

PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING – 16th December 2009

Pre-Committee Amendment Sheet

PLANNING APPLICATIONS

CIRCULATION: First

ITEM: APPLICATION REF: **09/0864/FUL**

Location: **40 - 52 Newnham Road**

Target Date: 14th December 2009

To Note:

The applicants have submitted the following additional statement regarding formal open space: 'The College owns extensive playing fields (some 28 acres – 135520 sq yds) and the total number of resident students / fellows is 620 giving a figure of 218 sq yds per person well in excess of the Council's standards of 16-18 sqm per person.' In the light of this information, I do not consider it necessary to seek contributions towards the provision of formal open space in the city, and I have amended the recommendation accordingly, as indicated below.

Following the Development Control Forum, the petitioners have indicated that two of the visual images they used at the time were slightly incorrect. The letter explaining this is attached to the amendment sheet together with two revised images. These alterations are in my view minor. They do not alter my overall view of the impact of the proposal.

Amendments To Text:

Add new paragraph 3.7: 'As indicated above, Listed Building Consent and Conservation Area Consent applications for the demolition and alteration of existing buildings on the site have already been approved, subject to conditions which prevent such development occurring before an acceptable development scheme for the whole site has been approved.'

Paragraph 6.18: Penultimate sentence should read, 'There was some concern that the site might be overdeveloped, and the clarity of the design compromised by the accommodation around the two Garden Building courtyards.' (The published wording of this paragraph was inadvertently copied from an earlier (incorrect) draft of the Panel minute.)

Paragraph 8.3: Final sentence should read, 'The application site and the Phase 1 site taken together accommodate 27 students at present, and in my view, since the combined site reaches the threshold of 20 students set in footnote 1 of policy 7/7 of

the local plan, the proposal is in accordance with that policy.'

Paragraph 8.45: add, 'A meeting has taken place with the public art co-ordinator, who is happy with the approach to this issue taken so far by the applicants.'

The minutes of the DCF are not yet available, but will be tabled separately at Committee.

Pre-Committee Amendments to Recommendation:

Reason 4 for refusal: omit the words 'transport mitigation measures'. Also insert the word 'informal' before 'public open space'.

Also add additional resolution:

'In the event that an appeal is lodged against a decision to refuse this application, DELEGATED AUTHORITY is given to Officers to complete a section 106 agreement on behalf of the Local Planning Authority, in accordance with the requirements of the Planning Obligation Strategy.'

DECISION:

CIRCULATION: First

ITEM: APPLICATION REF: **09/0931/FUL**

Location: **Old Maltings Prospect Row**

Target Date: 5th January 2010

To Note:

Additional information from applicants

- 1.1 Following completion of the Committee report, additional drawings illustrating the proposed courtyards on the southeast (Sheet 1) and northwest (Sheet 2) sides of the Maltings building have been received. These are attached to the amendment sheet as Appendix 1 and Appendix 2 respectively. Although I accept that these drawings give an accurate impression of the shape and volume of the spaces, it is my view that they present both the degree of sunlight reaching these areas, and the potential of plants to thrive in them in a very optimistic manner. They do not lead me to revise my view that the amount and type of internal and external space provided for future occupants of the development is unsatisfactory.
- 1.2 These drawings also include provision for a short projecting screen to the northwest-facing window on the second floor of the proposed Maltings

building. I accept that such a screen would eliminate the possibility of overlooking of the adjoining roof terrace at 17 Melbourne Place, and I recommend the deletion of the related reason for refusal, as indicated below.

- 1.3 A statement on renewable energy has also been received from the applicant. The statement proposes that solar hot water would be provided to units 1-4 and 8-11, using a solar thermal panel of approximately 1.5m area for each apartment. I am satisfied that this provision would meet the requirement to provide 10% of the developments total energy requirements on-site by renewable means, and that the proposal is therefore (subject to a condition on installation) in accordance with policy 8/16. I therefore recommend deletion of the relevant reason for refusal, as indicated below.
- 1.4 The applicants have also submitted additional information regarding trip generation. The applicants suggest that the TRICS database predicts 4-6 movements per day per 100m² of Class B8 storage space, which would produce 26-39 movements per day from the existing unit on site. I am content to accept the maximum figure of 39 as the baseline of existing daily movements on and off the site. This would reduce the net additional daily trips generated by the proposed development to 54.5, which would require lower contributions to ECATP and the public realm of £12480.50 and £16895 respectively.
- 1.5 The applicants have also suggested that the eleven small units proposed should be treated as being likely to generate only 5.1 trips per day each, rather than the 8.5 I have suggested. I have sought advice from County Transport, who have advised me that this rate should be used. On this basis, the total of net additional daily trips generated by the proposed development falls to 17.1, and therefore no contributions are required for ECATP or the public realm.

Urban design advice

- 2.1 Following completion of the Committee report, advice has been received from the Joint Urban Design team. The advice is attached to the amendment sheet as Appendix 3. As a result of this advice, I have added an additional reason for refusal as indicated below.

DCF

- 3.1 The minutes of the DCF are attached to this amendment sheet

Amendments To Text:

Pre-Committee Amendments to Recommendation:

Delete Reason 1 for refusal (see above).

Delete Reason 3 for refusal (see above).

Published Reason 4 for refusal to become Reason 3 (with the deletion of 'transport mitigating measures' from the wording).

Add new Reason 2 for refusal:

'The absence of a rhythmic ordering system to the fenestration causes the proposed corner building not to address or respond to the character prevalent in the listed buildings and the conservation area that are the immediate context of the site. The absence of doors that open out onto the street means that the building misses the opportunity to provide an attractive built frontage and connect with the street at ground floor level. For these reasons the proposal is in conflict with policies 3/4, 3/7, 3/12 and 4/10 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2006), and constitutes poor design in its context, contrary to advice in Planning Policy Statement 1 'Delivering Sustainable Development' (2005).'

Also add additional resolution:

'In the event that an appeal is lodged against a decision to refuse this application, DELEGATED AUTHORITY is given to Officers to complete a section 106 agreement on behalf of the Local Planning Authority, in accordance with the requirements of the Planning Obligation Strategy.'

DECISION:

CIRCULATION: First

ITEM: **APPLICATION REF:** **09/0706/CAC**

Location: **127a Hills Road**

Target Date: 20th September 2009

To Note: The relevant section from Amendment Sheet from Planning Committee 16/09/09 is set out below:

5.3 The comments of the Historic Environment Manager have been received. The officer notes that the possibility of an alternative solution has been explored without success. He is satisfied that there is no realistic alternative to the proposed demolition. The view of the HEM is that in these circumstances, the demolition of these buildings, and of the garden wall is justifiable in terms of the PPG15 criteria for wider public benefit.

5.4 English Heritage is of the view that the case for demolition has been substantiated as set out in PPG15 as bringing substantial benefit for the

community (i.e. as part of delivering the Station Area redevelopment).

An additional representation has been received from the occupier of 22 Brentwood Close, Cambridge. The representation is in the form of an objection to the proposals on the following grounds:

The buildings have made a significant contribution to the street scene for over a hundred years.

Although the principle of the public benefit of a bus link may be self-evident there is no assessment in the report of the method or design. Paragraph 8.9 refers to a consultation with the City Council but there is no evidence of the design having been submitted for consideration by the public or Members.

There is no assessment of whether an alternative approach to the bus link layout would not only be achievable but also enhance the public benefit by preserving the historic streetscene. This arm of the junction served the industrial mills beyond for many years. The scale of land take for the bus link is twice the width of the junction entrance and it is contended that the loss of the contribution that these buildings make and the scale of the junction will be detrimental and further erode the local character. Much has been lost of the other side of Hills Road and every effort should be made to preserve historic character.

The application should be deferred for submission of the detail of the highway design or refused on the basis that the proposal does not preserve or enhance the Conservation Area and the wider public benefits could be achieved by other means.

Condition 4 is welcomed but is not a substitute for retention.

Officer Note:

In response to the above letter and to questions raised by Members at the Chair's Brief a copy of a drawing, which was submitted in the Heritage Statement is attached to this Amendment Sheet. This drawing shows the alignment of the new bus link road and identifies which parts of the scheme are 'Highway Works' and which are 'Development Highway Works'. 'Highway Works' are those works that are permitted development (green) and 'Development Highway Works (red) are those works that need planning permission. Paragraph 8.9 of my report sets out the procedure for dealing with the works that require planning permission i.e. that the City Council will be consultees to that application which is determined by the County Council.

The County Council have held one workshop for key stakeholders in the bus link scheme including the Cycling Campaign. Some Councillors attended the workshop along with members of the Design and Conservation Panel. Further events are planned prior to the submission of the planning application.

There is an existing access off the highway between 127a Hills Road and the garden wall to the Earl of Derby PH. This did serve the RHM site and I have no reason to doubt that it was used by large vehicles. However this access does not constitute a

fourth arm to the junction and it is not technically possible to adapt this access to provide for the bus only link road.

Also in response to a question raised at Chair's Brief, the planning history of the site as listed in the report includes reference to an application for advertisement consent approved under reference 07/0045. This application allows of advertising hoardings around 127 Hills Road which are required to be removed when development is completed.

Amendments To Text:

Pre-Committee Amendments to Recommendation:

DECISION:

GENERAL ITEMS

CIRCULATION: First

ITEM:

Details: Cambridge Gateway Project – Consultation by
Cambridgeshire County Council on Planning
Application reference C/00501/09/CC

To Note:

In an email Councillor Walker asks that the requirements of pedestrians as well as cyclists be considered.

The Head of Environmental Services has requested that a condition be recommended to address contaminated land issues. This is set out below.

Design and Conservation (CB1) Sub-Panel

The minutes of the Design and Conservation (CB1) Sub-Panel are as follows:

Presentation by Alistair Frost of the County Council on the new (bus only) access road and cycle route.

This is intended to be seamlessly dovetailed into the CB1 development. According to Alistair Frost, the aim is for a shared-space feel with a cycle bypass lane and minimal street clutter.

The Panel's comments are summarised as follows:

- Illuminated (IGP) bollards. The number of bollards should be reduced and the design refined. There are standard products with a sign on metal posts with ground-mounted lights, which are robust and better looking than the plastic totems.
- Traffic islands. The Panel would have liked to see fewer islands, but accepted that the number was as dictated by the Dept of Transport.
- Traffic signals. The Panel were pleased that the design included only the legal minimum number.
- Pavement specification. Good workmanship (especially on joints) and future maintenance are key here. The panel recommended that consent should be subject to a tightly defined specification. Some concern was expressed regarding the choice of Marshall's Harvest Buff Conservation Paving – this is a vulnerable shade of paving that can discolour very quickly and be difficult to clean.

Conclusion.

The success of the access road would be dependant on the quality of the delivery. Further detail on the cycle bypass lane is needed before a full evaluation of the overall design can be made.

Visual presentations need to be coordinated with Landscape/Public Realm visuals and should include 'Look left/Look right' road texts.

Sample materials need to be viewed.

(Officer Note – the Sub-Panel raised the same issues as officers and therefore these matters have already been addressed in the report).

Comments from the applicant in response to the recommendations

The applicant has responded to the recommendations as follows:

Further detailed work:

1. The Computer Generated Images should be amended to show all proposed signs, poles, lights etc. including the traffic light controlled crossing. (I have requested that this been available prior to the Committee meeting).

Being progress will be with you shortly

2. Large scale trees, such as those which are proposed need at least 8 metres distance from buildings. There is no scope for consideration of reducing the scale of the trees as they are seen as essential in the street scene. The only option is to locate the trees in such a way that they do not lie within 8 metres of a building. The application site does not include the buildings either side of the link road but the position of trees approved under this application will present a constraint on the new buildings which are currently shown as too close to the trees. An alternative to moving the buildings would be to reduce the width of the new road.

I am told the original 6m has come out of discussion with Ashwell I am asking for backup from Ashwell

3. The type of tree species should be reviewed.

Happy to go with recommendation

4. The number of trees on the Hills Road frontage should be reduced from three trees to one larger tree in front of the new part of Block M6.

Yes happy to go with this recommendation

5. Tree pits should generally be larger and the detailing of tree pits needs to be re-worked to ensure trees will not be unstable.

We agree the detail can be re-worked

6. Tree pit details are required for the tree pits on Hills Road.

I think it falls outside the "approval" area as it is part of the PD works but there is no reason details should not be shared and tree installation work be considered in the same way as the approval

7. The paving design should be revised to ensure that signage and street furniture is located in co-ordination with the paving patterns.

Is being done where possible.

8. The location of lighting columns should be reviewed so that locations relate well to key elements of the public realm particularly paving details and planting.

I am told a couple of the lighting columns can be moved to an improved location in terms of paving and banding details.

9. Proposals for signage need to be finalised and agreed as part of the application. The aim should be to minimise the number and size of signs.

I am pleased it is recognised that we have already gone some way towards this, I can confirm every effort is being made to minimise number and size of signs.

10. 'Keep left' bollards should be reduced in number and redesigned.

The design team are working towards this I think the CGI fell short of the project team intentions

11. 'No entry' and 'Except Buses' signs to be mounted on traffic light posts to reduce clutter.

Sorry this is not possible we would not get the traffic signal team to adopt the

system if we went this route.

12. 'Cycle lane' sign to be mounted on lamp column.

Agreed

13. Review of the need for white lines between the bollard island and pedestrian island.

We think there is a small scope for change given the driver are on the whole bus driver

14. The position of cycle hoops should be reconsidered because they appear to be too close to the road.

Agreed, I think the location shown can be improved.

15. The palette of materials should be reviewed as there are concerns about the number of colours and the use of pink granites.

We are happy to review this and hope to be able to provide a site example early in the New Year, but would ask to meet officers to ensure we are meeting requirements.

16. A panel of proposed materials should be provided on site for approval prior to the commencement of development.

Agree to do a site panel

Amendments To Text:

Pre-Committee Amendments to Recommendation:

Additional condition to address issue of contaminated land, detailed wording recommended as follows:

No development approved by this permission shall be commenced prior to a contaminated land assessment and associated remedial strategy, together with a timetable of works, being submitted to the LPA for approval.

- (a) The contaminated land assessment shall include a desk study to be submitted to the LPA for approval. The desk study shall detail the history of the site uses and propose a site investigation strategy based on the relevant information discovered by the desk study. The strategy shall be approved by the LPA prior to investigations commencing on site.
- (b) The site investigation, including relevant soil, soil gas, surface and groundwater sampling, shall be carried out by a suitable qualified and accredited consultant/contractor in accordance with a quality assured sampling and analysis methodology.

- (c) A site investigation report detailing all investigative works and sampling on site, together with the results of the analysis, risk assessment to any receptors and a proposed remediation strategy shall be submitted to the LPA. The LPA shall approve such remedial works as required prior to any remediation commencing on site. The works shall be of such a nature as to render harmless the identified contamination given the proposed end use of the site and surrounding environment including any controlled waters.
- (d) Approved remediation works shall be carried out in full on site under a quality assurance scheme to demonstrate compliance with the proposed methodology and best practice guidance.
- (e) If, during the works contamination is encountered which has not previously been identified then the additional contamination shall be fully assessed and an appropriate remediation scheme agreed with the LPA.
- (f) Upon completion of the works, this condition shall not be discharged until a closure report has been submitted to and approved by the LPA. The closure report shall include details of the proposed remediation works and quality assurance certificates to show that the works have been carried out in full in accordance with the approved methodology. Details of any post-remedial sampling and analysis to show the site has reached the required clean-up criteria shall be included in the closure report together with the necessary documentation detailing what waste materials have been removed from site.

Reason: In order to ensure that any contamination of the site is identified and remediation measures are appropriately undertaken to secure full mitigation in the interests of environmental and public safety. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 4/13).

DECISION:
