



PLANNING

To: Councillors Dryden (Chair), Blencowe (Vice-Chair), Gawthrope, Hart, Hipkin, Pippas, C. Smart and Tunnacliffe

Despatched: Tuesday, 24 March 2015

Date: Wednesday, 1 April 2015

Time: 10.00 am

Venue: Committee Room 1 & 2 - Guildhall

Contact: Claire Tunnicliffe **Direct Dial:** 01223 457013

AGENDA

1 ORDER OF AGENDA

The Planning Committee operates as a single committee meeting but is organised with a three part agenda and will be considered in the following order:

- **PART ONE**
Major Planning Applications
Start time: 10.00am
- **PART TWO**
Minor/Other Planning Applications
Start time: 1.00pm
- **PART THREE**
General Items
Start time: If Part One is concluded before 12.30pm, the Chair may use his discretion to consider Part Three before the lunch break. Otherwise this will be heard at the conclusion of Part Two.

There will be a thirty minute lunch break before part two of the agenda is considered.

If the meeting should last to 6.00pm, the Committee will vote as to whether or not the meeting will be adjourned. If the decision is to adjourn the Committee will agree the date and time of the continuation meeting which

will be held no later than seven days from the original meeting.

2 APOLOGIES

3 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Members are asked to declare at this stage any interests, which they may have in any of the following items on the agenda. If any member is unsure whether or not they should declare an interest on a particular matter, they are requested to seek advice from the Head of Legal Services before the meeting.

4 MINUTES

To confirm the minutes of the meeting held on 04 February 2015 & 04 March 2015. (Attached separately).

Appendix 1 for Full Details of Central Government Planning Guidance

Part 1: Major Planning Applications (10am)

5 14/1154/FUL - WESTS GARAGE
(Pages 19 - 98)

6 14/1797/FUL - JUDGE BUSINESS SCHOOL, TRUMPINGTON STREET
(Pages 99 - 140)

7 14/1805/LBC - JUDGE BUSINESS SCHOOL, TRUMPINGTON STREET
(Pages 141 - 152)

8 14/1691/S73 - ADDENBROOKES CBC
(Pages 153 - 222)

9 14/1938/S73 - 1 MILTON ROAD
(Pages 223 - 246)

Part 2: Minor / Other Planning Applications (1.00pm)

10 15/0009/FUL - SLIPWAY, GARRET HOSTEL LANE
(Pages 247 - 252)

11 15/0010/LBC - SLIPWAY, GARRETT HOSTEL LANE
(Pages 253 - 258)

- 12 14/1947/FUL - LAND REAR OF 2 SAXON STREET**
(Pages 259 - 272)
- 13 15/0097/FUL - LAND ADJACENT TO 1 CAMPBELL STREET**
(Pages 273 - 286)
- 14 15/0033/FUL - 4 RUSTAT ROAD**
(Pages 287 - 292)
- 15 15/2028/FUL - ST STEPHEN CHURCH AND CHURCH HALL, 24
BROOKES ROAD**
(Pages 293 - 300)

<p>Part 3: General Items: If Part One is concluded before 12.30pm, the Chair may use his discretion to consider Part Three before the lunch break. Otherwise this will be heard at the conclusion of Part Two.</p>

- 16 REVIEW OF CHANGES TO DETERMINATION OF APPLICATIONS BY
PLANNING COMMITTEE**

Report attached separately.

- 17 RECORD OF OFFICER URGENCY ACTION**
(Pages 301 - 306)

The Committee is asked to note the Record of Officer Urgency Action: Urgency Powers to complete s106 Agreements without reference to s106 monitoring costs.

Meeting Information

Location The meeting is in the Guildhall on the Market Square (CB2 3QJ).

Between 9 a.m. and 5 p.m. the building is accessible via Peas Hill, Guildhall Street and the Market Square entrances.

After 5 p.m. access is via the Peas Hill entrance.

All the meeting rooms (Committee Room 1, Committee 2, the Council Chamber and the Small Hall) are on the first floor, and are accessible via lifts or stairs.

**Local
Government
(Access to
Information)
Act 1985**

Under Section 100D of the Local Government Act 1972, the following are “background papers” for each of the above reports on planning applications:

1. The planning application and plans;
2. Any explanatory or accompanying letter or document from the applicant;
3. Comments of Council departments on the application;
4. Comments or representations by third parties on the application as referred to in the report plus any additional comments received before the meeting at which the application is considered; unless (in each case) the document discloses “exempt or confidential information”
5. Any Structure Plan, Local Plan or Council Policy Document referred to in individual reports.

These papers may be inspected by contacting Head of Planning Services (01223 457103) in the Planning Department.

**Development
Control
Forum**

Meetings of the Development Control Forum are scheduled for a week after the meetings of Planning Committee if required

**Public
Participation**

Some meetings may have parts, which will be closed to the public, but the reasons for excluding the press and public will be given.

Members of the public who want to speak about an

application on the agenda for this meeting may do so, if they have submitted a written representation within the consultation period relating to the application and notified the Committee Manager that they wish to speak by **12.00 noon on the day before** the meeting.

Public speakers will not be allowed to circulate any additional written information to their speaking notes or any other drawings or other visual material in support of their case that has not been verified by officers and that is not already on public file.

For further information on speaking at committee please contact Democratic Services on 01223 457013 or democratic.services@cambridge.gov.uk.

Further information is available at

<https://www.cambridge.gov.uk/speaking-at-committee-meetings>

The Chair will adopt the principles of the public speaking scheme regarding planning applications for general items, enforcement items and tree items.

Cambridge City Council would value your assistance in improving the public speaking process of committee meetings. If you have any feedback please contact Democratic Services on 01223 457013 or democratic.services@cambridge.gov.uk

Representations on Planning Applications

Public representations on a planning application should be made in writing (by e-mail or letter, in both cases stating your full postal address), within the deadline set for comments on that application. You are therefore strongly urged to submit your representations within this deadline.

The submission of late information after the officer's report has been published is to be avoided.

A written representation submitted to the Environment Department by a member of the public after publication of the officer's report will only be considered if it is from someone who has already made written representations in time for inclusion within the officer's report. Any public

representation received by the Department after 12 noon two business days before the relevant Committee meeting (e.g. by 12.00 noon on Monday before a Wednesday meeting; by 12.00 noon on Tuesday before a Thursday meeting) will not be considered.

The same deadline will also apply to the receipt by the Department of additional information submitted by an applicant or an agent in connection with the relevant item on the Committee agenda (including letters, e-mails, reports, drawings and all other visual material), unless specifically requested by planning officers to help decision-making.

**Filming,
recording
and
photography**

The Council is committed to being open and transparent in the way it conducts its decision making. The public may record (e.g. film, audio, tweet, blog) meetings which are open to the public.

Anyone who does not want to be recorded should let the Chair of the meeting know. Those recording meetings are strongly urged to respect the wish of any member of the public not to be recorded.

Fire Alarm

In the event of the fire alarm sounding please follow the instructions of Cambridge City Council staff.

**Facilities for
disabled
people**

Level access to the Guildhall via the Peas Hill entrance.

A loop system is available in Committee Room 1, Committee Room 2 and the Council Chamber.

Accessible toilets are available on the ground and first floor.

Meeting papers are available in large print and other formats on request.

For further assistance please contact Democratic Services on 01223 457013 or democratic.services@cambridge.gov.uk.

**Queries on
reports**

If you have a question or query regarding a committee report please contact the officer listed at the end of relevant report or Democratic Services on 01223 457013 or democratic.services@cambridge.gov.uk.

**General
Information**

Information regarding committees, councilors and the democratic process is available at
<http://democracy.cambridge.gov.uk/>

Mod.Gov App

You can get committee agenda and reports for your tablet by using the mod.gov app

This page is intentionally left blank

APPENDIX 1 – DEVELOPMENT PLAN POLICY, PLANNING GUIDANCE AND MATERIAL CONSIDERATIONS

1.0 Central Government Advice

1.1 National Planning Policy Framework (March 2012) – sets out the Government's economic, environmental and social planning policies for England. These policies articulate the Government's vision of sustainable development, which should be interpreted and applied locally to meet local aspirations.

1.2 Circular 11/95 – The Use of Conditions in Planning Permissions: Advises that conditions should be necessary, relevant to planning, relevant to the development permitted, enforceable, precise and reasonable in all other respects.

1.3 Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010 – places a statutory requirement on the local authority that where planning permission is dependent upon a planning obligation the obligation must pass the following tests:

(a) necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms;

(b) directly related to the development; and

(c) fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development.

2.0 Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003

Planning Obligation Related Policies

P6/1 Development-related Provision

P9/8 Infrastructure Provision

P9/9 Cambridge Sub-Region Transport Strategy

3.0 Cambridge Local Plan 2006

3/1 Sustainable development

3/3 Setting of the City

3/4 Responding to context

3/6 Ensuring coordinated development

3/7 Creating successful places

3/9 Watercourses and other bodies of water

3/10 Subdivision of existing plots

3/11 The design of external spaces

3/12 The design of new buildings

3/13 Tall buildings and the skyline

3/14 Extending buildings

3/15 Shopfronts and signage

- 4/1 Green Belt
- 4/2 Protection of open space
- 4/3 Safeguarding features of amenity or nature conservation value
- 4/4 Trees
- 4/6 Protection of sites of local nature conservation importance
- 4/8 Local Biodiversity Action Plans
- 4/9 Scheduled Ancient Monuments/Archaeological Areas
- 4/10 Listed Buildings
- 4/11 Conservation Areas
- 4/12 Buildings of Local Interest
- 4/13 Pollution and amenity
- 4/14 Air Quality Management Areas
- 4/15 Lighting

- 5/1 Housing provision
- 5/2 Conversion of large properties
- 5/3 Housing lost to other uses
- 5/4 Loss of housing
- 5/5 Meeting housing needs
- 5/7 Supported housing/Housing in multiple occupation
- 5/8 Travellers
- 5/9 Housing for people with disabilities
- 5/10 Dwelling mix
- 5/11 Protection of community facilities
- 5/12 New community facilities
- 5/15 Addenbrookes

- 6/1 Protection of leisure facilities
- 6/2 New leisure facilities
- 6/3 Tourist accommodation
- 6/4 Visitor attractions
- 6/6 Change of use in the City Centre
- 6/7 Shopping development and change of use in the District and Local Centres
- 6/8 Convenience shopping
- 6/9 Retail warehouses
- 6/10 Food and drink outlets.

- 7/1 Employment provision
- 7/2 Selective management of the Economy
- 7/3 Protection of Industrial and Storage Space
- 7/4 Promotion of cluster development
- 7/5 Faculty development in the Central Area, University of Cambridge
- 7/6 West Cambridge, South of Madingley Road
- 7/7 College and University of Cambridge Staff and Student Housing
- 7/8 Anglia Ruskin University East Road Campus
- 7/9 Student hostels for Anglia Ruskin University
- 7/10 Speculative Student Hostel Accommodation
- 7/11 Language Schools

- 8/1 Spatial location of development
- 8/2 Transport impact
- 8/4 Walking and Cycling accessibility
- 8/6 Cycle parking
- 8/8 Land for Public Transport
- 8/9 Commercial vehicles and servicing
- 8/10 Off-street car parking
- 8/11 New roads
- 8/12 Cambridge Airport
- 8/13 Cambridge Airport Safety Zone
- 8/14 Telecommunications development
- 8/15 Mullard Radio Astronomy Observatory, Lords Bridge
- 8/16 Renewable energy in major new developments
- 8/17 Renewable energy
- 8/18 Water, sewerage and drainage infrastructure

- 9/1 Further policy guidance for the Development of Areas of Major Change
- 9/2 Phasing of Areas of Major Change
- 9/3 Development in Urban Extensions
- 9/5 Southern Fringe
- 9/6 Northern Fringe
- 9/7 Land between Madingley Road and Huntingdon Road
- 9/8 Land between Huntingdon Road and Histon Road
- 9/9 Station Area

- 10/1 Infrastructure improvements

Planning Obligation Related Policies

- 3/7 Creating successful places
- 3/8 Open space and recreation provision through new development
- 3/12 The Design of New Buildings (*waste and recycling*)
- 4/2 Protection of open space
- 5/13 Community facilities in Areas of Major Change
- 5/14 Provision of community facilities through new development
- 6/2 New leisure facilities
- 8/3 Mitigating measures (*transport*)
- 8/5 Pedestrian and cycle network
- 8/7 Public transport accessibility
- 9/2 Phasing of Areas of Major Change
- 9/3 Development in Urban Extensions
- 9/5 Southern Fringe
- 9/6 Northern Fringe
- 9/8 Land between Huntingdon Road and Histon Road
- 9/9 Station Area
- 10/1 Infrastructure improvements (*transport, public open space, recreational and community facilities, waste recycling, public realm, public art, environmental aspects*)

4.0 **Supplementary Planning Documents**

- 4.1 **Cambridge City Council (May 2007) – Sustainable Design and Construction:** Sets out essential and recommended design considerations of relevance to sustainable design and construction. Applicants for major developments are required to submit a sustainability checklist along with a corresponding sustainability statement that should set out information indicated in the checklist. Essential design considerations relate directly to specific policies in the Cambridge Local Plan 2006. Recommended considerations are ones that the council would like to see in major developments. Essential design considerations are urban design, transport, movement and accessibility, sustainable drainage (urban extensions), energy, recycling and waste facilities, biodiversity and pollution. Recommended design considerations are climate change adaptation, water, materials and construction waste and historic environment.
- 4.2 **Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Waste Partnership (RECAP): Waste Management Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (February 2012):** The Design Guide provides advice on the requirements for internal and external waste storage, collection and recycling in new residential and commercial developments. It provides advice on assessing planning applications and developer contributions.
- 4.3 **Cambridge City Council (January 2008) - Affordable Housing:** Gives advice on what is involved in providing affordable housing in Cambridge. Its objectives are to facilitate the delivery of affordable housing to meet housing needs and to assist the creation and maintenance of sustainable, inclusive and mixed communities.
- 4.4 **Cambridge City Council (March 2010) – Planning Obligation Strategy:** provides a framework for securing the provision of new and/or improvements to existing infrastructure generated by the demands of new development. It also seeks to mitigate the adverse impacts of development and addresses the needs identified to accommodate the projected growth of Cambridge. The SPD addresses issues including transport, open space and recreation, education and life-long learning, community facilities, waste and other potential development-specific requirements.
- 4.5 **Cambridge City Council (January 2010) - Public Art:** This SPD aims to guide the City Council in creating and providing public art in Cambridge by setting out clear objectives on public art, a clarification of policies, and the means of implementation. It covers public art delivered through the planning process, principally Section 106 Agreements (S106), the commissioning of public art using the S106 Public Art Initiative, and outlines public art policy guidance.

4.6 **Old Press/Mill Lane Supplementary Planning Document (January 2010)** Guidance on the redevelopment of the Old Press/Mill Lane site.

Eastern Gate Supplementary Planning Document (October 2011)

Guidance on the redevelopment of the Eastern Gate site. The purpose of this development framework (SPD) is threefold:

- To articulate a clear vision about the future of the Eastern Gate area;
- To establish a development framework to co-ordinate redevelopment within
- the area and guide decisions (by the Council and others); and
- To identify a series of key projects, to attract and guide investment (by the Council and others) within the area.

5.0 **Material Considerations**

Central Government Guidance

5.1 **Letter from Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government (27 May 2010)**

The coalition government is committed to rapidly abolish Regional Strategies and return decision making powers on housing and planning to local councils. Decisions on housing supply (including the provision of travellers sites) will rest with Local Planning Authorities without the framework of regional numbers and plans.

5.2 **Written Ministerial Statement: Planning for Growth (23 March 2011)**

Includes the following statement:

When deciding whether to grant planning permission, local planning authorities should support enterprise and facilitate housing, economic and other forms of sustainable development. Where relevant and consistent with their statutory obligations they should therefore:

(i) consider fully the importance of national planning policies aimed at fostering economic growth and employment, given the need to ensure a return to robust growth after the recent recession;

(ii) take into account the need to maintain a flexible and responsive supply of land for key sectors, including housing;

(iii) consider the range of likely economic, environmental and social benefits of proposals; including long term or indirect benefits such as increased consumer choice, more viable communities and more robust local economies (which may, where relevant, include matters such as job creation and business productivity);

(iv) be sensitive to the fact that local economies are subject to change and so take a positive approach to development where new economic data suggest that prior assessments of needs are no longer up-to-date;

(v) ensure that they do not impose unnecessary burdens on development.

In determining planning applications, local planning authorities are obliged to have regard to all relevant considerations. They should ensure that they give appropriate weight to the need to support economic recovery, that applications that secure sustainable growth are treated favourably (consistent with policy in PPS4), and that they can give clear reasons for their decisions.

5.3 City Wide Guidance

Arboricultural Strategy (2004) - City-wide arboricultural strategy.

Biodiversity Checklist for Land Use Planners in Cambridgeshire and Peterborough (March 2001) - This document aims to aid strategic and development control planners when considering biodiversity in both policy development and dealing with planning proposals.

Cambridge Landscape and Character Assessment (2003) – An analysis of the landscape and character of Cambridge.

Cambridge City Nature Conservation Strategy (2006) – Guidance on habitats should be conserved and enhanced, how this should be carried out and how this relates to Biodiversity Action Plans.

Criteria for the Designation of Wildlife Sites (2005) – Sets out the criteria for the designation of Wildlife Sites.

Cambridge City Wildlife Sites Register (2005) – Details of the City and County Wildlife Sites.

Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (November 2010) - a tool for planning authorities to identify and evaluate the extent and nature of flood risk in their area and its implications for land use planning.

Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (2005) – Study assessing the risk of flooding in Cambridge.

Cambridge and Milton Surface Water Management Plan (2011) – A SWMP outlines the preferred long term strategy for the management of surface water. Alongside the SFRA they are the starting point for local flood risk management.

Cambridge City Council (2011) - Open Space and Recreation

Strategy: Gives guidance on the provision of open space and recreation facilities through development. It sets out to ensure that open space in Cambridge meets the needs of all who live, work, study in or visit the city and provides a satisfactory environment for nature and enhances the local townscape, complementing the built environment.

The strategy:

- sets out the protection of existing open spaces;
- promotes the improvement of and creation of new facilities on existing open spaces;
- sets out the standards for open space and sports provision in and through new development;
- supports the implementation of Section 106 monies and future Community Infrastructure Levy monies

As this strategy suggests new standards, the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 standards will stand as the adopted standards for the time-being. However, the strategy's new standards will form part of the evidence base for the review of the Local Plan

Balanced and Mixed Communities – A Good Practice Guide (2006)

– Produced by Cambridgeshire Horizons to assist the implementation of the Areas of Major Change.

Green Infrastructure Strategy for the Cambridgeshire Sub-Region (2006)

- Produced by Cambridgeshire Horizons to assist the implementation of the Areas of Major Change and as a material consideration in the determination of planning applications and appeals.

A Major Sports Facilities Strategy for the Cambridge Sub-Region (2006)

- Produced by Cambridgeshire Horizons to assist the implementation of the Areas of Major Change.

Cambridge Sub-Region Culture and Arts Strategy (2006)

- Produced by Cambridgeshire Horizons to assist the implementation of the Areas of Major Change.

Cambridgeshire Quality Charter for Growth (2008)

– Sets out the core principles of the level of quality to be expected in new developments in the Cambridge Sub-Region

Cambridge City Council - Guidance for the application of Policy 3/13 (Tall Buildings and the Skyline) of the Cambridge Local Plan (2006) (2012) - sets out in more detail how existing council policy can

be applied to proposals for tall buildings or those of significant massing in the city.

Cambridge Walking and Cycling Strategy (2002) – A walking and cycling strategy for Cambridge.

Protection and Funding of Routes for the Future Expansion of the City Cycle Network (2004) – Guidance on how development can help achieve the implementation of the cycle network.

Cambridgeshire Design Guide For Streets and Public Realm (2007): The purpose of the Design Guide is to set out the key principles and aspirations that should underpin the detailed discussions about the design of streets and public spaces that will be taking place on a site-by-site basis.

Cycle Parking Guide for New Residential Developments (2010) – Gives guidance on the nature and layout of cycle parking, and other security measures, to be provided as a consequence of new residential development.

Air Quality in Cambridge – Developers Guide (2008) - Provides information on the way in which air quality and air pollution issues will be dealt with through the development control system in Cambridge City. It compliments the Sustainable Design and Construction Supplementary Planning Document.

The Cambridge Shopfront Design Guide (1997) – Guidance on new shopfronts.

Roof Extensions Design Guide (2003) – Guidance on roof extensions.

Modelling the Costs of Affordable Housing (2006) – Toolkit to enable negotiations on affordable housing provision through planning proposals.

5.6 Area Guidelines

Cambridge City Council (2003)–Northern Corridor Area Transport Plan:

Cambridge City Council (2002)–Southern Corridor Area Transport Plan:

Cambridge City Council (2002)–Eastern Corridor Area Transport Plan:

Cambridge City Council (2003)–Western Corridor Area Transport Plan:

The purpose of the Plan is to identify new transport infrastructure and service provision that is needed to facilitate large-scale development and to identify a fair and robust means of calculating how individual

development sites in the area should contribute towards a fulfilment of that transport infrastructure.

Buildings of Local Interest (2005) – A schedule of buildings of local interest and associated guidance.

Brooklands Avenue Conservation Area Appraisal (2002)
Cambridge Historic Core Conservation Area Appraisal (2006)
Storeys Way Conservation Area Appraisal (2008)
Chesterton and Ferry Lane Conservation Area Appraisal (2009)
Conduit Head Road Conservation Area Appraisal (2009)
De Freville Conservation Area Appraisal (2009)
Kite Area Conservation Area Appraisal (1996)
Newnham Croft Conservation Area Appraisal (1999)
Southacre Conservation Area Appraisal (2000)
Trumpington Conservation Area Appraisal (2010)
Mill Road Area Conservation Area Appraisal (2011)
West Cambridge Conservation Area Appraisal (2011)

Guidance relating to development and the Conservation Area including a review of the boundaries.

Jesus Green Conservation Plan (1998)
Parkers Piece Conservation Plan (2001)
Sheeps Green/Coe Fen Conservation Plan (2001)
Christs Pieces/New Square Conservation Plan (2001)

Historic open space guidance.

Hills Road Suburbs and Approaches Study (March 2012)
Long Road Suburbs and Approaches Study (March 2012)
Barton Road Suburbs and Approaches Study (March 2009)
Huntingdon Road Suburbs and Approaches Study (March 2009)
Madingley Road Suburbs and Approaches Study (March 2009)
Newmarket Road Suburbs and Approaches Study (October 2011)

Provide assessments of local distinctiveness which can be used as a basis when considering planning proposals

Station Area Development Framework (2004) – Sets out a vision and Planning Framework for the development of a high density mixed use area including new transport interchange and includes the **Station Area Conservation Appraisal**.

Southern Fringe Area Development Framework (2006) – Guidance which will help to direct the future planning of development in the Southern Fringe.

West Cambridge Masterplan Design Guidelines and Legal Agreement (1999) – Sets out how the West Cambridge site should be developed.

Mitcham's Corner Area Strategic Planning and Development Brief (2003) – Guidance on the development and improvement of Mitcham's Corner.

Mill Road Development Brief (Robert Sayle Warehouse and Co-Op site) (2007) – Development Brief for Proposals Site 7.12 in the Cambridge Local Plan (2006)

PLANNING COMMITTEE

1st April 2015

Application Number	14/1154/FUL	Agenda Item	
Date Received	17th July 2014	Officer	Mr Tony Collins
Target Date	16th October 2014		
Ward	Abbey		
Site	West's Garage Ltd	217 Newmarket Road	
	Cambridge CB5 8HD		
Proposal	The erection of new student housing (202 study bedrooms) and associated communal facilities, cycle parking, and external landscaping following demolition of the existing buildings.		
Applicant	HUB Cambridge LLP		

SUMMARY	<p>The development accords with the Development Plan for reasons which include the following:</p> <p>The scale and amended massing of the development respond appropriately to the context, including the conservation area.</p> <p>Independent consultants engaged by the Council have endorsed the applicants' assessment that the building would not cause unacceptable impacts on daylight or sunlight to neighbouring residential properties, and the proposal would not have any other unacceptable impacts on the residential amenity of neighbours</p> <p>The building provides an acceptable level of residential amenity for future occupiers</p>
RECOMMENDATION	APPROVAL

A.0 INTRODUCTION

- A.1 A report on this application was prepared and placed on the agenda for Planning Committee of 3rd December 2014. The recommendation was for refusal. The reasons for refusal set out in that agenda are attached to this report as Appendix A. After publication of that agenda, the applicants asked that a decision be deferred in order to allow them to make further amendments to the scheme. This was agreed, and the application was not discussed at December Committee. Amendments have now been made to the scheme, and additional information has also been submitted. The changes, and the additional information, are set out in section 2 below.

1.0 SITE DESCRIPTION/AREA CONTEXT

- 1.1 The site is a roughly rectangular site of 0.36 ha at the corner of Newmarket Road and River Lane. It has been occupied since the 1950's by a motor vehicle business. Vehicle repair operations on this site have gradually diminished in favour of vehicle sales. The desire to create additional vehicle sales space lies behind the present site owners' wish to relocate
- 1.2 The site is not allocated in the Cambridge Local Plan (2006), nor in the Cambridge Development Plan 2014 Draft Submission. It lies within the area of the Eastern Gate SPD, and within the Eastern Gate Opportunity Area in the Draft Submission.
- 1.3 The site falls outside any conservation area, but the boundary of the Riverside section of City of Cambridge Conservation Area No.1 (Central) runs along the western and northern boundaries of the site. There are three rowan trees just outside the northeast boundary of the site (within land owned by the City Council) which are protected by their position within the conservation area.
- 1.4 The site falls within the controlled parking zone.

2.0 THE PROPOSAL

- 2.1 The application proposes the removal of all buildings on the site (and the three rowan trees on adjacent land to the north), and the erection of buildings to house 202 students.
- 2.2 The scheme comprises four components grouped round a central courtyard which would be at basement level (one storey below

Newmarket Road street level). On the west side would be a two-storey building (termed the 'pavilion' building) while ranges along Newmarket Road, River Lane and Rowlinson Way would form a single main building enclosing the other three sides of the courtyard. The pavilion would have rooms facing the courtyard only, while the other three ranges would be double-banked, with rooms facing both the courtyard and the street.

2.3 The main entrance would be at the corner of River Lane and Newmarket Road. There would be a subsidiary entrance half-way along the River lane frontage. There would be a large double-height common room on the Newmarket Road side, allowing views out to the basement-level courtyard, with a reception point alongside the corner entrance. Cycle storage would be provided within the building off Newmarket Road and Rowlinson Way and bin stores off Rowlinson Way and River Lane. The upper floors, whose configuration is described in the assessment below, would contain student rooms grouped with shared kitchens.

2.4 The application was originally accompanied by the following supporting information:

1. Design and Access Statement
2. Planning Statement
3. Heritage Statement
4. Foul and Surface Water Drainage Strategy
5. Geoenvironmental Desk Study
6. Daylight and Sunlight Report
7. Energy Statement
8. Ventilation Statement
9. Transport Statement and Travel Plan
10. Noise Impact Assessment
11. Sustainability Statement and Checklist

2.5 In October 2014, amended plans and an addendum to the Design and Access Statement were received which showed the following amendments and additional information:

- ☐ Extended mullions to the rear windows on the Newmarket Road range to protect privacy in Godesdone Road. (Diagrams to show arcs of visibility are also included)
- ☐ Bronze cladding and blind windows to rear of pavilion block facing Godesdone Road gardens

- ☐ Shadow studies of courtyard
- ☐ Comparison of courtyard with equivalent space in student accommodation at the Brunswick site.
- ☐ Enlarged windows in courtyard elevations.
- ☐ Sunlight and daylight analysis for courtyard rooms
- ☐ Shadow analysis of site context with and without the development
- ☐ BRE sunlight and daylight analyses of 6-24 River Lane
- ☐ Additional facade detailing (soldier courses, stone mouldings, rusticated brick piers)
- ☐ Specifications for photographs and CGI images in the application
- ☐ Additional information on River Lane tree planting

2.6 In January, amended plans and a revised Design and Access Statement were received which showed the following amendments:

- ☐ Reduction in massing at western end of Newmarket Road range
- ☐ River Lane frontage set back from street
- ☐ Revised tree planting scheme in River Lane and Rowlinson Way.
- ☐ Pitched roofs added to pavilion building and Rowlinson Way range
- ☐ Reconfiguration of communal area in Newmarket Road range to allow views into courtyard through double-height space

2.7 The following additional information was also provided:

- ☐ Daylight and sunlight study for the amended proposal
- ☐ Verified views of amended scheme from Newmarket Road, River Lane and Coldhams Lane
- ☐ Methodology for verified views

3.0 SITE HISTORY

3.1 There is extensive history on this site in connection with the garage use, stretching back from 2006 to the 1960's, but the only relevant previous application is shown below.

Reference	Description	Outcome
13/1780	The erection of new student housing (257 study bedrooms)	Withdrawn

and associated communal facilities, cycle parking, and external landscaping following demolition of the existing buildings.

4.0 PUBLICITY

4.1	Advertisement:	Yes
	Adjoining Owners:	Yes
	Site Notice Displayed:	Yes

5.0 POLICY

5.1 See Appendix 1 for full details of Central Government Guidance, Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies, Supplementary Planning Documents and Material Considerations.

5.2 Relevant Development Plan policies

PLAN		POLICY NUMBER
Cambridge Plan 2006	Local	3/1 3/4 3/7 3/8 3/11 3/12 3/13
		4/4 4/11 4/13 4/14
		7/10
		8/2 8/3 8/6 8/9 8/10
		10/1

5.3 Relevant Central Government Guidance, Supplementary Planning Documents and Material Considerations

Central Government	National Planning Policy Framework March
-----------------------	--

Guidance	<p>2012</p> <p>National Planning Policy Framework – Planning Practice Guidance March 2014</p> <p>Circular 11/95</p>
Supplementary Planning Guidance	<p>Sustainable Design and Construction (May 2007)</p> <p>Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Waste Partnership (RECAP): Waste Management Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (February 2012)</p> <p>Planning Obligation Strategy (March 2010)</p> <p>Public Art (January 2010)</p> <p>Eastern Gate Supplementary Planning Document (October 2011)</p>
	<p><u>City Wide Guidance</u></p> <p>Arboricultural Strategy (2004)</p> <p>Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (November 2010)</p> <p>Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (2005)</p> <p>Cambridge and Milton Surface Water Management Plan (2011)</p> <p>Cambridge City Council (2011) - Open Space and Recreation Strategy</p> <p>Cambridge City Council - Guidance for the application of Policy 3/13 (Tall Buildings and the Skyline) of the Cambridge Local Plan (2006) (2012)</p>

	<p>Cambridge Walking and Cycling Strategy (2002)</p> <p>Cambridgeshire Design Guide For Streets and Public Realm (2007)</p> <p>Cycle Parking Guide for New Residential Developments (2010)</p> <p>Air Quality in Cambridge – Developers Guide (2008)</p>
	<p><u>Area Guidelines</u></p> <p>Cambridge City Council (2002)–Eastern Corridor Area Transport Plan</p> <p>Riverside and Stourbridge Common Conservation Area Appraisal (2012)</p> <p>Newmarket Road Suburbs and Approaches Study (October 2011)</p>

5.4 Status of Proposed Submission – Cambridge Local Plan

Planning applications should be determined in accordance with policies in the adopted Development Plan and advice set out in the NPPF. However, after consideration of adopted plans and the NPPF, policies in emerging plans can also be given some weight when determining applications. For Cambridge, therefore, the emerging revised Local Plan as published for consultation on 19 July 2013 can be taken into account, especially those policies where there are no or limited objections to it. However it is likely, in the vast majority of instances, that the adopted development plan and the NPPF will have considerably more weight than emerging policies in the revised Local Plan.

For the application considered in this report, the following policies in the emerging Local Plan are of relevance:

22 Eastern Gate Opportunity Area

6.0 CONSULTATIONS

Cambridgeshire County Council (Highways Development Management)

First comment (25th July 2014)

- 6.1 On-street works acceptable in principle. Building should be pulled back from River lane frontage to allow wider footway. Residents will not qualify for residents' parking permits.

Second comment (19th August 2014)

- 6.2 Holding objection because further information required. Expected to generate fewer motorised trips than the present use. Framework Travel Plan required. Preferred cycle route should be identified. Cycle parking meets City Council Standards, but confirmation that it is adequate to meet expected need is required.

Third comment (25th September 2014)

- 6.3 Further information required with respect to Tripos Court traffic data submitted. Cycling officer's concerns reiterated. Acceptability of proposed build-outs in River Lane to accommodate trees confirmed.

Fourth comment (10th November 2014)

- 6.4 No information submitted requires further comment from the highway authority.

Fifth comment (13th March 2015)

- 6.5 Issues require addressing before highway authority can give full advice.
- 6.6 Section 4.1 of the Transport Statement identifies a large number of pedestrians and cyclists accessing and egressing the development. Having reviewed the count data contained in the appendices it is apparent that the site is used as a through route by pedestrians and cyclists rather than 'stopping' at the site. This information was requested in our previous response but not yet provided. It is important that the applicant revisits the count

information to exclude those using the site as a through route to understand the net increase in trips generated by the site and distributing onto the surrounding highway network.

- 6.7 The County Council requested that further information be provided to detail whether the counts provided for Tripos Court encapsulate all movements. There are concerns that the survey does not capture all movements including deliveries and servicing which brings into question whether there is a secondary access and potential loss of trips. This information was requested in our previous response but not yet provided.
- 6.8 Concerns have been raised by local residents about cyclists from the development exiting onto Newmarket Road to access Anglia Ruskin University and the Cambridge Retail Park, particularly the potential for those to cycle on path to access crossing points. The County Council request that further consideration/ explanation should be provided to this issue and whether further mitigation is required. This should be accompanied by the number of pedestrians and cyclists expected to cross at this location on Newmarket Road and whether a crossing facility is required.

Head of Refuse and Environment

- 6.9 First Comment (18th August 2014)
- 6.10 No objection. Conditions recommended with respect to: Demolition and Construction Environmental Management Plan (DCEMP), assessment and insulation against traffic noise, assessment and insulation against noise from the adjacent public house, plant noise insulation, contaminated land and waste and recycling. Informatives recommended with respect to: Housing Health & Safety Rating System (HHSRS), noise insulation, waste and recycling.
- 6.11 Second comment (10th February 2015, following amendments)
- 6.12 First comments apply. Additional condition requested to reflect updated guidance.

Urban Design and Conservation Team

First advice (19th August 2014)

- 6.13 Scheme needs to be amended to address a number of concerns identified in these comments.
- 6.14 The privacy of Godesdone Road would be better safeguarded through the introduction of screens at the second floor rear section of the Newmarket Road block. Further articulation of the roof form is needed.
- 6.15 In terms of shadow studies and daylighting, the scheme fails to provide certainty in terms of the proposed courtyard amenity space which appears to fail the criteria identified in the BRE guidelines. In addition, the impact on neighbouring properties is unclear.
- 6.16 The daylighting study highlights significant failings in terms of the VSC and ADF assessment resulting in a number of poor quality living spaces. Further breaks and articulation of the building massing may be required to resolve the concerns highlighted.
- 6.17 In the submitted D&A Statement, the applicant has provided a series of views to demonstrate the impact of the proposals from surrounding streets. The applicant has not provided the 'specification' of each view such as the eye height and focal length. As such it is not possible to verify whether what is shown are accurate visual representations. The SPD at paragraph 3.4.12 states that applicants *'will be expected to produce accurate 3D computer models to inform an appropriate massing of their development proposals and to demonstrate the impact on any key views and vistas'*. Given the proximity to the Conservation Area and the close proximity of properties and associated amenity spaces on Godesdone Road and Beche Road, the applicant needs to confirm the accuracy of submitted views.
- 6.18 In terms of the elevations, the materials palette is acceptable as is the vertical proportioning of the building. A further level of 'richness and detail' is needed to help break up the monolithic qualities of the elevations and help the scheme respond more appropriately to the finer grain of the adjacent Conservation Area.

The linear form of the Rowlinson Way block needs to be further articulated.

- 6.19 Confirmation is needed that the trees proposed along River Lane can actually be delivered. These are crucial to helping to integrate the development into its context. Details of improvements to the Newmarket Road public realm are also needed.
- 6.20 As proposed the scheme fails to meet Policy 3/4, 3/7 and 3/12 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2006) and cannot be supported in Urban Design & Conservation terms.

Second advice (5th November 2014, following amendments)

- 6.21 Amendments and clarifications reviewed. Further comments, to address the urban design and conservation issues raised. We have reviewed this information and have the following comments to make.
- 6.22 Privacy of Godesdone Road residents – extended mullions resolves this concern.
- 6.23 Further articulation of the roof of the pavilion block – not sufficient; building still reads as strongly horizontal
- 6.24 Photo specifications suggest rear of the Newmarket Road block will read more significantly than previously thought and that it will impact on existing Godesdone Road properties - overbearing scale.
- 6.25 Shadow studies have been provided that show that the courtyard will be heavily shaded for over 6 months of the year – not acceptable. Comparison with Brunswick House student scheme – not valid because of level and degree of connection with exterior spaces.
- 6.26 Overshadowing in River Lane: analysis reveals that 3 of the existing houses opposite fail the BRE assessment as a result of the proposals. This indicates that the continuous built form and scale of this end is too great and fails to respond to the established context. Reduction in storey heights, combined with a more broken form is required.

- 6.27 Some courtyard units previously failed the BRE VSC and ADF assessment larger windows have resolved these concerns.
- 6.28 The introduction of the rusticated brickwork and cill and window head details all combine to provide both visual and shadow interest.
- 6.29 Rowlinson Way elevation, metal panels go some way to break up the linear nature of the block, but roof form still reads as a strong horizontal against the more varied forms of the adjacent Conservation Area. A further issue regarding overlooking of the rear gardens to houses fronting on to River Lane has been identified that needs to be resolved.
- 6.30 No confirmation has been provided that the trees on River Lane can be delivered.
- 6.31 Photo specifications have now been provided which reveal that the images shown on pages 36, 38, 39 of the Design & Access Statement Addendum were taken with a 17mm focal length, view across the Conservation Area is 22mm and photomerge images on pages 42, 43, 44 are all taken with an 18mm focal length. This has the effect of misrepresenting the scheme and making it appear less dominant than it will be in reality. Therefore the scheme will appear closer and more dominant than shown in each of these images and raises significant concerns about whether the overall scale and massing is appropriate for the existing established context.
- 6.32 The scheme has not addressed concerns of the D&C Panel regarding the bulky form of the Newmarket Road and River Lane building.
- 6.33 Conclusion: Overall the scheme fails to resolve a number of concerns and additional information has revealed significant new concerns which relate to the overall massing and consequent negative impacts of the scheme. As such it is likely that the proposals represent overdevelopment of the site and that an alternative development form is needed. Application in its current form fails to satisfy Policies 3/4, 3/7, 3/11, 3/13 and 4/11 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2006). Not supported.

Third advice (17th March 2015, following further amendments)

- 6.34 The full text of this advice is attached to this report as Appendix B. The conclusion is set out in full below.
- 6.35 The proposals will result in a significant change to the corner of Newmarket Road and River Lane. The verified views demonstrate the impact of the scheme in a more accurate way and allay previous concerns about how the proposals will sit in their context. As a result, the overall impact on the Conservation Area of the revised proposals is considered to be acceptable.
- 6.36 The amendments to the Godesdone Road and Rowlinson Way blocks to introduce a series of pitched gables, have removed previous concerns about the overly horizontal form addressed concerns about the impact of the horizontal forms of the proposed buildings that abut the adjacent Conservation Area.
- 6.37 In terms of the sunlight and daylight impacts, the usability of the amenity space has been independently assessed and is considered to be acceptable. The impact on properties to the east of the site on River Lane has been independently assessed and is considered to be acceptable.
- 6.38 The amendments to the scheme and additional information provided have improved the overall scheme and clarified the potential level of impact on the Conservation Area and adjacent properties. Overall the proposals are considered to be acceptable in design and conservation terms.

Head of Streets and Open Spaces (Landscape Team)

First comment (17th August 2014)

Courtyard:

- 6.39 Unclear how drainage strategy requirements and landscape proposals will interact. Large attenuation tank required to manage storm water drainage will conflict with tree planting strategy. Absence of tree planting will mean a loss of quality.
- 6.40 Greatly concerned about the quality of daylight in the courtyard space. Brunswick House not comparable with this application. In-paving planting around the seating areas unsustainable and not

supported. Access to courtyard awkward. Access from the ground floor common room should be provided.

Streetscape

- 6.41 Disappointed by lack of articulation of the building frontage and lack of tree or shrub planting on Newmarket Road.
- 6.42 Street trees along River Lane are vital to making the development settle into its surroundings. Need utilities survey and highway authority approval to demonstrate deliverability. Rear aspect of the Rowlinson Way block should be pulled back to allow for either the retention of the existing trees or for the provision of new trees. This boundary represents the edge of the conservation area and the trees help to soften and illustrate this edge.

Summary:

- 6.43 Not supported because of drainage/landscape interface issue, shadowing in the courtyard and requirement for streetscape softening.

Second comment (14th February 2015)

Courtyard

- 6.44 The courtyard space has decreased in size in order to allow for the changes to the River Lane frontage to occur. It's a difficult compromise to consider as they are equally valuable spaces. This change makes it even more important for a high quality landscape design to be produced which takes advantage of every positive element and adequately addresses the negative aspects. The proposed landscape plan seeks to achieve this with a specialised palette of plants suitable for low light situations, interesting seating arrangements and high quality materials.
- 6.45 The central open space is now achieving 2hrs of sunlight on the 21st of March which fulfils the BRE guidance. The applicant also states that the current scheme is an improvement to the previous iteration because of the improvement to the percentage of sunlight totals. An independent sunlight/shadowing assessment was completed by eb7 which verifies these statements and for that

reason, we are satisfied with the open space proposals in terms of size and aspect.

- 6.46 The relationship between the common spaces available within the lower ground and the courtyard is a welcome solution to the access issues highlighted in previous comments.

Streetscape

- 6.47 We are disappointed with the lack of consideration given to the Newmarket frontage in respect to the lack of tree or shrub planting which would soften the impact of such a monolithic structure. The hotels opposite have both provided street trees within their curtilages and we feel this could have been mirrored at this key location too.

Conclusion

- 6.48 Landscape can now support the proposed scheme.

Senior Sustainability Officer (Design and Construction)

- 6.49 Use of photovoltaics, CHP and air-source heat pumps acceptable. 10% carbon saving exceeded. Noise implications of air-source heat pumps must be addressed. Green and brown roofs supported.

Head of Streets and Open Spaces (Walking and Cycling Officer)

- 6.50 Cycle parking acceptable. Flush kerb needed for exit from Newmarket Road. Building should be set back from River Lane corner to allow for increased pedestrian use.

Access Officer

- 6.51 Should be 12 disabled rooms. Should be one disabled parking space for every disabled occupier. Parking spaces should not be on the external road. Location of disabled rooms not clear. Recommendations on detailed design of rooms.

Environment Agency

- 6.52 No objection subject to conditions on ground contamination, infiltration of water, piling, surface water drainage and pollution control. (No changes to this comment following amendments to scheme.)

Anglian Water

- 6.53 Foul sewerage network has capacity. Surface water/ flood risk assessment satisfactory.

Cambridgeshire Constabulary (Architectural Liaison Officer)

- 6.54 No objection to the proposal from a crime prevention or security perspective.
- 6.55 Support: main entrance design, security staffing for at least 16 hours/day, visitor access strategy.
- 6.56 Recommend: changes to recessed entrance off River Lane, fire doors on River Lane to be alarmed, student access fobs to be for main entrance and individual cluster only, ground floor windows to be blocked by internal screen or to have restricted opening, improved lighting and CCTV to cycle store.

Design and Conservation Panel (Meeting of 14th May 2014)

- 6.57 The conclusions of the Panel meeting were as follows:
- 6.58 **Courtyard.** Strong reservations were expressed as to the success of this central 'green oasis'. Located one storey below street level and flanked by elevations of five storeys, the Panel felt this would likely be a dank, gloomy area where planting beds would struggle to receive appropriate levels of sunlight. (Data on shadow/sunlight analysis would have been a helpful addition to the presentation.) The fact that drainage for the courtyard was yet to be examined was an additional concern. The design team are also recommended to explore the less ambitious possibility of using the courtyard as a more flexible outdoor gathering space for students, subject to effective management.
- 6.59 **River Lane elevation.**

- o Street trees. The Panel welcome the intention to introduce a new line of replacement street trees along this elevation that would help to offset the scale of the proposed development of this site. However, as the width of River Lane reduces significantly as it approaches Newmarket Road and there would likely be servicing requirements below ground, the deliverability of substantial re-planting was questioned.
- o Scale and massing. This was seen as a particular issue along this frontage and needs to be revised. As proposed, it appears longer and taller than the Newmarket Road elevation, with fenestration that fails to adequately break up the mass. A reduction in the scale is needed, with a stepping down for a less monolithic appearance. A reduction in the length of the facade to allow for replacement trees at the end of River Lane/Rowlinson Way junction could also contribute towards a more successful integration of a new development located adjacent to a Conservation Area.
- o Ground floor level accommodation (defensible spaces). Scepticism was expressed as to the likely success of these recessed areas as further opportunities for planting. It is the Panel's view that the proposed railings are likely to encourage the accumulation of litter, while poor levels of sunlight would make successful planting a challenge.
- o Student drop-off. For a proposal comprising 248 student rooms, the Panel were disappointed that a management plan for arrivals/departures at peak times was yet to be considered.
- o Servicing/car parking. The Panel understands that the City Council as landowner was yet to grant vehicular access to the scheme from Rowlinson Way.

6.60 **Newmarket Road frontage.** The Panel were broadly comfortable with the arrangement of the fenestration and vertical banding. The exploration into landscape improvements on Newmarket Road should also be investigated.

6.61 **River Lane/Newmarket Road corner.** This was seen as bulky and in need of re-examination.

6.62 **Student rooms.** Very little flexibility of layout or furniture is permissible in the narrow (2.2m wide) rooms. The architects are strongly advised to revisit the modules to create more useful, higher quality living spaces.

6.63 **Materials.** Very few comments were made as to the materials palette although it was generally regarded that the bronze-coloured cladding could be successful. (The architects are advised to angle the metal cills at a gradient that discourages pigeons from roosting.)

6.64 **Conclusion.** This development was presented as the creation of a 'gateway' in the context of the changing character of Newmarket Road. However, as the site abuts a Conservation Area comprising primarily two-storey residential dwellings, the Panel would have welcomed greater appreciation of the scheme's context and how this has informed its scale and massing particularly in relation to the impact on the modest dwellings on the western side of River Lane. The meanness of the student rooms underlines the overdeveloped nature of the proposal as a whole. The landscaping and opportunity for street trees particularly along River Lane and also Newmarket Road requires further consideration.

6.65 **VERDICT – RED (5), AMBER (1)**

Design and Conservation Panel (Meeting of 11th February 2015)

6.66 The Panel considered the most recent iteration of the scheme. Its conclusions were as follows:

6.67 The Panel appreciated that several adjustments had been made in response to comments from the previous review in May 2014.

6.68 **Eastern elevation.** The setting back of this elevation is a welcome improvement, as it allows for an improved public realm along River Lane both in terms of planting and greater separation from adjacent properties.

6.69 **Vertical townhouses.** The Panel was told that the massing of the building was seen as a series of vertical townhouses. This assertion was questioned, not least as massing of this development seems predominantly to consist of long horizontal blocks.

6.70 **Central courtyard.** The Panel continues to have concerns about this space being located a floor below the street and entrance level. Although the submission of additional technical information

on sunlight exposure is noted, (though it was not shown to the Panel), there were still concerns about overshadowing of the space from the surrounding blocks. In addition the circulation routes down to the courtyard seem very unclear and indirect.

- 6.71 **Context of Newmarket Road** This development needs to respond more effectively to its new context of the taller hotels along Newmarket Road.
- 6.72 **Termination to Coldham's Lane.** Although the Panel were informed of the SPD's limited specifications for this area, there was nevertheless the view that a more positive marker was needed for this end of Coldham's Lane. The view across from Coldham's Lane is a key view of the scheme, which does not yet live up to its potential to hold the opposite corner. Local sensitivities regarding building heights in this area are understood.
- 6.73 **Elevations to Newmarket Road** Although this elevation has developed, the Panel felt that the rigid grid of windows currently shown falls short of what a building in this prominent position requires. It was suggested that the horizontal bands of fenestration to the nearby Premier Inn achieve a degree of flexibility in window placement. Further work is needed here.
- 6.74 **Design of windows.** Further thought is also needed in terms of the detailed design of the windows to the student rooms to achieve daylighting, views, ventilation, sound attenuation, privacy and security. A very generic window design is currently illustrated on the elevations.
- 6.75 **Student rooms and adaptability.** The Panel questioned the proposed room width of 2.25 metres, which seems tight and allows for no flexibility in the layout of furniture. Issues around possible future change of use and adaptability are worth considering as more generous room widths would allow for a wider range of uses.
- 6.76 **Studio rooms** The Panel questioned whether the recessed windows achieved any benefits. At ground floor level they could become unsightly litter traps.
- 6.77 **Circulation corridors.** The Panel questioned the need for double corridors to achieve room groupings. They seemed to be very

narrow and, with no exposure to natural light, would need to be artificially lit at all times.

6.78 **Renewables/sustainability.** The Panel would encourage a more holistic approach to an environmental strategy for the development that goes beyond the token inclusion of PV panels.

6.79 **Conclusion.** Although the Panel welcome the improved visibility through to the courtyard from the ground floor cafe, and the set-back on the eastern elevation allowing River Lane more breathing space, it was felt that the design team have still failed to respond to the fundamental points raised at the last review. The majority Red vote should have prompted a substantial re-think, yet key areas of concern such as the quality of the accommodation and sunken courtyard remain substantially unchanged. This is a high profile site which deserves a better scheme.

6.80 **VERDICT – RED (6), AMBER (2)**

6.81 The above responses are a summary of the comments that have been received. Full details of the consultation responses can be inspected on the application file.

7.0 REPRESENTATIONS

7.1 The owners/occupiers of the following addresses made representations objecting to the proposal on the basis of the original drawings:

52 Abbey Road	11 Godesdone Road
69 Beche Road	12 Godesdone Road
82 Beche Road	14 Godesdone Road
84 Beche Road	20 Godesdone Road
85 Beche Road	45 River Lane
86 Beche Road	51 River Lane
94 Beche Road	48 Riverside
6 Godesdone Road	27 Silverwood Close
10 Godesdone Road	

7.2 Representations of objection on that basis were also received from:

Riverside Area Residents Association
CHS Limited, the housing association responsible for houses in
River Lane, Rowlinson Way and Stevenson Court
The user of a garage on Rowlinson Way

7.3 The representations can be summarised as follows:

Principle

- ☐ Introduces transient population
- ☐ Intensity of use
- ☐ Wasted opportunity to build houses

Context and design

- ☐ Overlarge scale
- ☐ Too massive
- ☐ Inappropriate development model (Double-banked, pushed to edges of site)
- ☐ Unbroken rooflines
- ☐ Sets precedent for harmful development in historic high street
- ☐ Not appropriate to mimic scale of buildings south of Newmarket Road
- ☐ Not in keeping with conservation area
- ☐ Creates canyon
- ☐ Appropriating highway land for cycle parking and bin collection
- ☐ No improvement to public realm

Neighbour amenity

- ☐ Overlooking towards: Godesdone Road, Beche Road, rear of west side of River Lane, opposite side of River Lane
- ☐ Overshadowing: in River Lane, in Godesdone Road
- ☐ Plant noise
- ☐ Rubbish
- ☐ Polluted air funnelled down river Lane
- ☐ Increased pedestrian traffic through housing area to the east
- ☐ Loss of privacy – River Lane
- ☐ Noise

Amenity for future occupiers

- ☐ Not enough leisure space or services for student occupiers

- ☐ Courtyard overshadowed

Highway issues

- ☐ Highway safety issues
- ☐ Cycle entrance from Newmarket Road unsafe
- ☐ Obstruction from delivery vehicles in River Lane
- ☐ Pedestrian safety at risk from narrower pavements
- ☐ Highway safety at corner
- ☐ Pick-up and drop-off
- ☐ Traffic generation

Car parking

- ☐ Contractors parking
- ☐ Disabled parking
- ☐ Pressure on car parking

Other issues

- ☐ Images misleading
- ☐ If City Council developed the garage area to the north this would create problems
- ☐ Impact on local doctors and dentists
- ☐ Unsatisfactory disabled access
- ☐ Archaeology

- 7.4 Several of the above respondents, including Riverside Area Residents Association and CHS also commented on the scheme as amended up to December 2014. All of these responses indicated that the amendments have no impact on their fundamental objections to the scheme as submitted.
- 7.5 Representations in support of the application have been received from the Estates Co-ordinator at Anglia Ruskin University
- 7.6 Following the latest amendments, further representations have been received from the owners or occupiers of the following addresses:

86 Beche Road
10 Godesdone Road
12 Godesdone Road
20 Godesdone Road
8 River Lane
10 River Lane
14 River Lane
16 River Lane
46 River Lane
51 River Lane
73 River Lane
48 Riverside

and from Riverside Area Residents Association, and CHS.

- 7.7 The additional representations on the revised scheme can be summarised as follows:

Principle

- ☐ Introduces transient population
- ☐ Intensity of use
- ☐ No significant improvement on original scheme

Context and design

- ☐ Overlarge scale
- ☐ Too massive
- ☐ Unbroken rooflines
- ☐ Bulky form
- ☐ Sets precedent for harmful development in historic high street
- ☐ Not appropriate to mimic scale of buildings south of Newmarket Road – north side should form key context
- ☐ Not in keeping with conservation area
- ☐ Tall form not needed at River Lane corner
- ☐ Newmarket Road frontage too bleak
- ☐ Impinges on views across conservation area
- ☐ Fails to abide by guidance of Eastern Gate SPD
- ☐ Storey heights exceed SPD guidance
- ☐ Poorly designed by comparison with application at Cheddars Lane

Neighbour amenity

- ☐ Overlooking towards: Godesdone Road, Beche Road
- ☐ Overshadowing: in River Lane,
- ☐ Interference with rights to peaceful enjoyment of property
- ☐ Low levels of daylight to neighbours
- ☐ Visual domination of Godesdone Road properties by Rowlinson Way range and pavilion building
- ☐ Noise from access to cycle parking

Amenity for future occupiers

- ☐ Not enough leisure space or services for student occupiers
- ☐ Courtyard overshadowed
- ☐ Vertical house model should be employed

Highway issues

- ☐ Unsafe cycle route
- ☐ Highway safety at corner
- ☐ Pick-up and drop-off
- ☐ Cycle path in Rowlinson Way not possible

Car parking

- ☐ Disabled parking
- ☐ Pressure on car parking

Other issues

- ☐ Images misleading
- ☐ Deficiencies in drawings

7.8 Representations in support of the revised proposal have been received from the Estates Co-ordinator at Anglia Ruskin University. The co-ordinator states that the room sizes proposed are considered appropriate by the University.

7.9 The above representations are a summary of the comments that have been received. Full details of the representations can be inspected on the application file.

8.0 ASSESSMENT

8.1 From the consultation responses and representations received and from my inspection of the site and the surroundings, I consider that the main issues are:

1. Principle of development
2. Context of site, design and external spaces
3. Public Art
4. Renewable energy and sustainability
5. Disabled access
6. Residential amenity
7. Refuse arrangements
8. Highway safety
9. Car and cycle parking
10. Third party representations
11. Planning Obligation Strategy

Principle of Development

- 8.2 This is not an allocated site. The principle of development for student accommodation would be in accordance with development plan policy provided that clauses in a Section 106 agreement were in place to restrict occupancy to full-time students of the city's two universities and to prevent such occupiers from keeping cars in the city. The applicants are prepared to enter into such an agreement, although it has not yet been completed.
- 8.3 In my opinion, subject to an appropriate legal agreement to restrict occupancy, the principle of the development is acceptable and in accordance with policy 7/10 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006.

Context of site, design and external spaces

Scale and massing

- 8.4 The proposed buildings would increase in height from north-west to south-east. The 'pavilion' building on the west side of the site, backing on to Godesdone Road gardens, and the Rowlinson Way range to the north would have two storeys above ground level, the River Lane range would begin at two storeys, rise to three storeys after the first three bays, rise again

to a set-back fourth storey after a further three bays, before reaching four full storeys for the last two bays. The full four storey height would be maintained on the diagonal façade at the corner, and along the eastern half of the Newmarket Road frontage. The most recent amendment has altered the configuration at the western end of this range; after the recess in the middle of this frontage, the fourth storey would now be set back for three further bays rather than the previous four and then reduce to three storeys for the final two bays (previously only the final bay was at three storeys).

- 8.5 I have assessed the scale and massing of the proposal against the existing built form which surrounds the site and against the guidance given in the Eastern Gate SPD. I have also considered the advice given by the Urban Design and Conservation team. I also note the concerns very strongly expressed in representations that the storey heights of the proposal do not correspond to the guidance in the SPD and that the proposal does not adhere to the maximum storey heights set out in Figure 39 of the SPD.
- 8.6 However, the SPD makes it clear in Section 3.4 that the heights are recommendations, that the creation of varied heights is important, and that proposals seeking to exceed the recommended storey heights must be tested in a robust way. In my view, the verified images submitted provide this robust testing. I consider that the 50mm lens views, which give a reasonable indication of what the eye would see, indicate that the proposal would respond appropriately to the Corner House, the houses on the opposite side of River Lane, and the houses to the north of the site on River Lane. The proposed buildings would not in my view dominate, nor read jarringly against the scale of these neighbouring buildings. The proposed building does not attempt to replicate the scale of the south side of Newmarket Road, which would in my view be inappropriate. The relationship with the buildings to the west on Newmarket Road is less comfortable, but I do not consider it reasonable to require development on this site to be configured on the basis that the present scale and forms immediately to the west will remain as they are in the long term. The SPD recommend an increase from the present heights on that site in any future development.

- 8.7 I note the particular concern about the four-storey section of the building raised in representations, and the associated assertion that additional height at the River Lane corner is not required. I accept that additional height at this point is not necessary, but in my view, the varying storey height of the proposed building lends interest to the elevations and conforms to the guidance in the SPD, which emphasises the value of varied roof heights. I remain of the view, notwithstanding representations, that setting back the uppermost storey at the corner of the site, whilst conforming strictly to the recommended maximum height in the SPD, would detract from, rather than improve the scheme.
- 8.8 I acknowledge and agree with the assertion of Riverside residents that the double-banked, corridor-based, edge-of-site development model has created difficulties for the scheme's designers, but that model in itself cannot form a reason for refusal, and in my view, the proposal as now configured has successfully overcome the difficulties created by that model. I also note the reference in representations to the student accommodation proposal recently submitted at Cheddars Lane. This application, however, must be judged on its own merits, and not by comparison with other proposed schemes nearby.
- 8.9 The existing buildings in the rear of the site are single-storey, but they have high gabled roofs, and in my view, notwithstanding neighbour representations which are strongly to the contrary, the two-storey height proposed for the pavilion and Rowlinson Way buildings is an appropriate reflection of this, and an acceptable response to the predominance of two-storey, pitched roof houses in the conservation area to the north and west. In my previous report, I identified the strongly horizontal form of these buildings as being unacceptable. The applicant's response to this has been to change the roof form of these blocks to a series of pitched planes. In my view, this is a significant and positive amendment. The apexes of these pitched roofs are above the level of the parapet originally shown, but the valleys are below that line. The pitched roofs are in my view an appropriate allusion to the forms of the commercial roofs currently in place, and relate well to the character of the conservation area. Paragraph 3.4.14 of the Eastern Gate SPD states: '[policy]... is intended to avoid long unvaried rooflines of large new buildings forming dominant and intrusive horizontal bands on the skyline, which would detract from the roofscape of the conservation area and the skyline of

the city...]. It is my view that in this most recent amendment, the two rear blocks are well-articulated, and their form would now avoid harmful impact on the character of the conservation area in line with the above paragraph from the SPD.

- 8.10 In this revised scheme, the reduction in mass at the west end of the Newmarket Road range, the set-back from River Lane, and the improved articulation of the Rowlinson Way range and the pavilion building have addressed the issues which previously concerned me about the massing. The verified images now submitted comply in a robust way with the requirements of Paragraph 3.4.9 of the Eastern Gate SPD, and confirm my view that the design now proposed is compliant with that guidance and acceptable. I am satisfied that the proposal would not have a harmful impact on the conservation area, and is appropriate in its context on the north side of Newmarket Road. I concur with the advice of the Urban Design and Conservation team that the proposal is acceptable in design terms, and complies with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 3/4, 3/12 and 4/11.
- 8.11 I concur with the advice of the Urban Design and Conservation team that the proposal responds in an appropriate manner to its context, including the immediately adjacent conservation area, and is acceptable in design terms.

Architectural detail

- 8.12 In this application, the applicants have responded to concerns about the horizontal mass of the building on both Newmarket Road and River Lane at the time of the previous application by introducing a number of elements which break up that mass and emphasize verticality. Recessed glazed section on both frontages, vertical window shapes, substantial reveals and the clear division of all the frontages into 5m wide, two-window bays which reflect the proportions of nearby houses, are all successful in this respect. In my view these features would diminish the perceived mass of the building and create a more comfortable relationship with the conservation area to the north and west.
- 8.13 Additional details introduced since the original submission of this application include a brickwork soldier course and stone moulding above the ground floor, rusticated brickwork piers around the entrance, and most recently, pitched roofs to both

the pavilion building backing on to Godesdone Road gardens, and the Rowlinson Way range. In my view these are positive changes, which would respond well to the local context, enhancing articulation, increasing the legibility of the principal entrance, and making a more successful transition from Newmarket Road to the character of the conservation area.

Materials

- 8.14 The application proposes a limited palette of materials; the building would be clad mostly in buff brick with pale mortar, and bronze metal would be used for doors, windows and metal cladding at the upper levels. In my view these materials would respond well to the local context. Appropriate quality could be secured by condition. In my view, the detailing and materials of the proposal are appropriate for the context and in accordance with policies 3/4 and 3/12 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006, and the guidance in paragraphs 3.4.18 to 3.4.20 of the Eastern Gate SPD.

Landscaping

- 8.15 The application proposes a central courtyard at basement level. The courtyard is now smaller than originally proposed because of the westward shift of the River Lane Range. I share the view of the landscape team that, on balance, this sacrifice is justified by the benefit achieved on the street frontage. In my report to December Committee, I expressed concerns about the quality of this courtyard space. The present amended scheme addresses this point in two ways: by the creation of a double-height communal space alongside the courtyard, and by an improved landscaping scheme. The double-height space would enable views into and out of the courtyard, making the access route to it more obvious, and enlivening its appearance. The landscaping scheme would make use of plants which thrive at lower levels of sunlight. As I have previously indicated, independent consultants have confirmed that the light levels in the courtyard should be regarded as adequate for a development of this type. The sustainable drainage officer has stated that he does not have concerns about the courtyard. I share the view of the landscape team that the revised proposal is acceptable in landscape terms.

- 8.16 In my earlier report in December, I expressed concerns about the loss the existing rowan trees in Rowlinson Way. I shared the view of the urban design and landscape officers that the introduction of substantial street trees in River Lane to soften and 'green' this part of the development is absolutely essential if the transition from the development into the established conservation area to the north is to be successful. It was my view then that because of uncertainty about the position of utilities in River Lane, the scheme as then configured could not guarantee the provision of appropriate replacement trees, and that consequently, harm would be caused to the character of the conservation area. The scheme as now amended is pulled back from Rowlinson Way at the north end of the River Lane range, allowing the insertion of three new trees as direct replacements for the existing rowans in this location. In addition, the relocation westwards of the River Lane frontage creates a significantly wider public realm at this point, allowing four new street trees to be planted at the south end of River Lane within the application site. In this way, the possibility of conflict with existing underground services is eliminated. Subject to conditions, I am confident that these trees could flourish. Both sets of trees would thus enhance the point of entry into the conservation area and soften the appearance of the new building.
- 8.17 I note the reservations expressed by the landscape team and respondents about the absence of trees on the Newmarket Road frontage, but this is not a specific aspiration of the SPD, and given the building line elsewhere on this side of the street, it would not be reasonable to expect developers to push the building frontage sufficiently far back on this side to accommodate significant trees. In my opinion, the landscaping proposals, both in the courtyard and the street, are acceptable. In this respect, the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 3/4, 3/7, 3/11, 4/4 and 4/11.

Design and Conservation Panel comments

- 8.18 I note that when presented with the amended scheme, Panel not only reiterated the firm 'red' verdict it had given to the earlier iteration of the scheme, but also indicated that in its view, the current design fails to respond to earlier Panel comments, and is of insufficient merit for the site. This is a very clear steer, but although I share some of the panel's misgivings about the

design, I do not consider that any of the issues Panel have raised in their analysis of the present scheme merit a refusal of the application. These issues require detailed assessment, and I set out in the table below my response to the Panel's concerns.

1	Vertical townhouses	The Newmarket Road and River Lane frontages are essentially horizontal, but in my view the fenestration patterns, articulation and detailing are successful in breaking up this horizontal mass in both cases and the design is successful to some extent in alluding to the town house form visually, even though it does not follow it functionally. I do not believe this comment could sustain a reason for refusal.
2	Central courtyard	The courtyard is a limited space, but the external consultants' review of daylight and sunlight information confirms that the light levels should be regarded as acceptable. I do not believe a refusal reason based on courtyard shortcomings could be sustained in this context.
3	Context - opposite side of Newmarket Road	Panel's verdict appears to suggest that new development on the north side of Newmarket Road should emulate more closely the forms already approved on the south side. I do not agree with this view; the two sides of the street have different histories and characters, and in my view the present scheme is successful in achieving a 'middle way' in terms of scale, massing and detail, between the approvals already granted and partly implemented on the south side, and the character of the conservation area to the north. I am firmly of the view that it would not

		be appropriate for a scheme on this site to mimic recent and imminent development on the south side of the road more closely.
	Termination to Coldham's Lane	In my view. Panel's suggestion that the centre of the Newmarket Road elevation of this site should act as a visual termination to Coldham's Lane is not well-founded. To create additional height at this point on the frontage, or to insert some distinctive feature here would be at odds with the guidance in the Eastern Gate SPD, which does not indicate any need for a marker at this point, and would unbalance the elevation when seen from east or west along Newmarket Road.
4	Newmarket Road elevation	Panel's concern is about the fenestration grid on this elevation. In my view, the vertical consistency of window placement is one of the elements which helps to emphasise vertical lines in the elevation and break up the horizontal form, making at least a partial allusion to the town house form. To eliminate these vertical lines would in my view re-emphasise the horizontal form of the range, which would be undesirable in my view, and would conflict with the wish to reduce horizontality expressed elsewhere by Panel.
5	Window design	I note panel's concerns that the window designs shown might either provide insufficient privacy for occupiers, or lead to visual 'untidiness' which would detract from the appearance of the elevations. In my view, this depends on the exact materials used, in particular whether

		clear, tinted, fritted or obscure glass, or other insert panels are used. This can be controlled by condition.
6	Room widths	Panel's view on the greater flexibility offered by wider rooms may be valid, especially if at some future date there is a need to change the building's use, but this is a matter of internal layout and could not form a reason for refusal.
7	Recessed windows	In my view, the recessed windows to studios would make a valuable contribution to the articulation of the building. I accept that they have some potential to trap litter, as can any form of articulation on a street frontage at ground floor level, but this issue can be addressed by condition. It would not be a reason to refuse the application.
8	Double corridors	I share Panel's bafflement at the applicant's insistence on using this configuration, but it is a matter of internal layout, and it could not form a reason for refusal of the application.
9	Renewable energy	The proposal is compliant with Local Plan policy on renewable energy and the Council's Sustainable Development Officer is content with this element of the design. Additional contributions to sustainability, as recommended by Panel, would be welcome, but their absence could not justify refusal of the application.

8.19 To summarise, Panel's concerns are either matters which could be addressed by condition (recessed windows, window design), issues over which Planning control does not have a remit (double corridors, room widths), policies with which the proposal

is already fully compliant (renewable energy, light to courtyard), or suggestions which in my view would detract from the scheme, or raise problems elsewhere (height, fenestration pattern, termination to Coldham's Lane). These points are firmly made in the Panel's advice, but having considered each of them carefully, in consultation with the Urban Design and Conservation team, I do not consider that any of them would justify refusal of the application.

Public Art

- 8.20 The applicants' expressed willingness to contribute to a wider public art scheme for the Eastern Gate area, in accordance with the Eastern Gate SPD, is acceptable in principle, although an Agreement has not yet been completed. Subject to such an agreement, the proposal is in accordance with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 3/7 and 10/1 and the Public Art SPD 2010.

Renewable energy and sustainability

- 8.21 The application proposes the use of photovoltaics, combined heat and power and air source heat pumps. The Sustainability officer is content that the carbon savings generated by the scheme would exceed the 10% required by policy. The noise implications of air source heat pumps would need to be controlled by condition. The Sustainability officer is also content with other measures to increase sustainability, including the use of green and brown roofs.
- 8.22 In my opinion the applicants have suitably addressed the issue of sustainability and renewable energy and the proposal is in accordance with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policy 8/16 and the Sustainable Design and Construction SPD 2007.

Disabled access

- 8.23 The proposal provides for disabled access and provides 16 accessible rooms, which are not all grouped in one place. The issues about detailed design raised by the access officer are not subject to planning control but are either covered by Part M of the Building Regulations or could be addressed by informatives.

- 8.24 I note concerns raised by the access officer and in representations that on-site disabled car parking is not provided. Parking spaces immediately adjacent to the site would, however make access to the development through the River Lane entrance very convenient.
- 8.25 In my opinion the proposal is compliant in respect of disabled access with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 3/7, 3/12 and 7/10.

Residential Amenity

Impact on amenity of neighbouring occupiers

Sunlight and daylight

- 8.26 The applicants have submitted a full daylight and sunlight study with respect to houses on the opposite side of River Lane. I do not consider that daylight or sunlight would be adversely affected in any other direction. In my previous report to Committee, in December 2014, I expressed concerns that the proposed range of the building fronting River Lane would overshadow the front of the houses opposite during the afternoon and evening. The Council has engaged independent consultants, eb7 to review the applicants' daylight and sunlight assessment. The review report is attached to this report as Appendix C.
- 8.27 The consultants' conclusions with respect to daylight for River Lane houses is as follows:

Looking at the overall impacts of the proposal on neighbouring daylight, it is true to say that there are isolated instances where noticeable impacts would occur. With the proposal in place the retained daylight to these windows would be in line with those commonly found in urban areas. On balance, applying professional judgement to the flexibility applied within this report, we would consider the conclusion on daylight to these neighbours to be valid, and the impacts to be acceptable and in line with the intentions of the BRE guidance.

- 8.28 The consultants' conclusions with respect to sunlight for River Lane houses is as follows:

The analysis indicates that there would be no noticeable impact to these neighbours' sunlight by reference to the Annual Probable Sunlight Hours (APSH) assessment. As such, we would agree with the conclusions of this report in that the impacts on the neighbours sunlight would be considered acceptable.

- 8.29 I accept the advice of the independent consultants engaged by the Council that the impacts of the proposal on daylight and sunlight to neighbouring properties are acceptable.

Privacy

- 8.30 In my view, the first series of amendments to the scheme, which introduced 'extended mullions' on windows on the rear of the west end of the Newmarket Road range, would resolve my earlier concerns about possible overlooking from these windows and protect the privacy of residents of Godesdone Road. I do not consider there would be any unacceptable loss of privacy for Godesdone Road residents from the River Lane range windows, because even were it possible to see over the pavilion block, the distance involved would be in excess of 40m. Similarly, even if rear elevations and rear gardens of houses in Beche Road would be visible from upper windows in the rear of the Newmarket Road range, the distances involved would be more than 75m. I do not consider this to be unacceptable. In my previous report to Committee in December, I raised concerns about loss of privacy for the occupiers of No. 33 River Lane. The latest revision reduces the number of first-floor windows in the Rowlinson Way range, which face this house and its garden, and extends the canted window configuration further west along this range, so that only the two windows furthest from River Lane would remain 'uncanted'. In my view, this resolves the issue of loss of privacy in this direction. The south side of the curtilage of No.33 is currently not overlooked, and the arrangement of canted windows would effectively eliminate such overlooking from the scheme. It would also reduce overlooking to gardens further north on River Lane, and in my view, given the mutual overlooking which already exists, no significant loss of privacy would occur in this direction. Beche Road houses and gardens are too far away and too affected by

existing overlooking for the same concern about the Rowlinson Way range to apply to them.

Visual domination

- 8.31 At the time of my previous report to Committee in December, verified views had not been provided. Without them, I had concerns about visual domination of adjacent properties at the west end of the Newmarket Road range and the south end of the River Lane range. The present revised scheme has pulled the whole of the River Lane range back from the highway, increasing the separation of the proposed building from No.6 River Lane, for example, from 11m to 15.5m. The revised scheme has also reduced the massing of the third floor at the west end of the Newmarket Road range. Having studied the verified views now provided, I am of the view that the buildings proposed, in their amended form, would not cause an unacceptable degree of visual domination in either of these locations. I do not consider that the relatively modest heights at the rear of the pavilion building and the west end of the Rowlinson Way range would lead to unacceptable visual domination of houses in Godesdone Road, which would be at a distance of 22m and 18m respectively. I do not consider that the issue of visual domination is of concern anywhere else on the site.

Noise and disturbance

- 8.32 I note neighbour concerns on this issue. However, given the very busy nature of Newmarket Road, the distance of the building from its neighbours, the fact that student accommodation is not likely to lead to a large number of motor vehicle movements, the positioning of the main entrance on Newmarket Road, and the fact that a relatively low proportion of the student rooms face outwards towards nearby houses, I do not consider that the impacts of noise, movement and light from the building on neighbouring occupiers would be unacceptable. I am also mindful of the fact that the premises could revert to vehicle repair activity, which generates considerable noise, without requiring planning permission. I am of the view that the particular issues associated with pick-up and drop-off at the beginnings and ends of university terms could be addressed by a condition requiring a management plan. I do not consider that the impact of increased pedestrian traffic to Tesco, or additional

rubbish would cause significant harm to neighbouring occupiers.

- 8.33 The reduction in mass now proposed at the west end of the Newmarket Road frontage, and the setting back of the River Lane frontage, which are supported by verified views, have resolved my earlier concerns about undue visual domination at 2-16 Godesdone Road and 6-16 River Lane, while the reduction of the number of first-floor windows on Rowlinson Way, together with the application of the canted configuration to all but two of the remaining windows here has resolved my earlier concerns about loss of privacy at 33 -39 River Lane. As far as daylight and sunlight are concerned, a review by independent consultants has concluded that the impact on the sunlight and daylight of neighbours would be acceptable using BRE guidelines. It is my view therefore that the proposed scheme would not have any unacceptable impact on the residential amenity of neighbouring occupiers and is in this respect compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 3/4 and 3/12.

Amenity for future occupiers of the site

- 8.34 In my report to Committee in December, I indicated concerns about the quality of the courtyard space. I have indicated above that I consider the revisions to the courtyard, including amended planting and the creation of a double-height internal communal space alongside the courtyard on the south side, would significantly improve the quality of that space and its amenity value to future occupiers. The independent consultants have confirmed that the levels of daylight and sunlight available to the courtyard, and to rooms looking on to it are acceptable
- 8.35 In my opinion the proposal as now configured would be a high-quality living environment and would provide an appropriate standard of residential amenity for future occupiers, and I consider that in this respect it complies with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 3/7 and 3/12.

Refuse Arrangements

- 8.36 I am of the view that adequate space is provided for the storage of waste and recycling on site. A management plan would be

necessary to ensure satisfactory arrangements for collection and retrieval of bins, but this could be addressed by condition.

- 8.37 In my opinion, subject to such a condition, the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policy 3/12.

Highway safety and the highway network

- 8.38 The highway authority previously raised issues about the narrowness of the footway at the corner of the site. The set-back of the River Lane frontage appears to be to address this issue, although the highway authority has not yet so far commented. The authority has also requested additional information relating to existing and future trip generation, a travel plan, and information relating to cycle access to road crossings to the west of the site. Such information has not been supplied and the County Council cannot therefore properly assess the impact the proposal might have on the highway network. In my view it is likely that mitigating measures secured through conditions or legal agreement will be sufficient to address the highway authority's concerns, and ensure that the proposal is compliant with policy 8/2 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006. The highway authority has not raised concerns about the safety of the cycle entrances, nor has the cycling officer. The highway authority has not raised concerns about obstruction from delivery vehicles.

- 8.39 I will provide updated information about submission of transport information and highway authority advice on the Amendment Sheet or at Committee.

Car and Cycle Parking

- 8.40 The proposal provides no car parking space on site. It provides disabled parking spaces within the street parking spaces on River Lane. In the view of the Access Officer this is not appropriate. He is also of the view that one disabled parking space should be available for every accessible room – 16 in this case. I acknowledge that the disabled car parking provided in this way is limited. To refuse the application on this basis, however, would rely on the requirement in policy 7/10 to make appropriate provision for students who are disabled. Policy 7/10 does not define either the quantum or the proximity to rooms which is necessary to make disabled car parking 'appropriate'

and in my view such a reason would be difficult to defend. Student use of cars can be precluded by a Section 106 agreement, and I do not consider that the application would increase pressure on car parking in the area, which is controlled. Pick-up and drop-off of students at term ends can also be controlled, by a management plan, secured by condition. The cycling officer has indicated that the cycle parking proposed is adequate.

- 8.41 In my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 8/6 and 8/10.

Third Party Representations

- 8.42 I have listed the issues raised below and indicate either the paragraph above where they are addressed, or my assessment of them.

Principle	
Introduces transient population	8.2
Intensity of use	8.2, 8.32, 8.38
Wasted opportunity to build houses	8.2
Context and design	
Overlarge scale	8.4-8.7, 8.9-8.11
Too massive	8.4-8.7, 8.9-8.11
Bulky form	8.4-8.6, 8.8-8.10
Inappropriate development model (Double-banked, pushed to edges of site)	8.8
Unbroken rooflines	8.4, 8.6, 8.7, 8.9, 8.10
Sets precedent for harmful development in historic high street	8.4, 8.6, 8.10
Not appropriate to mimic scale of buildings south of Newmarket Road; north side should form context	8.6
Not in keeping with conservation area	8.4, 8.5, 8.9-8.11
Tall form not needed at River Lane corner	8.7
Newmarket Road frontage too bleak	8.17

Impinges on views across conservation area	8.6
Fails to abide by guidance of Eastern Gate SPD	8.6
Storey heights exceed SPD guidance	8.6
Poorly designed by comparison with Cheddars Lane	8.8
Creates canyon	I do not accept that the scheme would have this impact
Appropriating highway land for cycle parking and bin collection	Only to a very limited degree. Acceptable in my view
No improvement to public realm	No policy basis to require this
Neighbour amenity	
Overlooking	8.30
Overshadowing	8.26-8.29
Rights to peaceful enjoyment of property	8.26-8.32
Low levels of daylight to neighbours	8.26-8.29
Visual domination of Godesdone Road	8.31
Plant noise	Condition could address this
Rubbish	8.32
Polluted air funnelled down river Lane	I do not consider there is evidence for this.
Increased pedestrian traffic through housing area to the east	8.32
Loss of privacy – River Lane	River Lane house frontages are already exposed to public view from the street
Noise	8.32 +condition
Amenity for future occupiers	
Not enough leisure space or services for student occupiers	8.34-35
Courtyard overshadowed	8.34-35
Highway issues	
Highway safety issues	8.38-39

Cycle entrance from Newmarket Road unsafe	8.38-39
Obstruction from delivery vehicles in River Lane	8.38-39
Pedestrian safety at risk from narrower pavements	8.38-39
Highway safety at corner	8.38-39
Pick-up and drop-off	8.24-5, 8.40 + condition
Traffic generation	8.38-8.39
Car parking	
Contractors parking	condition
Disabled parking	8.40
Pressure on car parking	8.40
Other issues	
Images misleading	8.6
If City Council developed the garage area to the north this would create problems	Civil matter
Impact on local doctors and dentists	No policy basis to use this as reason for refusal
Unsatisfactory disabled access	8.23. Not raised by access officer. I
Archaeology	condition

Planning Obligations

8.43 The Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Regulations 2010 introduced the requirement for all local authorities to make an assessment of any planning obligation in relation to three tests. If the planning obligation does not pass the tests then it is unlawful. The tests are that the planning obligation must be:

- (a) necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms;
- (b) directly related to the development; and
- (c) fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development.

8.44 In bringing forward my recommendations in relation to the Planning Obligation for this development I have considered these requirements.

8.45 The CIL regulations also bring into effect from 6th April 2015, new restrictions on the ability of local councils to collect pooled contributions for infrastructure.

8.46 The Planning Obligation Strategy (2010) provides a framework for expenditure of financial contributions collected through planning obligations and the Public Art Supplementary Planning Document 2010 addresses requirements in relation to public art. The applicants have indicated their willingness to enter into a S106 planning obligation in accordance with the requirements of the Strategy and relevant Supplementary Planning Documents. The proposed development triggers the requirement for the following community infrastructure:

Open Space

8.47 The Planning Obligation Strategy requires that all new residential developments, including student accommodation contribute to the provision or improvement of public open space. New student accommodation is included in this requirement unless the institution which the occupying students attend can demonstrate that it already provides suitable open space to meet the Council's standards for all its students including those to be accommodated in the development.

8.48 The application proposes 202 student units, each of which is assumed to be occupied by one person. Officers recommend that since the Council's ability to seek pooled contributions will shortly cease, ruling out contributions for overall provision of open space and sports facilities in this part of the city, negotiations with the applicant address the funding of specific named facilities or improvements which will meet the open space and recreation needs of the 202 occupiers of this site. Officers seek delegated authority to negotiate agreement to the funding of such projects on the basis that the scale of such a contribution is calculated using the formulae previously used to seek pooled contributions. In this case, the figures arising from those formulae would be as follows.

Outdoor sports facilities					
Type of unit	Persons per unit	£ per person	£per unit	Number of such units	Total £
studio	1	238	238	202	48076
1 bed	1.5	238	357		
2-bed	2	238	476		
Total					48076

Indoor sports facilities					
Type of unit	Persons per unit	£ per person	£per unit	Number of such units	Total £
studio	1	269	269	202	54338
1 bed	1.5	269	403.50		
2-bed	2	269	538		
Total					54338

Informal open space					
Type of unit	Persons per unit	£ per person	£per unit	Number of such units	Total £
studio	1	242	242	202	48884
1 bed	1.5	242	363		
2-bed	2	242	484		
Total					48884

8.49 Potential future occupiers of the proposed development might attend institutions which already provide sufficient open space and facilities in these categories. Were this to be ensured through a Section 106 agreement, the level of contribution expected in one or more of the above categories might be significantly reduced or eliminated. Subject to the completion of a S106 planning obligation to secure the requirements of the Planning Obligation Strategy (2010) in accordance with the Cambridge City Council Open Space Standards Guidance for Interpretation and Implementation (2010), I am satisfied that the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 3/8 and 10/1 and the Planning Obligation Strategy 2010 and the Cambridge City Council Open Space Standards Guidance for Interpretation and Implementation (2010).

Waste

- 8.50 The Planning Obligation Strategy (2010) requires that all new residential developments contribute to the provision of household waste and recycling receptacles on a per dwelling basis. My provisional assessment is that on the basis of £39 per student room, a sum of £7878 is required.
- 8.51 Subject to a S106 planning obligation to secure the requirements of the Planning Obligation Strategy (2010), the proposal is in accordance with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 3/7, 3/12 and 10/1 and the Planning Obligation Strategy 2010.

Public Art

- 8.52 The development is required to make provision for public art and officers have recommended as set out in paragraph 8.15 above that in this case a commuted public art payment to the S106 Public Art Initiative is appropriate, provided that in accordance with the CIL regulations 2010 the contribution is made towards a scheme which contributions from no more than four other schemes have already been made. This commuted sum needs to be secured by the S106 planning obligation.
- 8.53 Subject to the completion of a S106 planning obligation to secure this infrastructure provision, the proposal is in accordance with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 3/7 and 10/1 and the Public Art SPD 2010.

Planning Obligations Conclusion

- 8.54 It is my view that the planning obligation is necessary, directly related to the development and fairly and reasonably in scale and kind to the development and therefore the Planning Obligation passes the tests set by the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010.

9.0 CONCLUSION

- 9.1 In my view the principle of student accommodation on this site is acceptable.

- 9.2 The changes made to the scheme since its removal from the Planning Committee agenda of 4th December 2014, and the additional information supplied have addressed all the issues which led me to recommend refusal on that occasion. Subject to any concerns the highway authority has about additional transport accommodation being resolved, I now recommend approval.

10.0 RECOMMENDATION

APPROVE subject to the following conditions:

1. The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.

Reason: In accordance with the requirements of section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

2. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans as listed on this decision notice.

Reason: In the interests of good planning, for the avoidance of doubt and to facilitate any future application to the Local Planning Authority under Section 73 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

3. Prior to the commencement of development, a Demolition and Construction Environmental Management Plan (DCEMP) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The DCEMP shall include the consideration of the following aspects of demolition and construction:

- a) Demolition, 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/Demolition hours shall be carried out between 0800 hours to 1800 hours Monday to Friday, and 0800 hours to 1300 hours on Saturday and at no time on Sundays, Bank or Public Holidays, unless in accordance with agreed emergency procedures for deviation. Prior notice and agreement procedures for works outside agreed limits and hours.
- d) Delivery times for construction/demolition purposes shall be carried out between 0730 to 1800 hours Monday to Friday, 0800 to 1300 hours on Saturdays and at no time on Sundays, bank or public holidays, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the local planning authority in advance.
- e) Soil Management Strategy.
- f) Noise method, monitoring and recording statements in accordance with the provisions of BS 5228-1: 2009.
- g) Maximum noise mitigation levels for construction equipment, plant and vehicles.
- h) Vibration method, monitoring and recording statements in accordance with the provisions of BS 5228-2: 2009.
- i) Maximum vibration levels.
- j) Dust management and wheel washing measures in accordance with the provisions of London Best Practice Guidance: The control of dust and emissions from construction and demolition.
- k) Use of concrete crushers.
- l) Prohibition of the burning of waste on site during demolition/construction.
- m) Site lighting.
- n) Drainage control measures including the use of settling tanks, oil interceptors and bunds.
- o) Screening and hoarding details.
- p) Access and protection arrangements around the site for pedestrians, cyclists and other road users.
- q) Procedures for interference with public highways, including permanent and temporary realignment, diversions and road closures.
- r) External safety and information signing and notices.
- 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.

Reason: To protect the amenity of neighbouring residents and users of the highway. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/4, 4/13 and 8/2)

4. Prior to the commencement of development/construction, a noise insulation scheme detailing the acoustic noise insulation performance specification of the external building envelope of the residential units (having regard to the building fabric, glazing and ventilation) to reduce the level of noise experienced in the residential units as a result of the proximity of the habitable rooms to the high ambient noise levels in the area be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The scheme shall achieve the internal noise levels recommended in British Standard 8233:1999 "Sound Insulation and noise reduction for buildings-Code of Practice".

The approved scheme shall be fully implemented and a completion report submitted prior to the occupation of the residential or other noise sensitive development. The approved scheme shall remain unaltered in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure acceptable living standards for future occupiers. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/7, 3/12, and 4/13)

5. Prior to the commencement of development, a noise report shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority that considers the impact of noise from the neighbouring public house on the bedrooms/living rooms of the development. Following the submission of the noise report and prior to the commencement of refurbishment/ development works, a noise insulation scheme detailing the acoustic noise insulation performance specification of the external building envelope of the residential units (having regard to the building fabric, glazing and ventilation) for protecting the residential units from noise from the neighbouring industrial use shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority.

The scheme as approved shall be fully implemented before the use hereby permitted is commenced and prior to occupation of the residential units and shall not be altered without prior approval.

To ensure acceptable living standards for future occupiers.
(Cambridge Local Plan 2006, policies 3/7 and 4/13)

6. Before the development/use hereby permitted is occupied, a scheme for the insulation of the plant in order to minimise the level of noise emanating from the plant shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority and the scheme as approved shall be fully implemented before the use hereby permitted is commenced.

Reason: To protect the amenity of neighbouring occupiers.
(Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/4 and 4/13)

7. No development approved by this permission shall be COMMENCED prior to a contaminated land assessment and associated remedial strategy, being submitted to the LPA and receipt of approval of the document/documents from the LPA. This applies to paragraphs a), b) and c). This is an iterative process and the results of each stage will help decide if the following stage is necessary.
 - (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.

No development approved by this permission shall be OCCUPIED prior to the completion of any remedial works and a validation report/s being submitted to the LPA and receipt of approval of the document/documents from the LPA. This applies to paragraphs d), e) and f).

(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: To protect the future occupiers of the site from pollution (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/7 and 4/13)

8. No development approved by this planning permission shall take place until a scheme that includes the following components to deal with the risks associated with contamination of the site shall each be submitted to and approved, in writing, by the local planning authority:

1) A preliminary risk assessment which has identified: all previous uses; potential contaminants associated with those uses; a conceptual model of the site indicating sources; pathways and receptors; and potentially unacceptable risks arising from contamination at the site.

2) A site investigation scheme, based on (1) to provide information for a detailed assessment of the risk to all receptors that may be affected, including those off site.

3) The results of the site investigation and detailed risk assessment referred to in (2) and, based on these, an options appraisal and remediation strategy giving full details of the remediation measures required and how they are to be undertaken.

4) A verification plan providing details of the data that will be collected in order to demonstrate that the works set out in the remediation strategy in (3) are complete and identifying any requirements for longer-term monitoring of pollutant linkages, maintenance and arrangements for contingency action. Any changes to these components require the express written consent of the local planning authority. The scheme shall be implemented as approved.

Reason: To protect the quality of controlled waters in the local area. (Cambridge Local Plan policy 4/13)

9. If, during development, contamination not previously identified is found to be present at the site then no further development (unless otherwise agreed in writing with the local planning authority) shall be carried out until the developer has submitted a remediation strategy to the local planning authority detailing how this unsuspected contamination shall be dealt with and obtained written approval from the local planning authority. The remediation strategy shall be implemented as approved.

Reason: To protect the quality of controlled waters in the local area (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 3/14).

10. No infiltration of surface water drainage into the ground is permitted other than with the express written consent of the local planning authority, which may be given for those parts of the site where it has been demonstrated that there is no resultant unacceptable risk to controlled waters. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approval details.

Reasons: To protect the quality of controlled waters in the local area (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 3/14)

11. Piling or any other foundation designs using penetrative methods shall not be permitted other than with the express written consent of the Local Planning Authority, which may be given for those parts of the site where it has been demonstrated that there is no resultant unacceptable risk to groundwater. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To protect the quality of controlled waters in the local area. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 3/14)

12. No development approved by this planning permission shall take place until such time as a scheme to provide surface water drainage has been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority. The scheme shall be fully implemented and subsequently maintained, in accordance with the timing / phasing arrangements embodied within the scheme, or within any other period as may subsequently be agreed, in writing, by the local planning authority.

Reason: To provide a satisfactory method of surface water drainage and to prevent the increased risk or exacerbation of flooding to existing property, and to protect the quality of controlled waters in the local area. (Cambridge Local Plan policies 4/13, 4/16 and 8/18)

13. Prior to the commencement of any development, a scheme for the provision and implementation of pollution control of the water environment shall be submitted and agreed in writing with the Local Authority. The works/scheme shall be constructed and completed in accordance with the approved plans.

Reason: To prevent the increased risk of pollution to the water environment. (Cambridge Local Plan policies 4/13, 4/16 and 8/18)

14. No development shall take place within the site until the applicant, or their agent or successors in title, has secured the implementation of a programme of archaeological work in accordance with a written scheme of investigation which has been submitted by the applicant and approved in writing by the local planning authority.

Reason: To ensure that an appropriate archaeological investigation of the site has been implemented before development commences. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 4/9).

15. No development shall take place until samples of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure that the appearance of the external surfaces is appropriate. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/4, 3/12 and 3/14)

16. Full details of all non-masonry walling systems, cladding panels or other external screens including structural members, infill panels, edge, junction and coping details, colours, surface finishes/textures and relationships to glazing and roofing are to be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. This may consist of large-scale drawings and/or samples. Thereafter the development shall be undertaken in accordance with the agreed details unless the local planning authority agrees to any variation in writing.

Reason: To accord with Policy 3/4 and 3/12 of the 2006 Cambridge Local Plan.

17. Full details of all windows and doors, as identified on the approved drawings, including materials, colours, surface finishes/textures are to be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. This may consist of large-scale drawings and/or samples. Thereafter the development shall be undertaken in accordance with the agreed details unless the local planning authority agrees to any variation in writing.

Reason: To accord with Policy 3/4 and 3/12 of the 2006 Cambridge Local Plan.

18. Before starting any brick work, a sample panel of the facing materials to be used shall be erected on site to establish the detail of bonding, coursing and colour, type of jointing shall be agreed in writing with the local planning authority. The quality of finish and materials incorporated in any approved sample panel(s), which shall not be demolished prior to completion of development, shall be maintained throughout the development.

Reason: In the interests of the visual amenity and to ensure that the quality and colour of the detailing of the brickwork/stonework and jointing is acceptable and maintained throughout the development. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 3/12).

19. No development shall take place until full details of both hard and soft landscape works have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority and these works shall be carried out as approved. These details shall include proposed finished levels or contours; means of enclosure; car parking layouts, other vehicle and pedestrian access and circulation areas; hard surfacing materials; minor artefacts and structures (eg furniture, play equipment, refuse or other storage units, signs, lighting); proposed and existing functional services above and below ground (eg drainage, power, communications cables, pipelines indicating lines, manholes, supports); retained historic landscape features and proposals for restoration, where relevant. Soft Landscape works shall include planting plans; written specifications (including cultivation and other operations associated with plant and grass establishment); schedules of plants, noting species, plant sizes and proposed numbers/densities where appropriate and an implementation programme.

Reason: In the interests of visual amenity and to ensure that suitable hard and soft landscape is provided as part of the development. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/4, 3/11 and 3/12)

20. The development shall not be occupied until a plan for the future management of the proposed street trees has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The approved plan shall be adhered to thereafter.

Reason: To secure adequate replacement trees (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/7 and 4/4)

21. The development shall not be occupied until a programme for the planting of the proposed street trees in River Lane and Rowlinson Way has been agreed with the local planning authority. Tree planting shall be implemented in accordance with the agreed plan.

Reason: To ensure the provision of suitable replacement trees. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 4/4)

22. Prior to the commencement of the development, full details and plans for the on-site storage facilities for waste and recycling shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Such details shall identify the specific positions of where wheeled bins, or any other means of storage will be stationed to enable collection from within 10m of the kerbside of the adopted highway/ refuse collection vehicle access point. Details should include the on-site storage facilities for waste, including waste for recycling, the storage facilities for the separation of waste for recycling and composting within the individual student flats/clusters, and the arrangements for the disposal of waste detailed; these arrangements shall subsequently be provided and shall include provision for a minimum of 50% recycling/organic capacity. The approved arrangements shall be retained thereafter unless alternative arrangements are agreed in writing by the local planning authority.

Reason: To ensure appropriate arrangements for waste storage and collection. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 3/12)

23. The development hereby approved shall not be occupied until an operational management plan for the site, which provides details of site management, security, delivery handling, waste collection management, litter control and term end pick-up and drop-off arrangements has been submitted to and approved in writing by, the local planning authority. Occupation of the site shall take place only in accordance with the approved management plan.

Reason: To protect the amenity of neighbouring occupiers and highway users, and to ensure efficient operation of the highway network and protect highway safety. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/4, 3/7, 3/12 and 8/2)

INFORMATIVE: The applicant is advised that to satisfy the noise insulation condition for the building envelope as required above, the Council expects the scheme to achieve the 'good' internal noise levels of British Standard 8233:1999 'Sound Insulation and noise reduction for buildings-Code of Practice'. Where sound insulation requirements preclude the opening of windows for rapid ventilation and summer cooling, acoustically treated mechanical ventilation may also need to be considered within the context of this internal design noise criteria.

INFORMATIVE: The applicant is advised that to satisfy the condition relating to plant noise, the rating level (in accordance with BS4142:1997) from all plant and equipment, vents etc (collectively) associated with this application should be less than or equal to the existing background level (L90) at the boundary of the premises subject to this application and having regard to noise sensitive premises.

Tonal/impulsive noise frequencies should be eliminated or at least considered in any assessment and should carry an additional 5 dB(A) correction. This is to guard against any creeping background noise in the area and prevent unreasonable noise disturbance to other premises. This requirement applies both during the day (0700 to 2300 hrs over any one hour period) and night time (2300 to 0700 hrs over any one 5 minute period).

It is recommended that the agent/applicant submits a noise prediction survey/report in accordance with the principles of BS4142: 1997 'Method for rating industrial noise affecting mixed residential and industrial areas' or similar, concerning the effects on amenity rather than likelihood for complaints. Noise levels shall be predicted at the boundary having regard to neighbouring premises.

Such a survey / report should include: a large scale plan of the site in relation to neighbouring premises; noise sources and measurement / prediction points marked on plan; a list of noise sources; details of proposed noise sources / type of plant such as: number, location, sound power levels, noise frequency spectrums, noise directionality of plant, noise levels from duct intake or discharge points; details of noise mitigation measures (attenuation details of any intended enclosures, silencers or barriers); description of full noise calculation procedures; noise levels at a representative sample of noise sensitive locations and hours of operation.

Any report shall include raw measurement data so that conclusions may be thoroughly evaluated and calculations checked.

INFORMATIVE: The Housing Act 2004 introduces the Housing Health & Safety Rating System as a way to ensure that all residential premises provide a safe and healthy environment to any future occupiers or visitors.

Each of the dwellings must be built to ensure that there are no unacceptable hazards for example ensuring adequate fire precautions are installed; all habitable rooms have adequate lighting and floor area etc.

The applicant/agent is advised to contact the Residential Team at Mandela House, 4 Regent Street, Cambridge and Building Control concerning fire precautions, means of escape and the HHSRS

INFORMATIVE: The applicant is advised to note the following guidance about waste and recycling storage and collection. Further advice on waste provision for developments is available on our website.

Doors to bin stores should be sufficient in widths to allow the movement of bins at their widest and prevent entrapment of limbs. This is likely to be a minimum of 20cm in addition to the widest bin contained in the bin store.

Walls and doors should have protection strips to prevent damage and a mechanism for holding doors open should be available.

Doors should ideally be keypad entry or standard fire brigade keys. We do not support the use of electronic key fobs.

Roller shutters on bin stores can be considered to save space however the additional noise impacts should be considered.

Dropped kerbs should be provided to allow for ease of movement of bins to the collection vehicle and the pathway should be 1.5m in width taking the most direct route avoiding passing parked cars.

We do not advise the use of bin compactors, as they often cause excessive damage to bins or cause waste to get stuck inside bins. If bin compactors are used on site you should advise your waste collection contractor.

It is noted that in many areas residents are expected to pull bins past parking bays this is not recommended and often leads to bins being left out on the pavements or grassed areas.

For infill applications consideration should be given to parking arrangements alongside or opposite the access to the site. If car parking is currently permitted the consideration of parking restrictions may be required to ensure access is not inhibited.

Bins should be ordered direct from the Council's Waste Strategy team 10 weeks in advance of first occupation to ensure they arrive in time for the first residents moving in.

1. In the event that the application is refused, and an Appeal is lodged against the decision to refuse this application, delegated authority is sought to allow officers to negotiate and complete the Planning Obligation required in connection with this development.

2. Unless prior agreement has been obtained from the Head of Planning, in consultation with the Chair and Spokesperson of this Committee to extend the period for completion of the Planning Obligation required in connection with this development, if the Obligation has not been completed by 1 June 2015, or if Committee determine that the application be refused against officer recommendation of approval, it is recommended that the application be REFUSED for the following reason(s):

'The proposed development does not make appropriate provision for transport mitigation measures, open space, waste storage or public art in accordance with Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/7, 3/8, 3/12, 8/3 and 10/1 as detailed in the Planning Obligation Strategy 2010, the Public Art Supplementary Planning Document 2010 and the Eastern Corridor Area Transport Plan 2002.'

3. In the event that the application is refused, and an Appeal is lodged against the decision to refuse this application, AUTHORITY is to allow officers to negotiate and complete the Planning Obligation required in connection with this development

4. DELEGATED AUTHORITY is to officers to negotiate appropriate contributions to specific projects within the fields of open space provision and transport mitigation measures to a level equivalent to the previous tariffs for pooled contributions. **DELEGATED AUTHORITY** is also **GRANTED** to agree appropriate mitigation measures within a legal agreement to address the concerns outlined in the highway authority's most recent request for additional information.

This page is intentionally left blank

APPENDIX A

Reasons for recommendation of refusal in December 2014

1. Because of its height, unbroken length and poorly articulated roofline, the Newmarket Road range of the building would be poorly integrated into the locality, reading discordantly against the prevailing character on the north side of this road, creating an uncomfortable discontinuity of scale against the Corner House public house at its eastern end, and causing an unacceptable sense of visual domination for occupiers of houses on the east side of Godesdone Road. The application lacks the robust computer modelling necessary to support its claim that a full four-storey height on Newmarket Road and River Lane would not have a harmful impact on the surrounding context, and would be contrary to the Eastern Gate SPD, policies 3/4, and 3/12 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006, and government guidance on good design in Section 7 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2012.
2. Because of its height, limited articulation, and position hard up against the back of a narrow footway on River Lane, the eastern range of the building would overwhelm the houses on the opposite side of River Lane, overshadowing and visually dominating them to an unacceptable degree, contrary to policies 3/4 and 3/12 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 and government guidance on good design in Section 7 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2012.
3. The limited articulation, and particularly the largely unbroken horizontal form, of the northern Rowlinson Way range and the western 'pavilion' building would create a sense of overbearing bulk which would not respect the character of surrounding buildings in Godesdone Road, River Lane and Beche Road, would be poorly integrated with the locality, and would detract from the character of the Riverside section of City of Cambridge Conservation Area No.1 (Central), contrary to policies 3/1, 3/4, 3/12 and 4/11 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006, and government guidance on good design and conserving the historic environment in Sections 7 and 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2012.
4. The proposed basement courtyard would be heavily shaded because of the scale and massing of the proposed buildings, and would be poorly related to the communal functions of the building at street level. The application also fails to demonstrate that adequate drainage and appropriate tree planting can be reconciled in the courtyard. For these reasons, the landscape design would be poorly related to the function of the building and would not create outdoor space which is usable, safe and enjoyable, contrary to policies 3/7 and 3/11 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 and government guidance on good design in Section 7 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2012.

5. The application fails to demonstrate the deliverability within River Lane of street trees of sufficient scale to enable the eastern range of the building to be well-integrated into the locality and the Riverside section of City of Cambridge Conservation Area No.1 (Central), contrary to policies 3/1, 3/4, 3/11, 3/12, 4/4 and 4/11 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006, and government guidance on good design and conserving the historic environment in Sections 7 and 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2012.
6. The evidence submitted with the application is insufficient to demonstrate that the proposal would not have a harmful impact on the highway network or highway safety, contrary to policies 8/2 and 8/3 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 and government guidance in Section 4 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2012.
7. Occupancy of the speculative purpose-built student accommodation proposed is not limited to full-time students of the University of Cambridge or Anglia Ruskin University, nor do management arrangements exist to ensure occupiers do not keep cars in the city, nor could it be guaranteed that this location is suitably close to the educational institution involved. These issues render the proposal contrary to policy 7/10 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006.
8. The proposed development does not make appropriate provision for open space and sports facilities, waste facilities, public art and monitoring in accordance with Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/7, 3/8, 3/12 and 10/1, and as detailed in the Planning Obligation Strategy 2010, Public Art SPD and the Open Space Standards Guidance for Interpretation and Implementation 2010.

Application Ref: 14/1154/FUL

AMENDMENTS:

Received: 27th January 2015

Case Officer: Tony Collins

Response Date: 16th March 2014

Respondents: Jonathan Brookes and
Susan Smith

**Comments on amended proposals information submitted
January/February/March 2015**

Comments August 2014

The Urban Design & Conservation Team first commented on the application in August 2014 and raised a number of serious concerns with the proposals due to a lack of information that could allow an accurate assessment of the visual impact of the proposals and the daylighting/shadow impact on the proposed amenity space and the existing properties adjacent to the site. A number of concerns were raised relating to the details of the elevations. Overall the application was not supported in Urban Design & Conservation terms.

Amendments November 2014

A series of further amendments were submitted and we provided comments in November 2014. The amendments went some way to resolving a number of our concerns regarding the richness and detail of the proposed elevations, to resolve concerns about the quality of accommodation facing on to the courtyard and overlooking. However, the further information provided on the CGIs and assessment of shadow impact revealed that the scheme had potentially significant shortcomings that could not be overcome without a more fundamental redesign of the scheme and consequent loss of units. The delivery of trees on River Lane continued to be an issue as did the relationship of the Godesdone Road and Rowlinson Way blocks.

Overall the scheme failed to resolve a number of the previous concerns and indeed revealed potentially significant new concerns relating to the overall massing of the scheme. Our conclusion was that the proposals represented overdevelopment of the site and that an alternative development form was needed.

Amendments January and February 2015

The applicant has submitted a series of further revisions and clarifications as summarised in their description of the changes below.

1) Additional screens on rear elevation to enhance privacy in Godesdone Road. Increased articulation of pavilion building facing Godesdone Road. Increased window sizes in lower floors facing courtyard. Altered facade detailing. Introduction of fritted glass in some windows. Increased articulation of Rowlinson Way elevation. Addendum to Design and Access Statement.

2) Amendments to west end of upper storey; amendment to River Lane block; amendments to roofs of rear blocks; amendments to fenestration; amendment to

position of east elevation; amended tree planting; additional daylighting information; additional transport assessment; additional drainage information; additional verified views of development.

In addition, further documents have been produced to respond to concerns raised by local residents and to clarify further the specification and accuracy of the verified views.

Overall scale and massing

The scale and massing of the scheme has to be considered from four aspects.

- 1) The first is the impact on the Conservation Area and particularly the increase in the height of the Newmarket Road and River Lane corner and accordance with the guidance contained in the Eastern Gate SPD.
- 2) The second is how the overall scale and massing impacts on the existing properties in terms of shadow impact/daylighting and whether the scheme could be considered to be overbearing when viewed in the more immediate context.
- 3) The fourth aspect is daylighting into the proposed student accommodation.
- 4) The third is the impact on the quality of the courtyard that forms the only amenity space in the development.

Conservation Area Impact

1. The overall scale and massing identified in the Eastern Gate SPD has been the focus of significant discussions at both pre-application and application stages and summarised in previous comments on this application. The application now accords with the guidance given in the SPD with the exception of the 3 bay corner section fronting on to Newmarket Road and 2 bay return on to River Lane. The corner itself forms a chamfered section reducing the apparent length of the frontages when viewed at street level.

The impact of the increase from 3+setback 4th floor to a full 4 storeys has been assessed in terms of the impact on views within and across the Riverside Conservation Area. The view (unverified) is provided in the Design & Access Statement Rev A (page 22). Our view has remained consistent in that the change in the height is not significant in terms of these views and accordingly the departure from the SPD is acceptable. The form of the building will create a minor change to the established roofscape with the chimneys and varied roofline of the existing buildings of Riverside filtering views towards the site. The variation in the height helps to break down the horizontal nature of the Newmarket Road elevation and the increased height helps the scheme to respond to the increased scale of more recent developments on the south side of Newmarket Road.

The applicant has submitted verified views to satisfy paragraph 3.4.12 of the Eastern Gate SPD. Our assessment of each view is detailed below.

Verified views

The submitted verified views have helped to clarify uncertainty about the previously submitted views of the scheme. What they demonstrate, at 50mm, is a good approximation of what the naked eye would see when positioned at each of the viewpoints. As such they allow a more accurate and considered assessment of the impact to be made.

View 1: View from Newmarket Road looking West (50mm lens)

The proposals clearly create a significant change to the existing view looking west. Previous concerns related to the scale of the proposals when seen with the Corner House pub. Aside from any issues relating to the overall massing and scale and corresponding impact on River Lane, our view is that the 4 storey corner and receding 3+1 section of the building are appropriate in this context. The Corner House Pub still reads a significant and different form and the overall height of the corner block does not dominate over the existing pub. There is clearly a marked difference in scale between the proposed scheme and adjacent furniture warehouse but the SPD provides guidance on the height for the adjacent land should redevelopment occur.

View 2a: View from Newmarket Road North East (50mm lens)

This view demonstrates the problems with trying to reconcile the deep plan form of double banked accommodation in the finer grain of development to the north of Newmarket Road. The setback upper floor and minor 150mm setback on the west gable go some way to relieving the overall massing. However, the shadow indicated by the latter looks somewhat exaggerated in this view. If future development of the furniture showrooms occurs, in line with the SPD, then the depth of the proposals will be masked from this viewpoint.

View 2b: View from Newmarket Road North East (24mm lens)

This is similar to the view above although the chosen lens provides more context and as such is not what the eye would see. However the image demonstrates how the frontage responds to the changing character of the Coldhams Lane junction whilst stepping down to the lower scale of the section of Newmarket Road located immediately to the west of the site.

View 3: View from Coldhams Lane looking North West (50mm lens)

The limited view cone towards Riverside created by the scale of the recently completed hotels limits views of the scheme in a wider context. From this viewpoint the scheme appears appropriate in both scale and massing.

View 4a View from River Lane looking South East (24mm lens)

This view is not as the eye would see but does provide more context. The stepping up of the scheme is acceptable. The setting back of the building line on River Lane and Rowlinson Way allows for a better transition between the proposed and existing development. However further changes may be required to address concerns about the impact of the scheme on River Lane properties opposite the site.

View 4b View from River Lane looking South East (50mm lens)

The view provides a clearer indication of how the scheme would be seen standing at the chosen viewpoint. As with the previous view the scheme is acceptable in terms of the stepped form but, as noted above, may have to be changed to respond to

concerns about daylighting to River Lane properties opposite. The view demonstrates how the scheme hides the top of the Premier Inn when looking up River Lane.

River Lane

2. The impact of the scale and massing of the development at a local level in terms of the amenity of existing River Lane properties opposite the site has been the focus of ongoing concerns at both pre-application and application stages. When the daylighting and shadow impact studies were finally submitted as part of the amendments to the application in October 2014, they revealed significant concerns with regards to the impact on existing residential properties on the north side of River Lane. As a result of these concerns the City Council commissioned an independent evaluation of the proposals.

A revised Daylight report has been submitted by GVA which concludes at paragraph 5.1, *'that whilst the proposed development will result in reduction to the existing levels of sunlight and daylight to 6-24 River Lane none of these properties will suffer from unacceptably low levels of daylight or sunlight amenity when considered in the context of the locality and against the relevant criteria detailed in the BRE Guide.'*

The independent assessment undertaken by EB7 Ltd for Cambridge City Council agrees with the conclusions reached in the GVA study. So whilst there is some additional impact and the situation versus the existing will change, the level of change is concluded to be acceptable.

As such the scale and massing of the River Lane elevation with the stepped form and general compliance with the SPD guidance is acceptable in design and conservation terms.

Central amenity space

3. A revised Daylight report for the courtyard has been submitted by GVA. The shadow impact has also been reviewed by CCC appointed consultants EB7 Ltd. The GVA report 'Executive Summary' page 4 states *'the Time in Sun assessment shows that almost 40% of the courtyard area will benefit from at least two hours of direct sun light on 21 March. This is a significant improvement on the previous scheme, where the figure was marginally over 30%.'* The GVA report page 7 states *'to summarise, the Guidelines recommend that appropriate amenity areas should receive at least two hours of sunlight on 21 March.'* BRE guidelines paragraph 3.37 says *'as a check, it is recommended that at least half of the amenity areas listed above should receive at least two hours of sunlight on 21 March.'* When considered against the BRE wording and demonstrated through the GVA assessment, the space fails to meet the minimum recommendations identified by the BRE, however the conclusion is that this is to be expected given the urban nature of the site.

It should also be borne in mind that the amenity space referred to is only now improved in terms of the percentage receiving sunlight because it has been significantly reduced in size.

Therefore, whilst the space fails to meet the 50% guidance set out by the BRE, and the impact on the courtyard is entirely due to the scale and massing of the proposals

on the development site, the independent review undertaken for the City Council supports the GVA conclusion that the shadow impact on the proposed amenity space will be acceptable.

Daylighting to courtyard bedrooms

4. A revised Daylight report has been submitted by GVA. Previous issues were resolved with the October amendments. However since these amendments, the courtyard has reduced in size and so the impact may have changed. The daylighting to bedrooms has been reviewed by City Council appointed consultants who support the conclusions of the GVA study.

Elevations

Newmarket Road

The extent of the Newmarket Road frontage has been reduced by a bay as a result of the adjustment to the building line on River Lane to accommodate proposed tree planting.

The lower 3 storey block that rises to 3 storeys with a setback upper 4th storey block measures 25m in length and remains unchanged and improves the balance of the two sections along Newmarket Road. When compared to the originally submitted scheme, the setback 4th storey has been reduced in length by approximately 5m.

A modest 200mm setback creates a notional break between this section of the building and the 4 storey corner. As discussed before the impact of the change in scale of this corner, over the guidance in the Eastern Gate SPD, in views across the Conservation Area is not considered to be harmful.

River Lane

Changes were made to this elevation in October 2014 and were broadly supported. The introduction of the transoms to the northern River Lane 2 storey section of the building, demonstrates how the further subdivision of the window 'void' helps them to relate more appropriately to the existing proportioning of houses within the Conservation Area. A problem with full height glazing to bedrooms is the impact on the privacy of occupants as well as the 'clutter' that accumulates against the lower sections. This is well demonstrated on the M1 and M2 Student Block at CB1. Transoms should be introduced to break down the overall scale of the window openings and a spandrel panel or fritted glass introduced to the lower section to improve privacy and reduce the potential for a cluttered appearance.

The setting back of the building line allows for the trees to be delivered within the site ownership. It increases the footpath width and accommodates parking spaces and drop-off in an acceptable way. Trees will need to be semi-mature to provide an appropriate scale within the streetscape.

Rowlinson Way

The concerns relating to the horizontal form of the Rowlinson Way elevation have now been addressed through the introduction of a more articulated roofscape. A series of 4 shallow pitched roofs, reminiscent of the more industrial buildings on the site, creates more variety and breaks the scale of the building down and so creates a more appropriate transition to the adjacent Conservation Area. The changes result

in an overall increase in height of the proposals along this part of the site of approx. 1m to the top of the ridge.

The building line has been setback from its previous alignment to allow for replacement tree planting at the interface between the proposed development and the existing residential terrace to the north. Trees will need to be semi-mature to provide an appropriate scale in the streetscape.

Godesdone Road

The previous amendments introduced a series of blind windows that provided some relief to the other blank rear elevation of the pavilion block. We were still concerned about the strong horizontal form of the roof against this boundary and the Conservation Area. As with the Rowlinson Way block the scheme has been amended to introduce a series of shallow pitched roofs grouped into two pairs with a flat roof section located in between them. Again the change increases the overall height of the proposals from 6m to 7m (1m change) to the top of the ridge. The overall increase is acceptable and the roof form addresses previous concerns.

Our comments dated 5th November 2014 raised a concern that 'with the specification of views now provided...we are now concerned that the rear of the Newmarket Road block will read more significantly than previously thought and that it will impact on existing Godesdone Road properties in terms of the scale relationship. This is partly due to the rear not being setback like the front elevation and due to the continuous nature of the roof form. The scale, when combined with the other horizontal forms proposed, creates an overbearing scale against the existing Conservation Area.'

Verified views have not been produced of the views on page 32 of the amended D&A Statement. The views provided show the scheme as an outline 'line model' and do not provide the detail of the change in materials and architectural detailing. We have considered the impact of the proposal further and in light of the removal of the projecting section to the western end of the upper floor. The top floor of the building is proposed to be finished in metal cladding and will accordingly read as a more subservient 'roof' element with the brick of the floors below creating the main section of the building beneath. It will be important that the proposed coping between the 3rd and 4th storeys is clearly pronounced to create a clear separation between the two elements. Our previous concerns about this view and impact on the Conservation Area therefore no longer stand.

Courtyard elevations

The uppermost sections of the courtyards are proposed to be finished in the metal cladding used on the street elevations. A modest setback of approx. 100mm is proposed formed by the change in material at the upper floor. The change in materials at the upper level helps to break down the overall massing of the proposals.

Internal layout

The internal arrangement of the proposals has been the focus of a significant part of the discussions and comments by the Design and Conservation Panel. Whilst the internal layout of the proposals is outside the normal planning considerations, it is important to note that it plays an important design driver in terms of the overall depth

of the blocks and the horizontal connectivity needed to service the bedrooms. The internal layout has therefore driven the external form.

In terms of improvements to the scheme as part of the submitted amendments, the ground floor communal area now connects via a wide staircase to the lower ground floor and allows improved access to the amenity space.

All of the accommodation in the main development is accessed by one of 2 cores. The limited number of cores results in the need for longer corridors and the corresponding arrangements of rooms. Suggestions at the pre-application stage to introduce a third core and therefore greater flexibility in the arrangement and organisation of bedroom clusters have not been incorporated. A separate block backing on to Godesdone Road is accessed via the main entrance on Newmarket Road, through the communal area, down the stairs to the lower ground floor and across the amenity space. A staircore within the block then provides access to further corridors to serving the bedroom clusters.

The arrangement of units relies on the use of double banked corridors that allow access to the bedrooms and kitchens located off them. The corridors themselves have no apparent means of natural daylighting and could combine to create a somewhat 'warren like' effect typical of this kind of student accommodation model. However, the chosen accommodation model and consequent internal arrangements are outside the control of the planning system.

Conclusion

The proposals will result in a significant change to the corner of Newmarket Road and River Lane. The verified views demonstrate the impact of the scheme in a more accurate way and allay previous concerns about how the proposals will sit in their context. As a result, the overall impact on the Conservation Area of the revised proposals is considered to be acceptable.

The amendments to the Godesdone Road and Rowlinson Way blocks to introduce a series of pitched gables, have removed previous concerns about the overly horizontal form addressed concerns about the impact of the horizontal forms of the proposed buildings that abut the adjacent Conservation Area.

In terms of the sunlight and daylight impacts, the usability of the amenity space has been independently assessed and is considered to be acceptable. The impact on properties to the east of the site on River Lane has been independently assessed and is considered to be acceptable.

The amendments to the scheme and additional information provided have improved the overall scheme and clarified the potential level of impact on the Conservation Area and adjacent properties. Overall the proposals are considered to be acceptable in design and conservation terms.

This page is intentionally left blank



EB7 Ltd
Studio 1, Rushworth Studios
63 Webber Street
London
SE1 0QW

Tony Collins
Principal Planning Officer
Cambridge City Council
4 Regent Street,
Cambridge
CB2 1BY

Date: 20/02/2015

Ref: Wests Garage - Cambridge - Daylight and Sunlight report review

Dear Mr Collins

This practice has been instructed to conduct a review of the two daylight and sunlight reports submitted within a planning application for the development of the Wests Garage, Newmarket Road, Cambridge (14/1154/FUL). The reports reviewed have been written by GVA Schatunowski Brooks and are entitled:

1. Daylight and Sunlight Amenity Report in respect of 6-24 River Lane
2. Daylight, Sunlight and Time in Sun Amenity report

Both reports are based upon the correct policy and guidance.

The first report looks at the impact of the proposal on daylight and sunlight amenity to 6-24 River Lane. We feel that this assessment should consider all surrounding residential accommodation for daylight, sunlight and overshadowing including 33 River Lane to the north of the proposal and the rear of the properties along Godesdone Road.

The drawings of the existing buildings and proposal need should be shown in plan as well as 3D view in order to visually compare the location of each. The 3D drawings should show spot heights of the existing, proposed buildings as well as pertinent neighbours so that the accuracy of the model used can be verified. For the purposes of this review we have assumed that the model is accurate but would like to see the drawings with heights in order to verify this.

We note that the internal layouts of the neighbouring properties are assumed which is not uncommon for a daylight and sunlight report, but dimensions of the rooms should be shown. As the room layouts are assumed we would recommend that any planning decisions with regard to daylight to the neighbours should be based on Vertical Sky Component (VSC) rather than Average Daylight Factor (ADF) or No Sky-Line Contour (NSC). This report does primarily base its finding on VSC for daylight and as such we would agree with this approach.

This page is intentionally left blank

DEVELOPMENT CONTROL FORUM

10 September 2014

11.30 am

Present: Councillors Blencowe, Dryden, Hipkin and Pippas.

City Development Manager (Chair): Sarah Dyer

Principal Planning Officer: Toni Collins

Committee Manager: Claire Tunnicliffe

For Applicant:

Applicant Representative: Andy Thompson (Beacon Planning)

Applicant Representative: (Architect for applicant).

Applicant Representative

For Petitioners (in objection):

Lead Petitioner: Harry Goode

Resident: Lynette Gilbert

Resident: Helen Tonks

FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE COUNCIL

1 Declarations of Interest

No declarations were declared.

2 Induction by the Chair

The Chair outlined the role and purpose of the Development Control Forum. Those present were informed that no decisions would be taken at the meeting.

3 Application and Petition Details

Committee: Planning Committee

Date: 10 September 2014

Application No: 14/1154/FUL

Site Address: Wests Garage Site, 217 Newmarket Road

Description: The erection of new student housing (222 study bedrooms) and associated communal facilities, cycle parking, and external landscaping following demolition of the existing buildings.

Applicant: TBC

Agent: Beacon Planning LTD
Address: 7 Quay Court, Colliers Lane, Stow-cm-Quay, Cambridge, CB25 9AU
Lead Petitioner: Harry Goode
Address: 18 Godesdone Road, Cambridge, CB5 8HR
Case Officer: Tony Collins, Principal Planning Officer

Text of Petition:

Our Grounds for objecting to the Application:

- i. It's mass, bulk and roofline will have a negative impact on:
 - The character and appearance of the adjacent conservation area (ref: Local Plan Policy 4/11, Objective 9 and paras 3.4.2 and 3.4.14 of the Eastern Gate Supplementary Planning Document).
 - The amenity of residents in the CHS Group social housing opposite, on the east side of River Lane (ref: Local Plan Policy 3/12).
- ii. The proposal represents gross overdevelopment of the site, exacerbated by a hostile design that makes no attempt to integrate the scheme with the local community or enhance the public realm (ref: Local Plan Policies 3/4, 3/7 and Para 3.4.2 of the Eastern Gate SPD).
- iii. The extremely close proximity of the proposed hostel to residents in River Lane, Beche Road and Godesdone Road, coupled with the large number of occupants proposed, will cause considerable noise and disturbance (ref: Local Plan Policies 7/10 and 5/7).
- iv. The location of the hostel on a key junction directly opposite a public house raises major concerns about highway safety, both for the student occupants and motorists using the junction.
- v. The site is in a controlled parking zone made up of narrow residential streets lacking any adequate provision of parental drop off / pick up (ref: Local Plan Policy 8/2).

Our suggested changes:

- i. In keeping with the conservation area, and to mark the necessary break between north and south sides of Newmarket Road, student accommodation on the site should be in vertical units of 10 – 12 students per unit. This would create space for green interstices between units.
- ii. Units should not exceed two storeys, with a further sloping roof space or well set back further storey.
- iii. Development on the site should be sufficiently set back on all sides to allow a screen of tree planting.

- iv. Suitable drop off and pick up facilities for students should be provided internally. The entrance to such facilities should be situated as far down River Lane as possible, to avoid the dangers of traffic backing up towards the junction with Newmarket Road.
- v. With these changes, a new model of high quality student accommodation would be established for Cambridge, rejecting barracks like structures in favour of schemes integrated with local communities.

Case by Applicants:

- 1. The application is for a new purpose built student accommodation block, not a hostel as had been described.
- 2. There would be associated communal facilities, cycle parking and external landscaping of the existing building.
- 3. Wests had operated on this site since 1950 and would be relocating which would allow expansion of the business.
- 4. It would not be possible to expand the current building on the site.
- 5. In 2013 an application was withdrawn as this had not been supported by the Officers or members of the public.
- 6. Details from the Design Guide, using the Local Plan and its supplementary planning documents, was used as a starting point for the current application as submitted in July 2014.
- 7. This application was considerably different to the original application and major changes had been made to reflect that the site sits within an area of transformation.
- 8. The previous design was busy and confusing and of an awkward composition.
- 9. The buildings are of an appropriate height, with three plus one stories facing Newmarket Road; none would have an adverse effect on the local area.
- 10. The top floor is set back with the buildings reducing in size towards the conservation area.
- 11. The view from Elizabeth Way Bridge would show minimal impact to the sky line as the buildings would largely be screened by three story town houses. The five storey hotel would be more prominent on the sky line.
- 12. A public consultation was undertaken in June 2014 and there had been meetings with residents and officers previously.
- 13. The development would help to meet the need for student accommodation in Cambridge.
- 14. Designed in consultation with Anglian Ruskin University who advised that there is a need for hall style accommodation for first year students. The design had been inspired by Georgian townhouse typology.

15. There was no provision for student car parking on site to encourage green modes of transport.
16. Believed that the constraints of building in a conservation area had been turned into a positive.
17. The choice of materials was a reflection of the buildings sensitivity to the area.

Case by Petitioners:

18. In May 2014, the Design and Conservation Panel gave five red lights to the development and rejected the proposal.
19. Residents shared the concerns raised by the Panel and believed that the development would have an adverse impact on neighbouring properties.
20. The development would be harmful to the character and appearance of a historic high street and residential conservation area.
21. The Eastern Gate SPD states that doubled-banked blocks are identified as problematic; doubled-banked blocks are included into the top storey footprint.
22. The site was too narrow for the proposed development with the building built to the boundaries, with solid high walls and the pavements are narrow. Tree planting was only achieved by building into River Lane, which was restricted in width on the corner.
23. There would be a loss of parking bays if River Lane was narrowed.
24. The current site had an open aspect with on street greenery, which was encouraged in the Local Plan.
25. The development would have twelve disabled units but offered no disabled parking.
26. The allocated cycle spaces were unworkable with access to the main cycle store down a private road.
27. There was not space within the site for safe access to the cycle storage; the second cycle storage was accessed from the Newmarket Road footpath which could encourage cycling on the footpath.
28. The current site had three parking spaces but there would be no vehicle access into the site.
29. The proposed scheme estimates that there would be seventy trips a day by taxi but there was no mention of other traffic.
30. There was no allocated drop off or pick up areas for the start and end of term busy period and no sufficient turning circle.
31. This application was the same over development as the first application.
32. The site was an integral part of the historic high street and the Eastern Gate SPD outlined 'important visual cues' and references for development in the area.

33. The application ignored these cues and instead sought to inject bulky 'Travelodge style' form into the historic high street.
34. The development would set a precedent for further harmful development on the north side of the high street.
35. The building height facing Newmarket Road and River Lane would be higher than the recently installed street lamps.
36. The development would create an over bearing impact and loss of light for residents living opposite on River Lane.

Case Officers Comments:

37. Approximately twenty individual representations had been received to date.
38. Have received comments from a number of consultees:
 - Environmental Health: Do not object to the application but have recommended significant conditions on noise, traffic and contaminated land.
 - Highways: Have said that the building could be set further back from the boundary on River Road.
 - Access Officer: Has recommended improvements for disabled parking.

Members' Questions

39. What provisions have been made during peak drop off and pick up times for students.
40. What provision has been made for disabled parking?
41. Will there be any student parking on site?
42. Would the applicant make any changes to the scheme to make it more acceptable?
43. Would the applicant accept that there is a problem with the buildings up against the footpaths?
44. Why not increase the public space?
45. With regards to amenity space had it been taken into account that those 222 students would have friends to stay over?
46. The design is drawn on the Halls of Residence approach.
47. What is the impact of overshadowing on properties on River Lane?
48. Has there been any consultation with Cambridge University on this application?
49. What is the occupancy during non-term time?

Response to Members' Questions.

50. Each student would be given a time slot for allocated parking on River Lane for the start and end of term for pick up and drop off.
51. There is no parking for blue badge holders on site but they are able to park anywhere in the area.
52. There is no allocated student parking on site.
53. Does not agree that any changes are needed to the application.
54. Would not see any problems with the proximity of the buildings to the footpath.
55. River Lane is a wide street and it would not be a positive step to move the proposed buildings back further. The proposed buildings are set back and there is a landscaped zone introduced to the centre of River Lane.
56. The provision, size and quality of the amenity space was very high.
57. There has been no consultation with Cambridge University on this application. The application has been designed in line with the specification and consultation with Anglian Ruskin University, who have challenged the process to ensure a better managed scheme than the previous application.
58. There would be the standard agreement that the accommodation would be used by full time students during term time. Outside of term time the accommodation could be used by others who are not students.
59. This is not a Halls of Residence; the rooms have been broken into clusters to encourage communication between students and include communal space. There are vertical breaks and recesses to articulate the facade.

Summing up by the Applicants

60. The development would not have a negative impact to the surrounding area.
61. The existing building detracts from the character of the conservation area.
62. There have been two public consultations regarding this development and the scheme has undergone many changes.
63. The application would bring a reduction in daily car movements at a busy junction and the closure of vehicle access onto Newmarket Road.
64. The application brings much needed student accommodation to Cambridge.
65. The development meets the guidelines within the National Planning Framework.

66. Creates a provision of a green amenity space and significant enhancement to the public realm.
67. The concerns highlighted have been raised by fear.
68. The development would create a payment of £300,000 towards public spaces.
69. Does not accept the argument of over development.

Summing up by the Petitioners

70. The application is one of gross over development, the wrong development model, hostile in design, offers inadequate open spaces.
71. The scale, bulk and flat-roofed form is harmful to the character and appearance of the historic high street in a residential conservation area.
72. The development would have an unacceptable impact on neighbouring properties due to bulk, loss of light and overlooking.
73. The high density student blocks would bring an increase in noise to those neighbours directly adjacent to development.
74. The application is similar to the first application.
75. The applicant has 'cherry picked' aspects from the Local Plan.

The meeting ended at 11.30 am

CHAIR

This page is intentionally left blank

Application Number	14/1797/FUL	Agenda Item	
Date Received	14th November 2014	Officer	Mr Toby Williams
Target Date	13th February 2015		
Ward	Market		
Site	Judge Business School Trumpington Street Cambridge Cambridgeshire CB2 1AG		
Proposal	Demolition of unlisted former hostel buildings fronting onto Tennis Court Road (Bridget's and Nightingale) and construction of an extension to the former Addenbrooke's Hospital Building for the Cambridge Judge Business School including a link to Keynes House, a new substation and associated cycle parking and landscaping.		
Applicant	University of Cambridge		

SUMMARY	<p>The development accords with the Development Plan for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -The replacement building is of high quality design. -The demolition of the hostel buildings is justified. -The setting of the listed buildings would be preserved and the character and appearance of the Conservation Area would be enhanced.
RECOMMENDATION	APPROVAL

1.0 SITE DESCRIPTION/AREA CONTEXT

- 1.1 The site is the old Addenbrooke's hospital (currently occupied by the Judge Business School), Nightingale and Bridget's Hostels which front onto Tennis Court Road, Keynes House and the curtilage of these buildings.
- 1.2 The old Addenbrooke's building is a large Grade II listed building in a prominent position, set back in a formal courtyard

bounded by listed railings to Trumpington Street. It is visible from Tennis Court Road, in glimpse views between the hostel buildings and in longer views from Regent Street.

- 1.3 The old Addenbrooke's building was constructed as a hospital in 1766 when the first patients were admitted. It has been much extended since, notably in the 1860's by Matthew Digby Wyatt. Subsequent to the listing, it was converted for the Judge Business School (JBS) by the architect John Outram and opened in 1996 following the relocation of Addenbrookes hospital to the south of the city. The conversion works undertaken by Outram were radical and extensive. They include two newer brick blocks called the Ark and the Castle that sit on the Tennis Court Road side of the site and extensive internal works, mainly a gallery, to the former hospital building itself that are contained within the 1860's brickwork shell.
- 1.4 The Outram works to the listed building are extremely unusual and specific to the listed building, displaying a colourful array of architectural features inside and outside the building, including new brickwork, door panelling, services and decoration which are now an intrinsic part of the character of the listed building.
- 1.5 Nightingale and Bridget's Hostels are not listed or Buildings of Local Interest. They are currently vacant, most recently occupied by Anglia Ruskin University for 121 students to the summer of 2014.
- 1.6 To the front of the site, facing Trumpington Street, is Keynes House which is curtilage listed.
- 1.6 The site and its buildings fall within the Central Conservation Area.
- 1.7 Opposite and within landscaped grounds are the Downing College buildings, the two closest of which are contemporary additions and not listed. To the north and adjacent to Nightingale Hostel is Kings Hostel, a grade II listed building. To the south, on the same side of the street as Bridget's Hostel, is the University Department of Pharmacology, a modern functional building.

2.0 THE PROPOSAL

- 2.1 The proposal seeks to provide additional teaching, office, breakout and dining spaces for the Judge Business School, in particular for its executive education sector (4,790sqm). The provision of this space requires the removal of the two hostel buildings and the provision of a purpose built facility. Rectangular in shape, it would occupy a footprint and height (with a recessive 4th storey) not dissimilar to the two hostel buildings. It would link to the existing Ark building and the former hospital building via double height, single storey plinth providing a courtyard and landscaped podium space above.
- 2.2 At ground floor level, the main circulation and teaching spaces would be provided together with kitchen and delivery facilities. Upper floors would contain additional kitchen, dining, teaching and meeting spaces. The roof would accommodate a flat solar pv and solar thermal array which would not be visible from street level. The basement would contain plant.
- 2.3 The new building would be constructed from brick, with pre-cast concrete detailing to the windows. It would be set back 600mm further than the existing hostel buildings from Tennis Court road allowing for a widening of the pavement to 2m. The façade of the proposed building onto Tennis Court Road is recessed half way along its length by a 4.5m deep cut at a width of 18m, which allows for a break in the building form and which is occupied by a 2nd floor terrace.
- 2.4 Servicing arrangements are unaltered from Tennis Court Road. The main entrance to the JBS would remain from Trumpington Street through the old hospital building, but secondary access into the new building would be available from Tennis Court Road. New cycle parking is proposed. A new substation would be provided to the rear of Keynes House, together with an elevated walkway to the old Addenbrooke's building.
- 2.5 The application is accompanied by the following information.
- Planning Statement
 - Design and Access Statement
 - Heritage Statement
 - Archaeological Evaluation
 - Economic Impact Assessment

- Energy Statement
- Ecological Assessment
- Transport Assessment
- Travel Plan
- Condition and Conversion Survey
- Roof Plant Environmental Noise Assessment
- Ground Investigation Report
- Ventilation and Extraction Report
- Demolition Method Statement

2.6 The application has been amended to address a number of issues raised by consultees. The amendments, which have been subject to further consultation, include:

- Revised plans for the southern elevation and works/link to the Ark building
- Increased cycle parking provision
- Deletion of the removal of the main exterior front door to the old Addenbrooke's building
- Report Investigating the Potential to Retain the Hostel Buildings
- Additional Transport Assessment and Travel Plan Addendum Report

2.7 The proposal is accompanied by a separate application (14/1805/LBC) for listed building consent which is to be considered elsewhere on this agenda. The proposed alterations to the listed building would not be justified if the application for planning permission was refused.

3.0 SITE HISTORY

3.1 There is no relevant planning history for the site.

4.0 PUBLICITY

4.1	Advertisement:	Yes
	Adjoining Owners:	Yes
	Site Notice Displayed:	Yes

5.0 POLICY

5.1 See Appendix 1 for full details of Central Government Guidance, Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies, Supplementary Planning Documents and Material Considerations.

5.2 Relevant Development Plan policies

PLAN	POLICY NUMBER
Cambridge Local Plan 2006	3/1, 3/4, 3/7, 3/11, 3/12, 3/13, 3/14 4/10, 4/11, 4/13, 5/4 7/5, 7/9 8/2, 8/3, 8/6, 8/16 10/1
Key SPD and guidance	Planning Obligation Strategy SPD Central Conservation Appraisal

5.3 Relevant Central Government Guidance, Supplementary Planning Documents and Material Considerations

Central Government Guidance	National Planning Policy Framework March 2012 National Planning Policy Framework – Planning Practice Guidance March 2014 Circular 11/95 Ministerial Statement (1 December 2014) by Brandon Lewis Minister of State for Housing and Planning (Department of Communities and Local Government)
-----------------------------------	---

Supplementary Planning Guidance	<p>Sustainable Design and Construction (May 2007)</p> <p>Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Waste Partnership (RECAP): Waste Management Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (February 2012)</p> <p>Planning Obligation Strategy (March 2010)</p> <p>Public Art (January 2010)</p>
City Wide Guidance	Cambridge City Council - Guidance for the application of Policy 3/13 (Tall Buildings and the Skyline) of the Cambridge Local Plan (2006) (2012)
Area Guidelines	<p>Cambridge City Council (2002)–Southern Corridor Area Transport Plan:</p> <p>Cambridge Historic Core Conservation Area Appraisal (2006)</p>

5.4 Status of Proposed Submission – Cambridge Local Plan

Planning applications should be determined in accordance with policies in the adopted Development Plan and advice set out in the NPPF. However, after consideration of adopted plans and the NPPF, policies in emerging plans can also be given some weight when determining applications. For Cambridge, therefore, the emerging revised Local Plan as published for consultation on 19 July 2013 can be taken into account, especially those policies where there are no or limited objections to it. However it is likely, in the vast majority of instances, that the adopted development plan and the NPPF will have considerably more weight than emerging policies in the revised Local Plan.

For the application considered in this report, there are no policies in the emerging Local Plan of relevance.

6.0 CONSULTATIONS

Cambridgeshire County Council (Highways Development Management)

6.1 *Application as submitted*

Traffic and Transport

Holding Objection: Further information is required regarding existing and future trip generation to and from the site. Trumpington Street is identified as an accident cluster site and therefore the County Council request that the applicant consider the manoeuvres associated with the accidents identified.

The proposals include the removal of 15 car parking spaces, with 26 spaces being provided post occupation. Details have not been provided how many staff will be allocated spaces and whether the parking for Browns staff and the car club will remain, therefore further information is required.

There are currently 222 cycle parking spaces provided on site, this is to be increased by 80 additional spaces to 302 spaces. The cycle parking standards require one cycle parking space be provided for all students using the site and 1 for every 2 members of staff. The County Council recommend that cycle parking be provided in accordance with minimum standards.

The Southern Corridor Area Transport Plan is referred to in the policy section of the document although no attempt has been made to calculate the level of contribution. This is required.

Having reviewed the Transport Statement and Travel Plan submitted in support of the application the County Council require that further information be provided prior to being in a position to comment fully on the application.

Highway Safety

No objection: The application provides additional footway on the Tennis Court Road frontage of the site. The Highway Authority would be willing to accept any additional footway width as highway maintainable at the public expense and this should be dedicated under Section 37 of the Highways Act 1980.

A Traffic Management Plan condition is recommended.

6.2 *Application as amended*

Officer Note: An additional Transport Assessment and Travel Plan Addendum report has been submitted to address the issues raised by the County Council Transport Team. At the time of writing this report, no further comments have been received. I will report these on the Amendment Sheet or orally at Committee.

Head of Refuse and Environment

- 6.3 No objection subject to conditions relating to construction and delivery hours, piling and a contaminated land informative.

Urban Design and Conservation Team

6.4 *Application as submitted*

In essence, with respect to the demolition of the hostels and replacement building issues, the hostels make a limited positive contribution to the conservation area and there is conflict with Policies 4/10 and 4/11 of the Local Plan, but this should not be an outright obstacle if a suitable replacement building is proposed. With reference to NPPF paragraph 134, the “less than substantial harm” of the demolition would need to be outweighed by the public benefits of the proposal.

Proposed

The overall concept of providing additional facilities for the Business School to remain on the site is accepted; they have stated that the building and the very particular architecture of John Outram, with the historic building, provide the ‘identity’ of the school.

The Hostel Buildings.

The demolition of the Bridget’s and Nightingale hostels buildings is said to be central to providing the quantity of development proposed by the Judge Business School. There has been some analysis submitted about the potential for reuse of these

buildings. The application contains a report about refurbishing them as hostels/student accommodation – which the Business School say they do not need. There does not however, appear to have been serious consideration of a design that re-uses and extends the existing buildings to provide facilities that the Business School does want. This is required.

The Replacement Building.

The general choice of materials is appropriate. However, in order that they work together cohesively within the building as well as with adjacent buildings, a condition addressing the detailed choice is advised.

Scale and massing

A number of concerns were raised at pre-application stages relating to the bulk and unbroken length of built form along the Tennis Court Road street frontage as well as the loss of glimpsed views between the hostel buildings to the rear elevation of the old Addenbrooke's Hospital Building. The submitted long distance views from the adjacent Downing College site indicate the proposed building will be screened due to the arrangement of existing buildings within the Downing site and the extent of tree cover.

The proposed scheme includes an external roof terrace at second floor level on the Tennis Court Road frontage. The terrace is set back approximately 3.5m and extends approximately 17m in width.

East Elevation

The existing hostel buildings incorporate a number of windows at basement and ground floor level, the majority of which are at head height with few at waist level. Most of these windows are barred and have obscured glazing for privacy.

The submitted scheme proposes a series of vertical windows along the Tennis Court Road. The proportion of glazing at ground floor level has increased from 10% to 20%. The height of the proposed window cills has reduced from 2165mm to 1550mm. The lower cill level is supported.

South Elevation

The south elevation of the existing Bridget's Hostel includes a number of windows and an entrance door at ground floor level. Further thought to the arrangement of materials, detailing, openings and their position is required for this elevation to strengthen its visual presence, proportions and overall composition.

Conclusion:

Little consideration has been given to an alternative approach whereby benefits could be obtained without demolition of the hostels. The south elevation of the proposed building is unsatisfactory in its visual contribution to the aspect along Tennis Court Road. In terms of the NPPF, any public benefits of the proposals need to be weighed against the (less than substantial) harm of the demolitions.

6.5 *Application as amended*

There have been a number of meetings with the applicant to discuss the proposals.

The amended/revised plans address the south elevation (to service yard/Tennis Court Road) of the new building; and the east and northern (external) elevations of the "Ark" – the Outram extension of the main building.

Three outstanding areas of concern in relation to the impact of the proposals on heritage assets were recently discussed:

1. Panelling of windows on the east wall of the Ark
2. Panelling of decorative corner pier on northern elevation of the Ark
3. Removal of doors to north entrance/lobby area

Taking each of these matters in turn we comment as follows:

1. In our view, impacts on the Ark remain in relation to the east wall (what will become a corridor) due to the proposed removal of the colourful and particular windows framing/surrounds (beside the coloured brick piers now to be retained). Such

removal is, in our view, detrimental and not agreed at this stage, however we consider that this can be agreed at a later date and to address the matter we suggest a condition to enable acceptable treatment to be agreed.

2. The lower level, including decorative piers, of the northern (external) elevation of the “Ark” would be clad. We understand that the central panels are for aesthetic consideration in order to “tie” the space together with the new lobby area being created. Discussion at the 10th March meeting with the applicant, agent and architect revealed that structural constraints necessitated the placing of structural piers at either side/end of this elevation. We questioned in detail the requirement and evidence to justify such piers as they in effect “cover up” a key decorative building feature of the Ark. The agent undertook to supply the Council with further structural information to explain this requirement. We have not yet seen this information, however we now have a better understanding of why a pier is necessary in this location. While undesirable in heritage terms, it was explained that the “grid” construction of the first floor above this lobby area necessitated a pier being placed directly in front of this decorative column.
3. The proposed removal of the original Outram doors in the canted north entrance screen remains a further adverse aspect on the original Outram design – especially for the sake of plain replacements. These are not agreed at this stage so a condition is required to enable acceptable replacement.

Confirmation of the omission from the overall scheme of the removal of the Outram front doors from the main front façade is welcomed and supported.

Hostel Buildings Report

The report sets out to justify the existing proposals in terms of (what is considered by the applicant) the cellular nature of the hostels and square metre comparisons. The study however does not include an architectural study of other (perhaps radical) options of remodelling and extension.

In terms of the replacement of the Hostels in the conservation area by the proposed block fronting Tennis Court Road, the massing, materials, and more recently the adjustments made to

fenestration of the south facing elevation, are considered acceptable in design terms.

Conclusion

The revised drawings go some way to ameliorating the concerns set out in our original comments in respect of the impact the proposals on the listed building. However, it remains that conditions are required to still control certain changes as set out above. Finally, before the application is determined it would be helpful to see the promised justification by way of illustration of the structural requirements of the first floor construction outside the canted north screen and to agree same as evidence for the pier referred to in section 2 above.

In addition to these conditions, standard conditions as set out in our previous comments dated 31 December, 2014, are also required.

With the conditions outlined in sections 1 and 3 above and the further evidence requested in section 2, we conclude that the applications are acceptable in design terms and comply with policies 4/10 (Listed Buildings) and 4/11 (Conservation Areas) of the Cambridge Local Plan (2006).

Senior Sustainability Officer (Design and Construction)

- 6.6 No objection: The applicant has submitted a sustainability statement outlining their approach to sustainable design and construction. The document clearly demonstrates that the principles of sustainable design and construction have been integrated into design development. For example, one of the key objectives for the project is to deliver a building that achieves the highest possible environmental and sustainability standards, which is evident in the targeting of a BREEAM 'excellent' rating for the scheme.

Key elements that have been integrated into the design include:

-The creation of efficient floor plates to optimise passive environmental strategies (shallow floor plan and high ceilings to maximise daylighting and natural ventilation);

-Exposed thermal mass in the form of exposed in-situ concrete soffits, combined with secure night ventilation to further assist a passive cooling strategy.

-The integration of shading devices into the architectural design of the building, with the use of pre-cast fins to help prevent excessive solar gain and deep external reveals as part of the façade design.

All of these measures are supported. Other measures being incorporated to help the building achieve the targeted BREEAM 'excellent' rating include:

-The hierarchical approach to reducing energy requirements and associated carbon emissions, which means that the building can achieve the 25% reduction in CO2 emissions compared to Part L 2010;

-The specification of water efficient sanitary ware and appliances to enable achievement of a 40% reduction in potable water use;

-Sustainable sourcing of materials and measures to reduce construction waste.

The applicant has submitted an Energy Statement setting out carbon calculations and a feasibility assessment of a range of renewable energy technologies. The preferred technologies to be utilised are photovoltaic panels and solar thermal panels. Together these technologies are predicted to reduce emissions and represent a 10.3% reduction. This approach is supported.

The overall approach to integrating sustainable design and construction into the design of the scheme, and the proposals related to renewable energy provision are supported.

Access Officer

- 6.7 No objection: Where doors are double and unpowered, one leaf should be at least 800mm. The decoration could include good colour contrast to aid visually impaired users. Raked auditoriums could have wheelchair access at top and bottom of theatres and handrails on steps. This is generally a very good access proposal.

Head of Streets and Open Spaces (Sustainable Drainage Officer)

6.8 *Application as submitted*

I cannot support the application as it currently stands because of the following reasons:

-Although there is a discussion around site discharge there are no actual proposals for what the final surface water discharge rate is to be.

-A plan indicating the contributing areas should be provided to justify the contributing area, any green planting areas however small should be excluded from this calculation.

Whilst the application has demonstrated there is no flood risk to the development by no commitment to a discharge rate it has not demonstrated that flood risk will not be increased as a result of the development.

Head of Streets and Open Spaces (Public Art Officer)

6.9 *Application as submitted*

It is disappointing that for such a significant development, advice has not been sought for the inclusion of public art within it at a much earlier stage of the design process and that a Public Art Delivery Plan (PADP) has not been developed to outline how this will be done and by whom. It is crucial that the developer seeks expert advice about how to develop the arts proposals and that the Council's Public Art Officer is contacted as soon as possible to also provide advice. It is crucial that the PADP has details of the budget submitted. Any proposals developed to integrate work within the fabric of the building will require the LA's approval prior to commencement of development.

Application as amended

Officer note: The applicants have appointed a public art consultancy 'InSite Arts'. A draft PADP has been submitted and I am awaiting further advice from the Public Art Officer

regarding this. I will report any further comments on the amendment sheet or orally at the meeting.

English Heritage

- 6.10 No Objection: English Heritage consider the existing nurses hostel buildings on Tennis Court Road make a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the Central Cambridge Conservation Area and are satisfied that the scale, massing, design and materials of the proposed replacement building, together with the proposed internal and external alterations to the grade II listed Old Addenbrooke's Hospital (now the Judge Business School) building and the proposed link building to Keynes House would not cause harm to the conservation area and are therefore contextually appropriate for this sensitive site. We would have no objection should your authority be minded to approve the application.

Environment Agency

- 6.11 No Objection. Recommend a condition that if, during development, contamination not previously identified is found to be present at the site then no further development shall be carried out until the developer has submitted a remediation strategy to the local planning authority. Informatives regarding surface water drainage, foul water and pollution prevention are recommended.

Cambridgeshire Constabulary (Architectural Liaison Officer)

- 6.12 No Objection: In terms of crime, the JBS has seen 7 x crimes recorded in 3 years. These are broken down as 4 x theft related, 2 x stolen cycles and 1 x burglary. The security of the new building has been thoroughly considered. The lecture theatre windows in relation to the footpath on Tennis Court Road should be glazed with laminated glass to minimise the risk of damage. The lecture theatres will be air conditioned, these windows will be non-opening. No further comments are made and there is no objection on crime and disorder grounds.

Cambridgeshire County Council (Archaeology)

- 6.13 The development area was evaluated in 2013 to determine the significance of archaeological remains. The evaluation demonstrated the presence of a cemetery of 14th century or earlier date, most probably associated with the medieval proprietary chapel of St. Edmund. Evidence of Medieval occupation of unknown extent and duration was also found. This archaeological evidence was found to be truncated in the later 18th century due to quarrying ahead of the construction of Addenbrooke's Hospital (now the Judge Business School). In addition, later cemetery evidence is also at the Judge Business School relating to the infirmary cemetery of Old Addenbrooke's Hospital. The archaeological evidence present in the development area is of great significance in terms of the understanding more of the lost parish of St Edmund's and requires excavation in advance of construction.

We do not object to development from proceeding in this location but consider that the site should be subject to a programme of archaeological investigation. A written scheme of investigation has been agreed and a condition to ensure that investigative works are carried out in accordance with it is recommended.

Design and Conservation Panel (Meeting of 11 June 2014)

6.14 1. Presentation - Cambridge Judge Business School – Phase 1

The Panel's comments are as follows:

- ☐ Long and short distant views. Following comments made at the December 2013 site visit, the provision of these views is very much welcomed. The extent of the tree cover in the Downing College/Tennis Court Road as demonstrated in these views is compelling.
- ☐ Heritage value of hostel buildings. The Panel were informed by officers that as the original Historic Core Appraisal document did not include buildings that made a positive contribution to the Conservation Area, the value of these hostel buildings was yet to be determined. This is regarded as a crucial issue by the Panel and one that needs urgent clarification. As described in the presentation, these buildings are a part of the character of

Tennis Court Road, but should they be confirmed as heritage assets, a specific case for their demolition or how their loss would be mitigated would need to be made.

- ☐ Views facing south along Tennis Court Road
- ☐ Courtyard set-back. The Panel would welcome further development of the proposed overhanging planting seen only very faintly in the images provided. This would provide some relief and enhancement to what would otherwise be a stark façade.
- ☐ Set-back element (materials). Very little information was provided as to the quality of this element. Further articulation is therefore needed. The Panel note the difficulties in needing to provide glazing appropriate for a social space, versus the impact of additional solar gain for a passively ventilated building.
- ☐ Views facing north. The Panel were informed that a screen wall would be used to obscure refuse bins etc. This would make for a very stark/negative experience at street level. The inclusion of additional trees behind this wall is recommended in order to break up this long masonry frontage on Tennis Court Road.
- ☐ Rear service yard. The Panel would like to see views maintained of the rear elements of the Outram Building, as this provides some delight for the passer-by at street level.
- ☐ Treatment of the Roofscape/roof profile. This was not presented in great detail to the Panel, although all agreed that the inclusion of a 'box' as the highest element would be more appropriate than a pitched roof in this context.
- ☐ Materials and detailing. All agreed these would be crucial to the success of the scheme.
- ☐ War Memorial. As referred to at the December site visit, there is some evidence to suggest that a historic WW1 war memorial is located on this site, whether within Keynes House or elsewhere. The Panel will look forward to a definitive outcome regarding this matter.
- ☐ Cycle parking. The Panel would stress the need for appropriate cycle parking provision to accommodate the additional staff and pupils using the site.

Conclusion:

The design team are praised for their excellent site analysis and clear presentation.

Some reservations were expressed in general terms as to the appropriateness of such a clear break in the façade above 1st floor level and more specifically as to the nature of the set-back element. Greater articulation is needed here.

This proposal relies on the demolition of the existing Nightingale and Bridget hostels however, and some feeling persisted among Panel members that this building's ability to enhance the character and appearance of the Conservation Area was yet to be proven.

VERDICT – GREEN (6), AMBER (1)'

Disability Consultative Panel (Meeting of 28 October 2014)

- 6.15 Some of the accessible features were commented upon as follows:

The accessible courtyard parking will be retained.

Entrance: The existing heavy double doors will be replaced by power-assisted doors and more glazing. The flush threshold will be retained. A secondary door will be activated by an adjustable sensor. The Panel would welcome some form of tactile directional indicators to aid those approaching the entrance from the street that may be visually impaired.

Atrium - Reception desk: This will be at desk height in the centre of the space.

The Panel would request that the architects consider the distances that ambulant disabled student, lecturers or visitors may need to cross. The Panel would for example welcome benches and other seating in the atrium space in a variety of styles and heights. A walking stick/crutch holder at the reception desk is also recommended. The Panel expressed some concern regarding the potentially hazardous marble flooring, although some assurance was provided in the form of absorbent mats at the entrance and various staff members that would be available to help manage the atrium space.

New signage strategy: With various lift cores, staircases and walkways within the new and existing building, the need for a 2 year signage project has been identified. The Panel note that

interim measures will be in place in anticipation of this main project.

Accessible lecture theatres: The Panel welcomes the inclusion of hearing induction loops in all teaching and meeting room spaces as well as the exploration into wider door widths and movable lecture theatre furniture. However, consideration also needs to be shown towards disabled lecturers who may need a ramp or handrail to reach the stage and a table instead of a lectern.

Tennis Court Road pavement: The Panel welcomed the proposal to widen the footpath, as this is currently a narrow road where high speed vehicular movements can make this a hostile environment for pedestrians and wheelchair users.

Conclusion

The Panel welcome the variety of accessible features included in this proposal and the fact that disabled students had been approached to provide comments at an early stage.

- 6.16 The above responses are a summary of the comments that have been received. Full details of the consultation responses can be inspected on the application file.

7.0 REPRESENTATIONS

- 7.1 I have not received any representations from third parties.

8.0 ASSESSMENT

- 8.1 From the consultation responses received and from my inspection of the site and the surroundings, I consider that the main issues are:

1. Principle of development
2. Context of site, design and external spaces
3. Public Art
4. Renewable energy and sustainability
5. Disabled access
6. Amenity of adjacent occupiers
7. Refuse arrangements
8. Highway safety

- 9. Car and cycle parking
- 10. Planning Obligation Strategy

Principle of Development

- 8.2 The issues of principle can be placed into two main categories. Firstly, there is the question of the loss of the student accommodation use which has to be balanced against the public benefits of strengthening the Judge Business School's (JBS) educational provision. Secondly, there is the proposed physical loss of the two hostel buildings which has to be balanced against whether the replacement building is an acceptable alternative in terms of its design and contribution to the character and setting of the Conservation Area and adjacent listed buildings.

Loss of Student Use

- 8.3 Policy 5/4 states that in cases of redevelopment and change of use that the loss of residential accommodation will not be permitted unless it can be demonstrated that:
- a) the property is unfit for human habitation and cannot be rehabilitated;
 - b) it is a subsidiary part of a non-residential property;
 - c) it is a Listed Building which can be best preserved through a change of use;
 - d) it is necessary for the provision of community facilities for which there is a need in Cambridge; or
 - e) the lost accommodation is replaced by at least an equivalent amount of new residential floorspace. Such provision will be made on site unless otherwise agreed.
- 8.4 The hostels have been occupied by Anglia Ruskin University students since 1990 on a leasehold arrangement which came to an end in 2014. They are currently vacant but did accommodate approximately 121 students.
- 8.5 In relation to criteria a), the application is accompanied by a Condition Survey report which concludes that whilst the hostel buildings are not unfit for human habitation, they could not be viably converted into modern student accommodation. The application does not accord with criteria a.

- 8.6 Criteria b and c are not relevant.
- 8.7 With reference to criteria d, policy 5/11 excludes University teaching accommodation from the definition of a community facility. It could not therefore be argued that the loss of the housing is necessary for the provision of a community facility. The terms of this criterion are not met.
- 8.8 With reference to criteria e, the applicants state that the Old Press/Mill Lane site will be likely to make provision for 200 student units and that the University is planning an additional 280 student units for phase 1 at North West Cambridge. I am not aware of a causal relationship between the loss of ARU student accommodation from the application site and the provision of additional University of Cambridge student accommodation. Neither is there a direct relationship with the site and the provision of additional accommodation for Anglia Ruskin University students at CB1 where ultimately 1,250 units could be occupied by ARU students and for whom progress has been made in provision at the former Brunswick site under policy 7/9 of the Local Plan. This accommodation was not put forward and approved as full or partial replacement for lost accommodation for ARU from the hostels.
- 8.9 In my view, criteria e of policy 5/4 is not satisfied. In my opinion, however, evidence of student completions and commitments (3,133 units) since the start of the plan period for the emerging Local Plan, demonstrates that the loss of the site for housing either ARU or University of Cambridge students would not significantly prejudice their respective student housing need. On this basis, I see no harm arising from the loss of the student units against the provisions of policy 5/4 even though none of the criteria are met. This loss must, in any case, be balanced against the needs of the JBS which are supported under policy 7/5, and discussed below.

The needs and economic impact of the Judge Business School

- 8.10 Policy 7/5 promotes the development or redevelopment of University sites in the City Centre. It states that such proposals will be permitted if they allow improved facilities, a reduction in parking, improvement to external environment and amenity space and better use of land. In my view, the proposal accords with all of these criteria, particularly in making better use of land.

8.11 The JBS is a provider of education and research. It has been located on the old Addenbrookes site in the city centre for 15 years and has grown substantially in that time, both in size and reputation.

8.12 The application is accompanied by a report on the impact of the JBS on the City of Cambridge and its economy, which goes some way to demonstrating a wider public economic benefit from allowing the proposal.

8.13 The impact can be summarised as follows:

1. Practical involvement of students with local companies.
2. Start-up Assistance: 'Accelerate Cambridge' nurturing new Cambridge start-ups
3. Entrepreneurship: Providing education for entrepreneurs
4. Education in Business and Management.
5. Research: Work done by the Centre for Business Research on the region's economic activity and how the presence of the University affects it.
6. Executive Education.
7. Employment and Expenditure: 200 staff, 550 students and other visiting participants such as Executive Education delegates, represents around 4% of the University of Cambridge overall as measured in terms of expenditure

8.14 In particular, the JBS state:

'...we are severely constrained in our ambitions by the shortcomings in our physical space. Our facilities are neither extensive enough nor good enough to support growth and compare poorly with our direct competitors, many of whom are in the process of improving their facilities even further e.g. Oxford Said Business School, who last year completed phase two of a four phase expansion programme and London Business School, who are refurbishing the old Marylebone Town Hall for educational purposes. Recognising this threat we have initiated plans to expand our footprint on our city centre site with the support of the university and with significant philanthropic donations. If these plans can be realised then we can move forward with confidence, building on the successful progress of the past ten years.

We believe that the future success of this business school and the prosperity of the city are aligned and we trust that readers of this report will share that view and determine that we find ways to work together to achieve our ambitions.'

- 8.15 In my view, the proposed JBS extensions will have a positive economic impact on the local economy. The JBS has put forward a robust case for a need to remain on the existing site. The difficulties with the current JBS accommodation will be rectified through the new building. The need to maintain a competitive edge with other business schools and improve existing facilities in this location is justified. With regard to policy 5/4 and lost student accommodation as weighed against the benefits of improving the JBS's accommodation under policy 7/5, there is, in my opinion, a justifiable and strong argument for accepting the proposal in principle.

Loss of the Hostel Buildings

- 8.16 The proposal would involve the demolition of the two hostel buildings and their replacement with a purpose designed building for the JBS.
- 8.17 Notwithstanding that officers agree that the buildings are not worthy of being locally listed as non-designated heritage assets, the hostel buildings do have a limited positive impact on the character and appearance of the Conservation Area by virtue of their following qualities:
- ☐ Scale and height: being relative to nearby buildings
 - ☐ Materials: traditional Gault brick and slate
 - ☐ Fenestration: multi-pane, characteristic of the surrounding streets
 - ☐ Discrete block form and spacing: in particular in context with Kings Hostel but also Downing College.
 - ☐ Embellishment: particularly the southernmost (Bridget's) hostel having attractive red brick detailing.
 - ☐ Glimpse views: through to the Addenbrooke's building.
 - ☐ Break in building form.

8.18 An additional report was submitted by the applicants in order to establish whether the current hostel buildings are capable of adaptation by the JBS. This concludes that:

- The retention and reuse of the hostel buildings would reduce the available area by approximately 1,000m². The spaces that could be provided would be compromised in their scale which would further reduce the extent of the elements from the brief that could be achieved within the existing hostel buildings.
- To enable the large scale spaces to be located within the existing buildings there would need to be significant and costly structural alteration, which would be likely to result in a scheme where the majority of the internal structure is removed - a facade retention proposal.
- There would need to be significant amendments to the building services, beyond the replacement of the all the listing services, this would include the replacement and upgrading of all the windows and major thermal improvements to walls and the roof to bring the existing buildings in line with the current Building Regulations.

8.19 I accept that it would not possible to accommodate the needs of the JBS within the current buildings on site. I place little merit on the potential for a façade retention scheme only and this has not been specifically sought by either the Council's Urban Design and Conservation team or English Heritage. However, the buildings are not structurally unsound and could probably continue in student use subject to the necessary investment. As such, the proposed demolition is in conflict with policies 4/10 and 4/11 of the Local Plan but, in my view, and that of Conservation Officers and English Heritage, this should not be an outright obstacle if a suitable replacement building is proposed.

8.20 With reference to NPPF paragraph 134, the "less than substantial harm" of the demolition needs to be outweighed by the public benefits of the proposal. One part of these public benefits is the wider economic impact of strengthening the JBS education offer that would be brought about. The second is the contribution the new building would make to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area and setting of the adjacent listed buildings compared to that existing.

- 8.21 In my opinion, whilst there is conflict with policies 4/10 and 4/11, in light of NPPF guidance, this should not necessarily be an outright obstacle to accepting demolition of the hostel buildings. Subject to a suitable replacement building being proposed, the principle of the development is acceptable and in accordance with Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies, 5/4, 7/9, 4/10 and 4/11.

Context of site, design and external spaces

- 8.22 The overall concept of providing additional facilities for the JBS to remain on the site is accepted by Conservation Officers, the Design & Conservation Panel and English Heritage. The way in which these additional facilities are provided affects the listed building, its setting and the townscape of some of the most prominent streets in the conservation area.

Scale and Massing

- 8.23 The proposed building rises to 4 storeys and is approximately 0.5m higher than the existing roofline of Bridget's Hostel and 0.75m higher than Nightingale Hostel. At 3rd floor level it is set-back 4m on the east and north elevations and 1m on the south elevation. The scale of the building, in comparison to that existing, is acceptable.
- 8.24 Previously there were concerns regarding the massing and unbroken length of the building with particular reference to the loss of the glimpse view between the hostels from Tennis Court Road to the back of the old Addenbrooke's building. Officers have accepted that long-distance views from Downing College between the hostel buildings do not appear to be readily apparent because of the extent of tree cover (both deciduous and coniferous) and the limited angle of view from Downing. The Design & Access Statement provides a number of studies which demonstrates this. In my opinion, the gap between the buildings does not form an important view from within the Conservation Area and is not crucial to the setting of the old Addenbrooke's building either from Tennis Court Road or Downing.
- 8.25 Oblique views of the scheme up and down Tennis Court Road are important. The Design & Access Statement demonstrates through a series of CGI's that the proposed set-back in the

middle of the building is of sufficient depth (4.5m) to suggest a break in building form and help preserve the existing sense of rhythm and spacing of buildings. This is accepted by the Urban Design and Conservation team and addresses issues raised by the Design and Conservation Panel.

Southern Façade

- 8.26 The southern façade of the new build would be prominent along Tennis Court Road. The existing view of Bridget's hostel presents a fine grain of detailing and a strong composition of windows and balance of solid and void terminating at ground level.
- 8.27 The proposal has been amended to strengthen the southern façade with the introduction of larger windows and a rebalancing of the proportions and positions of openings. The Urban Design and Conservation team are now satisfied with how this elevation would appear. I agree with their assessment.

Eastern Facade

- 8.28 The existing hostel buildings incorporate a number of windows at basement and ground floor level, the majority of which are at head height with few at waist level. Most of these windows are barred and have obscured glazing for privacy.
- 8.29 The proposed façade has been revised to lower the windows onto Tennis Court Road which, whilst preserving the privacy of associated lecture rooms, provides more animation at street level. The Design & Access Statement compares the existing extent of openings from the hostel building with those proposed. The proposal compares favourably and would provide a greater degree of animation at street level to improve the pedestrian experience. The pre-cast concrete fins to the windows would give deep reveals to the openings and would work well in giving modulation to the façade.

Listed Building Interventions

- 8.30 There has been concern whether the joins between the proposal and the more recent Ark building by Outram have been successfully delivered to minimise the loss of listed fabric.

- 8.31 Four key issues were highlighted by Conservation Officers. I outline how these issues have been addressed by the applicants below:

1: Front Door

- 8.32 The applicants originally proposed the removal of the external front door to the old Addenbrooke's building. This is part & parcel of what appears to be Outram's conversion and visually signifies the vibrancy of the architecture contained behind it. The proposal would have removed an important visual component of the building in favour of a glazed entrance door. The applicants have removed this element of their proposal from the scheme.

2: Eastern Elevation of the Ark

- 8.33 This elevation currently exhibits multi-coloured brickwork columns. The columns were originally proposed as being over-clad. Officers considered the brickwork, by Outram, was of importance and required being revealed rather than hidden. The applicants have responded by revealing the brick columns of the Ark building and providing a light-weight glazing system above. I have recommended condition 4 on the associated application for listed building consent to ensure that agreement is reached regarding the extent of loss of the window frames between the brick columns.

3: Northern and Western Elevations of the Ark

- 8.34 The applicants also propose the brickwork in this location to be partially clad. The plans have been amended to lessen the extent of cladding and officers have met with the applicants to clarify the structural constraints of new columns having to be placed in front of existing columns. A further structural report has been provided which justifies the positioning of the new structural columns and I am confident that the interface is satisfactory.

4: Outram Doors on the Canted Elevation

- 8.35 The proposal includes the removal of the original Outram doors in the canted north entrance screen. This removal remains a concern to officers and does not appear necessary. Plain

glazed replacements are proposed which would open up internal views of the new foyer area. The removal of these doors is not agreed at this stage. Condition 3 is recommended on the associated application for listed building consent to enable an acceptable replacement.

Overall

- 8.36 There is no question that the proposal is a well thought-out extension to the old Addenbrooke's hospital building. The scale is acceptable and the means of linking the old to the new via a landscaped podium will make efficient use of otherwise underused spaces. The relatively plain architectural design of the proposal gives more of a clinical impression than the old hospital building to which it adjoins. That said, the design and modular detailing with deep reveals and use of high quality materials is impressive and has the support of the Urban Design and Conservation team, English Heritage and the Design and Conservation Panel. To my mind, the replacement building would improve the character and appearance of the Conservation Area and the setting of adjacent listed buildings. It is therefore compliant with policies 3/12, 3/14 and 4/11 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006. Whilst the demolition of the hostels is in conflict with policy 4/10, the quality of the replacement building and the improvement to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area is a significant public benefit and together with the economic benefits the strengthening of the JBS education offer would bring, the proposal accords with paragraph 134 of the NPPF (2012).

Public Art

- 8.37 The application did not originally include a public art delivery plan (PADP). This has now been submitted from public art consultants InSite Arts. The PADP includes two strands.
- 8.38 The first is to create a permanent work for the new building. The PADP states:

‘The general public will not have access into this new building. Therefore it is most appropriate that a permanent artwork is developed for the school on the exterior of the building along Tennis Court Road and/ or

on its South Elevation to give public access to this artwork...A permanent artwork could be integrated within the Southern Elevation of the new building to Tennis Court Road. This work may form part of the elevation or be applied to the elevation. The appointed artist and Stanton Williams will work together to agree the best and most appropriate location for the proposed artwork'

8.39 The PADP includes an indicative programme and a suggested budget of £132,200 for this.

8.40 The second strand is to provide a temporary work with the aim of sharing the story of the old Addenbrookes building, its arts programme and the future of the JBS. The PADP states that it would include:

- '1. Specially commissioned temporary events from local artists and art organisations from the city.
2. Partnerships with existing arts events and programmes linked to wider city initiatives.
3. Dialogue with the Fitzwilliam Museum, to explore the possibility of the Forecourt becoming an extended venue to the Museums Outdoor Gallery or explore possibilities for a relationship between the two buildings.
4. Working with art institutions, potentially Anglia Ruskin School of Art, with work from this relationship being exhibited.'

8.41 The PADP includes an indicative programme for the temporary work and a suggested budget of £45,000 for this.

8.42 The PADP also includes a proposed management structure and artist selection process. It recommends close involvement with the chosen artists and the architects Stanton Williams.

8.43 I am awaiting feedback from the Council's Public Art Officer on the submitted PADP and will report this on the amendment sheet or orally at Committee.

Renewable energy and sustainability

8.44 The building would be targeted to be built to BREEAM excellent. The design of the building includes: shallow floor plans and high ceilings to maximise daylighting and natural

ventilation; exposed thermal mass, with passive cooling technology; and the integration of shading devices to help prevent excessive solar gain. The building is predicted to achieve a 25% reduction in CO2 emissions compared to Part L of the 2010 Building Regulations. The Council's Sustainability Officer supports these measures.

- 8.45 The applicant has submitted an Energy Statement setting out carbon calculations to satisfy the 10% renewables requirement under policy 8/16. This proposes solar photovoltaic and solar thermal panels which are predicted to represent a 10.3% reduction in carbon emissions. This approach is supported.
- 8.46 In my opinion, the applicants have suitably addressed the issue of sustainability and renewable energy and the proposal is in accordance with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policy 8/16 and the Sustainable Design and Construction SPD 2007.

Disabled access

- 8.47 The application includes a comprehensive Access Statement demonstrating that an inclusive environment will be created. Both the Council's Access Officer and the Disability Consultative Panel have commented on and support the proposal. The Access Statement confirms flush thresholds between new and old; tactile directional indicators; a low desk height reception; accessible lecture theatres; hearing induction loops in all reception, teaching and meeting room spaces; the retention of 4 disabled car parking spaces; and a signage strategy
- 8.48 In my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 3/7 and 3/12.

Amenity of Adjacent Occupiers

Impact on amenity of neighbouring occupiers

- 8.49 Neighbours include the grounds and buildings of Downing College to the east, Kings Hostel to the north and laboratory buildings to the south. There are no dwellings affected by the proposal. Because the scale of building is very similar to that existing, I do not consider that the visual impact of the proposed building from any of these neighbouring buildings would be

harmful. The application includes shadow plans, which demonstrates a negligible impact in terms of overshadowing to Kings Hostel compared to the existing situation.

8.50 I note that the Environmental Health Officer has recommended conditions regarding construction and delivery hours, dust and piling. The Highways Officer has recommended a Traffic Management Plan condition for construction traffic. I propose conditions 3, 4, 5 and 15 accordingly.

8.51 In my opinion the proposal adequately respects the amenity of its neighbours and the constraints of the site and I consider that it is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 3/4 and 3/7.

Refuse Arrangements

8.52 The proposal would utilise the existing service yard off Tennis Court Road for deliveries and refuse collection. An internal storage area for bins is proposed within the internal layout. This is satisfactorily located and is of adequate size to serve the building.

8.53 In my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policy 3/12.

Highway Safety

8.54 The Highways Officer has not raised any concern with regard to the impact of the scheme on highway safety. I recommend condition 14 to ensure that the additional pavement width is provided onto Tennis Court Road.

8.55 In my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policy 8/2.

Car and Cycle Parking

Car Parking

8.56 Existing car parking is provided across three main areas of the site; in front of Keynes House, to the rear of Keynes House and behind Nightingale Hostel. The total number of spaces is to be reduced from 41 to 26, mainly because of the loss of those

spaces to the rear of Nightingale Hostel for the new build. The approach to the reduction in car parking is acceptable and together with the implementation of a Travel Plan, this will ensure that sustainable travel to and from the site is promoted. There is already a car club space on site and the applicants have confirmed that it will remain.

Cycle Parking

- 8.57 The site currently has 292 cycle parking spaces. A further 80 spaces were proposed as part of the original application. This has been subsequently increased by 24 spaces, meaning 396 cycle spaces in total are proposed.
- 8.58 The cycle parking standards require that 1 cycle space be provided for every 2 members of staff. 270 staff are forecast at the JBS, requiring 135 cycle parking spaces for staff.
- 8.59 The cycle parking standards require that cycle parking be provided for all students using the site. The total maximum number of students using the site in any given hour is estimated at 404.
- 8.60 The standards therefore require a total of 539 cycle spaces to be provided and the application is 143 spaces short (539-396).
- 8.61 Paragraph 1.2 of the standards, states that some flexibility for the historic core area of the city where land constraints may make application of the standards difficult for change of use or refurbishment will be applied. In my view, the applicants have sought to meaningfully increase their cycle parking provision and some flexibility should be applied in this case. The cycle stands would all be a mixture of Sheffield hoops and Falco racking. Internally within the Ark building, shower and changing facilities would be provided together with locker space.
- 8.62 In my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 8/6 and 8/10.

Planning Obligation Strategy

Planning Obligations

8.63 The Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010 have introduced the requirement for all local authorities to make an assessment of any planning obligation in relation to three tests. If the planning obligation does not pass the tests then it is unlawful. The tests are that the planning obligation must be:

- (a) necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms;
- (b) directly related to the development; and
- (c) fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development.

In bringing forward my recommendations in relation to the Planning Obligation for this development I have considered these requirements. The Planning Obligation Strategy (2010) provides a framework for expenditure of financial contributions collected through planning obligations. The Public Art Supplementary Planning Document 2010 addresses requirements in relation to public art. The applicants have indicated their willingness to enter into a S106 planning obligation in accordance with the requirements of the Strategy and relevant Supplementary Planning Documents. The proposed development triggers the requirement for the following community infrastructure:

Transport

8.64 Contributions towards catering for additional trips generated by proposed development are sought where 50 or more (all mode) trips on a daily basis are likely to be generated. The site lies within the Southern Corridor Area Transport Plan where the contribution sought per trip is £369.

8.65 The applicants have submitted a transport assessment on which the following assessment of additional trips and contributions is based.

-226 additional trips x £369 = £83,394.

8.66 However, the applicants state that they do not believe it reasonable or justifiable to continue collecting contributions at a

rate of £369 per trip given that 6 schemes totalling £5,150,000 have now been implemented within the Southern Corridor. They state that the contribution per generated trip should be reduced to £143 resulting in a revised SCATP contribution of £32,207 (bearing in mind the scheme would result in a 27% reduction in car trips).

- 8.67 The County Council Transport team has not responded to the latest addendum to the TA. I am mindful that a revised contribution rate may be unacceptable to the County. I will report any further comments from the Transport team on the amendment sheet or orally at the meeting.
- 8.68 Subject to the completion of a S106 planning obligation to secure this infrastructure provision, I am satisfied that the proposal accords with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 8/3 and 10/1 and the Planning Obligation Strategy 2010.

Public Art

- 8.69 The development is required to make provision for public art and officers have recommended as set out in paragraphs 8.36 to 8.42 above that in this case provision for public art should be made on site. This needs to be secured by the S106 planning obligation.
- 8.70 Subject to the completion of a S106 planning obligation to secure this infrastructure provision, I am satisfied that the proposal accords with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 3/7 and 10/1 and the Public Art SPD 2010.

Travel Plan

- 8.71 The application includes a Travel Plan which has been revised to address a number of issues raised by the County Council. It includes measures such as:
- ☐ The retention of a Car Club space on site
 - ☐ Modal shift targets
 - ☐ Travel Information Packs for staff and students
 - ☐ The appointment of a Travel Plan Co-ordinator
 - ☐ A basic bicycle repair kit available on site
 - ☐ 'Doctor Bike' visits and bike security marking.
 - ☐ Promotion of the existing UoC cycle-to-work salary sacrifice scheme.

- ☐ Promotion of the UoC-wide subsidised fares for travel via the Uni4 bus service
- ☐ Promotion of Train season ticket discounts through membership of the Cambridge Travel for Work (TfW) Partnership, providing a 10% discount for season tickets,
- ☐ Car share promotion

8.72 The provisions of the Travel Plan can be safeguarded through the S106.

Planning Obligations Conclusion

8.73 It is my view that the planning obligation is necessary, directly related to the development and fairly and reasonably in scale and kind to the development and therefore the Planning Obligation passes the tests set by the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010.

9.0 CONCLUSION

9.1 The principle of development is acceptable. The scale of the proposal would be in keeping with existing buildings. The design of the new build would improve the character and appearance of the Conservation Area and setting of adjacent listed buildings. Subject to conditions, specific works to the listed fabric of the Ark building would be acceptable. Overall the proposal would provide much needed space for the Judge Business School in a well-designed building.

10.0 RECOMMENDATION

APPROVE subject to completion of the s106 Agreement, in accordance with advice from Cambridgeshire County Council Transport Team regarding SCATP payments and/or other contributions towards specified highway infrastructure works, by 1 June 2015 and the following conditions:

1. The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.

Reason: In accordance with the requirements of section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

2. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans as listed on this decision notice.

Reason: In the interests of good planning, for the avoidance of doubt and to facilitate any future application to the Local Planning Authority under Section 73 of the Town and Country Planning Act 19.

3. Except with the prior written agreement of the local planning authority in writing no construction work or demolition shall be carried out or plant operated other than between the following hours: 0800 hours to 1800 hours Monday to Friday, 0800 hours to 1300 hours on Saturday and at no time on Sundays, Bank or Public Holidays.

Reason: In order to safeguard the amenity of adjacent occupiers (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 4/13).

4. Except with the prior agreement of the local planning authority in writing, there should be no collection or deliveries to the site during the demolition and construction stages outside the hours of 0700hrs and 1900hrs on Monday - Saturday and there should be no collections or deliveries on Sundays or Bank and public holidays.

Reason: In order to safeguard the amenity of adjacent occupiers (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 4/13).

5. Prior to any piling taking place the applicant shall provide the local authority with a report / method statement for approval detailing the type of piling and mitigation measures to be taken to protect local residents noise and or vibration. Potential noise and vibration levels at the nearest noise sensitive locations shall be predicted in accordance with the provisions of BS 5228-1&2:2009 Code of Practice for noise and vibration control on construction and open sites. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: In order to safeguard the amenity of adjacent occupiers (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 4/13).

6. The roof top plant shall be installed and shall work within the operational parameters as set out in the "Roof Plant - Environmental Noise Assessment" report dated 3rd October 2014, prepared by Applied Acoustic Design.

Reason: To protect adjacent the amenity of adjacent occupiers (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 4/13).

7. The demolition of the buildings and the control over dust shall be carried out in accordance with the submitted Demolition Method Statement of 23rd October 2014.

Reason: To protect adjacent the amenity of adjacent occupiers (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 4/13).

8. All ventilation and extraction equipment shall be installed in accordance with the "Ventilation and Extraction Report", prepared by ARUP, dated 3rd October 2014.

Reason: To protect adjacent the amenity of adjacent occupiers (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 4/13).

9. With the exception of any demolition and underground enabling works, no development shall commence until details of the surface water drainage for the site have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The drainage works shall be constructed in accordance with the approved details prior to the occupation of any part of the development hereby approved.

Reason: In order to ensure adequate means of surface water drainage NPPF 2012

10. No demolition of the Bridget's or Nightingale Hostels shall be commenced until evidence of the full funding and the indicative programme for the construction of the replacement building hereby approved has been first submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In the interests of safeguarding the character and appearance of the Conservation Area (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 4/11).

11. Prior to the removal of any existing foundations and prior to any excavation or construction of new foundations/piles, a system of monitoring the nearby listed buildings/structures for movement shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The submission shall include details of acceptable parameters, frequency and accuracy of measurements, location of monitoring points, etc. Should movement outside the agreed parameters be detected, work on site will cease and the Local Planning Authority and structural engineers will be notified immediately. Thereafter the monitoring shall be undertaken in accordance with the agreed details.

Reason: To protect the adjacent buildings from harm (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 4/10).

12. Before starting any brick or stone work, a sample panel of the facing materials to be used shall be erected on site to establish the detail of bonding, coursing and colour, type of jointing and this shall be agreed in writing with the local planning authority. The quality of finish and materials incorporated in any approved sample panel(s), which shall not be demolished prior to completion of development, shall be maintained throughout the development.

Reason: In the interests of the visual amenity of the Conservation Area and to ensure that the quality and colour of the detailing of the brickwork/stonework and jointing is acceptable and maintained throughout the development (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/12 and 4/11).

13. Prior to their installation, the details of the following shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority:

A: Window design, including sills, lintels, jambs, transoms, mullions, thresholds and reveal depths.

B: All non-masonry walling systems, cladding panels or other external screens including structural members, infill panels, edge, junction details, colours, surface finishes/textures and relationships to glazing and roofing.

C: All masonry (stone, artificial stone, terracotta, brick, faience, etc.) wall or parapet copings including cross-sections and drips.

D: Full details of the means of re-siting of any commemorative plaque(s) salvaged from the demolished buildings.

The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: In the interests of the visual amenity of the Conservation Area (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 4/11).

14. Prior to the occupation of the new building, the additional footway on the Tennis Court Road frontage of the site shall be constructed and provided to an adoptable standard and thereafter remain publicly accessible as if it were part of the public highway for the purposes of its use.

In the interests of improving the public realm and pavement width (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/4, 3/7, 8/2).

15. No demolition or construction works shall commence until a traffic management plan has been agreed in writing by the Planning Authority. It shall include the following:
 - i. Movements and control of muck away lorries (all loading and unloading should be undertaken off the adopted public highway).
 - ii. Contractor parking, all such parking should be within the curtilage of the site and not on street.
 - iii. Movements and control of all deliveries (all loading and unloading should be undertaken off the adopted public highway).
 - iv. Control of dust, mud and debris.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 8/2).

16. If the buildings are scheduled for demolition during the bird breeding season, a check shall be carried out for nesting birds. If any active bird nests are identified, they should be left undisturbed until the chicks have fledged.

Reason: In order to protect existing wildlife (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 4/3).

17. The Archaeological works shall be carried out in accordance with the submitted 'Specification for Archaeological Monitoring at The Judge Institute' prepared by the Cambridge Archaeological Unit, dated 10 March 2015.

Reason: In order to protect historic features of the site (Cambridge Local Plan policies 3/4 and 4/10).

18. The proposed on-site renewable energy technologies shall be fully installed and operational prior to the occupation of the approved building and shall thereafter be maintained and remain fully operational.

Reason: In the interests of reducing carbon dioxide emissions (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 8/16).

19. The cycle parking as shown on the approved plans shall be provided in full prior to the occupation of the building.

Reason: In order to ensure timely provision and promote cycling to and from the site (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 8/2)

INFORMATIVES

S106

This planning permission should be read in conjunction with the associated deed of planning obligation prepared under s.106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended). The applicant is reminded that under the terms of the s106 Agreement you are required to notify the City Council of the date of commencement of development.

Works to the Highway

This development involves work to the public highway that will require the approval of the County Council as Highway Authority. It is an OFFENCE to carry out any works within the public highway, which includes a public right of way, without the permission of the Highway Authority. Please note that it is the applicant's responsibility to ensure that, in addition to planning permission, any necessary consents or approvals under the Highways Act 1980 and the New Roads and Street Works Act 1991 are also obtained from the County Council.

No part of any structure may overhang or encroach under or upon the public highway unless licensed by the Highway Authority and no gate / door / ground floor window shall open outwards over the public highway. Public Utility apparatus may be affected by this proposal. Contact the appropriate utility service to reach agreement on any necessary alterations, the cost of which must be borne by the applicant.

Contaminated Land

If during the works contamination is encountered, the LPA should be informed, additional contamination shall be fully assessed and an appropriate remediation scheme agreed with the LPA. The applicant/agent need to satisfy themselves as to the condition of the land / area and its proposed use, to ensure a premises prejudicial to health situation does not arise in the future

Considerate Contractors

New development can sometimes cause inconvenience, disturbance and disruption to local residents, businesses and passers-by. As a result the City Council runs a Considerate Contractor Scheme aimed at promoting high standards of care during construction. The City Council encourages the developer of the site, through its building contractor, to join the scheme and agree to comply with the model Code of Good Practice, in the interests of good neighbourliness. Information about the scheme can be obtained from The Considerate Contractor project Officer in the Planning Department (Tel: 01223 457121).

2. Unless prior agreement has been obtained from the Head of Planning, in consultation with the Chair and Spokesperson of this Committee to extend the period for completion of the Planning Obligation required in connection with this development, if the Obligation has not been completed by 1 June 2015, or if Committee determine that the application be refused against officer recommendation of approval, it is recommended that the application be refused for the following reason(s):

'The proposed development does not make appropriate provision for transport mitigation measures and public art in accordance with Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/7, 3/12, 8/3 and 10/1 as detailed in the Planning Obligation Strategy 2010, the Public Art Supplementary Planning Document 2010 and the Southern Corridor Area Transport Plan 2002.'

3. In the event that the application is refused, and an Appeal is lodged against the decision to refuse this application, delegated authority is sought to allow officers to negotiate and complete the Planning Obligation required in connection with this development

PLANNING COMMITTEE

1st April 2015

Application Number	14/1805/LBC	Agenda Item	
Date Received	14th November 2014	Officer	Mr Toby Williams
Target Date	9th January 2015		
Ward	Market		
Site	Judge Business School Trumpington Street Cambridge Cambridgeshire CB2 1AG		
Proposal	Internal and external alterations to the Grade II listed former Addenbrooke's Hospital building, including the construction of links to Keynes House and to the proposed new building for the Cambridge Judge Business School.		
Applicant	University of Cambridge		

SUMMARY	The development accords with the Development Plan for the following reasons: -The fabric of the listed buildings would be preserved subject to conditions.
RECOMMENDATION	APPROVAL

1.0 SITE DESCRIPTION/AREA CONTEXT

- 1.1 The site is the old Addenbrooke's hospital (currently occupied by the Judge Business School), Nightingale and Bridget's Hostels which front onto Tennis Court Road, Keynes House and the curtilage of these buildings.
- 1.2 The old Addenbrooke's building is a large Grade II listed building in a prominent position, set back in a formal courtyard bounded by listed railings to Trumpington Street. It is visible from Tennis Court Road, in glimpse views between the hostel buildings and in longer views from Regent Street.
- 1.3 The old Addenbrooke's building was constructed as a hospital in 1766 when the first patients were admitted. It has been much extended since, notably in the 1860's by Matthew Digby Wyatt. Subsequent to the listing, it was converted for the Judge Business School (JBS) by the architect John Outram and

opened in 1996 following the relocation of Addenbrookes hospital to the south of the city. The conversion works undertaken by Outram were radical and extensive. They include two newer brick blocks called the Ark and the Castle that sit on the Tennis Court Road side of the site and extensive internal works, mainly a gallery, to the former hospital building itself that are contained within the 1860's brickwork shell.

- 1.4 The Outram works to the listed building are extremely unusual and specific to the listed building, displaying a colourful array of architectural features inside and outside the building, including new brickwork, door panelling, services and decoration which are now an intrinsic part of the character of the listed building.
- 1.5 Nightingale and Bridget's Hostels are not listed or Buildings of Local Interest. They are currently vacant, most recently occupied by Anglia Ruskin University for 121 students to the summer of 2014.
- 1.6 To the front of the site, facing Trumpington Street, is Keynes House which is curtilage listed.
- 1.7 The site and its buildings fall within the Central Conservation Area.
- 1.8 Opposite and within landscaped grounds are the Downing College buildings, the two closest of which are contemporary additions and not listed. To the north and adjacent to Nightingale Hostel is Kings Hostel, a grade II listed building. To the south, on the same side of the street as Bridget's Hostel, is the University Department of Pharmacology, a modern functional building.

2.0 THE PROPOSAL

- 2.1 The proposal seeks listed building consent to facilitate planning application 14/1797/FUL for additional teaching, office, breakout and dining spaces for the Judge Business School. That proposal links to the existing Ark building and the back of the old Addenbrooke's hospital building. Various alterations to the historic fabric are required, including a link to Keynes House, links and knocking through to the Ark building, removal of windows in the Ark building, its over-cladding and alterations to existing glazing and doors.

2.2 The application is accompanied by the following information.

- Design and Access Statement
- Heritage Statement

2.3 The application has been amended to address a number of issues raised by Conservation Officers. The amendments, which have been subject to further consultation, include:

-Deletion of the removal of the main exterior front door to the old Addenbrooke's building.

-Alteration to the design/interface of the new build with the Ark, in particular the revealing of the brick columns of the Ark internally to the scheme.

3.0 SITE HISTORY

3.1 There is no relevant planning history for the site.

4.0 PUBLICITY

4.1 Advertisement:	Yes
Adjoining Owners:	Yes
Site Notice Displayed:	Yes

5.0 POLICY

5.1 See Appendix 1 for full details of Central Government Guidance, Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies, Supplementary Planning Documents and Material Considerations.

5.2 Relevant Development Plan policies

PLAN	POLICY NUMBER
Cambridge Local Plan 2006	4/10
Key SPD and guidance	Planning Obligation Strategy SPD Central Conservation Appraisal

5.3 Relevant Central Government Guidance, Supplementary Planning Documents and Material Considerations

Central Government Guidance	National Planning Policy Framework March 2012 National Planning Policy Framework – Planning Practice Guidance March 2014 Circular 11/95 Ministerial Statement (1 December 2014) by Brandon Lewis Minister of State for Housing and Planning (Department of Communities and Local Government)
Supplementary Planning Guidance	Sustainable Design and Construction (May 2007)
Area Guidelines	Cambridge Historic Core Conservation Area Appraisal (2006)

5.4 Status of Proposed Submission – Cambridge Local Plan

Planning applications should be determined in accordance with policies in the adopted Development Plan and advice set out in the NPPF. However, after consideration of adopted plans and the NPPF, policies in emerging plans can also be given some weight when determining applications. For Cambridge, therefore, the emerging revised Local Plan as published for consultation on 19 July 2013 can be taken into account, especially those policies where there are no or limited objections to it. However it is likely, in the vast majority of instances, that the adopted development plan and the NPPF will have considerably more weight than emerging policies in the revised Local Plan.

For the application considered in this report, there are no policies in the emerging Local Plan of relevance.

6.0 CONSULTATIONS

Urban Design and Conservation Team

6.1 *Application as submitted*

The Listed Building.

A main change to the LB [other than minor changes to internal cellular office partitions, which are acceptable] is to alter the access between the canted rear wall of the Outram interventions and the new raised courtyard and the circulation space beneath it. Whilst changes to the means of egress & access may be acceptable as a concept, the removal of the Outram design doors is unnecessary and unacceptable. The intention appears to be to impose stylistic details from the new build onto the division/skin of the existing buildings to make the new work take visual precedence over the historic work. The existing division should remain visually clear and new work should come up to historic fabric and touch it lightly rather than impose itself upon the LB. The existing doors have the character of the LB, as altered, and replacing them with as proposed is not considered appropriate. The way in which the edge of the raised courtyard meets the back of the LB will be extremely important in structural as well as visual terms (hence proposed condition).

Similarly the linking of the new executive reception area behind the ward wing with a glazed roof section appears to be showing the chopping out of historic brickwork to accept a steel channel to support the structure spanning the gap. This seems to be unnecessarily damaging when surface fixing could be an option. In particular, the means of working around the pilasters needs to be shown and agreed.

A further intervention is the proposed cladding of a polychrome brick wall by Outram [rear external elevation of 'The Ark'] which becomes internal to the circulation space between the new block and the rear of the LB. The 'cloaking' of this feature of the LB as it stands does not make sense when the continuing brickwork at higher levels is clearly seen through the glazed roof to this circulation space. The blocking of the existing windows [if really required] in a reversible manner is entirely possible. The premise of this application is that the new building is not proposed to try to compete with either the original historic

building nor its 1990s additions [see also comments of C & D Panel], so trying to reduce the impact of its flamboyant presence cannot be right. That would be to try to make the new-build elements pre-eminent or to be embarrassed by the earlier work.

The proposed link between Keynes House and the main LB is acceptable as a concept [and seems likely to be not dissimilar to earlier such links]. Again there is little detail about the structural intrusion into the historic fabric, rainwater drainage and how junctions [glass-to-brick, for example] are made.

The proposed works to the front of the LB are limited but include replacing the front doors. Whilst they may be from Outram's alterations, they most certainly are now an integral part of the character of the building. It may not be impossible to render the doors compliant with the DDA and it is not clear why large amounts of daylight are necessary at this point in the LB. Nonetheless, there may be some scope for alterations to the doors and draught-lobby but there is inadequate detail to really assess the impact of the scheme.

Conclusion:

Listed Building: The proposals are not acceptable in some of their direct impacts on some of the interfaces with the Outram phase.

The means of fixing glazed roofing into the old building (especially around the pilasters) should be clarified and agreed (by condition if appropriate).

6.2 *Application as amended*

There have been a number of meetings with the applicant agents to discuss the proposals.

The amended/revised plans address the south elevation (to service yard/Tennis Court Road) of the new building; and the east and northern (external) elevations of the "Ark" – the Outram extension of the main building.

Three outstanding areas of concern in relation to the impact of the proposals on heritage assets were recently discussed:

1. Panelling of windows on the east wall of the Ark
2. Panelling of decorative corner pier on northern elevation of the Ark
3. Removal of doors to north entrance/lobby area

Taking each of these matters in turn we comment as follows:

1. In our view, impacts on the Ark remain in relation to the east wall (what will become a corridor) due to the proposed removal of the colourful and particular windows framing/surrounds (beside the coloured brick piers now to be retained). Such removal is, in our view, detrimental and not agreed at this stage, however we consider that this can be agreed at a later date and to address the matter we suggest a condition to enable acceptable treatment to be agreed.
2. The lower level, including decorative piers, of the northern (external) elevation of the “Ark” would be clad. We understand that the central panels are for aesthetic consideration in order to “tie” the space together with the new lobby area being created. Discussion at the 10th March meeting with the applicant, agent and architect revealed that structural constraints necessitated the placing of structural piers at either side/end of this elevation. We questioned in detail the requirement and evidence to justify such piers as they in effect “cover up” a key decorative building feature of the Ark. The agent undertook to supply the Council with further structural information to explain this requirement. We have not yet seen this information, however we now have a better understanding of why a pier is necessary in this location. While undesirable in heritage terms, it was explained that the “grid” construction of the first floor above this lobby area necessitated a pier being placed directly in front of this decorative column.
3. The proposed removal of the original Outram doors in the canted north entrance screen remains a further adverse aspect on the original Outram design – especially for the sake of plain replacements. These are not agreed at this stage so a condition is required to enable acceptable replacement.

Confirmation of the omission from the overall scheme of the removal of the Outram front doors from the main front façade is welcomed and supported.

Conclusion

The revised drawings go some way to ameliorating the concerns set out in our original comments in respect of the impact the proposals on the listed building. However, it remains that conditions are required to still control certain changes as set out above. Finally, before the application is determined it would be helpful to see the promised justification by way of illustration of the structural requirements of the first floor construction outside the canted north screen and to agree same as evidence for the pier referred to in section 2 above.

In addition to these conditions, standard conditions as set out in our previous comments dated 31 December, 2014, are also required.

With the conditions outlined in sections 1 and 3 above and the further evidence requested in section 2, we conclude that the applications are acceptable in design terms and comply with policies 4/10 (Listed Buildings) and 4/11 (Conservation Areas) of the Cambridge Local Plan (2006).

English Heritage

- 6.3 No Objection: English Heritage consider the existing nurses hostel buildings on Tennis Court Road make a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the Central Cambridge Conservation Area and are satisfied that the scale, massing, design and materials of the proposed replacement building, together with the proposed internal and external alterations to the grade II listed Old Addenbrooke's Hospital (now the Judge Business School) building and the proposed link building to Keynes House would not cause harm to the conservation area and are therefore contextually appropriate for this sensitive site. We would have no objection should your authority be minded to approve the application.

7.0 REPRESENTATIONS

- 7.1 I have not received any representations from third parties.

8.0 ASSESSMENT

8.1 From the consultation responses received and from my inspection of the site and the surroundings, I consider that the main issue is whether the proposed loss of listed fabric to the Ark building is justified.

8.2 Four key issues are highlighted by Conservation Officers. I outline how these issues have been addressed by the applicants below:

1: Front Door

8.3 The applicants originally proposed the removal of the external front door to the old Addenbrooke's building. This is part & parcel of what appears to be Outram's conversion and visually signifies the vibrancy of the architecture contained behind it. The proposal would have removed an important visual component of the building in favour of a glazed entrance door. The applicants have removed this element of their proposal from the scheme.

2: Eastern Elevation of the Ark

8.4 This elevation currently exhibits multi-coloured brickwork columns. The columns were originally proposed as being over-clad. Officers considered the brickwork, by Outram, was of importance and required being revealed rather than hidden. The applicants have responded by revealing the brick columns of the Ark building and providing a light-weight glazing system above. I have recommended condition 4 to ensure that agreement is reached regarding the extent of loss of the window frames between the brick columns.

3: Northern and Western Elevations of the Ark

8.5 The applicants also propose the brickwork in this location to be partially clad. The plans have been amended to lessen the extent of cladding and officers have met with the applicants to clarify the structural constraints of new columns having to be placed in front of old. Further information has been provided on this which justifies the positioning of the structural columns and I am confident that the interface is satisfactory.

4: Outram Doors on the Canted Elevation

- 8.6 The proposal includes the removal of the original Outram doors in the canted north entrance screen. This removal remains a concern to officers and does not appear necessary. Plain glazed replacements are proposed which would open up internal views of the new foyer area. The removal of these doors is not agreed at this stage. Condition 3 is recommended to enable an acceptable replacement.

9.0 CONCLUSION

- 9.1 Conservation Officers were originally concerned with regard to the cumulative loss of listed fabric and the over-cladding of elements of the Ark building. The issues they have raised reflect a desire from Conservation Officers to value more and retain more of the Outram new build and to only lose elements of its visual setting to the proposed extensions if necessary. The applicants have made amendments to try and address those concerns and the amendments have been acknowledged by officers. Subject to conditions, the fabric of the listed buildings would be preserved. The proposal is compliant with policy 4/10 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006.

10.0 RECOMMENDATION

GRANT CONSENT subject to the following conditions:

1. The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this consent.

Reason: To comply with the requirements of Section 18 of the Planning (Listed Building & Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (as amended by section 51(4) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004).

2. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans as listed on this decision notice.

Reason: In the interests of good planning, for the avoidance of doubt and to facilitate any future application to the Local Planning Authority under Section 73 of the Town and Country Planning Act 19

3. Notwithstanding the approved plans, prior to the removal of the rear doors on the canted north elevation of the Outram conversion, details of the replacement doors shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To avoid harm to the special interest of the listed building (Cambridge Local Plan 2006, policy 4/10).

4. Notwithstanding the approved plans, prior to the removal of any listed fabric, the extent of the removal of windows, brick columns and the cladding of the external brickwork of the Ark building, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To avoid harm to the special interest of the listed building by ensuring that the minimal extent of removal of listed fabric is achieved (Cambridge Local Plan 2006, policy 4/10).

5. Prior to the commencement of the development of the raised courtyard, full details of the junctions between it and the adjacent listed buildings, including cross-sections, fixings, rainwater disposal, etc. shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To avoid harm to the special interest of the listed building (Cambridge Local Plan 2006, policy 4/10).

6. Prior to the installation of the link structure to Keynes House, full details of the means of 'building in' structural support to the fabric of the historic building(s) including, pad-stones, bolted or other fixings, in situ lintels, etc. shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The works shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To avoid harm to the special interest of the listed building (Cambridge Local Plan 2006, policy 4/10).

7. With the exception of details required by condition 6, prior to the installation of any other such intervention, full details of the means of 'building in' structural support to the fabric of the historic building(s) including, pad-stones, bolted or other fixings, in situ lintels, etc. shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The works shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To avoid harm to the special interest of the listed building (Cambridge Local Plan 2006, policy 4/10).

Application Number	14/1691/S73	Agenda Item	
Date Received	24th October 2014	Officer	Mr John Evans
Target Date	23rd January 2015		
Ward	Queen Ediths		
Site	Land South Of Robinson Way West Of The Forvie Site Robinson Way Cambridge		
Proposal	S73 Application to vary condition 63 to read: no occupation of any clinical research and treatment (D1 and/or clinical in-patient treatment), or biomedical and biotech research and development (B1b), or higher education building under use classes B1 and D1, or sui generis medical research institute uses shall take place, until the off-site highway works at Hills Road/Fendon Road/Robinson Way roundabout and Queen Ediths Way/Mowbray Road/Fendon Road have been fully laid out and implemented in accordance with the approved schemes/plans set out in the Highway Design Report 140546/DS/KTP/01 dated Oct 2014		
Applicant	Cambridge Medipark Limited		

SUMMARY	<p>The development accords with the Development Plan for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The amended pedestrian focused scheme significantly improves connectivity across the Addenbrooke's roundabout and compliments the shift in policy to aid more sustainable modes of transport. 2. There will be a slight reduction in motor vehicle capacity for Addenbrooke's roundabout, however when balanced with the positive improvements to cycle and pedestrian connectivity this reduction is acceptable.
---------	---

	<p>3. Contributions will be secured for Fendon Road roundabout which will enable the County Council to provide a comprehensive improvement to this roundabout.</p> <p>4. The proposed changes to Condition 63 still achieve, albeit by different means, the reason for the original condition which was to safeguard highway safety and network capacity.</p>
RECOMMENDATION	APPROVAL

1.0 SITE DESCRIPTION/AREA CONTEXT

- 1.1 The main application site relates to the Cambridge Biomedical Campus (CBC), an irregular shaped area of agricultural land to the west and south west of the main Addenbrooke's campus covering a total area of 28.8 ha.
- 1.2 Outline permission was granted for a mix of uses on the site to secure the 2020 Vision in 2009. Reserved matters approval has recently been granted for Papworth Hospital and AstraZeneca projects within CBC.
- 1.3 **Condition 63** of the outline permission relates to three off site highway works, which are part of a suite of highway improvements required to mitigate the transport impact of the approved development and improve vehicle capacity and promote sustainable modes of transport. These locations are:
- ☐ Hills Road/Fendon Road/ Robinson Way roundabout. (Main Addenbrooke's roundabout).
 - ☐ Queen Ediths Way/ Mowbray Road/Fendon road. (Fendon Road roundabout).
 - ☐ Long road Trumpington high street interchange.

- 1.4 The improvements to the Long Road and Trumpington Road junction have already been implemented.
- 1.5 The application proposal therefore affects the following two roundabouts described below:

Addenbrooke's Roundabout

- 1.6 The existing junction at Addenbrooke's roundabout consists of a four arm roundabout, approached from Hills Road – north, Fendon Road, Hills Road – south and the entrance to Addenbrooke's hospital. (Referred to as Addenbrooke's roundabout in this report). The existing roundabout has two circulatory lanes and two lane approaches on each arm. The roundabout is part signalised for vehicular traffic. It has two advanced stop boxes and partial on road cycle lanes around the gyratory.

Fendon Round Roundabout

- 1.7 The existing Fendon Road roundabout is a four arm roundabout, approached from Queen Ediths Way – west, Mowbray Road, Queen Ediths Way- east and Fendon Road. (Referred to as 'Fendon Road roundabout' in this report'). This roundabout is not signalised and there are no controlled pedestrian or cycle facilities. Pedestrians and cyclists are able to use the controlled crossing.

Original outline permission

- 1.8 The original scheme secured by **Condition 63** required vehicle capacity enhancements to Addenbrooke's roundabout consisting of an additional lane on the gyratory. **Condition 63** required further enhancements to vehicle capacity for the Fendon Road roundabout.
- 1.9 Details of the roundabout upgrades are required prior to commencement. The new Papworth Hospital project is expected to commence in this month. To avoid delays to this project, a 7 month extension has been provided to agree the works required under **Condition 63** through the recent approval of the concurrent Section 73 application **14/2094/S73**, in March 2015.

2.0 THE PROPOSAL

- 2.1 Permission is sought for the variation of **Condition 63** to agree an alternative pedestrian focused design for the Addenbrooke's roundabout and the provision of contributions to upgrade the Fendon Road roundabout.

Proposed changes to Addenbrooke's roundabout

- 2.2 The application proposal is a pedestrian focused scheme which introduces five signalised controlled crossing points around the connecting roads.
- 2.3 The pedestrian islands on the road arms will be slightly enlarged and graded for level access. Pedestrian barriers will be removed.
- 2.4 Advanced stop boxes (orange boxes for cyclists to position themselves ahead of waiting traffic) are also proposed. A section of on road cycle lane is provided to the eastern most carriageway. The footway surrounding the roundabout will be made dual use for pedestrians and cyclists.
- 2.5 The original submission had a 'wishbone' pedestrian/cycleway running through the centre of the roundabout connecting crossings. This element has been removed from the amended proposal following public consultation and views from the highway authority.

Fendon Road Roundabout

- 2.6 Improvements to this roundabout have been allocated through the S106 Southern Corridor Area Transport Plan scheme (SCATP). The County Council have therefore indicated that to ensure coordinated, cost effective improvements to this roundabout the applicant should make a financial contribution.
- 2.7 Given the above, the upgrades to the Fendon Road roundabout originally proposed in the application submission have been withdrawn.

- 2.8 To secure these changes **condition 63** will be amended as follows:

No occupation of any floorspace for clinical research and treatment (D1 and/or clinical in-patient treatment), or biomedical and biotech research and development (B1b) or higher education building under use classes B1 and D1 or sui generis medical research institute uses shall take place until:

(i) the offsite highways works at Hills Road/Fendon Road/Robinson Way shall have been fully laid out and implemented in accordance the approved schemes/plans in the Highway Design Report prepared by Lanmoor Consulting dated March 2015, reference 140546/DS/KTP/01 Rev C.

(ii) the offsite highways works to improve pedestrian connectivity at the Queen Ediths Way/Mowbray Road/Fendon Road have been facilitated. A scheme shall be agreed by the Local Planning Authority within 24 months, and the work carried in accordance with the agreed scheme within 36 months of the date of this permission.

Reason: In order to safeguard highway safety and network capacity (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/7, 8/2 and 8/11).

- 2.9 The application as submitted was accompanied by the following supporting information:

1. Planning Statement
2. Highway Design Report October 2014

Amended plans and Additional Information

- 2.10 The following amendments are proposed which reflect the description of proposal above:

Additional information

- Summary report of consultation event held on 28 January 2014.
- Commitment to securing funding for the Fendon Road roundabout.

- The originally proposed scheme for Fendon Road roundabout is no longer proposed in this application. A revised scheme is to be re-designed and re-consulted upon by Cambridgeshire County Council at a later date.
- Counsel opinion on the legal mechanism for securing funding for the Fendon Road roundabout.
- Revised Highway Design Report dated March 2015.

Design Changes to Addenbrooke's roundabout

- Amended layout plan for the Addenbrooke's roundabout providing:
- Removal of wishbone pathway across the centre of the roundabout.
- Additional crossing points signalised to assist crossing safely.
- Introduction of dual use footpaths around the Addenbrooke's roundabout.
- A cycle 'off slip' added towards Addenbrooke's roundabout from Fendon Road.
- Partial on carriageway cycle lanes reinstated and four cycle advance stop boxes added.
- Pedestrian islands graded to provide level access.
- Additional street scene visuals and supporting technical calculations.
- Revised Highway Design Report.

3.0 SITE HISTORY

Reference	Description	Outcome
06/0796/OUT	Outline application for up to 215,000sqm floorspace (excluding plant areas) comprising 60,000sqm of clinical research and treatment (D1), 115,000sqm	Approved

of biomedical and biotech research and development (B1(b)), 15,000sqm of biomedical and biotech research and development (B1(b)) or clinical research and treatment (D1), and 25,000sqm of either clinical research and treatment (D1) or higher education or sui generis medical research institute uses, and including related support activities within use classes A1, A3, B1 or sui generis uses, with no individual premises used for support activities to exceed 500sqm; new areas of public realm; landscaping; parking areas; highway works; drainage works and all other associated infrastructure. All matters are reserved for subsequent approval.

14/2094/S73	Section 73 to vary condition 63 to extend the timeframe for submission and agreement of Off-Site Highway Works.	Approved
-------------	---	----------

4.0 PUBLICITY

4.1	Advertisement:	Yes
	Adjoining Owners:	Yes
	Site Notice Displayed:	Yes

5.0 POLICY

5.1 See Appendix 1 for full details of Central Government Guidance, Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies, Supplementary Planning Documents and Material Considerations.

5.2 Relevant Development Plan policies:

PLAN		POLICY NUMBER
Cambridge Plan 2006	Local	3/4 3/11
		4/4 4/13
		8/2 8/3 8/4

5.3 Relevant Central Government Guidance, Supplementary Planning Documents and Material Considerations:

Central Government Guidance	National Planning Policy Framework March 2012
	National Planning Policy Framework – Planning Practice Guidance March 2014
	Circular 11/95
	Ministerial Statement (1 December 2014) by Brandon Lewis Minister of State for Housing and Planning (Department of Communities and Local Government)
	<u>City Wide Guidance</u>
	Cambridge Walking and Cycling Strategy (2002)
	Protection and Funding of Routes for the Future Expansion of the City Cycle Network (2004)
County Guidance	Transport Strategy for Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire
Background papers and other relevant documents	Equality Impact Assessment

5.4 Status of Proposed Submission – Cambridge Local Plan:

Planning applications should be determined in accordance with policies in the adopted Development Plan and advice set out in the NPPF. However, after consideration of adopted plans and the NPPF, policies in emerging plans can also be given some weight when determining applications. For Cambridge, therefore, the emerging revised Local Plan as published for consultation on 19 July 2013 can be taken into account, especially those policies where there are no or limited objections to it. However it is likely, in the vast majority of instances, that the adopted development plan and the NPPF will have considerably more weight than emerging policies in the revised Local Plan.

For the application considered in this report the following policies in the emerging Local Plan are of relevance:

Policy 16: Cambridge Biomedical Campus

Policy 80: Supporting sustainable access to development

Policy 81: Mitigating the transport impact of development

6.0 CONSULTATIONS

Cambridgeshire County Council (Transport)

(Full Consultation response is attached as APPENDIX A)

Summary of response on application as submitted

- 6.1 The original scheme proposed for the Addenbrooke's access gyratory on Hills Road was a scheme intended to provide additional highway capacity.
- 6.2 The City Deal identifies Addenbrooke's roundabout as being subject to a scheme in the second tranche of works.
- 6.3 In the intervening years since the outline permission there have been significant changes to the transport policy in the NPPF and Transport Strategy for Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire. The approach to dealing with traffic from developments has also changed. The committed growth levels of traffic predicted in the outline Transport Assessment have not occurred.

- 6.4 Recent policies at national and local level have concentrated more on facilitating a modal shift away from the private car to pedestrian, cycle and public transport based trips.
- 6.5 With this in mind the Highway Authority requested the developer to look again at the junction design. The resultant revised scheme, which is acceptable to the Highway Authority, provides improved pedestrian connectivity across the junction. There are also benefits, albeit more limited, for cyclists.
- 6.6 Minor changes to figures required on the Addenbrooke's gyratory junction modelling. Four minor changes required to the detailed design of the roundabout.

Summary of comments on amended plans

- 6.7 The proposed amended design of Addenbrooke's roundabout and provision of contributions for Fendon Road roundabout is supported.
- 6.8 Wishbone path: The Highway Authority would consider removal of this facility acceptable.
- 6.9 The provision of a signalised crossing on the inbound arm of the access to Addenbrooke's on the amended plans provides additional controlled linkage for pedestrians and cyclists.
- 6.10 Whilst the provision for on-carriageway cyclists is not improved greatly by the proposals, the current scheme is seen as providing those improvements that can reasonably and practically be provided within the scope of developers works whilst not resulting in significant disincentive to cyclists, as may have resulted from implementation of the original scheme.
- 6.11 The scheme as proposed enhances connectivity, particularly for pedestrians, which feeds into the toolkit for achieving aspirations of the developing City Deal strategy.

Summary of comments for Fendon Road roundabout

- 6.12 Members of both the City and County Council and local residents have agreed to develop a scheme to improve connectivity in the area around the junction through the SCATP.

- 6.13 With a resolution by the Council to progress a scheme in the immediate future it is considered more appropriate for the developer to provide a financial contribution towards the wider scheme, avoiding wasted time, cost and disruption, whilst contributing to wider benefits.

Head of Streets and Open Spaces (Walking and Cycling Officer)

Comments on Application as Submitted

- 6.14 The proposal for this roundabout provides some improvement at some arms of the roundabout for pedestrians but it does not address many of the safety and convenience issues for vulnerable users travelling to and through the area. The roundabout will remain a significant barrier to those considering cycling and walking to Addenbrooke's.
- 6.15 As part of the Transport Strategy for Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire, and as included in schemes to be funded through the City Deal, bus priority measures are proposed between Addenbrooke's and Newmarket Road, around the ring road and this may impact on this junction. Extending the dutch-style cycleways approved for Hills Road further south to this junction and beyond may also be considered in the future.
- 6.16 It is important to consider, therefore, the future of this junction and ensure that any works provide the best improvements for vulnerable users possible in the timescales available and, at a minimum, do not impede any future plans for the roundabout.

Comments on application as amended

- 6.17 Amendments supported.

Environment Agency

- 6.18 No objections.

Cambridge City Council Access Officer

Comments on application as Submitted

- 6.19 Priority in the scheme is for disabled pedestrians. The Equality Impact Assessment shows the scheme will make improvements for vulnerable users navigating the junction.
- 6.20 Not many pedestrians use the Addenbrooke's roundabout as a crossing point. Those coming south along Hills Road would probably cross to the hospital side well before the roundabout. The scheme does not solve the poor overall connectivity.
- 6.21 Support for the puffin or toucan crossings even if this results in losing cycle reservoirs.

Comments on application as amended

- 6.22 Application as amended is supported. Removing the central wishbone pathway is acceptable because the signalised crossing helps vulnerable users.
- 6.23 Additional crossing point to Hills Road south supported.
- 6.24 The above responses are a summary of the comments that have been received. Full details of the consultation responses can be inspected on the application file.

7.0 REPRESENTATIONS

Comments on the application as submitted

- 7.1 Councillor Tim Moore has commented on this application. His comments are set out below:
- Pedestrian access improvements welcomed, particular for those approaching from Fendon Road.
 - The proposed use of the centre of the Addenbrookes roundabout will not suit everyone, especially the more vulnerable and has significant implications in terms of adjusting its internal routes to accommodate pedestrian traffic.
 - The roundabout is dangerous to all who walk or cycle near to it and most people go out of their way to avoid it.
 - The proposed lights must be sensitive to slower moving people.

- The crossing points should have tactile paving and be free from trip hazards.
- Other wider access problems not addressed in this application.
- Cycle traffic passing through the roundabout needs the relative safety of the cycle lanes which are removed from this submission.
- The Fendon Road roundabout does not have a separate path which is considered dangerous.

7.2 The owners/occupiers of the following addresses have made representations:

8 Kinnaird Way
 269 Hills Road
 255 Hills Road
 292a Hills Road
 301 Hills Road
 317 Hills Road
 5 Fendon Road
 6 Fendon Road
 7 Fendon Road
 10 Fendon Road
 44 Fendon Road
 1 Elm Road
 25 Nightingale Avenue
 23 Rathmore Road
 27 Rathmore Road
 23 Violet Close
 University Medical Library, Addenbrooke's
 Mitochondrial Biology Unit, Medical Research Council
 Whitlocks, High Street, Trumpington

7.3 The representations can be summarised as follows:

Comments on application presentation

- The application submission is unclear.
- The works need to be explained with clear visuals.
- Poor Consultation.

Principle of development

- The general attempt to improve roundabout is supported.
- Support not implementing vehicle capacity improvements.

- The rationale for not increasing vehicle capacity on the Addenbrooke's roundabout is unclear.
- What are the wider plans for pedestrian and cycle access with the growth of CBC.
- The layout of the Perne Road improvements should inform the design.

Comments on technical matters

- The proposed Fendon Road crossing is located too far from the roundabout to be used.
- The proposed Fendon Road crossing should be located further to the north east closer to Fendon Road roundabout.
- The proposed Fendon Road crossing would conflict with the driveways of adjacent residential properties.
- The proposed Fendon Road crossing is not cost effective.
- The proposed Fendon Road is dangerous because vehicles are accelerating away from the roundabout.
- There is too much vegetation on the Addenbrooke's roundabout which inhibits visibility.
- The existing crossing points have steep gradients which is difficult for wheelchair users.

Cycle related concerns

- It is dangerous to stack up cyclists left of traffic a junction.
- This is a missed opportunity to improve pedestrian and cyclist safety at the Fendon Road/Queen Ediths Way/Mowbray Road roundabout.
- The pavement outside 307 Hills Road is not wide enough to accommodate cyclists and pedestrians.
- Object to any loss of cycle space around the roundabout.

Trees

- Any lost trees should be replaced.
- Hills Road should be improved with landscaping.

Wider access related issues

- The guided busway route out the back of the proposed research quarter should be improved with adequate lighting.

- There is great need to have a controlled crossing either in Fendon Road at the Queen Ediths Way end or in Mowbray Road as well as the proposed crossing in Queen Ediths Way.
- This need is generated by the location of local nursery, primary, secondary schools, colleges and other services.
- Permanent lights at the end of Fendon Road: traffic already waits in Fendon Road when approaching the junction with Hills Road and Robinson Way.
- A scheme is needed to improve cycling further to the south on Hills Road.

Other Issues

- Additional traffic fumes may result from idling engines waiting for the Fendon Road crossing point.

Cambridge University Hospitals: NHS Foundation Trust

- There are no safe pedestrian crossings on or close to the Hills Road/Fendon Road/Addenbrookes entrance.
- Attempts welcomed to improve the safety of this complex and heavily used junction.
- There are currently no safe pedestrian crossings on or close to the Hills Road/Fendon Road/Robinson Way entrance.
- The proposed wishbone path through the centre of the roundabout does not cater for all the access roads.
- Pedestrians are directed towards the footpath between bus entry and exit points without provision of a safe crossing point.
- Currently there are only two advance cycle stop boxes. The proposal removes some of the on road cycle lanes which is of concern.
- The proposals are not the most effective use of funds to deal with the issues.

Camsight

- Improvements to pedestrian connectivity welcomed.
- Signalised crossing points need to be sensitive to those who need more time to cross.
- It would be helpful if the cycle routes are kept as clear as possible from the footway.

Comments on Application as Amended

7.4 The owners/occupiers of the following addresses have made representations:

31 Hinton Road
15 Shelly Garden

7.5 The representations can be summarised as follows:

- The scheme does not reduce the overall hostility of the junction for cyclists at the entrance to Addenbrooke's.
- Advanced stop lines on the roundabout do nothing to improve the situation.
- There has been a general lack of consultation.
- Dual use paths are unsatisfactory.
- A more ambitious scheme is required.

Cambridge University Hospitals: NHS Foundation Trust

- The updated design addresses issues pedestrians face in order to cross the linked routes.
- The new design establishes safe crossing routes reducing the issues pedestrians face when using this junction on their journey.
- Support that the new design makes best use of existing traffic light infrastructure whilst creating new crossing points where there are none at present.
- These are much needed and appreciated improvements.
- The position of the Fendon Road junction is unfortunate but it is understood there would be an adverse effect on vehicle capacity if it were sited closer to Addenbrooke's roundabout.
- The overall design of the junction does need updating and it is hoped this will be included in the City Deal or similar funding in the coming years.
- Until this time, the proposed crossing measures suitably address a number of issues faced when using this junction and are the most suitable resolution to the discharge of the current planning condition.

7.6 The above representations are a summary of the comments that have been received. Full details of the representations can be inspected on the application file.

8.0 ASSESSMENT

8.1 From the consultation responses and representations received and from my inspection of the site and the surroundings, I consider that the main issues are:

1. Principle of development
2. Context of site, design and external spaces
3. Disabled access
4. Residential amenity
5. Third party representations

Principle of Development

Purpose of Condition 63 – Mitigating impact of CBC

- 8.2 The original intention of the highway upgrades secured through **Condition 63** was to increase vehicle capacity deemed necessary to mitigate the impact of the proposed CBC development. Since the grant of approval, and the drafting of **Condition 63**, the County Highways Authority requirements have changed and improvements to pedestrian connectivity is considered the greater priority. The revised approach is because of three reasons:
- 8.3 Firstly, the estimated committed growth set out in the original Transport Assessment since 2004 has not been fully realised in accordance with those originally projected figures. This means that the extra lane on the Addenbrooke's roundabout gyratory is no longer required to mitigate the impact of this development. This is evidenced by traffic monitoring¹ undertaken by the County Council which shows that, since 2004, there has been a 13% decline in car movements across the River Cam screenline, and an increase of just 2% in car movements across all of the main radial routes into Cambridge despite continued housing and economic growth in the sub-region.
- 8.4 Secondly, there has been a greater modal shift from car based journeys to sustainable modes within CBC. The revised junction modelling data takes account of the employee modal shift which is linked to the evolution and future compliance with the site wide Addenbrooke's Travel Plan and which will sit

¹ *Traffic Monitoring Report 2013 Cambridgeshire County Council*

above individual travel plans for occupiers such as Papworth Hospital and AstraZeneca. The 2013 travel survey has continued to show a reduction in staff using the private car and an increase in sustainable modes of transport. The modal share for walking and cycling in 2013 was 31% for staff which has increased from 22% in 2005 and 27% in 2009, which further evidences that the additional vehicular lane on the Addenbrooke's gyratory within the original consent is no longer required.

- 8.5 Thirdly, recent policies at national and local level now strongly promote a modal shift away from the private car to pedestrian, cycle and public transport based trips, or linked trips using these modes, such as park and ride or park and cycle. This is also the broad principle of the strategy within the developing City Deal. The National Planning Policy Guidance (paragraph 6) states that Travel Plans, Transport Assessments and Statements should reduce the need for new development to increase existing road capacity or provide new roads.
- 8.6 This policy position is also rehearsed in the 2014 Transport Strategy for Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire and the emerging 2014 Cambridge Local Plan. This shift in policy emphasis on sustainable travel modes and transport impact mitigation justifies the revised pedestrian focused design improvements now proposed.
- 8.7 In addition to the above three reasons, increases in capacity locally have been found to encourage additional car based trips, and that capacity has often disappeared in advance of the full development generation appearing. Furthermore, by allowing local traffic growth at specific locations, this can exacerbate existing problems elsewhere on the network. This is a phenomenon that has been observed to follow implementation of many schemes, nationally, and verified by research which contributes to the overall officer view that the originally proposed extra lane on the gyratory will not provide any lasting vehicular capacity in the short to medium term.
- 8.8 The original scheme, when considered against this approach, would not provide any pedestrian connectivity improvements and would be likely to further deter cyclists from using what is, already, a challenging junction.

- 8.9 The County Council have already carried out the original works to the Long road Trumpington High Street interchange as required by **Condition 63**.

Wider strategic projects

- 8.10 There are two strategic projects which may affect both Addenbrookes and Fendon Road roundabouts in the medium and /or long term:

- 1) S106 funding from the SCATP has been allocated for the Fendon Road roundabout.
- 2) The City Deal (phase 2) may enable a more comprehensive redesign of the Addenbrookes roundabout as part of wider treatment of this corridor.

- 8.11 Given that funding is now allocated for an improvement scheme for the Fendon Road roundabout, all parties consider a financial contribution should now be provided to facilitate these works. This will be secured through the revised wording of **Condition 63** attached to this permission, which is linked to a Deed offered by the applicant. The Council's solicitor is considering the precise wording of **Condition 63** to ensure it fulfils all of the tests of reasonableness and precision. I will provide an update on the pre Committee amendment sheet of any alterations which are deemed necessary.

- 8.12 The facilitation of works through a Deed is not considered appropriate for the Addenbrooke's roundabout because there is no committed scheme in the short to medium term. The roundabout is only identified as a phase 2 project in City Deal, which has an uncertain time frame. On this basis, the application proposal is considered an appropriate intermediate measure to enhance pedestrian connectivity without major reconfiguration of the junction.

- 8.13 The CBC development triggered a number of transport improvements, of which the two roundabout upgrades formed a small part. These included the Addenbrooke's Access Road, contributions to the Cambridgeshire Guided Busway (including revenue contributions), SCATP payments, improvements to the M11 (Junction 11) as well as the requirement for travel plans,

limiting through traffic, parking surveys and implementation of parking controls (if required).

- 8.14 It is considered that the principle of a pedestrian focused scheme for the Addenbrooke's roundabout and the provision of contributions to facilitate works to Fendon Road roundabout is acceptable and in accordance with Cambridge Local Plan policies 3/4 and 8/4 and guidance contained within the Framework.

Pedestrian, Cycle and Vehicle Connectivity

- 8.15 The key issue is the design issue is the detailed design and function of the Addenbrooke's roundabout upgrades and the impact on different users.

Pedestrian connectivity

- 8.16 The application proposal is a pedestrian focused scheme. The revised proposal provides signals to three of the roundabout arms and a new crossing on Fendon Road which will allow the junction to be crossed more safely from all directions. In taking a pedestrian focused approach, the proposal accords with the key principles for walking and cycling accessibility set out in Local Plan policy 8/4 and paragraph 35 of the Framework.
- 8.17 Concerns raised regarding the distance along Fendon Road at which the Toucan crossing is provided are noted. Its position approximately 40m from the main roundabout is not optimum for convenience of walking around the roundabout. However, on balance its location is an appropriate compromise given the need for such a crossing to increase all round connectivity and the negative impact on vehicle capacity if the crossing point was moved closer to the roundabout. The proposed location avoids conflict with existing driveways and provides sufficient reaction time for drivers exiting the gyratory to stop. Its proposed position does not present a risk to highway safety.
- 8.18 The amended proposal provides an additional Toucan crossing on the Hills Road south exit. The junction modelling submitted shows this results in a reduction in vehicle capacity in the region of 4%. This is considered acceptable when weighed against the benefit to pedestrian connectivity gained from the additional crossing point. County Officers have found there to be some

minor discrepancies in the calculations which underpin the traffic flows entered into the junction modelling assessment and have requested some further modelling. An update to Committee will be provided on the amendment sheet. This notwithstanding, an appropriate weight is given to sustainable travel modes over the car, in accordance with part a of Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 8/4.

- 8.19 The amended application proposal removes the originally proposed central wishbone dual use pedestrian/cycleway path across the centre of the roundabout. This course of action is in response to numerous concerns raised at the consultation event on 28 January that the pathway was unlikely to be used. The wishbone pathway would have required four stops at controlled crossings to cross the roundabout which was considered unduly tortuous for pedestrians. The revised crossing points on all four arms of the roundabout provide a continuous safe route for pedestrians, in particular more vulnerable users. This means that the tree planting in the centre of the roundabout can be left intact.
- 8.20 The amendments ensure maximum convenience for walking through improvements to the existing roundabout function. Improved links with the surrounding walking network are achieved, which accords with the principles for walking accessibility within Cambridge Local Plan policy 8/4 and paragraphs 17, 32 and 35 of the Framework.

Cycle connectivity

- 8.21 The proposed scheme provides some improvement for cycle connectivity across the Addenbrooke's roundabout. This includes some improvements for more confident on road cyclists and the provision of dual use footpaths off the main carriageway.
- 8.22 The original application as submitted proposed the removal of the four short sections of on road cycle lane. The revised plans reinstate these lanes, so there is no reduction in cycle demarcation on the carriageway. This change is in response to comments raised through the application process and consultation event held by the application in January 2015.

- 8.23 The application as amended now provides an additional four advance stop boxes around the gyratory and three arms of the roundabout. These advance stop boxes enable cyclists to wait ahead of queuing traffic and gain priority at these signalised areas of the roundabout. Provision of these features, in addition to the new section of on carriageway cycle lane improves cycle connectivity, in accordance with Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 8/4.
- 8.24 Whilst the provision for on-carriageway cyclists is not a comprehensive improvement, the current scheme provides changes that can reasonably and practically be provided within the scope of **Condition 63**. The original scheme would have resulted in a significant disincentive to cyclists through provision of an additional vehicular lane on the gyratory. It is against this fallback position, which could still be implemented, that the current proposals should be assessed.

Vehicle Connectivity

- 8.25 The original intention of the infrastructure upgrades required by **Condition 63** was to improve vehicle capacity. Addenbrooke's roundabout is nearing capacity and experiences queuing along all arms of the roundabout at peak times. In light of the County Highways Authority's updated requirements for a pedestrian focused scheme (for the reasons set out in the principle of development subsection), the applicant has carried out revised junction modelling to demonstrate that the roundabout will still operate satisfactorily under the proposed revised layout. This modelling accounts for the likely development commitments which will place further strain on infrastructure.
- 8.26 The junction modelling uses industry-standard software (called LINSIG) to assess the operation of the junction. This assessment shows that the revised application proposal results in a slight reduction in vehicle capacity at the junction of around 4%. This reduction in overall capacity is not considered significant given the improvements the signalised crossing points will bring to pedestrians.
- 8.27 Furthermore, and as noted in paragraph 8.7 above, although the originally proposed scheme would, on a 'predict and provide' basis, provide some localised increase in highway capacity at the junction itself, this is unlikely to bring any

significant traffic benefits overall due to constraints elsewhere on the network and would further increase pedestrian severance.

- 8.28 Strategic improvements to the Hills Road corridor overall, which may require significant remodeling of the Addenbrooke's roundabout junction, will be considered through the second tranche of City Deal proposals in the medium to long term and through any additional development proposed beyond the CBC outline approval. It is not within the remit of this Section 73 application to mandate wholesale reconfiguration of this challenging junction.
- 8.29 In my opinion the pedestrian focused proposal will not significantly harm vehicle capacity at the Addenbrooke's roundabout and provides an appropriate interim solution for the short to medium term. The application is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policy 3/4, 8/2 and 8/4.

Disabled access

Equality Impact Assessment

- 8.30 Officers have carried out an Equality Impact Assessment to inform the assessment of the scheme. Safety and directness of crossing are the key issues which affect disabled people, older people with reduced mobility and access related issues relevant to pregnancy and maternity.
- 8.31 Addenbrooke's roundabout is a barrier to connectivity, particular for people with reduced mobility and wheelchair users. Any scheme which seeks to improve connectivity will need to balance the conflicting requirements of different modes which use the roundabout.
- 8.32 The new signalised crossing points introduce a safe route around the junction which does not involve judging vehicle speeds and assessing risk, which is currently the case. This is a significant improvement as compared with current situation and the originally approved scheme in the outline permission.
- 8.33 The omission of the wishbone pathway through the centre of the roundabout will not reduce the safety and convenience of

crossing the junction as compared with the originally submitted scheme.

- 8.34 The amended scheme improves access for wheelchair users through graded level treatment of the pedestrian islands at the crossing points. In so doing appropriate provision is made for access through the roundabout in accordance with Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 8/4.

Visual amenity and landscaping

- 8.35 The key issue relates to the visual appearance of the improvements to the Addenbrooke's roundabout in context.
- 8.36 The revised application proposal removes the central wishbone pathway across the centre of the Addenbrooke's roundabout. As such there will be no tree removals or changes to the green amenity within the centre of the roundabout, which would have been substantially reduced by the application proposal as originally submitted.
- 8.37 The design of the signalised Toucan crossing points are to the standard County specification. In my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policy 3/4.

Residential Amenity

Impact on amenity of neighbouring occupiers

- 8.38 The proposed crossing points will have minimal impact on the amenities of adjacent residential properties. The proposed toucan crossing will not emit a crossing noise, so will not result any disturbance for residential properties.
- 8.39 It is considered unlikely the signalised crossing points will result in greater air pollution from idling vehicles, as compared with the current situation.
- 8.40 It is considered that the proposal adequately respects the residential amenity of adjacent residential properties and the constraints of the site and I consider that it is compliant with and Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policy 3/4.

Third Party Representations

- 8.41 The issues raised in the representations received have been considered in the above report and are summarised in table 1 below:

Table 1: Representations received

Issue	Officer Comment/report section
<p>The application submission is not clear what is proposed.</p> <p>The works need to be explained with clear visuals.</p> <p>Poor Consultation.</p>	<p>The applicant carried out a consultation evening on 28 January 2015 in order to consult on amendments to the design and explain the proposals to interested parties.</p> <p>Clear, colour plans of the changes have been provided together with non-technical summaries of how the changes affect different travel modes.</p>
<p>The proposed use of the centre of the Addenbrooke's roundabout will not suit everyone, especially the more vulnerable and has significant implications in terms of adjusting its internal routes to accommodate pedestrian traffic.</p>	<p>In response to the majority of views at the consultation event the originally proposed wishbone pathway in the centre of the Addenbrooke's roundabout has been removed. See paragraphs 2.5 and 8.29.</p>
<p>This is a missed opportunity to improve pedestrian and cyclist safety at the Fendon Road/Queen Ediths Way/Mowbray Road roundabout.</p>	<p>The revised Addenbrooke's scheme makes a significant improvement to pedestrian safe and accessibility.</p>

Permanent lights at the end of Fendon Road: traffic already waits in Fendon Road when approaching the junction with Hills Road and Robinson Way.	The impact of the Fendon round signalised crossing has been modelled. It will not significantly affect vehicle capacity in the proposed location 40m from the junction.
The crossing points should have tactile paving and be free from trip hazards.	The new crossing points include tactile paving. Pedestrian island will be graded for level access. See paragraph 8.30.
Cycle traffic passing through the roundabout need the relative safety of the cycle lanes which are removed from this submission.	The partial on road cycle lanes have been reinstated in response to concerns raised through the representations received. See paragraph 8.17.
The scheme does not reduce the overall hostility of the junction for cyclists at the entrance to Addenbrooke's.	The proposal is not a comprehensive redesign of the roundabout. This would be beyond the scope of works required under Condition 63 of the outline permission.
The guided busway route out the back of the proposed research quarter should be improved with adequate lighting.	This is not within the scope of this Section 73 application. Lighting proposals for the Cambridge Guided Bus are covered by the Cambridge Guided Busway Order.
Any lost trees should be replaced.	The amended scheme no longer proposes any tree removals.
Hills Road should be improved with landscaping.	General landscaping along Hills Road is outside the scope of this S73 application.
The rationale for not increasing vehicle capacity on the Addenbrooke's roundabout is unclear.	See Paragraphs 8.3, 8.4 and 8.5.

9.0 CONCLUSION

- 9.1 The additional lane on the Addenbrooke's roundabout gyratory secured as part of the outline CBC development (06/0796/OUT) is no longer required. The proposed amended scheme will provide significant improvements to pedestrian connectivity for the Addenbrooke's roundabout and some improvement for cycle connectivity. Junction modelling demonstrates there will not be a significant impact on vehicle capacity. Financial contributions for the Fendon Road roundabout will be secured through the revised **Condition 63** and associated Deed. Approval is recommended.

10.0 RECOMMENDATION

APPROVE subject to the following conditions:

Start Date

1. Application for approval of the reserved matters shall be made to the Local Planning Authority before 15 October 2021

Reason: In accordance with the requirements of section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

Time period for Development of Reserved Matters Approvals

2. The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of two years from the date of approval of the last of the reserved matters to be approved.

Reason: In accordance with the requirements of section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

Reserved Matters Approval for Development Phases

3. No development on any phase shall commence until approval of the details of the access, appearance, landscaping, layout and scale within that phase (hereinafter called the reserved matters) has been obtained from the Local Planning Authority in writing.

Reason: To ensure that all necessary details are acceptable (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/2, 3/4, 3/7, 3/11, 3/12, 4/2, 4/3, 4/4, 9/3, 9/5).

Environmental Statement

4. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the mitigation measures set out in the Environmental Statement of October 2006, Volumes 1, 2 and 3, including Vol. 3 addendum dated June 2007 unless provided for in any other conditions attached to this planning permission.

Reason: To ensure that the development takes place in accordance with the principles and parameters contained within the Environmental Statement (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 9/3, 9/5 and 10/1).

Planning Parameters: Piazza and Circus

5. Unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority, the following parameters for the proposed Piazza and Circus shall be provided:
 - a) a minimum of 46.5m width and a minimum of 6,000sqm in area for the Piazza.
 - b) a minimum of 104m in diameter and a minimum of 7,000 sqm in area for the Circus.
 - c) a maximum 1000sqm in gross floor area for buildings within the Circus.

Reason: To ensure that sufficient space is afforded to the Circus and Piazza areas to enable them to function as a strategic area of public realm within the Addenbrooke's Site and to ensure the proposal accords with approved plan PP2 (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/4, 3/7, 3/11 and 9/5).

Planning Parameters: Parameter Plans

6. Unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority, the development shall be substantially in accordance with the following parameters:

- a) Maximum building heights above ground level (including roof level plant but excluding flues) shall not exceed those specified on approved plan PP2.
- b) Maximum building envelopes shall not exceed those specified on approved plan PP2.
- c) Building lengths and widths shall accord with the maximum and minimum parameters as specified in the text to approved plan PP3.
- d) Building heights above ground level shall be no lower than those specified on approved plan PP4.
- e) Flue heights shall not exceed 8m as shown on approved plan PP3.
- f) Building facades facing south onto the southern spine road shall occupy no more than 60% of their plot width, as measured from and along the southern spine road, within 12m of the boundary with the southern spine road.
- g) West facing building facades within the allocated biomedical and biotech research and development area, shall occupy no more than 60% of their plot width, as measured from and along the 35m building line, within 9m of the boundary with the 35m building line.
- h) Building facades which face the Boulevard (except those facades facing east onto the Boulevard north of the Cambridgeshire Guided Busway route), shall occupy between 20% and 70% of their plot width, as measured from and along the boundary with the Boulevard, within 6m of the permitted maximum building envelope extent adjacent to the Boulevard.
- i) Building facades which face the Circus or Piazza shall exceed 60% of their plot width within 6m of the permitted maximum building envelope extent where facing the Circus or Piazza.

Reason: In order to mitigate the visual impact of the proposed development on the setting and special character of Cambridge, the retained Green Belt, the Green Corridor and surrounding open countryside and to ensure subsequent development responds positively to key areas of public realm (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/2, 3/4, 3/6, 3/7, 3/11, 3/12, 4/2, 4/3, 9/3, and 9/5).

Planning Parameters: Strategic Gaps

7. A minimum of two gaps of at least 25m in width shall be provided within the biomedical and biotech research and development area shown on parameter plan 1 south of the Cambridgeshire Guided Busway route between buildings. The gaps shall run from the western boundary adjacent to the railway to the eastern boundary adjacent to the Boulevard and shall not be occupied by any buildings. Unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority, the precise location of the first gap shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority concurrently with the first submission of reserved matters for buildings within the allocated biomedical and biotech research and development area south of the Cambridgeshire Guided Busway route and the precise location of the second gap shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority concurrently with the second submission of reserved matters for buildings within the allocated biomedical and biotech research and development area south of the Cambridgeshire Guided Busway route.

Reason: In order to mitigate the visual impact of the proposed development on the setting and special character of Cambridge, the retained Green Belt, the Green Corridor and surrounding open countryside and to ensure subsequent development responds positively to key areas of public realm (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/2, 3/4, 3/6, 3/7, 3/11, 3/12, 4/2, 4/3, 9/3, and 9/5).

Planning Parameters: Land Use

8. Unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority, land uses shall substantially accord with the land use locations as specified on approved plan PP1.

Reason: To ensure that the development takes place in accordance with the principles and parameters contained within the approved plans and Environmental Statement (Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003 policies 6/1 and 9/8 and Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 9/3, 9/5 and 10/1).

Planning Parameters: Allocation of Floorspace

9. Unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority, the development shall not exceed 215,000sqm of gross external floor space (excluding areas for plant and car parking structures. Areas for plant would include areas for plant within passive void areas between useable floor levels) and shall not exceed gross external floor space limits for the following uses:
- a) 115,000sqm of biomedical and biotech research and development (B1(b)).
 - b) 60,000sqm for clinical research and treatment (D1 and/or clinical in-patient treatment).
 - c) 25,000sqm of either clinical research and treatment (D1 and/or clinical in-patient treatment) or higher education or sui generis medical research institute uses.
 - d) 15,000sqm of biomedical and biotech research and development (B1(b)) or clinical research and treatment (D1 and/or clinical in-patient treatment).

Reason: To ensure that the development takes place in accordance with the principles and parameters contained within the description of development and Environmental Statement and to provide flexibility within the allocated floor space tolerances should Papworth Hospital decide to no longer relocate to the site and given the unknown floorspace size of Papworth Hospital (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 9/5).

Planning Parameters: Ancillary Uses

10. Unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority, ancillary uses for individual occupiers within use classes A1, A3, B1, D1 (crèches/nurseries) or sui generis ancillary uses shall not individually exceed 500sqm gross floor space.

Reason: To ensure the balance of uses is appropriate to the site (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 9/5).

Permitted Development Restriction

11. Notwithstanding the provisions of Schedule 2, Part 2, Class A of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995 (or any Order revoking and re-enacting that order with or without modification) the erection, construction, maintenance, improvement or alteration of a gate, fence, wall or other means of enclosure shall not be allowed without the granting of planning permission or reserved matters approval.

Reason: In order to safeguard the character and appearance of the development of the site (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/4, 3/7 and 3/12).

Materials

12. No development of a building shall take place until sample panels of the materials to be used in the construction of its external surfaces has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The panels shall show the proposed combination of external materials to be used. The development shall be constructed in accordance with the approved samples.

Reason: To ensure that the appearance of the external surfaces is appropriate (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/4, 3/7 and 3/12).

Levels

13. No development of a building shall take place until full details of the proposed levels of the building, associated structures and associated building plot, compared to existing levels of the site, have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved development shall be constructed in accordance with the approved levels details unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In order to safeguard the character and appearance of the area (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/4, 3/7 and 3/12).

Amenity Space Strategy

14. Concurrent with the submission of any reserved matters application for any clinical development, an Informal Amenity Space Strategy shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The Strategy shall examine the requirement for informal landscaped open space within the associated clinical building plot to meet the needs of visitors, patients and employees of the proposed clinical development. The size, location and timing of provision for any such space shall accompany the Strategy. The amenity space shall be provided in accordance with the approved Strategy and shall be capable of use no later than the occupation of the associated clinical development.

Reason: To ensure the needs of visitors, patients and employees associated with the clinical development of the site are adequately addressed (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/7, 3/11, 9/3).

Ecology: Site Wide Nature Conservation Management Plan

15. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the Site Wide Nature Conservation Management Plan dated September 2010.

Reason: To ensure that the development of the site conserves and enhances ecology (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 4/3, 4/6 and 4/8).

Ecology: Reserved Matters Applications

16. Any reserved matters application shall demonstrate how it accords with the aims and objectives of the Nature Conservation Management Plan and shall detail which specific ecological measures are proposed and the timing for their delivery. The ecological measures shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details and timing of delivery.

Reason: To ensure that the development of the site conserves and enhances ecology (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 4/3, 4/6 and 4/8).

Strategic Site Surface Water

17. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the Cambridge Biomedical Campus Extension Surface Water Strategy Report dated 20 October 2011.

Reason: In order to safeguard against the risk of flooding, to ensure adequate flood control, maintenance and efficient use and management of water within the site, to ensure the quality of the water entering receiving water courses is appropriate and monitored and to promote the use of sustainable urban drainage systems to limit the volume and rate of water leaving the site (Cambridge Local Plan policy 3/1).

Individual Site Surface Water

18. Any reserved matters application shall include a detailed surface water strategy pursuant to the reserved matters site for which approval is sought. The strategy shall demonstrate how the management of water within the reserved matters application site for which approval is sought accords with the approved details of the strategic site wide surface water strategy. The strategy shall be based upon a SUDS hierarchy, as espoused by DTI publication 'Sustainable Drainage Systems CIRIA C609' and this Council's adopted supplementary planning document 'Sustainable Design and Construction' (2007). The strategy shall maximise the use of measures to control water at source as far as practicable to limit the rate and quantity of run-off and improve the quality of any run-off before it leaves the site or joins any water body.

If source control infiltration SUDS methods are demonstrated to be impracticable or only partly feasible, the strategy shall promote other measures such as swales, surface water retention ponds, wetlands or other surface water retention measures to promote infiltration and mimic as far as possible existing natural greenfield run-off patterns (rates and volumes).

The strategy shall include details of all flow control systems and the design, location and capacity of all such SUDS features and shall include ownership, long-term adoption, management and maintenance scheme(s) and monitoring arrangements/responsibilities, including detailed calculations to demonstrate the capacity of receiving on-site strategic water retention features without the risk of flooding to land or buildings. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details and no building pursuant to the particular reserved matters for which approval is being sought shall be occupied or used until such time as the approved detailed surface water measures have been fully completed in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: In order to safeguard against the increased risk of flooding, to ensure adequate flood control, maintenance and efficient use and management of water within the site, to ensure the quality of the water entering receiving water courses is appropriate and monitored and to promote the use of sustainable urban drainage systems to limit the volume and rate of water leaving the site (Cambridge Local Plan policy 3/1).

Ground Water

19. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the Groundwater Assessment Report Cambridge Biomedical Campus September 2011.

Reason: To safeguard the ground water spring flow of Nine Wells Local Nature Reserve (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 4/6).

Surface Water Modelling: Hobson's Brook/Conduit and Vicar's Brook

20. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the Cambridge Biomedical Campus Hydraulic Modelling Report dated August 2010.

Reason: To ensure that proposed drainage for the 2020 site, combined with proposed drainage for Clay Farm, Bell School and Glebe Farm sites, do not result in any increased flooding within Hobson's Brook/Conduit and Vicar's Brook systems and that suitable mitigation is carried out if required (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 3/1).

Foul Water

21. The development shall be carried out in accordance with plans: 53337/K/02 Proposed Foul Drainage Layout, 60196686/SK-03 Proposed route of plumbing main, 60196686/SK-04, 53337/K/22 Infrastructure and external services details sheet 2 (foul water), 53337/K/27 Infrastructure and external services details foul water pumping station, AO/12576 Issue C sheet 1 General Arrangement of pumps, 53337/K/30 RevZ2 pump station compound details.

Reason: To prevent the increased risk of pollution to the water environment and to prevent an increased risk of flooding to existing property (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 8/18).

Construction Environmental Management Plan

22. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the Cambridge Biomedical Campus Extension Side Wide Construction Environmental Management Plan October 2011.

Reason: To ensure the environmental impact of the construction of the development is adequately mitigated and in the interests of the amenity of nearby residents/occupiers (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 4/13).

Construction Method Statement

23. Prior to the commencement of development of any approved reserved matters phase, a Construction Method Statement (CMS) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority for that phase. The CMS shall demonstrate how the construction of the reserved matters approval accords with the details of construction criteria A-U (except criteria E) of the Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP). In addition to criteria A-U, 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 the Local Planning Authority agrees in writing to the variation of any detail in advance of it being undertaken.

Reason: To ensure the environmental impact of the construction of the development is adequately mitigated and in the interests of the amenity of nearby residents/occupiers (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 4/13).

Detailed Waste Management Plan for Construction

24. Prior to the commencement of development of any approved reserved matters phase, a Detailed Waste Management Plan (DWMP) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority for that phase. The DWMP shall demonstrate how the construction of the reserved matters approval will accord with the details of the principles of the Outline Waste Management Plan. The DWMP shall include details of:
- a) the anticipated nature and volumes of waste.
 - b) measures to ensure the maximisation of the reuse of waste.

- c) measures to ensure effective segregation of waste at source including waste sorting, storage, recovery and recycling facilities to ensure the maximisation of waste materials both for use within and outside the site.
- d) any other steps to ensure the minimisation of waste during construction.
- e) the location of facilities pursuant to criteria b/c/d.
- f) proposed monitoring and timing of submission of monitoring reports.
- g) the proposed timing of submission of a Waste Management Closure Report to demonstrate the effective implementation, management and monitoring of construction waste during the construction lifetime of the development.

Unless otherwise agreed in writing, thereafter the implementation, management and monitoring of construction waste shall be undertaken in accordance with the agreed details and no individual building subject to a Detailed Waste Management Plan shall be occupied until the Waste Management Closure Report has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure the sustainable management of construction waste (Cambridge Local Plan policy 3/1 and Cambridge City Council Sustainable Design and Construction SPD 2007).

Foundations

25. In the event that the foundations of any building require piling, prior to any piling taking place in association with that building, a method statement shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority detailing the type of piling to be used, potential noise and vibration levels at the nearest noise sensitive locations in accordance with British Standard 5228 - Part 4 and mitigation measures to be undertaken in order to safeguard the amenity of adjacent residents/occupiers. The piling mitigation shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To protect the amenity of nearby residents/occupiers (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 4/13).

Construction Times

26. Unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority pursuant to criteria C of the Construction Environmental Management Plan, no construction work shall be carried out or plant operated other than between the following hours: 0730 to 1800 Monday to Friday, 0800 to 1300 on Saturdays and at no time on Sundays, Bank or Public Holidays.

Reason: To protect the amenity of nearby residents/occupiers (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 4/13).

Collection and Delivery Times

27. Unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority pursuant to criteria D of the Construction Environmental Management Plan, there shall be no collection or deliveries to the site for the purposes of construction outside the hours of 0730 to 1800 Monday to Friday, 0800 to 1300 on Saturdays and at no time on Sundays, Bank or Public Holidays.

Reason: To protect the amenity of nearby residents/occupiers (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 4/13).

Lighting: West Facing Facades

28. Unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority, except for building access points, no west facing external facades of buildings adjacent to the railway line and no south facing external facades of buildings adjacent to the southern spine road shall be directly lit by external up-lighters or down-lighters.

Reason: To safeguard the character and setting of the Green Corridor and surrounding open countryside and to encourage the continued foraging of bats (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/2, 3/4, 3/11, 3/12, 4/2, 4/3, 9/3 and 9/5).

Lighting: Individual Development Plots

29. Prior to the erection or installation of any outdoor lighting associated with the development of an individual building plot, a detailed outdoor lighting scheme applicable to that plot and associated building/s shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall specify the method of lighting (including details of the type of lights, orientation/angle of the luminaries, the spacing and height of lighting columns/fixings), the extent/levels of illumination over the site and on adjacent land and measures to be taken to contain light within the curtilage of the site. The scheme shall be implemented in accordance with approved details and shall thereafter be maintained as such.

Reason: In the interests of visual amenity and to ensure that the development will not result in unacceptable light pollution (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/11, 4/13 and 4/15).

Extraction Equipment

30. No occupation of a building shall take place until details of equipment for the purpose of extraction and/or filtration of fumes, odours and/or hazardous material such as airborne bacterial and viral organisms from the building have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved extraction/filtration scheme shall be fully installed before the use hereby permitted is commenced.

Reason: To protect the amenity of nearby residents/occupiers (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 4/13).

Insulation

31. No occupation of a building shall take place until a scheme for the insulation of the building(s) and/or plant in order to minimise the level of noise emanating from the building(s) and/or plant has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The insulation scheme shall be fully implemented before the use hereby permitted is commenced.

Reason: To protect the amenity of nearby residents/occupiers (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 4/13).

Waste

32. No development of a building shall take place until full details of on-site storage facilities for that building for trade waste, including waste for recycling, have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Such details shall identify the specific positions of where wheelie bins, paladins or any other means of storage will be stationed and the arrangements for the disposal of waste. The approved facilities shall be provided prior to the commencement of the use hereby permitted and shall be retained thereafter unless alternative arrangements are agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To protect the amenities of nearby residents/occupiers, to safeguard visual amenity and to ensure adequate waste storage and recycling provision (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/12 and 4/13).

Contaminated Land: Assessment and Remedial Strategy

33. Notwithstanding the submitted contamination report as part of the Environmental Statement, no development of an approved reserved matters phase shall take place until a contaminated land assessment and associated remedial strategy, together with a timetable of works for that phase, have been submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The contaminated land assessment and associated remedial strategy shall adhere to the following points.

- a) The site investigation strategy shall be carried out in accordance with the approved Geo-environmental Remediation and Mitigation Strategy (September 2011).
- b) The site investigation, including relevant soil, soil gas, surface and groundwater sampling, shall be carried out by a suitably 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 Local Planning Authority. The Local Planning Authority 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 Local Planning Authority.
- f) Upon completion of the works, this condition shall not be discharged until a closure report has been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. The closure report shall include details of the proposed remediation works and quality assurance certificates to show that the works have been carried out fully 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 (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 4/13).

Contaminated land: Gas Risk

34. Should the contaminated land assessment and associated remedial strategy identify the presence of material with potential to generate an identifiable ground gas risk for a building, prior to the commencement of development of that building, a specification for gas protection to be incorporated into the building design to prevent build up of potentially asphyxiating gases shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: In order to safeguard the health and safety of future occupants of buildings (Cambridge Local Plan 2006, policy 4/13).

Renewable Energy: 10% Requirement

35. No development of a building shall take place until a renewable energy statement for that particular building, which demonstrates that at least 10% of the building's total predicted energy requirements will be from on-site renewable energy sources, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The statement shall include the total predicted energy requirements for that building in the form of an Energy Statement of the building and shall set out a schedule of proposed on-site renewable energy technologies, their respective energy contributions, location, design and a maintenance programme. The approved renewable energy technologies shall be fully installed and operational prior to the occupation of the approved building and shall thereafter be maintained and remain fully operational in accordance with the approved maintenance programme, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In the interests of reducing carbon dioxide emissions (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 8/16 and Supplementary Planning Document 'Sustainable Design & Construction' 2007).

Renewable Energy: LDF Percentage Flexibility

36. If any reserved matters application for the development of a building is submitted after three years from the date of outline planning permission and if a specific policy regarding renewable energy that stipulates a higher on-site renewable energy percentage requirement than 10% is formally adopted as part of the Local Development Framework prior to the making of any such reserved matters application and it is not demonstrated that to require full compliance would not be economically or technically viable, the specified higher on-site renewable energy percentage requirement specified by the new policy shall apply pursuant to condition 35. The Energy Statement, installation, operation and maintenance of the renewable energy technologies shall continue to apply pursuant to condition 35.

Reason: The period of consent for which outline planning permission is given is for a longer period than the standard 3-year permission. There is likelihood, given that Government policy on sustainable development and renewable energy is moving rapidly, that new policies will be adopted within the Local Development Framework that will require a higher renewable energy percentage requirement that, without this condition, could not be accounted for. The Local Planning Authority considers that this approach is consistent with the aims and objectives of PPS1 Delivering Sustainable Development (2005).

BREEAM and NEAT Building Standards

37. No development of a building shall take place until a pre-assessment BREEAM report or, in the case of an NHS building, a pre-assessment NEAT report, which is prepared by an approved BREEAM or NEAT assessor, indicating that the building is capable of achieving at least a 'very good' rating or above, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. No later than 6 months after occupation of the building, a BREEAM or NEAT certificate shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority demonstrating that applicable building achieves at least a "very good" BREEAM or NEAT rating or above. In the event that such a rating is replaced by a comparable national measure of sustainability for building design, that measure shall be applicable to the proposed building unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In the interests of reducing carbon dioxide emissions and promoting principles of sustainable construction and efficient use of buildings (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 8/16 and Supplementary Planning Document 'Sustainable Design & Construction' 2007).

Tree Protection Robinson Way: Assessment Surveys

38. No development within a building plot that is within 20m of Robinson Way shall take place until a land survey, tree survey and arboricultural implications assessment, which are applicable to the associated building plot, in accordance with BS:5837:2005, have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority: The surveys shall include:
- a) The location of all trees, shrub masses and hedges.
 - b) The location of streams, buildings and other structures, boundary features and services.
 - c) Spot heights of ground level throughout the site.
 - d) The location of trees on land adjacent to or which overhang the development site.
 - e) A categorization of trees or groups of trees for their quality and value in accordance with table 1 of the British Standard.

Reason: In the interests of accurately establishing the quality and value of trees on or adjacent to the site and the implications for development (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 4/3 and 4/4).

Tree Protection Robinson Way: Method Statements and Plan

39. No development within a building plot that is within 20m of Robinson Way shall take place until an arboricultural method statement, tree constraints plan and tree protection plan, which are applicable to the associated building plot, in accordance with BS:5837:2005, have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. These shall include:

- a) Plans showing trees to be removed, identified by number.
- b) Plans showing trees to be retained, identified by number, with canopies accurately plotted.
- c) A tree constraints plan that identifies root protection areas of retained trees.
- d) The precise location and design details for the erection of protective tree barriers and any other physical protection measures.
- e) A method statement in relation to construction operations in accordance with paragraph 7.2 of the British Standard.

Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: In the interests of visual amenity and safeguarding trees that are worthy of retention (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 4/3 and 4/4).

Tree Protection Robinson Way: Protective Fencing

40. No development within a building plot that is within 20m of Robinson Way shall take place until fencing for the protection of any retained tree within the associated building plot has been fully erected in accordance with the approved plans and particulars. The fencing shall be retained intact for the full duration of the development until all equipment, materials and surplus materials have been removed from the site. Nothing shall be stored or placed in any fenced area in accordance with this condition and the ground levels within those areas shall not be altered, nor shall any excavations be made without the written consent of the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In the interests of visual amenity and safeguarding trees that are worthy of retention (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 4/3 and 4/4).

Tree Protection Robinson Way: Excavation Trenches

41. No development within a building plot that is within 20m of Robinson Way shall take place until full details of the position and proposed depth of excavation trenches for all services (including cables, pipes, surface water drains, foul water drains and public utilities) and their means of installation which pass underneath the canopy of any existing tree adjacent to Robinson Way, have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: In the interests of visual amenity and safeguarding trees that are worthy of retention (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 4/3 and 4/4).

Structural Landscaping: Site Wide Scheme

42. Structural Landscaping along the western edge of the allocated biotech and biomedical research and development area shown on parameter plan 1, south of the Cambridgeshire Guided Bus embankment shall be carried out in accordance with the following drawings:

Drawing No 1777/C42/001C: Landscape Proposals Western Boundary

Drawing No 1777/C42/003E: Tree Pit Details Longitudinal Section

Drawing No 1777/C42/004E: Tree Pit Details Cross Section
Western Boundary Landscape Specification Revision A

Unless, any alternative scheme(s) which provides a minimum 12-14m structural woodland landscaping scheme, with additional 3m x 4.8m deep tree blocks positioned at a maximum of 15m centres, in accordance with parameter plan 6 and plan 1700/SK180707.01B, along the western edge of the allocated biotech and biomedical research and development area shown on parameter plan 1, south of the Cambridgeshire Guided Bus embankment are approved through subsequent discharge of this condition by the local planning authority. Development shall then be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: In order to mitigate the visual impact of the proposed development on the setting and special character of Cambridge, the retained Green Belt, the Green Corridor and surrounding open countryside. Details for part (a) of the structural landscaping have already been agreed. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/2, 3/4, 3/6, 3/7, 3/11, 3/12, 4/2, 4/3, 9/3, and 9/5).

Structural Landscaping: Implementation and Replacement

43. All planting, seeding or turfing comprised in the approved structural landscaping scheme shall be fully carried out in the first planting and seeding seasons following the commencement of development of any building, or in accordance with a landscaping phasing plan that is submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Any trees or plants which within a period of 5 years from the completion of the development die, are removed or become seriously damaged or diseased, shall be replaced in the next planting season with others of similar size and species as those originally planted, unless the Local Planning Authority gives written consent to any variation.

Reason: In order to mitigate the visual impact of the proposed development on the setting and special character of Cambridge, the retained Green Belt, the Green Corridor and surrounding open countryside (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/2, 3/4, 3/6, 3/7, 3/11, 3/12, 4/2, 4/3, 9/3, and 9/5).

Structural Landscaping: Management Plan

44. The Management of the Structural Landscaping approved through condition 42 shall be carried out in accordance with the Cambridge Biomedical Campus Western Boundary Landscape Management Specification Revision A dated 04 November 2011.

If any alternative structural landscaping scheme is agreed through condition 42, then a replacement landscape management plan for the approved structural landscaping scheme including long-term design objectives, management responsibilities and management and maintenance schedules for all landscape areas for a minimum period of 25 years, shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority prior to the commencement of any planting. The landscape management plan shall be carried out as approved.

Reason: To ensure satisfactory arrangements are in place to ensure the proper management and maintenance of landscaped areas (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/2, 3/4, 3/6, 3/7, 3/11, 3/12, 4/2, 4/3, 9/3, and 9/5).

Landscaping: Development Plot Schemes

45. Unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority, any reserved matters application for the erection of a building shall include an accompanying landscaping scheme for the associated plot. The landscaping scheme shall include full details of planting plans and written specifications, including cultivation proposals for maintenance and management associated with plant and grass establishment, details of the mix, size, distribution, density and levels of all trees/hedges/shrubs to be planted and the proposed time of planting. No development within the site for which reserved matters approval is sought shall commence until the landscaping scheme has been approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In order to mitigate the visual impact of the proposed development on the setting and special character of Cambridge, the retained Green Belt, the Green Corridor and surrounding open countryside (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/2, 3/4, 3/6, 3/7, 3/11, 3/12, 4/2, 4/3, 9/3, and 9/5).

Landscaping: Development Plot Implementation and Replacement

46. All planting, seeding or turfing comprised in the approved landscaping schemes for the individual plots shall be fully carried out in the first planting and seeding seasons following the commencement of development, or in accordance with a landscaping phasing plan that is submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Any trees or plants which within a period of 5 years from the completion of the development die, are removed or become seriously damaged or diseased, shall be replaced in the next planting season with others of similar size and species as those originally planted, unless the Local Planning Authority gives written consent to any variation. The landscaping shall be fully completed in accordance with the approved scheme and/or phasing plan within the respective development plot.

Reason: In order to mitigate the visual impact of the proposed development on the setting and special character of Cambridge, the retained Green Belt, the Green Corridor and surrounding open countryside (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/2, 3/4, 3/6, 3/7, 3/11, 3/12, 4/2, 4/3, 9/3, and 9/5).

Landscaping: Development Plot Management

47. A landscape management plan for any building plot including long-term design objectives, management responsibilities and management and maintenance schedules for all landscape areas for a minimum period of 25 years, shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority prior to the occupation of any part of the buildings for which reserved matters approval is being sought. The landscape management plan shall be carried out as approved.

Reason: To ensure satisfactory arrangements are in place to ensure the proper management and maintenance of landscaped areas (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/2, 3/4, 3/6, 3/7, 3/11, 3/12, 4/2, 4/3, 9/3, and 9/5).

Earthworks

48. Prior to the commencement of development of any approved reserved matters phase, details of earthworks associated with that phase shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. These details shall include the proposed grading and mounding of land areas including the levels and contours to be formed, showing the relationship of proposed grading and mounding to existing vegetation and surrounding landform including timing. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: In the interests of visual amenity and to ensure that any earthworks are appropriate to the site context and surrounding landscape (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/4, 3/11 and 3/12).

Hard Landscaping

49. Unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority, no development of a building shall take place until full details of hard landscape works associated with its plot have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and these works shall be carried out as approved prior to the occupation of any part of the building hereby approved. These details shall include: proposed finished levels or contours; means of enclosure; car parking layouts; other vehicle and pedestrian access and circulation areas; hard surfacing materials; minor artefacts and structures; furniture; refuse or other storage units; signs; any proposed public art.

Reason: In the interests of visual amenity and to ensure that suitable hard landscape is provided as part of the development (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/4, 3/11 and 3/12).

Transport: The Boulevard

50. Any reserved matters application for the development of the proposed Boulevard shall include a detailed engineering scheme/plan showing all footway/footpath/cycleway links comprising dimensions, levels, forms of construction, kerbing, surface water drainage, street lighting systems and traffic calming measures, together with a phasing plan that is linked to the occupation of buildings on the site. The scheme/plan shall substantially accord with approved parameter plans PP7, PP8, PP9 and PP10 and shall include:

- a) Intersections with the Addenbrooke's Access Road and Cambridgeshire Guided Bus (including details of a signalised crossing).
- b) Proposed intersections and alterations to all existing roads, footpaths and cycleways (including Robinson Way).
- c) Details of the proposed location of all bus stops together with details of proposed alterations to existing bus stops within Addenbrooke's.
- d) Details of the proposed upgrading of public footpath no.47 (or an equivalent route) within the site.
- e) Details of all proposed cycle routes, both dedicated and on-road.
- f) Details of all proposed materials and finishes.
- g) Detailed design of all proposed street furniture (including all signs, lighting, bollards, bus stops/shelters, cycle parking).
- h) a planting scheme for attenuation ponds.
- i) a single avenue of large tree planting (including specification) either side of the Boulevard.
- j) Details of management and maintenance responsibilities for all planting.

The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: In order to safeguard highway safety and to secure an appropriate means of access for users of the development (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/7, 8/2 and 8/11).

Transport: Southern Spine Road

51. Any reserved matters application for the development of the proposed Southern Spine Road shall include a detailed engineering scheme/plan showing all footway/footpath/cycleway links comprising dimensions, levels, forms of construction, kerbing, surface water drainage, street lighting systems and traffic calming measures, together with a phasing plan that is linked to the occupation of buildings on the site. The scheme/plan shall substantially accord with approved parameter plans PP7, PP8, PP9 and PP10 and shall include:

- a. Intersections with the Addenbrooke's Access Road.
- b. Proposed intersections and alterations to all existing roads, footpaths and cycleways (including Robinson Way).
- c. Details of the proposed location of all bus stops together with details of proposed alterations to existing bus stops within Addenbrooke's campus.
- d. Details of all proposed cycle routes, both dedicated and on-road.
- e. Details of all proposed materials and finishes.
- f. Detailed design of all proposed street furniture (including all signs, lighting, bollards, bus stops/shelters, cycle parking).
- g. a half avenue of large tree and hedge planting on the northern side of the Southern Spine Road.
- h. Details of management and maintenance responsibilities for all planting.

The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: In order to safeguard highway safety and to secure an appropriate means of access for users of the development (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/7, 8/2 and 8/11).

Car Parking: On-Plot research and Development

52. On-plot car parking provision for any biotech or biomedical research and development use shall be provided at a ratio of 1 space for every 72 square metres of gross floor area measured externally or any such ratio agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority that provides a lesser amount of on-plot car parking provision.

Reason: To ensure that the development takes place in accordance with the principles and parameters contained within the Environmental Statement, to ensure the predicted impacts of vehicular movements are not exceeded and to ensure the proposal encourages sustainable modes of transport to and from the site (Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003 policies 6/1 and 9/8 and Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 8/10 9/3, 9/5 and 10/1).

Car Parking: Clinical, Higher Education or Sui Generis (Employee)

53. Car parking provision for employees of any clinical research and treatment (D1 and/or clinical in-patient treatment) or higher education or sui generis medical research institute uses shall be provided at a ratio of 1 space for every 72 square metres of gross floor area measured externally or any such ratio agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority that provides a lesser amount of car parking provision.

Reason: To ensure that the development takes place in accordance with the principles and parameters contained within the Environmental Statement, to ensure the predicted impacts of vehicular movements are not exceeded and to ensure the proposal encourages sustainable modes of transport to and from the site (Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003 policies 6/1 and 9/8 and Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 8/10 9/3, 9/5 and 10/1).

Car Parking: Clinical, Higher Education or Sui Generis (Patients and Visitors)

54. Car parking provision for patients and visitors for any clinical research and treatment (D1 and/or clinical in-patient treatment) or higher education or sui generis medical research institute uses shall be provided at a ratio of 1 space for every 773 square metres of gross floor area measured externally or any such ratio agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority that provides a lesser amount of car parking provision.

Reason: To ensure that the development takes place in accordance with the principles and parameters contained within the Environmental Statement, to ensure the predicted impacts of vehicular movements are not exceeded and to ensure the proposal encourages sustainable modes of transport to and from the site (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 8/10 9/3, 9/5 and 10/1).

Car Parking: Disabled Spaces

55. Unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority, disabled car parking spaces shall constitute at least 5% of the total number of spaces provided.

Reason: To ensure that the development provides sufficient disabled parking (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 8/10).

Car Parking: Existing Modal Share

56. The submission of any reserved matters application for approval of any building shall include a summary from the Addenbrooke's Annual Travel Survey showing the current modal share for staff, patients and visitors cycling to Addenbrooke's.

Reason: To enable an accurate estimation of the modal share of people cycling to Addenbrooke's Campus (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 8/6).

Car Parking: Trip Estimation

57. The submission of any reserved matters application for approval of any building shall include an estimation of the total number of staff, patients and visitors that will visit the building in a typical day.

Reason: To ensure that the proposed level of cycling provision is appropriate to the nature of the proposed building and its use (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 8/6).

Car Parking: Calculation of Spaces Required

58. Unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority, the submission of any reserved matters application for approval of any building shall include a quantum of cycle parking provision that is equivalent to:

a) For staff provision, a level which will provide a total number of spaces which cater for at least 10% more than the existing modal share percentage of staff cycling to work as shown by the latest Addenbrooke's Annual Travel Survey. The final level of provision to be calculated shall assume that only 80% of staff will be on-site at any one time.

b) For patients and visitors, a level which will provide a total number of spaces which cater for at least 10% more than the existing modal share percentage of patients and visitors cycling to work as shown by the latest Addenbrooke's Annual Travel Survey. The final level of provision to be calculated shall assume that cycle parking spaces are used 3 times daily.

Reason: To ensure that the proposed level of cycling provision is appropriate to the nature of the proposed building and its use (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 8/6).

Cycle Parking: Details of Facilities

59. No development of a building shall commence until details of facilities for the covered, secure parking of bicycles relevant to that building have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The facilities shall be provided in accordance with the approved details prior to the occupation of the building for which permission is sought and shall thereafter be retained and shall not be used for any other purpose unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure appropriate provision for the secure storage of bicycles (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 8/6).

Archaeological

60. Notwithstanding the submitted archaeological mitigation strategy, no development of a building or material operation constituting development relating to any roadway/footpath or area of public realm shall take place until the implementation of a programme of archaeological work, in accordance with a written scheme of investigation relating to that building or material operation constituting development relating to any roadway/footpath or area of public realm, has been submitted by the applicant, approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and carried out in accordance with the approved details.

This written scheme will include the following components, completion of each of which will trigger the phased discharging of the condition:

- a) fieldwork in accordance with the agreed written scheme of investigation.
- b) post-excavation assessment (to be submitted within six months of the completion of fieldwork, unless otherwise agreed in writing in advance with the Local Planning Authority).
- c) completion of post-excavation analysis, preparation of site archive ready for deposition at a store approved by the Local Planning Authority, completion of an archive report, and submission of a publication report (to be completed within two years of the completion of fieldwork, unless otherwise agreed in advance in writing with the Local Planning Authority).

Reason: To ensure that an appropriate archaeological investigation of the site has been implemented before development commences (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 4/9).

Shop Front Design Guide

61. Prior to the occupation of any A1 or A3 use, a tenants' shopfront design guide shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter the development shall be undertaken in accordance with the agreed signage protocol unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure that the details of development respect the character and appearance of the public realm (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 3/15).

Public Realm Design Strategy

62. Unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority, any reserved matters application in respect of the development of the proposed Circus and Piazza, shall include a comprehensive Public Realm Design Strategy applicable to the entirety of the proposed Circus and Piazza areas. The Strategy shall set out a vision for the proposed Circus and Piazza areas and shall include detailed information and accompanying plans of the following items:

Movement Strategy

A Movement Strategy that includes:

- a) Detailed guidance on the provision of measures to promote the use of the Circus and Piazza as a space that is principally for use for pedestrians, cyclists and the Cambridgeshire Guided Bus and which limits the ability of any other vehicles to utilise the Circus and Piazza for primary access and/or service delivery requirements.
- b) A plan with cross-sections showing proposed roads, bus lanes, footpaths and cycleways (widths and specifications).
- c) Detailed design and location of speed restraint measures.

Car Parking

- a) The location of car parking spaces and measures to control their use.
- b) The location of drop-off spaces.

Drainage

A Sustainable Drainage Scheme that includes:

a) Design standards and methodology for the implementation of a sustainable urban drainage system (using a SUD's hierarchy), including the detailed design of specific features and their maintenance/management requirements and how the system relates to the strategic management of water within the site.

Soft Landscaping

A Soft Landscaping Scheme that includes:

a) Planting plans and written specifications/details of the species, mix, size, distribution and density of all trees/hedges/shrubs to be planted, the timing of planting and management and maintenance responsibilities.

b) Tree locations and planting specifications where adjacent to or within the highway.

c) The design and location of incidental green/informal spaces/enclosures.

d) The design and location of key focal points.

Hard Landscaping

A Hard Landscaping Scheme that includes:

a) The design and location of all bus stops and shelters.

b) The design and location of all CCTV cameras and associated cabling.

c) The design and location of all cycle parking stands and shelters.

d) The design and location of all seating.

e) The design and location of all bollards, signage and bins.

f) Samples of paving materials and finishes.

g) Details of carriageway materials and finishes.

h) Proposed levels changes.

i) A strategy for the provision of public utilities equipment which includes consultation with statutory undertakers and agreement in respect of the location and appearance of statutory undertakers' plant, compounds and associated structures.

Public Art Strategy

a) The submission of a Public Art Strategy in accordance with the requirements of the relevant schedule of the S106 agreement and conditions 64, 65 and 66 of this permission.

Lighting

A Lighting Scheme that includes:

a) The design and location of all lighting, including amenity lighting, within the Circus and Piazza, including guidance on the height of the lighting columns and the types, colour and brightness of proposed lights, and measures to limit light pollution.

Coordinated Development

a) Consideration of how the proposed design and layout of the Piazza will integrate with plans and scheduling for works within the extended Piazza promoted as part of the Forum site adjacent.

b) Consideration of how the proposed design and layout of the Circus and Piazza will integrate with the Boulevard, the Cambridgeshire Guided Busway and proposed alterations to Robinson Way.

c) The provision of detailed design principles to be used to guide the detailed design of the public realm on the proposed development parcels where they adjoin the Circus and Piazza.

Phasing

a) Detailed guidance on how the provision of the Circus and Piazza and those elements that are contained within it are to be provided.

Management and Maintenance

A Management and Maintenance Strategy that identifies:

a) Responsibilities for all elements, including SUD's, contained within the Circus and Piazza.

Should the detailed design and/or location of any of the items listed not be included within the Public Realm Design Strategy, then the phased provision of such information shall be agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority prior to the commencement of works within the Circus and Piazza. The approved Public Realm Design Strategy shall be carried out in accordance with the agreed details, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In the interests of the amenity of the intended users of the Circus and Piazza and to secure a high quality environment that is befitting the strategic importance of the space (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/4, 3/7, 3/11, 3/12, 4/15, 8/4, 9/3 and 9/5).

Off-Site Highways Works

63. No occupation of any floorspace for clinical research and treatment (D1 and/or clinical in-patient treatment), or biomedical and biotech research and development (B1b) or higher education building under use classes B1 and D1 or sui generis medical research institute uses shall take place until:

(i) the offsite highways works at Hills Road/Fendon Road/Robinson Way shall have been fully laid out and implemented in accordance the approved schemes/plans in the Highway Design Report prepared by Lanmoor Consulting dated March 2015, reference 140546/DS/KTP/01 Rev C.

(ii) the offsite highways works to improve pedestrian connectivity at the Queen Ediths Way/Mowbray Road/Fendon Road have been facilitated. A scheme shall be agreed by the Local Planning Authority within 24 months, and the work carried in accordance with the agreed scheme within 36 months of the date of this permission. "

Reason: In order to safeguard highway safety and network capacity (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/7, 8/2 and 8/11).

Public Art Details

64. Where the approved Public Art Strategy secured under the S106 agreement associated with this application indicates, a reserved matters application shall include the following details of public art to be provided within that relevant phase:

- a) Details of the consultation, approval and commissioning process for artists and associated proposed public art.
- b) Details of community engagement and consultation including measures to promote public involvement in the evolution of the public art.
- c) Descriptions, plans and images of the public art that will be realised.
- d) Details of how the public art complies with any approved public realm strategy for the development.
- e) Project timescales.
- f) Delivery mechanisms.
- g) The total amount allocated for the proposed public art including a breakdown of the total cost of the implementation of the public art and the apportionment of the costs across its various elements, including maintenance and decommissioning costs (if applicable).

Reason: To ensure that the details of public art come forward at the appropriate stage in the planning process in accordance with the Public Art Strategy and that the proposed public art positively contributes to its context within the public realm (Cambridge Local Plan policies 3/4, 3/7, 3/11, 3/12, 9/5 and 10/1).

Public Art Maintenance and Implementation Details

65. No development of a reserved matters phase that contains an approved element of public art within it shall commence until such time as the following implementation and maintenance details have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority:

- a) Phasing and dates for the installation of the approved public art.
- b) Legal ownership and insurance details.
- c) Responsibility for implementation.

- d) Responsibility for maintenance and maintenance schedules.
- e) Details of decommissioning including timescales and reparation (if applicable).

Reason: To ensure that details of the maintenance and implementation of public art come forward at the appropriate stage in the planning process and that details surrounding subsequent ownership, maintenance, insurance and decommissioning are thoroughly considered (Cambridge Local Plan policies 3/4, 3/7, 3/11, 3/12, 9/5 and 10/1).

Provision and Maintenance of Public Art

66. In relation to any reserved matters phase containing an approved element of public art, the public art as defined in the S106 agreement shall be provided and managed and maintained in accordance with the approved Public Art Strategy secured under the S106 agreement and the approved public art details and the approved public art implementation and maintenance details unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The public art shall not be moved or removed once implemented either permanently or temporarily other than in accordance with the agreed details or other written approval of the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure that the public art is implemented at an appropriate stage in the phased development of the site and that the public art once provided is properly managed and maintained (Cambridge Local Plan policies 3/4, 3/7, 3/11, 3/12, 9/5 and 10/1).

Informatives

Section 73 approval

The original outline planning permission 06/0796/OUT continues to subsist, as well as this new outline approval granted under Section 73 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

Environmental Health

Due to the proximity of this site to existing residential premises and other noise sensitive premises, impact pile driving is not recommended.

New development can sometimes cause inconvenience, disturbance and disruption to local residents, businesses and passers by. As a result the City Council runs a Considerate Contractor Scheme aimed at promoting high standards of care during construction. The City Council encourages the developer of the site, through its building contractor, to join the scheme and agree to comply with the model Code of Good Practice, in the interests of good neighbourliness. Information about the scheme can be obtained from The Considerate Contractor project Officer in the Planning Department (Tel: 01223 457121).

In relation to environmental construction noise impact we recommend the developer uses the standard the City Council requires in relation to noise levels when letting contracts, known as clause 109 Noise Control.

The developer is advised to contact the Health & Safety Executive, 14 Cardiff Road, Luton, LU1 1PP: -Tel No: 01582 444200 concerning health and safety regulation requirements associated with the construction and operational phases.

To satisfy the condition relating to noise insulation, the noise level from all plant and equipment, vents etc (collectively) associated with this application should not raise the existing background level (L90) by more than 3 dB(A) both during the day (0700 to 2300 hrs over any one hour period) and night time (2300 to 0700 hrs over any one 5 minute period), at the boundary of the premises subject to this application and having regard to noise sensitive premises. Tonal/impulsive noise frequencies should be eliminated or at least considered in any assessment and should carry an additional 5 dB(A) correction. This is to guard against any creeping background noise in the area and prevent unreasonable noise disturbance to other premises.

It is recommended that the agent/applicant submits a noise prediction survey/report in accordance with the principles of BS4142: 1997 "Method for rating industrial noise affecting mixed residential and industrial areas" or similar. Noise levels shall be predicted at the boundary having regard to neighbouring residential premises.

Such a survey / report should include: a large scale plan of the site in relation to neighbouring premises; noise sources and measurement / prediction points marked on plan; a list of noise sources; details of proposed noise sources / type of plant such as: number, location, sound power levels, noise frequency spectrums, noise directionality of plant, noise levels from duct intake or discharge points; details of noise mitigation measures (attenuation details of any intended enclosures, silencers or barriers); description of full noise calculation procedures; noise levels at a representative sample of noise sensitive locations and hours of operation. Any report shall include raw measurement data so that conclusions may be thoroughly evaluated and calculations checked.

To satisfy the standard condition relating to fume filtration/extraction, it is recommended that an effective and appropriate odour/fume extract system be installed to ensure an odour nuisance is not caused to the occupiers of neighbouring premises. The system will need to deal with the two main phases of contaminants within cooking emissions: the particulate (grease, small food and smoke particles) and gaseous (odour vapour/volatile organic compounds).

It is recommended that flue terminals do not impede the final discharge termination point.

The flue / duct height should terminate at least one metre above the roof ridge level to which it is attached and a minimum operating efflux velocity of 10 to 15 metres a second should be achieved. However, the effectiveness of this system is dependent on buildings nearby. If buildings nearby are likely to have an effect on the dispersion and dilution of odour, the flue height should be at least one metre above the ridge of those buildings.

It is not likely that any significant ground remediation will be required at the site, although if any deposited materials are encountered the Local Planning Authority should be informed and the materials should be dealt with in an appropriate manner.

The applicants are advised that the ES has identified that buildings should be subject to gas protection measures to ensure any risk from the build up of dangerous gases is adequately mitigated.

Waste Management

The applicants are advised to contact Cambridgeshire County Council Waste Management Team to discuss the content of any outline or detailed Waste Management Plan prior to submission.

S106

This planning permission should be read in conjunction with the associated deed of planning obligation prepared under s.106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended). References in the conditions to the S106 agreement are references to that associated deed.

Strategic and On-Plot Surface Water Drainage Strategies

The applicants are advised that notwithstanding the submitted Flood Risk Assessment, that strategic and on-plot surface water drainage strategies should demonstrate that the minimum discharge rate from any control structure is no less than 3 l/sec. The overall discharge rate for the site to remain unchanged. Site-specific strategies shall be within the management, maintenance and responsibility of a single site-wide management company. This is to ensure that drainage within the site is strategically managed and to minimise the risk of flooding to property and land. The discharge rates shown in Appendix C revision 29/05/07 with 5 flow controls for the site with varying flow rates are acceptable, in principle, to the Environment Agency.

Trees

The applicants are advised to appoint a competent arboriculturalist to oversee the project. The arboriculturalist should monitor, record and confirm the implementation and maintenance of tree protection measures as set out in the conditions of the planning permission. All arboricultural works should be carried out by a competent tree contractor, proficient in both root zone and aerial arboricultural work and shall follow strictly the agreed method statements and specifications. The applicants are advised to arrange a pre-construction site meeting between site agent, the developer's chosen arboriculturalist and the Council's delegated arboricultural officer.

Considerate Contractors

New development can sometimes cause inconvenience, disturbance and disruption to local residents, businesses and passers by. As a result the City Council runs a Considerate Contractor Scheme aimed at promoting high standards of care during construction. The City Council encourages the developer of the site, through its building contractor, to join the scheme and agree to comply with the model Code of Good Practice, in the interests of good neighbourliness. Information about the scheme can be obtained from The Considerate Contractor Project Officer in the Planning Department (Tel: 01223 457121).

Cycle Parking

The level of staff cycle parking provision for a building that is estimated to have 2,778 staff would be calculated as follows: 2,222 (or 80%) of those staff would be assumed to be on site on a typical day. The 2006 cycling mode share from the Addenbrooke's Travel Survey for staff is 25%. 10% would be added (i.e. 35%) meaning that the number of staff cycle parking spaces that would have to be provided would be 778.

The level of patient and visitor cycle parking provision for a building which is estimated to have 526 patients and visitors would be calculated as follows: The 2006 cycling mode share for patients and visitors from the Addenbrooke's Travel Survey is 3%. 10% would be added (i.e. 13%). Given that it is assumed that cycle parking spaces will turn over 3 times per day, the number of patient and visitor cycle parking spaces that would have to be provided for would be 23.

Recommended Planting Mix

The following woodland planting mixes are recommended:

East and West of the Railway Line

(to be planted at 1.5m centres in groups of 5-7 of the same species)

Species	Planting size cm	% mix
Quercus robur	Feathered 125/150	10
Fraxinus excelsior	10-12	5
Tilia cordata	10-12	5
Prunus avium	10-12	5
Taxus baccata	100/125	15
Acer campestre	Feathered 125/150	15
Ilex aquifolium	60-80	15
Crataegus monogyna	60-80	20
Corylus avellana	60-80	10

Within the woodland belt to the east of the railway line (20/20 site) the mix should be supplemented with 14-16cm girth Tilia cordata and Fraxinus excelsior trees on a double planting grid of 15m north-south as shown on plan 1700/SK180707.01B (which may or may not be staggered depending on the final design) or a grid to coincide with the wider areas of the planting belt. Within the woodland belt to the west of the railway (Hobsons Brook GC) the mix shall be supplemented as above on a planting grid to be agreed.

N.B. The planting on the west of the railway must not be compromised by the spoil deposit from Clay Farm, i.e. the bunding adjacent to the railway.

Woodland Mix for South of 20/20 adjacent to Nine Wells

(to be planted at 1.5m centres in groups of 5-7 of the same species)

Species	Planting size cm	% mix
Fagus sylvatica	Feathered 125/150	10
Sorbus torminalis	10-12	5
Quercus robur	Feathered 125/150	5
Prunus avium	12-14	5
Taxus baccata	100/125	15
Acer campestre	Feathered 175/200	15
Ilex aquifolium	60-80	15
Crataegus monogyna	60-80	20
Corylus avellana	60-80	10

This page is intentionally left blank

Application Number	14/1938/S73	Agenda Item	
Date Received	8th December 2014	Officer	Miss Catherine Linford
Target Date	9th March 2015		
Ward	West Chesterton		
Site	1 Milton Road Cambridge CB4 1UY		
Proposal	Section 73 application to vary condition 2 of application 14/0543/FUL for substitution/addition of plans to permit amendments to be made to the scheme.		
Applicant	S C Milton Road Ltd		

SUMMARY	<p>The development accords with the Development Plan for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> The proposed amendments would not have a significant detrimental impact on the appearance of the approved buildings, the character or appearance of the Conservation Area, or the setting of the Portland Arms which is a Building of Local Interest (BLI). <input type="checkbox"/> The proposed amendments would not have a significant detrimental impact on the occupiers of neighbouring properties or future occupiers of the site.
RECOMMENDATION	APPROVAL

1.0 SITE DESCRIPTION/AREA CONTEXT

- 1.1 The application site is a 'T shaped' parcel of land situated on Mitchams Corner, at the junction of Milton Road and Victoria Road, with frontages on Milton Road, Victoria Road and Corona Road. The surrounding area is mixed in character with the Staples site opposite to the south; residential properties adjacent to the site on Victoria Road to the west; commercial and residential properties adjacent to the site on Milton Road to

the north; and residential properties adjacent to the site on Corona Road to the north.

- 1.2 Planning permission has been granted on the site for the erection of student accommodation comprising 211 student rooms (following demolition of existing buildings) and a commercial unit to be used for Class A1 food retail purposes, together with bicycle and car parking and associated infrastructure (14/0543/FUL). Demolition works have commenced.

2.0 THE PROPOSAL

- 2.1 Permission is sought to vary condition 2 of the previous permission (14/0543/FUL) to permit minor material amendments to the approved scheme. The amendments are as follows:

Site wide

- ☐ Addition of a gate and turnstile to the main entrance on Milton Road;
- ☐ Installation of a fence between Block A and Block C to conceal refuse and cycle storage;
- ☐ Relocation of cycle storage;

Block A

- ☐ Single storey extension to the rear;
- ☐ Removal of double doors on southern elevation due to the relocation of the refuse store;

Block E

- ☐ Replacement of student room with a refuse store and relocation of this student room within the building;
- ☐ Replacement of internal cycle and refuse store with gym and laundry room;
- ☐ Bay window moved across one room on the northern elevation due to the provision of the refuse store.

Block F

- ☐ Ground floor corridor deleted and rooms extended into this space with individual entrance doors provided on the southern elevation;
- ☐ Relocation of windows on the northern elevation; and
- ☐ Rooflights inserted on the northern elevation.

2.2 If permission is granted for the minor material amendment this will lead to a variation of condition 2 and will result in a fresh planning permission being granted.

3.0 SITE HISTORY

Reference	Description	Outcome
06/0075/OUT	Outline consent for residential development and related infrastructure	A/C
13/1326/FUL	Erection of student accommodation comprising 260 student rooms (following demolition of existing building) and a commercial unit to be used for A1 food retail purposes; together with bicycle and car parking and associated infrastructure.	REF
14/0543/FUL	Erection of student accommodation comprising 211 student rooms (following demolition of existing buildings) and a commercial unit to be used for Class A1 food retail purposes, together with bicycle and car parking and associated infrastructure.	A/C

The Decision Notice for the previously application 14/0543/FUL is attached to the report as Appendix 1.

PUBLICITY

4.1	Advertisement:	Yes
	Adjoining Owners:	Yes
	Site Notice Displayed:	Yes

5.0 POLICY

5.1 See Appendix 1 for full details of Central Government Guidance, Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies, Supplementary Planning Documents and Material Considerations.

5.2 Relevant Development Plan policies

PLAN		POLICY NUMBER
Cambridge Plan 2006	Local	3/1 3/4 3/7 3/14
		4/4 4/11 4/12
		5/1 5/12
		8/6

5.3 Relevant Central Government Guidance, Supplementary Planning Documents and Material Considerations

Central Government Guidance	National Planning Policy Framework March 2012
	National Planning Policy Framework – Planning Practice Guidance March 2014
	Circular 11/95
Supplementary Planning Guidance	Sustainable Design and Construction (May 2007)
	Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Waste Partnership (RECAP): Waste Management Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (February 2012)

	<u>City Wide Guidance</u> Arboricultural Strategy (2004) Cycle Parking Guide for New Residential Developments (2010)
	<u>Area Guidelines:</u> Buildings of Local Interest Castle and Victoria Conservation Area Appraisal

5.4 Status of Proposed Submission – Cambridge Local Plan

Planning applications should be determined in accordance with policies in the adopted Development Plan and advice set out in the NPPF. However, after consideration of adopted plans and the NPPF, policies in emerging plans can also be given some weight when determining applications. For Cambridge, therefore, the emerging revised Local Plan as published for consultation on 19 July 2013 can be taken into account, especially those policies where there are no or limited objections to it. However it is likely, in the vast majority of instances, that the adopted development plan and the NPPF will have considerably more weight than emerging policies in the revised Local Plan.

For the application considered in this report, the following policy in the emerging Local Plan is of relevance:

Policy 21: Mitcham's Corner Opportunity Area

6.0 CONSULTATIONS

Cambridgeshire County Council (Highways Development Management)

- 6.1 No significant adverse effect upon the Public Highway should result from this proposal if it gains the benefit of Planning Permission.

Head of Refuse and Environment

- 6.2 No objection, subject to a condition requiring a noise report and insulation scheme for the gym.

Urban Design and Conservation Team

- 6.3 The proposed amendments are acceptable in design terms. Further details relating to the treatment and design of the entrance gates, fences and turnstile should be provided as part of the public art submission and material condition. The treatment of the courtyard extension should be conditioned. The treatment of the fence proposed between Blocks A and C should be conditioned, we recommend that a 'hit and miss' brick wall should be specified as we are concerned that a solid wall or fence will have a fortress like appearance.

English Heritage

- 6.4 The application should be determined in accordance with national and local policy guidance, and on the basis of your specialist Conservation advice.

Landscape

- 6.5 While the principle of an extension is acceptable, the area causes the removal of a portion of the open green space. This is disappointing as the scheme is very much a hard-paved scheme with little green space to enjoy. It is encouraging, however, that this space will effectively act as a patio area during times of pleasant weather accommodating an indoor/outdoor use pattern. We feel that because of this, we can approve of this addition.

Drainage

- 6.6 No comment.

Architectural Liaison Officer

- 6.7 Having previously viewed and commented on the various submissions for 1 Milton Road, Cambridge I was satisfied with the security arrangements proposed. With the latest documents

and drawings, the security arrangements appear to have been enhanced in terms of students entering the site with gate and turnstile proposals between supermarket and the Portland Arms Public House. Visitor management is always an issue, I assume during normal office hours this would be though main reception, out of office hours would require a resident to attend the gate to allow entry which would be fine. I would not like to see automatic gate release to allow visitor access.

- 6.8 The above responses are a summary of the comments that have been received. Full details of the consultation responses can be inspected on the application file.

7.0 REPRESENTATIONS

- 7.1 The owners/occupiers of the following addresses have made representations:

- ☐ 4 Corona Road
- ☐ 14A Corona Road
- ☐ 16 Corona Road
- ☐ 12-20 Victoria Road

- 7.2 The representations can be summarised as follows:

- ☐ The rear access to 16 Corona Road would be blocked by a cycle store
- ☐ The Victoria Road gate has been removed from the scheme
- ☐ The proposed entrance doors on the south elevation of Block F would cause noise and have an impact on privacy
- ☐ Blocking of a right of way

- 7.3 The above representations are a summary of the comments that have been received. Full details of the representations can be inspected on the application file.

8.0 ASSESSMENT

- 8.1 From the consultation responses and representations received and from my inspection of the site and the surroundings, I consider that the main issues are:

1. Context of site, design and external spaces
2. Residential amenity
3. Refuse arrangements

4. Car and cycle parking
5. Third party representations

Context of site, design and external spaces

Site wide amendments

Addition of a gate and turnstile to the main entrance on Milton Road

- 8.2 The entrance on Milton Road, between Block B and the Portland Arms, would be the main pedestrian entrance into the site, and as it is not manned it is proposed that a turnstile is installed here, with a gate, which incorporates an 'air lock' system, alongside it to provide cycle access. This arrangement would secure the entrance, preventing tailgating. At first, the Urban Design and Conservation team did raise concerns about the prominence of the turnstile but as views of the turnstile looking north would be blocked by the existing 2m high wall adjacent to the Portland Arms it is considered to be acceptable in principle.
- 8.3 It is proposed that the gates, and fencing and turnstile form part of the public art scheme for the site along with the gate on Victoria Road. As the public art scheme has not been finalised or approved I recommend that full details of the turnstile and fencing is secured by condition to ensure an appropriate treatment of the turnstile and fencing if the public art scheme is not approved (28).

Installation of a fence between Block A and Block C to conceal refuse and cycle storage

- 8.4 The addition of a fence between Blocks A and C is supported as it would conceal the refuse and cycle storage. It is recommended that a 'hit and miss' brick wall is used instead of a solid fence as this would appear less 'fortress like'. I recommend that details are required by condition (29).

Relocation of cycle storage

- 8.5 The relocation of cycle storage would not have a detrimental impact on the site and this is considered to be acceptable.

Amendments to Block A

Single storey extension to the rear

- 8.6 The proposed single storey extension would result in a reduction in the amount of external amenity space available on the site. However, the proposed extension would provide a communal amenity space with large, full height sliding doors providing access and surveillance of the central courtyard and it is therefore considered to be acceptable. The Urban Design and Conservation team and the Landscape team support the proposed extension, and it is recommended that materials samples are required by condition (20 and 21).

Removal of double doors on southern elevation due to the relocation of the refuse store

- 8.7 This amendment would have no detrimental impact on the appearance of the building and is acceptable.

Amendments to Block E

Replacement of student room with a refuse store and relocation of this student room within the building

- 8.8 This amendment would have no detrimental impact on the appearance of the building and is acceptable

Bay window moved across one room on the northern elevation due to the provision of the refuse store

- 8.9 This amendment would have no detrimental impact on the appearance of the building and is acceptable

Amendments to Block F

Ground floor corridor deleted and rooms extended into this space with individual entrance doors provided on the southern elevation

- 8.10 This amendment would have no detrimental impact on the appearance of the building and is acceptable.

Relocation of windows on the northern elevation and insertion of rooflights on the northern elevation.

- 8.11 This amendment would have no detrimental impact on the appearance of the building and is acceptable
- 8.12 In my opinion the proposed amendments would not have a detrimental impact on the appearance of the approved buildings, the character or appearance of the Conservation Area, or the setting of the Portland Arms which is a Building of Local Interest. There proposed amendments are therefore compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 3/4, 3/12, 4/11 and 4/12.

Residential Amenity

Site wide amendments

Relocation of cycle storage

- 8.13 The cycle storage alongside the common boundary with 16 Corona Road has been extended and will not block the entrance to this neighbouring property. I consider it to be acceptable.

Amendments to Block A

Single storey extension to the rear

- 8.14 The proposed extension would not have a detrimental impact on neighbouring properties and I consider it to be acceptable.

Amendments to Block E

Replacement of student room with a refuse store and relocation of this student room within the building; and replacement of internal cycle and refuse store with gym and laundry room

- 8.15 This amendment would not have an impact on neighbouring properties. However, the introduction of a gym may cause noise disturbing the occupiers of the neighbouring student rooms and I therefore recommend a condition requiring a noise insulation scheme (27).

Bay window moved across one room on the northern elevation due to the provision of the refuse store

- 8.16 This window would look into the site and would not have an impact on neighbouring properties. I consider it to be acceptable.

Amendments to Block F

Ground floor corridor deleted and rooms extended into this space with individual entrance doors provided on the southern elevation

- 8.17 Concern has been raised that the introduction of individual entrance doors would lead to a loss of privacy for 16 Corona Road and cause noise and disturbance. The proposed doors would replace windows and in my view would not lead to an increase in overlooking. I consider that the comings and goings to these five rooms would be infrequent and would not be high number and it is therefore my view that it would be unreasonable to withhold permission.

Relocation of windows on the northern elevation and insertion of rooflights on the northern elevation.

- 8.18 The relocation of windows on the northern elevation of Block F would not result in an in overlooking. I therefore consider this amendment to be acceptable. Views would not be possible from the proposed rooflights and I therefore also consider this amendment to be acceptable.
- 8.19 In my opinion the proposed amendments adequately respect the residential amenity of its neighbours and of future occupiers and I consider that they are compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 3/4 and 3/7.

Third Party Representations

The Victoria Road gate has been removed from the scheme

- 8.20 The gate on Victoria Road has not been removed from the scheme and is shown on the submitted plans.

Blocking of a right of way

- 8.21 It was originally proposed that the residents of Corona Road that have a right of way over the site would be provided with a code or a fob to open the gate. Otherwise the gate will be kept closed for security reasons and to prevent ad hoc parking on the site. This has not changed.

9.0 CONCLUSION

- 9.1 The proposed amendments would not have a significant detrimental impact on the appearance of the approved buildings, the character or appearance of the Conservation Area, or the setting of the Portland Arms which is a Building of Local Interest (BLI). The proposed amendments would also not have a significant detrimental impact on the occupiers of neighbouring properties or future occupiers of the site.

10.0 RECOMMENDATION

APPROVE subject to the following conditions:

1. The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of two years and seven months from the date of this permission.

Reason: In accordance with the requirements of section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

2. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans as listed on this decision notice.

Reason: In the interests of good planning, for the avoidance of doubt and to facilitate any future application to the Local Planning Authority under Section 73 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

3. Except with the prior written agreement of the local planning authority no construction work or demolition shall be carried out or plant operated other than between the following hours: 0800 hours to 1800 hours Monday to Friday, 0800 hours to 1300 hours on Saturday and at no time on Sundays, Bank or Public Holidays.

Reason: To protect the amenity of the adjoining properties. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 4/13)

4. Except with the prior written agreement of the local planning authority, there should be no collection or deliveries to the site during the demolition and construction stages outside the hours of 0700 hrs and 1900 hrs on Monday - Saturday and there should be no collections or deliveries on Sundays or Bank and public holidays.

Reason: Due to the proximity of residential properties to this premises and that extensive refurbishment will be required, the above conditions are recommended to protect the amenity of these residential properties throughout the redevelopment in accordance with policies 4/13 and 6/10 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2006)

5. No development shall commence until a programme of measures to minimise the spread of airborne dust from the site during the demolition / construction period has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be implemented in accordance with the approved scheme.

Reason: In the interests of residential amenity. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006, policy 4/13)

6. Before the development hereby permitted is commenced details of the following matters shall be submitted to and approved by the local planning authority in writing.

i) contractors access arrangements for vehicles, plant and personnel,

ii) contractors site storage area/compound,

- iii) the means of moving, storing and stacking all building materials, plant and equipment around and adjacent to the site,
- iv) the arrangements for parking of contractors vehicles and contractors personnel vehicles.

Thereafter the development shall be undertaken in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To protect the amenity of the adjoining properties during the construction period. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 4/13)

7. 7a. Prior to the commencement of demolition hereby approved (excluding any pre-construction, enabling works or piling), the applicant shall submit a report in writing, regarding the demolition noise and vibration impact associated with this development, for approval by the local authority. The report shall be in accordance with the provisions of BS 5228:2009 Code of Practice for noise and vibration control on construction and open sites and include full details of any piling and mitigation measures to be taken to protect local residents from noise and or vibration. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To protect the amenity of the adjoining properties during the construction period. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 4/13)

7b. Prior to the commencement of the development hereby approved (including any pre-construction enabling works or piling, but excluding demolition), the applicant shall submit a report in writing, regarding construction noise and vibration impact associated with this development, for approval by the local authority. The report shall be in accordance with the provisions of BS 5228:2009 Code of Practice for noise and vibration control on construction and open sites and include full details of any piling and mitigation measures to be taken to protect local residents from noise and or vibration. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details. Due to the proximity of this site to existing residential premises and other noise sensitive premises, impact pile driving is not recommended.

Reason: To protect the amenity of the adjoining properties during the construction period. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 4/13)

8. The development hereby permitted shall not be occupied until a Management Plan for the student accommodation has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To protect the amenity of neighbouring residents. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006, policy 3/7)

9. Prior to the commencement of construction, a noise insulation scheme detailing the acoustic noise insulation performance specification of the external building envelope of the residential units (having regard to the building fabric, glazing and ventilation) to reduce the level of noise experienced in the residential units as a result of the proximity of the habitable rooms to the high ambient noise levels in the area be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The scheme as approved shall be fully implemented before the use hereby permitted is commenced and shall not be altered without prior approval.

The scheme as approved shall be fully implemented and a completion report submitted prior to the occupation of the residential development. The approved scheme shall remain unaltered in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To protect the amenity of occupiers (Cambridge Local Plan 2006, policy 4/13)

10. All deliveries to the local convenience store shall be via the front of the retail premises on Milton Road. There shall be collections or deliveries only between the hours of 09.30hrs to 16.00hrs and 18.00hrs and 21.00hrs Monday to Saturday; and there shall be no collections or deliveries outside the hours of 09.00hrs and 13.00 hrs on Sundays and Bank Holidays, and there shall not be by articulated vehicles at those times (Sundays and Bank Holidays).

Reason: In the interests of highway safety and residential amenity (Cambridge Local Plan 2006, policies 4/13 and 8/2.

11. No development approved by this permission shall be COMMENCED (excluding demolition) prior to a contaminated land assessment and associated remedial strategy, being submitted to the Local Planning Authority and receipt of approval of the document/documents from the Local Planning Authority. This applies to paragraphs a), b) and c). This is an iterative process and the results of each stage will help decide if the following stage is necessary.

(a) The contaminated land assessment shall include a desk study to be submitted to the Local Planning Authority 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 Local Planning Authority 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 Local Planning Authority. The Local Planning Authority 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.

No development approved by this permission shall be OCCUPIED prior to the completion of any remedial works and a validation report/s being submitted to the LPA and receipt of approval of the document/documents from the Local Planning Authority. This applies to paragraphs d), e) and f).

(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 Local Planning Authority.

(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 the interests of residential amenity. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006, policy 4/13.

12. No development approved by this planning permission shall take place (excluding demolition) until a scheme that includes the following components to deal with the risks associated with contamination of the site shall each be submitted to and approved, in writing, by the local planning authority: 1) A preliminary risk assessment which has identified: all previous uses, potential contaminants associated with those uses, a conceptual model of the site indicating sources, pathways and receptors, potentially unacceptable risks arising from contamination at the site. 2) A site investigation scheme, based on (1) to provide information for a detailed assessment of the risk to all receptors that may be affected, including those off site. 3) The results of the site investigation and detailed risk assessment referred to in (2) and, based on these, an options appraisal and remediation strategy giving full details of the remediation measures required and how they are to be undertaken. 4) A verification plan providing details of the data that will be collected in order to demonstrate that the works set out in the remediation strategy in (3) are complete and identifying any requirements for longer-term monitoring of pollutant linkages, maintenance and arrangements for contingency action. Any changes to these components require the express written consent of the local planning authority. The scheme shall be implemented as approved.

Reason: To protect and prevent the pollution of controlled waters (particularly the River Cam and underlying Secondary A Aquifer) from potential pollutants associated with current and previous land uses in line with National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF; paragraphs 109, 120, 121), EU Water Framework Directive, Anglian River Basin Management Plan and Environment Agency Groundwater Protection (GP3:2013) position statements A4 to A6, J1 to J7 and N7.

13. No occupation of any part of the permitted development shall take place until a verification report demonstrating completion of works set out in the approved remediation strategy and the effectiveness of the remediation shall be submitted to and approved, in writing, by the local planning authority. The report shall include results of sampling and monitoring carried out in accordance with the approved verification plan to demonstrate that the site remediation criteria have been met. It shall also include any plan (a "long-term monitoring and maintenance plan") for longer-term monitoring of pollutant linkages, maintenance and arrangements for contingency action, as identified in the verification plan. The long-term monitoring and maintenance plan shall be implemented as approved.

Reason: To protect and prevent the pollution of controlled waters (particularly the River Cam and underlying Secondary A Aquifer) from potential pollutants in line with Environment Agency Groundwater Protection (GP3, 2013) position statements J6 and J7

14. Air intake for the mechanical ventilation shall be taken from the rear of the buildings.

Reason: In the interests of the amenity of occupiers. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006, policy 4/13)

15. Prior to the occupation, the on-site storage facilities for waste, including waste for recycling and the arrangements for the disposal of waste shall be provided. The approved arrangements shall be retained thereafter unless alternative arrangements are agreed in writing by the local planning authority.

Reason: To protect the amenities of nearby residents and occupiers of the site (Cambridge Local Plan 2006, policy 3/12 and 4/13)

16. The convenience store hereby approved shall be open between the hours of 07.00 hrs and 23.00 hrs Monday to Sunday only.

Reason: In the interests of residential amenity. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006, policy 3/7 and 4/13)

17. Prior to occupation, details of equipment for the purpose of extraction and filtration of odours shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The approved extraction/filtration scheme shall be installed before the use hereby permitted is commenced.

Reason: In the interests of residential amenity. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006, policy 4/13)

18. Development shall not begin (excluding demolition) until a scheme for surface water disposal has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Infiltration systems shall only be used where it can be demonstrated that they will not pose a risk to groundwater quality. The scheme shall be implemented as approved.

Reason: To protect and prevent the pollution of controlled waters (particularly the River Cam and underlying Secondary A Aquifer) in line with National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF; paragraphs 109, 121), EU Water Framework Directive, Anglian River Basin Management Plan and Environment Agency Groundwater Protection (GP3:2013) position statements G1 to G13, N7 and N10. The water environment is potentially vulnerable and there is an increased potential for pollution from inappropriately located and/or designed infiltration sustainable drainage systems (SUDS) such as soakaways, unsealed porous pavement systems or infiltration basins.

19. Piling or any other foundation designs using penetrative methods shall not be permitted other than with the express written consent of the local planning authority, which may be given for those parts of the site where it has been demonstrated that there is no resultant unacceptable risk to groundwater. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To protect and prevent the pollution of controlled waters (particularly the River Cam and underlying Secondary A Aquifer) in line with National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF; paragraphs 109, 121), EU Water Framework Directive, Anglian River Basin Management Plan and Environment Agency Groundwater Protection (GP3:2013) position statement N7. Piling or any other foundation designs using penetrative methods can result in risks to potable supplies from, for example, pollution / turbidity, risk of mobilising contamination, drilling through different aquifers and creating preferential pathways. Thus it should be demonstrated that any proposed piling will not result in contamination of groundwater.

20. No development shall take place until samples of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure that the appearance of the external surfaces is appropriate. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/4, 3/12 and 3/14)

21. Before starting any brick or stone work, a sample panel of the facing materials to be used shall be erected on site to establish the detail of bonding, coursing and colour, type of jointing shall be agreed in writing with the local planning authority. The quality of finish and materials incorporated in any approved sample panel(s), which shall not be demolished prior to completion of development, shall be maintained throughout the development.

Reason: In the interests of the visual amenity of the Conservation Area and to ensure that the quality and colour of the detailing of the brickwork/stonework and jointing is acceptable and maintained throughout the development. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/12 and 4/11)

22. Prior to the commencement of construction (excluding demolition and enabling works), details of the link between Block A and the Portland Arms PH are to be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority and the construction carried out in accordance with the details approved.

Reason: In order that the position and nature of the new construction does not adversely affect the appearance of the Building of Local Interest and to comply with Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 4/11 and 4/12.

23. No occupation of any new building erected pursuant to this permission shall take place until full details of both hard and soft landscape works have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority and these works shall be carried out as approved. These details shall include proposed finished levels or contours; means of enclosure; car parking layouts, other vehicle and pedestrian access and circulation areas; hard surfacing materials; minor artefacts and structures (eg furniture, play equipment, refuse or other storage units, signs, lighting); proposed and existing functional services above and below ground (eg drainage, power, communications cables, pipelines indicating lines, manholes, supports); retained historic landscape features and proposals for restoration, where relevant. Soft Landscape works shall include planting plans; written specifications (including cultivation and other operations associated with plant and grass establishment); schedules of plants, noting species, plant sizes and proposed numbers/densities where appropriate and an implementation programme.

Reason: In the interests of visual amenity and to ensure that suitable hard and soft landscape is provided as part of the development. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/4, 3/11 and 3/12)

24. No development shall commence until details of facilities for the covered, secured parking of bicycles for use in connection with the development hereby permitted shall be submitted to and approved by the local planning authority in writing. The approved facilities shall be provided in accordance with the approved details before use of the development commences.

Reason: To ensure appropriate provision for the secure storage of bicycles. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 8/6)

25. Prior to installation full details of the collapsible handrails proposed on the roof shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: In the interests of visual amenity and the impact on the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006, policy 3/12 and 4/11)

26. The bollards shown on dwg no. 110-00-Rev32 shall be installed prior to occupation and retained in perpetuity.

Reason: To prevent ad hoc parking. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006, policy 8/2)

27. 1. Prior to the occupation of the gym, a noise report that considers the impacts of airborne and impact noise upon the student development shall be submitted in writing to the local planning authority for consideration.

2. Following the submission of the noise report and prior to the occupation of the gym, an acoustic insulation scheme detailing the noise and vibration insulation performance specification of the internal building envelope of the gym to protect the adjoining residential units from activities within the gym, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority.

Reason: In the interests of the amenity of the occupiers of the neighbouring student rooms. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006, policy 4/13)

28. Prior to installation full details of the gates, fencing and turnstile shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure that their appearance does not have a detrimental impact on the character or appearance of the Conservation Area. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006, policy 4/11)

29. Prior to installation full details of the fence/wall between Blocks A and C shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure that its appearance does not have a detrimental impact on the character or appearance of the Conservation Area. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006, policy 4/11)

30. Prior to the commencement of development hereby approved (excluding any pre-construction, enabling works or piling, or demolition) full details of the service doors for the food store shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure that deliveries do not impact on the highway network. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006, policy 8/2)

31. The Management Plan required by condition 8 shall include arrangements for the beginning and end of term.

This page is intentionally left blank

PLANNING COMMITTEE 2015

1st April

Application Number	15/0009/FUL	Agenda Item	
Date Received	12th January 2015	Officer	Mr Tony Collins
Target Date	9th March 2015		
Ward	Castle		
Site	Garret Hostel Lane Cambridge Cambridgeshire CB2 1TJ		
Proposal	To install a bollard and rail fence on the narrow quay running alongside Garret Hostel Lane slipway and the approach to Garret Hostel Bridge.		
Applicant	Mr Dave Prinsep The Guildhall Cambridge Cambridgeshire CB2 3QJ United Kingdom		

1.0 SITE DESCRIPTION/AREA CONTEXT

- 1.1 The site is the slipway and quay at the north-east corner of the bridge where Garret Hostel Lane crosses the river. It is wholly within City of Cambridge Conservation Area No.1 (Central). The bridge itself is listed Grade II. Nearby sections of Trinity College are listed Grade I, and nearby buildings at Trinity Hall to the south are listed Grade II. None of these are adjacent to the site, and the proposal would not have any impact on the setting of any listed buildings other than the bridge

2.0 THE PROPOSAL

- 2.1 The proposal is to erect a bollard-and-rail fence along the north edge and west end of the quay. The fence would extend 12m along the north side of the quay, and 1.5m across the west end. There would be two rails, the uppermost at 850mm above the quay surface.

3.0 SITE HISTORY: None

4.0 PUBLICITY

- | | | |
|-----|------------------------|-----|
| 4.1 | Advertisement: | Yes |
| | Adjoining Owners: | Yes |
| | Site Notice Displayed: | Yes |

5.0 POLICY

5.1 Central Government Advice

National Planning Policy Framework 2012
National Planning Practice Guidance 2014
Circular 11/95 – The Use of Conditions in Planning Permissions
(Annex A)

5.2 Cambridge Local Plan 2006

3/1 Sustainable development
3/4 Responding to context
3/7 Creating successful places
3/9 Watercourses and other bodies of water
3/11 The design of external spaces
4/10 Listed Buildings
4/11 Conservation Areas

5.3 Material Considerations

City Wide Guidance

Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Strategic Flood Risk
Assessment (November 2010)
Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (2005)
Cambridge and Milton Surface Water Management Plan (2011)
Cambridgeshire Design Guide For Streets and Public Realm
(2007)

6.0 CONSULTATIONS

Cambridgeshire County Council (Engineering)

6.1 Comments awaited.

Urban Design and Conservation team

6.2 Supported subject to conditions to control details and
archaeological investigation

Cam Conservators

6.3 No objection

6.4 The above responses are a summary of the comments that have been received. Full details of the consultation responses can be inspected on the application file.

7.0 REPRESENTATIONS

7.1 The owners/occupiers of the following addresses have made representations objecting:

25 Ashfield Road
56 Bateman Street
10 Cook Close
39 Kerridge Close
44 Lantree Crescent
320 Milton Road
17 Petworth Street
33 Priory Road
B3 Riverside Mill, Godmanchester
2 Beedon Drive, Bracknell
23 Somerville Road, Eton

7.2 The representations can be summarised as follows:

- ☐ Unnecessary
- ☐ Unlawful
- ☐ Tyranny
- ☐ Action resembles fascist Italy
- ☐ Hostile to business
- ☐ Will not stop punt operators
- ☐ Doesn't benefit locals
- ☐ Waste of council tax payers' money
- ☐ Ensuing Judicial Review will waste more money
- ☐ Blocks public access
- ☐ Health and safety risk
- ☐ Obstacle to disabled river users
- ☐ Ignores history and tradition
- ☐ Stated justification is not the true reason; therefore application fraudulent

7.3 A petition of 114 signatures objecting to the proposal on the grounds that it blocks off the last public access point to the middle river has been submitted.

7.4 Cambridge Past, Present and Future have submitted representations which do not object to the proposal.

7.5 The representation can be summarised as follows:

- ☐ Supported in principle, but should have conditions to control materials, add lockable gate, and improve paving.
- ☐ Railings should not be attached to the bridge

7.6 The above representations are a summary of the comments that have been received. Full details of the representations can be inspected on the application file.

8.0 ASSESSMENT

Principle of Development

8.1 Representations suggest that the proposal would limit access to the river and would therefore be contrary to policy 3/9 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006. The proposal would not block access to the slipway and would not prevent the launching of boats. Were gated access through the fence to be provided, there would be no restriction of access to the river from the quay either. Subject to such a condition, I am of the view that the proposal would not be in conflict with policy 3/9.

Context of site, design and external spaces

8.2 In my view the fence is of an appropriate design. I do not consider it would have any negative impact on the conservation area or the setting of the listed bridge. The conservation officer does not object.

8.3 In my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 3/4, 3/7, 3/11 and 4/11.

Disabled access

8.4 I am uncertain of the extent to which this quay is actually likely to be used by disabled people wishing to board boats. This facility could be safeguarded by the incorporation of a gate, lockable both open and closed, as suggested in representations. The inclusion of such a gate would eliminate

concerns about disabled access. I recommend a condition to secure this.

- 8.5 In my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 3/7 and 3/12.

Highway Safety

- 8.6 I do not consider there to be any highway safety implications of the proposal. I await the highway authority's comment. I will report any comment received on the amendment sheet, or orally at Committee.
- 8.7 In my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policy 8/2.

Third Party Representations

- 8.8 With the exception of those relating to access to the river, for fully abled and disabled users, which I have addressed above, the representations all relate to the motivation of the applicant, the likely efficacy of the scheme in preventing unsanctioned punt operations, and the impact on public finances. I do not consider any of these issues to be material planning considerations.

9.0 RECOMMENDATION

APPROVE subject to the following conditions:

1. The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.

Reason: In accordance with the requirements of section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

2. Notwithstanding the submitted drawings, no development shall take place until a revised drawing providing a gate in the fence which can be locked in both the open and shut positions, have been submitted to and approved in writing by, the local planning authority. Development shall proceed only in accordance with the approved drawings.

Reason: To ensure safe access to the river (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 3/9)

PLANNING COMMITTEE

1st April 2015

Application Number	15/0010/LBC	Agenda Item	
Date Received	6th January 2015	Officer	Mr Tony Collins
Target Date	3rd March 2015		
Ward	Castle		
Site	Garret Hostel Lane Cambridge CB2 1TJ		
Proposal	Listed building consent to install a bollard and rail fence on the narrow quay running alongside Garret Hostel Lane slipway and the approach to Garret Hostel Bridge.		
Applicant	Mr Dave Prinsep The Guildhall Cambridge CB2 3QJ		

1.0 SITE DESCRIPTION/AREA CONTEXT

- 1.1 The site is the slipway and quay at the north-east corner of the bridge where Garret Hostel Lane crosses the river. It is wholly within City of Cambridge Conservation Area No.1 (Central). The bridge itself is listed Grade II. Nearby sections of Trinity College are listed Grade I, and nearby buildings at Trinity Hall to the south are listed Grade II. None of these are adjacent to the site, and the proposal would not have any impact on the setting of any listed buildings other than the bridge

2.0 THE PROPOSAL

- 2.1 The proposal is to erect a bollard-and-rail fence along the north edge and west end of the quay. The fence would extend 12m along the north side of the quay, and 1.5m across the west end. There would be two rails, the uppermost at 850mm above the quay surface.

3.0 SITE HISTORY: None

4.0 PUBLICITY

- | | | |
|-----|------------------------|-----|
| 4.1 | Advertisement: | Yes |
| | Adjoining Owners: | Yes |
| | Site Notice Displayed: | Yes |

5.0 POLICY

5.1 Central Government Advice

National Planning Policy Framework 2012
National Planning Practice Guidance 2014
Circular 11/95 – The Use of Conditions in Planning Permissions
(Annex A)

5.2 Cambridge Local Plan 2006

3/1 Sustainable development
3/4 Responding to context
4/10 Listed Buildings
4/11 Conservation Areas

6.0 CONSULTATIONS

Cambridgeshire County Council (Engineering)

- 6.1 Comments awaited. Any comments will be reported on the amendment sheet or orally at Committee.

Urban Design and Conservation team

- 6.2 Supported subject to conditions to control details and archaeological investigation

Cam Conservators

- 6.3 No objection
- 6.4 The above responses are a summary of the comments that have been received. Full details of the consultation responses can be inspected on the application file.

7.0 REPRESENTATIONS

7.1 The owners/occupiers of the following addresses have made representations objecting:

25 Ashfield Road
56 Bateman Street
10 Cook Close
39 Kerridge Close
44 Lantree Crescent
320 Milton Road
17 Petworth Street
33 Priory Road
B3 Riverside Mill, Godmanchester
2 Beedon Drive, Bracknell
23 Somerville Road, Eton

7.2 The representations can be summarised as follows:

- Unnecessary
- Unlawful
- Tyranny
- Action resembles fascist Italy
- Hostile to business
- Will not stop punt operators
- Doesn't benefit locals
- Waste of council tax payers' money
- Ensuing Judicial Review will waste more money
- Blocks public access
- Health and safety risk
- Obstacle to disabled river users
- Ignores history and tradition
- Stated justification is not the true reason; therefore application fraudulent

7.3 Cambridge Past, Present and Future have submitted representations which do not object to the proposal.

7.4 The representation can be summarised as follows:

- Supported in principle, but should have conditions to control materials, add lockable gate, and improve paving.
- Railings should not be attached to the bridge

- 7.5 The above representations are a summary of the comments that have been received. Full details of the representations can be inspected on the application file.

8.0 ASSESSMENT

Context and design including impact on the conservation area

- 8.1 In my view the fence is of an appropriate design. I do not consider it would have any negative impact on the conservation area or the setting of the listed bridge. The conservation officer does not object.
- 8.2 In my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 3/4, 3/7, 3/11 and 4/11.

Third Party Representations

- 8.3 None of the objections relate to listed building or conservation issues.

9.0 RECOMMENDATION

GRANT CONSENT subject to the following conditions:

1. The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this consent.

Reason: To comply with the requirements of Section 18 of the Planning (Listed Building & Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (as amended by section 51(4) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004).

2. Large scale drawings of iron/steel railings, railing finials, backstays, dog bars, horizontal crossmembers, gates, gateposts, gate piers, means of fixing into wall copings/ground/paving, attachments to buildings, junctions between panels of railings, etc. must be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority before commencement of works.

Reason: To avoid harm to the special interest of the Listed Building (Cambridge Local Plan 2006, policy 4/10).

3. Prior to any excavation works taking place on the site, the need or not for an archaeological investigation to be undertaken is to be established via the County Archaeologist. In the event that investigation is required, development shall proceed only in accordance with a scheme of investigation agreed by the local planning authority.

Reason: To ensure protection of archaeological remains. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 4/9)

This page is intentionally left blank

Application Number	14/1947/FUL	Agenda Item	
Date Received	5th December 2014	Officer	Mr Sav Patel
Target Date	30th January 2015		
Ward	Abbey		
Site	Land Adjacent 2 Saxon Road Cambridge		
Proposal	Erection of new 1.5 storey dwelling following demolition of existing lock-up garage.		
Applicant	Mr Ian Jolley 21 Belvoir Road Cambridge CB4 1JH		

1.0 SITE DESCRIPTION/AREA CONTEXT

- 1.1 The site is currently occupied by a single storey pitched roof lock-up garage building. The building forms the rear boundary of no.59 Beche Road and partially (approx. 800mm) extends into the rear garden of no.61. To the north there is a side passage which enables access to the rear gardens of no.61 to 67 which are arranged in a terrace row. Beyond the side passage is no.2 Saxon Road which is a two storey semi-detached dwelling.
- 1.2 The built form of the area is characterised by predominately two-storey pitched roof terrace and semi-detached dwellings with small threshold spaces in front.
- 1.3 The building fronts directly onto the pavement and is in a poor state of repair. The building measures 5 x 5.1 metres externally; eaves height of 2.3 metres and 4.55 metres to the ridge. The building is of brick construction with a corrugated cement roof and timber boarding on the gables.
- 1.4 The site is located within a Conservation Area and a Controlled Parking Zone.

2.0 THE PROPOSAL

- 2.1 The proposal is to demolish the existing garage and replace it with a new 1.5 storey dwellinghouse. The proposed dwelling would contain a bedroom on the ground floor and living accommodation on the first floor within the roof space. The

proposed building would also contain cycle parking and bin storage provision.

2.2 The proposed dwelling would maintain the existing pitched form of the existing garage but would be 6 metres to the ridge and 3.8 metres to the eaves. The proposed dwelling would occupy the same footprint as the existing garage.

2.3 The application is accompanied by the following supporting information:

1. Design Statement
2. Plans

3.0 SITE HISTORY

Reference	Description	Outcome
14/1384/FUL	Conversion of existing lock-up garage into 1.5 storey dwelling.	WITHDRAWN

4.0 PUBLICITY

4.1	Advertisement:	Yes
	Adjoining Owners:	Yes
	Site Notice Displayed:	Yes

5.0 POLICY

5.1 Central Government Advice

National Planning Policy Framework 2012
National Planning Practice Guidance 2014
Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010
Circular 11/95 – The Use of Conditions in Planning Permissions (Annex A)

Ministerial Statement (1 December 2014) by Brandon Lewis
Minister of State for Housing and Planning (Department of Communities and Local Government)

5.2 Cambridge Local Plan 2006

3/1 Sustainable development
3/3 Setting of the City
3/4 Responding to context
3/7 Creating successful places
3/11 The design of external spaces
3/12 The design of new buildings
4/11 Conservation Areas
5/1 Housing provision
8/4 Walking and Cycling accessibility
8/6 Cycle parking

5.3 Supplementary Planning Documents

Cambridge City Council (May 2007) – Sustainable Design and Construction
Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Waste Partnership (RECAP): Waste Management Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (February 2012)

5.4 Material Considerations

City Wide Guidance

Cycle Parking Guide for New Residential Developments (2010)

Area Guidelines

Riverside and Stourbridge Common Conservation Area Appraisal (2012)

6.0 CONSULTATIONS

Cambridgeshire County Council (Engineering)

- 6.1 The proposal makes no provision for parking cars off street whilst removing the current off street provision. The proposal is therefore likely to impose additional parking demands upon the on street parking on the surrounding streets. The proposal is unlikely to result in any significant adverse impact on highway safety. The proposal would not qualify for Resident's Permits (other than visitors) within the existing parking scheme. If permission is granted the conditions relating to the redundant

crossover must be returned to normal footway and kerb and traffic management plan.

Head of Refuse and Environment

- 6.2 No objections in principle subject to conditions relating to construction hours and contaminated land.

Urban Design and Conservation team

- 6.3 The application is supported subject to a condition on materials. The proposed building is appropriate to the conservation area provided it is constructed from appropriate materials.
- 6.4 The above responses are a summary of the comments that have been received. Full details of the consultation responses can be inspected on the application file.

7.0 REPRESENTATIONS

- 7.1 The owners/occupiers of the following addresses have made representations:

- 1 Saxon Road
- 59 Beche Road

- 7.2 The representations can be summarised as follows:

- Would not improve the area;
- Loss of privacy;
- Loss of view, light and feeling of enclosure due to increase in height;
- Increase in vehicular traffic;
- Too small for housing – example of Abbey Street development are bigger units – and no external amenity space;
- The proposal would not comply with the National Space Standards
- Bins are likely to be kept outside;
- Removal of existing roof – concerns with roofing material likely to be asbestos
- Concerns with ground works and stability of existing properties

- 7.3 The above representations are a summary of the comments that have been received. Full details of the representations can be inspected on the application file.

8.0 ASSESSMENT

Principle of Development

- 8.1 The application site is located within, and surrounded by, residential development. The site is located within walking distance of the retail park and supermarket on Newmarket Road and within reasonable cycling distance into the city centre. The site is also within close proximity to bus stops.
- 8.2 The proposed residential redevelopment of the site is considered to be acceptable in this location and context. Windfall housing sites such as this are permitted subject to the existing land use and compatibility with adjoining uses.
- 8.3 In my opinion, the principle of the development is acceptable and in accordance with policy 5/1.

Context of site, design and external spaces

- 8.4 The built form of the area is characterized by mainly two-storey Victorian terraced and semi-detached dwellings on long narrow plots fronting the highway. Car parking is primarily on-street although there are some examples off street parking, particularly opposite the site, for a small number of dwellings.
- 8.5 The site is located close to the junction of Saxon Road and Beche Road. The dwellings in Saxon Road are set back from the junction by the length of the gardens of dwellings facing Beche Road.
- 8.6 The existing garage building is in poor condition and does not contribute positively to the street scene or appearance of the Conservation Area. Nevertheless, any new development would need to be of a high standard of design to ensure it enhances, or at least preserves, the appearance of the Conservation Area.
- 8.7 The proposed building has been designed to match the form of the existing building whilst maintaining the appearance and feel of an ancillary building within the street scene. The main

differences between the existing and proposed buildings are the increased eave and ridge heights, introduction of rooflights and the different opening facing Saxon Road.

- 8.8 The eaves height has been raised from 2.3 metres to 3.8 metres; an increase of 1.5 metres. The ridge height has increased from 4.55 metres to 6 metres; an increase of 1.45 metres. The ridge would match the eaves height of the existing dwelling at no.2 and in doing so would appear proportionate with the existing house. The form and scale of the proposed building would in my view be proportionally in keeping with the existing built form whilst maintaining an ancillary appearance. The design is simple and understated, and with the use of slate and reclaimed brick would also be an improvement on the existing rundown building.
- 8.9 The height of the building has been reduced from that which was submitted in the previous withdrawn scheme and the layout has been changed to match the existing building.
- 8.10 No external space is proposed for the dwelling due to the site's limited size. However, the site is located within close proximity to Midsummer Common and Stourbridge Common. Therefore, given the access to outdoor spaces and sustainable location of the site, the lack of outdoor amenity space is acceptable in this context.
- 8.11 In my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 3/4, 3/7, 3/11, 3/12.

Residential Amenity

Impact on amenity of neighbouring occupiers

- 8.12 Concerns have been raised regarding the impact on the residential amenity of surrounding occupiers in terms of loss of light, loss of view, creating a sense of enclosure.
- 8.13 The building is located to the rear of no.59 Beche Road and forms the rear boundary of the curtilage. The side elevation of the existing building is located 7.6 metres from the existing single storey element on the rear elevation of no.59 and 9.45 metres from the main two storey rear elevation. The proposed building would maintain the same level of separation. The only

difference is the additional increase in height of the eaves and ridge, which amounts to 1.5 metres. I do not consider this additional increase in height with the existing level of separation and the building being north of no.59 would have any significantly adverse impact on the residential amenity of the adjoining neighbour in terms of loss of light or creating a sense of enclosure. The southern elevation is blank so there would be no overlooking of the existing garden.

- 8.14 The proposed building would also not create any overlooking issue of the surrounding neighbours as none of the proposed windows would enable direct views over the adjacent gardens. Rooflights are proposed in the front and rear roofscape. The rooflights in the rear roofscape are proposed to be high level with a cill height of 1.8 metres to prevent overlooking of the rear gardens of the properties in Beche Road and no.2 Saxon Road. The rooflights in the front roofscape would enable views onto the Saxon Road and would not cause overlooking of the dwellings opposite the site over and above that which currently exists. Furthermore the window would be located 17 metres from the rear elevation of no.57 Beche Road and 11.6 metres from the side boundary.
- 8.15 Whilst the proposed building will have some degree of impact on the area, I do not consider the degree of harm would be significant enough to warrant refusal.
- 8.16 In my opinion the proposal adequately respects the residential amenity of its neighbours and the constraints of the site and I consider that it is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 3/4 and 3/7.

Amenity for future occupiers of the site

- 8.17 Concerns have been raised by the size of the proposed accommodation and its compliance with national space standards. It is important to note that the current Local Plan (2006) does not contain prescribed residential space standards. Whilst there is a presumption to introduce standards in the emerging Local Plan, only limited weight can be given to this. Nevertheless, I think it would be relevant to assess how the proposal relates to the emerging local plan requirements (policy 50: residential space standards). Policy 50 (residential space standards) requires the gross floor area of a 1bed unit to be

37sqm. The proposed building would have a gross internal floor area of 38.72 sqm. The proposed level of accommodation would be compliant with the emerging local plan.

- 8.18 Whilst there are no space standards in the current local plan, consideration needs to be given to whether the level of accommodation provides a high quality living environment for a future occupier. In my view, for the size of accommodation proposed; a 1bed unit, I am satisfied that the level of accommodation is acceptable in this location close to outdoor amenity areas.
- 8.19 In my opinion the proposal provides a high-quality living environment and an appropriate standard of residential amenity for future occupiers, and I consider that in this respect it is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 3/7 and 3/12.

Refuse Arrangements

- 8.20 The proposal includes bin storage provision within the footprint of dwelling. A dedicated storage area is proposed on the ground floor adjacent to the front door. There is provision for three receptacles. This is considered to be acceptable for this size of unit. Concerns have been raised about maintaining the storage of the bins within the allocated area within the building. I have recommended a condition to ensure the bins after they have been emptied are placed back into the storage area. I have also recommended a condition for details of ventilation to be provided for our approval.
- 8.21 Subject to these conditions, in my opinion, the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policy 3/12.

Highway Safety

- 8.22 No concerns have been raised from County Highways regarding highway safety. However a condition has been recommended to remove the crossover and reinstate the kerb line and footpath.
- 8.23 In my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policy 8/2.

Car and Cycle Parking

- 8.24 The proposal does not include any car parking. The site is located close to public transport links and is a reasonable walk and cycle distance into the city centre. Therefore, I am satisfied that this development can justify being car free.
- 8.25 The proposal includes a cycle space within the building adjacent to the bin store. Whilst this is not ideal, I am satisfied with the provision made.
- 8.26 In my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 8/6 and 8/10.

Third Party Representations

- 8.27 I have addressed some of the comments received in the third party representations. However, I set out below my response to those issues that I have not addressed:

Removal of existing roof – concerns with roofing material likely to be asbestos

- 8.28 If the existing roof of the building is asbestos then the applicant will need to ensure any works to the roof is carried out in accordance with the relevant asbestos regulations.

Concerns with ground works and stability of existing properties

- 8.29 The Environmental Services Team has recommended a contamination condition due to the previous use of the building, which I have agreed to, to ensure the ground base is investigated for contaminants and remediated if necessary. As for stability of existing properties, this will be for the applicant to ensure the construction works and proposed building does not compromise the structural integrity of surrounding buildings.

Planning Obligation Strategy

Planning Obligations

- 8.30 As a result of the Ministerial Statement (1 December 2014) by Brandon Lewis Minister of State for Housing and Planning (Department of Communities and Local Government) developer

contributions on small-scale developers, for sites of 10-units or less, and which have a maximum combined gross floor space of 1,000 square metres, affordable housing and tariff style contributions should not be sought. This also applies to all residential annexes and extensions. The proposed development falls below this threshold therefore it is not possible to seek planning obligations to secure community infrastructure in this case.

9.0 RECOMMENDATION

APPROVE subject to the following conditions:

1. The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.

Reason: In accordance with the requirements of section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

2. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans as listed on this decision notice.

Reason: In the interests of good planning, for the avoidance of doubt and to facilitate any future application to the Local Planning Authority under Section 73 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

3. No development shall take place until samples of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure that the appearance of the external surfaces is appropriate. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/4, 3/12 and 3/14)

4. Except with the prior written agreement of the local planning authority no construction work or demolition shall be carried out or plant operated other than between the following hours: 0800 hours to 1800 hours Monday to Friday, 0800 hours to 1300 hours on Saturday and at no time on Sundays, Bank or Public Holidays.

Reason: To protect the amenity of the adjoining properties.
(Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 4/13)

5. Contaminated Land No development approved by this permission shall be COMMENCED prior to a contaminated land assessment and associated remedial strategy, being submitted to the LPA and receipt of approval of the document/documents from the LPA. This applies to paragraphs a), b) and c). This is an iterative process and the results of each stage will help decide if the following stage is necessary.

(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.

No development approved by this permission shall be OCCUPIED prior to the completion of any remedial works and a validation report/s being submitted to the LPA and receipt of approval of the document/documents from the LPA. This applies to paragraphs d), e) and f).

(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: To avoid adverse effects of pollution (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 4/13).

6. Prior to occupation, the redundant vehicle crossover of the footway must be returned to normal footway and kerb at no cost to the Highway Authority and to the satisfaction of the Highway Authority.

Reason: For the safe and efficient operation of the public highway (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 3/7)

7. No demolition or construction works shall commence on site until a traffic management plan has been agreed with the Planning Authority in consultation with the Highway Authority. The principle areas of concern that should be addressed are:

- i. Movements and control of muck away lorries (all loading and unloading should be undertaken off the adopted public highway)
- ii. Contractor parking, for both phases all such parking should be within the curtilage of the site and not on street.
- iii. Movements and control of all deliveries (all loading and unloading should be undertaken off the adopted public highway)
- iv. Control of dust, mud and debris, please note it is an offence under the Highways Act 1980 to deposit mud or debris onto the adopted public highway.

Reason: in the interests of highway safety and to protect the residential amenity of adjacent residents (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 Policy 3/7).

- 8. Prior to development of the dwelling hereby approved, details of the type of ventilation for the bin storage area shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans.

Reason: To protect the residential amenity of the future occupier (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 4/13)

- 9. The refuse bins for the dwelling hereby approved shall on the day they have been emptied be collected and placed into their storage area as identified on drawing no. P-01 rev A. This provision shall be continue to the carried out in perpetuity.

Reason: In the interests of the visual amenity of the Conservation Area (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/12 and 4/11).

- 10. No new windows or openings of any kind shall be inserted into the south and east elevations of the dwelling hereby approved.

Reason: To protect the amenity of the adjoining properties. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 4/13)

INFORMATIVE: This development involves work to the public highway that will require the approval of the County Council as Highway Authority. It is an OFFENCE to carry out any works within the public highway, which includes a public right of way, without the permission of the Highway Authority. Please note that it is the applicant's responsibility to ensure that, in addition to planning permission, any necessary consents or approvals under the Highways Act 1980 and the New Roads and Street Works Act 1991 are also obtained from the County Council.

INFORMATIVE: No part of any structure may overhang or encroach under or upon the public highway unless licensed by the Highway Authority and no gate / door / ground floor window shall open outwards over the public highway.

INFORMATIVE: Public Utility apparatus may be affected by this proposal. Contact the appropriate utility service to reach agreement on any necessary alterations, the cost of which must be borne by the applicant.

Application Number	15/0097/FUL	Agenda Item	
Date Received	20th January 2015	Officer	Michael Hammond
Target Date	17th March 2015		
Ward	Romsey		
Site	Land Adjacent To 1 Campbell Street Cambridge Cambridgeshire CB1 3NE		
Proposal	Erection of a 2 bedroom end of terrace house.		
Applicant	Mr Dan Strauss 14 Adams Road Cambridge CB3 9AD		

1.0 SITE DESCRIPTION/AREA CONTEXT

- 1.1 The application site, land adjacent to no.1 Campbell Street, is comprised of an unbuilt area of land situated between no.1 and no.1A Campbell Street on the west side of the road.
- 1.2 The surrounding area is predominantly residential in character and is formed of two-storey terraced and semi-detached properties designed in traditional brick and slate materials. The residential properties have small rear gardens and are served by on-street parking on Campbell Street. To the north of the application along Mill Road there are a variety of different uses that serve the surrounding residential properties.
- 1.3 The site falls within the Central Cambridge Conservation Area.

2.0 THE PROPOSAL

- 2.1 The proposal seeks full planning permission for the erection of a two-storey end of terrace dwelling with a rear courtyard. The proposed dwelling would face onto Campbell Street and would follow the building line established by no.1 Campbell Street to the south-west of the application site. Parking has been designated at the front of the property on Campbell Street.
- 2.2 The design of the proposed dwelling mirrors no.1 Campbell Street and is very similar to the other residential properties visible from the application site on Campbell Street and Argyle Street.

2.3 Planning permission was previously approved on site for a very similar scheme to this proposed one (10/0450/FUL). The only difference between the previously approved scheme and the proposed scheme is the widening of the rear roof dormer to match the neighbouring dormer of no.1 in terms of mass and scale.

2.4 The application is accompanied by the following supporting information:

1. Design Statement
2. Drawings

3.0 SITE HISTORY

Reference	Description	Outcome
10/0450/FUL	Erection of one 2-bed dwelling.	Permitted
10/1054/EXP	Change of use of office building (B1a) to two residential dwellings, erection of 2 two storey rear extensions and alterations to fenestration.	Permitted

4.0 PUBLICITY

4.1	Advertisement:	Yes
	Adjoining Owners:	Yes
	Site Notice Displayed:	Yes

5.0 POLICY

5.1 Central Government Advice

National Planning Policy Framework 2012
National Planning Practice Guidance 2014
Circular 11/95 – The Use of Conditions in Planning Permissions (Annex A)

Ministerial Statement (1 December 2014) by Brandon Lewis
Minister of State for Housing and Planning (Department of Communities and Local Government)

5.2 Cambridge Local Plan 2006

3/1 Sustainable development
3/4 Responding to context
3/7 Creating successful places
3/11 The design of external spaces
3/12 The design of new buildings
4/11 Conservation Areas
5/1 Housing provision
8/2 Transport impact
8/6 Cycle parking
8/10 Off-street car parking

5.3 Supplementary Planning Documents

Cambridge City Council (May 2007) – Sustainable Design and Construction
Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Waste Partnership (RECAP): Waste Management Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (February 2012)

5.4 Material Considerations

City Wide Guidance

Cycle Parking Guide for New Residential Developments (2010)
Roof Extensions Design Guide (2003)

Area Guidelines

Mill Road Area Conservation Area Appraisal (2011)

6.0 CONSULTATIONS

Cambridgeshire County Council (Engineering)

Original comments (27/01/2015)

- 6.1 Further information and clarification is required regarding parking provision and existing dwellings.
- 6.2 The development has potential to impose additional parking demands upon the on-street parking on the surrounding streets and, whilst this is unlikely to result in any significant adverse

impact upon highway safety, there is potentially an impact upon residential amenity which the Planning Authority may wish to consider when assessing this application. Recommended conditions/ informatives:

- *No unbound material.*
- *No gates erected unless details have first been submitted and approved by the LPA.*
- *First use of vehicular access.*
- *Drainage measures.*
- *Visibility splays*
- *Redundant vehicle crossover returned to normal footway and kerb.*
- *Traffic management plan.*
- *Highways informative.*

Second comments (29/01/2015)

- 6.3 No mention was made in the application regarding the works within the public highway to remove the existing vehicular access. I consider that there is now sufficient clarity for the Planning Authority to be able to consider the full impact of the proposal.

Head of Refuse and Environment

- 6.4 No objection, subject to following comments and conditions:
- *Construction hours*
 - *Construction Collection/Delivery Hours*

Urban Design and Conservation team

- 6.5 The principle of the new house is supported, however the form of the roof is not. The applicant would be advised to revert back to the previous roof form of the 2010 application which may be supported by the Conservation Team subject to details and materials. This application does not conform to policies 3/4, 3/12 and 4/11 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006.
- 6.6 The above responses are a summary of the comments that have been received. Full details of the consultation responses can be inspected on the application file.

7.0 REPRESENTATIONS

7.1 The owners/occupiers of the following addresses have made representations:

- 1 Campbell Street
- 2 Campbell Street
- 3 Campbell Street

7.2 The representations can be summarised as follows:

- The proposed dwelling would exacerbate on-street parking.
- Noise and disturbance from construction.
- There would be a loss of parking spaces.
- Loss of manoeuvring space could impact on highway safety.
- Contractor vehicles will block residents and emergency services from accessing street safely.
- To place a condition on the work such that no construction vehicles obstruct the highway at any time.
- No works should take place on the highway.
- No inconvenience to residential amenity should be caused at any time during the project.

7.3 The above representations are a summary of the comments that have been received. Full details of the representations can be inspected on the application file.

8.0 ASSESSMENT

Principle of Development

8.1 The proposed residential redevelopment of the site to create a two bed end of terrace dwelling house is considered to be acceptable in this location and context. Windfall housing sites such as this are permitted subject to the existing land use and compatibility with adjoining uses.

8.2 In my opinion, the principle of the development is acceptable and in accordance with policy 5/1 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2006).

Context of site, design and external spaces and Impact on Conservation Area

- 8.3 The proposed dwelling would be visible from the street scene of Campbell Street.
- 8.4 The surrounding area is characterized primarily of two-storey terraced style properties, formed of brick walls and slate roofs, facing towards and running parallel to the road.
- 8.5 The proposed dwelling has been designed to mirror the neighbouring dwelling at no.1 Campbell Street by matching the fenestration, materials and overall built form of this neighbouring property. The proposed scale and design of the proposed dwelling is reflective of the context of the site and is generally in keeping with the character of the area.
- 8.6 The Conservation Team is supportive of the principle and overall design and scale of the proposed dwelling, but is not supportive of the form of the roof.
- 8.7 It has been identified that a very similar rear roof box type dormer was approved at no.1 Campbell Street adjacent to the application site, as well as no.7 Campbell Street to the south of the application site. The Conservation Team has stated that dormers constructed before the 2011 Conservation Area designation should carry little weight. Their presence nevertheless is a precedent for other box dormers and so similar proposals cannot be restricted in this area.
- 8.8 The proposed rear dormer would only be partially visible from the street scene and would be relatively secluded in the area. While the proposed rear dormer is considered to be large in scale, there is a strong precedent in the surrounding area and so the introduction of this rear dormer will not stand out significantly in comparison to the wider area. In this context, I believe that the proposed rear dormer would be acceptable and would not have a significant enough impact to cause detrimental harm to the character of the area or the wider conservation area.
- 8.9 The Conservation Team has also suggested that the obscure glazing in the windows on the front façade be replaced with clear glazing. I agree with this advice and consider that obscure glazing on the front of these properties is not in keeping with the

character of the area and as a result a condition has been attached to ensure that these windows are fully clear glazed and not obscure glazed.

- 8.10 In my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 3/4, 3/7, 3/11, 3/12 and 4/11.

Residential Amenity

Impact on amenity of neighbouring occupiers

- 8.11 The main consideration is the impact that the proposed dwelling will have on neighbouring properties.

Overshadowing/ Loss of Light

- 8.12 The only properties that would be susceptible to loss of light would be those properties orientated to the north of the application site, along Mill Road. However, it is considered that the proposed dwelling is of a scale that would only result in an insignificant level of overshadowing of the end of the rear gardens/ yards of properties along Mill Road and so the amenity of these properties will not be detrimentally harmed in terms of overshadowing.

Enclosure/ Visual Dominance

- 8.13 The proposed dwelling is of a great enough separation distance from properties along Mill Road and Argyle Street to the north and west of the site as to not be perceived as visually dominant from these properties.
- 8.14 The proposed dwelling does not extend beyond no.1 Campbell Street and so there is no concern regarding visually enclosing this neighbouring property.
- 8.15 The main consideration is the issue of enclosure from the first floor side window of no.1a Campbell Street. However, it is considered that the existing mass and scale of the blank gable of no.1 Campbell Street already visually dominates the outlook from the first floor side window and so the introduction of the new blank gable formed by the proposed dwelling will not exacerbate levels of enclosure from this window.

Overlooking/ Loss of Privacy

- 8.16 The proposed dormer windows will offer views into the rear courtyards and gardens of properties nearby along Campbell Street, Argyle Street and Mill Road. There is however a sense of mutual overlooking from these properties where there are already views from first floor windows and other former windows that offer views across the rear gardens of surrounding properties. As a result, I do not consider that the proposed views created by the dormer windows will compromise the privacy of any of the surrounding residential properties due to the existing mutual levels of overlooking experienced in the context of the site.
- 8.17 There is a small first floor side window proposed on the side of the proposed dwelling that would look directly across to the window of no.1a Campbell Street. A condition has been attached to ensure that this window is obscure glazed and can only be partially opened to prevent overlooking.
- 8.18 In my opinion the proposal adequately respects the residential amenity of its neighbours and the constraints of the site and I consider that it is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 3/4 and 3/7.

Amenity for future occupiers of the site

- 8.19 The application provides a two-bedroom home with outdoor amenity space. The site is located in a sustainable location, with adequate cycle provision, close to services and facilities in the immediate area, as well as within walking distance to nearby bus stops. In my opinion the proposal provides a high-quality living environment and an appropriate standard of residential amenity for future occupiers, and I consider that in this respect it is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 3/7 and 3/12.

Refuse Arrangements

- 8.20 The scheme provides adequate internal refuse storage provision within the dwelling internally. The Environmental Health team are satisfied with the level of provision and the refuse arrangements overall. In my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policy 3/12.

- 8.21 In my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policy 3/12.

Highway Safety

- 8.22 The Highway Authority has not raised any objections to the proposed scheme in terms of highway safety. The proposed dwelling does not create any new or alter any existing vehicular access and so there will be no implications in this regard.
- 8.23 Concerns have been raised regarding the loss of the existing turning area formed by the application site. The existing off-street parking spaces on the application site does not form an official turning area as part of the recognised highway and so the loss of this space for vehicular turning is acceptable.
- 8.24 In my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policy 8/2.

Car and Cycle Parking

- 8.25 The application provides adequate cycle provision internally within the dwelling.
- 8.26 Concerns have been raised regarding the loss of parking and increase in demand in parking that the proposed dwelling will cause. It is acknowledged that the two existing car parking spaces on the application site will be lost as a result of the proposed dwelling. The removal of these parking spaces will however allow for an additional on-street parking space outside the front of the proposed dwelling and so there will be an overall loss of 1 parking space as a result of the proposed scheme.
- 8.27 With regard to these objections around the pressure on car parking in the surrounding area, it is my view that on-site provision is not necessary for this development, and is in accordance with the Councils parking standards. I do not consider it likely that car ownership levels amongst future occupiers of the proposed development will exceed the level provided for on-street to such an extent as to cause harm to the amenity of neighbouring occupiers. The existing pressure on on-street car parking space will in itself be a disincentive to such additional car ownership. The site is also located in a

sustainable location; close to existing facilities and services, within cycling distance of the city centre and within walking distance of nearby bus stops and so it is considered that there is not a strong dependency on private car as a means of travel.

- 8.28 In my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 8/6 and 8/10.

Third Party Representations

- 8.29 The majority of the issues raised in the representations received have been considered in the above report.

The following issues have also been raised:

Noise and disturbance from construction.

Conditions have been attached, as recommended by the Environmental Health, to limit the construction hours and construction collection and delivery hours to prevent disturbance taking place into unneighbourly hours.

Contractor vehicles will block residents and emergency services from accessing street safely.

A condition has been attached, as recommended by the Highway Authority, to provide a traffic management plan prior to the demolition and construction phase to prevent these phases of the development causing any highway safety issues.

Proposed conditions.

The suggested condition made by neighbouring properties relating to no works taking place on the highway, and for no construction vehicles to block the public highway have not been attached as they have been covered by the traffic management plan condition. The suggested condition stating that no inconvenience to residential amenity shall take place has not been attached as the traffic management plan, construction collection and delivery hours, and construction hour's condition have been included to help mitigate this impact.

Planning Obligation Strategy

- 8.30 As a result of the Ministerial Statement (1 December 2014) by Brandon Lewis Minister of State for Housing and Planning (Department of Communities and Local Government) tariff style developer contributions on small-scale developers, for sites of 10-units or less, and which have a maximum combined gross floor space of 1,000 square meters should not be sought. The proposed development falls below this threshold, and therefore it is not possible to seek planning obligations to secure community infrastructure in this case.

9.0 RECOMMENDATION

APPROVE subject to the following conditions:

1. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans as listed on this decision notice.

Reason: In the interests of good planning, for the avoidance of doubt and to facilitate any future application to the Local Planning Authority under Section 73 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

2. The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.

Reason: In accordance with the requirements of section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

3. The ground floor and first floor windows as shown on the front elevation of drawing no.10 1261:002A, shall be fully clear glazed and not partially obscure glazed.

Reason: To ensure that the dwelling is in keeping with the character of the area, and wider Conservation Area. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/4, 3/12 and 4/11).

4. The first floor side window identified on the side elevation on drawing number (10 1261 002) shall be obscure glazed to a minimum level of obscurity to conform to Pilkington Glass level 3 or equivalent prior to occupation of the dwelling and shall have restrictors to ensure that the window cannot be opened more than 45 degrees beyond the plane of the adjacent wall and shall be retained as such thereafter.

Reason: In the interests of residential amenity (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/4 and 3/12).

5. Except with the prior written agreement of the local planning authority no construction work or demolition shall be carried out or plant operated other than between the following hours: 0800 hours to 1800 hours Monday to Friday, 0800 hours to 1300 hours on Saturday and at no time on Sundays, Bank or Public Holidays.

Reason: To protect the amenity of the adjoining properties. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 4/13)

6. Except with the prior agreement of the local planning authority in writing, there should be no collection or deliveries to the site during the demolition and construction stages outside the hours of 0700 hrs and 1900 hrs on Monday - Saturday and there should be no collections or deliveries on Sundays or Bank and public holidays.

Reason: Due to the proximity of residential properties to this premises and that extensive refurbishment will be required, the above conditions are recommended to protect the amenity of these residential properties throughout the redevelopment in accordance with policies 4/13 and 6/10 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2006).

7. No unbound material shall be used in the surface finish of the driveway within 6 metres of the highway boundary of the site.
Reason: To avoid displacement of loose material onto the highway in the interests of highway safety

8. Notwithstanding the provision of Class A of Schedule 2, Part 2 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995, (or any order revoking, amending or re-enacting that order) no gates shall be erected across the approved access unless details have first been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Reason: In the interests of highway safety.
9. Prior to the commencement of the first use the vehicular access where it crosses the public highway shall be laid out and constructed in accordance with the Cambridgeshire County Council construction specification. Reason: In the interests of highway safety and to ensure satisfactory access into the site.
10. The access shall be constructed with adequate drainage measures to prevent surface water run-off onto the adjacent public highway, in accordance with a scheme submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, in consultation with the Highway Authority. Reason: To prevent surface water discharging to the highway.
11. Two 2.0 x 2.0 metres visibility splays shall be provided as shown on the drawings. The splays are to be included within the curtilage of the new dwelling. One visibility splay is required on each side of the access, measured to either side of the access, with a set-back of two metres from the highway boundary along each side of the access. This area shall be kept clear of all planting, fencing, walls and the like exceeding 600mm high. Reason: In the interests of highway safety.
12. The redundant vehicle crossover of the footway must be returned to normal footway and kerb at no cost to the Highway Authority. Reason: for the safe and efficient operation of the public highway
13. The access shall be provided as shown on the approved and retained free of obstruction. Reason: In the interests of highway safety.

14. No demolition or construction works shall commence on site until a traffic management plan has been agreed with the Planning Authority in consultation with the Highway Authority. The principle areas of concern that should be addressed are: i. Movements and control of muck away lorries (all loading and unloading should be undertaken off the adopted public highway) ii. Contractor parking, for both phases all such parking should be within the curtilage of the site and not on street. iii. Movements and control of all deliveries (all loading and unloading should be undertaken off the adopted public highway) iv. Control of dust, mud and debris, please note it is an offence under the Highways Act 1980 to deposit mud or debris onto the adopted public highway. Reason: in the interests of highway safety
15. This development involves work to the public highway that will require the approval of the County Council as Highway Authority. It is an OFFENCE to carry out any works within the public highway, which includes a public right of way, without the permission of the Highway Authority. Please note that it is the applicant's responsibility to ensure that, in addition to planning permission, any necessary consents or approvals under the Highways Act 1980 and the New Roads and Street Works Act 1991 are also obtained from the County Council. No part of any structure may overhang or encroach under or upon the public highway unless licensed by the Highway Authority and no gate / door / ground floor window shall open outwards over the public highway. Public Utility apparatus may be affected by this proposal. Contact the appropriate utility service to reach agreement on any necessary alterations, the cost of which must be borne by the applicant.

Application Number	15/0033/FUL	Agenda Item	
Date Received	9th January 2015	Officer	Mr Amit Patel
Target Date	6th March 2015		
Ward	Coleridge		
Site	4 Rustat Road Cambridge CB1 3QT		
Proposal	Single storey rear extension and new porch.		
Applicant	Mr And Mrs G And M Smith 7 Alms Hill Bourn CB23 2SH		

SUMMARY	<p>The development accords with the Development Plan for the following reasons:</p> <p>No harmful impact on the neighbours</p> <p>Responds satisfactorily to the context</p>
RECOMMENDATION	APPROVAL

1.0 SITE DESCRIPTION/AREA CONTEXT

- 1.1 The site is 4 Rustat Road. It is a two-storey building finished in pebble dash and tiled roof. The site is located on the western side of the road. The area is mainly residential in character with semi-detached properties. There is a guest house to the south of the application site.
- 1.2 The area is not within a Conservation Area. The building is not listed or a Building of Local Interest. There are no Tree Protection Orders on site and the site falls outside a controlled parking zone.

2.0 THE PROPOSAL

- 2.1 The proposal is for a single-storey rear extension and a new porch to the existing dwelling. The single-storey extension measures 4.5m deep by 7.2m wide by 2.4m to the eaves 3.8m to the ridge and will have a hipped roof.

3.0 SITE HISTORY

None

4.0 PUBLICITY

4.1	Advertisement:	No
	Adjoining Owners:	Yes
	Site Notice Displayed:	No

5.0 POLICY

5.1 See Appendix 1 for full details of Central Government Guidance, Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies, Supplementary Planning Documents and Material Considerations.

5.2 Relevant Development Plan policies

PLAN		POLICY NUMBER
Cambridge Plan 2006	Local	3/1 3/4 3/14 4/4

5.3 Relevant Central Government Guidance, Supplementary Planning Documents and Material Considerations

Central Government Guidance	National Planning Policy Framework March 2012 National Planning Policy Framework – Planning Practice Guidance March 2014 Circular 11/95 Ministerial Statement (1 December 2014) by Brandon Lewis Minister of State for Housing and Planning (Department of Communities and Local Government)
Supplementary Planning Guidance	Sustainable Design and Construction (May 2007)

5.4 Status of Proposed Submission – Cambridge Local Plan

Planning applications should be determined in accordance with policies in the adopted Development Plan and advice set out in the NPPF. However, after consideration of adopted plans and the NPPF, policies in emerging plans can also be given some weight when determining applications. For Cambridge, therefore, the emerging revised Local Plan as published for consultation on 19 July 2013 can be taken into account, especially those policies where there are no or limited objections to it. However it is likely, in the vast majority of instances, that the adopted development plan and the NPPF will have considerably more weight than emerging policies in the revised Local Plan.

For the application considered in this report, there are no policies in the emerging Local Plan which are of relevance.

6.0 CONSULTATIONS

Cambridgeshire County Council (Highways Development Management)

- 6.1 No significant adverse effect upon the Public Highway should result from this proposal if it gains benefit of Planning Permission.

Head of Refuse and Environment

- 6.2 The proposal in representations to limit construction hours to 9 to 5 Monday to Friday would not be reasonable. Recommend the standard working hours condition.

The above responses are a summary of the comments that have been received. Full details of the consultation responses can be inspected on the application file.

7.0 REPRESENTATIONS

- 7.1 Cllr Pippas has commented that No. 2 Rustat Road is a guest house and construction activity will disturb the guests. He has suggested restricting the hours of construction activity to 9-5 Monday to Friday and no time on the weekends.

- 7.2 The above representations are a summary of the comments that have been received. Full details of the representations can be inspected on the application file.

8.0 ASSESSMENT

- 8.1 From the consultation responses and representations received and from my inspection of the site and the surroundings, I consider that the main issues are:

1. Context of site, design and external spaces
2. Residential amenity
3. Third party representations

Context of site, design and external spaces

- 8.2 The single-storey extension will be to the rear of the property. There are other extensions of a similar scale and massing within the locality. The plans show that this element will be finished in materials matching the external appearance of the main house. I consider, subject to a condition to control materials, that this element is acceptable in design terms.
- 8.3 The front porch extension will be visible in the street. There are other properties that have been extended in a similar way. This also will be finished in matching materials to the main house. Subject to a condition to control this I consider that this element is acceptable in design terms.
- 8.4 In my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 3/4 and 3/14.

Residential Amenity

Impact on amenity of neighbouring occupiers

- 8.5 Comments have been received relating to working hours during construction. The application is for an extension to the house. Although there will be some noise and disturbance from construction activity it would not be reasonable to control the hours as suggested in this representation.

- 8.6 The front porch will not extend beyond the existing building elevations and therefore will not have a harmful impact on the neighbours.
- 8.7 The single-storey extension is the full width of the existing house. It is slightly set in off the common boundary with the attached neighbour at 6 Rustat Road. Number 4 already benefits from a two-storey extension and the proposed single-storey element projects a further 4.5m. The proposal is due south of number 6 and there will be a degree of overshadowing. However, given the limited depth of the proposed extension, the 2.4m eaves height and the pitched and hipped roof form, I do not consider that the proposal will have a harmful impact through loss of light to this neighbour. There are no windows in the elevation facing number 6 and therefore there will not be any loss of privacy to this neighbour.
- 8.8 With regards to number 2 Rustat Road the proposal is due north of number 2 and is set off the common boundary by 1.8m. Considering the size and height as well as the design, I do not consider that there will be any significant loss of light to this neighbour. There are no windows in the elevation facing this neighbour and therefore there will be no loss of privacy to this neighbour.
- 8.9 In my opinion the proposal adequately respects the residential amenity of its neighbours and the constraints of the site and I consider that it is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 3/4 and 3/7.

Third Party Representations

- 8.10 The third party comments received have been addressed in the main body of the report under the heading residential amenity.

9.0 CONCLUSION

- 9.1 The proposals for a single-storey rear extension and the porch are considered acceptable subject to condition. I recommend APPROVAL.

10.0 RECOMMENDATION

APPROVE subject to the following conditions:

1. The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.

Reason: In accordance with the requirements of section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

2. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans as listed on this decision notice.

Reason: In the interests of good planning, for the avoidance of doubt and to facilitate any future application to the Local Planning Authority under Section 73 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

3. The extension hereby permitted shall be constructed in external materials to match the existing building in type, colour and texture.

Reason: To ensure that the extension is in keeping with the existing building. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/4, 3/12 and 3/14)

4. Except with the prior written agreement of the local planning authority no construction work or demolition shall be carried out or plant operated other than between the following hours: 0800 hours to 1800 hours Monday to Friday, 0800 hours to 1300 hours on Saturday and at no time on Sundays, Bank or Public Holidays.

Reason: To protect the amenity of the adjoining properties. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 4/13)

PLANNING COMMITTEE

1st April 2015

Application Number	14/2028/FUL	Agenda Item	
Date Received	22nd December 2014	Officer	Miss Catherine Linford
Target Date	16th February 2015		
Ward	Romsey		
Site	St Stephens Church And Church Hall 24 Brooks Road Cambridge		
Proposal	Relocation of approved sub-station position and increase of approved height of external plant terrace. Application reference - 11/1200/FUL		
Applicant	Mr Nigel Corrigan New Cambridge House Bassingbourn Road Littington CB1 9AJ		

SUMMARY	<p>The development accords with the Development Plan for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> The proposal would not have a detrimental visual impact; <input type="checkbox"/> In relation to planning matters the proposal would not have a significant detrimental impact on neighbouring properties.
RECOMMENDATION	APPROVAL

1.0 SITE DESCRIPTION/AREA CONTEXT

- 1.1 The site is located on the junction of Brooks Road and Coldhams Lane at the western end of the roundabout. The site is triangular in shape and tapers to the rear, between houses on Coldham's Grove and Brooks Road. The site does not fall within a Conservation Area, nor is it listed or classed as a Building of Local Interest. There are 5 Tree Protection Orders on trees located to the front of the site, on the roundabout and these provide a visually important tree belt.
- 1.2 Planning permission has been granted for a replacement Church on the site and this is currently under construction.

2.0 THE PROPOSAL

- 2.1 Full planning permission is sought for a substation, which would stand adjacent to the common boundary with 26 Brooks Road. The substation would measure 3m x 3m x 2.4m in height.

3.0 SITE HISTORY

Reference	Description	Outcome
07/0425/FUL	Erection of 2 2 bed flats and 10 1 bed flats	REF and dismissed at appeal.
10/0145/FUL	Alterations and extensions for assembly and leisure use	WDN
10/0875/FUL	Construction of a replacement Church with ancillary offices, meeting rooms and cafeteria (following demolition of existing Church)	REF
11/1200/FUL	Erection of Church and associated facilities together with car and bicycle parking, refuse storage and landscaping following demolition of existing Church and The Parsonage.	A/C

4.0 PUBLICITY

4.1	Advertisement:	Yes
	Adjoining Owners:	Yes
	Site Notice Displayed:	Yes

5.0 POLICY

- 5.1 See Appendix 1 for full details of Central Government Guidance, Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies, Supplementary Planning Documents and Material Considerations.

5.2 Relevant Development Plan policies

PLAN		POLICY NUMBER
Cambridge Plan 2006	Local	3/1 3/4 3/7 3/12

5.3 Relevant Central Government Guidance, Supplementary Planning Documents and Material Considerations

Central Government Guidance	National Planning Policy Framework March 2012 National Planning Policy Framework – Planning Practice Guidance March 2014 Circular 11/95
-----------------------------	---

5.4 Status of Proposed Submission – Cambridge Local Plan

Planning applications should be determined in accordance with policies in the adopted Development Plan and advice set out in the NPPF. However, after consideration of adopted plans and the NPPF, policies in emerging plans can also be given some weight when determining applications. For Cambridge, therefore, the emerging revised Local Plan as published for consultation on 19 July 2013 can be taken into account, especially those policies where there are no or limited objections to it. However it is likely, in the vast majority of instances, that the adopted development plan and the NPPF will have considerably more weight than emerging policies in the revised Local Plan.

For the application considered in this report, there are no policies in the emerging Local Plan that are of relevance

6.0 CONSULTATIONS

Cambridgeshire County Council (Highways Development Management)

- 6.1 No significant adverse effect upon the Public Highway should result from this proposal if it gains the benefit of Planning Permission.

Head of Refuse and Environment

- 6.2 No objection, subject to conditions related to construction hours and noise insulation.
- 6.3 The above responses are a summary of the comments that have been received. Full details of the consultation responses can be inspected on the application file.

7.0 REPRESENTATIONS

- 7.1 The owners/occupier of the following address has made a representation:
- ☐ 26 Brooks Road
 - ☐ Linda S Russell, Solicitors and Planning Consultants, 57 North Hill, Colchester, Essex (on behalf of 26 Brooks Road)
- 7.2 The representations can be summarised as follows:
- ☐ Concern about health risks
 - ☐ Noise and disturbance
 - ☐ The substation is too big and too high
 - ☐ Lack of information regarding the size of the substation
 - ☐ The substation could be situated elsewhere on the site
 - ☐ Due to its utilitarian design the substation would have a detrimental visual impact
 - ☐ If the application is approved it is requested that a condition is added requiring additional boundary landscaping
 - ☐ Fire risk
- 7.3 A petition has been submitted which contains 86 signatures.
- 7.4 The above representations are a summary of the comments that have been received. Full details of the representations can be inspected on the application file.

8.0 ASSESSMENT

8.1 From the consultation responses and representations received and from my inspection of the site and the surroundings, I consider that the main issues are:

1. Background
2. Context of site, design and external spaces
3. Residential amenity
4. Third party representations

Background

8.2 In 2011 planning permission was granted for a replacement Church on the site (11/1200/FUL). This did not include the provision of a substation. During the technical design stage process, which took place after planning permission was granted, it was found that a substation would be required for the Church. It is proposed that the substation is located 1m from the southern boundary with 26 Brooks Road. The applicant has explained that this is the only location on the site where a substation could be located. UK Power Networks require the substation to be accessible by a vehicle at all times. The proposed location is easily accessible and would be in front of the gate that would secure the site. Situating the substation further into the car park would not enable it to be accessed as UK Power Networks require. Situating the substation further into the car park would also impact on the tree roots of protected trees. A storm water attenuation tank is being installed under the car park which also influences the location of the substation.

Context of site, design and external spaces

8.3 The proposed substation would be set back 23.4m from the street frontage and would not be a prominent feature when seen from the street. The structure would have a low pitched roof and would be a maximum of 2.4m in height. Considering the landscaping proposed along the boundary it is my view that the proposed substation would also not be a prominent feature when viewed from the neighbouring property, 26 Brooks Road. I consider it to be visually acceptable, subject to a condition

requiring further details of the landscaping to ensure that it is appropriate and adequate (4).

- 8.4 In my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 3/4, 3/7, 3/11, 3/12.

Residential Amenity

- 8.5 The only neighbouring property that may be directly impacted on by the proposals is 26 Brooks Road. Environmental Health have been consulted on the application and have raised no objection. In order to ensure that the noise level remains acceptable it is recommended that a noise assessment and insulation scheme is required by condition (5). This would include details of the equipment, and the sound reducing qualities of the enclosure, and would include consideration of low frequency noise.
- 8.6 The proposed substation would stand 1m from the common boundary with 26 Brooks Road, to the north of this neighbour. Due to the orientation it is my view that it would not overshadow 26 Brooks Road to an unacceptable degree and due to its height it is my opinion that it would not dominate or enclose this neighbour to an unacceptable degree.
- 8.7 Concern has been raised regarding the impact the substation could have on health and fire risk. This is not a planning consideration and cannot be taken into consideration.
- 8.8 In my opinion the proposal adequately respects the residential amenity of its neighbours and the constraints of the site and I consider that it is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 3/4 and 3/7.

Third Party Representations

- 8.9 The issues raised have been addressed above.

9.0 CONCLUSION

- 9.1 In my opinion there is no planning reason to refuse the application and I therefore recommend that it is approved subject to conditions.

10.0 RECOMMENDATION

APPROVE subject to the following conditions:

1. The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.

Reason: In accordance with the requirements of section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

2. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans as listed on this decision notice.

Reason: In the interests of good planning, for the avoidance of doubt and to facilitate any future application to the Local Planning Authority under Section 73 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

3. Except with the prior written agreement of the local planning authority no construction work or demolition shall be carried out or plant operated other than between the following hours: 0800 hours to 1800 hours Monday to Friday, 0800 hours to 1300 hours on Saturday and at no time on Sundays, Bank or Public Holidays.

Reason: To protect the amenity of the adjoining properties. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 4/13)

4. No development shall commence until details of soft landscape works have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Soft landscape works shall include planting plans; written specifications (including cultivation and other operations associated with plant and grass establishment); schedules of plants, noting species, plant sizes and proposed numbers/densities where appropriate and an implementation programme.

Reason: In the interests of visual amenity and to ensure that suitable hard and soft landscape is provided as part of the development. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/4, 3/11 and 3/12)

5. Before the substation is installed a scheme for the insulation of the substation in order to minimise the level of noise emanating from the substation shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority and the scheme as approved shall be fully implemented before the substation is in use. The scheme shall include the consideration of low frequency noise.

Reason: to protect the amenity of neighbouring properties.
(Cambridge Local Plan 2006, policy 4/13)

Record of Officer Urgency Action

Urgency Powers to complete s106 Agreements without reference to s106 monitoring costs

Decision of:	Director of Environment: Simon Payne
Reference:	15/URGENCY/PLN/01
Date of decision:	19 March 2015
Decision Type:	Officer Urgent Action
Matter for Decision:	<p>That the Council as local planning authority will not require payment of monitoring fees to be included in planning obligations entered into under section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 in relation to the following developments:</p> <p>Ashley Hotel, 74-76 Chesterton Road 14/1111/FUL</p> <p>Travis Perkins, Devonshire Road 11/1295/FUL</p> <p>Gresham Road, University Health Centre 14/1211/FUL</p> <p>Land r/o 268 Queen Ediths Way 14/1382/FUL</p> <p>Aparthotel, Milton Road 14/0052/FUL</p>
Why the decision had to be made (and any alternative options):	<p>The implications of the court's judgment must be reflected in the draft s106 agreements which need to be finalised prior to the Planning Committee's next meeting on 1 April.</p>
Officer decision(s):	<p>To agree that the Council as local planning authority will not require payment of monitoring fees to be included in planning obligations entered into under section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 in relation to the following developments:</p> <p>Ashley Hotel, 74-76 Chesterton Road 14/1111/FUL</p> <p>Travis Perkins, Devonshire Road 11/1295/FUL</p> <p>Gresham Road, University Health Centre 14/1211/FUL</p> <p>Land r/o 268 Queen Ediths Way 14/1382/FUL</p> <p>Aparthotel, Milton Road 14/0052/FUL</p>

Committee consideration: The Chair, Vice Chair and Opposition Spokesperson of the Planning Committee were consulted prior to the action being authorised.

Briefing Note/Report: A briefing note detailing the requirement for the decision is attached.

Conflicts of interest: None

Note: City Council Constitution: Part 3 Para states:

Urgency Action

Each Director is authorised to act on behalf of the Executive or the Council (after consultation, if practicable with the relevant Executive Councillor or, in respect of non-executive functions, the relevant Chair or, in either case, the Chief Executive) in relation to matters within his/her area(s) of responsibility in cases of urgency or emergency. Any such action to be reported as soon as possible to the relevant Executive Councillor and Scrutiny Committee or, for non-executive functions, the relevant committee or sub-committee.

In exercising this power, a Director shall either consult:

- Members, in which case the Executive Councillor (in respect of executive functions) or the Chair (in respect of regulatory functions) and, so far as practical in the time available, spokesperson(s); or
- the Chief Executive (if available) before taking action.

If only the Chief Executive is consulted, the Director shall, as soon as possible after taking the action in question, inform the Executive Councillor, Chair and spokesperson(s) of what has happened. (This shall be in addition to reporting the action taken to the next meeting of the relevant committee or sub-committee)."

OFFICER DECISION UNDER URGENCY POWERS

REPORT TO DIRECTOR OF ENVIRONMENT

The purpose of this report is to ask the Director of Environment to make a decision under the urgency powers set out in paragraph 3.6 of Part 3 of the Council's Constitution that the Council as local planning authority will not require payment of monitoring fees to be included in planning obligations entered into under section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 in relation to the following developments.

Site Address/Reference	Committee Date	Status
Ashley Hotel, 74-76 Chesterton Road 14/1111/FUL	01-Oct-14	Undetermined
Travis Perkins, Devonshire Road 11/1295/FUL	04-Sep-13	Undetermined
Gresham Road, University Health Centre 14/1211/FUL	03-Dec-14	Undetermined
Land r/o 268 Queen Edith's Way 14/1382/FUL	04-Feb-15	Refused/s106 not completed
Aparthotel, Former Milton Road School site 14/0052/FUL	04-Jun-14	At appeal

Reason why an urgent decision is required

An urgent decision is required to enable the section 106 in relation to the proposed aparthotel on the Former Milton Road School site to be completed. This is necessary to clarify the Council's position regarding reason for refusal 3 in advance of the Informal Hearing on 21 April 2015.

An urgent decision is required to enable the section 106 in relation to the proposed development at land rear of 268 Queen Edith's Way to be completed. This is necessary to clarify the Council's position regarding reason for refusal 4 in the event of an appeal.

An urgent decision is required to enable the section 106s in relation to the Ashley Hotel, the Travis Perkins site and the University Health Centre site to be completed. This is necessary to avoid a delay in issuing the Decision Notices in each case.

Background

Under section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 any person interested in land in the area of a local planning authority can enter into a planning obligation:

- (a) Restricting the development or use of the land in question in any specified way

- (b) Requiring specified operations or activities to be carried out in, on, under, or over the land;
- (c) Requiring the land to be used in any specified way; or
- (d) Requiring a sum or sums to be paid to the authority ...on a specified date or periodically

Regulation 122 of the Community Infrastructure Regulations 2010 (the CIL Regulations) states that a planning obligation may only constitute a reason for granting planning permission for a development if the obligation is –

- (a) Necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms
- (b) Directly related to the development; and
- (c) Fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development

The Council's Planning Obligation Strategy 2010 requires that all new developments contribute to the costs of monitoring the implementation of planning obligations. From April 2014 the Council has required monitoring fees at 5% of the total value of the financial contributions up to a maximum of £50,000.

On 3rd February 2015 judgment was given in the High Court case of *Oxfordshire County Council v Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government and others* [2015] EWHC 186 (Admin). The case concerned an appeal against a Planning Inspector's decision that the payment of a monitoring/administration fee was not necessary to make the development under consideration acceptable in planning terms. That is, that the requirement for payment of a monitoring/administration fee did not meet the tests set out in the CIL Regulations.

The Court held that it was part of the local authority's functions as a local planning authority to administer, monitor and enforce planning obligations in section 106 agreements. Although the planning obligations in the Oxfordshire case related to non-planning functions such as education and libraries, the local authority was exercising its planning functions when addressing the impact of the proposed development on the need for public services in the local community. The Inspector had been entitled to conclude that the costs of administration and monitoring would be included in the local authority's resources and budget for the discharge of its functions under section 106. The authority was seeking a fee based on its standard table of fees rather than any individualised assessment of special costs liable to be incurred for the particular development. The Inspector had been entitled to conclude that a contribution towards administration and monitoring costs was not "necessary" to make the development acceptable in planning terms.

In the case of each of the above applications the Council has sought planning obligations to pay monitoring fees based on the Council's standard calculation of fees as set out in the Planning Obligation Strategy and not on an individualised assessment of special costs liable to be incurred for those particular developments.

The effect of the judgment in the Oxfordshire case is that the Council is unable to pursue the monitoring fee obligations as these do not meet the tests set out in the CIL Regulations.

The City Development Manager has informed the Planning Committee of the effect of the judgment and amendments were made to reports that were presented to the Committee on 4 March 2015 via the Amendment Sheet to remove reference to contributions towards monitoring costs.

The Applications

Three cases involve applications which have yet to be determined because the s106 Agreement has not been completed. In each of these cases Planning Committee resolved to grant the application subject to completion of a section 106 agreement. Authority is needed to remove the requirement to pay monitoring contributions so that the Agreements can be completed and planning permission issued.

The fourth case involves an application which has been refused but where the applicant wishes to complete the related s106 Agreement.

In the fifth case the application was refused and the decision is currently at appeal. In order to complete the s106 Agreement and resolve one of the reasons for refusal authority is needed to remove the requirement to pay monitoring costs from the draft Agreement.

The following table sets out the details of the five applications:

Site Address/Referenc	Committee Date	Status
Ashley Hotel, 74-76 Chesterton Road 14/1111/FUL	01-Oct-14	Undetermined
Travis Perkins, Devonshire Road 11/1295/FUL	04-Sep-13	Undetermined
Gresham Road, University Health Centre 14/1211/FUL	03-Dec-14	Undetermined
Land r/o 268 Queen Ediths Way 14/1382/FUL	04-Feb-15	Refused/s106 not completed
Aparthotel, Former Milton Road school site 14/0052/FUL	04-Jun-14	At appeal

Both City Council and County Council monitoring costs are affected by the Oxfordshire judgement.

Consultations

I have consulted the Chair, Vice Chair and Spokes of Planning Committee by email.

Councillors Dryden, Hipkin and Smart support the action.

I have not had a reply from Councillor Blencowe.

Decision to be made

The decision is to be taken under Urgency powers and will be reported back to Planning Committee on 1 April 2015