

## CC2C Station Area and Clifton Road Areas of Major Change

Written statements from the Rustat Neighbourhood Association by Roger Crabtree, Chairman (1384)

Relates to Representation 27518

### 2C.1 Policy 20

- i) *Would the loss of existing office accommodation in the Clifton Road Area be adequately compensated for by the proposed B1 (a) and (b) allocations within the Station Areas West?*

There is very little actual office accommodation at present on the Clifton Road estate besides Rustat House.; the majority of the current land use consists of commercial / retail and light industrial single storey units and workshops such as Screw Fix, Halfords, Tyre outlets, printing workshops and even an Indian takeaway.

We had understood that the developers were proposing to demolish all these units and instead built a mixed use site of dwellings and offices blocks.

We are most concerned about the potential complete loss of the employment and retail facility that the present units provide. This is a valued economic resource for this part of Cambridge and especially important as the only other nearby industrial / commercial unit site, The Paddocks, is also due to be demolished during the period of the Plan.

The site also provides valuable employment for a number of people in the service industry where high tech knowledge and skills are not generally needed.

So, while our Association is not opposed to the redevelopment of the site, we strongly believe the mixed use must consist of a mix of dwellings, offices and the sort of trading outlets and workshops that we have now. It seems to us that both the planning system and development industry is ill-disposed to (or finds it difficult to deliver) successful live-work within developments, but we feel that this land could be very well suited to such use-classes, which is sustainable and supports vibrant and varied communities in a digital age.

- ii) *Notwithstanding the Council's comments on page 6 of reference document RD/GEN/081 which relate to supplementary planning documents, the policy delegates a significant amount of detail in terms of the development schema for the Clifton Road Area to a future subsidiary document. Could the Council clarify if any progress has been made in respect of the preparation of the Supplementary Planning Document (SPD)? Should the*

*policy contain a timeframe for the preparation of the SPD and indicate that no planning application will be submitted until the SPD has been adopted by the Council?*

iii)

Our Association has welcomed the proposal to subject the site to a Supplementary Planning Document, which should provide appropriate guarantees about matters such as overall quality (and procedures for assuring and monitoring quality) tenure mix, sufficiency, scope and type of open space, numbers of dwellings and offices, density and height limits, especially for buildings close to the Rustat Road residential area.

We would very much welcome a timeframe for the preparation of this SPD, and are very keen to be given the opportunity to work with the developers, before plans are set in stone, to help achieve a sound outcome.

We are very concerned to ensure that any plans for the site properly reflect that this site is different from CB1 in that it directly abuts a residential area - a CB1 part 2 would not be appropriate. So, we believe an SPD is critical to ensure that appropriate parameters are established which fully reflect its different context. Given this, it would be important to stipulate that no planning application should be made before the SPD is adopted following appropriate public consultation and input.

We further suggest that the SPD should incorporate a 'Design Code' process which would be subject to legal agreement as was undertaken by the parties for Trumpington Meadows.

We note that USS are already undertaking technical work on an SPD. The Association would like to seek assurances that the SPD would be impartial and subject to a high degree of consultation and public input. .

iv) *With regard to criterion (q), is there potential to create an eastern access to the station for pedestrians and cyclists?*

We support the principle of an eastern pedestrian and cycle access to the station, but only if appropriate parking controls have been introduced for streets near such an access point, in order to avoid a yet further increase in commuter parking on residential roads.

In the context of this local issue of access to the station, the criterion needs to extend more widely to consider pedestrian and cycle access which is integrated into all networks and in all directions.

## **2C Site M2**

i) *Are there any constraints which would negate the reasonable prospect of the site being developed within the lifetime of the Plan? For example, the site contains a significant number of occupied office units and its*

*redevelopment would also necessitate the relocation of the Royal Mail's Cambridge Mail Centre.*

We are not able to comment on the removal of the possible constraints. The Royal Mail originally planned to vacate their Clifton Road site but now appear to want to stay put. While this should not prevent the redevelopment of the rest of the site, a continued Mail Centre would, we believe, significantly affect the number of dwellings the site could accommodate and influence the tenure mix.

We are unsure how would the Plan be able to set realistic development parameters with this major uncertainty.

- ii) *Would the creation of the proposed leisure related uses unacceptably prejudice the residential amenity of the residents of Rustat Road which borders the site?*

We are not aware of any proposals about the possible leisure related uses; whether they would affect the residential amenity would depend on both their nature and location.

However we can attest to the detrimental impact of the current leisure centre site on our neighbourhood, including competition for parking, noise and anti-social behaviour and policing incidents, so we would urge a precautionary and carefully planned approach, based on good evidence, within an SPD.

- iii) *Is it the intention that the site should be accessed solely from Cherry Hinton Road?*

We are concerned that a single point access to the redeveloped site would worsen traffic congestion at rush hour time, even if, overall, traffic movements are not significantly different from now. The Hills Road bridge area is already very congested at rush hour times.

So we think that careful consideration, including a full traffic assessment, should be made on the pros and cons of a second access point. This could enter the site from the top of Davy Road. There is already a grassed area at that point, which would make such access easy to achieve.

If this second access does go ahead, we would, like to see the loss of that green space compensated for by equivalent space elsewhere within the site.

- iv) *Is the figure of 550 dwellings in criterion (n) the maximum residential capacity of the site and will the figure be replicated in the proposed SPD?*

We believe 550 dwelling is an absolute maximum for this site and would need to be appropriately reduced if the Royal Mail site is not available. It will be crucial that the SPD states this very clearly.

It is abundantly clear that the progressive increase in residential densities in developments around this area is creating untenable and very poor developments – the Waterboard site and the ‘Marque’ being exemplars that must not be allowed, nor encouraged by planning policy. This is especially the case if a sustainable mix of uses is to be achieved on this major development site.

rdc 15.5.16