I2

Amendments have resulted in a greater clarity and definition across the masterplan and we now feel that the application is acceptable in this regard.

Design and Conservation Panel comments 23rd July 2008

The Urban Design Team supports suggestions made by Panel which will result in a significant improvement to the quality of the proposals. In the absence of a mechanism such as a design code to tie the built form together, the parameter plans should, as far as possible, help to establish some principles that will guarantee a greater degree of consistency around the square. As a result we would recommend:

- That the Silo extension fixes a parapet height for all buildings around the square. Additional storeys will need to be set back from this parapet.
- The colonnade will also need to be extended to run along the east face of I1.
- Provide a consistent parapet height with around the square with A1, A2 and I1 using the parapet height of the extension to K1.

With these amendments we feel that the application would be acceptable in urban design terms.

Building I2 and the proximity to the footpath

The Design and Conservation Panel also raised concerns about the proximity of the I2 building to the footpath with their view being that larger buildings should command a more generous space in front of them. They suggested that the building line on the south side of Station Road be revisited.

We would suggest that in order to achieve a degree of symmetry on the approach to the Station and to allow adequate space for the continuation of the avenue of trees up to the Station Square, the north face of I2 should be moved south by approximately 3m. This realignment would result in a similar width of space as in front of the consented O'Callaghans Hotel opposite and so achieve a more balanced approach to the Station Square. It would we believe meet the aspirations of the D&C Panel through the provision of a more generous space in front of the building.

The north face of building I1 would also need to move south by approximately 3m in order to maintain a consistent building line with the revised I2.

Urban Design Conclusion

There are only three issues which we believe need further work. One of these relates to Building I2, one relates to Buildings A1, A2 and I1 and the final issue relates to 125 Hills Road. These are summarised as follows:

- We believe that the location of I2 should be moved 3m south to create a more generous space and setting for what will be a hugely significant building in the area. We believe that it would have further benefits to the quality of the public realm and approach to the railway station through the creation of a more symmetrical approach and allow for the continuation of the tree lined avenue through to the square.

- The Design and Conservation Panel have suggested methods for achieving a greater sense of unity around the square through the introduction of a consistent parapet level and the continuation of the colonnade along the front of Building I1 based on the parapet height of the Silo extension. We support this view and believe that it will benefit the setting of the Station and creation of a high quality Station Square.

- We would like to see an option prepared which shows the retention of 125 Hills Road before we are convinced that the masterplan requires the demolition of this BLI. This view is supported by the Design and Conservation Panel and has been previously expressed by the Urban Design Team.

With these three amendments we will be able to recommend approval of the outline application in Urban Design terms.

Sustainable Development and Construction

Conclusion

Overall the sustainability proposals for CB1 are of a relatively good standard and should deliver a considerably better scheme in terms of environmental performance than has previously been proposed. They do go some way to exploiting the opportunities that are available to such a large and mixed-use development, whilst also reflecting some of the site constraints. The commitments made are certainly deliverable and do not in a general sense exceed what can and is being achieved currently elsewhere.

Ensuring the ambitions to keep moving the bar as the development moves forward and new technologies and practices become available is key. There are still a number of outstanding issues to resolve to have that certainty. These are:

1. Revise proposed conditions to ensure that all targets are secured;
2. Draft conditions to relate later stages of development to new, adopted policies within the LDF, including one to replace the existing BREEAM scheme with the new national one for non-residential buildings, if and when this is launched;
3. Seek a more detailed strategy to be developed to look at delivering higher carbon savings, in line with national trajectory, to show that current strategy is suitably future-proofed;

4. Seek a diagram to show how the orientation of the blocks and relative heights of blocks would permit widespread installation of both types of solar technology;
5. Indicate on masterplan where energy centres will be located and fuel storage in the event of use of biomass;
6. Seek a more strategic approach to climate adaptation included as part of the Design and Access statement;
7. Seek further information on the proposed water consumption target for non-residential buildings;
8. A firm commitment to meet policy 4/16 Lighting is necessary, to ensure that subsequent designs meet safety, energy efficiency and light pollution objectives of the policy;

Conservation

The CB1 site offers an exceptional opportunity that has to deliver the highest possible quality. The potential basis for radical change to the historic environment depends on securing that quality.

Justifications

The historic environment justifications for the overall extent of change, and for “public interest” exceptions to PPG15, depend on the delivery of a successful transport interchange. Greater resolution of the transport issues and their historic environment implications would have been extremely helpful.

The Beacon Planning reports provide additional support for the specific
demolition proposals. In strategic terms, they provide sufficient justification (subject to the provision of appropriately enhancing replacements in terms of buildings and/or streetscape, as applicable) for:

a) The proposals for the listed Station, apart from the demolition of the British Transport Police building. The Beacon report underestimates the architectural and historic significance of this building in terms of the contribution it makes to the setting of the main Station building. In historic environment terms, very specific justification in terms of both

the overall vision for the functional needs of the Station, and the architectural quality and appropriateness of the replacement is required for this demolition; such justification has not yet been provided.

b) The demolition of the Buildings of Local Interest 127 and 127A Hills Road, but not 125 (demolition not justified, must be retained), as essential for the transport interchange;
c) The demolition of Sleerperz (BLI);
d) The demolition of Wilton Terrace (BLI).

Conservation Conclusions

This scheme is of exceptional significance for Cambridge, in terms of both its potential functional benefits, and its impacts on the city's special historic character. From a historic environment perspective, the Masterplan proposals in this application go a long way towards, but do not as yet sufficiently demonstrate, that the former will be delivered in a way which will enhance the latter. There are very significant issues in terms of how to secure delivery, at detail stage, of the quality to which the Masterplan aspires and the potential justifications for it require.

The following further information is needed to allow the historic environment issues to be fully assessed and resolved:
a) Confirmation that the proposals for circulation in the Square fully represent and resolve the transport needs, including the aspirations of the rail operators.
b) Details of proposed visitor information and other facilities in or adjoining the Square.
c) Details of the proposed traffic management measures, and associated installations and signage, within and arising from the CB1 proposals.
d) A block model clearly showing the relationships between the parameter plans and the surrounding area.
e) A skyline strategy which resolves potential impacts on wider views, on the Designated Historic Park and Garden, and on the landmark roles of the Mill and Silo.
f) Resolution of the detailed matters noted above. Draft design and access statements, to be prepared for pre-application discussion,

will have to demonstrate that the specific challenges of the individual proposals have been fully understood.
g) Development of the Public Art strategy, including retention of historic features and new permanent art features, to mitigate adverse impacts and where possible enhance the historic environment.

The following specific issues need to be addressed by condition or other means:
a) how design quality is to be secured.
b) integration of planting so as to give the best chance for trees to reach architectural scale

The following should be covered by condition:

a) No demolitions of the listed building, the Buildings of Local Interest, or the Deities unless and until a contract has been let, in each case, for a replacement building which has the benefit of full planning permission.
b) Recording of buildings prior to demolition
c) Salvage of materials and features from buildings to be demolished
d) Safeguarding, during the works, of historic buildings and features to be retained.

OVERALL CONCLUSION OF POLICY TEAM

Notwithstanding the existence of some outstanding concerns, the decision to be taken by Planning Committee is whether, on balance the scheme can be approved taking into account all material considerations including the benefits of the scheme, or whether its deficiencies are so serious that it should be refused. The relative weight to be attached to these considerations will vary depending upon the importance attached to them by the decision taker. In the view of officers, the scheme has now reached a stage where it is acceptable. If approved, the proposal will advance the regeneration of the Station Area by a further step and help to ensure that the Station Area can cope with the planned growth of the City.

The following officers were consulted and contributed to the Policy and Projects Composite Response:

City Council – Transport Officers
City Council – Cycling and Walking Officer
City Council – Policy Officers
City Council – Consultation Officer
City Council – Historic Buildings and Conservation Manager
City Council - Urban Design, Landscape and Public Art
City Council – Environmental Co-ordinator

City Council – Access Officer

No further comments.

City Council – Building Control

No response.

City Council- Community Development

No further comments.

City Council- Community Development - Equalities

No response.

City Council – Active Communities

No response.

City Council – Arts and Entertainment

No response.

City Council - Tourism and City Centre Management

No response.

City Council – Housing

The relocation of affordable housing to blocks F1, F2 and D1 is preferred as it will have more residential feel.

Boundary treatment with Ravensworth Gardens needs to be handled sensitively.

Some reservations about the impact of the MSCP on block F2.

The sizes of the accommodation in terms of person accommodation will be resolved direct with Ashwell.

City Council – Environmental Services

Comments on revised application should be read in conjunction with original consultation response.

Air Quality

Model verification has been carried out and background pollutant levels have been subject to a more detailed analysis.

Some issues that were raised previously have not been tackled – vehicle speeds in modelling and cumulative development impact. New modelling has been carried out using a different base year which leads to major discrepancies in traffic data. As a result EHO has not confidence in model results.

Meetings with the developer have suggested that a commitment to mitigation measures would be a way forward. However there is no firm commitment to implementation of mitigation measures and no mention of responsive phased approach to parking provision. In the interests of moving forward the following mitigation measures should be secured via planning conditions and s106 Agreement:

By Condition

- Residential and Commercial Travel Plans.

- Car Clubs – including expansion of provision as reserved matters applications are brought forward.

- Car free student accommodation – parking for student accommodation should not be included when calculating total parking provision across the site as a whole.

- Parking provision should be pinned to a maximum of 0.7 spaces per residential unit and 1 space per 125 sq m office space including the Great Eastern House site.

- A set of rigid air quality criteria for controlling phased car parking provision below the maxima quoted above, in particular for commercial developments should be developed and agreed.

- Indirect emissions from buildings should be conditioned in accordance with advice from the Sustainable Construction Co-Ordinator.

- Cycling and walking facilities should be formally agreed.

By s106 Agreement

A continuous ambient air quality monitoring station to ensure compliance with air quality objectives during construction and to inform the amount of car parking provision in later stages of the development.

Ongoing internet support for Residential and Commercial Travel Plans.

Funds to support and foster the subsidised use of public transport by workers/residents for 5 years following occupation of a development.

Contaminated Land

Contaminated land issues can be dealt with by condition. A s106 Agreement is required to cover the costs of employing an independent consultant to oversee the next phases of site investigations, site remediation proposals and remediation work.

Noise and Vibration

Revised proposals are acceptable with regard to Block H in particular. Conditions as recommended previously remain of relevance.

Environment Agency

No further comments.

Anglian Water

No further comments.

Cambridge Water Company

No response.

Transco

No response.

National Grid

No further comments.

Natural England

No further comments.

Countryside Agency

No response.

Go East

No further comments.

Network Rail

No response.

National Express East Anglia

No further comments.

DfT Rail Group - Rail Regional and Passenger Relations

No response.

Passenger Focus

No further comments.

Stagecoach

No response.

Cambridge Licensed Taxi Owners Association

No response.

Cambridge Cycling Campaign

The revised application is a major improvement on earlier versions. CCC greatly value the developers efforts to consult CCC.

Outstanding matters

20 mph Zone

The 20 mph zone is welcomed but the way in which it is implemented is not satisfactory.20 mph signs are needed on Tenison Road past the junction with the NAR, where the CGB enters the site under Hills Road Bridge and on the new bus link at the Hills Road/Brooklands Avenue junction.

The Triangle site should be included in the 20 mph zone.

When decisions are made about the allocation of s016 funds priority should be given to the establishment of a 20 mph zone in Petersfield.

Protection for CGB Northern Route

This route is referred to in the SADF. The CLP 2006 seeks to protect routes for the expansion of cycling and walking and the route is identified in the bid for Cycling Demonstration Town status.

The space between Blocks G1 and G2 is insufficient to provide for the CGB and a cycle/footpath. A minimum width of 3m for the cycleway and 2m for a footpath is needed in addition to the requirements of the CGB. Space also needs to be secured alongside the MSCP/Block B1.

Pedestrian/Cycle link to Devonshire Road

This is too narrow and must accord with up to date Government guidance.

Cycle Access from Carter Bridge

This would best be achieved by a link through the Ravensworth Gardens development. This would necessitate a break in Block F2. It is appreciated that this would cause some detriment to the amenities of residents of Ravensworth Gardens but this needs to be balanced against the impact on residents of Devonshire Road. There are also land ownership constraints to be overcome. A decision must be made on this issue as part of the Masterplan and should not be deferred.

Road Layout and On Road Cycle Lanes

Hills Road/Brooklands Avenue Junction

The most serious deficiency in the plans is the wholly unrealistic and unworkable proposals for cycle entry into the development from this junction. For pedestrians and less confident cyclists the toucan crossing is welcomed but it is slow and awkward to use therefore cyclists must be permitted to use the bus only link to access the site.

There is a similar prohibition on cyclists turning right out of the new link road which must be removed.

The toucan crossing on the link road is unnecessary and should be removed to facilitate cyclists using the junction.

Station Road Area

The installation of cycle lanes is welcomed but cycle lanes must be continuous, 2 metres wide and mandatory. Provision for 12 rail replacement buses seems excessive.

Tenison Road and the NAR

Cyclists should be encouraged to use the NAR as access to the Station and mandatory cycle lanes should be placed in Tenison Road to achieve this.

The works to remove motor vehicle exit lanes from the Station Road/Tenison Road junction are welcomed.

The NAR is welcomed but needs to be wider to accommodate 2 m wide mandatory cycle lanes.

Surfacing of the Square

The use of natural stone needs further consideration as this can be slippery and is difficult to maintain when over-ridden by heavy vehicles such as buses.

Cycle Parking

CCC welcomes the provision of 2812 spaces in the MSCP. However a sizeable proportion of the spaces are accommodated in two tier stands. Discussions are ongoing regarding the use of such stands which will continue as the detailed plans for the MSCP are brought forward.

Cycle parking for other uses including uses surrounding the Square must be accommodated in detailed proposals to avoid any reduction in capacity of the MSCP spaces for rail users.

Managing Construction Works

During the construction phase it is vital that cycle routes remain open and Station cycle parking maintained at or above its current level.

Cambridge Urban Forum

No further comments.

Commission for Architecture and the Built Environment (CABE)

No further comments.

RIBA

No response.

Cambridgeshire Horizons

No response.

SHAPE

No response.

Cambridge Preservation Society

Welcome improvements made especially the Northern Access Road. However CPS continue to object to the scheme on the grounds of lack of overall vision and make the following detailed comments.

Community provision should not only rely on facilities that people have to pay for. A community centre should be provided near the Park.

Overall there is a lack of green space. The Station Square is not a truly public space.

There should not be cycle routes across the Park and close to play areas.

A MUGA should be included within the Park.

The vast expanse and facades of the MSCP/Block B1 and Block H1 need to be better addressed both in relation to the new urban quarter and the railway line.

Further consideration is needed of the capacity of the bus interchange and shelters must be designed to prevent unsightly clutter.

The tall buildings and in particular Block I2 detract from the setting of the listed buildings.

Block I2 will dominate the skyline and hide the Mill as a landmark feature.

The CPS strongly regrets the loss of listed buildings and BLIs.

A more integrated approach is required to the new junction on Hills Road.

English Heritage

Copy of letter from English Heritage is attached at Appendix Two to this report.

The revisions constitute fine tuning not a major review which would be needed to address concerns of EH.

The realignment of Station Road is supported.

It would be possible to retain Sleeperz and parts of the Railway offices through a re-design of the scheme (see plan attached to EH letter 04.08.08). The problem of 'space leakage' between Sleeperz and the north wing of the Station could be addressed through tree planting. This amendment could also provide a degree of degradation of scale to the MSCP, protecting the setting of the Station.

A realignment of the new link road junction on Hills Road may allow retention of existing buildings. If this is not feasible then a lot more design work is needed to show a real townscape enhancement to justify loss of existing buildings. PPG 15 requires a clear demonstration of impact on the Conservation Area and this cannot be determined from the limited information provided to date.

EH are not convinced by the rationale regarding the height of block I2. The current proposals do not comply with the SADF. Not only is I2 higher than the Mill and Silo but other buildings exceed the 5 storey limit set out in the SADF and are not compatible with the character of the area or the Red House hotel proposals.

EH strongly recommend that the application be refused. If approved then stringent conditions should be applied to safeguard issues identified in original consultation response.

Victorian Society

No response.

Twentieth Century Society

No response.

Garden History Society

No response.

Cambs Constabulary Arch Liaison

The D and A Statement refers to mixture of residential and non-residential uses that may improve safety over single, non-residential uses. Care must taken to ensure that a mix of conflicting uses does not lead to circumstances that foster disorder.

Short term student occupation may conflict with permanent dwelling use and high numbers of students may be targets for robberies etc..

Cambs Constabulary

No comments in relation to initial consultation. Agents representing Cambridgeshire Constabulary make the following comments.

Cambridgeshire Constabulary have a key role in the delivery of effective policing across the County.

Development of this scale will have significant implications for the Constabulary's resources and it is entirely appropriate for the impact on policing to be appropriately mitigated.

CC welcome the commitment from the Developer to provide policing facilities which have been highlighted in the draft Heads of Terms for the s106. This commits 1080 sq m for a police station. A development of this scale is likely to necessitate floorspace of c. 420 sq m to accommodate front counter and associated policing floorspace. A commitment to provide facilities must be secured by condition or s106 Agreement.

The proposals must comply with Secured by Design Standards.

Defence Estates - Air Safeguarding

Confirmed that there are no safeguarding objections subject to conditions.

Cambridge Friends of the Earth

No response.

Wildlife Trust

No response.

Cambridgeshire Fire and Rescue

Adequate provision for fire hydrants is required.

Cambridge Ambulance Station

No response.

Cambridgeshire NHS Primary Care Trust

Comments are based on the revised application and correspondence from the Developers to the PCT (not seen by Officers).

The revised plans make it unclear as to what is being proposed for NHS Health facilities on site. Urgent clarification is needed before the PCT can confirm their support for the scheme.

The use of Block A2 as a polyclinic is no longer being discussed with the PCT as a possible location for three GP surgeries including Woodlands. Currently Block G2 has been suggested as the location for Woodlands only and as part of a mixed use building.

There has been some indication that Block A2 is to be used as a private health facility. The PCT has not approved any new NHS funded acute services although if Addenbrookes were to provide some of their existing services at A2 the PCT would be unlikely to have any objection.

There have been no discussions with Ashwell on the suitability of Block G2 or F2.

2300 sq m of floorspace is needed to consolidate GP premises in central Cambridge and to provide a range of community based services. No other sites have been identified that are suitable for this facility.

Some consolidation and re-provision of GP premises is essential to deliver the existing level of service to the current and growing population and to provide for the shift towards care in the community.

Block A2 is ideal and the PCT are keen to re-open discussions with the Developers.

Sport England

No further comments.

University of Cambridge (Estate Management and Buildings Service)

No response in respect of first consultation.

U of C supports the principle of mixed use development and an improved transport interchange.

Additional student accommodation is welcomed.

The scheme has the potential to improve access to the Station but the revised proposals are not a wholly conflict free solution.

The potential for the scheme to increase congestion in the immediate vicinity and the wider area is a concern because staff and students use these routes for instance to Homerton College and Addenbrookes.

East of England Development Agency

Reiterate that this is a gateway site for Cambridge. It is essential that it is of exemplar design and quality. EEDA encourage the City Council's D & C panel to consider this issue.

Cambridge Ethnic Community Forum

No response.

Bike Parking and Security Association

No longer active.

Bike Rail

No longer active.

Appendix One

Response from County Transport dated 24 September 2008

Project:	Cambridge Station Area Redevelopment	**To:**	Cambridgeshire County Council
Subject:	Evaluation of Revised Transport Assessment	**From:**	Huw Nicholas
Date:	24th of September 2008	**cc:**	-

Introduction

Atkins have been commissioned to provide technical advice and co-ordination of the County Council's transportation consultation response to the revised planning documents for the redevelopment of Cambridge station area, known as CB1. This includes an evaluation of the revised Transport Assessment; provision of comments on the revised master plan; and coordination of comments and input from Highways Development Control and other CCC transportation officers.

The Transport Assessment and master plan have been revised following the County Council's first consultation response that was provided to Cambridge City Council and subsequent meetings with the applicant (Ashwell) and their transportation consultants (Mott MacDonald).

This Technical Note represents Cambridgeshire County Councils response to the CB1 revised planning application with regards to transportation and highways.

Trip Generation Methodology

The County Council's previous consultation response raised a number of queries with regards to the trip generation figures. Following discussions with the applicants transport consultant these issues have been

resolved to the satisfaction of the County Council. The trip distribution, assignment and model split assumptions are accepted.

Baseline Trip Generation

The revised baseline trip generation is provided in Table 2.1 below.

Table 0.1 – Application Area Baseline Trip Generation by Mode

Mode	AM Peak		PM Peak		Daily (24hrs)		
	Arrival	Departure	Arrival	Departure	Arrival	Departure	Total
Vehicular *inc. Servicing Vehicles*	313	48	85	277	1675	1537	3212
Cyclist	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**

Table 2.1 shows that currently across a typical day, land uses within the CB1 development site generate a total of 9,791 person trips. Of these, 3,212 (33% of total trips) are vehicular trips.

Proposed Trip Generation

Multi-Modal Trip Generation

The revised TA has been amended to take account of the County Council's previous comments regarding trip generation for the proposed development. These changes

are reflected in Table 2.2 below and are accepted by the County Council. The total person trip generation for the CB1 development proposal is 27,371.

Table 0.2 – CB1 Trip Total Trip Generation by Mode

Mode	AM Peak		PM Peak		Daily (24hrs)		
	Arrival	Departure	Arrival	Departure	Arrival	Departure	Total
Vehicular	296	147	132	255	1874	1778	3652
HGV/Servicing Vehicles	4	1	0	0	41	56	97
Cyclist	917	369	377	797	4816	4383	9199
Pedestrian	529	701	509	545	4397	4269	8666
Public Transport	705	178	216	602	3057	2700	5757
TOTAL	**2451**	**1396**	**1234**	**2199**	**14185**	**13186**	**27371**

Net-Change in Trip Generation

The net-change in person trips by mode as a result of the CB1 proposal is set out below in Table 2.3. The CB1 development will result in an additional 3,645 person trips in the AM peak, 2,173 in the PM peak and 17,580 in a typical day (24hr period) a 79% increase in total person trips. The most significant increases are for the more sustainable modes, with a 455% increase in pedestrians trips. This significant increase in pedestrian movements is accounted for to a large extent by internal trips to CB1 with, for example, office staff using the leisure and retail facilities.

There is only a modest increase in vehicular traffic (16%) and this is largely due to the restricted opportunities for car

parking within the CB1 development, particularly for the non-residential elements of the scheme, and is accounted for mainly by increased servicing and residential related trips.

Table 0.3 – CB1 Net-Change in Trip Generation by Mode

Mode	AM Peak		PM Peak		Daily (24hrs)			% Daily Change
	Arrival	Departure	Arrival	Departure	Arrival	Departure	Total	
Vehicular	-13	100	47	-22	240	297	537	+16
Cyclist	504	330	290	456	3130	2924	6054	+93
Pedestrian	356	684	472	402	3688	3656	7344	+455
Public Transport	428	152	158	373	1924	1721	3645	+73
TOTAL	**1275**	**1266**	**967**	**1209**	**8982**	**8598**	**17580**	**+79**

VISSIM Validation

A VISSIM micro-simulation model has been produced by the applicants transport consultants to accompany the Transport Assessment and it covers the transport study area. The model has been produced to cover the AM and PM peak periods for both existing scenario and the 'with development' (including committed development and rail passenger growth) scenarios. The main purpose of producing a VISSIM model in support of the application is to:

- Test with greater accuracy the operational capacity of the Tenison Road junction;
- Examine the interaction of vehicular traffic and pedestrians/cyclists within the station square; and,

- Provide a reasonable visual representation of how the local highway network will operate with CB1 (including committed developments and rail passenger growth).

With regards to the second bullet point, this has now been superseded by the inclusion of a fully operational Northern Access Road and the cessation of vehicular access to the Multi-Storey Car Park through the square. The model has been amended to reflect this factor.

A full validation has been undertaken on both the existing and the 'With Development' scenarios to provide the confidence that the model is robust for the purpose for which it has been produced. This validation process has now been completed to our satisfaction and therefore the model provides a reasonably robust visualisation of the CB1 master plan.

The VISSIM modelling confirms that the CB1 proposal and master plan are able to be accommodated within the transportation and highway network, subject to the securing of appropriate mitigation measures to promote more sustainable travel and reduce through traffic in the Tenison Road area.

Development Impacts

The following section provides analysis of the assessment of the impact of the development proposals on the transportation network. There is a relatively minor increase in vehicular traffic as a result of the CB1 development during the peak hours (Table 2.3 refers) as a result of the restricted car parking provision for the commercial uses, the significant quantum of student accommodation, and the nature of the majority of the housing being for Addenbrooke's Key Workers.

Highway Network

Hills Road Corridor

An assessment has been undertaken of the Hills Road corridor using TRANSYT, from its junction with Cherry Hinton Road through to its junction with Regent Street/Gonville Place (Catholic Church junction), and all junctions in between. The purpose of this assessment is to examine how the corridor operates as one system. The results of this assessment show that with a fully occupied CB1, along with committed developments, the overall the corridor would operate within acceptable limits.

Whilst the overall operation of the corridor is considered to be within acceptable limits this does not remove the requirement for the applicant to implement measures to further reduce the quantum of private vehicular trips associated with CB1.

Hills Road/Brooklands Ave/Bus-Only Road

The TA contains proposals to significantly alter the physical layout and operation of the junction of Hills Road with Brooklands Avenue. The changes to the layout are to provide additional operational capacity and also a new fourth arm to the station area. This fourth arm is a bus-only link into and out of CB1 linking the transport interchange with Hills Road and provides a new route for services to/from the south avoiding the need to negotiate the Hills Road/Station Road junction. This will provide reduced journey times and increased reliability for buses.

An analysis of the operation of this junction has been undertaken using LinSig. This analysis shows that in 2017, with committed developments and a fully occupied CB1, the revised junction would operate slightly over its theoretical capacity. The junction's level of operation in 2017 is not significantly worse than is currently

experienced on a typical day, without CB1. Whilst the operation of the junction will have a minor dis-benefit for the private motor car, it does offer significant benefits for buses which is desirable and consistent with national and local policy guidance.

The physical layout of the junction has been subject to a Stage 1 Safety Audit by CCC. This has highlighted a number of minor issues that will need to be resolved in order to deliver an acceptable junction arrangement. However, there are no fundamental problems with the principle of the layout this junction as the issues raised can all be dealt with at detailed design stage and can be overcome by the applicant. Therefore, the County Council raises no objection to the layout the revised junction.

Hills Road/Station Road

The TA contains a proposal to alter the configuration of the junction of Station Road with Hills Road. The proposal is to relocate the war memorial to the west side of Hills Road and to provide an additional controlled pedestrian crossing, which will be of significant benefit in terms of safety and providing greater permeability and accessibility to and from CB1/Cambridge station. Capacity analysis of this junction shows that it operates within its theoretical capacity, in a similar manner to current conditions.

Station Road/Tenison Road

The TA contains a proposal to undertake amendments to the layout of this junction, predominantly on the Tenison Road arm. The proposed changes are to introduce a ‘raised table’ as a speed restricting feature to achieve 20mph along Station Road, and to increase the size of the existing pedestrian refuge and decrease the kerb radii on the eastern side to accommodate more pedestrians. The gradient of the change of surface to/from the table on

Station Road should be slightly graduated to ensure as smooth a ride for bus passengers as possible, whilst retaining the visual and physical change in the characteristics of the road. Therefore, subject to detailed design the proposed changes to the junction layout are considered acceptable.

As a result of the introduction of the Northern Access Road this junction will experience an increase in movements from vehicles accessing/departing the multi-storey car park/taxi rank/Kiss & Ride from Station Road. However, there will be a slight decrease in movements from vehicles that currently access the car park and station (drop-off/taxi rank) from the Tenison Road area.

An assessment of the operation of the revised junction within the TA shows that in the AM Peak the Tenison Road arm of the junction would be significantly over its theoretical operating capacity and results in lengthy queuing along Tenison Road greater than is currently experienced. However, we consider that these results do not provide a true representation of the actual likely impacts. The reason for this is due to the limitations of the PICADY model - the effect of reducing the speed of traffic on Tenison Road to 20mph cannot be taken into account. It was for this purpose that the VISSIM model was produced.

The validated VISSIM model still shows that queuing will occur along the Tenison Road junction during both the AM and PM peak periods, but that these queues would be shorter in both distance and duration than is predicted in the PICADY model. However, the maximum queue length still extends approximately 20m beyond the traffic signals at the junction of Tension Road and Devonshire Road, and also causes queuing on Devonshire Road as a result of traffic not being able to always discharge on the green

phase. This peak within the peak only lasts for a maximum of approximately 15 minutes and builds and recedes very rapidly.

Analysis of both the VISSIM model and traffic data contained within the TA and local knowledge the majority of the problems that are currently and likely to occur with CB1 are a result of vehicles trying to avoid the Catholic Road junction and Hills Road. Removal or dissuasion of this movement will significantly reduce the attractiveness of these routes to through traffic and result in reduced queue lengths.

Northern Access Road

A new priority junction (Northern Access Road) is proposed onto Tenison Road approximately where the current vehicular access to the Focus DIY Store is located. The proposed layout of this junction is acceptable, subject to detailed design.

The operation of the proposed junction of the Northern Access Road with Tension Road has been tested using PICADY. This shows that with a fully occupied CB1 and committed development in 2017 the junction (NAR arm) operates at acceptable capacity limits in the PM Peak, but during the AM peak it operates within its capacity limits.

Pedestrian & Cycle Network

Car parking spaces within the CB1 development have been limited to the number that currently exists across the site. This means that there will be greater numbers of people walking and cycling to the CB1 development, particularly during the peak periods. There will be an increased demand for pedestrian and cycle movements from all directions towards the station area, but in particular through the Tenison Road/Devonshire Road area with the strong

desire line of the students travelling to/from the ARU East Road site.

The CB1 master plan puts forward a network of pedestrian and cycle routes to cater for numerous pedestrian and cycle movements that currently exist and those that are anticipated. The movement network provides a number of route choices, both on and off-road, across and within the site to spread the demand and to ensure a high level of permeability catering for the needs of all abilities of cyclists, and those that currently do not cycle. This also includes upgraded cycle access to the station area and the cycling parking facility from the Cater Cycle Bridge – see Section 9.

As part of the CB1 development the operation of Station Road is to be enhanced by removing the on-street parking, widening of the footways to accommodate the additional demand, and to provide traffic calming features to reduce the overall speed to 20mph. The removal of the on-street car parking will significantly reduce delay to traffic, particularly buses, and also provide a more direct and safer direct, on-road access for cyclists. Previously the on-street parking presented a hazard to cyclists through opening doors and other vehicles, particularly buses, trying to squeeze through the reduced width. The inclusion of the traffic calming features, such as the raised table, a change of materials towards the Station Square will all assist in physically reducing speeds along this road. This will create a safer environment for pedestrians allowing them to cross more freely Station Road, particularly close to the station building where a lot of movements are anticipated.

Cycle access from the south is provided via a new Toucan crossing on the northern ramp of the Hills Road Bridge and connects to a cycle route down from the bridge into the

CB1 development. A Toucan crossing is also on the northern and eastern arms of the revised 4-arm junction

Public Transport Network

In the previous consultation response concern was raised by County officers about the available capacity on public transport to accommodate the anticipated increase in demand that is expected from both the CB1 development and other sites, such as the Cambridge Southern Fringe. The concern was in relation to both bus and rail capacity.

Buses

Table 2.3 in section 2.2.2 of this report shows that there will be substantial passenger growth on the bus network as a result of the CB1 proposal. Previously the County Council has raised a concern about the ability of the existing and planned expanded bus network, including CGB, to accommodate the growth in demand.

Discussions have been held with Stagecoach, the main provider of bus services within Cambridge City, about how they would respond to an increase in demand as a result of the CB1 development. Representatives for Stagecoach have confirmed that as demand increases they will expand their service capacity, and possibly choice, to meet this demand. However, Stagecoach has indicated that in the first few months of any expanded or new service, revenue support may be required in order to meet the growing demand prior to that service becoming commercially viable.

Surveys of bus loading in the station area shows that during the AM Peak buses that are departing the station experience high loading, whilst in the PM peak services arriving at the station experience high loading. However, the demand for bus travel associated with CB1 is counter to this pattern with there being high arrivals in the station area during the AM peak and high departure during the PM

peak. Survey data has shown that there is some spare capacity on existing services that can accommodate the profile of demand generated by CB1.

Rail

The Rail Utilisation Strategies (RUS) that cover Cambridge Station (Greater Anglia and East Coast Mainline) predict that there will be approximately a 19% growth in passenger numbers during the period 2007 to 2017. This growth takes account of the house-building targets for Cambridgeshire. Currently services to/from Cambridge experience regular over-crowding and are operating over their capacity. In response to the current and predicted growth a strategy to increase capacity both at Cambridge station itself and the rolling stock. These include:

- Introducing 12 car trains on London routes;
- Extending platforms at stations to accommodate 12 car trains;
- Provision of an island platform for London services at Cambridge Station; and,
- A new station at Chesterton.

The increased demand from/to the rail station has also been factored into the design of the transport interchange and movement network, and has been tested within the VISSIM model.

Interface with CGB

The Cambridgeshire Guided Busway Team have confirmed that they are satisfied with the layout of the transport interchange, particularly with regards to the provision of the extended ‘city-bound’ stop for use by the majority of services that call at the City Centre. The CGB Team still

wish their other previous comments to stand, but do not offer any objection to the outline planning application.

Northern Access Road

Previously the master plan had shown that access to the multi-storey car park and private vehicle aspect of the transport interchange (Taxi Rank, Kiss & Ride, disabled parking) was through the station square from Station Road. This resulted in a conflict of movements with the strong pedestrian desire lines along Station Road to and from the station building. The Transport Assessment has been revised to take account of the provision of the Northern Access Road, linking the multi-storey car park and station square from Tenison Road.

The revision of the planning application to provide the Northern Access Road is welcomed. In order to maximise the benefits of the enhanced station square the NAR should be delivered as early as is practically possible or any other interim arrangement that avoids the traffic accessing the revised station square.

Transport Interchange

Taxi Rank/Kiss & Ride

The layout of the taxi rank and Kiss & Ride arrangements within the station square has been revised as a result of discussions regarding the provision of a ‘north/south’ cycle route/corridor through the station square and the provision of the Northern Access Road. The layout of the station square is to be the subject of a detailed planning application in the near future and as such more detailed comments will be made at that time.

However, the applicant has put forward two options for the detailed layout of the station square and in particular the taxi rank and Kiss & Ride. Option 1 is acceptable in principle. Option 2 presents an improved layout for taxi drop-off, but the County Council is concerned that this is sufficient space to accommodate all manoeuvres at busy times. This will need to be demonstrated at the detailed stage. However, the County Council considers that the northern servicing within the station square is neither safe nor practical in both options – see Section 7.3.2.

Bus Interchange

Since the last consultation response provided by the County Council, discussions have taken place between the Council and the applicant regarding the issues it raised regarding the layout and number of stops. These issues have been resolved to the satisfaction of the County Council in the revised TA and as such the principle of the bus interchange, layout and stop numbers is accepted. However, the County Council does not consider that the allocation of stops within the TA are correct and the most efficient, but this is a matter of detail that can be dealt with at the implementation stage in conjunction with Bus Operating Companies.

To ensure that there is an adequate number of bus stops to serve the current and future level of bus services we have undertaken a bus stop accumulation study. This examines the arrival pattern, load/unloading period, and then departure of all services current and future proposed (CGB and TIF). This study revealed that there even during the AM and PM peak periods when service provision would be at its most intense there is sufficient capacity to accommodate the demand for buses. Management of loading of buses, patricianly those heading for the City Centre, would ensure that buses do not dwell too long

while loading blocking use by other services; manage bunching of services; and spread passenger loads.

The design of the bus interchange has not only been informed by the technical work associated with the development of the CB1 master plan and development concept, but has also been informed by two other bus studies undertaken by Steers Davis Gleave for the County Council. These studies have reinforced the conclusions that 12 bus bays (plus some flexibility for more stops in the future) is adequate to accommodate the greatly expanded bus service provision, both in terms of routes and frequency, that is being planned for. The studies, along with discussion with the Bus Operating Companies, have confirmed that the linear through style arrangement of stops is what is required at Cambridge rail station to best manage the volume of passengers and services.

Rail Replacement and Servicing Vehicles

Rail Replacement Bus

The master plan for CB1, in particular the bus interchange and station square, has been designed to accommodate up to 16 rail replacement buses for the times when such a quantity is required. This has been done in consultation with the Network Rail and National Express and the strategy has been accepted by both parties, and is endorsed by the County Council.

Servicing Vehicles

Individual units and blocks will have their own servicing incorporated within their own plots and finalised when the detailed design of each building/plot is undertaken, in particular the County Council had concerns about how the H-Blocks and those within the station building would be serviced. The principle of servicing the H-Blocks has been resolved to the satisfaction of the County Council.

However, the County Council has serious concerns over the proposal to service the station building from the northern service area even during the night. The area is located on a strong and multiple pedestrian and cyclist desire line and conflicts with the taxi rank and Kiss & Ride facility. This servicing area will be difficult to manage during the day and during the night visibility of pedestrians will be further reduced presenting a serious safety problem. The management of servicing at the southern location is preferable for all station building uses and should take place outside of the peak hours, preferably after the evening peak. Late evening/night time deliveries may have an impact upon residential amenity and as such the implications of this strategy should be explored by Environmental Health officers of the City Council.

Management Strategy – Transportation

Access Rights over Station Square

It is noted within the Draft Management Plan for CB1 that the station square will remain within private ownership for maintenance and management purposes and will not be adopted public highway. However, the station square has elements within it that require vehicular access, albeit on a restricted basis through the use of a rising bollard. In particular, the County Council wants to secure the right for all public transport vehicles (buses) to pass through the station square to access the bus interchange. The County Council is concerned that access may be restricted in the future to certain Bus Operating Companies and requires this risk be removed through the Management Strategy or s106.

Student Arrival/Departure Traffic Management Plan

For the majority of the year the students occupying the accommodation blocks throughout the CB1 development, either ARU term time students or non-term time students, will generate very few vehicular trips. However, at the start and end of each term there will be a high demand for vehicular access to these blocks for picking up/dropping off of students and possessions. Given the nature and location of some of the student blocks, for example the H-Blocks, this may interfere with the operation of the transport interchange and the general highway network.

In order to manage these peak periods of demand the applicant should prepare a traffic management plan for student arrival and departure periods. Initial discussions have been held between the applicant and the County Council's Network Manager about the structure and operation of such a plan. From these discussions it was clear that there are a number of options that could be put in place to manage arrivals and departures successfully, whilst not impacting upon the operation of the interchange or general highway network.

The applicant should, in consultation with the County and City Council, prepare a Student Arrival and Departure Traffic Management Plan and that this should form part of the Management Strategy/s106 Agreement for CB1.

Carter Cycle Bridge

Since the first consultation response the options for a direct cycle/pedestrian link from the Carter Cycle Bridge to the station area have been discussed between the County, City, applicant and Cambridge Cycle Campaign. These discussions and subsequent analysis have ruled out options 1 and 4. Of the two options that remain the County

Council considers that option 2 provides the greatest benefit for pedestrians and cyclists as it offers greater lane width and a more direct access.

However, both options 2 and option 3 are deliverable and would operate satisfactorily for pedestrians and cyclists using the access and those continuing to use the Carter Cycle Bridge. On this basis the County Council does not object to the planning application as in principle it considers that a link to the Carter Bridge can be delivered. However, the County Council would wish to reserve its position with regards to the detail until such time as a detailed planning application for the link is submitted for planning permission.

Mitigation Measures/S106 Requirements

Whilst the development proposal has sought to minimise the vehicular trip generation of the site, particularly during the peak periods, in order to achieve as sustainable a development as practically possible, measures are still required to better accommodate the additional pedestrian, cycle and bus trips the development gives rise to. In addition, planning policy nationally and locally requires developments to maximise the use of sustainable modes further, particularly given the high level of accessibility this location enjoys.

SCATP

The site falls within the boundary of the Southern Corridor Area Transport Plan. Table 2.3 shows that the CB1 development is predicted to result in a net increase in daily person trips over the current operation. Therefore, the CB1 development is required to make an appropriate contribution towards the SCATP schemes.

Cambridgeshire Guided Busway – Capital Contribution

The Cambridgeshire Guided Busway (Southern Section) starts/finishes at Cambridge station, to the south of the station building and links directly into the bus interchange. This infrastructure will provide direct access to CB1 and the train station from the south and also provides direct access to Addenbrookes. The CGB provides excellent links to the development and also Addenbrooke's, a particular benefit for those occupying the Key Worker housing within CB1 for the hospitals staff.

The direct link to the CGB system is key transportation benefit for the site and as such a contribution towards the capital cost of such a facility should be secured.

Bus Revenue Support

The revised TA seeks to demonstrate that there is sufficient capacity on the existing bus network to accommodate the demand created by CB1. However, there is concern that whilst across a typical day the average loading from CB1 is less than capacity this may not be the case during the peak periods. Therefore, it is recommended that a contribution should be sought towards revenue support for bus services that might require expansion as a result of increased demand from CB1.

The revenue support should be used to provide additional capacity prior to the occupation of each phase of development to ensure sufficient capacity is available for the new occupants.

Framework Travel Plan

Section 8 of the Transport Assessment - *'Promoting Smarter Choices via Travel Plans'* provides an overarching framework for the individual Travel Plans to follow. It is clear in its intention to just be providing a framework -

based on the fact that the new development and details of operational needs / travel patterns of employees are unknown at this stage. It states that when details of the occupiers are clear, a Travel Plan Framework will then be developed for each detailed application. This does seem the most appropriate way forward to ensure they are tailored to the individual occupiers and so they take ownership of their TP.

It is not clear from the Framework Travel Plan if the measures and management of travel planning will extend to the residential elements of the scheme. The residential areas should be included within the Framework Travel Plan.

This section therefore stays quite theoretical, providing many examples of possible measures for the Travel Plans (which are all good suggestions), but with no firm commitments to them. The exception to this is Ashwell's proposal to make spaces available within the development to enable the 'StreetCar' car club scheme to be extended to the station area. It is therefore difficult to assess what the Travel Plans will really achieve. It simply provides a good basis for what should be important aspects of the individual Travel Plans.

A more detailed Travel Plan Framework that includes more commitment to certain measures and short, medium and long term targets along with a monitoring and review strategy is required to be secured as an item within the s106. In particularly, within the management of the CB1 development a Travel Plan Co-ordinator should be appointed to drive forward the Travel Plan.

Car Club

The Framework Travel Plan sets out that space will be provided within the development for Car Clubs and that

Ashwell has held initial discussions with Streetcar for the provision of such spaces. There is a concern that in the early years/phases of the development that there will not be sufficient use or resident population to provide the scheme from an early stage. Consideration should be given, in discussion with Streetcar, to the provision of early years revenue support.

Tenison Road Area Management and Improvement Scheme

Section 4.1.4 and 4.2 have highlighted that there is likely to be an increase in cycle movements along Tenison Road and the surrounding streets, along with an increase in the amount of queuing during the peak periods.

In order to mitigate the vehicular impact, discourage through traffic and to create a more pleasant and safe environment for pedestrians, cyclists and residents a contribution towards a scheme to provide traffic management measures should be secured as part of the s106.

Conclusions & Conditions

Conclusion

Since the issuing of the County Council's first consultation response on the CB1 planning application the applicant has worked closely with the County Council and City Council on resolving the objections and areas of deficiency within the Transport Assessment. The revised TA has resolved these issues and for the most part the transportation impacts of the development and the shape/form of the movement network have been set out to the satisfaction of the County Council.

The provision of the Northern Access Route from an early stage is a huge benefit in achieving the aim of the Station

Area Development Framework to reduce the conflict between modes outside the station building.

The Highway Authority does not offer an objection to the revised outline planning application for the redevelopment of Cambridge Station Area (CB1) subject to the securing of appropriate mitigation measures and conditions set out in section 11.2 of this report.

Conditions

The County Council requests that the following conditions be attached to any planning permission.

1. Prior to the commencement of development, a site wide Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The CEMP shall accord with and give effect to the principles for such a Statement proposed in the Environmental Statement submitted with the application and shall include the consideration of the following aspects of construction:

    a) Site wide construction and phasing programme.

    b) Contractors' access arrangements for vehicles, plant and personnel including the location of construction traffic routes to, from and within the site, details of their signing, monitoring and enforcement measures.

    c) Construction hours.

    d) Delivery times for construction purposes.

    f) Soil Management Strategy

    g) Noise method, monitoring and recording statements in accordance with the provisions of BS 5228 (1997).

h) Maximum noise mitigation levels for construction equipment, plant and vehicles.

i) Vibration method, monitoring and recording statements in accordance with the provisions of BS 5228 (1997).

j) Maximum vibration levels.

k) Dust management and wheel washing measures.

l) Site lighting.

m) Drainage control measures including the use of settling tanks, oil interceptors and bunds.

n) Screening and hoarding details.

o) Access and protection arrangements around the site for pedestrians, cyclists and other road users.

p) Procedures for interference with public highways, including permanent and temporary realignment, diversions and road closures.

q) External safety and information signing and notices.

r) Liaison, consultation and publicity arrangements including dedicated points of contact.

s) Consideration of sensitive receptors.

t) Prior notice and agreement procedures for works outside agreed limits.

u) Complaints procedures, including complaints response procedures.

v) Membership of the Considerate Contractors Scheme.

2. All reserved matters applications shall include a detailed Construction Method Statement for the development parcel that is being sought for approval. The details shall be accompanied by a statement that demonstrates how the proposal accords with the approved Construction Environmental Management Plan. In addition the CMS shall also provide a specific construction programme and a plan identifying: the contractor site storage area/compound; screening and hoarding locations; access arrangements for vehicles, plant and personnel; building material, plant and equipment storage areas; contractor parking arrangements for construction and personnel vehicles; and the location of contractor offices. Thereafter the development shall be undertaken in accordance with the agreed details unless otherwise agreed in writing by the local planning authority, in consultation with Cambridgeshire County Council as Highway and Transport Authority.

3. Prior to the commencement of development a detailed scheme for changes to the Carter Cycle Bridge shall be submitted to and approved by the local planning authority in writing, in consultation with Cambridgeshire County Council as Highway and Transport Authority and owner of the Carter Cycle Bridge. The works to the cycle bridge shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details in advance of the use of the multi storey car park or the occupation of any other part of the development or in accordance with a timetable agreed in writing by the City Council.

4. Prior to commencement of development a detailed scheme for alterations of the junction of Station Road with Hills Road shall be submitted to and approved by the local planning authority in writing, in consultation with Cambridgeshire County Council as Highway and Transport Authority. The works to the junction shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details in advance of the use of the multi storey car park or the occupation of any other part of the development or in accordance with a timetable agreed in writing by the City Council.

5. Prior to commencement of development a detailed scheme for alterations of the junction of Tenison Road with Station Road shall be submitted to and approved by the local planning authority in writing. The works to the junction shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details in advance of the use of the multi storey car park or the occupation of any other part of the development or in accordance with a timetable agreed in writing by the City Council.

6. Prior to commencement of development a detailed scheme for alterations of the junction of Hills Road with Brooklands Avenue and creation of a fourth arm to the junction shall be submitted to and approved by the local planning authority in writing, in consultation with Cambridgeshire County Council as Highway and Transport Authority. The works to the junction shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details in advance of the use of the multi storey car park or the occupation of any other part of the development or in

accordance with a timetable agreed in writing by the City Council.

7. Prior to commencement of development a detailed scheme for alterations of the junction of the proposed Northern Access Road with Tenison Road shall be submitted to and approved by the local planning authority in writing, in consultation with Cambridgeshire County Council as Highway and Transport Authority. The works to the junction shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details in advance of the occupation of any development on Blocks C1, C2, D1, F1, F2, G1 and G2 or in accordance with a timetable agreed in writing by the City Council.

8. Prior to commencement of development a detailed scheme for alterations of the junction of the proposed Southern Access Road with Station Road shall be submitted to and approved by the local planning authority in writing, in consultation with Cambridgeshire County Council as Highway and Transport Authority. The works to the junction shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details in advance of the occupation of any development on Blocks I1, I2, K1, K2, L1, L2, L3, L4, M1 and M2 or in accordance with a timetable agreed in writing by the City Council.
9. Prior to the commencement of development a detailed scheme for the temporary Northern Access Road, including the junction onto Station Road and details of taxi queuing, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by Cambridge City Council, in consultation with Cambridgeshire County Council as Highway and Transport Authority. The temporary Northern Access

Road shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details in advance of the use of the multi-storey car park. The temporary Northern Access Road shall not be closed or obstructed until such time as the Northern Access Road is in place and provides a complete link between Tenison Road and the station square/multi-storey car park.

10. On completion and opening of the Multi-Storey Car Park the temporary car park shall cease operation and be closed.
11. Prior to or concurrently with the submission of the first of the reserved matters application(s) relating to student accommodation, a Student Departure and Arrival Traffic Management Strategy shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority, in consultation with Cambridgeshire County Council as Highway and Transport Authority. Thereafter the approved Student Departure and Arrival Traffic Management Strategy shall be applicable to all student accommodation within the application site boundary and shall be operational upon first occupation of any block of student accommodation. Arrivals and departures of all occupiers of the student accommodation shall be carried out in accordance with the approved Student Departure and Arrival Traffic Management Strategy, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the local planning authority, in consultation with Cambridgeshire County Council as Highway and Transport Authority.
12. The detailed design of the bus interchange shall be the subject of a reserved matters submission. The design

shall layout, arrangement and allocation of bus stops, bus shelters, information systems and waiting facilities.

13. Prior to the commencement of development a detailed scheme for the temporary bus interchange facilities shall be submitted to and approved in writing by Cambridge City Council, in consultation with Cambridgeshire County Council as Highway and Transport Authority. The temporary bus interchange shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details in advance of the cessation of use of the existing bus stops. The temporary bus interchange shall not be closed or obstructed until such time as the permanent bus interchange is operational.

Appendix Two

Copy of letter from English Heritage dated 4 August 2008

Mrs Sarah Dyer
582742
Cambridge City Council
582701
The Guildhall
Cambridge
Cambridgeshire
CB1 2JL

Direct Dial: 01223

Direct Fax: 01223

Our ref: P00063306

4 August 2008

Dear Mrs Dyer

Notifications under Circular 01/2001 & GDPO 1995
STATION AREA REDEVELOPMENT, STATION ROAD, CAMBRIDGE, CAMBRIDGESHIRE
Application No 08/0266/OUT

Thank you for your letter of 15 July 2008 notifying English Heritage of the above application.

Summary

The current application seeks outline consent for a high density redevelopment of the station area in the south-east part of Cambridge, including the provision of a new transport interchange. The existing station building is Listed Grade II and the site lies within the Central Cambridge Conservation Area. The site also abuts the Brooklands Ave Conservation Area. The proposals include the demolition of a number of buildings of local interest that

make a positive contribution to the Conservation Area. The scheme also requires the demolition of part of the listed station building. The current application is in outline only and CAC and Listed Building Consent Applications are not included. English Heritage has previously opposed these proposals.

English Heritage Advice

English Heritage submitted a very detailed response to this application dated 11th April 2008. In that response English Heritage identified reservations regarding the impact of the proposal on the Conservation Area and the grade II Listed station building having regard to:

- The impact of the proposed development on the character of the conservation area;
- The proposed alterations to the character of Hills Road - both in terms of the demolition of the existing buildings, the increase in the highway space and the size of the highway junction at Hills Road/Brooklands Avenue;
- The proposed alterations to the character of Station Road;
- The proposed demolition of the protruding north wing of the grade II listed Railway Station building
- The location and size of the proposed multi-storey car park; and
- The proposed height of the development.

The current proposed changes to the design amount to 'fine tuning,' along with additional supporting documentation, rather than the major review that would be required to address all the concerns of English Heritage as outlined above.

In respect of these latest changes and the additional information provided, we would make the following comments:

Alignment of Station Road

We welcome the decision to retain the existing alignment of Station Road throughout its length and to cut the south wall of Building A1 back to accommodate this.

Sleeperz and Other Structures at the Northern End of the

Station

In the Conservation Area Appraisal for the Station Area undertaken by Qube (June 2004), and forming an Appendix to the Station Area Development Framework (SADF), Sleeperz is described as '*the best of the remaining unlisted railway buildings and the one with the strongest relationship in terms of style and materials with the station. A positive feature which should only be altered/replaced with good justification.'* The additional report (by Beacon Planning) submitted to support the demolition of Sleeperz and adjacent structures concludes that to retain these buildings would make it impossible to provide a satisfactory space in which to accommodate all the necessary transport movements which the railway station generates and is required by Policy 9/9 of the Cambridge Local Plan. However, from an examination of the plans, it would appear possible to turn the space required for the taxis and drop off area through 90 degrees, while at the same time reducing the width of Buildings A1 and A2 to maintain access in from the north (and to retain a future through-route for the guided bus). See attached diagram. This would enable Sleeperz and the best parts of the Railway Offices to be retained, along with the projecting wing at the north end of the station. The problem of space 'leakage' could be overcome by tree planting between the east gable of Sleeperz and the northern wing of the station, which at the same time would provide a pleasant pedestrian route through to the car park (if it is to remain at the north end of the site). A development along these lines could provide a better relationship between Building A1 and Building I1, enabling a continuity of the arcade facing the station square. As well as retaining a group of buildings that make a positive contribution to the Conservation Area and the setting of the Listed station building, such a solution would also provide some visual screening to the south end of the multi-storey car park and provide a degree of gradation in the scale of the buildings at the northern end of the station square, thereby protecting the setting of the Listed station building.

Hills Road Junction

The new junction onto Hills Road is a further cause for concern. While the principle of forming a new access is both understood

and accepted, we do not accept that the actual location, geometry or design of the access has to be as indicated in the application, since this will necessarily result in the loss of at least two buildings of local interest in the conservation area and an awkward off-set in the junction in relation to Brooklands Avenue. Assuming that this junction is only to be used by buses, it would be possible to re-route the cycle traffic further north, through the entrance leading to the Triangle Site, and thereby reduce the width required on the new junction. This, coupled with a re-alignment of the junction might enable all the existing buildings to be retained. In the event that it is proven not to be feasible to revise the geometry of the junction, then we would expect a lot more design work to be done on this new junction and the buildings associated with it, which should show some real townscape enhancement to justify the loss of these buildings. PPG 15 requires the applicant to clearly demonstrate the impact their proposals will have on a Conservation Area and this cannot be determined from the limited information provided to date.

Heights of New Buildings

We remain concerned over the height of many parts of the new development and are not convinced by the rationale put forward for the height of Building I2. In the SADF document, paragraph 3.55 states that building heights should be compatible with the overall character of the area and existing developments, while the mill and silo should remain the tallest structures (with five storeys of commercial development along Station Road and stepping down to 2 or 3 storeys where buildings adjoin Ravensworth Gardens). The model submitted in support of the application clearly illustrates that the current proposal does not accord with this requirement of the SADF. Not only is Building I2 higher than the mill and silo, but many of the other new structures exceed 5 storeys limit set out in the SADF document, nor could they be described as being compatible with the overall character of the area and existing developments (or indeed the recently approved hotel on the Red House site).

Recommendation

While there have been improvements in some aspects of the

application, we remain seriously concerned over a number of keys aspects in the proposals. Further work is required to investigate alternatives that might enable the

retention of a number of buildings of local interest, while the overall heights should be reduced in line with the SADF. Finally we would wish to see more design work carried out on the Hills Road junction so that some real townscape enhancement is delivered. Without this additional work we are unable to support the proposals and would strongly recommend that the City Council refuse the application.

In the event that the LPA is minded to approve the application, we would recommend that stringent conditions be attached to any permission granted to safeguard the issues identified in the recommendations set out in our letter of 11th April 2008.

Yours sincerely

David Grech
Historic Areas Advisor
E-mail: david.grech@english-heritage.org.uk