

SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT TO: Planning Committee

1 December 2010

AUTHOR/S: Executive Director / Corporate Manager – Planning and Sustainable Communities

**S/1362/10 AND S/1363/10 – PAMPISFORD
Erection of Two Business Units (Class B1) (Extension of Time of S/1060/07/F)
and
B1 (Business) development- Phase 3 (Extension of time of S/1061/07/F)
Iconix, Pampisford Park, LONDON ROAD, Pampisford, Cambridge,
Cambridgeshire, CB22 3EG**

Recommendation: Delegated Approval/Refusal

Date for Determination: 10 November 2010

Further Information received after publication of the agenda reports.

1. Comments have been received on 24 November from Councillor Tony Orgee, recommending refusal of the application. He states:
2. "Pampisford Parish Council has already written to you about these planning applications and I fully endorse all the comments they have made.

The fundamental question for me is: have there been any significant changes since the original applications were made. To this, I answer a definite Yes.

It is now very common, particularly when travelling on the A505 in the morning and evening 'rush hour' periods, to see traffic tailing back from the Sawston roundabout as far as the M11 motorway. This is a daily occurrence. I have even seen the tailback as far as down the slip road and onto the motorway itself. This is significant and highly dangerous.

Traffic also extends back to the east of the Sawston roundabout, and on particularly bad mornings, traffic rat-runs through Pampisford Village

The addition of another 300 jobs in the area, as proposed by Iconix, can only have serious consequences for traffic congestion on the A505. As such, I do not believe that the road infrastructure in the immediate area can sustain the extra traffic that would result from the Iconix proposals. I do not believe that the road improvements suggested by Iconix would address the traffic problems in any meaningful way.

I therefore completely agree with the well-argued views of Pampisford Parish Council that the applications S/1362/10 and S/1353/10 should be rejected.

If, however, officers are minded to approve these applications, then the applications should only be approved with far more stringent requirements than is the case with the original applications, regarding encouraging future employees to travel to the site by means other than the car. Any conditions / section 106 requirements should include making a significant contribution to improving cycling

facilities in the immediate area. This must include upgrading the footway south of the Iconix site to a dual footway/cycle path as far as the Sawston roundabout, where it would meet up with the cycleway provided as part of the Genome campus approval some years ago. There is also an extremely strong case for providing a cycleway alongside the Sawston bypass (A1301) to its northern end, and also a safe crossing over the A1301. Any travel to work plan must be realistic and achievable.

In summary, I oppose these applications because I believe that the traffic consequences of approving them would make an already overloaded road even more congested. In my view the measures suggested by Iconix to address this significant traffic problem would not be successful and local residents would have to live with the consequences. The almost certain increase in rat-running through the village, if these applications were approved and implemented, would, in my view, have an adverse effect on residential amenity, village character and the local environment.

We do need jobs, but we also need appropriate infrastructure to support them. More and more, local businesses are telling us that lack of infrastructure is holding back jobs creation. In this case, the local infrastructure requirements are such that any section 106 funding from an individual development is unlikely to be sufficient to address local needs.

Tony Orgee
District Councillor for The Abingtons ward”

3. Councillor Orgee’s comments have been referred to the applicant and Local Highway Authority for a response. In the event that these responses are not available for in time for the Planning Committee, or that further information is required from the applicant to clarify the issues raised, Members are requested to delegate to officers authority to:
 - a) Refuse the applications if the concerns raised are supported by the Local Highway Authority and cannot be resolved by the imposition of suitable conditions.
 - b) If the concerns are not supported by the Local Highway Authority, to issue planning permissions subject to suitable conditions or Section 106 Agreement, as required.

Contact Officer: Ray McMurray – Principal Planning Officer
Telephone: (01954) 713259