

Mr. David Rush  
Development Control Manager  
South Cambridgeshire District Council  
Cambourne Business Park  
Cambourne  
Cambridge  
CB3 6EA

t +44 (0) 1223 326806  
f +44 (0) 1223 329346  
e jmb@januarys.co.uk  
w januarys.co.uk

**Our ref:** jmb  
**Your ref:**

25 January 2007

Dear David

**S/2134/06/F: FULL APPLICATION FOR THE ERECTION OF TWO B1 BUSINESS UNITS (CLASS B1), TOGETHER WITH NEW ACCESS, RECONFIGURED CAR PARK TO THE SOUTH AND ANCILLARY INFRASTRUCTURE – PHASE II**

**S/2135/06/O: OUTLINE APPLICATION FOR CLASS B1 BUSINESS UNITS (CLASS B1) – PHASE III**

**'ICONIX', PAMPISFORD PARK, LONDON ROAD, PAMPISFORD**

Further to our recent exchange of correspondence, I am pleased to enclose a revised landscape plan and associated sections in support of the scheme. 6 copies of the following are attached: -

- Proposed Site Plan P037/105 P2
- P037/101 P2
- Revised Parking Schedule
- Revised Landscape Plan 02-10D
- Section D1 and D2
- Drainage Statement
- Note from Ecological Consultant (CSa)

With specific regard to the issues that you asked us to address, I set these out below under specific headings, which I believe reflect what is outstanding: -

**1) Clarification with regard to how the structured planting over the ditch towards the north of the site is to work in practice?**

Two notional sections have been produced and the positions marked on the landscape proposals drawing. Section C-C indicates a potential solution to enable planting to be carried out between the proposed car park and the existing ditch. The position of the existing open ditch is clearly marked on the revised landscape plans.

The concerns of the Council's ecologist have been noted regarding the amount of planting proposed along the southern boundaries, i.e. it will lead to the shading of the watercourse, thus limiting its potential as a wildlife corridor and lowering water quality. The retained ditch is shown on Section C-C, with suitable re-profiling. The applicant is happy to work with the LPA to seek to provide an appropriate landscaping solution, and it is suggested this could be achieved through the imposition of a suitably worded condition if deemed necessary. However, as requested, the ditch has been kept open on one side to limit overshadowing of water courses.

## **2) Area around the mast and by the entrance into the site**

The applicant's arboricultural consultant has confirmed that the removed and retained trees in the vicinity of the mast are correctly shown on SMC drawing number P037/120/P2.

I can further confirm that the trees shown to be retained and removed at the site frontage (adjacent to the site access) are accurately plotted. Appended to this letter is an accurate site survey drawing, which can be cross-referenced with the submitted plans.

The landscaping plan shows the omission of landscaping to the north of units 4 and 5.

## **3) Trees and shrub planting to the rear (west) of units 2-3**

Additional trees have been positioned in the car park to avoid services and changes in level. Furthermore a tree pit section has been included on the landscape proposals drawing. The amendments are designed to help break up the parking area. Due to the change in levels within the car park area, there is need for a retaining wall, which limits the potential for further tree planting.

## **4) Need to pick up landscaping proposals from previous schemes**

The Landscape scheme now includes further information regarding the landscape bund to the west of units 2 and 3. Details were shown as part of the approved scheme S/1377/05/F, but this strip of land in fact fell outside the application site area.

The detailed specification as shown on the landscape plan (to the west of Units 2 and 3), includes areas of native planting (hatched) to reflect the previously approved scheme.

Additional tree planting has been included in this area within the latest landscape plan. The buffer has also been increased in depth through reducing the pinch points. Section A-A shows the gradient of the boundary bund. The reduced mound heights will be beneficial when establishing the proposed planting. This will also help the dependency on retaining walls.

## **5) Cycle parking**

The scheme has been amended as shown on SMC plan no. 120 revision P2, which shows the provision of cycle parking increased from a ratio of 1:80 (which formed the basis for cycle parking provision for unit 1) to a 1:50 ratio. This is less than the parking provision requirement as set out in appendix 7/2 of the Local Plan (2004). However, the proposal does include covered cycle storage, which is not a strict required by the provisions in the Local Plan.



It is also proposed that a Green Travel Plan be introduced through the imposition of a condition whereby the uptake of cycle parking provision is monitored, and in the event that there is sufficient demand, further space will be provided, as appropriate, at the expense of car parking spaces. It is also worth noting that the scheme includes the proposed provision of showers, which together with the covered and secure cycle parking, will encourage sustainable modes of transport.

#### **6) Overspill car parking on outline application site**

We have found no evidence of unauthorised parking in this area. Notwithstanding this point, I would like to confirm that there is not right for any of the adjacent landowners or tenants to occupy the site as overspill parking. Moreover, in policy terms, there is significant merit in restricting such unauthorised activities. The onus in PPG13 is very much in restricting parking provision.

#### **7) Detailed access arrangements from public highway**

We would like to confirm that with regard to the outline application the detailed access from the public highway should be considered for approval at the outline stage. However, the applicant is not seeking approval for the internal layout of phase 3 at this stage. This would be subject to further reserved matters proposals.

#### **8) Parking numbers**

On layout plan 105-P1 I can confirm that there were unfortunately a number of discrepancies in terms of the provision of car parking and the allocation between units. This is now clarified on an updated plan produced by SMC (105- P2). Our apologies for any confusion caused.

#### **9) Disabled car parking spaces**

3 disabled parking spaces adjacent to units 2 & 3 are to be provided as requested. I can confirm that the parking space arrangements conform to Part M of Building Regulations, which requires a 1200mm strip of land to be provided on one side and to the rear of the space. As is shown on the submitted plans there are a number of parking spaces, which are 'handed', and which will facilitate ease of access both on the driver and passenger side of the vehicle. The comments from the disability panel are noted. These have been relayed onto the project team to enable the detailed comments to be developed into the scheme.

#### **10) Changes to ground level**

The changes in ground level compared to the submitted plans has been checked.

I can confirm that heights relative to ground level are generally represented consistently and fairly. Typically, the architects have taken a finished ground level of 23.16m with a parapet level of 31.91m (8.75m above finished ground level). Drawing 115 shows this slightly differently with a parapet level of 7.950 and finished ground at -0.760 and therefore representing the building as being 8.71m high above finished ground.

To clarify this I would however draw attention to the fact that the buildings are always the same height and ground floor levels are to a consistent datum throughout the development to ensure they are always clear of any risk of flooding (i.e. to meet EA requirements). Finished ground levels, however, vary and any differences in level are reconciled by the use of a plinth feature, which may vary in height. With reference to Blyth and Blyth drawing 19374: 90:002 B, the maximum change in level around Units 4 and 5 will be between 22.96m and 23.36m (400mm difference i.e. + or - 200mm from the levels indicated on the section).

### **11) Surface water attenuation**

I attach a summary of a report from Blyth and Blyth, which should provide the appropriate clarification.

### **12) Ecology**

The comments from the Council's Ecology Officer are noted. We have also reviewed the comments from the Parish Council in relation to this issue (Appendix 2 of their consultation response). In order to address the issues raised, I attach a copy of a response from CSa, the applicant's ecological consultants, which deals with all the points raised.

### **13) Emergency Access**

I can confirm that the applicant is happy for the emergency access to be removed if required. We have yet to receive definitive advice on this issue, but would suggest that this could be dealt with through the imposition of a condition.

### **14) Highway related matters**

As you will be aware Savills, the applicant's Transport Consultants, are in dialogue with the County Council. Despite pre-application discussions, the County has requested further information as summarised below (extracted from an e-mail from the County): -

*a. Multimodal impact analysis covering the peaks and the full 24 hour day, as per our Transport Assessment Guidelines. At present the TA covers vehicles in AM and PM peaks only.*

*b. The forecast year of opening is 2010 for the development. We also require an analysis to show 5 years into the working life of the development.*

*c. Whilst the TRICS database provides a useful starting point for predicting trip generation it does not fully reflect the potential modal share of journeys to the site. The County consider that the existing similar use on the site will provide a more robust understanding of the modal choices for journeys to/from the site, rather than relying on TRICS information. A survey of the site to be undertaken for the full hours of operation of the units.*

*d. Car Parking – The County have raised concerns regarding the high level of parking (which accords with the LPA's adopted standards). The County have indicated that over provision of parking spaces will encourage people to drive to the site, as this would not be in accordance with national and Structure Plan Policies P8/1, P8/5 or P8/8, and*



*should be examining ways to reduce car travel by further restricting parking rather than predicting and providing. This would suggest the need for a Green Travel Plan*

*e. Junction Capacity - The TA does not examine the capacity of critical junctions in the vicinity of the site, such as the angled T junction of London Road/A1301 (0.6km south of the development entrance) and the major roundabout junction of the A505 and A130.*

*f. Clarification regarding the two County Accident Sites near to the site and the implications that the proposed development will have an impact upon.*

*g. An assessment of the routes to Whittlesford Station and Sawston village for pedestrians and cyclists. This is required in order to be sure that the use of sustainable modes is feasible, safe and attractive.*

The applicant's Transport Consultants have already had a meeting with the County relative to the above matters, and have commissioned the further survey work requested in relation to points (c) and (e) outlined above. This is being carried out today (24<sup>th</sup> January). Following the receipt of the data, the Highway Consultant will be working through the data next week. The earliest that all the points can be addressed will be at the end of next week.

Whilst it is regrettable that this issue is not yet resolved, we are advised by our Transport Consultants that there was apparently a delay in the Council consulting the Highway Authority, which has not been helped by the recent Christmas / New Year break. We are however doing everything we can to provide a response within your timescales and will be speaking with the County throughout. We will keep you posted on this.

#### **14) Parish Council comments**

In addition to the Parish Council's comments on Ecology, we would like to make the further brief comments in relation to their submission to you: -

- In relation to Local Plan policy EM6, one cannot and should not read this policy alone. It relates to sites within village frameworks and close to them and / or other suitable brownfield sites. This policy is but one of the employment policies in the 2004 Local Plan; a further policy (EM1) positively allocates part of the application site for B1 development. There is no mention of small-scale in this policy, which you would not expect as a major B1 allocation. Also of interest, the policy in the Pampisford inset map refers to the site as being at Sawston.
- Pampisford had a 1996 population of 350. However its larger neighbour Sawston, to which this site relates every bit as much had a 1996 population of 7,260. This was doubtless taken into account by the Council in allocating the site positively for B1 development in the 2004 Local Plan (and indeed repeating the allocation which has historically existed).
- The height and density of development is not untypical of that generally prevalent locally in this general employment area. The fact that the site is allocated for employment use means that there is an inevitability of taller built structures – especially when one is dealing with a largely undeveloped site.

- We consider a number of the conditions suggested by the Parish are inappropriate and / or unworkable. Others are appropriate and would be acceptable. If you would welcome our view on these, please let us know.

Please do let me know if there are any further points you wish us to address at this stage and as promised, we will keep you abreast of progress on the highways front. Please note that I am on leave next week (29<sup>th</sup> January – 2<sup>nd</sup> February inclusive) but Colin Brown (01223 326826) is fully up to speed and will be able to deal with matters while I am away.

Yours sincerely



**Justin Bainton** BA (Hons) DipTP MSc MRTPI  
Planning Consultant

Enc.

cc. Chris Goldsmith – Turnstone Estates Ltd  
Nigel Dalton – SMC Covell Matthews