



Cambridge City Council Planning

Date: Tuesday, 11 June 2019

Time: 10.00 am

Venue: Committee Room 1 & 2, The Guildhall, Market Square, Cambridge, CB2 3QJ

Contact: democratic.services@cambridge.gov.uk, tel:01223 457000

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: 10am
- **Part Two**
Minor/Other Planning Applications
Start time: 1.30pm
- **Part Three**
General and Enforcement Items
Not applicable

There will be a thirty minute lunch break before part two of the agenda is considered. With a possible short break between agenda item two and three which will be subject to the Chair's discretion.

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 Election of Vice Chair
In appointments to Chairs and Vice Chairs agreed by Council on 22 May 2019, the incorrect Councillor was included in the report. Planning Committee is requested to agree to the appointment of Cllr Mike Sargeant as Vice Chair for 2019/20.

3 Apologies

4 Declarations of Interest

5 Minutes (Pages 19 - 40)

Part 1: Major Planning Applications (10am)

6 18/0806/FUL - 291 Hills Road (Pages 41 - 126)

7 19/0288/FUL - Development Land at 75 Cromwell Road (Pages 127 - 178)

8 18/1993/FUL - Land Between 21 And 29 Barton Road (including 27 Barton Road And Croft Gardens) (Pages 179 - 238)

9 18/1245/FUL - Former Hamilton Lodge Hotel 156 - 160 Chesterton Road And Land Rear Of 162 Chesterton Road (Pages 239 - 274)

10 18/1930/FUL - Redevelopment Area Of Mill Lane Cambridge (Pages 275 - 394)

11 18/1931/LBC - Redevelopment Area Of Mill Lane Cambridge (Pages 395 - 412)

12 17/2265/FUL - Homerton College, Hills Road (Pages 413 - 448)

13 17/2266/LBC - Homerton College, Hills Road (Pages 449 - 462)

Part 2: Minor/Other Planning Applications (1.30pm)

14 18/1807/FUL - India House, 31 Newnham Road (Pages 463 - 502)

15 18/1859/FUL - 39 Akeman Street (Pages 503 - 512)

16 18/1520/FUL - 11 Napier Street (Pages 513 - 532)

17 18/1887/FUL - 57 Peverel Road (Pages 533 - 548)

Planning Members: Smart (Chair), McQueen (Vice-Chair), Baigent, Green, Lord, Page-Croft, Sargeant and Tunnacliffe

Alternates: Herbert, Nethsingha and Thornburrow

Information for the public

The public may record (e.g. film, audio, tweet, blog) meetings which are open to the public. For details go to:

www.cambridge.gov.uk/have-your-say-at-committee-meetings

For full information about committee meetings, committee reports, councillors and the democratic process:

- Website: <http://democracy.cambridge.gov.uk>
- Email: democratic.services@cambridge.gov.uk
- Phone: 01223 457000

Appendix 1 – Development Plan Policy, Planning Guidance and Material Considerations

(Updated October 2018)

1.0 Central Government Advice

1.1 National Planning Policy Framework (July 2018) – 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 Planning Practice Guidance (March 2014)

The guidance complements the National Planning Policy Framework and provides advice on how to deliver its policies.

Guidance is provided in relation to the following:

Advertisements (March 2014)
Air quality (March 2014)
Appeals (March 2014)
Before submitting an application (February 2018)
Brownfield land registers (July 2017)
Climate change (June 2014)
Community Infrastructure Levy (March 2018)
Conserving and enhancing the historic environment (February 2018)
Consultation and pre-decision matters (June 2018)
Crown Development (July 2017)
Design (March 2014)
Determining a planning application (July 2017)
Ensuring effective enforcement (February 2018)
Ensuring the vitality of town centres (March 2014)
Environmental Impact Assessment (July 2017)
Flexible options for planning permissions (March 2014)
Flood Risk and Coastal Change (March 2014)
Hazardous Substances (July 2017)
Health and wellbeing (July 2017)
Housing and economic land availability assessment (September 2018)
Housing need assessment (September 2018)
Land affected by contamination (June 2014)
Land stability (March 2014)
Lawful development certificates (March 2014)

Light pollution (March 2014)
 Local Plans (September 2018)
 Making an application (June 2018)
 Minerals (October 2014)
 Natural Environment (January 2016)
 Neighbourhood Planning (September 2018)
 Noise (March 2014)
 Open space, sports and recreational facilities, public rights of way and local green space (March 2014)
 Permission in principle (June 2018)
 Plan making (September 2018)
 Planning obligations (May 2016)
 Renewable and low carbon energy (June 2015)
 Rural housing (May 2016)
 Self-build and custom housebuilding (July 2017)
 Starter homes (March 2015)
 Strategic environmental assessment and sustainability appraisal (February 2015)
 Transport evidence bases in plan-making and decision-taking (March 2015)
 Travel plans, transport assessments and statements in decision-taking (March 2014)
 Tree Preservation Orders and trees in conservation areas (March 2014)
 Use of Planning Conditions (June 2018)
 Viability (July 2018)
 Water supply, wastewater and water quality (March 2015)
 When is permission required? (June 2018)

1.3 **Circular 11/95 – The Use of Conditions in Planning Permissions (Annex A only):** Model conditions.

1.4 **Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010**

Paragraph 122 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.

Paragraph 123 Other than through requiring a highway agreement to be entered into, a planning obligation (“obligation A”) may not constitute a reason for granting planning permission to the extent that

(a) obligation A provides for the funding or provision of an infrastructure project or provides for the funding or provision of a type of infrastructure; and

(b) five or more separate planning obligations that —

(i) relate to planning permissions granted for development within the area of the charging authority; and

(ii) which provide for the funding or provision of that project, or provide for the funding or provision of that type of infrastructure

have been entered on or after 6th April 2010.

1.5 Planning Policy Statement – Green Belt protection and intentional unauthorised development August 2015

Sets out changes to national planning policy to make intentional unauthorised development a material consideration, and also to provide stronger protection for the Green Belt.

1.6 Technical housing standards – nationally described space standard – published by Department of Communities and Local Government March 2015 (material consideration).

Development Plan policy

2.0 The Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Plan (Development Plan Documents) July 2011

Minerals and Waste Core Strategy : this sets out the Councils' strategic vision and objectives for future development and management of minerals and waste within Cambridgeshire and Peterborough, including strategic site allocations over the Plan period to 2026. The document also contains a suite of development control policies to guide minerals and waste development.

Minerals and Waste Site Specific Proposals Plan (2012) : this sets out the Councils' allocations for site specific proposals for future development and management of minerals and waste within Cambridgeshire and Peterborough. It identifies site specific land allocations for future minerals and waste management development and other supporting site specific policies.

Proposals Maps: Map A: shows minerals and transport proposals; Map B: shows waste management proposals; Map C: shows Mineral Safeguarding Areas.

3.0 Cambridge Local Plan 2018

- Policy 1: The presumption in favour of sustainable development
- Policy 2: Spatial strategy for the location of employment development
- Policy 3: Spatial strategy for the location of residential development
- Policy 4: The Cambridge Green Belt
- Policy 5: Strategic transport infrastructure
- Policy 6: Hierarchy of centres and retail capacity
- Policy 7: The River Cam
- Policy 8: Setting of the city
- Policy 9: Review of the Local Plan
- Policy 10: The City Centre
- Policy 11: Development in the City Centre Primary Shopping Area
- Policy 12: Fitzroy/Burleigh Street/Grafton Area of Major Change
- Policy 13: Cambridge East
- Policy 14: Areas of major change and opportunity areas – general principles
- Policy 15: Cambridge Northern Fringe East and new railway Station Area of Major Change
- Policy 16: South of Coldham's Lane Area of Major Change
- Policy 17: Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrooke's Hospital) Area of Major Change
- Policy 18: Southern Fringe Areas of Major Change
- Policy 19: West Cambridge Area of Major Change
- Policy 20: Land between Huntingdon Road and Histon Road Area of Major Change
- Policy 21: Station Areas West and Clifton Road Area of Major Change
- Policy 22: Mitcham's Corner Opportunity Area
- Policy 23: Eastern Gate Opportunity Area
- Policy 24: Mill Road Opportunity Area
- Policy 25: Cambridge Railway Station, Hills Road Corridor to the City Centre Opportunity Area
- Policy 26: Old Press/Mill Lane Opportunity Area
- Policy 27: Site specific development opportunities
- Policy 28: Carbon reduction, community energy networks, sustainable design and construction, and water use
- Policy 29: Renewable and low carbon energy generation
- Policy 30: Energy-efficiency improvements in existing dwellings
- Policy 31: Integrated water management and the water cycle
- Policy 32: Flood risk

- Policy 33: Contaminated land
- Policy 34: Light pollution control
- Policy 35: Protection of human health from noise and vibration
- Policy 36: Air quality, odour and dust
- Policy 37: Cambridge Airport Public Safety Zone and Air Safeguarding Zones
- Policy 38: Hazardous installations
- Policy 39: Mullard Radio Astronomy Observatory, Lord's Bridge
- Policy 40: Development and expansion of business space
- Policy 41: Protection of business space
- Policy 42: Connecting new developments to digital infrastructure
- Policy 43: University development
- Policy 44: Specialist colleges and language Schools
- Policy 45: Affordable housing and dwelling mix
- Policy 46: Development of student housing
- Policy 47: Specialist housing
- Policy 48: Housing in multiple occupation
- Policy 49: Provision for Gypsies and Travellers
- Policy 50: Residential space standards
- Policy 51: Accessible Homes
- Policy 52: Protecting garden land and the subdivision of existing dwelling plots
- Policy 53: Flat conversions
- Policy 54: Residential moorings
- Policy 55: Responding to context
- Policy 56: Creating successful places
- Policy 57: Designing new buildings
- Policy 58: Altering and extending existing buildings
- Policy 59: Designing landscape and the public realm
- Policy 60: Tall buildings and the skyline in Cambridge
- Policy 61: Conservation and enhancement of Cambridge's historic environment
- Policy 62: Local heritage assets
- Policy 63: Works to a heritage asset to address climate change
- Policy 64: Shopfronts, signage and shop security measures
- Policy 65: Visual pollution
- Policy 66: Paving over front gardens
- Policy 67: Protection of open space
- Policy 68: Open space and recreation provision through new development
- Policy 69: Protection of sites of biodiversity and geodiversity importance
- Policy 70: Protection of priority species and habitats
- Policy 71: Trees

Policy 72: Development and change of use in district, local and neighbourhood centres

Policy 73: Community, sports and leisure facilities

Policy 74: Education facilities

Policy 75: Healthcare facilities

Policy 76: Protection of public houses

Policy 77: Development and expansion of visitor accommodation

Policy 78: Redevelopment or loss of visitor accommodation

Policy 79: Visitor attractions

Policy 80: Supporting sustainable access to development

Policy 81: Mitigating the transport impact of development

Policy 82: Parking management

Policy 83: Aviation development

Policy 84: Telecommunications

Policy 85: Infrastructure delivery, planning obligations and the Community Infrastructure Levy

4.0 Supplementary Planning Documents

(These have been prepared in parallel with the Local Plan preparation and will be shortly adopted by the Executive Councillor by an out of cycle decision. Significant weight can be attached to them; they were brought before Development Plan Scrutiny Sub-Committee for prior consideration and comment on the dates shown)

- 4.1 The New Museums Site Development Framework (March 2016)** – Sets out the joint aspirations of the council and the University of Cambridge regarding future changes to the site. These should improve the urban form with changes to the public realm, provide better access for all and adopt more sustainable forms of development while respecting the site's heritage and surroundings. Future development on the site offers an opportunity to create an improved, more coherent development and especially to improve the public realm on the site.
- 4.2 Ridgeons site Planning and Development Brief (July 2016)** – created to ensure that any future development on this site, allocated for residential development in the 2018 Local Plan as R12, is appropriate to its context and delivers the aspirations as set out in the Local Plan.
- 4.3 Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Flood and Water (December 2016)** - produced by Cambridgeshire County Council in its role as Lead Local Flood Authority, in partnership with the city and district council. It provides detailed guidance to support the implementation of flood and

water related policies in each of the Cambridgeshire local planning authorities' local plans.

- 4.4 **Mitcham's Corner Development Framework (January 2017)** - supports Local Plan Policy 22: Mitcham's Corner Opportunity Area and is designed to ensure that future development in the area is appropriate to its context and delivers the aspirations as set out in the Local Plan. It provides greater certainty and detail to support delivery of development in the coming years.
- 4.5 **Mill Road Depot Planning and Development Brief (March 2017)** - supports Local Plan Policy 24: Mill Road Opportunity Area and is designed to ensure that future development on this site, allocated for residential development in the 2018 Local Plan as R10, is appropriate to its context and delivers the aspirations as set out in the Local Plan. It provides greater certainty and detail to support delivery of development in the coming years.
- 4.6 **Land North of Cherry Hinton (February 2018)** - supports Local Plan Policy 13: Cambridge East, and is designed to ensure that future residential-led development on this site is delivered successfully. It provides greater certainty and detail to support delivery of development in the coming years. It outlines the aspirations for the area, as well as the key issues, constraints and opportunities that will influence how new development will take place.
- 4.7 **Grafton Area of Major Change - Masterplan and Guidance (February 2018)** - Prepared in partnership with local stakeholders to help guide the development of the area, supporting Policy 12 of the Local Plan. The area is designated in the Plan as the primary location for providing additional comparison retail in the City Centre along with other mixed uses including leisure uses, and the SPD promotes a number of key strategies for change. These aim to take advantage of the opportunities to provide an improved street environment including public realm enhancements as well as a positive and attractive destination to support the vitality and viability of the centre for retail and associated uses. The SPD envisages a phased approach to ensure the area continues to perform as a mainstream City Centre leisure and retail location while ensuring phased improvement will deliver the area's longer-term strategy.

5.0 Former Supplementary Planning Documents

(These documents, prepared to support policies in the 2006 local plan, are no longer SPDs, but are still material considerations.)

- 5.1 **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.
- 5.2 **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.
- 5.3 **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.
- 5.4 **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.
- 5.5 **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.

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

5.7 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.

6.0 Other Material Considerations

6.1 City Wide Guidance

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 complements the Sustainable Design and Construction Supplementary Planning Document.

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

Balanced and Mixed Communities – A Good Practice Guide (2006) – Produced by Cambridgeshire Horizons to assist the implementation of the Areas of Major Change.

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.

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

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 and South Cambridgeshire Level 1 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.

Cambridge City Council Draft Air Quality Action Plan 2018-2023 - Sets out Cambridge City Council's priority actions for improving areas of poor air quality in the city and maintaining a good level of air quality in a growing city.

The plan responds to the evidence gathered from air quality monitoring across Cambridge and analysis of the sources of air pollution contributing to the problem. The Identified actions fall in to three main categories: reducing local traffic emissions as quickly as possible to meet national objectives, maintaining pollutant levels below national objectives, and improving public health by reducing population exposure to air pollutants.

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

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.

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

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

Cambridge Sub-Region Culture and Arts Strategy (2006) - Produced by Cambridgeshire Horizons to assist the implementation of the Areas of Major Change.

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

Cambridgeshire County Council Transport Assessment Guidelines (2017) - Provides guidance to applicants, developers, their agents and local authority officers on when a Transport Assessment (TA) is required and what it should contain. It also gives guidance on what information may be required for smaller applications through a Transport Statement (TS).

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.

Cambridgeshire Green Infrastructure Strategy (2011) - Designed to assist in shaping and co-ordinating the delivery of Green Infrastructure in the county, to provide social, environmental and economic benefits now and in the future. It demonstrates how Green Infrastructure can be used to help to achieve four objectives:

- 1) To reverse the decline in biodiversity
- 2) To mitigate and adapt to climate change
- 3) To promote sustainable growth and economic development
- 4) To support healthy living and well-being.

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

Contaminated Land in Cambridge - Developers Guide (2009) – Aims to ensure developers are aware of their responsibilities regarding contaminated land. Outlines the Council's requirements and the information needed in order to assess planning applications.

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

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.

Indoor Sports Facility Strategy 2015-2031 (updated June 2016) – With the Playing Pitch Strategy, forms a guide for the future provision and management of sports pitches, built facilities and community use services to serve existing and new communities in the City and South Cambridgeshire. In line with the NPPF, the strategies set out to evaluate existing built facilities, and assess the future need for sport and active recreation, as the region grows and develops, identifying opportunities for new provision, and the expansion of existing facilities.

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

Playing Pitch Strategy 2015-2031 (updated June 2016) – With the Indoor Sports Facilities Strategy, forms a guide for the future provision and management of sports pitches, built facilities and community use services to serve existing and new communities in the City and South Cambridgeshire. In line with the NPPF, the strategies set out to evaluate existing built facilities, and assess the future need for sport and active recreation, as the region grows and develops, identifying opportunities for new provision, and the expansion of existing facilities.

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.

6.2 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 Plans 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.

Barrow Road Conservation Area Appraisal (2016)

Brooklands Avenue Conservation Area Appraisal (2013)

Cambridge Historic Core Conservation Area Appraisal (2015)

Castle and Victoria Road Conservation Area Appraisal (2012)

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 (2014)

Mill Road Area Conservation Area Appraisal (2011)

Newnham Croft Conservation Area Appraisal (2013)

New Town and Glisson Road Conservation Area Appraisal (2012)

Riverside and Stourbridge Common Conservation Area Appraisal (2012)

Southacre Conservation Area Appraisal (2013)

Storeys Way Conservation Area Appraisal (2018)

Trumpington Conservation Area Appraisal (2010)

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.

This page is intentionally left blank

PLANNING

3 April 2019

12.30 - 5.25 pm

Present:

Planning Committee Members: Councillors Smart (Chair), Blencowe (Vice-Chair), Baigent, Green, Hipkin, McQueen, Page-Croft, Thornburrow and Tunnacliffe

Officers:

Interim Planning Delivery Manager: Eileen Paterson

Urban Extensions Project Manager: Julian Sykes

Principal Planner: Nigel Blazeby

Principal Planner: Lorraine Casey

Principal Planner: Patricia Coyle

Senior Planner: Lorna Gilbert

Senior Planner: Mairead O'Sullivan

Senior Planning Officer: Lewis Tomlinson

Senior Planning Policy Officer: Nancy Kimberley

Senior Technical Officer: Adam Finch

Legal Adviser: Richard Pitt

Committee Manager: James Goddard

FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE COUNCIL**19/44/Plan Apologies**

No apologies were received.

19/45/Plan Declarations of Interest

Name	Item	Interest
Councillor Baigent	All	Personal: Member of Cambridge Cycling Campaign.
Councillors Green and Thornburrow	18/1353/FUL	Personal: Application made by Cambridge Investment Partnership. Councillors Green and Thornburrow wanted to

		make this clear as councillors sitting on the committee. (Established in January 2017, CIP is a joint venture between Cambridge City Council and Hill Investment Partnerships.)

19/46/Plan Minutes

The minutes of the meeting held on 6 March 2019 were currently with officers for comment.

19/47/Plan 17/1748/FUL - 45 Cavendish Avenue

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for the erection of a single storey 2 bedroom dwelling house to the rear of 45 Cavendish Avenue.

The Committee received a representation in objection to the application from a Cavendish Avenue resident.

The representation covered the following issues:

- i. The Objector was speaking on behalf of various residents. There were many objections from residents in the area.
- ii. The application would have an adverse effect on the character of the area.
 - a. Concern about design, scale and massing.
 - b. Other properties in the area had extensions, but no subdivision of land. This would be the first in the area.
- iii. Concern over loss of green corridor.
 - a. High risk of flooding in the area.
 - b. Mitigation measures were not sustainable. Referred to comments by the Drainage Officer. There was insufficient space available to provide compensatory flood storage. A pumped drainage system was not a sustainable form of drainage and would increase residual flood risk.

Mr McKeown (Applicant's Agent) addressed the Committee in support of the application.

Councillor McGerty (Queen Edith's Ward Councillor) addressed the Committee about the application:

- i. Expressed concern about the application.
- ii. The new Local Plan was recently adopted. The Planning Committee should be confident in applying its policies.
- iii. The application was an overdevelopment of the site when compared to existing properties in the area.
- iv. It was a nice design in an inappropriate location as it was out of character with the area.
- v. Two bedrooms were listed in the application but the design could accommodate three. The house was designed for the needs of the current proposed occupant, but occupants and their needs may change in future. The design should clearly label the number of occupants, not just the number of bedrooms. The 'snug' had the potential to be another bedroom.
- vi. Queried if appropriate amenity space was provided. The garden could be overlooked by neighbours so there was no private amenity space.
- vii. Policy 6.40 (subdivision of land) was a material consideration for this application.
- viii. There were no other back garden developments in Cavendish Avenue. The application would have a negative impact on the green corridor and 'green lung' function of the area.

The Committee:

Unanimously resolved to reject the officer recommendation to approve the application.

Councillors McQueen and Page-Croft left due to personal commitments after the vote to reject the Officer's recommendation.

Unanimously resolved (by 7 votes to 0) to refuse the application contrary to the officer recommendation for the following reasons:

- i. The north side of Cavendish Avenue is characterised by a mix of semi-detached and detached houses with established large rear gardens. The proposed dwelling would occupy a sizeable footprint within the rear garden of 45 Cavendish Avenue, and both the existing and proposed properties would have relatively small and constrained garden areas compared to surrounding houses in Cavendish Avenue. The proposed

development, by virtue of the design, scale and footprint of the dwelling, therefore fails to respond positively to its context and detracts from the character and appearance of the area, contrary to Policies 52, 55 and 57 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2018.

- ii. By virtue of the location of the dwelling relative to surrounding properties, the amenity spaces to the front and rear of the dwelling would be poorly lit and overlooked by houses in Cavendish Avenue and Magnolia Close respectively. The development therefore fails to provide an acceptable quality living environment and standard of amenity and privacy for future occupiers, contrary to Policies 50, 52, 56 and 57 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2018.

Resolved (3 votes to 3 with 1 abstention – and on the Chair’s casting vote) to discount the following reason for refusal: Drainage (reference Policies 31 and 32 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2018 and NPPF paragraph 163).

19/48/Plan 17/0705/FUL - The Bell Educational Trust Ltd, Red Cross Lane

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for installation of a replacement Multi Use Games Area (MUGA).

The Principal Planner corrected two errors in the Officer’s report:

- i. A Landscape Strategy compliance condition needed to be included.
- ii. A majority of the boundary fence was 4m high (not 3m).

The Committee received a representation in objection to the application from a local resident.

The representation covered the following issues:

- i. There were no other MUGAs close to developments ie flats/houses where people lived.
- ii. It was too close to residents and the public highway. This led to safety concerns. Sport England guidance said the MUGA should be located further away.
- iii. Implementing the MUGA would lead to a loss of light and view for residents.
- iv. The streetscene would be destroyed as trees were replaced with a very high fence.
- v. Noise from football games would impact on neighbouring properties.

- vi. Suggested there were errors and estimates in the noise report. The apartment block was incorrectly identified within the original documentation as 2 storey rather than 3 storey properties.

Ms Sutton (Applicant) addressed the Committee in support of the application.

Councillor McGerty (Queen Edith's Ward Councillor) addressed the Committee about the application:

- i. Thanked the Bell School for engaging with councillors and officers.
- ii. The MUGA was large. Referred to P7 & 8 of the drawing pack. Queried if the diagram showed how close the MUGA would be to local flats. The site context had changed since the tennis courts (MUGA site) were put in.
- iii. Suggested the flats would not have been built if it were clear they would have less amenity space (due to the MUGA).
- iv. S106 funding criteria required sports amenity space to be available to the Bell school and residents. The current segmented games area was acceptable. Queried why the segments needed to be combined into one large MUGA. This could cause more noise than the segmented games areas.

Councillor Pippas (Queen Edith's Ward Councillor) addressed the Committee about the application:

- i. The Bell School sold its football pitch and flats were then subsequently built. The flats would now be 4m away from the proposed wooden fence around the MUGA.
- ii. People bought the flats expecting one thing and could get another.
- iii. Suggested the MUGA was being developed to allow more flats to be put on the (former) football pitch land. Queried why other alternatives such as planting flowers could not be implemented.
- iv. The MUGA would create noise for flat occupiers.
- v. Residents were concerned that balls flying over the fence surrounding the MUGA would go into peoples' dwellings or onto the public highway.

Councillor Baigent left the committee as he felt unwell.

The Committee:

Unanimously resolved (by 6 votes to 0) to grant the application for planning permission in accordance with the officer recommendation, for the reasons set out in the officer report, and subject to the conditions recommended by the

officers, with an additional condition requiring compliance with the landscape plan and accompanying management strategy.

19/49/Plan 18/0907/FUL - 50 St Stephens Place and 51 Canterbury Street

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for the demolition of an office building and the erection of a development of nine flats.

The Committee received a representation in objection to the application from a St Stephen's Place resident.

The representation covered the following issues:

- i. Referred to speaking notes and attached diagram that were tabled at committee.
- ii. The scale and massing of the development constituted an over-development of site.
- iii. Requested the proposal be deferred until a daylight / sunlight study could be undertaken.
- iv. The application did not answer objections from the last iteration, which had been refused. There were unresolved concerns about car parking, access and the party wall.
- v. The application would affect the character of the area.

The Committee noted points in the written statement from Castle Ward Councillors Holt and Payne. The statement was tabled at committee. It referred to:

1. Significant reduction of light to St Stephen's Place and 51 Canterbury Street.
2. The proposed development would be out of character with the surrounding area.

The Committee:

Unanimously resolved (by 6 votes to 0) to grant the application for planning permission in accordance with the officer recommendation, for the reasons set out in the officer report, and subject to the conditions recommended by the officers.

19/50/Plan 19/0051/PIP - Cambridge and Huntingdon Health Authority, 18 Vinery Road

The Committee received an application for planning permission in principle.

The application sought approval for a residential development of 9 dwellings.

Mr Mead (Applicant's Agent) addressed the Committee in support of the application.

The Committee:

Unanimously resolved (by 6 votes to 0) to grant the application for planning permission in accordance with the officer recommendation, for the reasons set out in the officer report, and subject to the conditions recommended by the officers.

19/51/Plan 18/1945/FUL - Unit 2, 61 Ditton Walk

The Committee received an application for change of use from B1 to flexible B1/D1 use.

The Senior Planner corrected a typographical error in her report:

REFUSE for the following reasons:

1. The proposed flexible B1/D1 use does not guarantee the return of the **B1(c)** floorspace at the end of the 10 year period for the flexible permission. As a result the proposal has the potential to result in the loss of the **B1(c)** floor space contrary to policy 41 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2018).

Ms Joslyn (Applicant's Representative) addressed the Committee in support of the application.

The Committee:

Resolved (3 votes to 3 – and on the Chair's casting vote) to refuse the application for change of use in accordance with the officer recommendation, for the reasons set out in the officer report (amended above), and subject to the conditions recommended by the officers.

19/52/Plan 18/1353/FUL - Kingsway Clinic, Carlton Way

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for the conversion of former NHS Clinic into 4no. flats.

Councillor Green proposed an amendment to the Officer's recommendation to improve the boundary wall visual impact through a landscape condition. The Senior Planner suggested amending the boundary condition to include planting.

This amendment was **carried unanimously**.

The Committee:

Unanimously resolved (by 6 votes to 0) to grant the application for planning permission in accordance with the officer recommendation, for the reasons set out in the officer report, and subject to the conditions recommended by the officers and additional boundary treatment condition.

7. Prior to the occupation of the units, details of a boundary treatment for the flat adjacent to Carlton Way shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The boundary treatment should provide some defensible space for this occupier. The boundary treatment shall be completed in accordance with the approved details prior to the first occupation of the development (or other timetable agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority) and retained as approved thereafter.

Reason: To ensure an appropriate boundary treatment is implemented in the interests of visual amenity and privacy (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policies 55, 57 and 59).

19/53/Plan 18/0217/FUL - 82 Regent Street

The Committee received an application for change of use from Class A2 to Nail Treatment/Beauty Treatment Salon, sui generis.

The Committee:

Unanimously resolved (by 6 votes to 0) to grant the application for change of use in accordance with the officer recommendation, for the reasons set out

in the officer report, and subject to the conditions recommended by the officers.

19/54/Plan 18/1974/S73 - The Jenny Wren, 80 Campkin Road

The Committee received an application for Section 73 application.

The application sought approval for to vary condition 2 of permission 17/0927/FUL (New building comprising of a Public House at ground floor with nine residential units on the upper floors(two 1xbed units & seven studio units) along with car and cycle parking and associated landscaping following the demolition of the existing buildings) as follows:- 1) omission of the basement; relocation of bin and bike store to external structure and relocation of cellar from basement to former bin/bike store and2) increase in building height by 300mm.

Councillor Price (King's Hedges Ward Councillor) addressed the Committee about the application:

- i. The application was considered/approved under the previous Local Plan.
- ii. If the application came before committee now it would not meet Local Plan standards.
- iii. There was no reference to Policy 76 in the Officer's report, specifically 'cellerage'. Requested Policy 76 be applied to protect the pub.
- iv. Residents were concerned that the pub was incrementally being changed into housing. They were concerned over the loss of pubs in the city.
- v. Requested the application be deferred.
- vi. If the application were approved, a condition would be needed to require the pub to be open before residences were occupied.

The Committee:

Resolved (by 4 votes to 0) to grant the application for planning permission in accordance with the officer recommendation, for the reasons set out in the officer report, and subject to the conditions recommended by the officers.

19/55/Plan Odour Study

Matter for discussion

Cambridge City Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council commissioned consultants Odournet to undertake an Odour Impact Assessment, in order to assess the level and risk of odour impact posed by Cambridge Water Recycling Centre (CWRC) to both inform the North East Cambridge Area Action Plan and aid consideration of development proposals. That assessment had been completed.

To accompany the study, a technical note had been prepared jointly with Environmental Health to set out how officers intend to interpret the results of the Odournet Assessment.

Members of the three Committees (Joint Development Control Committee – Cambridge Fringes, Cambridge City Planning Committee and South Cambridgeshire DC Planning Committee) were asked to note both reports.

Discussions

The Committee received a report from the Senior Planning Policy Officer and the Urban Extensions Project Manager.

Councillor Blencowe said the report had been presented to the Joint Development Control Committee. If land owners wanted to develop their sites before the Area Action Plan was approved, or the Water Recycling Centre moved, the Officer's report set out assessment criteria for applications to be measured against.

The Urban Extensions Project Manager said an agent representing (affected) land owners had submitted a letter objecting to the report on the morning of committee. Officers would respond to this.

The Committee:

The Committee **unanimously** resolved to note the findings of the 'Odour Impact Assessment for Cambridge Water Recycling Centre (2018) (appendix A), and the Technical Note on interpretation of 'Odour Impact Assessment for Cambridge Water Recycling Centre' (October 2018) (Appendix B), for the purposes of considering planning applications in the vicinity.

The meeting ended at 5.25 pm

CHAIR

This page is intentionally left blank

PLANNING

24 April 2019
10.00 am - 3.45 pm

Present:

Planning Committee Members: Councillors Blencowe (Vice-Chair, in the Chair), Baigent, Green, Hipkin, McQueen, Nethsingha, Page-Croft, Thornburrow and Tunnacliffe

Councillor McQueen left after the consideration and vote on item 19/65/Plan

Officers:

Interim Planning Delivery Manager: Eileen Paterson
Principal Planner: Nigel Blazeby
Principal Planner: Lorraine Casey
Principal Planner: Tony Collins
Planning Officer: Mary Collins
Planning Technician: Alice Young
Senior Planning Officer: Lewis Tomlinson
Legal Adviser: Keith Barber
Committee Manager: Toni Birkin
Committee Manager: James Goddard

FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE COUNCIL
19/56/Plan Apologies

Apologies were received from Councillor Smart.

19/57/Plan Declarations of Interest

Name	Item	Interest
Councillor Baigent	19/59/Plan	Personal: Had objected to the application prior to becoming a councillor. He had made no statements on the Romsey Labour Club outside of Planning Committee since being elected.

		The committee were considering a new application today that was separate to the one he had commented on previously.
Councillor Thornburrow	19/62/Plan	Personal: Had requested that application be considered at Committee

19/58/Plan Minutes

The minutes of the meeting held on 3 April 2019 would be reviewed at a future meeting.

19/59/Plan 19/0004/FUL - Romsey Labour Club, Mill Road

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for serviced apartment (sui generis use class) scheme containing 39no self- contained 1xbed room units along with Cafe, gym and community space at ground floor with a vehicle drop-off zone, disabled car parking space, cycle parking and associated landscaping and retention of existing BLI frontage.

The Principal Planner updated his report by referring to details on the amendment sheet. He also updated text as follows:

4. Amend Condition 21 to read: 'The **operator of the** proposed serviced apartments shall keep records of the lengths of stay of all guests and shall retain them for 24 months. The said records shall be made available to the local planning authority on request, within seven days.

Mr McKeown (Applicant's Agent) addressed the Committee in support of the application.

Councillor Thornburrow proposed an amendment to the Officer's recommendation to include a sprinkler system informative.

This amendment was **carried unanimously**.

The Committee:

Resolved (by 5 votes to 4) to grant the application for planning permission in accordance with the officer recommendation, for the reasons set out in the officer report and amendment sheet, and subject to the conditions recommended by the officers subject to amendment of condition 21 which will include the additional words 'The operator of...' at the beginning of the condition. Also subject to the following informative:

INFORMATIVE: The applicant is strongly urged, in the interests of fire safety, to consider the installation of a sprinkler system in the development hereby approved.

19/60/Plan 19/0227/FUL - 23 Barrow Road

Withdrawn from the agenda.

19/61/Plan 19/0040/FUL - The Pavillion, Recreation Ground, Nightingale Avenue

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for the demolition of existing pavilion and construction of new pavilion and associated landscaping.

Ian Ross addressed the Committee in support of the application on behalf of the agent.

Councillor George Pippas (Queen Edith's Ward Councillor) addressed the Committee about the application as follows:

- i. Supportive of the application.
- ii. The existing building was is in a poor condition.
- iii. Facility would be used by many people.
- iv. Area currently lacks community space.
- v. Suggested that an outside tap or fountain would be beneficial.

County Councillor McGerty (Queen Edith's, Ward Councillor) addressed the Committee about the application as follows:

- i. Existing building needs to be replaced.
- ii. Acknowledged the collaborative process over the design had been impressive.
- iii. New toilets would be a useful addition.

- iv. However, some concerns had been raised.
- Loss of vegetation and impact on the street scene.
 - Residents would like the tree line reinstated.
 - Climate Change mitigations not robust enough.

Councillors proposed an additional condition to the Officer's recommendation regarding climate change mitigations and sustainability.

This amendment was **carried unanimously**.

The Committee:

Unanimously resolved to grant the application for planning permission in accordance with the officer recommendation, for the reasons set out in the officer recommendation and subject to an additional condition requiring details of sustainability measures to be used in the construction of the building.

19/62/Plan 18/0824/FUL - 2 Rayleigh Close

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for a two storey side and front extension, first floor front extension and single storey front and side extensions.

The Committee noted the amendment sheet and the correction to conditions.

The Committee received a representation in objection to the application from a local resident.

The representation covered the following issues:

- i. Has long term health conditions and had adapted her property to her needs.
- ii. Currently spends a lot of time in the garden or the garden room.
- iii. The application would mar the enjoyment of the garden area.
- iv. Proposed extension would be large and overbearing.
- v. Large tree in her garden would be damaged by the building.
- vi. Proposed building would be in close proximity to neighbouring houses.
- vii. Area had flooded in recent years and an additional building would increase the risk of future floods

Mr Paxton (Applicant's Agent) addressed the Committee in support of the application.

Councillor Robertson (Petersfield Ward Councillor) addressed the Committee about the application as follows:

- i. Ground level in the area was sloped with the applicant's property on a higher elevation than the neighbouring property. This would increase the feeling on overbearing and dominance.
- ii. Property might not be in a flood zone but the area had flooded in recent times.
- iii. The large tree would be damaged by the proximity of the proposed extension and any additional drainage in the area would further damage the root system.

An additional condition regarding drainage was proposed.

This amendment was **carried unanimously**.

The Interim Arboricultural Officer clarified her comments regarding the possible impact on the tree and explained how the construction method statement would be monitored during construction work.

The Committee:

Resolved (by 8 votes to 1) to grant the application for planning permission in accordance with the officer recommendation, for the reasons set out in the officer report, and subject to the conditions recommended by the officers with additional standard drainage condition to require a surface water drainage scheme and corrections to condition no. 5 as set out below.

Prior to occupation of the development, hereby permitted, the 1st floor windows on the eastern elevation shall be top hung and obscure glazed to a minimum level of obscurity to conform to Pilkington Glass level 3 or equivalent and shall have restrictors fitted to ensure that the windows cannot be opened more than 100mm beyond the plane of the adjacent wall. The glazing shall thereafter be retained in accordance with the approved details.

19/63/Plan 19/0248/FUL - Meadowcroft House, 16 Trumpinton Road

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for the erection of a one bed, one person dwelling and relocation of existing refuse store with associated landscaping and parking provision.

The Committee received a representation in objection to the application from a local resident.

The representation covered the following issues:

- i. Speaking on behalf of himself and other residents of nearby apartments.
- ii. Amenity of property would be damaged by increased noise and smells.
- iii. Open views would be lost.
- iv. Proposal does not confirm with minimum space standards.
- v. Parking ramp would be noisy.
- vi. Visual appearance would be out of character with the area.
- vii. Contrary to policies 52, 55 and 57.

The Committee:

Resolved (by 5 votes to 3 and 1 abstention) to grant the application for planning permission in accordance with the officer recommendation, for the reasons set out in the officer report, and subject to the conditions recommended by the officers.

19/64/Plan 18/1642/FUL - 4 Green End Road

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for a change of use from dwelling to 9-bedroom (10 person) HMO (sui generis) with single storey rear extension and associated alterations and detached cycle store.

The Committee noted the amendment sheet.

The Committee:

Unanimously resolved to grant the application for planning permission in accordance with the officer recommendation, for the reasons set out in the officer report, and subject to the conditions recommended by the officers.

19/65/Plan 19/0095/FUL - Land Rear of 17 Hills Avenue

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for the erection of a single storey dwelling with associated access and landscaping.

The Committee:

Resolved (by 8 votes to 0 with 1 abstention) to grant the application for planning permission in accordance with the officer recommendation, for the reasons set out in the officer report, and subject to the conditions recommended by the officers.

19/66/Plan 19/0155/FUL - Land R/O 3 and 5 Spalding Way

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for a single storey dwelling to the rear of 3 and 5 Spalding Way.

The Committee received a representation in objection to the application from a local resident.

The representation covered the following issues:

- i. Currently enjoying a peaceful retirement and spending considerable time in the garden and garden room.
- ii. Development would have a considerable impact on this space.
- iii. Noise issues from cars using what is currently a footpath.
- iv. Noise from residents of new property and the existing residents of number 3 and 5 who would have their outdoor space considerable reduced.
- v. Dominance and overbearing nature of the planned building.
- vi. Height of the extension an issue.
- vii. Current sewage system struggles to cope with current waste volume and has overflowed in recent times. Additional property would add to the problem.
- viii. Concerns regarding flooding.

Richard Ball (Applicant's Agent) addressed the Committee in support of the application.

Removal of Permitted Development Rights to prevent a future loft conversion was suggested.

Members of the Committee had a number of concerns regarding this application including, loss of amenity space for plots numbers 3 and 5, fire safety, scale of the proposal and overdevelopment.

The Committee:

Resolved (by 5 votes to 3 and 1 abstention) to reject the officer recommendation to approve the application.

The Chair canvassed the Committee for their reasons for refusal and on a show of hands the following were agreed:

1. Amenity of existing residents of number 3 and 5.
2. The height, form and layout of the proposal.

Resolved (by 5 votes to 2 with 1 abstention) to refuse the application contrary to the officer recommendation for the following reasons:

1. Spalding Way is characterised by semi-detached dwellings fronting the highway with established large rear gardens. The proposed dwelling would be sited within the rear gardens of Nos. 3 and 5 Spalding Way. The form, height and layout of the proposal would be out of character with the linear pattern of development in the area. As such the proposal is contrary to policies 52, 55 and 57 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2018.
2. The introduction of the proposed dwelling in the rear gardens of Nos. 3 and 5 Spalding Way would significantly reduce the garden sizes to these properties leaving them with an inadequate level of amenity space. Coupled with this, the introduction of the new dwelling would introduce activity through the movement of vehicles and people within a quiet garden environment that will further impact on the quality of these gardens through noise and general disturbance. This would result in an unacceptable level of amenity for the occupiers of Nos. 3 and 5 Spalding Way and as such the proposal is contrary to policies 52 and 56 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2018.

19/67/Plan 18/1685/FUL - 229 Milton Road

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for Construction of 1 No. 1 1/2 Storey Dwelling to land rear of No. 229 Milton Road, Cambridge.

Councillor Nethsingha proposed an amendment to the Officer's recommendation that to remove the requirement for obscure glazing to the bedroom.

This amendment was **carried unanimously**.

The Committee:

Unanimously resolved to grant the application for planning permission in accordance with the officer recommendation, for the reasons set out in the officer report, and subject to the conditions recommended by the officers. In addition, the reference to bedroom windows was removed from condition 8.

19/68/Plan 36/2018 - 5 Barrow Road

The Committee received an application to (1) confirm, or (2) not to confirm, or (3) to confirm subject to modification(s) the Tree Preservation Order 36/2018 that relates to a 5 Barrow Road.

The Committee:

Unanimously resolved to accept the officer recommendation and grant permission to confirm without modification the TPO that was the subject of the application.

19/69/Plan 37/2018 - 26 Newton Road

The Committee received an application to (1) confirm, or (2) not to confirm, or (3) to confirm subject to modification(s) the Tree Preservation Order 37/2018 that relates to a 26 Newton Road.

The Committee:

Unanimously resolved to accept the officer recommendation and grant permission to confirm without modification the TPO that was the subject of the application.

19/70/Plan 38/2018 - 156 Green End Road

The Committee received an application to (1) confirm, or (2) not to confirm, or (3) to confirm subject to modification(s) the Tree Preservation Order 38/2018 that relates to a 156 Green End Road.

The Committee:

Unanimously resolved to accept the officer recommendation and grant permission to confirm without modification the TPO that was the subject of the application.

19/71/Plan Farewell to Councillor Blencowe

The Committee thanked Councillor Blencowe for his services to the Planning Committee and praised his commitment and professionalism in the roles of Chair and Planning Committee Member.

The meeting ended at 3.45 pm

CHAIR

PLANNING COMMITTEE

11th June 2019

Application Number	18/0806/FUL	Agenda Item	
Date Received	18th May 2018	Officer	Nigel Blazeby
Target Date	17th August 2018		
Ward	Queen Ediths		
Site	291 Hills Road Cambridge CB2 8RP		
Proposal	Residential development containing 14 flats comprising 8 x 2-bed units and 6 x 1-bed units, along with access, car parking and associated landscaping following demolition of the existing buildings.		
Applicant	Gibson Developments Ltd		

SUMMARY	The development accords with the Development Plan for the following reasons: - The current proposal has responded to the reasons for refusal on the previous scheme (17/1372/FUL) which is a material consideration; - The proposal raises no new material issues in terms of the impact on residential amenity, response to context, transport or other matters. - Whilst affordable housing is a policy requirement it has been adequately demonstrated that it would not be viable to provide it.
RECOMMENDATION	APPROVAL

0.0 Update

- 0.1 Members may recall that the planning application was presented to the 29 August 2018 Planning Committee meeting and Members resolved to grant planning permission at that time.

- 0.2 The Previous Committee report and extract from the relevant Amendment Sheet are attached as Appendixes A and B.
- 0.3 Members had been advised that the proposal fell below the relevant affordable housing threshold contained within Policy 5/5 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 and as such no affordable housing was required.
- 0.4 Members may recall that on the same day, 29th August 2018, the Inspector's report into the [then emerging] 2018 Local Plan was published having the effect of requiring full weight to be afforded to policies in the Cambridge Local Plan 2018. This fact was not known to officers or Members at the time the Planning Committee was in session.
- 0.5 Following the 29 August 2018 planning committee the applicants were informed that, despite the resolution of the committee, the planning permission could not be issued due to the change in circumstances and the weight that now needed to be afforded to policies in the 2018 Local Plan.
- 0.6 The key change between the 2006 and 2018 Local Plan policies, of particular relevance to the proposal, is the reduction in the affordable housing threshold from 15 to 10. The proposal for 14 flats represents a net gain of 13 dwellings on the site which is now above the threshold and hence affordable housing is required.
- 0.7 The applicants have stated that it would be unviable to provide any affordable housing and later submitted a viability assessment in an attempt to demonstrate this.
- 0.8 The aim of this update report is to inform members of the outcome of the viability assessment alongside an assessment of the proposal against the key changes within the 2018 Local Plan.

1.0 SITE DESCRIPTION/AREA CONTEXT

- 1.1 The site comprises No. 291 Hills Road which is a detached property within a generous plot on the north western corner of the junction with Queen Edith's Way, also known as 'Raylands' The existing property is a substantial Edwardian building currently in use as a single dwellinghouse. Hills Road forms a

major route into the city. The character of this part of Hills Road is predominantly residential.

- 1.2 The existing dwelling is not a Listed Building and is not a Building of Local Interest. The site is not within a conservation area. There is a tree preservation order on the site which covers 11 trees on the southern and northern sides. The site is outside the controlled parking zone and the air quality management zone. There are no other relevant site constraints.

2.0 THE PROPOSAL

- 2.1 The proposal is for residential development containing 14 flats comprising 8 x 2-bed units and 6 x 1-bed units, along with access, car parking and associated landscaping following demolition of the existing buildings.
- 2.2 The full site description, summary of the proposal and details of the relevant planning history of the site are contained within the Aug 2018 planning committee report (attached as Appendix A to the report).

3.0 POLICY

- 3.1 See Appendix 1 for full details of Central Government Guidance, Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policies, Supplementary Planning Documents and Material Considerations.
- 3.2 Relevant Development Plan policies

PLAN		POLICY NUMBER
Cambridge	Local	1, 3, 28, 29, 31, 32, 34, 35, 36, 45, 50, 51, 52, 55, 56, 57, 59, 70, 71, 80, 81, 82, 85
Plan 2018		

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

Central Government Guidance	National Planning Policy Framework 2019 National Planning Policy Framework – Planning Practice Guidance March 2014 Circular 11/95 (Annex A)
Supplementary Planning Guidance	Sustainable Design and Construction (May 2007) Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Waste Partnership (RECAP): Waste Management Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (February 2012) Planning Obligation Strategy (March 2010)
Material Considerations	<u>City Wide Guidance</u> Cycle Parking Guide for New Residential Developments (2010)
	<u>Area Guidelines</u> Newnham Croft Conservation Area Appraisal (2013)

4.0 CONSULTATIONS

Cambridgeshire County Council (Highways Development Management)

- 4.1 The recently submitted information does not change the Highway Authority's previous comments.

Drainage Officer

- 4.2 Drainage has no further comments to make.

Environmental Health Officer

- 4.3 I can confirm that I have no concerns regarding the amended details and my memo (including commentary and recommended conditions) dated 1st June 2018 remains relevant.

- 4.4 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.

5.0 REPRESENTATIONS

- 5.1 The owners/occupiers of the following addresses have made representations objecting to the proposal since the 29th August Planning Committee:

- 2 Grantchester Road
- 14 Hartington Grove
- 77 Hartington Grove
- 271 Hills Road
- 276 Hills Road
- 299 Hills Road
- 7 Luard Close
- 35 Selwyn Gardens
- 234 Queen Ediths Way
- Hills Road Area and Queen Edith's Way Residents Association

- 5.2 The representations can be summarised as follows:

- 14 flats is an overdevelopment of the site
- The basement could result in subsidence on neighbouring properties
- Loss of a large family home
- Need for more large family homes not 1-2 bed flats
- Out of keeping with the character of the street as it is one of the main gateways to Cambridge
- Questions about the accuracy of the estimated revenues or costs within the viability assessment
- Highway Safety issues due to increase of traffic with the busy road/busy junction
- Increase in noise and disturbance as 22 people instead of 4
- Inadequate arrangements for Flat 1 in order to meet requirements of Building Regulations M4(3) for 'Wheelchair user dwellings'
- Loss of mature trees
- The basement construction plan would cause damage to the TPO trees due to the fence

- 5.3 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.

6.0 ASSESSMENT

- 6.1 The majority of the assessment is contained within the 29th August 2018 report. However, due to a change in the local policy, the main issues to consider in this report are:

1. Affordable Housing
2. Amenity for future occupiers of the site
3. Third party representations

Affordable Housing

- 6.2 The key change between the 2006 and 2018 Local Plan policies, of particular relevance to the proposal, is the reduction in the affordable housing threshold from 15 to 10. The proposal represents a net gain of 13 dwellings on the site which is now above the threshold and hence affordable housing is required.
- 6.3 The applicants have stated that it would be unviable to provide any affordable housing and later submitted a viability assessment in an attempt to demonstrate this. Their assessment concluded that:

Having considered all the information and modelled the development scenario, we conclude that this development, as proposed, produces a Residualised Price of £946,999 which is substantially below the Benchmark Land Value of £1.75 - £1.8 Million, before any upward adjustment for a premium is included, for the existing property and cannot therefore afford to make a contribution towards affordable housing in accordance with planning policy.

- 6.4 The Council appointed an Independent Consultant to review the submitted viability assessment. The consultant concluded in March 2019 that:

We have reviewed the Applicant's viability assessment which seeks to demonstrate that the proposed scheme cannot support any affordable housing as the scheme generates a deficit in the region of c. £0.80m to c. £0.85m. We have undertaken our own

assessment of the proposed scheme which generates a deficit of c. £0.38m. Consequently, the proposed scheme cannot support any affordable housing.

- 6.5 The Council has since received a revised conclusion from the Independent Consultant following further discussion with the Applicant in regards to various points of the March 2019 conclusion. The consultant has concluded in April 2019 that:

Following our March 2019 report, we have been instructed to reach an agreed final position with the Applicant and following further discussions with the Applicant we have made the following changes to our assessment summarised below:

- 1) Removal of the value of the car parking spaces of £210,000 as these are priced into the apartment sale values;*
- 2) Inclusion of NHBC warranty costs equating to c. £0.027m;*
- 3) Removal of ground rent income as the freehold will not be disposed of to an investor;*
- 4) Adjustment of S106 costs from £40,000 to £36,223.*

In conclusion, our revised appraisal generates a residual land value of c. £1.09m and when benchmarked against a site value of £1.70m the scheme generates a deficit of c. £0.61m (£608,401).

- 6.6 The Council published both the applicant's viability assessment and the independent review on the website and consulted with local residents and other interested parties.
- 6.7 Following the submission of a viability assessment, and the review of it by an independent consultant, it has been adequately demonstrated that it would not be viable to provide affordable housing as part of the development. It is to be noted that the S106 agreement shall include a clawback clause. This clause would ensure that if the development delivers more revenue than predicted within the viability assessment, the applicant will need to pay a financial contribution to the Council for the delivery of affordable housing off site.

Amenity for future occupiers of the site

- 6.8 Policy 50 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2018) sets out internal residential space standards. All of the units either comply or exceed the space standards. Therefore it is my opinion that the

units would provide a high quality internal living environment for the future occupants. The gross internal floor space measurements for units in this application are shown in the table below:

Unit	Number of bedrooms	Number of bed spaces (persons)	Number of storeys	Policy Size requirement (m ²)	Proposed size of unit	Difference in size
1	1	2	1	50	53	+3
2	2	3	1	61	60	0
3	1	2	1	50	60	+11
4	2	3	1	61	60	+1
5	2	3	1	61	72	+9
6	2	3	1	61	61	0
7	1	2	1	50	50	0
8	2	3	1	61	61	0
9	1	2	1	50	60	+11
10	2	3	1	61	60	0
11	1	2	1	50	60	+7
12	2	3	1	61	79	+18
13	2	3	1	61	75	+14
14	1	2	1	61	65	+4

6.9 Policy 50 of Cambridge Local Plan (2018) states that all new residential units will be expected to have direct access to an area of private amenity space.

6.10 All the proposed units will have direct access to an area of private amenity space in the form of a balcony or terrace. It is also to be noted, that the proposal includes a landscaped area to the north of the site for the occupants of the flats to enjoy.

6.11 In my opinion the proposal provides an acceptable 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 (2018) policy 50.

Accessible homes

6.12 The development has been assessed for compliance with Policy 51 in relation to the all the new units. I have recommended a condition to ensure the proposal complies with

the requirements of Part M4 (2) of the Building Regulations. Policy 51 does not require this type of development to provide any units that meet the requirements of Building Regulations M4 (3) 'wheelchair user dwellings'.

Third Party Representations

6.13 I have dealt with the third party representations in the table below.

Representation	Response
14 flats is an overdevelopment of the site	There is a need for a range of dwelling types across the City
The basement could result in subsidence on neighbouring properties	This is not a planning issue.
Loss of a large family home	I do not consider the proposal will appear cramped and the site makes good use of the land in providing 100% affordable housing
Need for more large family homes not 1-2 bed flats	There is a need for a range of dwelling types across the City.
Out of keeping with the character of the street as it is one of the main gateways to Cambridge	See paragraphs 8.28 – 8.38 of the 29th August 2018 report
The question is why would the developer plan to make deficit over £800,000 when they could sell the property for £1.75m to £1.80m? The developer paid £1,715,000 for the property, so would end up making a minimal loss, when stamp duty and other costs were taken into account.	The motives of the developer are not a planning issue.

Questions about the accuracy of the estimated revenues or costs within the viability assessment. The assessment fails to provide 'affordable housing revenue assumptions'.	The assessment has been independently reviewed by a consultant appointed by the Council and we accept the findings of the independent review. The findings indicate that a 100 percent market scheme is not viable, therefore it follows that a scheme providing affordable housing would also not be viable.
Highway Safety issues due to increase of traffic with the busy road/busy junction	See paragraph 8.64 of the 29th August 2018 report
Increase in noise and disturbance as 22 people instead of 4	See paragraphs 8.58 – 8.60 of the 29th August 2018 report
Inadequate arrangements for Flat 1 in order to meet requirements of Building Regulations M4(3) for 'Wheelchair user dwellings'	Policy 51 does not require this type of development to provide any units that meet the requirements of Building Regulations M4 (3) 'wheelchair user dwellings'
Loss of mature trees	See paragraph 8.67 of the 29th August 2018 report
The basement construction plan would cause damage to the TPO trees due to the fence	See paragraph 8.67 of the 29th August 2018 report. The Tree Officer comments were contained within the amendment sheet. The Tree Officer stated that the 'primary concern on this site is the impact of construction activity and in order to safeguard the healthy retention of trees during demolition and construction it will be necessary for all activity to adhere to a detailed and phased tree protection methodology written in accordance with the recommendations set out in BS 5837: 2012.' Various conditions have been recommended in line with this. As no changes have been made to the proposed development since these comments were received,

7.0 CONCLUSION

- 7.1 The applicant has demonstrated that it would not be viable to provide affordable housing as part of the development. I also consider that the proposal will comply with the policies Cambridge Local Plan 2018.

8.0 RECOMMENDATION

- 8.1 **APPROVE** subject to completion of the s106 Agreement 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 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended by 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 construction work or demolition work shall be carried out or plant operated other than between the following hours: 0800hours and 1800 hours on Monday to Friday, 0800 hours and 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 2018 policy 35).

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 0700 hrs and 1900 hrs on Monday Saturday and there should be no collections or deliveries on Sundays or Bank and public holidays.

Reason: To protect the amenity of the adjoining properties (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policy 35).

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: To protect the amenity of nearby properties (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policy 36).

6. No demolition or construction works shall commence on site until a traffic management plan has been submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 Policy 81).

7. In the event of the foundations for the proposed development requiring piling, no such piling shall take place until a report / method statement detailing the type of piling and mitigation measures to be taken to protect local residents noise and or vibration has been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority. 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. 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 (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policy 35).

8. 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 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 and prevent the pollution of controlled waters from potential pollutants associated with current and previous land uses in line with National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), paragraphs 109, 120, 121 and the Environment Agency's approach to groundwater protection (available at: <https://www.gov.uk/government/collections/groundwater-protection>).

9. Prior to commencement and in accordance with BS5837 2012, a phased tree protection methodology in the form of an Arboricultural Method Statement (AMS) and Tree Protection Plan (TPP) shall be submitted to the local planning authority for its written approval, before any tree works are carried and before equipment, machinery or materials are brought onto the site for the purpose of development (including demolition). In a logical sequence the AMS and TPP will consider all phases of construction in relation to the potential impact on trees and detail tree works, the specification and position of protection barriers and ground protection and all measures to be taken for the protection of any trees from damage during the course of any activity related to the development, including supervision, demolition, foundation design, storage of materials, ground works, installation of services, erection of scaffolding and landscaping.

Reason: To satisfy the Local Planning Authority that trees to be retained will be protected from damage during any construction activity, including demolition, in order to preserve arboricultural amenity in accordance with section 197 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and Cambridge Local Plan 2018 Policy 71: Trees.

10. The approved tree protection methodology will be implemented throughout the development and the agreed means of protection shall be retained on site until all equipment, and surplus materials have been removed from the site. Nothing shall be stored or placed in any area protected in accordance with approved tree protection plans, and the ground levels within those areas shall not be altered nor shall any excavation be made without the prior written approval of the local planning authority. If any tree shown to be retained is damaged, remedial works as may be specified in writing by the local planning authority will be carried out.

Reason: To satisfy the Local Planning Authority that trees to be retained will not be damaged during any construction activity, including demolition, in order to preserve arboricultural amenity in accordance with section 197 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and Cambridge Local Plan 2018 Policy 71: Trees.

11. Prior to the commencement of site clearance a pre-commencement site meeting shall be held and attended by the site manager, the arboricultural consultant and LPA Tree Officer to discuss details of the approved AMS.

Reason: To satisfy the Local Planning Authority that trees to be retained will not be damaged during any construction activity, including demolition, in order to preserve arboricultural amenity in accordance with section 197 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and Cambridge Local Plan 2018 Policy 71: Trees.

12. No demolition/development shall take place until the applicant, or their agents or successors in title, has secured the implementation of a programme of archaeological work in accordance with a written scheme of investigation (WSI) which has been submitted to and approved by the local planning authority in writing. For land that is included within the WSI, no demolition/development shall take place other than in accordance with the agreed WSI which shall include:
 - a) The statement of significance and research objectives;
 - b) The programme and methodology of site investigation and recording and the nomination of a competent person(s) or organisation to undertake the agreed works

- c) The programme for post-excavation assessment and subsequent analysis, publication & dissemination, and deposition of resulting material. This part of the condition shall not be discharged until these elements have been fulfilled in accordance with the programme set out in the WSI.

Developers will wish to ensure that in drawing up their development programme, the timetable for the investigation is included within the details of the agreed scheme.

Reason: To ensure that the significance of historic environment assets is conserved in line with NPPF section 12.

- 13. Prior to commencement of development (including demolition and site clearance), an ecological survey report shall be undertaken and submitted to the local planning authority for approval in writing. This shall include, as appropriate to the findings of the survey:
 - i. a construction environmental management plan (CEMP) including a risk assessment of potentially damaging construction activities, practical measures (both physical measures and sensitive working practices) to avoid or reduce impacts during construction, and details of responsible persons and lines of communication; and
 - ii. ecological mitigation measures to be provided on site.

Any approved CEMP shall be adhered to and implemented throughout the construction period strictly in accordance with the approved details, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the local planning authority. Any approved ecological mitigation measures shall be implemented prior to first occupation of the development hereby permitted (or in accordance with an alternative timescale that has been agreed in writing by the local planning authority) and retained as such thereafter.

Reason: To protect local wildlife (Policy 70 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2018)).

14. Prior to commencement of development (other than demolition), a surface water drainage works scheme in accordance with the submitted Drainage Statement by JPP Consulting, Revision B dated February 2018, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The submitted details shall:

- i. include results of infiltration testing in accordance with BRE Digest 365 should be submitted to the local planning authority to identify whether infiltration of the surface water runoff would be feasible;
- ii. be designed such that there is no surcharging for a 1 in 30 year event and no internal property flooding or flooding off site for a 1 in 100 year event + 40% an allowance for climate change;
- iii. include detailed drawings of the entire proposed surface water drainage system, including levels, gradients, dimensions and pipe reference numbers;
- iv. provide information about the design storm period and intensity, the method employed to delay and control the surface water discharged from the site and the measures taken to prevent pollution of the receiving groundwater and/or surface waters; and
- v. provide a management and maintenance plan for the lifetime of the development which shall include the arrangements for adoption by any public authority or statutory undertaker and any other arrangements to secure the operation of the scheme throughout its lifetime.

The surface water drainage scheme shall be completed in accordance with the agreed details prior to first occupation of the development, and shall be managed and maintained thereafter in accordance with the agreed details and the management and maintenance plan for the lifetime of the development.

The drainage scheme must adhere to the hierarchy of drainage options as outlined in the NPPF PPG.

Reason: To ensure appropriate surface water drainage (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policies 31 and 32).

15. No development above ground level, other than demolition, shall commence until full details of both hard and soft landscape works have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The 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); 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.

All hard and soft landscape works shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details. The works shall be carried out prior to the occupation of any part of the development or in accordance with a programme agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The maintenance shall be carried out in accordance with the approved schedule. Any trees or plants that, within a period of five years after planting, are removed, die or become in the opinion of the Local Planning Authority, seriously damaged or defective, shall be replaced as soon as is reasonably practicable with others of species, size and number as originally approved, unless the Local Planning Authority gives its written consent to any variation.

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 2018 policies 55, 57 and 59).

16. The dwellings hereby approved shall not be occupied until details of facilities for the covered, secured parking of bicycles for use in connection with the development hereby permitted have been submitted to and approved by the local planning authority in writing. The approved facilities shall be provided in accordance with the approved details before dwellings are occupied.

Reason: To ensure appropriate provision for the secure storage of bicycles (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policies 55, 56, and 82).

17. Prior to the commencement of construction of external surfaces, samples of the brick and hung tiles, and details of the brick mortar shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the agreed details thereafter.

Reason: To ensure that the external appearance of the development does not detract from the character and appearance of the area (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policies 55, 57 (for new buildings)).

18. Prior to the installation of balustrades, details of the materials and design shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the agreed details and retained as such thereafter.

Reason: To ensure that the external appearance of the development does not detract from the character and appearance of the area (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policies 55, 57 (for new buildings)).

19. Prior to the installation of windows, details of the window, glazing type and reveals shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the agreed details and retained as such thereafter.

Reason: To ensure that the external appearance of the development does not detract from the character and appearance of the area (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policies 55, 57 (for new buildings)).

20. The windows identified as having obscured glass on the approved plans shall be obscure glazed to a minimum level of obscurity to conform to Pilkington Glass level 3 or equivalent prior to first occupation of those units 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 2018 policies 55 and 58).

21. There shall be no access to the areas shown on the approved plans as 'green roof' other than for maintenance purposes. At no time shall these areas be used for amenity space.

Reason: In the interests of residential amenity (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policies 55 and 58).

22. Prior to first vehicular use of the vehicle access ramp hereby permitted, the roof covering the ramp shall be completed in accordance with the agreed details, and shall be retained as such thereafter.

Reason: In the interests of residential amenity (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policies 55 and 58)

23. Prior to the commencement of development (other than demolition and site clearance), a noise insulation scheme detailing the acoustic noise insulation performance/specification of the external building envelope to reduce the level of noise experienced in the residential units (having regard to the building fabric, glazing, ventilation, internal plant related noise and external balconies/terraces) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The scheme as approved shall be fully implemented and a completion report submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority prior to first occupation of the units. The approved scheme shall be retained as such thereafter.

To protect the amenity of future occupants of this property from the high ambient noise levels in the area (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policy 35).

24. Prior to commencement of use of the vehicular access hereby permitted, the access where it crosses the public highway shall be laid out and constructed in accordance with the Cambridgeshire County Council construction specification, or in accordance with alternative details that have been submitted to and agreed in writing by the local planning authority. The access shall be constructed with adequate drainage measures to prevent surface water run-off onto the adjacent public highway. The access shall be retained as such thereafter.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 Policy 81).

25. Prior to commencement of use of the vehicle access hereby permitted, the visibility splays, access and manoeuvring areas shall be provided as shown on the approved drawings. The areas within the visibility splays shall be kept clear of all planting, fencing, walls and the like exceeding 600mm high thereafter. The access and manoeuvring areas shall be maintained thereafter free of any obstruction that would prevent a domestic vehicle from being able to manoeuvre with ease so it may enter and leave the property in a forward gear.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 Policy 81)

26. Notwithstanding the provision of Class A of Schedule 2, Part 2 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 (as amended) (or any order revoking, amending or re-enacting that order) no gates shall be erected across the approved vehicular access unless details have first been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 Policy 81).

27. No unbound material shall be used in the surface finish of the driveway within 6 metres of the highway boundary of the site.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 Policy 81)

28. The on-site renewable and low carbon energy technologies as shown on the approved plans and as detailed in the '10% reduction in Carbon by LZC Onsite Energy or 10% Improvement in Energy Demand' letter from Green Heat Ltd dated 6 July 2017 shall be fully installed and operational prior to first occupation of the development (or in accordance with an alternative timescale agreed in writing by the local planning authority) and shall thereafter be maintained in accordance with a maintenance programme, which shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority prior to the occupation of the development. The technologies shall remain fully operational in accordance with the approved maintenance programme, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the local planning authority.

No review of this requirement on the basis of grid capacity issues can take place unless written evidence from the District Network Operator confirming the detail of grid capacity and its implications has been submitted to, and accepted in writing by, the local planning authority. Any subsequent amendment to the level of renewable technology provided on the site shall be in accordance with a revised scheme submitted to and approved in writing by, the local planning authority.

Reason: In the interests of reducing carbon dioxide emissions and to ensure that the development does not give rise to unacceptable pollution (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policy 29).

29. Prior to first occupation of the development, a water efficiency specification for each dwelling type, based on the Water Efficiency Calculator Methodology or the Fitting Approach sets out in Part G of the Building Regulations 2010 (2015 edition) shall be submitted to the local planning authority. This shall demonstrate that all dwellings are able to achieve a design standard of water use of no more than 110 litres/person/day. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the agreed details thereafter.

Reason: To ensure that the development makes efficient use of water and promotes the principles of sustainable construction (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policy 31 and Supplementary Planning Document 'Sustainable Design & Construction' 2007).

30. Notwithstanding the approved plans, all flat roofed elements within the development shall be green or brown roofs. No development above ground level, other than demolition, shall commence until full details of these green or brown roofs have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority and these works shall be carried out as approved. The details shall include details of build-ups, make up of substrates, planting plans for biodiverse roofs, methodologies for translocation strategy and drainage details where applicable. The green roofs shall be installed in accordance with the approved details and shall be maintained thereafter.

Reason: In the interests of responding suitably to climate change and water management (Cambridge Local Plan 2018; Policy 31).

31. Notwithstanding the approved plans, the building, hereby permitted, shall be constructed to meet the requirements of Part M4(2) 'accessible and adaptable dwellings' of the Building Regulations 2010 (as amended 2016).

Reason: To secure the provision of accessible housing (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policy 51).

INFORMATIVE:

To satisfy the condition requiring the submission of a program of measures to control airborne dust above, the applicant should have regard to:

-Council's Supplementary Planning Document - "Sustainable Design and Construction 2007":

<http://www.cambridge.gov.uk/public/docs/sustainable-design-and-construction-spd.pdf>

-Guidance on the assessment of dust from demolition and construction:

http://iaqm.co.uk/wp-content/uploads/guidance/iaqm_guidance_report_draft1.4.pdf

- Air Quality Monitoring in the Vicinity of Demolition and Construction Sites 2012

http://www.iaqm.co.uk/wp-content/uploads/guidance/monitoring_construction_sites_2012.pdf

-Control of dust and emissions during construction and demolition - supplementary planning guidance:

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.

- 8.2 **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.**

This page is intentionally left blank

18/0806/FUL – Appendix A

PLANNING COMMITTEE

29th August 2019

Application Number	18/0806/FUL	Agenda Item	
Date Received	18th May 2018	Officer	Charlotte Burton
Target Date	17th August 2018		
Ward	Queen Ediths		
Site	291 Hills Road Cambridge CB2 8RP		
Proposal	Residential development containing 14 flats comprising 8 x 2-bed units and 6 x 1-bed units, along with access, car parking and associated landscaping following demolition of the existing buildings.		
Applicant	N/A C/O Agent		

SUMMARY	The development accords with the Development Plan for the following reasons: The current proposal has responded to the reasons for refusal on the previous scheme (17/1372/FUL) which is a material consideration; The proposal raises no new material issues in terms of the impact on residential amenity, response to context, transport or other matters.
RECOMMENDATION	APPROVAL

1.0 SITE DESCRIPTION/AREA CONTEXT

- 1.1 The site comprises No. 291 Hills Road which is a detached property within a generous plot on the north western corner of the junction with Queen Edith's Way, also known as 'Raylands' The existing property is a substantial Edwardian building currently in

use as a single dwellinghouse. Hills Road forms a major route into the city. The character of this part of Hills Road is predominantly residential.

- 1.2 The existing dwelling is not a Listed Building and is not a Building of Local Interest. The site is not within a conservation area. There is a tree preservation order on the site which covers 11 trees on the southern and northern sides. The site is outside the controlled parking zone and the air quality management zone. There are no other relevant site constraints.

2.0 THE PROPOSAL

- 2.1 The proposal is for residential development containing 14 flats comprising 8 x 2-bed units and 6 x 1-bed units, along with access, car parking and associated landscaping following demolition of the existing buildings. Flat 1 would be an accessible unit.
- 2.2 The proposed building would take the form of two 'villas' with a glazed link. The main entrance to the units would be within the glazed link fronting Queen Edith's Way, with a secondary entrance on the Hills Road frontage. Externally, the scheme would substantially have the same appearance as the previously refused scheme 17/1372/FUL (see planning history below). I have outlined the differences below.
- 2.3 The 'villas' would be predominantly two storeys plus a pitched roof storey above. There would be lower one-and-a-half and two storey elements on the northern and eastern sides. The design includes recessed balconies, roof terraces and green roofs, as well as mock chimney stacks and a projecting 'turret' of balconies on the south west corner. The materials would be red/brown brick with hung tiles and glazing.
- 2.4 Vehicular access would be via Queen Edith's Way and a pedestrian/cycle access taken from the existing access off Hills Road. A covered ramp would provide access into the basement which provides 14 residents' car parking spaces (including one disabled space for Flat 1) and two visitor spaces, (including one disabled space). One accessible visitor car parking space would be provided at the surface level close to the main entrance.

- 2.5 A cycle store would be integrated into the ground floor close to the main entrance to the building. It would provide space for 26 cycles on Sheffield hoops. 8 visitor cycle parking spaces would be provided with four spaces provided on Sheffield hoops close to the main entrance and four spaces provided near to the secondary entrance. A timber bin store would be provided close to Queen Edith's Way with capacity for 6 x 1100 litre bins.
- 2.6 The landscaping scheme includes the retention of 11 mature trees on the site and replacement planting on the boundaries. The site would be laid out to provide informal communal spaces around the building. A wire grid for climbing plants is shown on the northern elevation.
- 2.7 The main differences between the current proposal and the previous application (17/1372/FUL) are listed below and covered in more detail in the assessment section of this report:
- Reduction in the number of units from 15 to 14 dwellings.
 - Rearrangement of the residents' cycle parking from the basement to ground level. Associated alterations to the external elevations to include obscure glazing on ground floor elevation.
 - Increase in the floor space of small units.
 - Visitor car parking space at surface level.

3.0 SITE HISTORY

- 3.1 The planning history comprises:

Reference	Description	Outcome
18/0715/DEMDET	Prior notification of the demolition of a two storey detached dwelling.	Prior approval required as to the method of demolition and site restoration
17/1372/FUL	Residential development containing 15 flats comprising 8 x 2-bed units and 7 x 1-bed units, along with access, car parking and associated landscaping following	Refused

	demolition of the existing buildings	
C/90/0371	CHANGE OF USE (FROM RESIDENTIAL DWELLING HOUSE (C3) TO GUEST HOUSE (C1)).	Withdrawn
C/65/0515	Erection of detached house or bungalow with garage	Permitted

3.2 The recent application 17/1372/FUL was refused by committee on the following grounds:

1. The proposal fails to provide affordable housing to meet housing needs in accordance with the requirements of policy 5/5 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2006) and Paragraph 30 of the Affordable Housing Supplementary Planning Document (2008) which requires the threshold for providing affordable housing (as set out in policy 5/5) to be considered as the gross number of dwellings proposed where the site consists of the site of a single dwelling.
2. The proposal would provide inconvenient and poorly accessible residents' cycle parking which fails to comply with the Cycle Parking Guide for New Residential Developments (2010) and Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 8/6, 3/7 and 3/12.
3. The proposal would provide cramped accommodation which fails to provide a high quality living environment for the future occupants contrary to Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policy 3/7 and paragraph 56 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2012).
4. The proposed site layout design fails to provide arrangements for visitor car parking contrary to Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policy 8/10, which would create an inconvenient and poorly accessible situation for visitors contrary to Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 3/7, 3/11 and 3/12.

3.3 The refused application is a material consideration that is relevant in the assessment of the current application. I have referred to the refused application in the assessment section of my report below.

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
		4/3 4/4 4/9 4/13
		5/1 5/10 5/14
		8/2 8/6 8/10
		10/1

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

Central Government Guidance	National Planning Policy Framework July 2018 National Planning Policy Framework – Planning Practice Guidance March 2014 Circular 11/95 (Annex A)
Supplementary Planning Guidance	Sustainable Design and Construction (May 2007) Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Waste Partnership (RECAP): Waste Management Design Guide Supplementary Planning

	Document (February 2012) Affordable Housing (January 2008) Planning Obligation Strategy (March 2010)
Material Considerations	<u>City Wide Guidance</u> Arboricultural Strategy (2004) Biodiversity Checklist for Land Use Planners in Cambridgeshire and Peterborough (March 2001). Cambridge Landscape and Character Assessment (2003) Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (November 2010) Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (2005) Cambridge and Milton Surface Water Management Plan (2011) Cambridge City Council (2011) - Open Space and Recreation Strategy Balanced and Mixed Communities – A Good Practice Guide (2006) Cycle Parking Guide for New Residential Developments (2010)

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 should be taken into account.

6.0 CONSULTATIONS

Cambridgeshire County Council (Highways Development Management)

- 6.1 No objection. The proposal should have no significant impact on the public highway. Recommend conditions for unbound material, removal of permitted development rights for gates, construction specification, access drainage, visibility splays, access and manoeuvring areas, removal of redundant vehicle crossover, and construction traffic management plan; and accompanying informatives.

Environmental Health

- 6.2 No objection subject to conditions on construction hours, collection during construction, piling, dust and noise insulation. Adequate ventilation can be provided by use of whole house mechanical ventilation. This will allow the future occupiers to be able to control internal thermal comfort and cooling without compromising acceptable internal noise levels. Noise mitigation is required for the proposed balconies, which should be secured through the noise insulation condition. The proposed hammer driven / impact piling is not recommended in residential locations and alternative methods should be sought through the piling condition.

Refuse and Recycling

- 6.3 No objection.

Urban Design and Conservation Team

- 6.4 No objection to minor changes compared to the previous scheme which are considered to be acceptable in urban design terms.

Senior Sustainability Officer (Design and Construction)

- 6.5 No objection. Recommend conditions for renewable energy implementation and water efficiency.

Access Officer

- 6.6 No further comments to the Disability Panel's response.

Head of Streets and Open Spaces (Tree Team)

- 6.7 No comments received on the current application.

Head of Streets and Open Spaces (Landscape Team)

- 6.8 No objection. The outline landscape treatments are generally acceptable. Recommend a condition for hard and soft landscaping details, boundary details and a landscape management and maintenance plan. It is unclear how the hedge treatment around the periphery of the site is to be completed and/or installed. Detailed information regarding planting methodology and how the existing vegetation is to be either integrated or replaced needs to be provided within any condition submission information. Highly invasive methods such as trench planting will be unlikely to be supportable in respect of protecting retained trees and/or vegetation.

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

- 6.9 No comments received.

Cambridgeshire County Council (Flood and Water Management)

- 6.10 No objection subject to condition for surface water drainage scheme and maintenance arrangements.

Head of Streets and Open Spaces (Sustainable Drainage Officer)

- 6.11 No objection subject to condition for surface water drainage scheme. All new or altered external surfaces within the site boundary should be of permeable construction. The geocellular storage may need to be moved further north to ensure a gravity outfall can be achieved.

Head of Streets and Open Spaces (Public Art Officer)

- 6.12 The development should require a public art proposal.

Environment Agency

- 6.13 No objection. Refer to Flood Risk Standing Advice.

Anglian Water

- 6.14 The surface water strategy/flood risk assessment submitted with the planning application relevant to Anglian Water is unacceptable. No evidence has been provided to show that the surface water hierarchy has been followed. Recommend a condition for a surface water management strategy.

Cambridgeshire Constabulary (Architectural Liaison Officer)

- 6.15 No objection. There has been some consideration to crime prevention. Concerns regarding visitor cycle storage which appears to be away from the main part of the development and should be moved closer to the visitor car parking. Recommend a condition for external lighting.

Developer Contributions Monitoring Unit

- 6.16 See section below headed Planning Obligations (s106 Agreement).

Disability Panel meeting on 31 July

- 6.17 The scheme is described as 'compliant with current Approved Document Part M of the Building Regulations. External surfaces will be paved in a smooth hard material suitable for use by wheelchairs. All doors are to have level thresholds which will be of a sufficient width to facilitate wheelchair access. An internal lift is

to be provided of sufficient size (internal car size 1800x1800mm) for use by a wheelchair user and attendant. Control buttons are to be at a height suitable for wheelchair users and will include tactile indications. The lift will also incorporate a visual and audible indication of the floor reached. One unit, provided at ground floor level, is to be fully accessible and WC accommodation in all flats has been designed for use by the visiting disabled. Light switches, electrical socket outlets and intercom door entry systems are to be located at a height suitable for disabled use.' This is encouraging for a scheme of this scale, as larger developments often fail to meet appropriate standards. Further consideration could nevertheless be given to the design of the accessible unit, such as quality of the bathroom space, the style of door used (the Panel would recommend a sliding door) and the relationship between the bedroom and bathroom which ideally should be an ensuite for maximum convenience. Look to Lifetime Homes compliance for flexibility and adaptability.

- 6.18 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 to the proposal:

• 15 Almoners Avenue	• 209 Hills Road
• 11 Alwyne Road	• 224 Hills Road
• 2 Babraham Road	• 248 Hills Road
• 24 Baldock Way	• 250 Hills Road
• 21 Bowers Croft	• 251 Hills Road
• 2B Cavendish Avenue	• 267 Hills Road
• 4 Chalk Grove	• 269 Hills Road
• 3 Corfe Close	• 271 Hills Road
• 42 Devonshire Road	• 272 Hills Road
• 6 Golding Road	• 276 Hills Road
• 16 Grantchester Road	• 277 Hills Road
• 24 Green Street	• 278 Hills Road
• 14 Hartington Grove	• 282 Hills Road
• 77 Hartington Grove	• 284 Hills Road
• 10 Hills Avenue	• 289 Hills Road

- Dwelling to rear of 289 Hills Road
- 292A Hills Road
- 295 Hills Road
- 296 Hills Road
- 301 Hills Road
- 25 Holbrook Road
- 83 Holbrook Road
- 5 Knightly Avenue
- 8 Queen Edith's Way
- 1a Queen Edith's Way
- 12 Queen Edith's Way
- 23 Queen Edith's Way
- 67 Queen Edith's Way
- 222 Queen Edith's Way
- 234 Queen Edith's Way
- 67 Rock Road
- 35 Selwyn Gardens
- 1 Stansgate Avenue
- 29 Urwin Gardens
- 1 Pearson Court, Milton

7.2 The representations can be summarised as follows:

Principle

- No justification for demolition. The building appears to be in good condition. The developer has not explored any options to retain, convert and/or extend the building.
- Loss of family housing. Proposed flats would not meet housing demand.
- The proposal avoids affordable housing contributions by reducing the number of units.
- Concerns about use as house in multiple occupation.

Character

- The existing dwelling has architectural, historical and social importance as well as group value.
- The proposal would be out of character with the area, in terms of scale and massing, architectural style and materials, and would be a characterless and bland proposal that would not have a positive impact on such a prominent location on major route into the city.

Transport impact

- Impact on highway safety and congestion, pollution and accidents.
- Impact of demand for parking on roads, cycle lane and pavement.
- Traffic at the junction needs modelling.

- Impact of construction traffic on highway safety and contractors parking on verge
- The site is in an unsustainable location.
- Plans do not show the entrance to the Devonshire House Dental Practice opposite the proposed entrance.

Environment

- Loss of trees and greenery on the character of the area and amenity value.
- Impact on the long term health and future of the trees retained or planted.
- Damage to trees during construction, in particular excavation of the basement.
- Impact on biodiversity.
- Impact on climate change resilience.
- The proposal includes few sustainable features to reduce carbon emissions and save water.
- Demolition of existing dwelling is unsustainable.

Impact on neighbours

- Adverse impact on the amenity of the immediate neighbours through loss of privacy, perception of overlooking, overbearing sense of enclosure, light pollution from the atrium, in particular No. 289 and the dwelling to the rear of No. 289
- Deciduous trees offer only partial screening and do not extend along the entire boundary with the neighbouring properties.
- Even narrow windows would result in loss of privacy to neighbouring properties.
- The dwelling to the rear of No. 289 is a separate dwelling and pays Council Tax as such.

Amenity of future occupiers

- Inadequate noise assessment.
- Inaccessible cycle parking. No provision for non-standard bicycles, such as cargo cycles.

Other

- Concerns about pre-determined outcomes and transparency.
- Developer profit. No benefits to the local community.

7.3 The Hills Road Area Residents Association and Queen Edith's Way Residents Association have submitted detailed representations objecting to the proposal on the following grounds: no justification for demolition, out of character with the area, impact on the amenities of neighbouring properties, concerns about trees, impact on traffic congestion, accidents, noise and air pollution, and meeting housing needs.

7.4 The application has been called-in to the planning committee by Councillors McGerty (Ward Councillor) on the grounds of the impact on the safety and congestion of the highway. Cllrs McGerty and Pippas (Ward Councillor) have submitted a joint representation objecting on the same grounds as raised by the residents' associations.

7.5 A petition for a Development Control Forum (DCF) was received. The lead petitioner was 248 Hills Road and the petition was supported by 27 signatories objecting to the proposal. The petitioners' grounds for requesting the DCF can be summarised as:

- There is no case for demolishing "Raylands" (policy 5/4 of CLP 2006).
- The plans do not safeguard environmental character (policy 3/3 of CLP 2006).
- The application does not respond to the local context (policy 3/4 of CLP 2006).
- Cramped living accommodation (policy 3/7 of CLP 2006).
- The development would have a significant adverse impact on the amenities of neighbouring properties, provide inadequate amenity space, detract from the prevailing character and appearance of the area, and adversely affect trees (policy 3/10 of CLP 2006).
- A negative impact on the local setting (policy 3/12 of CLP 2006).
- Damage to trees (policy 4/4 of CLP 2006).
- Adverse effects on health and the environment (policy 4/13 of CLP 2006).
- No provision for affordable housing (policy 5/5 of CLP 2006).

- Unacceptable transport impact (policy 8/2 of CLP 2006).

7.6 The DCF was held on 8 August. A copy of minutes is attached as an **appendix** to this report. I have responded to the petitioners grounds above in the 'Third Party' section of my assessment below. During the DCF, the following queries were also raised by Cllr McGerty (Ward Councillor), which I have also responded to in my assessment.

- Is the applicant able to provide a Tree Protection Method statement as part of the planning application?
- Is the applicant able to provide a detailed plan of new planting and make this a firm undertaking during the planning process?
- Could the grass verges on Queen Edith's Way be protected with Heras fences during construction?

7.7 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 Due to the substantial similarities between the current scheme and the previous scheme (17/1372/FUL), the previous decision is a material consideration that I must give significant weight to. As such, I must concentrate my assessment on the changes that the applicant has made to overcome the previous reasons for refusal. These are in summary affordable housing provision, cramped living accommodation, inadequate residents' cycle parking, and inadequate visitor car parking. I have assessed these first below.

8.2 Other matters such as the impact on the character of the area and the impact on residential amenity – which were previously considered to be acceptable and not reasons for refusal - I must consider in terms of the changes that are proposed under the current application and whether these have an unacceptable impact compared to the previous scheme. For completeness, I have provided a full assessment of the material considerations in the second section below.

Assessment against reasons for refusal 17/1372/FUL

Affordable housing

8.3 The reason for refusal on the previous application stated:

The proposal fails to provide affordable housing to meet housing needs in accordance with the requirements of policy 5/5 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2006) and Paragraph 30 of the Affordable Housing Supplementary Planning Document (2008) which requires the threshold for providing affordable housing (as set out in policy 5/5) to be considered as the gross number of dwellings proposed where the site consists of the site of a single dwelling.

8.4 The refused scheme proposed 15 units following the loss of a single dwelling on the site, resulting in a net gain of 14 units. Policy 5/5 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2006) states that developments on sites of 0.5 hectares or more and all developments including an element of housing which have 15 or more dwellings will only be permitted if they provide an agreed mix of affordable housing types to meet housing needs. The Council will seek as affordable housing 40% or more of the dwellings or an equivalent site area.

8.5 The Affordable Housing Supplementary Planning Document (2008) provides further guidance on the interpretation of policy 5/5. Paragraph 30 of the SPD states:

In considering whether a development meets the threshold for providing affordable housing, it is the net increase in the number of dwellings on a site that will be considered, except where the site consists of the site of a single dwelling (discounting any subsidiary dwellings such as those for a dependent relation or domestic assistant), when the gross number of new dwellings will be considered. The intention is to lessen the financial penalty involved in the redevelopment of existing housing areas and buildings, which are often built to low sustainability standards and which often use land inefficiently, but not to incentivise the loss of large single-family dwelling houses which are limited in numbers within the City.

8.6 The Committee gave weight to paragraph 30 of the SPD when applying policy 5/5 on the previous application and as the previous scheme provided a gross number of 15 new dwellings, was

refused on the basis that it failed to provide affordable housing to meet housing needs.

- 8.7 The current proposal would provide 14 units following the demolition of the existing dwelling. Thus the gross number of new dwellings would be 14 (rather than 15). In accordance with paragraph 30 of the SPD, this would not trigger the requirement for affordable housing contributions under policy 5/5.

- 8.8 Paragraph 31 of the SPD goes on to say:

New housing developments should make efficient use of land. Where developments use land inefficiently to avoid having to provide any affordable housing, planning permission is likely to be refused. Regard will be had to the density recently achieved in comparable development elsewhere in Cambridge and to the 30 dwellings per hectare (dph) net national indicative minimum in making this assessment.

- 8.9 In my opinion, the current proposal does not represent an inefficient use of land. The revised scheme has responded to the concerns raised in the other reasons for refusal by using more ground floor space for cycle parking and increasing the size of the units. The proposal has retained the same building envelope as the previous scheme, so the need to respond to these other issues has reduced the number of units. The site area is 0.2ha and the proposal would have a density of 70 dph, not taking into account the constraints of the site in terms of maintaining the mature trees and character of the site which reduce the developable area.

- 8.10 For these reasons, in my opinion the current proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 5/5 and 10/1 and the Affordable Housing SPD (2008).

Cramped living accommodation

- 8.11 The reason for refusal on the previous application stated:

The proposal would provide cramped accommodation which fails to provide a high quality living environment for the future occupants contrary to Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policy 3/7 and paragraph 56 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2012).

8.12 The Council has no adopted space standards, however the national Technical Housing Standards (2015) (THS) are a material consideration and provide guidance on acceptable living accommodation and residential amenity for the future occupants.

8.13 For reference, I have provided the floor spaces from the previous scheme which were considered by the Committee to be unacceptable below:

Unit	Beds	Floor space (sqm)	THS (sqm)	Difference (sqm)
Flat 1	1-bed (2 persons)	44	50	-4
Flat 2	1-bed (2 persons)	45	50	-5
Flat 3	2-bed (3 persons)	64	61	+3
Flat 4	1-bed (2 persons)	54	50	+4
Flat 5	2-bed (3 persons)	60	61	-1
Flat 6	2-bed (3 persons)	71	61	+10
Flat 7	2-bed (3 persons)	58	61	-3
Flat 8	1-bed (2 persons)	45	50	-5
Flat 9	2-bed (3 persons)	64	61	+3
Flat 10	1-bed (2 persons)	58	50	+8
Flat 11	2-bed (3 persons)	59	61	-2
Flat 12	1-bed (2 persons)	56	50	+4
Flat 13	2-bed (3 persons)	79	61	+18
Flat 14	2-bed (3 persons)	75	61	+14
Flat 15	1-bed (2 persons)	62	50	+12

8.14 I have provided the floor spaces for the current proposal below, including the external amenity spaces. The floor spaces meet the THS or are within 1 sqm. In my opinion, the floor space would provide a good level of residential amenity, particularly combined with the external amenity space for each unit and the quality of the internal spaces in terms of light and outlook.

Unit	Beds	Floor space (sqm) internal + external	THS (sqm)	Difference (sqm)
Flat 1	1-bed (2 persons)	53 + 7	50	+3
Flat 2	2-bed (3 persons)	60 + 4	61	-1
Flat 3	1-bed (2 persons)	60 + 4	50	+10
Flat 4	2-bed (3 persons)	60 + 4	61	-1
Flat 5	2-bed (3 persons)	72 + 4	61	+11
Flat 6	2-bed (3 persons)	61 + 7	61	0
Flat 7	1-bed (2 persons)	50 + 4	50	0
Flat 8	2-bed (3 persons)	61 + 4	61	0
Flat 9	1-bed (2 persons)	60 + 4	50	+10
Flat 10	2-bed (3 persons)	60 + 4	61	-1
Flat 11	1-bed (2 persons)	60 + 4	50	+10
Flat 12	2-bed (3 persons)	79 + 28	61	+18
Flat 13	2-bed (3 persons)	75 + 4	61	+14
Flat 14	1-bed (2 persons)	65 + 4	61	+4

	persons)			

- 8.15 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.

Inadequate residents' cycle parking

- 8.16 The previous scheme had residents' cycle parking within the basement car park. This was refused on the following grounds:

The proposal would provide inconvenient and poorly accessible residents' cycle parking which fails to comply with the Cycle Parking Guide for New Residential Developments (2010) and Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 8/6, 3/7 and 3/12.

- 8.17 The current proposal has relocated the residents' cycle parking to a store on the ground floor. The store includes space for 26 cycles, which exceeds the Council's adopted cycle parking standards by two spaces. The dimensions of the store and the spacing of the stands meets the Council's Cycle Parking Guide for New Residential Developments (2010). A 1.2m wide door would provide access to the store from the front elevation near to the main entrance. This would be a convenient location and I am satisfied the store would provide a useable facility. In my opinion, the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policy 8/6.

Inadequate visitor car parking

- 8.18 The final reason for refusal of the previous scheme was as follows:

The proposed site layout design fails to provide arrangements for visitor car parking contrary to Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policy 8/10, which would create an inconvenient and poorly accessible situation for visitors contrary to Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 3/7, 3/11 and 3/12.

- 8.19 The current proposal includes a visitor car parking space on the surface level close to the main entrance, as well as two additional visitor spaces within the basement car park. The surface space

would be accessible for disabled visitors, and a further disabled space would be provided for the accessible unit (Flat 1) and one of the two visitor spaces within the basement would also be accessible. In my opinion, the surface level visitor space would provide a convenient arrangement for drop-offs and deliveries. The basement spaces could be used for planned visitors. The proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policy 8/10.

Summary

8.20 For these reasons, in my opinion the current proposal has overcome the reasons for refusal on the previous application.

Other material considerations

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

1. Principle of development
2. Affordable housing / Housing mix
3. Context of site, design and external spaces
4. Disabled access
5. Residential amenity
6. Refuse arrangements
7. Transport Impact
8. Highway safety
9. Car and cycle parking
10. Trees
11. Ecology
12. Surface water drainage
13. Renewable energy and sustainability
14. Public Art
15. Planning Obligations (s106 Agreement)

Principle of development

8.22 The principle of development was not a reason for refusal of the previous scheme. The existing property is not a Listed Building and is not within a conservation area. The demolition of the existing building would be permitted development under Class B, Part 11, Schedule 2 of The Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended),

subject to prior approval from the local planning authority as to the method of demolition and any proposed restoration of the site. Thus, the principle of demolition cannot be resisted and therefore is acceptable in principle.

8.23 Policy 5/1 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2006) supports residential development on windfall sites, subject to the existing land use and compatibility with adjoining uses. The site is already in residential use and is situated within an established residential area. I have assessed the compatibility of the proposal with adjoining uses in terms of the impact on neighbouring properties and the wider area in the relevant section of my assessment below. In summary, I find this to be acceptable and therefore the principle of development is compliant with policy 5/1.

8.24 Third parties have referred to policy 3/10 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2006) which relates to the sub-division of existing plots and to developments within the curtilage of existing properties. While the site is currently a single dwelling and the proposal would create multiple-dwellings, I do not consider that this policy strictly applies to the proposal, as the existing dwelling would not be retained alongside the proposed development. Nonetheless, the aims of policy 3/10 in terms of protecting the amenities of neighbouring properties, providing acceptable amenity for the future occupants, the impact on the character of the area, and impact on trees and wildlife have been fully assessed in my report below in relation to other policies within the development plan, and I find these to be acceptable.

Affordable housing / Housing mix

8.25 I have addressed the affordable housing in relation to the previous reason for refusal in my assessment above, and I consider this to be acceptable.

8.26 Third parties have objected to the proposed flats rather than family housing on the grounds that it does not meet local housing demand and that there is evidence of over-provision of flats within the area with several recent flatted developments standing empty. Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policy 5/10 requires housing development on sites of 0.5ha or more, or capable of accommodating 15 or more dwellings to provide a mix of dwelling sizes, measured in the number of bedrooms. As the current

proposal is for 14 units and the site area is 0.2ha, this policy does not apply.

- 8.27 Nonetheless, the supporting text to policy 5/10 explains that the purpose is to create mixed and inclusive communities offering a choice of housing and lifestyle. In my opinion, the proposed mix of 1 and 2-bed flats would be suitable for a range of occupiers, including individuals, couples, small families or small house-shares. The surrounding area is characterised by detached family houses. In my opinion, the proposal would complement rather than contrast with the existing housing stock to achieve a mix of dwelling types within the area. In my opinion, the diversification of the housing types from predominantly detached houses to include smaller properties would enhance the community rather than detract from the area, in accordance with the aims of policy 5/10.

Context of site, design and external spaces

- 8.28 The external appearance of the proposal remains substantially the same as the previous scheme, and the impact of the proposal on the character of the area was not a reason for refusal. The main changes are the obscure glazing of windows on the south (Queen Edith's Way) elevation for the bike store and changes to the landscaping scheme to provide space for surface level visitor car parking. I do not consider these to have a material impact on the appearance of the site compared to the previous scheme, and therefore the scheme provides an acceptable response to the local context for the reasons given below, and is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 3/7 and 3/12 in this respect.

- Response to context

- 8.29 The site occupies a prominent position on the busy Hills Road junction, which is a main route into the city. The site has frontages onto Hills Road and Queen Edith's Way which are both predominantly residential, albeit the latter has a more suburban character. Hills Road is the subject of the 'Cambridge Suburbs and Approaches: Hills Road' (March 2012) study which provides an overview of the character of the area. However this document has no statutory status and should only be used as a starting point for a wider assessment of the character of the area, which also takes account of recent developments on both Hills Road and Queen Edith's Way.

- 8.30 The site currently has a verdant character dominated by mature trees and planting along the frontages and within the site. The existing dwelling is largely screened from view, as are the neighbouring properties along this side of Hills Road. The site is overgrown, however the existing vegetation contributes to the 'bosky' character of this part of Hills Road, and is important for setting the character of the road as it moves northwards into the city. However, the Suburbs and Approaches study highlights the recent development of three dwellings on the opposite side of the junction which are more visible behind boundary planting and more prominent in views from the junction.
- 8.31 The existing dwelling – known as 'Raylands' – is a redbrick detached Edwardian villa which is characteristic of this part of Hills Road. To the north of the junction, the character of Hills Road is set by large detached or semi-detached villas dating from the early decades of the 20th century. Building styles and materials vary considerably although render and brown/red brick with a tiled roof is perhaps the most common combination, but used in a variety of architectural approaches from more historical styles to Arts and Crafts. However, there has been some later infilling or redevelopment, notably on the northeast side – which are interspersed between the villas.
- 8.32 Queen Edith's Way is characterised by detached properties usually dating from later than the villas on Hills Road. There is arguably less consistency in design than on Hills Road and, again, there are examples of infill development. There are examples of higher density flatted developments - Dean Court and Wessex Court – as well as Editha House. Contemporary designs have been supported within the immediate vicinity including 6 no. dwellings at Nos. 3-5 Queen Edith's Way (16/2135/FUL) which was approved in June 2017.
- 8.33 While I accept that the existing building is characteristic of this part of Hills Road and that there is local support for retaining the building, for the reasons I have given, the demolition of 'Raylands' cannot be resisted in planning terms. I have assessed the proposed replacement building in terms of how the layout, scale and massing, design and materials, and landscaping provide an appropriate response to the surrounding context.

- Layout

8.34 The proposal is for two linked 'villas'. The building has been set back into the site, retaining a similar building line on Hills Road and Queen Edith's Way, albeit with a projecting gable and 'turret' element on the south western corner. In terms of access, the proposal addresses both frontages. The existing vehicle access from Hills Road would become a pedestrian and cycle access, and a new access would be created from Queen Edith's Way, similar to other accesses along this road. There is open space for landscaping around the building so that it would not appear a cramped form of development and does not represent over-development of the site in visual terms.

- Scale and massing

8.35 The 'villas' would be separated by 4.7m with the linking element recessed between 5.1-6.2m from the front elevation. The use of glazing on the front elevation of the link with a void behind would ensure this element is visually light weight. The 'villas' themselves would have slightly longer frontages than the neighbouring traditional properties, however they would be further broken down with projecting elements and the pitched roof forms. Overall, this approach successfully breaks down the scale and massing of the building into separate elements that respond to the pattern of villas along this part of Hills Road and Queen Edith's Way. The building steps down to one-and-a-half storeys on the eastern side which forms a transition to the bungalow at No.1a Queen Edith's Way. I consider the scale and massing to be appropriate.

- Design and materials

8.36 The 'linked villas' design has taken cues from the character of the traditional villas and reinterpreted this in a contemporary design. Influences have been taken from the surrounding area, in particular, the pitched roof forms, the chimney stacks and the corner bay balcony feature. The use of red/brown brick would be similar to those approved at Nos.3-5 Queen Edith's Way, while the use of hung tiles on the roof scape would be a contemporary use of a traditional material that is prevalent along Hills Road. The balcony balustrades would be metal. I have recommended a condition for materials samples to be submitted for approval.

- Landscaping

8.37 The proposal retains significant tree planting along the frontages, which maintains the verdant character of the site and the junction, and partially screens the proposed building. I am satisfied that the important trees of highest amenity value can be retained for the reasons set out in the section below. The site is currently overgrown and in my opinion, a well-maintained landscaping scheme would enhance the appearance of the site. The Landscape Architect supports the indicative landscaping scheme and details could be secured through the recommended conditions.

- Movement and Access

8.38 The site would have accesses from both Hills Road and Queen Edith's Way, which link to the main entrances to the units on both frontages. The bin store would be located close to the main entrances and in a convenient location near to the public highway for collection. Cycle parking would be provided within the ground floor with convenient access. The vehicular access to the basement parking would be 5m wide and pedestrian access would be via the staircore, which would be convenient and safe.

Disabled access

8.39 The proposal includes a lift within the central atrium which provides access to all units. Flat 1 on the ground floor is identified as 'accessible'. A disabled resident car parking space is provided within the basement, and a further disabled visitor space is provided within the basement and another on the surface level near to the main entrance. The comments from the Disability Panel relate to internal matters that should be addressed by the applicant through building control. The proposal provides good accessibility for disabled users in my opinion, and is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 3/7 and 3/12 in this respect.

Residential Amenity

8.40 The neighbouring properties are No.289 Hills Road and the separate annex to the west and No.1a Queen Edith's Way to the north. The proposal would not impact on other neighbouring

properties on the opposite corners of the junction. I have also considered the impact on the wider area. The impact on residential amenity was not a reason for refusal on the previous scheme and I have highlighted in my assessment where the current proposal has the same impact on neighbouring properties as the previous proposal, and where there are differences I have taken these into account.

- *No. 289 Hills Road*

8.41 This is a substantial detached property set within a large plot, which is currently used as a single dwellinghouse. There are windows on the side elevation facing towards the application site and the property has a private garden to the rear including a conservatory attached to the rear elevation. I have received objections from the owner/occupiers and I visited this property during the previous application.

8.42 The closest part of the proposed building to the shared boundary would be the two storey element on the northern side of the eastern 'villa', which would be within 5-7m of the boundary. The adjacent part of the curtilage of No. 289 is used as a driveway, with hedge and garden beyond. The proposal would be approximately 2-3m closer than the existing dwelling, however the side elevation would be approximately 1.5m lower with a flat roof, rather than a pitched roof. The highest three-storey part of the eastern 'villa' would be approximately 11-12m from the boundary and would be similar in height to the existing pitched roof. In my opinion, this part of the building would not have a significant overbearing or enclosing impact compared to the existing situation, and this would be the same as the previous application.

8.43 The western 'villa' would introduce built form directly to the south of No. 289 where there is currently open space at the front of the existing dwelling. The side elevation of No. 289 is between 4-8m from the boundary. The proposed three storey 'villa' would be between 9-10m from the boundary, so the separation distance between the buildings would be 13-18m. There are substantial deciduous trees planted along the boundary within the application site, which would be retained to provide partial screening. I am satisfied that these trees - combined with the separation distance - would soften the visual impact of the building so that it would not have a significant overbearing impact on No.289. The side

elevation and the ridge height would be of domestic proportions, so in my opinion the relationship would be similar to between other villas along Hills Road, including between Nos.287 and 289 which has a smaller gap between the properties (between approximately 6.6-9.5m). This would be the same as the previous application.

- 8.44 In terms of overlooking, the side elevation of No. 289 includes windows that serve habitable rooms and would be sensitive to overlooking. There would be three first floor unobscured windows on the northern side elevation of the western 'villa' serving the main living space and bedroom of Flat 8. These windows would be between 13-18m away from the windows on the side elevation of No.289 and views would be partially screened by the mature trees to be retained on the site. While I appreciate that these trees are deciduous, they are mature with a relatively dense canopy and are protected under the TPO. The proposed windows would be relatively narrow which would reduce the scope of views. For these reasons, in my opinion the proposal would not result in a significant loss of privacy for No. 289. This would be the same as the previous application.
- 8.45 There would be one unobscured second floor window on the northern elevation of the eastern 'villa' serving the bedroom of Flat 13. This would be over 12m from the boundary with No. 289. The window would align with the driveway to the annex to the rear of No. 289. Views towards the rear garden of No. 289 and the conservatory at the rear would be over 20m and would be partially screened by the proposed landscaping shown on the site plan (details of which would be secured through the landscaping condition) and further screened by the hedge and tree planting within the garden of No. 289 itself. The windows on the glazed link and the eastern 'villa' would be obscure glazed, so there would be no views towards the conservatory or the private garden.
- 8.46 The balconies on the northern side of the building have been designed to be inset with solid side walls to prevent direct views towards No. 289. There may be some narrow oblique views from the balconies towards the windows on the side elevation of No. 289, but these would be over a significant distance and would be partially obscured by the trees. This is the same as the previous application and in my opinion this is acceptable. I have recommended a condition to prevent the green roofs from being accessed other than for maintenance.

8.47 Regarding light emission from the glazed link on the northern elevation, this would consist of two strips of obscure glazing and a central panel of hung tiles. This is a recessed link set back from the boundary. The obscure glazing would diffuse the light so that there would be no direct light beams. Moreover, this would be filtered by the mature trees and additional planting. As such, while light would be visible from the windows and the garden of No.289, in my opinion it is unlikely that this would have a significant impact on residential amenity. This is the same as the previous application and the Environmental Health team has raised no concerns about this.

8.48 For these reasons, in my opinion the proposal would not have a significant adverse impact on the residential amenity of the occupants of No. 289.

- *Annex to the rear of No. 289*

8.49 This is a two storey annex converted from an outbuilding which is understood from the occupants to be used as a separate dwelling. The lawful status of the annex as a separate dwelling is unconfirmed because there is no record in the planning history of sub-division of the plot of No. 289 into two units or conversion of the annex into a separate dwelling, both of which would require planning permission. Nonetheless, I have assessed the impact on this annex on the basis of its being used as a separate dwelling. The annex is located on the boundary with No. 291 and is attached to a structure on the application site. There are no windows on the southern elevation facing towards the application site, but there are windows the gable end western elevation. I have seen the annex from my site visit to No. 289.

8.50 The north eastern corner of the eastern 'villa' would be within 5m of the southern elevation of the annex. This would be approximately 2m closer than the existing building. The proposed building would be one-and-a-half storeys on this corner with a sloped roof rising to two storeys. As the building would only be visible in oblique views from the window on the southern elevation, I am satisfied that it would not have a significant overbearing or enclosing impact. Moreover, the site plan shows additional planting which would soften the visual impact of the proposal, the

detail of which would be secured through the landscaping condition.

8.51 The first floor windows on the north elevation of the eastern 'villa' facing towards the annex would be obscure glazed to prevent oblique views into the windows. There would be no balconies or roof terraces with views towards the annex. The proposed building is to the south of the annex, however would not result in significant loss of light to the windows on the south elevation compared to the existing situation. As above, light from the glazed link would be visible from the window on the southern elevation, however as the light would be diffused by the obscure glazing and due to the separation distance and filtering by additional landscaping, it is unlikely to have a significant impact on the residential amenity of the occupants.

8.52 For these reasons, in my opinion the proposal would not have a significant adverse impact on the residential amenity of the occupants of the annex.

- *No.1a Queen Edith's Way*

8.53 This is a detached bungalow with a courtyard on the western side and windows serving habitable rooms opening onto the courtyard. I have visited this property.

8.54 The closest part of the building would be between 10-12m to the western elevations of No. 1a, which is similar to the nearest part of the existing dwellinghouse. The side elevation would be approximately double the length of the existing dwellinghouse. However, the elevation would be approximately 1.5m lower and the highest part of the roof would be approximately 2.4m lower. I am satisfied due to the separation distance that this would not have a significant overbearing impact on the courtyard area. The highest three storey part of the building would be over 16m from the boundary and would be lower than the highest part of the existing building, so would be acceptable. The vehicle ramp enclosure would be 2.5m high which would not have a significant impact.

8.55 There would be no first floor windows on the elevation facing towards No. 1a. There would be some roof lights. I have no sections showing the height of these above the internal floor level.

However the proposed plans confirm that the base of the roof lights would be at least 1.8m above the finished floor level. Regardless, due to the separation distance and presence of trees along the boundary within the application site, I am satisfied that there would be no significant loss of privacy, should views from these windows be possible.

8.56 The shadow diagrams show no significant overshadowing compared to the existing situation, and some minor reduction in overshadowing from 5pm on 21 June. There would be some minor increase in the area of the courtyard in shade after 3pm on 21 March. However, this would not fail the BRE guidance as the property would retain at least 2 hours of sunlight across at least 50% of its external amenity space. This is acceptable, in my opinion.

8.57 I have recommended a condition to ensure that the vehicle ramp is covered in accordance with the approved plans prior to first use of the ramp in order to reduce the noise and disturbance impact from vehicle movements.

- *Wider area*

8.58 The proposal would intensify the use of the site, increasing from a single dwelling to 14 households. However, it is a large plot with space for landscape buffering to mitigate the impact on the immediate neighbours. The site is situated on a busy junction so that the impact of additional comings and goings on the nearby properties is unlikely to be significant. I have discussed the transport impact and parking provision in the sections below and I am satisfied that this would not have a significant impact on residential amenity.

8.59 I have recommended the conditions requested by the Environmental Health team to control the impacts of construction and plant noise in the wider area, and I am satisfied that these are sufficient. In terms of air quality, the site is not within the Air Quality Management Area and as such an air quality assessment is not required. The Environmental Health team has raised no objection to the proposal in terms of the increase in air pollution from traffic generated.

8.60 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.

- Future occupants

8.61 I have assessed the quality of the internal accommodation in the relevant section above in relation to the previous reason for refusal. The Environmental Health team is satisfied that the proposed mechanical ventilation system would provide the occupants with an acceptable internal noise level from traffic and have recommended further mitigation for the external amenity space, which would be secured through a noise insulation condition. In my opinion this is acceptable and the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 3/7 and 3/12 in this regard.

Refuse Arrangements

8.62 A bin store is proposed near to the front of the site which provides capacity for 6no. 1100l bins. The Waste Team has advised that the capacity is acceptable in accordance with the RECAP guidance. The bin store would have a green roof; however no elevations have been submitted. These would be submitted under the landscaping condition I have recommended. The detailed comments from the Waste Team regarding the doors and locks are management issues that I do not consider it to be necessary to secure through conditions. The bin store arrangements are the same as the previous application and this was not a reason for refusal. As such, in my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policy 3/12 in this regard.

Transport Impact

8.63 The applicant has submitted a Transport Statement which demonstrates that the future occupants would not be dependent on private cars, given the highly sustainable location of the site close to public transport connections at Addenbrooke's and along Hills Road and Long Road. The improvements to the cycle network along Hills Road also promote sustainable transport modes. Thus while car parking spaces would be provided, the proposal is unlikely to generate a significant additional demand on the public

highway network. The applicant has stated their intention to issue Travel Packs to the future occupants which is supported, however these are not necessary to make the development acceptable in my view and therefore securing these through a condition would not be reasonable in my view. In my opinion, the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policy 8/2.

Highway Safety

- 8.64 The proposal includes the creation of a new vehicle access onto Queen Edith's Way and the removal of the existing vehicle access from Hills Road. The new access would be a minimum of 5m wide and would have visibility splays within the public highway. Concerns have been raised by third parties regarding the highway safety implications of the new access so close to the junction and from refuse lorries/removal vans. The Highways Authority has not raised highway safety concerns, subject to conditions, and I accept this advice. The impact of refuse lorries/removal vans would be a temporary situation and is unlikely to have a significant impact. Moreover, removal and delivery vans would be able to enter the site and use the visitor parking spaces so would not need to park on the highway, which is controlled through double yellow lines. I have recommended those conditions that have been requested by the Highways Authority where they are reasonable. In my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policy 8/2.

Car and Cycle Parking

- *Car parking*

- 8.65 The proposal provides 14 car parking spaces in the underground car park, including one disabled space for the accessible unit (Flat 1). This provides one space per unit, which is in accordance with the Council's adopted standards outside the controlled parking zone. I have assessed the visitor car parking provision in the relevant section above in relation to the previous reason for refusal. In my opinion, the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policy 8/10.

- *Cycle parking*

8.66 I have assessed the residents' cycle parking in the relevant section above in relation to the previous reason for refusal. 8 no. visitor cycle parking spaces would be provided at ground level as shown on the proposed site plan. The Cambridgeshire Police Constabulary has raised a concern about the location of the visitor cycle parking, however I consider that this relates well to the main and secondary entrances to the building so would have good natural surveillance. In my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policy 8/6.

Trees

8.67 The proposal includes the loss of some of the trees on the site. However, the 11 trees that are subject to a recent tree preservation order (TPO) from September 2017 would be retained. This was supported by the Tree Officer and Landscape Architect on the previous application subject to suitable replacement planting which would be secured through the landscaping condition. I accept their advice that the proposal retains the trees of highest amenity value and that these can be protected during and after the construction. This was not a reason for refusal on the previous application, and in my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policy 4/4.

Ecology

8.68 The site is currently overgrown and could be used by protected species, in particular roosting bats. An ecology survey has not been undertaken. However, I have recommended a condition for an ecological construction method statement and ecological mitigation measures based on survey findings to be undertaken to be submitted to the Council for approval. I am satisfied that, should the survey identify the presence of important species on the site, this would provide an appropriate level of protection during construction and mitigation within the proposed development.

Surface Water Drainage

8.69 The Sustainable Drainage Engineer and the Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) support the proposal and are satisfied that a detailed surface water drainage scheme can be secured through conditions. While I recognise the concerns of third parties with regard to the impact of the basement excavation on the water

table, I accept the advice of consultees and in my opinion the proposal is acceptable in this regard, subject to the recommended condition.

Renewable energy and sustainability

- 8.70 In line with the requirements of policy 8/16 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2006), major developments are required to meet at least 10% of their energy needs from the use of on-site renewable energy, with the requirement measured in terms of carbon reduction. Photovoltaic panels are proposed to meet this requirement, and while the roof plan shows the location of these panels, carbon calculations, although referred to in the Sustainability Statement, do not appear to have been submitted. As the general choice of technology is supported, it is considered that the submission of carbon calculations can be dealt with by way of condition, as recommended by the Council's Sustainability Officer.
- 8.71 The proposal also includes the use of Mechanical Ventilation with Heat Recovery (MVHR) which is supported from an energy efficiency and internal air quality perspective. The proposal also includes the provision of biodiverse green roofs, low-flow sanitary ware and appliances to reduce water consumption, which are supported. Subject to conditions to secure the implementation of these sustainability measures, 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.

Public Art

- 8.72 The Public Art Officer has advised that the proposal should require a public art proposal in line with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 3/7 and 10/1 and the Public Art Strategy SPD. The applicant has not included a public art proposal. In my opinion, the site's verdant and enclosed character - which would be maintained through the proposal - does not lend itself to a public art proposal contribution to the street scene. This was not sought under the previous application and lack of public art provision was not a reason for refusal. While I appreciate the comments from the Public Art Officer, in this instance, I do not consider that a public art proposal is necessary or reasonable to request.

Planning Obligations (s106 Agreement)

8.73 The Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Regulations 2010 have introduced the requirement for all local authorities to make an assessment of any planning obligation in relation to three tests. Each planning obligation needs to pass three statutory tests to make sure that it 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.

8.74 In line with the CIL Regulations, councils can pool no more than five S106 contributions towards the same project. The new 'pooling' restrictions were introduced from 6 April 2015 and relate to new S106 agreements. This means that all contributions now agreed by the city council must be for specific projects at particular locations, as opposed to generic infrastructure types within the city of Cambridge. In bringing forward my recommendations in relation to the Planning Obligation for this development I have considered these requirements.

8.75 The Developer Contribution Monitoring Unit (DCMU) has recommended that contributions be made to the following projects:

Infrastructure	Identified project	Contribution
Community Facilities	The proposed development is within 1 mile of the Clay Farm Community Centre site. Towards the provision of and / or improvement of equipment at the Clay Farm Community Centre	£15,702.00 (plus indexation)
Indoor Sports	The proposed development is within one mile of Netherhall School. The improvement of sports facilities at Netherhall	£5,649.00 (plus indexation)

	School is highlighted in the Council's Interim approach to S106 funding agreed by the City Council's Executive Councillor for Communities in June 2016. Towards the provision and/or improvement of new indoor gym and studio (including equipment) at Netherhall School.	
Outdoor Sports	This proposed development is within 500m of Nightingale Recreation Ground. The Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Playing Pitches Strategy (2016) highlights scope for improving the capacity of this facility there in order to mitigate the impact of local development. For the provision of and / or improvements to access to the grass playing pitches at Nightingale Recreation Ground.	£4,998.00 (plus indexation)
Informal Open Space	This proposed development is within 500m of Nightingale Recreation Ground, which is on the council's 2016/17 target list of informal open spaces for which specific S106 contributions may be sought. The Informal Open Spaces Audit (2016) highlights that the scope for improving the open space facilities in order to mitigate the impact of local development.	£5,082.00 (plus indexation)

	For the provision of and/or improvement of and/or access to the Informal Open Space at Nightingale Avenue Recreation Ground.	
Play provision for children and teenagers	This proposed development is within 550 metres of Nightingale Avenue play area, which is on the Council's 2016/17 target list of play areas for which specific S106 contributions may be sought. Towards the provision and/or improvement of the children's play area at Nightingale Avenue play area.	£3,792 (plus indexation)

8.86 I agree with the DCMU that the planning obligation is necessary, directly related to the development and fairly and reasonably in scale and kind to the development and therefore passes the tests set by the CIL Regulations. 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 3/8, 5/14 and 10/1 and the Planning Obligation Strategy 2010.

9.0 THIRD PARTY COMMENTS

9.1 I have assessed the issues raised in third party representations as follows:

Representation	Assessment
<u>Principle</u>	
No justification for demolition. The building appears to be in good condition. The developer has not explored any options to retain, convert and/or extend the building.	See 'Principle of development' section above. There are no planning grounds to resist the demolition of the unprotected building.
Loss of family housing. Proposed flats would not meet	See 'Affordable housing / Housing mix' section.

housing demand.	
The proposal avoids affordable housing contributions by reducing the number of units.	I have addressed this in the relevant section of my report above in relation to the previous reason for refusal.
Concerns about use as house in multiple occupation.	The units could be occupied as houses in multiple occupation for up to 6 occupants under permitted development rights. However, in my opinion, it is unlikely that even the 2-bed units would be occupied in this way.
<u>Character</u>	
The existing dwelling has architectural, historical and social importance as well as group value.	The existing dwelling is not a listed building and is not within a conservation area. As such, it is not protected from demolition. The principle of demolition cannot be resisted in planning terms for the reasons previously given.
The proposal would be out of character with the area, in terms of scale and massing, architectural style and materials, and would be a characterless and bland proposal that would not have a positive impact on such a prominent location on major route into the city.	I have addressed this in the relevant section of my report above.
<u>Transport impact</u>	
Impact on highway safety and congestion, pollution and accidents.	The Highways Authority has not advised me of any concerns about highway safety issues. This was not a reason for refusal on the previous proposal. The current proposal is for one fewer units and thus – as the previous decision is a

	material consideration that I must give weight to – there would be no reasonable grounds on which to recommend that this impact would be unacceptable.
Impact of demand for parking on roads, cycle lane and pavement.	The current proposal provides residents car parking at levels that meet the Council's adopted maximum car parking standards. Visitor car parking spaces have been provided. The site is in a sustainable location and in my opinion, there would not be reasonable grounds on which to require parking exceeding the maximum standards or to recommend refusal based on the impact of additional demand for offsite parking.
Traffic at the junction needs modelling.	The Highways Authority has assessed the proposal on the basis of the additional impact of traffic generated from the new units on the overall operation of the public highway network, and has not advised that a traffic model is required due to the scale of the proposal.
Impact of construction traffic on highway safety and contractors parking on verge	The Highways Authority has recommended a condition for a Traffic Management Plan which would include details of the movement and control of deliveries and arrangements for contractor's parking which should be within the curtilage of the site and not on street wherever possible. The Highways Authority would review the information submitted by the applicant and

	advise of any highway safety concerns.
The site is in an unsustainable location.	I disagree as the site is located on major routes within the city within close proximity to bus stops along Hills Road and the bus interchange at Addenbrooke's Hospital, as well as to hospital and biomedical campus which is a major employment site.
Plans do not show the entrance to the Devonshire House Dental Practice opposite the proposed entrance.	There is no requirement for the plans to show this detail and I am mindful that the Local Highways Authority has assessed the proposal and is satisfied that it will not adversely affect highway safety.
<u>Environment</u>	
Loss of trees and greenery on the character of the area and amenity value.	The trees of highest amenity value on the site have been identified and protected by the Council's Tree Officer. These trees would be retained and would be enhanced by additional landscaping.
Impact on the long term health and future of the trees retained or planted.	Please see the 'trees' section of my assessment
Damage to trees during construction, in particular excavation of the basement.	Please see the 'trees' section of my assessment and the recommended tree protection conditions.
Impact on biodiversity.	Please see the 'ecology' section of my assessment and the recommended ecology condition.
Impact on climate change resilience.	The Council has no adopted policies on climate change resilience, albeit it is a principle of sustainable development.

	Please see comments below.
The proposal includes few sustainable features to reduce carbon emissions and save water.	The proposal includes photovoltaic panels, green roofs, a Mechanical Ventilation with Heat Recovery (MVHR) and low flow sanitary ware and appliances. The proposal is supported by the Council's Sustainability Officer in accordance with adopted policies.
Demolition of existing dwelling is unsustainable.	The principle of demolition cannot be resisted in planning terms for the reasons previously given.
<u>Impact on neighbours</u>	
Adverse impact on the amenity of the immediate neighbours through loss of privacy, perception of overlooking, overbearing sense of enclosure, light pollution from the atrium, in particular No. 289 and the dwelling to the rear of No. 289	I acknowledge the concerns of the immediate neighbours and I have assessed these in detail in the relevant section of my report above.
Deciduous trees offer only partial screening and do not extend along the entire boundary with the neighbouring properties.	The existing trees are deciduous thereby providing less screening in the winter months, however these are mature trees so have a relatively dense canopy. The indicative landscaping plan shows additional planting along the boundary to extend the tree screen. Appropriate species and the maturity of the specimens can be secured through the recommended landscaping condition.
Even narrow windows would result in loss of privacy to	I accept that there would be some views from the windows

neighbouring properties.	towards the windows on the neighbouring property, as per my assessment below. However, I consider that the narrowness of these windows combined with the screening offered by the retained mature trees and the separation distance would not result in an unacceptable loss of privacy. Some degree of mutual overlooking between neighbouring properties is acceptable, and I consider that the degree proposed would not be significantly harmful.
The dwelling to the rear of No. 289 is a separate dwelling and pays Council Tax as such.	Paying Council Tax as a separate dwelling does not make the dwelling lawful in planning terms. As above, there is no record of the subdivision or conversion of the curtilage of No. 289 to create a separate dwelling. Therefore, the lawfulness of this use in planning terms is unconfirmed. Nonetheless, I have assessed the impact on the annex to the rear as a separate dwelling in terms of the residential amenity that the occupants should expect.
<u>Amenity of future occupiers</u>	
Inadequate noise assessment.	The Environmental Health team has assessed the applicant's submission and advised me that the impact of noise from traffic on the amenity of the future occupants could be mitigated using mechanical ventilation, and such details would be secured through the recommended condition. I

	accept the advice of my colleagues on this matter.
Inaccessible cycle parking. No provision for non-standard bicycles, such as cargo cycles.	Please see the 'cycle parking' section of my assessment above. There is no policy requirement to provide for non-standard bicycles, however as there is an over-provision of Sheffield hoops according to the adopted standards and there is space within the store, I consider that cargo bicycles could be accommodated within the proposed store.
<u>Other</u>	
Concerns about pre-determine outcomes and transparency.	The outcome of the application has not been pre-determined. Advice given to the applicant prior to determination is given on a 'without prejudice' basis.
Developer profit. No benefits to the local community.	Developer profit is not a material planning matter. The proposal would make planning obligations towards community facilities, open space and recreational facilities as listed above, which would be secured through a legal agreement.

9.2 I have responded to the petitioners' grounds as follows:

Grounds	Response
There is no case for demolishing "Raylands" (policy 5/4 of CLP 2006)	There are no planning grounds to resist the demolition of this unprotected building.
The plans do not safeguard environmental character (policy 3/3 of CLP 2006)	See 'Context' section of my assessment.
The application does not respond to the local context (policy 3/4 of CLP 2006)	See 'Context' section of my assessment.

Cramped living accommodation (policy 3/7 of CLP 2006)	See paragraphs 8.11-8.15
The development would have a significant adverse impact on the amenities of neighbouring properties, provide inadequate amenity space, detract from the prevailing character and appearance of the area, and adversely affect trees (policy 3/10 of CLP 2006)	See the 'Residential amenity', 'Context' and 'Trees' sections of my assessment.
A negative impact on the local setting (policy 3/12 of CLP 2006)	See 'Context' section of my assessment.
Damage to trees (policy 4/4 of CLP 2006)	See 'Trees' section of my assessment.
Adverse effects on health and the environment (policy 4/13 of CLP 2006)	See assessment of residential amenity and environment in my assessment above.
No provision for affordable housing (policy 5/5 of CLP 2006)	See paragraphs 8.3-8.10.
Unacceptable transport impact (policy 8/2 of CLP 2006)	See 'Transport impact' and 'Highway safety' sections of my assessment.

- 9.3 The queries raised by Cllr McGerty (Ward Councillor) at the DCF were put to the applicant for a response. At the time of writing, a response has not been received from the applicant, however any response received prior to committee will be reported on the amendment sheet or as a verbal update. I have provided my assessment of the matters raised as follows:

Query	Considerations
Is the applicant able to provide a Tree Protection Method statement as part of the planning application?	The Tree Officer was satisfied on the previous application that these details could be secured through a condition worded so that these details would be agreed prior to the commencement of works. The Tree Officer would review these

	details. This is a standard approach that the Council takes on similar applications and I cannot see reasonable grounds for taking a different approach on this application. The lack of information was not a reason for refusal on the previous application and this is a material consideration. In my opinion, there would not be reasonable planning grounds to require the applicant to submit this information prior to determination and such detail can be appropriately secured through the recommended condition.
Is the applicant able to provide a detailed plan of new planting and make this a firm undertaking during the planning process?	The Council does not usually require a detailed landscape scheme to be submitted prior to determination as these details can be agreed through the recommended condition. The Landscape Officer has recommended this approach. While I accept that the landscaping scheme is important to the character of the street and to the screening between the proposal and neighbouring properties, I am satisfied that there is sufficient space for an appropriate landscaping scheme to be put in place. Again, the lack of landscaping details was not a reason for refusal on the previous application, and I do not consider that there would be reasonable grounds to recommend refusal.
Could the grass verges on	Details of contractor parking and

Queen Edith's Way be protected with Heras fences during construction?	the control of this would be agreed through the condition for the Traffic Management Plan. In my opinion, this would not be reasonable grounds to recommend refusal as the impact would be temporary.

10.0 CONCLUSION

10.1 While I acknowledge that there is strong local opposition to the current proposal, I must give strong weight to the decision on the previous planning application which is a material consideration. In my opinion, for the reasons I have given, the current proposal has overcome the previous reasons for refusal, namely affordable housing, cramped living accommodation, inadequate residents' cycle parking, and inadequate visitor car parking. I have assessed the proposal in full and no new material issues have been raised, in terms of residential amenity, response to the local context, environmental quality, transport impact and highway safety, and other matters. For these reasons, my recommendation is for approval subject to conditions and the completion of a S106 Agreement to secure planning obligations.

11.0 RECOMMENDATION

APPROVE subject to completion of the s106 Agreement 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 1990.

3. No construction work or demolition work shall be carried out or plant operated other than between the following hours: 0800 hours and 1800 hours on Monday to Friday, 0800 hours and 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. There should be no collections from or deliveries to the site during the demolition and construction stages outside the hours of 0800 hours and 1800 hours on 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. 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: To protect the amenity of nearby properties Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 4/13

6. No demolition or construction works shall commence on site until a Traffic Management Plan has been submitted to and agreed in writing by the local planning authority. The principle areas of concern that should be addressed are:
 - i. Movements and control of muck away lorries (wherever possible all loading and unloading should be undertaken off the adopted public highway)
 - ii. Contractor parking, for both phases (wherever possible all such parking should be within the curtilage of the site and not on street).
 - iii. Movements and control of all deliveries (wherever possible 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.

Development shall be carried out in accordance with the agreed details thereafter, unless any variation has been agreed in writing by the local planning authority.

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

7. In the event of the foundations for the proposed development requiring piling, prior to the development 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 from 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.

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. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 4/13)

8. 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: In the interests of the protection of water resources.

9. Prior to the commencement of development (including demolition), and in accordance with BS5837 2012, a phased Arboricultural Method Statement (AMS) and Tree Protection Plan (TPP) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority, before any equipment, machinery or materials are brought onto the site for the purpose of development. In a logical sequence the AMS and TPP will consider all phases of construction in relation to the potential impact on trees and detail the specification and position of protection barriers and ground protection and all measures to be taken for the protection of any trees from damage during the course of any activity related to the development, including demolition, foundation design, storage of materials, ground works, installation of services, erection of scaffolding and landscaping.

Reason: In the interests of tree protection (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 4/4).

10. Prior to the commencement of site clearance, a pre-commencement site meeting shall be held and attended by the site manager, the arboricultural consultant and local planning authority's Tree Officer to discuss details of the approved AMS.

Reason: In the interests of tree protection (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 4/4).

11. Prior to the commencement of development (including demolition), a written scheme of archaeological investigation (WSI) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. This shall include:
- i. the statement of significance and research objectives;
 - ii. the programme and methodology of site investigation and recording and the nomination of a competent person(s) or organisation to undertake the agreed works; and
 - iii. the programme for post-excavation assessment and subsequent analysis, publication and dissemination, and deposition of resulting material.
- For land that is included within the WSI, no demolition/development shall take place other than in accordance with the agreed WSI until an evaluation report in accordance with the programme set out in the agreed WSI has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority.

Reason: In the interests of archaeology.

12. The approved AMS and TPP will be implemented throughout the development and the agreed means of protection shall be retained on site until all equipment, and surplus materials have been removed from the site. Nothing shall be stored or placed in any area protected in accordance with this condition, and the ground levels within those areas shall not be altered nor shall any excavation be made without the prior written approval of the local planning authority.

Reason: In the interests of tree protection (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 4/4).

13. Prior to commencement of development (including demolition and site clearance), an ecological survey report shall be undertaken and submitted to the local planning authority for approval in writing. This shall include, as appropriate to the findings of the survey:
 - i. a construction environmental management plan (CEMP) including a risk assessment of potentially damaging construction activities, practical measures (both physical measures and sensitive working practices) to avoid or reduce impacts during construction, and details of responsible persons and lines of communication; and
 - ii. ecological mitigation measures to be provided on site.Any approved CEMP shall be adhered to and implemented throughout the construction period strictly in accordance with the approved details, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the local planning authority. Any approved ecological mitigation measures shall be implemented prior to first occupation of the development hereby permitted (or in accordance with an alternative timescale that has been agreed in writing by the local planning authority) and retained as such thereafter.

Reason: In order to protect important species and habitats.

14. Prior to commencement of development (other than demolition), a surface water drainage works scheme in accordance with the submitted Drainage Statement by JPP Consulting, Revision B dated February 2018, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The submitted details shall:

- i. include results of infiltration testing in accordance with BRE Digest 365 should be submitted to the local planning authority to identify whether infiltration of the surface water runoff would be feasible;
- ii. be designed such that there is no surcharging for a 1 in 30 year event and no internal property flooding or flooding off site for a 1 in 100 year event + 40% an allowance for climate change;
- iii. include detailed drawings of the entire proposed surface water drainage system, including levels, gradients, dimensions and pipe reference numbers;
- iv. provide information about the design storm period and intensity, the method employed to delay and control the surface water discharged from the site and the measures taken to prevent pollution of the receiving groundwater and/or surface waters; and
- v. provide a management and maintenance plan for the lifetime of the development which shall include the arrangements for adoption by any public authority or statutory undertaker and any other arrangements to secure the operation of the scheme throughout its lifetime.

The surface water drainage scheme shall be completed in accordance with the agreed details prior to first occupation of the development, and shall be managed and maintained thereafter in accordance with the agreed details and the management and maintenance plan for the lifetime of the development.

Reason: In the interests of surface water drainage.

15. Prior to first occupation of the development hereby permitted, a hard and soft landscaping scheme shall be implemented in accordance with details that have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. These details shall include:
- a) 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 (e.g. furniture, play equipment, refuse or other storage units, signs, lighting); proposed and existing functional services above and below ground (e.g. drainage, power, communications cables, pipelines indicating lines, manholes, supports); retained historic landscape features and proposals for restoration, where relevant;

b) 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;

c) a landscape maintenance and management plan, including long term design objectives, management responsibilities and maintenance schedules for all landscape areas;

d) boundary treatments indicating the positions, design, materials and type of boundary treatments to be erected.

Development shall be carried out and maintained in accordance with the agreed details. Any trees or plants that, within a period of five years after planting, are removed, die or become in the opinion of the local planning authority, seriously damaged or defective, shall be replaced as soon as is reasonably practicable with others of species, size and number as originally approved, unless the local planning authority gives its written consent to any variation.

Reason: In the interests of visual amenity (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/4 and 3/11).

16. Notwithstanding the approved plans, details of the cycle parking shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The cycle parking shall be provided in accordance with the agreed details prior to first occupation of the development, and shall be retained as such thereafter.

Reason: In the interests of residential amenity (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 8/6).

17. Prior to the commencement of construction of external surfaces, samples of the brick and hung tiles, and details of the brick mortar shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the agreed details thereafter.

Reason: To ensure the development responds positively to the character of the area (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/4, 3/4 and 3/12).

18. Prior to the installation of balustrades, details of the materials and design shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the agreed details and retained as such thereafter.

Reason: To ensure the balustrades are an appropriate design (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/4, 3/7 and 3/12).

19. Prior to the installation of windows, details of the window, glazing type and reveals shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the agreed details and retained as such thereafter.

Reason: To ensure the windows are an appropriate design (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/4, 3/7 and 3/12).

20. The windows identified as having obscured glass on the approved plans shall be obscure glazed to a minimum level of obscurity to conform to Pilkington Glass level 3 or equivalent prior to first occupation of those units 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).

21. There shall be no access to the areas shown on the approved plans as 'green roof' other than for maintenance purposes. At no time shall these areas be used for amenity space.

Reason: To protect the residential amenity of neighbouring properties.

22. Prior to first vehicular use of the vehicle access ramp hereby permitted, the roof covering the ramp shall be completed in accordance with the agreed details, and shall be retained as such thereafter.

Reason: To protect the residential amenity of neighbouring properties.

23. Prior to the commencement of development (other than demolition and site clearance), a noise insulation scheme detailing the acoustic noise insulation performance/specification of the external building envelope to reduce the level of noise experienced in the residential units (having regard to the building fabric, glazing, ventilation, internal plant related noise and external balconies/terraces) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The scheme as approved shall be fully implemented and a completion report submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority prior to first occupation of the units. The approved scheme shall be retained as such thereafter.

Reason: To protect the amenity of future occupants of this property from the high ambient noise levels in the area (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 4/13).

24. Prior to commencement of use of the vehicular access hereby permitted, the access where it crosses the public highway shall be laid out and constructed in accordance with the Cambridgeshire County Council construction specification, or in accordance with alternative details that have been submitted to and agreed in writing by the local planning authority. The access shall be constructed with adequate drainage measures to prevent surface water run-off onto the adjacent public highway. The access shall be retained as such thereafter.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety and to ensure satisfactory access into the site, and to prevent surface water discharging to the highway (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 8/2).

25. Prior to commencement of use of the vehicle access hereby permitted, the visibility splays, access and manoeuvring areas shall be provided as shown on the approved drawings. The areas within the visibility splays shall be kept clear of all planting, fencing, walls and the like exceeding 600mm high thereafter. The access and manoeuvring areas shall be maintained thereafter free of any obstruction that would prevent a domestic vehicle from being able to manoeuvre with ease so it may enter and leave the property in a forward gear.

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

26. Notwithstanding the provision of Class A of Schedule 2, Part 2 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 (as amended) (or any order revoking, amending or re-enacting that order) no gates shall be erected across the approved vehicular access unless details have first been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

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

27. 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 (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 8/2).

28. The on-site renewable and low carbon energy technologies as shown on the approved plans and as detailed in the '10% reduction in Carbon by LZO Onsite Energy or 10% Improvement in Energy Demand' letter from Green Heat Ltd dated 6 July 2017 shall be fully installed and operational prior to first occupation of the development (or in accordance with an alternative timescale agreed in writing by the local planning authority) and shall thereafter be maintained in accordance with a maintenance programme, which shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority prior to the occupation of the development. The technologies shall remain fully operational in accordance with the approved maintenance programme, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the local planning authority.

No review of this requirement on the basis of grid capacity issues can take place unless written evidence from the District Network Operator confirming the detail of grid capacity and its implications has been submitted to, and accepted in writing by, the local planning authority. Any subsequent amendment to the level of renewable technology provided on the site shall be in accordance with a revised scheme submitted to and approved in writing by, the local planning authority.

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

29. Prior to first occupation of the development, a water efficiency specification for each dwelling type, based on the Water Efficiency Calculator Methodology or the Fitting Approach sets out in Part G of the Building Regulations 2010 (2015 edition) shall be submitted to the local planning authority. This shall demonstrate that all dwellings are able to achieve a design standard of water use of no more than 110 litres/person/day. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the agreed details thereafter.

Reason: To ensure that the development makes efficient use of water and promotes the principles of sustainable construction (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 3/1 and Supplementary Planning Document 'Sustainable Design & Construction' 2007).

INFORMATIVE: Dust condition informative

To satisfy the condition requiring the submission of a program of measures to control airborne dust above, the applicant should have regard to:

-Council's Supplementary Planning Document - "Sustainable Design and Construction 2007":

<http://www.cambridge.gov.uk/public/docs/sustainable-design-and-construction-spd.pdf>

-Guidance on the assessment of dust from demolition and construction

http://iaqm.co.uk/wp-content/uploads/guidance/iaqm_guidance_report_draft1.4.pdf

- Air Quality Monitoring in the Vicinity of Demolition and Construction Sites 2012

http://www.iaqm.co.uk/wp-content/uploads/guidance/monitoring_construction_sites_2012.pdf

-Control of dust and emissions during construction and demolition - supplementary planning guidance

https://www.london.gov.uk/sites/default/files/Dust%20and%20Emissions%20SPG%208%20July%202014_0.pdf

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.

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

This page is intentionally left blank

PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING – 29th August 2018

Amendment/De-brief Sheet

MAJOR PLANNING APPLICATIONS

CIRCULATION: First

ITEM: APPLICATION REF: 18/0806/FUL

Location: 291 Hills Road

Target Date: 17.08.2018

To Note:

Applicant response to Development Control Forum

As per paragraph 7.7 of the committee report, Cllr McGerty (Ward Councillor) requested the applicant responds to the following queries:

- Is the applicant able to provide a Tree Protection Method statement as part of the planning application?
- Is the applicant able to provide a detailed plan of new planting and make this a firm undertaking during the planning process?
- Could the grass verges on Queen Edith's Way be protected with Heras fences during construction?

The applicant's agent provided a response on 10 August 2018:

- A tree protection plan was provided showing the position of protective fencing around trees to be retained, areas of ground protection, and areas of no-dig construction. The agent notes that the Tree Officer is supportive of the information submitted.
- A revised landscape masterplan has been submitted which has introduced four trees along the northern boundary with No.289 Queen Edith's Way. The applicant's agent has responded that all landscaping including boundary treatments would be secured though the recommended landscape condition and noted that this was not a requirement of the previous application and the landscape officer is supportive of the proposal.
- The applicant's agent has responded that it is extremely uncommon for arrangements for contractor parking to be requested prior to determination. These arrangements would not be known until a contractor has been appointed. The applicant's agent expects a construction management plan would be secured through conditions and notes that this issue was not raised during the determination on the previous application and a consistent approach should be adopted. The agent notes that the onus will be on the

appointed contractor to ensure that the construction phase of the development will not detriment highway safety within the area.

The applicant's response does not alter the officer recommendation. The Tree Officer has been consulted on the tree protection plan and the response is given below. The officer recommendation is that it is appropriate, reasonable and necessary for these details to be secured through conditions 9, 10 and 12 (trees), condition 15 (landscaping) and condition 6 (traffic management plan).

Floor space

The applicant has submitted revised floor plans in response to issues raised by Councillor Smart at the Development Control Forum in relation to the internal space standards. The revised plans make minor internal alterations and adjusted the position of some lobbies to increase the floor areas to Flats 2,3,4,9 and 10 so that these units meet the national Technical Housing Standards (March 2015) (THS). This has reduced the floor space of Flats 5 and 11, however these units remain above the THS. Updated paragraph 8.14 of the committee report below:

Unit	Beds	Floor space (sqm) internal + external	THS (sqm)	Difference (sqm)
Flat 1	1-bed (2 persons)	53 + 7	50	+3
Flat 2	2-bed (3 persons)	61 + 4	61	0
Flat 3	1-bed (2 persons)	61 + 4	50	+11
Flat 4	2-bed (3 persons)	62 + 4	61	+1
Flat 5	2-bed (3 persons)	70 + 4	61	+9
Flat 6	2-bed (3 persons)	61 + 7	61	0
Flat 7	1-bed (2 persons)	50 + 4	50	0
Flat 8	2-bed (3 persons)	61 + 4	61	0
Flat 9	1-bed (2 persons)	61 + 4	50	+11
Flat 10	2-bed (3 persons)	61 + 4	61	0
Flat 11	1-bed (2 persons)	57 + 4	50	+7
Flat 12	2-bed (3 persons)	79 + 28	61	+18
Flat 13	2-bed (3 persons)	75 + 4	61	+14
Flat 14	1-bed (2 persons)	65 + 4	61	+4

Tree Officer comments

The following comment was received from the Tree Officer on 24 August:

In terms of arboricultural impact, the proposal is similar to that previously submitted and subject to replacement planting I have no objection to the proposed tree removals, which have not changed.

The primary concern on this site is the impact of construction activity and in order to safeguard the healthy retention of trees during demolition and construction it will be necessary for all activity to adhere to a detailed and phased tree protection methodology written in accordance with the

recommendations set out in BS 5837: 2012. To this end I request that, should permission be granted, the below conditions are attached.

Prior to commencement and in accordance with BS5837 2012, a phased Arboricultural Method Statement (AMS) and Tree Protection Plan (TPP) shall be submitted to the local planning authority for its written approval, before any tree works are carried and before equipment, machinery or materials are brought onto the site for the purpose of development (including demolition). In a logical sequence the AMS and TPP will consider all phases of construction in relation to the potential impact on trees and detail tree works, the specification and position of protection barriers and ground protection and all measures to be taken for the protection of any trees from damage during the course of any activity related to the development, including supervision, demolition, foundation design, storage of materials, ground works, installation of services, erection of scaffolding, the use of piling rigs, cranes and other plant and landscaping.

Prior to the commencement of site clearance a pre-commencement site meeting shall be held and attended by the site manager, the arboricultural consultant and LPA Tree Officer to discuss details of the approved AMS.

The approved AMS and TPP will be implemented throughout the development and the agreed means of protection shall be retained on site until all equipment, and surplus materials have been removed from the site. Nothing shall be stored or placed in any area protected in accordance with the TPP, and the ground levels within those areas shall not be altered nor shall any excavation be made without the prior written approval of the local planning authority. If any tree shown to be retained is damaged, remedial works as may be specified in writing by the local planning authority will be carried out. If any tree shown to be retained is removed, uprooted, destroyed or dies, another tree shall be planted at the same place and that tree shall be of such size and species, and shall be planted at such time, as may be specified in writing by 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).

These conditions have been recommended as conditions 9, 10 and 12.

Third party representation

A further representation has been received on behalf of Hills Road Area Residents Association and the Federation of Cambridge Residents Associations dated 22 August 2018. The representation can be summarised as follows:

- Understand that the emerging Local Plan has been adopted.
- The threshold for affordable housing in the new Local Plan aligns with the

revised NPPF and has been reduced to 10 units.

- Request that the application is deferred from the August committee to consider whether it is consistent with both with the revised NPPF and the new Local Plan requirements in regard to delivering affordable housing and the affordable housing threshold for sites.
- If the application is not deferred, what options does the Committee have to either decide to defer it themselves to ensure it is heard under the new approved Local Plan, or insist that the weight to be given to the new Local Plan and the revised NPPF in regard to policies on affordable housing must now be so significant as to outweigh the existing Local Plan for this application?

A response will be provided in the officer presentation.

Letter from the applicant

A letter has been received from the applicant's solicitor on 23 August which can be summarised as follows:

- The applicant objected to the Development Control Forum (DCF) taking place as the petition was clear that the objections raised were on principle. The guidance makes it clear that petitions objecting on principle will not be considered at a DCF.
- The DCF gave an opportunity for objectors to forcefully express their views in opposition to the application to committee members and did not offer any scope for building consensus and resolving concerns.
- The decision on the previous application 17/1372/FUL is a material consideration and the local planning authority is required to have regard to the importance of consistency in decision making.
- The previous application was subject to a DCF at which the majority of the members of the planning committee were present. The application was considered by the committee with the benefit of a full report and members had a full opportunity to debate and take account of the objections raised.
- The applicant has addressed the four reasons for refusal on the previous application. In all other aspects the current application is the same as the previous application. There would be no reason for the Council to refuse the application on grounds that were not given in relation to 17/1372/FUL.
- Case law identifies that if a different decision is to be made, reasons for that departure have to be given, unless it is obvious why an earlier decisions had to be reversed. There is no reason to reach a different decision in respects of the application which has not materially changed since the previous decision.

Amendments To Text: None

Pre-Committee Amendments to Recommendation: None

Agenda Item 7

PLANNING COMMITTEE

11th June 2019

Application Number	19/0288/FUL	Agenda Item	
Date Received	4th March 2019	Officer	Ganesh Gnanamoorthy
Target Date	3rd June 2019		
Ward	Romsey		
Site	Development Land At 75 Cromwell Road Cambridge		
Proposal	Erection of 295 dwellings including 40% affordable housing; a nursery and community facility (D1), access, car and cycle parking, including basement car park, play equipment and landscaping, substation and associated works.		
Applicant	Cambridge Investment Partnership		

SUMMARY	The development accords with the Development Plan for the following reasons: - The development would significantly increase the amount of housing (both affordable and market) to help meet demand within the city; - The proposed development would make efficient use of vacant brownfield land by providing a high quality residential-led development that would not have any significant adverse impact on the residential amenity of the neighbouring occupiers; - The design and scale of the proposed development responds appropriately to the surrounding built form; - The proposal would provide new community facilities in the form of a nursery and community use and a generous amount of open space for public use.

	- The proposed development meets high standards of sustainability with fabric-first construction, MVHR, CHP, green roofs, EV charging points and sustainable urban drainage.
RECOMMENDATION	APPROVAL

0.0 BACKGROUND

0.1 This planning application has been submitted by Cambridge Investment Partnership (CIP) which is a joint venture company set up by Cambridge City Council and Hill Investment Partnership. The purpose of the partnership is to deliver 500 net new council rented homes across the City using mainly council owned sites/assets. The City Council has received £70 million support from central government as part of the Devolution Deal to help achieve this target. The development proposed at Cromwell Road includes 118 new council rented homes proposed or 23.6% of the 500 home target.

1.0 SITE DESCRIPTION/AREA CONTEXT

1.1 The application site is an irregular shaped plot of land with a strong north-south orientation, and occupies approximately 3.27 hectares in area.

1.2 The site is bound to the west by railway lines, to the south by residential properties along Cavendish Place and Cavendish Road, to the east by residential properties along Cromwell Road together with a small parade of shops, and to the north by residential properties along Cromwell Road and Winstanley Court. The building heights of the properties in the nearby area range from between two and six storeys, including a number of flatted developments to the north of the site.

1.3 The site currently benefits from two access points. These include the principal access and only vehicular access from Cromwell Road, and an emergency vehicle access from Cromwell Road.

1.4 The site is currently vacant, but was previously in use as a timber yard (use class Sui Generis) by a company called

Ridgeons. The site has been vacant since June 2018. Prior to Ridgeons vacating the site, outline planning permission was granted to redevelop the site with permission granted for up to 245 dwellings, together with community floor space. An application for the demolition of the buildings associated with the timber yard has since been submitted and approved and works have commenced on the removal of existing and now vacant structures.

- 1.5 The property is not located within a designated conservation area although the Mill Road conservation area is sited to the south and west of the site. There are no listed buildings on the site or in the immediate vicinity.
- 1.6 The site falls partially (to the west) within the Strategic District Heating Area as shown on the adopted Cambridge Local Plan (2018) proposals map.
- 1.7 The entirety of the site is also shown on the proposals map as a 'Proposal Site', identifying the site as being suitable for residential development.

2.0 THE PROPOSAL

- 2.1 This application proposes a comprehensive redevelopment of the site involving the erection of 295 dwellings (including 40% for Council rent), a nursery and community facility (use class D1), car and cycle parking (including basement level parking), open space provision, new substations and associated works.
- 2.2 The residential accommodation includes a range of dwelling types and tenures with 2, 3 and 4 bedroom houses and 1 and 2 bedroom apartments of both tenures. All of the new dwellings proposed meet or exceed the residential space standards within Policy 50 of the Local Plan. The dwellings are proposed within buildings ranging between two and seven storeys in height.
- 2.3 The nursery/community facility would have a floor area of 410 square metres, and would be located at ground floor level of a four storey building with three floors of residential apartments above.

- 2.4 The proposal provides a number of communal open spaces within the site, including a sizeable central park which runs north to south through the middle of the site.
- 2.5 Along the western edge of the site, the application proposes a series of six flat-roofed flat blocks ranging between four and seven storeys. The blocks would be interlinked by lower elements with the exception of the northern-most block (Block A). A park is proposed to the east of these blocks with the remainder of the site made up of two and three storey houses, green spaces, and associated infrastructure.
- 2.6 The proposal has been amended since submission to take on board comments from statutory consultees. The changes include alterations to landscaping and open spaces, the elevational appearance of the nursery building, improved visibility splays to the Cavendish Place access and updated noise and vibration and air quality assessments. A further period of consultation has been undertaken as a result of these changes.
- 2.7 It is worthy of note that the scheme has been through an extensive pre-application process with officers, and has also benefitted from a previous outline approval for 245 homes and the preparation of a site wide Supplementary Planning Document.
- 2.8 The application is accompanied by the following supporting information:
- Air Quality Assessment;
 - Preliminary Ecological Appraisal;
 - Daylight/Sunlight, Overshadowing Assessment;
 - Design and Access Statement;
 - Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Strategy Report;
 - Phase 1 and Phase II Land Contamination Assessments;
 - Landscape Management Plan;
 - External Lighting Report;
 - Noise and Vibration Assessment;
 - Planning Statement;
 - Statement of Community Involvement;
 - Transport Assessment;
 - Framework Travel Plan;

- Tree Survey, Arboricultural Impact Assessment, Method Statement and Tree Protection Plan;
- Construction Phase Health and Safety Plan;
- Energy Strategy Report;
- Overheating Assessment;
- Town and Views Assessment
- Archaeological Desk-Based Assessment
- Bat Survey
- Breeding Bird Survey
- Ecological Enhancement Plan
- Utility Services Report
- Materials Management Plan
- Verified Views Study
- Ventilation Statement
- Public Art and Delivery Plan
- Construction Phase Health & Safety Plan and Traffic Management Plan

3.0 SITE HISTORY

3.1 The application site has an extensive planning history. The most relevant applications are detailed below

Reference	Description	Outcome
18/5332/SCRE	Request for EIA Screening Opinion in respect of the proposed development of the former Ridgeons site, Cromwell Road, Cambridge for the development of up to 295 dwellings, a basement car park and approximately 272sqm nursery and community facility.	Pending
18/1432/FUL	Demolition of all buildings and hardstanding on the site and construction of a soil strip as part of the land contamination remediation strategy.	Permission Granted
16/1904/OUT	Outline application for erection of up to 245 dwellings, including affordable housing, a nursery and/or community facility, open space, car parking, cycle parking and associated works following	Permission Granted

the demolition of all existing buildings on the site

4.0 PUBLICITY

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

5.0 POLICY

5.1 See Appendix 1 for full details of Central Government Guidance, Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policies, Supplementary Planning Documents and Material Considerations.

5.2 Relevant Development Plan policies

PLAN	POLICY NUMBER
Cambridge Local Plan 2018	1, 3, 14, 24, 28, 29, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 45, 47, 50, 51, 55, 56, 57, 59, 60, 61, 68, 70, 71, 73, 74, 75, 80, 81, 82, 85

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

Central Government Guidance	National Planning Policy Framework February 2019 National Planning Policy Framework – Planning Practice Guidance March 2014 Circular 11/95 (Annex A)
Supplementary Planning Guidance	Sustainable Design and Construction (May 2007) Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Waste Partnership (RECAP): Waste Management Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (February 2012) Planning Obligation Strategy (March 2010)

Material Considerations	<u>City Wide Guidance</u> Cycle Parking Guide for New Residential Developments (2010) Public Art SPD 2010.
	<u>Area Guidelines</u> Cromwell Road SPD

6.0 CONSULTATIONS

Cambridgeshire County Council (Highways Development Management)

- 6.1 The Highways Officer raised concerns with the content and level of detail provided within the Traffic Management Plan and hardworks plans and recommended that the application be refused due to the concerns that existed. The applicants subsequently produced revised documents and drawings and the Highways Officer has confirmed that this resolves his concerns.
- 6.2 The Highways Officer has recommended conditions be attached with relation to securing details of road maintenance/management, and restricting private water discharging onto the highway.

Cambridgeshire County Council (Education)

- 6.3 Requests have been made for contributions towards primary and secondary school projects and library contributions with a specified financial sum required to be spent towards the cost of providing the early years nursery facility.

Conservation Officer

- 6.4 No comments received

Urban Design Officer

- 6.5 The Council's Urban Design Officer was generally supportive of the scheme as originally submitted although it was recommended that changes were made to various aspects including the nursery elevation, cycle stores and public realm.

- 6.6 Firstly, it was considered that the nursery/community facility should have a greater distinctiveness from the residential above. Secondly, the developer was encouraged to revisit the design of 'The Square', and junction of Park Road and East Mews with regard to materials and kerb detailing.
- 6.7 Amendments to the scheme have been made and the Urban Design Officer has confirmed that the scheme is now considered acceptable with regard to urban design.

Sustainability Officer

- 6.8 The Council's Sustainability Officer has confirmed that the scheme is acceptable from a sustainability point of view subject to the imposition of conditions securing a revised Carbon Reduction Statement, water efficiency specification, combined heat and power specification and BREEAM compliance.

Landscape Officer

- 6.9 The Council's Landscape Officer had raised concerns with regard to the design of the southern square, the central park area, materials, and some of the planting proposals within the original application submission.
- 6.10 The applicant has subsequently made amendments and the Landscape Officer was re-consulted accordingly. The officer has confirmed that the details provided are now acceptable although conditions have been suggested to secure further detailed design and management information.

Tree Officer

- 6.11 The Council's Tree Officer has raised no objection to the proposal although some concerns have been raised with regard to the proximity of hard landscaping to the root protection areas of existing trees which are to be retained and the potential for harm to be caused if appropriate protection measures are not put in place. It has been recommended that a condition be attached in the event of permission being granted to secure an Arboricultural Method Statement and Tree Protection Plan to address the above concerns.

Drainage Officer

- 6.12 The Council's Drainage Officer has raised no objections to the proposal subject to conditions securing full drainage scheme details, as well as a maintenance plan for the drainage system.

Archaeology Officer

- 6.13 The County Council's Archaeology Officer has raised no objections to the proposal subject to a condition requiring the applicant to secure the implementation of a programme of archaeological works in accordance with a Written Scheme of Investigation.

Environmental Health Officer

- 6.14 The Council's Environmental Health Officer has been consulted on the proposal. Initial concerns were raised with regard to noise and air quality, although further information has been provided which has overcome these concerns. The application is considered acceptable subject to the imposition of conditions.

Environment Agency

- 6.15 The Environment Agency have raised no objections to the proposal subject to conditions relating to contamination, submission of a materials management plan, and information relating to piling and sustainable drainage.

Local Lead Flood Authority

- 6.16 No objection raised.

Developer Contributions Monitoring Officer

- 6.17 A list of contributions required to mitigate the impact of the development has been provided.

Enabling (Affordable Housing) Officer

- 6.18 No objection raised.

Ecology Officer

6.19 No comment received.

Public Art Officer

6.20 No comment received.

Fire and Rescue

6.21 No objection subject to the imposition of a condition securing fire hydrants, locations of which should be agreed by the Water Authority.

Anglian Water

6.22 No objection raised.

Network Rail

6.23 No objection raised.

Designing Out Crime Officer

6.24 No objection raised, and confirms that the scheme would achieve Secure by Design Gold standard.

Cambridge International Airport

6.25 No objection subject to the imposition of a condition removing permitted development rights with regard to cranes and construction equipment so as to ensure that development which might impact upon aircraft safety can be controlled.

6.26 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:

- 17 Cromwell Road

- 19 Cromwell Road
- 21 Cromwell Road
- 29A Cromwell Road
- 45 Cromwell Road
- 50 Cromwell Road
- 65 Cromwell Road
- 69 Cromwell Road
- 71 Cromwell Road
- 81 Cromwell Road
- 100 Cromwell Road
- 108 Cromwell Road
- 33 Winstanley Court
- 66 Winstanley Court
- 123 Sedgwick Street

7.2 The representations can be summarised as follows:

- Desire for the brick wall to the rear of properties 57 – 73 Cromwell Road and the application site to remain
- General need for an access over or under the railway line
- Loss of privacy and overlooking with relation to properties on Cromwell Road and within Winstanley Court
- Loss of light to gardens along Cromwell Road
- Seven storeys too tall for the area
- Properties generally too tall
- Development could be of a higher quality design
- Construction noise
- Too much social housing being provided
- Not enough social housing being provided
- Local schools will not be able to cope with the increased demand for places
- Harm to existing wildlife

7.3 Camcycle responded to the proposal as originally submitted and raised concerns with regard to layout, lack of visibility splays along Cavendish Place, cycle store access to some flat blocks, and the one-way nature of The Sidings Road. Amendments have been made to address the concerns raised, with the exception of the request to provide a level access footpath over the main entrance road. This was due to the County Council's Highways Officer expressing concern with the suggested amendment on highway safety grounds. Camcycle

have subsequently confirmed that their concerns have been resolved.

- 7.4 Cambridge Past, Present and Future have commented on the proposal. Concerns have been raised regarding the amount of affordable housing proposed, with 50% being considered more appropriate. Concerns have also been expressed over the design of the development being too similar to other large developments.

Design and Conservation Panel

- 7.5 Proposals for the site have been before the panel on two occasions. On the first occasion, a high level presentation was given as the plans were first emerging. The panel concluded as follows: *'Though appreciating of this project's intentions, the Panel were unconvinced by the current layout and found the landscaping generally unambitious. While interested in the architectural design theme suggested, the lack of basic information such as detailed plans left the Panel unable to comment in depth. Overall, the site would benefit from further design development of all aspects before it is submitted for planning.'* The verdict was 7 ambers and 1 red with further design development required.
- 7.6 On the second occasion, a more detailed presentation was given. The panel concluded as follows: *'The scheme is ambitious in its development and clearly dedicated to sustainability. However, it suffers from a lack of consideration of how the space will be used by residents and visitors. The flow of foot traffic is broken at awkward moments in the landscaping and the pedestrian square is liable to be overtaken by parked cars if not rethought. Some redesign of the landscaping with residents in mind should still be undertaken. A strong and coherent park design offering delight and enjoyment for all its users would greatly enhance the scheme.'* The verdict was 3 green and 5 ambers.
- 7.7 The panel's concerns were primarily focussed on pedestrian movements throughout the scheme and the southern square where parking management was a concern. The panel's comments were subsequently discussed with the applicants, urban design and landscape officers and amendments made to address the concerns raised. The southern square now

incorporates a much larger area of open space including soft landscaping and cycle storage.

- 7.8 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. Residential amenity
4. Refuse arrangements
5. Highway safety
6. Car and cycle parking
7. Drainage
8. Trees and ecology
9. Energy and Sustainability
10. Affordable housing
11. Public art
12. S106 contributions
13. Third party representations

Principle of Development

- 8.2 Policy 3 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2018) seeks to ensure that the majority of new development should be focused in and around the existing urban area, making the most effective use of previously developed land, and enabling the maximum number of people to access services and facilities locally. The proposal is for a residential-led development within a predominantly residential area. The proposal would make use of previously developed land, and falls within an existing urban area. The principal of residential development on the site, with a nursery/community use, has already been established under the approved outline planning permission detailed in section 3 of this report.
- 8.3 It is worthy of note that the site is allocated as a proposal site in the adopted Local Plan, which identifies the site as suitable for

residential development. Appendix B states that the 3.27ha site has an indicative capacity of 245 dwellings. As noted in Footnote 8, the indicative capacity is an approximate number based on the initial assessment carried out in the context of the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment. Footnote 8 advises that the final number of dwellings may be greater or smaller depending on the detailed assessment and the detailed design. In other words, the final quantum of development should be design led. In addition, both the Local Plan and the NPPF are clear that developments should seek to make the efficient use of land, particularly in the case of previously development brownfield land such as this. Subject to the design and impact of a scheme containing more than the indicative 245 dwellings being demonstrated to be acceptable, the principle of making better use of the land can be supported.

- 8.4 The provision of a nursery/community facility would help to meet the needs of the residents of the new development, as well as the wider community, and would provide facilities to contribute to the additional needs within the area created by the development, and such a provision is supported by the Cromwell Road SPD.
- 8.5 With the above in mind the principle of development is considered acceptable subject to the material considerations discussed below being satisfactorily met.

Context of site, design and external spaces (and impact on heritage assets)

- 8.6 The site is located to the north and east of the Mill Road Conservation Area, although does not sit within it. As discussed earlier in this report, the site sits within a predominantly residential area with varying building heights.
- 8.7 The proposed development has been laid out with linked apartment blocks along the western edge of the site (along the boundary with the railway lines) with height varying between four and seven storeys. The nursery and community facility will be located at ground floor level of the most northerly of these which would be four storeys tall. To the eastern edge and southern part of the site, houses are proposed with heights of two and three storeys. This distribution of taller apartment blocks adjacent to the railway and lower 2-3 storey houses to

the east and south surrounding a large open space accords with the principles established within the Supplementary Planning Document. This layout ensures that the development responds well to, and integrates well with, the surrounding context with a gradual increase in height being achieved from the existing residential properties with the taller blocks of flats being sited centrally to the western boundary of the site, and away from existing development. This graduated increase in height also ensures that the development has an acceptable impact on the character and setting of the Mill Road conservation area.

- 8.8 The scheme has been laid out in a logical manner with street layouts providing easy access to all properties, whilst being kept to minimum to ensure that the development would not feel car dominated. The location of the park in the centre of the site ensures that it would benefit from natural surveillance and feel like a safe space. The park helps the development relate well to the character and identity of Cambridge as a whole with development often punctuated by open spaces, providing a sense of openness. The concerns initially expressed by the Design and Conservation Panel regarding the layout are noted although the desire to provide a central park area, along with the need to have lower level housing towards existing dwellings and the conservation area means that the layout provided is the most logical and avoids harm to existing residents. It is also in accordance with the approved parameter plans under the outline consent.
- 8.9 The buildings have been designed with the Mill Road conservation area in mind, with a number of features evident within the conservation area reflected in the proposal. Examples of these include bay windows, decorative lintels, and soldier course brick banding. A further reference to the conservation area is the decision to use brickwork as the prevailing material throughout the development. It is recommended that, in the event of planning permission being granted a condition should be attached to secure samples and a schedule of all external materials so as to ensure an appropriate finish.
- 8.10 Neighbours have expressed concerns regarding the proposed height of the tallest part of the development. Although the proposed height of seven storeys is greater than the heights of properties in the immediate vicinity, these taller buildings are

located centrally in the site and furthest from existing buildings. The two seven storey buildings have purposefully been located where the central park is at its widest. It is considered appropriate to view the appearance of the proposal in the context of the wider area. With this in mind, it is worthy of mention that Pym Court, the most recent development to the north along Cromwell Road includes six storey buildings, one fewer than this proposal and with far more limited open space provision.

- 8.11 Comments have been received suggesting that the design should be of a higher quality than that which is proposed. Officers have engaged in considerable pre-application discussions with the applicants to ensure that the design of the development, as proposed, is of a high quality.
- 8.12 The applicant has provided a fully rendered verified view study of the proposal – showing the existing and proposed views from a number of different locations. The methodology used is considered appropriate and, having reviewed the document, I consider that the images adequately demonstrate that the proposal would appear acceptable within the context of the wider area.
- 8.13 Concerns have been raised with regard to the proposal being an overdevelopment of the site. The proposal has a density of 90 dwellings per hectare, which is comparable with nearby density levels along Cromwell Road ranging between 84 and 111 dwellings per hectare. The proposal sits comfortably at the lower end of this range and is considered acceptable in this context.
- 8.14 It is acknowledged that the current proposal is for fifty dwellings more than the previously approved outline scheme, although the rationale for this was an attempt to provide more of the tenure of homes which have been identified as being in greatest demand in the local area – that being one and two bedroom properties. The previous scheme had a greater proportion of three and four bedroom properties than the current. The change in tenure has allowed for a greater number of dwellings to be provided, and of a tenure which best provides for the identified local need.

- 8.15 The proposal includes a number of landscaped areas within the site, including a park, other communal green spaces (such as the 'Southern Square'), a children's play area, and other planting and landscaped areas.
- 8.16 The Council's Landscape Officer has been consulted on the proposal and recommendations were made to improve the scheme, as summarised in section 6 of this report. The concerns of the Design and Conservation Panel have also been considered and changes incorporated accordingly. The Landscape Officer has been consulted on the amendments made and has confirmed that the scheme is now satisfactory subject to the imposition of a number of conditions.
- 8.17 I consider that the quantum of open space proposed, at 0.72 hectares, is of a sufficient scale for the development proposed. The outline application provided 0.60 hectares of open space and this application has provided a pro rata uplift accordingly.
- 8.18 The Landscape Officer has recommended a number of conditions be imposed to secure further details of some of the landscape features including boundary treatment, green roofs and tree pits, and these have been recommended.
- 8.19 It is my opinion that the form, height and layout of the proposed development is appropriate to the surrounding pattern of development and the character of the area and would not constitute overdevelopment. In my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2018) policies 52, 55, 56, 57, 59, 60 and 61.

Residential Amenity

Impact on amenity of neighbouring occupiers

- 8.20 With regard to the properties in, and along the entrance to, Winstanley Court which are made up of three storey (including roof level accommodation) houses and a part three, part four storey block of flats. It is noted that residents of some of these properties have raised concerns regarding overlooking and a loss of light. The part of the development which has the greatest potential for adversely impacting on these properties is 'Block A', a four storey building with nursery and community use at ground floor level and residential on the upper floors.

- 8.21 Block A would be an irregular shaped building with an eastern elevation facing the rear of a short staggered terrace of three storey (including roof level accommodation) houses. The proposed building would have a minimum separation distance with the rear of these properties of 18m, which I consider to be an acceptable distance. It is acknowledged that there are some openings facing these properties and these will provide views towards the rear of these properties, as well as some winter gardens. It is accepted that the proposed development would provide a greater level of overlooking than the existing situation due to the fact that there are no residential properties on this site at present, however, given the distance between the properties, I do not consider the level of overlooking or privacy loss caused to be significantly harmful. The part three, part four storey flat block at Winstanley Court is offset to the elevations of Block A, and so all views towards windows are acute only. The acute views, along with a minimum separation distance of 11m leads me to consider that the impact on these flats would be acceptable.
- 8.22 The location of Block A to the west of the properties in Winstanley Court means that impact on overshadowing, sunlight and daylight receipt are minimal. The applicant has provided a comprehensive sunlight, daylight and overshadowing report which confirms that the proposed buildings will not cause a significant loss of light in any existing buildings. It is also worthy of note that the parameters plans with the original outline scheme established that a six storey building in this location would be acceptable in principle and the proposed building is just four storeys, of a similar scale to the existing building at Winstanley Court.
- 8.23 To the south of the short staggered three storey (including roof level) terrace referred to in paragraph 8.9 would be an access road into the site, and beyond this (further to the south) would be the flank elevation of a semi-detached, three storey property. This property would be situated some 13m away from the flank of the existing end-of-staggered-terrace property. The proposed flank wall would have no windows facing this property, is positioned oblique to the existing property, to the south-west and is sufficiently far enough away for me to be content that there would not be an adverse impact on the amenities of the existing house at 83 Cromwell Road.

- 8.24 The sunlight and daylight study undertaken by the applicant indicates that the development would be acceptable with respect to sunlight and daylight receipt, as well as overshadowing using standard methodology. I have no reason to dispute this conclusion.
- 8.25 A number of pairs of semi-detached houses would run north to south across the site to the east of the park. These properties would be three storeys in height and would have rear gardens facing eastwards, onto the rear gardens of existing two storey properties fronting Cromwell Road.
- 8.26 The separation between these properties will range from 31 to 57 metres. This gap, would ensure that these properties would not have a significant adverse impact on these existing properties with regard to overlooking, overshadowing, loss of light or outlook.
- 8.27 To the south of the semi-detached pairs discussed in the previous two paragraphs would sit some properties perpendicular to those just described. The eastern-most of these would have a flank elevation facing the boundary with numbers 19 and 21 Cromwell Road. These properties have raised concerns regarding the impact of the proposal on their amenity.
- 8.28 The submitted sunlight, daylight and overshadowing assessment undertaken sets out, in great detail, the methodology adopted, and how this fits with BRE guidelines.
- 8.29 With regard to daylight, the relevant test is a two stage process, with both tests needing to fail for there to be considered an unacceptable harm on sunlight receipt. The analysis was carried out using 3D modelling, and all but two properties passed the first test (an angular check) – those being 19 and 21 Cromwell Road.
- 8.30 The second part of the test is a vertical sky component check, assessing the light receipt to all windows at ground floor level. These two properties both pass the test, indicating an acceptable impact on daylight receipt.
- 8.31 With regard to sunlight receipt to these properties, the BRE test only requires windows facing within 90 degrees of due south to

be tested. In this instance, neither of these properties have such windows. The impact of the proposal on the daylight receipt is, therefore, considered acceptable.

8.32 On the issue of overshadowing, the BRE guidelines seek to ensure that outdoor spaces are not permanently in shade for large parts of the year. The test that needs to be passed is whether or not 50% of the open space would receive two hours of sunlight on 21st March. The study highlights that the most likely properties to be impacted are, again, 19 and 21 Cromwell Road. However, the test demonstrates that the two hour threshold is exceeded for more than half of the garden space in both cases. On 21st June, when the gardens are likely to get greater use, the test shows more than 90% of the garden would achieve more than two hours of sunlight. With regard to 19 and 21 Cromwell Road, it is worthy of note that prior to the demolition works that are currently taking place on site, a large warehouse building was sited to the rear of these properties, and directly at the boundary with 21 Cromwell Road, and this exceeded 9.00m (equivalent to 3-4 storeys) in height. The dwellings proposed are just two storeys and are situated further from the boundary with 21 Cromwell Road.

8.33 Going further south, the proposal is for predominantly two storey properties, with separation distances ranging between 10 and 32 metres from existing properties. Again, these distances are considered acceptable with regard to neighbouring amenity, especially with the majority of the properties achieving separation distances at the higher end of the range given.

8.34 I have assessed the potential impact on the residential amenity of the surrounding occupiers in terms of sunlight, daylight, overlooking, overbearing sense of enclosure and overshadowing. I am satisfied that the proposal, due to its siting, layout and distance from existing dwellings and boundaries, would not have a significant adverse impact on the residential amenity of the neighbouring occupiers such that it would warrant refusal.

Wider area

8.35 Neighbours have raised concerns regarding the impact of noise, dust and reverberation during the construction phase. The Environmental Health Team has recommended various

construction related conditions in order to protect the residential amenity of occupiers of properties in the wider area during construction. These relate to noise during construction, construction hours, plant specifications, mitigating noise from the nursery use, and securing details of the winter gardens. I have no reason to deviate from the advice given and have recommended these conditions accordingly. 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 (2018) policies 35, 55 and 56.

Amenity for future occupiers of the site

- 8.36 Policy 50 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2018) sets out internal residential space standards. All units proposed comply with, and most exceed, these standards. In this regard, I consider that all the new homes proposed would provide a high quality internal living environment for the future occupants.
- 8.37 Policy 50 of Cambridge Local Plan (2018) states that all new residential units will be expected to have direct access to an area of private amenity space.
- 8.38 All of the proposed dwellings benefit from a private amenity area. These take the forms of gardens, balconies and winter gardens.
- 8.39 As well as the private amenity spaces, the development incorporates a number of shared green spaces, including a park running north to south through the middle of the site, and other smaller pockets of landscaped greenery.
- 8.40 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 (2018) policy 50.
- 8.41 The development has been assessed for compliance with Policy 51 and all dwellings comply with the requirements of Part M4 (2) of the Building Regulations. In addition, 5% of all affordable units have been designed to M4 (3), indicating that they are suitable for wheelchair users. In order to ensure the

units are provided to these standards, I have recommended a condition to secure these requirements.

- 8.42 Subject to the imposition of a condition as suggested in the previous paragraph, I am content that the proposal complies with Cambridge Local Plan (2018) policies 50 and 51.

Refuse Arrangements

- 8.43 The proposed refuse storage arrangements are shown to be of a logical layout, with flats having internal communal bin stores and houses having their own bin stores. The nursery and community facility would have a dedicated refuse store on the sidings. The applicant has provided calculations of storage provision and these demonstrate that the quantum of provision is in accordance with the required levels. The applicant has provided detailed tracking plans demonstrating how refuse vehicles would be able to negotiate the development safely when collecting refuse and recycling.
- 8.44 The Council's Refuse and Recycling Officer has been consulted on the application and no response has been received.
- 8.45 Drag distance would be within ten metres and this would comply with the RECAP Waste Design Guide (2012).
- 8.46 In my opinion the proposal is compliant in this respect with Cambridge Local Plan (2018) policy 57.

Highway Safety

- 8.47 The application has been supported by a number of plans demonstrating how the development would be accessed and egressed. This includes swept path analysis which show safe use by refuse trucks is possible within the site. The Highway Authority was consulted as part of the application and have raised no objection to the scheme. They have suggested that a condition be attached in the event of permission being granted to ensure private water does not discharge onto the highway to protect the safety of users.
- 8.48 In my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2018) policy 81.

Car and Cycle Parking

8.49 The Cambridge Local Plan (2018) seeks to support developments that incorporate sustainable forms of transport, including walking, cycling and public transport. This, however, does not negate the requirement for schemes to provide an appropriate level of car parking within a scheme.

Car Parking

8.50 Policy 82 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2018) requires new developments to comply with, and not exceed, the maximum car parking standards as set out within appendix L of the same document.

8.51 The site is not located within a Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) and, with this in mind, the maximum car parking provision on site is for:

- No more than a mean of 1.5 spaces per dwelling (up to 2 bedrooms)
- No less than a mean of 0.5 spaces per dwelling, up to a maximum of 2 spaces per dwelling (3 or more bedrooms)

8.52 The nursery/community use would require a maximum of 2 spaces per 3 members of staff.

8.53 The proposal affords 258 car parking spaces, with all 2, 3 and 4 bedroom houses having an allocated space each. Parking is provided at basement and ground level. All two bedroom flats, and half of the one bedroom flats would have parking space access also. In total, 82% of properties would have dedicated parking.

8.54 All wheelchair homes would have parking spaces in close proximity.

8.55 Visitor parking is provided along the main entrance – via Cromwell Road and The Sidings.

8.56 The nursery/ community use would have a dedicated drop off point with two spaces for this purpose. This element would have 3 dedicated spaces for staff.

Cycle Parking

- 8.57 Policy 82 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2018) requires new developments to comply with the cycle parking standards as set out within appendix L of the same document.
- 8.58 The standards set out that one cycle space should be provided for dwellings of up to 3 bedrooms, and three spaces for 4 bedroom dwellings. It is stated that cycle parking should not, where possible, be located at basement level. For the nursery/community use, one space is required for every five members of staff.
- 8.59 The proposal provides 635 cycle parking spaces.
- 8.60 All dwellings are compliant with the required standards outlined above. The flat blocks would have internal cycle stores with external access. Four of the blocks would have internal access also. All cycle stands would be Sheffield stands.
- 8.61 Sixty-four visitor spaces are proposed, and these are located in various locations across the site including in the park area, The Sidings Road between blocks of flats, and alongside the children's play area.
- 8.62 The nursery/community use would have 10 staff spaces and 20 visitor spaces.
- 8.63 The scheme has been designed to allow for connections with the Chisholm Trail cycle route, which is a cycle route proposed between Cambridge and Cambridge North train stations and being delivered by the Greater Cambridge Partnership. This site performs a key role in linking the route along the sidings to Cromwell Road. The scheme has been designed to maximise permeability through the site. The County Council are exploring the potential for future connections to the east and west of the site and the proposed layout has been specifically designed to allow for these connections to be made in the future.
- 8.64 In my opinion the proposal promotes the prevalence of sustainable transport methods, and provides an acceptable balance between car and cycle parking. I consider the proposal to be compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2018) policy 82.

Integrated water management and flood risk

- 8.65 The application has been designed with a number of drainage features incorporated. These include swales, rain gardens, a wetland area, and undulating landscape. A flood risk and drainage strategy report was submitted with the application.
- 8.66 The Drainage Team has advised that the strategy is acceptable, although the design details would need to be secured by way of condition to ensure that the intended delivery is realised. These conditions are therefore recommended. In my opinion, the proposal is compliant with the paragraph 163 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2019) and policy 31 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2018).

Trees & Ecology

Trees

- 8.67 The application was accompanied by a tree survey, arboricultural impact assessment and tree protection plan. Further information on tree pit details has also been provided.
- 8.68 The 'The Arboricultural Impact Assessment identifies 56 trees plus groups of trees and hedges. 26 trees plus the majority of groups and hedges are retained in the proposals including key boundary features such as G001, A006 and H002 and trees to the rear of existing gardens of properties along Cromwell Road. The majority of landscape features scheduled for removal are identified as being of low quality. The proposed development includes 130 new trees in a carefully considered landscape design and a wide variety of sustainable urban drainage features incorporated into the landscaping.'
- 8.69 The Council's Tree Officer has been consulted on the proposal and has raised no objection to the proposal. The officer has noted that the development will be in close proximity to the root protection area of some trees and has requested that conditions be attached to ensure that the health of these are duly considered during construction.
- 8.70 In my opinion, subject to these conditions, the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2018) policy 71.

Ecology

- 8.71 The Ecology officer has been consulted as part of the application, although no comment has been received.
- 8.72 Concerns have been raised by local residents regarding the harm of the development to existing wildlife, with particular mention of hedgehogs.
- 8.73 The application has been supported by an Ecological Enhancement Plan and this acknowledges that the existing site is of low ecological value. The report outlines a number of possible opportunities for providing ecological habitats on site. These include bird and bat boxes, hedgehog friendly fences, and provision of native plants beneficial to wildlife.
- 8.74 Although no comment has been received from the Council's Ecological Officer, it is considered appropriate to attach a condition requiring a scheme for ecological enhancement to be provided in order to ensure that the recommendations of the submitted are adequately implemented.
- 8.75 The proposal would therefore be in accordance with Policy 70 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2018).

Energy and Sustainability

- 8.76 The proposed development includes a series of renewable energy and sustainability measures to reduce carbon emissions and to save energy in accordance with Policy 28. These include the following:
- Green biodiverse/sedum roofs to all apartment buildings
 - Sustainable urban drainage integrated into landscaping – wetland, rainwater gardens, swales, SUDS tree pits, permeable paving etc. – whereas the existing site is nearly 100% hard-paved, the proposed development includes a sustainable drainage system that means even in severe storm events the majority of water infiltrates into the soil within the site, taking pressure off the surrounding infrastructure
 - Combined Heat and Power (CHP) plant serving all apartments – this would convert unused energy into

- electricity to power communal areas of apartment buildings, reducing residents' energy bills
- Fabric-first – thicker, denser insulation and wall construction to minimise heat loss and reduce residents' energy bills
- Mechanical Ventilation with Heat Recovery (MVHR) for all apartments and affordable houses
- Electric vehicle charging points – every home with an allocated space has active electric vehicle charging installed plus 10% of all communal parking spaces. The remainder all have ductwork installed and electric capacity for 50 more electric vehicle points to be connected in the future.
- Photovoltaic (PV) panels on the roofs of houses and apartments
- BREEAM 'Very Good' nursery/community facility

8.77 The Energy report demonstrates that the approach chosen would exceed the 19% reduction in carbon dioxide emissions target within policy 28. A comprehensive approach has been taken to sustainability and the measures proposed combine to form a highly sustainable development.

8.78 The Council's Sustainability Officer has been consulted on the proposal and has raised no objections subject to the imposition of conditions relating to the provision of a carbon reduction statement (which the development would then adhere to, once approved), and demonstrating compliance with the required BREEAM standards.

8.79 I have no reason to consider the information submitted differently to the Sustainability Office and have recommended the suggested conditions accordingly.

Affordable Housing

8.80 Policy 45 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2018) seeks to secure 40% affordable housing on schemes of 15 or more dwellings.

8.81 The proposed development is for a scheme of 295 dwellings with 118 of these being affordable for social rent. This equates to 40% of the total number of dwellings. Of these, 57 would be 1-bedroom units, 48 2-bedroom units and 13 3-bedroom units.

- 8.82 It is noted that one representation has suggested that the amount of affordable housing proposed is too great. The policy sets out a minimum provision, and it is considered that anything less than the required 40% would not be acceptable in this instance.
- 8.83 The Council's Growth Officer has been consulted on the proposal and has raised no objections to the amount and breakdown proposed.
- 8.84 Whilst Policy 45 requires a mix of intermediate and affordable rented housing, 40% of the proposed new homes would deliver council rented housing only. In this case a very significant and un-met need has been found to exist for Council rented housing. The Council has identified that the significant levels of affordable rented need might otherwise go unmet without its own direct intervention. In my opinion the proposed tenure of affordable housing is justified in this case.

Public Art

- 8.85 The applicant has provided a public art strategy and delivery plan as part of their submission. The applicant proposes an amount of £250,000 towards public art within the site. This is commensurate with other schemes in the area (Mill Road Depot provided £200,000) and I consider that the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2018) policy 56 and the Public Art SPD 2010.

S106 Contributions

- 8.86 The Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Regulations 2010 have introduced the requirement for all local authorities to make an assessment of any planning obligation in relation to three tests. Each planning obligation needs to pass three statutory tests to make sure that it 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.

- 8.87 In line with the CIL Regulations, councils can pool no more than five S106 contributions towards the same project. The new 'pooling' restrictions were introduced from 6 April 2015 and relate to new S106 agreements. This means that all contributions now agreed by the city council must be for specific projects at particular locations, as opposed to generic infrastructure types within the city of Cambridge.
- 8.88 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 applicant has indicated their willingness to enter into a S106 planning obligation in accordance with the requirements of the Strategy. I have summarised the Heads of Terms below. Financial contributions would be calculated using formulae based on the final housing mix agreed through reserved matters.

Heads of Terms		Summary
City Council Infrastructure		
Informal open space		£53,406.00 plus indexation towards the provision of and/or improvement of and/or access to Informal Open Space facilities at Coldham's Common £20,000.00 plus indexation towards the provision of and/or improvement of and/or access to Informal Open Space facilities at Great Eastern Street.
Provision for children and teenagers		No contribution sought (play area to be provided on site)
Indoor sports		£166,780.00 plus indexation towards the provision of and/or improvement to the fitting out of an indoor sports zone at the Abbey Sports Complex, Pool Way, off Whitehill Road, Cambridge CB5 8NT.
Outdoor sports		£147,560.00 plus indexation towards the improvement to and enhancement of the artificial grass pitch carpet (from sand to rubber crumb) at Coldham's Common.
Community facilities		£416,218.00 (to be provided on site)

Affordable housing	40% provision on site. Tenure and dwelling type mix to be submitted for approval.
County Council – Education / Refuse	
Early years	On site contribution of a nursery. Indicative contribution figure £323,050 (Council) in writing.
Primary School	£833,350 towards St Philip's OR other relevant project as agreed with the Local Planning Authority (in consultation with Cambridgeshire County Council) in writing.
Secondary School	£466,400 – towards Coleridge OR other relevant project as agreed with the Local Planning Authority (in consultation with Cambridgeshire County Council) in writing.
Life Long Learning (Libraries)	£31,063.50
Strategic waste	No contributions sought
Monitoring	£650
County Council – Transport	
Chisholm Trail	
NHS	£107,090.90 (based on £363.02 per dwelling)

8.89 Subject to the completion of a S106 planning obligation to secure the above infrastructure and affordable housing provision, I am satisfied that the proposal accords with Cambridge Local Plan (2018) policy 45 and the Planning Obligation Strategy 2010.

Third Party Representations

8.90 The majority of matters raised in the representations have been addressed in this report already. There are, however, other points which remain unaddressed, and I will discuss these in turn now.

8.91 One representation has requested clarity as to whether the cycle

track would be upgraded to a standard suitable for adoption by the County Council. The applicant has confirmed that the entire route of the Chisholm trail within the site will meet adoptable standards and the intention is for the Highway Authority to adopt these roads and maintain them in perpetuity.

- 8.92 Comments have been raised regarding whether an existing brick wall located at the rear of 57-73 Cromwell Road would be retained within the proposal. The Developer has confirmed that this is, indeed, the case, and this is also shown on the plans. The previously electrified wires mounted on this wall will be removed.
- 8.93 Concerns have been raised with regard to the ability of local primary schools to cope with the existing demand for school places. This is accepted and a mitigation payment has been recommended to the County Council towards expanding existing facilities.
- 8.94 The desire for an access over or under the railway line is noted. However, it is not for the Local Planning Authority to dictate what should be provided by the development, and the responsibility of Officers is to assess the acceptability of the scheme for them. Requests for infrastructure can be made where it is considered necessary to make the development acceptable, but in this case I consider it would be unreasonable to make such a request of the developer.

9.0 CONCLUSION

- 9.1 The proposed is for the comprehensive redevelopment of the site involving the erection of 295 dwellings (including 40% for Council rent), a nursery and community facility (use class D1), car and cycle parking (including basement level parking), open space provision, a new substation and associated works.
- 9.2 The proposed development has had extensive pre-application consultation with a variety of consultees prior to its submission. Nevertheless, the scheme has been amended post submission to address issues that were not satisfactorily resolved at the pre-application stage and to take on board local concerns.
- 9.3 The proposal has been guided by the previously approved outline planning consent, as well as the Cromwell Road SPD

and Cambridge Local Plan (2018) which are material considerations.

- 9.4 The application has been considered against the relevant policies, and upon assessment, I consider that the application complies with national and local policies, and should, therefore, be granted planning permission subject to appropriate planning conditions and a S106 legal agreement.

10.0 RECOMMENDATION

APPROVE subject to (1) the prior completion of a S106 agreement to secure the planning obligations specified in paragraph 8.87 of this report, and (2) 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 construction work or demolition work shall be carried out or plant operated other than between the following hours: 0800 hours and 1800 hours on Monday to Friday, 0800 hours and 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 2018, Policy 35).

4. Prior to the commencement of above ground works, samples (including on site panels of a minimum size of 1x1m) and a schedule of materials to be used in all external elevations of the buildings hereby approved shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by, 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 2018, Policies 52, 55 and 57).

5. Prior to the commencement of above ground works, a scheme for the provision of fire hydrants shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details. The approved scheme shall detail the implementation strategy for the fire hydrants (noting the hydrants may be installed in a phased manner across the site). No dwellings shall be occupied until the fire hydrants serving that part of the site have been implemented and installed in accordance with the approved Scheme.

Reason: In the interests of residential safety (Cambridge Local Plan 2018, Policy 35).

6. Notwithstanding the plans hereby approved, 5% of all affordable dwellings shall be constructed to meet the requirements of Part M4(3) 'wheelchair user dwellings', and all dwellings shall be constructed to meet the requirements of Part M4(2) 'accessible and adaptable dwellings' of the building Regulations 2010 (as amended 2016).

Reason: To secure the provision of accessible housing (Cambridge Local Plan 2018, Policies 50 and 51).

7. No part of the development shall be occupied until details of facilities for the covered, secured parking of bicycles for use in connection with that part of the development hereby permitted have been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority. The approved facility shall be provided in accordance with the approved details prior to the occupation of each dwelling.

Reason: To ensure appropriate provision for the secure storage of bicycles (Cambridge Local Plan 2018, Policies 52, 55, 56 and 82).

8. The public art provision shall be fully implemented in accordance with the submitted Public Art Strategy and Delivery Plan V2 dated May 2019, unless otherwise approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Once in place, the public art shall not be moved or removed otherwise than in accordance with the approved maintenance arrangements.

Reason: To accord with the provisions of Cambridge City Council Public Art SPD (2010) (Cambridge Local Plan 2018, Policy 56).

9. No development shall take place until an archaeological written scheme of investigation (WSI) has been submitted to and approved by the local planning authority in writing. For land that is included within the WSI, no development shall take place other than in accordance with the agreed WSI which shall include:

- A. The statement of significance and research objectives;
- B. The programme and methodology of site investigation and recording and the nomination of a competent person(s) or organisation to undertake the agreed works;
- C. The programme for post-excavation assessment and subsequent analysis, publication & dissemination, and deposition of resulting material. This part of the condition shall not be discharged until these elements have been fulfilled in accordance with the programme set out in the WSI.

Reason: To ensure that an appropriate archaeological investigation of the site has been implemented before development commences (Cambridge Local Plan 2018, Policy 33).

10. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the construction phase traffic management plan Rev D dated 08/04/2019, considered as part of this application, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety (Cambridge Local Plan 2018, Policy 81).

11. Prior to first occupation, details of the proposed arrangements for the future management and maintenance of the proposed streets within the development shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority (The streets shall thereafter be maintained in accordance with the approved management and maintenance details until such time as an Agreement has been entered into under Section 38 of the Highways Act 1980 or a Private Management and Maintenance Company has been established), unless otherwise agreed in writing.

Reason: To ensure satisfactory development of the site and to ensure estate roads are managed and maintained thereafter to a suitable and safe standard (Cambridge Local Plan 2018, Policy 81).

12. The manoeuvring and parking areas shall be provided as shown on the drawings hereby approved, and retained free of obstruction.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety and to ensure an adequate level of parking provision is retained (Cambridge Local Plan 2018, Policies 81 and 82).

13. The works shown on Drawing Number PL02 Revision C provided by TPA shall not be commenced until such time as this access is closed as a temporary access for residents of the site.

Reason: In the interests of the safe and effective operation of the highway (Cambridge Local Plan 2018, Policy 81).

14. All areas of private land (i.e. that which is not to become adopted public highway) shall be constructed so that all its falls and levels are such that no private water from these areas drains across or onto the adopted public highway.

Reason: In the interests of the safe and effective operation of the highway (Cambridge Local Plan 2018, Policy 81).

15. Prior to the commencement of development above ground level, a Carbon Reduction Statement shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. This Statement shall demonstrate that across the development the residential units shall cumulatively achieve minimum reductions in CO₂ emissions of 19% below the Target Emission Rate of the 2013 edition of Part L of the Building Regulations, and shall include the following details:

- a) Levels of carbon reduction achieved at each stage of the energy hierarchy;
- b) A summary table showing the percentage improvement in Dwelling Emission Rate over the Target Emission Rate for each proposed unit and the development as a whole;

Where on-site renewable or low carbon technologies are proposed, the statement shall also include:

- c) A schedule of proposed on-site renewable energy technologies, their location, design, and a maintenance programme; and
- d) Details of any mitigation measures required to maintain amenity and prevent nuisance.

The approved measures for each dwelling shall be fully implemented in accordance with the approved Statement prior to the first occupation of that dwelling. Any associated renewable and/or low carbon technologies shall thereafter be retained and remain fully operational in accordance with the approved maintenance programme.

No review of this requirement on the basis of grid capacity issues can take place unless written evidence from the District Network Operator confirming the detail of grid capacity and its implications has been submitted to, and accepted in writing by, the local planning authority. Any subsequent amendment to the level of renewable/low carbon technologies provided on the site shall be in accordance with a revised scheme submitted to and approved in writing by, the local planning authority."

Reason: In the interests of reducing carbon dioxide emissions and to ensure that development does not give rise to unacceptable pollution (Cambridge Local Plan 2018, Policies 28, 35 and 36).

16. Prior to the occupation of the apartments hereby approved (to be provided within Blocks A-F), further information shall be submitted and agreed in writing by the local planning authority in relation to the technical specification of the proposed gas fired Combined Heat and Power System, including emissions standards. Any gas fired CHP shall meet an emissions standard of:

Spark ignition engine: less than 150 mgNO_x/Nm³

Compression ignition engine: less than 400 mgNO_x/Nm³

Gas turbine: less than 50 mgNO_x/Nm³

Reason: In the interests of reducing carbon dioxide emissions and to ensure that development does not give rise to unacceptable pollution (Cambridge Local Plan 2018, Policies 28, 35 and 36).

17. Prior to the occupation of each dwelling, a water efficiency specification for that dwelling, based on the Water Efficiency Calculator Methodology or the Fitting Approach sets out in Part G of the Building Regulations 2010 (2015 edition) shall be submitted to the local planning authority. This shall demonstrate that the dwelling is able to achieve a design standard of water use of no more than 110 litres/person/day and that the development shall be carried out in accordance with the agreed details.

Reason: To ensure that the development makes efficient use of water and promotes the principles of sustainable construction (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 Policy 28).

18. Within 6 months of the commencement of above ground works to Block A, a BRE issued Design Stage Certificate shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority demonstrating that BREEAM 'very good' as a minimum will be met, with 3 credits for Wat 01 (water consumption). Where the interim certificate shows a shortfall in credits for BREEAM 'excellent', a statement shall be submitted identifying how the shortfall will be addressed. In the event that such a rating is replaced by a comparable national measure of sustainability for building design, the equivalent level of measure shall be applicable to the proposed development.

Reason: In the interests of reducing carbon dioxide emissions and promoting principles of sustainable construction and efficient use of buildings (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 Policy 28).

19. Within 6 months of occupation of the nursery/community facility in Block A, a BRE issued post Construction Certificate shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, indicating that the approved BREEAM rating has been met. In the event that such a rating is replaced by a comparable national measure of sustainability for building design, the equivalent level of measure shall be applicable to the proposed development.

Reason: In the interests of reducing carbon dioxide emissions and promoting principles of sustainable construction and efficient use of buildings (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 Policy 28).

20. Prior to commencement of the development and in accordance with BS5837 2012, a phased tree protection methodology in the form of an Arboricultural Method Statement (AMS) and Tree Protection Plan (TPP) shall be submitted to the local planning authority for its written approval, before any tree works are carried and before equipment, machinery or materials are brought onto the site for the purpose of development. In a logical sequence the AMS and TPP will consider all phases of construction in relation to the potential impact on trees and detail tree works, the specification and position of protection barriers and ground protection and all measures to be taken for the protection of any trees from damage during the course of any activity related to the development, including supervision, demolition, foundation design, storage of materials, ground works, installation of services, erection of scaffolding and landscaping.

Reason: To satisfy the Local Planning Authority that trees to be retained will be protected from damage during any construction activity, including demolition, in order to preserve Arboricultural amenity in accordance with section 197 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 Policy 71).

21. The approved tree protection methodology will be implemented throughout the development and the agreed means of protection shall be retained in situ until all equipment, and surplus materials have been removed from the affected part of the site. Nothing shall be stored or placed in any area protected in accordance with approved tree protection plans, and the ground levels within those areas shall not be altered nor shall any excavation be made without the prior written approval of the local planning authority. If any tree shown to be retained is damaged, remedial works as may be specified in writing by the local planning authority will be carried out.

Reason: To satisfy the Local Planning Authority that trees to be retained will not be damaged during any construction activity, including demolition, in order to preserve arboricultural amenity in accordance with section 197 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 Policy 71).

22. If any tree shown to be retained on the approved tree protection methodology is removed, uprooted, destroyed or dies within five years of project completion, another tree shall be planted at the same place and that tree shall be of such size and species, and shall be planted at such time, as may be specified in writing by the local planning authority.

Reason: To satisfy the Local Planning Authority that arboricultural amenity will be preserved in accordance with section 197 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 Policy 71).

23. No development shall commence above ground level until a surface water drainage scheme for the site, based on sustainable drainage principles and in accordance with Cambridge City Council local plan policies, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The scheme shall subsequently be implemented in accordance with the approved details before the development is occupied.

The scheme shall include:

- a) Details of the existing surface water drainage arrangements including runoff rates for the QBAR, 3.3% Annual Exceedance Probability (AEP) (1 in 30) and 1% AEP (1 in 100) storm events;
- b) Full results of the proposed drainage system modelling in the above-referenced storm events (as well as 1% AEP plus climate change) , inclusive of all collection, conveyance, storage, flow control and disposal elements and including an allowance for urban creep, together with a schematic of how the system has been represented within the hydraulic model;
- c) Detailed drawings of the entire proposed surface water drainage system, including levels, gradients, dimensions and pipe reference numbers, details of the swales, bio-retention areas, permeable paving and green roofs;
- d) A plan of the drained site area and which part of the proposed drainage system these will drain to;
- e) Full details of the proposed attenuation and flow control measures;
- f) Site Investigation and test results to confirm infiltration rates;

- g) Full details of the maintenance/adoption of the surface water drainage system;
- h) Measures taken to prevent pollution of the receiving groundwater and/or surface water

The drainage scheme must adhere to the hierarchy of drainage options as outlined in the NPPF PPG

Reason: To ensure that the proposed development can be adequately drained and to ensure that there is no increased flood risk on or off site resulting from the proposed development (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 Policy 28).

- 24. Details for the long term maintenance arrangements for the surface water drainage system (including all SuDS features) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to the first occupation of any of the buildings hereby permitted. The submitted details should identify runoff sub-catchments, SuDS components, control structures, flow routes and outfalls. In addition, the plan must clarify the access that is required to each surface water management component for maintenance purposes. The maintenance plan shall be carried out in full thereafter.

Reason: To ensure the satisfactory maintenance of drainage systems that are not publically adopted, in accordance with the requirements of paragraphs 163 and 165 of the National Planning Policy Framework (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 Policy 28).

25. No development approved by this planning permission shall take place until a remediation strategy 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 (PRA) including a Conceptual Site Model (CSM) of the site indicating potential sources, pathways and receptors, including those off site. 2. The results of a site investigation based on (1) and a detailed risk assessment, including a revised CSM. 3. Based on the risk assessment in (2) an options appraisal and remediation strategy giving full details of the remediation measures required and how they are to be undertaken. The strategy shall include a plan providing details of how the remediation works shall be judged to be complete and arrangements for contingency actions. The plan shall also detail a long term monitoring and maintenance plan as necessary. 4. No occupation of any part of the permitted development shall take place until a verification report demonstrating completion of works set out in the remediation strategy in (3), unless the phased occupation of the development is first agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The long term monitoring and maintenance plan in (3) shall be updated and be implemented as approved.

Reason: To protect and prevent the pollution of controlled waters from potential pollutants associated with current and previous land uses in line with National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), paragraphs 170, 178, 179 and Environment Agency Groundwater Protection Position Statements which can be found here: <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/groundwater-protection-position-statements> (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 Policy 32).

26. 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 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 and prevent the pollution of controlled waters from potential pollutants associated with current and previous land uses in line with National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), paragraphs 170, 178, 179 and Environment Agency Groundwater Protection Position Statements which can be found here: <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/groundwater-protection-position-statements> and To ensure that any unexpected contamination is rendered harmless in the interests of environmental and public safety (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 Policy 33).

27. Piling or investigation boreholes 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 from potential pollutants associated with current and previous land uses in line with National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), paragraphs 170, 178, 179 and Environment Agency Groundwater Protection Position Statements which can be found here: <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/groundwater-protection-position-statements> (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 Policy 33).

28. No development shall commence above ground level (or such other date or stage in development as may be agreed in writing with the Local Authority) until a Materials Management Plan has been submitted to and approved, in writing, by the local planning authority. The plan will include:

- 1) An inspection and sampling strategy for the testing of excavation formations;
- 2) A procedure for screening contamination discovered in the development phase to be screened against criteria outlined in the remediation strategy;
- 3) A stockpile validation strategy;
- 4) Detailed material re-use criteria;
- 5) Details of arisings processing; and

- 6) A verification plan providing details of the data that will be collected in order to demonstrate that the works set out in 1) to 5) 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 consent of the local planning authority. The scheme shall be implemented as approved.

Reason: To protect and prevent the pollution of controlled waters from potential pollutants associated with current and previous land uses in line with National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), paragraphs 170, 178, 179 and Environment Agency Groundwater Protection Position Statements which can be found here: <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/groundwater-protection-position-statements>, to ensure full mitigation through the agreed remediation measures in the interests of environmental and public safety (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 Policy 33).

29. No development above ground level shall commence 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 (e.g. furniture, play equipment, refuse or other storage units, signs, lighting); proposed and existing functional services above and below ground (e.g. drainage, power, communications cables, pipelines indicating lines, manholes, supports), bridges, boardwalks and Forest School. Soft Landscape works shall include detailed planting plans showing location of species; written specifications (including soils importation and quality control of soils) 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 2018; Policies 55, 57 and 59).

30. No development above ground level shall commence until a schedule of landscape maintenance for a minimum period of five years has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The schedule shall include details of the arrangements for its implementation.

Reason: To ensure that the landscaped areas are maintained in a healthy condition in the interests of visual amenity (Cambridge Local Plan 2018; Policies 55, 57 and 59).

31. Prior to first occupation or the bringing into use of the development, hereby permitted, a landscape maintenance and management plan, including long term design objectives, management responsibilities and maintenance schedules for all landscape areas shall be submitted to and approved by the local planning authority in writing. The landscape plan shall be carried out as approved. Any trees or plants that, within a period of five years after planting, are removed, die or become in the opinion of the local planning authority, seriously damaged or defective, shall be replaced as soon as is reasonably practicable with others of species, size and number as originally approved.

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 2018; Policies 55, 57 and 59).

32. No development above ground level shall commence until there has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority a plan indicating the positions, design, materials and type of boundary treatments to be erected. The boundary treatment shall be completed before the use hereby permitted is commenced and retained thereafter. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure an appropriate boundary treatment is implemented (Cambridge Local Plan 2018; Policies 55, 57 and 59).

33. Prior to first occupation full details of all tree pits, including those in planters, hard paving and soft landscaped areas must be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority and these works shall be carried out as approved.

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 2018; Policies 55, 57 and 59).

34. Details of the biodiverse (green) roof(s) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to any above ground works on the apartment blocks commencing. Details of the green roof(s) shall include means of access for maintenance, plans and sections showing the make-up of the sub base to be used and include the following:

- a) Roofs can/will be biodiverse based with extensive substrate varying in depth from between 80-150mm,
- b) Planted/seeded with an agreed mix of species within the first planting season following the practical completion of the building works (the seed mix shall be focused on wildflower planting indigenous to the local area and shall contain no more than a maximum of 25% sedum,
- c) The biodiverse (green) roof shall not be used as an amenity or sitting out space of any kind whatsoever and shall only be used in the case of essential maintenance or repair, or escape in case of emergency,
- d) The biodiverse roof(s) shall be carried out strictly in accordance with the details so approved and shall be maintained as such thereafter,
- e) Where solar panels are proposed, biosolar roofs should be incorporated under and in-between the panels. An array layout will be required incorporating a minimum of 0.75m between rows of panels for access and to ensure establishment of vegetation,
- f) A management/maintenance plan approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority,
- g) Evidence of installation shall be required in photographic form prior to handover.

Reason: To ensure the development provides the maximum possible provision towards water management and the creation of habitats and valuable areas for biodiversity. (Cambridge Local Plan 2018; Policy 31).

35. No development above ground level shall commence until there has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority sample panels of building and surfacing materials.

Reason: In the interests of visual amenity and to ensure that suitable hard landscape is provided as part of the development (Cambridge Local Plan 2018; Policies 55, 57 and 59).

36. No development above ground level shall commence until there has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority detailed designs for the Forest Garden and Central Park Play Area including planting, layout, play equipment, furniture, fencing and surfacing.

Reason: In the interests of amenity and to ensure that suitable hard and soft landscape is provided as part of the development (Cambridge Local Plan 2018; Policies 55, 57 and 59).

37. Prior to the first occupation of the development (or phase of) hereby approved the following shall be submitted to, and approved by the local planning authority.

A completion report demonstrating that remediation as set out in the approved document Remediation Strategy and Verification Plan - Former Ridgeons Site, ref: 724323-MLM-ZZ-XX-RP-J-0002 (MLM Group, 9th April 2019) has been undertaken for the site (or phase of) and that the land has been remediated to a standard appropriate for the end use.

Details of any post-remedial sampling and analysis (as defined in the approved material management plan) shall be included in the completion report along with all information concerning materials brought onto, used, and removed from the development. The information provided must demonstrate that the site has met the required clean-up criteria.

Thereafter, no works shall take place within the site such as to prejudice the effectiveness of the approved and implemented scheme of remediation.

Reason: To ensure that any unexpected contamination is rendered harmless in the interests of environmental and public safety (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 Policy 33).

38. Prior to commencement of any external facades a noise insulation scheme detailing the acoustic / noise insulation performance specification of the external building envelope of habitable residential rooms (having regard to the building fabric elements - including glazing and alternative ventilation provision) to reduce the level of noise experienced in these rooms as a result of external ambient noise levels in the area, shall be submitted in writing for approval by the local planning authority. Any alternative ventilation provision required shall be capable of achieving a minimum of 2 air changes per hour (ACH) and internal ventilation operational noise levels shall be considered. The scheme as approved shall be fully constructed and implemented before the use hereby permitted is commenced and shall be retained thereafter.

The noise insulation / mitigation scheme shall be in accordance with the principles, mitigation measures and recommendations detailed in the submitted 'Noise and Vibration Assessment'; Former Ridgeons Site, Cromwell Road, Cambridge; RP01-18310 REV6 (Cass Allen, 23 May 2019)

Reason: To protect the amenity of properties (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policy 35).

39. Prior to the commencement of any external facades to any residential units within blocks A, D, E and F, full details of the design and construction of the enclosed winter gardens to the said blocks, including the acoustic / noise insulation performance specification of the glazing, to reduce the level of noise experienced at the residential units shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The design and construction shall be in accordance with the principles, mitigation measures and recommendations detailed in the submitted 'Noise and Vibration Assessment'; Former Ridgeons Site, Cromwell Road, Cambridge; RP01-18310 REV6 (Cass Allen, 23 May 2019).

The winter gardens shall be constructed and installed in accordance with the approved details and retained in situ thereafter.

Reason: To protect the amenity of properties (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policy 35).

40. Prior to the commencement of any above ground works to Block A, a scheme for the insulation of or other noise mitigation measures for the ground floor non-residential uses of Block A (Nursery and Community Rooms) in order to minimise the level of internal and external noise emanating from the said building uses shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The scheme shall include the specifications (location, length, height and surface density) of an acoustically absorptive and imperforate environmental noise barrier / fence that shall be provided as a boundary treatment to the ground floor external nursery play area. The scheme as approved shall be fully implemented before the building hereby permitted is occupied and shall be thereafter retained as such.

Reason: To protect the amenity of nearby properties (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policy 35).

41. Prior to the commencement of any external facades, full details and specifications for protection of external amenity space from noise (including public areas, balconies and terraces), taking into account the existing noise climate and current UK noise standards for external amenity areas, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Development shall then be carried out in accordance with the approved details and shall thereafter be maintained in perpetuity.

Reason: To protect the amenity of properties (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policy 35).

42. The D1 use of the ground floor of Block A of the development shall be restricted to use as a nursery and community meeting and/or exhibition space and for no other purpose, including any other purpose in Class D1 of the Schedule to the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) Order 1987, or in any provision equivalent to that Class in any statutory instrument revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification).

Reason: To protect the amenity of nearby properties (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policy 35).

43. The community facility (D1 class use) shall only be open to the public between the hours of 08:00 and 23:00 Monday to Saturday and 09:00 and 20:00 Sunday and Bank Holidays.

Reason: To protect the amenity of nearby properties (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policy 35).

44. The nursery (D1 class use) shall only be open to the public between the hours of 07:00 and 19:00 Monday to Friday.

Reason: To protect the amenity of nearby properties (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policy 35).

45. All service collections / dispatches from and to the D1 use (Block A, Ground Floor) within the approved development (including refuse / recycling collections) during the operational phase shall only be permitted between the hours of 0700 hrs and 2100 hrs Monday to Saturday and 0800 hrs and 1900 hrs on Sundays and any Bank / Public Holiday.

Reason: To protect the amenity of nearby properties (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policy 35).

46. Prior to the installation of any artificial lighting, an artificial lighting scheme shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The scheme shall include details of any artificial lighting of the site and an artificial lighting impact assessment with predicted lighting levels at proposed and existing residential properties shall be undertaken. Artificial lighting on and off site must meet the Obtrusive Light Limitations for Exterior Lighting Installations contained within the Institute of Lighting Professionals Guidance Notes for the Reduction of Obtrusive Light - GN01:2011 (or as superseded) and as detailed within the Mott Macdonald "Mill Road Development - Lighting Strategy" document dated 8th December 2017.

The approved lighting scheme shall be installed, maintained and operated in accordance with the approved details / measures.

Reason: To protect the amenity of nearby properties (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policy 35).

47. The electric vehicle charge points and associated infrastructure as detailed in and as shown on drawing 'Cromwell Road Electric Car Charging Space Plan - Basement' (CRD-EV02) and 'Cromwell Road Electric Car Charging Space Plan - House Block A' (CRD-EV01) both dated 20/5/2019) shall be fully installed and operational before final occupation and shall be retained and maintained thereafter. Every electric vehicle charge point installed with a house is to be operational prior to occupation of that house.

Reason: In the interests of encouraging more sustainable modes and forms of transport and to reduce the impact of development on local air quality, in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF, 2019) paragraphs, 110, 170 and 181, Cambridge City Council's adopted Air Quality Action Plan (2018) (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policy 36).

48. The provision of the allocated car club parking space and car club vehicle shall be fully implemented and operational before more than 50% of the apartments are occupied and shall be retained and maintained thereafter.

Reason: In the interests of encouraging more sustainable modes and forms of transport and to reduce the impact of development on local air quality, in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF, 2019) paragraph, 103, 110, 170 and 181, and Cambridge City Council's adopted Air Quality Action Plan (2018) (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policy 35).

49. Prior to the commencement of any above ground works a specification for all ground gas and vapour protection to be incorporated into the building design 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 and the installation of any gas/vapour protection measures must be inspected and documented by a competent person.

Reason: To ensure full mitigation through the agreed remediation measures in the interests of environmental and public safety in accordance with policy 33 of Cambridge Local Plan (2018).

50. Prior to the first occupation of any of the development a scheme for ecological enhancement including native planting, measures to allow dispersal of hedgehogs and in-built features for nesting birds, roosting bats and shall be provided to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The measures shall be implemented in accordance with the agreed scheme.

Reason: To improve the bio-diversity contribution of the site (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policy 69).

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.

INFORMATIVE: Please note that the use of permeable paving does not give the Highway Authority sufficient comfort that in future years water will not drain onto or across the adopted public highway and physical measures to prevent the same must be provided.

Application Number	18/1993/FUL	Agenda Item	
Date Received	18th December 2018	Officer	Mairead O'Sullivan
Target Date	19th March 2019		
Ward	Newnham		
Site	Land Between 21 And 29 Barton Road (including 27 Barton Road And Croft Gardens).		
Proposal	Redevelopment for College accommodation (Comprising 4 new buildings which would provide 60 graduate rooms and 12 x 2 bed and 12 x 1 bed family apartments) and refurbishment and extension of 27 Barton Road, together with associated cycle and car parking and external works following demolition of existing buildings (1-12 Croft Gardens, storage building and garages).		
Applicant	Kings College Developments Ltd		

SUMMARY	The development accords with the Development Plan for the following reasons: - The case for the demolition of Croft Gardens is considered acceptable - The scale, massing, design and materials proposed for the replacement buildings would preserve and enhance the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. - The revised proposal is not considered to give rise to any significant adverse impacts to the amenity of surrounding occupiers.
RECOMMENDATION	APPROVAL

1.0 SITE DESCRIPTION/AREA CONTEXT

- 1.1 The site lies on the southern side of Barton Road. It comprises a set piece of three buildings (1-12 Croft Gardens) which are set

back from the street and arranged around a formal garden space with topiary hedges. There is a another building further back in the site known as 27 Barton Road (Holmcroft) and a large barn structure which was previously a riding school. The site is owned by Kings College. 1-12 Croft Gardens is used as family accommodation. 27 Barton Road contains three apartments but is currently vacant.

- 1.2 Nos. 1-12 Croft Gardens date from the 1930s and were previously denoted as positive buildings in the West Cambridge Conservation Area Appraisal and have recently been designated as Buildings of Local Interest (BLIs); they are by the same architect as Maitland House, also a BLI. They are a set piece of three white rendered buildings with green roof pantiles and steps up to the front doors and a central garden. No. 27 Barton Road probably dates from 1840s and has also been recently designated as a BLI. It is set well back in the site but can be glimpsed from Barton Road. It is also finished in white render with green pantiles. The other large building on site is a storage building and former riding school. This has no architectural merit and is not visible from the street being set towards the back of the site.
- 1.3 The site is not typical in the Conservation Area but has a landmark quality and is considered harmonious in the street. There are many large trees to the rear of the site which provide a green backdrop.
- 1.4 The West Cambridge Conservation Area states that Barton Road is pleasantly residential and urban with buildings of varied quality and age. The site is bounded by residential properties to the east and west and to the gardens of properties and the Millington Road Nursery (operated by the College) and residential properties at the south of the site.

2.0 THE PROPOSAL

- 2.1 The application seeks full planning permission for the redevelopment of the site for new college accommodation. The proposal includes demolition of 1-12 Croft Gardens and the existing storage and garage buildings on site. No 27 Barton Road is the only building proposed to be retained on site. The site is proposed to be redeveloped to include 3 crescent buildings which form a set piece. The two buildings which run

perpendicular to the road are proposed to be graduate family accommodation. The block to the south is proposed to be graduate rooms. A further building is proposed to the front of the site adjacent to 29 Barton Road. This would also provide graduate rooms.

- 2.2 The application follows from a previously withdrawn proposal (16/0687/FUL) to redevelop the site. The previous proposal was to demolish all of the buildings on site. This was not supported by several consultees including the Conservation Team and Historic England. There was also a large volume of objections from members of the public. Since the submission of the previous application, there have been extensive pre-application discussions between the applicant and the local authority. The current proposal takes a different design approach to the previous scheme. The Millington Road Nursery formed part of the previous scheme but is not included in the current proposal. The current proposal retains no. 27 Barton Road. The previous proposal included an element of market housing whilst the current proposal is solely for use by students.
- 2.3 Buildings A and B lie to the front of the site running perpendicular to Barton Road. They would provide a total of 24 graduate family apartments (12 x 2 bed and 12 x 1 bed units). These buildings are curvilinear two and a half storey buildings with gable ends adjacent to Barton Road with projecting hardwood bay windows at first and second floor. This pair of buildings are both 12.3m in height dropping to 7.55m at the eaves. The windows have deep hardwood reveals. These buildings would be finished in a gault brick with clay roof tiles. There is brickwork detailing and tile creasing proposed between the windows and over the doors which provides interest and texture.
- 2.4 A communal garden space is proposed in between these buildings. The landscape plan shows the space as a semi-formal lawn with paths, topiary and ornamental trees. Seating areas are proposed within this space. At the southern end of this garden a grass amphitheatre is shown. To the front of these buildings a low wall with railings and a hedge behind is proposed. Cycle parking is proposed tucked behind the hedge. Some additional cycle parking is shown at the northern end of buildings A and B.

- 2.5 Building C lies at the southern end of the site and runs perpendicular to Buildings A and B. It is also curvilinear in form. It is similar in design to buildings A and B but wider and concave. It has a double gable to the east and western side elevation. It would also be finished in gault brick with tile roof and with brick and tile detailing. This building is proposed to accommodate 48 en suite graduate rooms. Each floor is laid out with bedrooms at either side of the central corridor facing north and south. There is a stairwell with lift at either side of the buildings. Each floor has two large kitchen/dining areas at either side of the building.
- 2.6 Building D (often referred to as 27A) is proposed to be sited in a currently open part of the site in front of 27 Barton Road. This building would sit in line with no 29 Barton Road. Building D is proposed to be three storey with a projecting hardwood bay at ground to third floor on the Barton Road elevation. This building would have a gable end and flat roof element facing the street. It echoes no 29 in terms of height and footprint. No 29 is a very ornate building with decorative brickwork detail whereas the proposal for building D is simpler. The materials would also be gault brick and clay tiles. Building D has its primary outlook to the east looking into the site. Some elements of decorative brickwork are proposed but not to the same degree as Buildings A, B and C. This building would provide 12 graduate rooms. This building is laid out with blocks of 4 bedrooms on each floor with a shared bathroom and kitchen dining area.
- 2.7 No. 27 Barton Road is proposed to be retained as part of the development. This is referenced as building E on the plans. This building would be used as communal facilities for students living on site. It is proposed to contain a common room, laundrette and small library. A lightweight extension of timber and glazing is proposed to the rear of no. 27. This allows level access to be provided while retaining the steps on the front elevation which are important to the character of the BLI. Although the large open area to the front of the site will be built on, no 27 will retain a garden setting. A lawn is proposed to the front of the building and raised beds for growing fruit and vegetables are proposed to the rear of the building.
- 2.8 A circuit road runs through the site with access points from Barton Road at either side of Building A and B. Car parking is proposed at both the east and west side of the building. Cycle

storage buildings are provided at the western side of the site adjacent to no 27. A bin store is proposed at the eastern side of the site. The bin and bike store buildings are proposed to be lightweight timber structures. The green roof tiles from Croft Gardens are proposed to be reused on these buildings.

- 2.9 The application has been amended since submission to provide additional planting on the southern boundary with 4C Millington Road. The applicants have confirmed that the use of the space to the rear of the site can be conditioned to be only accessed for maintenance and upkeep to minimise any disturbance to 4C Millington Road. Further information has been provided to the Highway Authority and Transport Assessment Team. The applicants have clarified refuse collection arrangements. Additional ecological survey work has also been carried out and a further report has been submitted in response to comments from the Ecology officer.

3.0 SITE HISTORY

Reference	Description	Outcome
16/0687/FUL	Demolition of existing dwellings (1-12 Croft Gardens and 3 flats in No. 27 Barton Road), existing storage buildings and Nursery School (4A Millington Road). Redevelopment for residential and student accommodation, provision of new children's nursery and associated cycle and car parking and outdoor space.	Withdrawn

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 2018 policies, Supplementary Planning Documents and Material Considerations.

5.2 Relevant Development Plan policies

PLAN	POLICY NUMBER
Cambridge Local Plan 2018	1 28 31 32 35 36 46 52 55 56 57 58 59 61 62 70 71 81 82

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

Central Government Guidance	National Planning Policy Framework 2019 National Planning Policy Framework – Planning Practice Guidance from 3 March 2014 onwards Circular 11/95 (Annex A)
Previous Supplementary Planning Documents (These documents, prepared to support policies in the 2006 local plan are no longer SPDs, but are still material considerations.)	Sustainable Design and Construction (May 2007) Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Waste Partnership (RECAP): Waste Management Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (February 2012) Public Art (January 2010)
Material Considerations	<u>City Wide Guidance</u> Arboricultural Strategy (2004) Biodiversity Checklist for Land Use Planners in Cambridgeshire and Peterborough (March 2001).

	Buildings of Local Interest (2005) Cambridge and Milton Surface Water Management Plan (2011) Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (November 2010) Cambridge City Council Waste and Recycling Guide: For Developers. Cambridge City Nature Conservation Strategy (2006) Cambridgeshire County Council Transport Assessment Guidelines (2017) Cycle Parking Guide for New Residential Developments (2010)
	<u>Area Guidelines</u> West Cambridge Conservation Area Appraisal (2011)

6.0 CONSULTATIONS

Cambridgeshire County Council (Highways Development Management)

First comment

- 6.1 Objection: The Highway Authority requests that the application be refused in its present format. The applicant is intending to relocate the motor vehicular access for the site and has failed to show appropriate inter vehicle visibility splays to the same. The request can be overcome if the applicant provides a plan showing appropriate inter vehicle visibility splays which should be 2.4m x 43m. The Highway Authority would be prepared to consider a reduction of these splays in line with the precepts of Manual for Streets if empirical data in the form of a speed and volume count is provided by the applicant. Should the Planning Authority be minded to approve, conditions are recommended

requiring adequate drainage to prevent water run-off to the highway and a construction traffic management plan.

Second comment

- 6.2 No objection: Drawing number 49217/PP/001 within the recently loaded Transport Statement show appropriate inter vehicle visibility splays and pedestrian visibility splays from the proposed access and as such the Highway Authority's request that the application be refused is withdrawn. Comments from the Major Development Team will follow.

Transport Assessment Team (Major developments)

First comment

- 6.3 Objection: Further information is required before a full assessment of the traffic impact can be made for this development.

Second comment

- 6.4 No objection: Further information has now been provided responding to our queries. Subject to the mitigation, requiring improvements to the nearest two bus stops on Barton Road (RTPI and raised kerbs), a maintenance contribution for the RTPI (secured by S106 agreement) and a Travel Plan being secured by condition, there is no objection to the development.

Environmental Health

- 6.5 No objection: Three informatives and seven conditions are recommended. The conditions cover the following points:

- Construction hours
- Collections during construction
- Construction/demolition noise/vibration & piling
- Dust
- Artificial lighting
- EV charging points
- Plant noise

Refuse and Recycling

- 6.6 Further information needed: From the diagram it looks like the refuse vehicle can drive all the way round, but from the design and access statement it says it can only go half way and has to turn to come back out, because the paved terraced area to the rear near the 60 student rooms is for emergency access only. The refuse vehicle really needs to be able to drive all the way round rather than turn in turning heads and come back out, only to go up the next road and do the same.
- 6.7 No objection: As the site will be managed, and bins will be brought to a collection point near the road, there is no need for refuse vehicle to enter the site.

Urban Design and Conservation Team

- 6.8 No objection: In order to assess the impact of the proposals, we need to consider the legislation that governs development within conservation areas, the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and local plan policy on conservation within the city. Under section 72 of the planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, it states that 'special attention shall be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance' of a conservation area. Therefore any applications that come forward for development within conservation areas need to be assessed by the impact they will have on that heritage asset.
- 6.9 The National Planning Policy Framework 2019, paragraph 184 says that heritage assets (in this case the West Cambridge Conservation Area) are 'an irreplaceable resource, and should be conserved in a manner appropriate to their significance', and in 185 c) we should be ensuring that 'the desirability of new development [makes] a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness'. Paragraph 194 states that 'any harm to, or loss of, the significance of a designated heritage asset (from its alteration or destruction, or from development within its setting), should require clear and convincing justification.' Paragraph 197 is also relevant in that a 'balanced judgement will be required having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset'.

6.10 Taking all of the above into consideration, any works within a conservation area need to ensure that they preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the conservation area bearing in mind the potential impact of the loss of a building or important space can have on that heritage asset. Section 7 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2018 is on Protecting and Enhancing the Character of Cambridge and has a number of policies to deal with development within the city that are relevant to these proposals:

- Policy 55: Responding to context
- Policy 56: Creating successful places
- Policy 57: Designing new buildings
- Policy 59: Designing landscape and the public realm
- Policy 61: Conservation and enhancement of Cambridge's historic environment
- Policy 62: Local heritage assets

All of these policies are to ensure that development within the city is appropriate for the location and the interest of the city as a whole and the comments below take these policies into consideration.

The Site

6.11 Within the West Cambridge Conservation Area Appraisal (2011), it writes of the buildings along Barton Road being of varied quality and age which add to the views along the road, and that the topiary of Croft Gardens (described as 'interesting buildings') is a good use of space. Since this document was written, both 1-12 Croft Gardens and 27 Barton Road (which probably dates back to 1840) have been designated as Buildings of Local Interest (BLIs). In the Barton Road Suburb and Approaches Study (2009), 27 Barton Road was suggested as a candidate for BLI designation and both that building and the Croft Gardens properties were depicted as positive in the Character Assessment Map. Both of these documents emphasise the good qualities of the site both in terms of the buildings and the landscaping.

Existing Buildings

6.12 The 1930s nos. 1-12 Croft Gardens were previously denoted as positive buildings in the West Cambridge Conservation Area

Appraisal and have recently been designated as BLIs as they are by the same architect as Maitland House, also a BLI. They have a landmark quality due to their design, materials and landscaping. They are atypical of the conservation area and therefore distinctive in the streetscape. The older no. 27 Barton Road is also a BLI, but it sits quietly, to the rear of the site with occasional glimpses of it visible from the public highway. It appears on the earliest Ordnance Survey maps and is believed to date back to the late 1830s/early 1840s. It was designated as a BLI to highlight its age and architectural quality which is a positive addition to the conservation area. The storage shed, the former riding school building, is not visible from outside of the site and is not of special interest.

- 6.13 The proposed new buildings would see the demolition of nos. 1-12 Croft Gardens and the riding school. No. 27 Barton Road would be refurbished and extended. A new three storey building on the site, adjacent to no. 29, would create a new edge to the street. The main concern is the appropriateness of the proposals and whether they meet the tests above with regard to national and local policies.

The Existing Qualities of the Site that Contribute to the Conservation Area

- 6.14 The buildings, landscape and trees on the site have a quality that makes a positive contribution to the streetscape and the character and appearance of the conservation area. The site is not typical of the conservation area, but it has an impact in the street due to the atypical nature of the development and landscaping.

1-12 Croft Gardens

- 6.15 The applicants have made a case for the demolition of these buildings. We have considered the structural report and take into account that the condition of the properties is such that the existing materials, although not all of the roof tiles, would have to be replaced should a full refurbishment take place. With the upgrades that would be necessary to bring the buildings up to the required standards to meet Building Regulations, the character and profile details would be changed due to the need for additional insulation having to be external to allow for appropriate internal dimensions. As such, the original style and

some of the details of the buildings would be lost. The changes that would occur would have a negative impact on their appearance and on some of the reasons for designation as BLIs.

The Replacement Buildings

- 6.16 To agree to the loss of these buildings, it needs to be considered whether the replacement buildings are appropriate to the location in terms of their design, scale and massing to ensure the preservation or enhancement of the conservation area. The height of the two gable ends, which will face Barton Road, is a transition between the two storeys of nos. 19 and 21, and the three storeys of nos. 29 and 31. These two curved ranges could make a positive contribution to the streetscape and the conservation area as a whole provided that the materials and detailing are carefully chosen and implemented. The curve leads the eye into the site and a well-constructed building would be a good addition to the existing building form in this part of the city.
- 6.17 The proposed landscaping between the two blocks has been designed specifically for the site and will add interest, just as the existing hedging and topiary does for the existing villas. Whereas now there is a villa that forms an end stop to views through the open space, the new proposals will see another curved building at the end with the all-important tree belt beyond being retained in part with additional planting to mitigate the impact of the removal of some of the trees.
- 6.18 Taking all of the above points into consideration, on balance, we can support the loss of the BLIs due to the structural issues that the existing buildings have, what that would mean for any refurbishment of those properties and the suitability of the replacement blocks and landscaping. The new buildings will bring a change to the conservation area from the existing built forms, but this is seen as appropriate for this location provided that the proposed conditions are to be agreed.

27 Barton Road

- 6.19 The proposals now involve retaining no. 27 Barton Road, the original building on the site, and to extend it so that access is improved and it can be used as a community building for the

site. The refurbishment of the building is welcomed as an important re-use of this heritage asset. The proposed refurbishment will not have such an effect on the exterior of this building as the other BLIs as it will not be to residential standards. The frontage will be retained and the alterations will be to the rear. This rear elevation is the least sensitive to an extension, and the proposals will mean that it has the potential to be well used by the residents on the site.

- 6.20 The application documents state that they will be retaining as many features as possible. There are some architectural features in the building which add positively to its character for example the shutter boxes to the French doors, the covings, and some of the doors and their architraves. It will be interesting to see what is to be retained internally. The plan of the site will mean that there will be directed glimpse views of no. 27. Currently views of the house are few and far between due to its siting at the back of the site and the vegetation that is in front of it. By managing the land to the front, and positioning the proposed new development to the front and side of it, there will be more opportunities for the public to get glimpse views of it as they pass by. This will add to the character of the conservation area.

27A Barton Road

- 6.21 The new three storey building will be adjacent to no. 29 Barton Road and takes its cues on the scale from that property and the adjacent no. 31. The proposed location of this building is supported as the open space to the front of no. 27 is not depicted as being an important open space in the appraisal in terms of preservation of the character or appearance of the conservation area, and an appropriate development in this location can be supported. The design of the proposed building is appropriate in its scale and massing. It will be an obvious new build, but with elements that link it to the existing building stock in the area. The materials and details for this building will need to take their cues from the existing structures so that they visually work with those colours and textures and have a positive impact on the local area.

Other structures

- 6.22 The re-use of the green pantiles on the cycle sheds will be a link to the existing buildings on the site.

Conclusion

- 6.23 There will be a more intensive use of the site with the larger number of residents and greater density of development. However it is considered that well detailed buildings in appropriate materials, which will be conditioned, could preserve the character and appearance of the conservation area. The sample panels, as proposed as a condition, should include elements of the brick pattern detailing to ensure that the craftsmanship of the exterior is to the highest standard. With the new building construction being to passivhaus standards, the sustainability credentials of the development will be an exemplar in the city and these standards should be encouraged in new developments.
- 6.24 The new buildings will also be distinctive, as are nos. 1-12 Croft Gardens, with a good rhythm to the window and door openings on the elevations. There is playfulness to the use of the materials and if well executed they will be a positive addition to the city's built form. The proposed Landscape Masterplan shows the careful integration of the buildings with the landscape and the low car use. It creates what could be a pleasant, green area on one of the main roads into the city which reflects the landscaped character of the approach.
- 6.25 These comments have taken into consideration the harm that may be incurred through the loss of the BLIs and balanced that against the benefits of the new development. The Conservation Team support the proposals subject to the appropriate discharge of the suggested conditions regarding brickwork and roofing details and archaeology.

Senior Sustainability Officer (Design and Construction)

- 6.26 No objection: The information provided is acceptable. Two conditions are recommended regarding implementation of the sustainability matrix and passivhaus.

Access Officer

- 6.27 See comments from Disability Panel for full assessment. The stepped garden should have ramped access to all parts and pathway surfaces suitable for wheelchairs (there are several natural surfaces available). Query why only 48 of 60 rooms accessible. Would like to see a minimum 3 of the 60 graduate rooms and one of the 12 x 2 bed and one of the 12 x 1 bed family to be wheelchair accessible rooms. Likewise the drawings for the toilets and platform lift in communal areas.

Head of Streets and Open Spaces (Tree Team)

- 6.28 No objection: While the extent of tree loss is not ideal, there are no formal objections sufficient to recommend refusal of the scheme subject to the protection of trees to be retained and replacement planting. It should be noted that further archaeological investigation has been recommended. As any excavation can have a serious impact on trees any archaeological investigations must be included in the tree protection assessment and no archaeological investigations should be carried out within the RPA of retained trees. Four conditions are recommended requiring further sign off of a phased TS and AMS, a tree site visit, compliance with approved tree measures and replacement tree planting should any approved trees fail.

Head of Streets and Open Spaces (Landscape Team)

- 6.29 No comments received.

Cambridgeshire County Council (Flood and Water Management)

- 6.30 No objection: A condition requiring compliance with the drainage information submitted is recommended.

Head of Streets and Open Spaces (Sustainable Drainage Officer)

- 6.31 No objection: The proposals fully meet the requirements of policies 32 and 32 of the adopted Cambridge City Council local plan and are fully supported. The proposals represent SuDs good best practice and no conditions are required.

Head of Streets and Open Spaces (Nature Conservation Officer)

- 6.32 No objection: Boundary treatments to adjoining gardens should include sufficient gaps (150mm X 150mm) to allow access for hedgehogs. Three conditions are recommended requiring a protected species licence for the demolition of the barn, bird and bat boxes and ecologically sensitive lighting.

Historic England

- 6.33 No objection: The current revised proposal for the redevelopment of the site follows from extensive pre-application discussions between the applicant and the Local Authority. At the time of the previous 2016 application, Historic England did not support the proposal to demolish Croft Gardens as they are designated BLIs and a compelling case had not been made for their removal. At the time Historic England recommended that the application be refused.
- 6.34 Historic England has been involved in discussions and workshops regarding the current proposal which now proposes the retention of 27 Barton Road. Whilst the preference would be that the buildings on site are retained, Historic England has considered the detailed document provided to support the application which includes detail of structural issues and Historic England is of the view that a convincing case for demolition has been made.
- 8.35 The scale, massing, design and materials proposed for the replacement buildings would be complementary to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. The retention of no 27 is welcomed and there is no objection to the extension and refurbishment work to this building.
- 6.36 Overall the proposed scheme would not harm the significance of the West Cambridge Conservation Area.

Environment Agency

- 6.37 No objection: Informatives are recommended.

Anglian Water

- 6.38 No objection: There are assets owned by Anglian Water or those subject to an adoption agreement within or close to the development boundary that may affect the layout of the site. The Council's drainage officer should be consulted.

Cambridgeshire Constabulary (Architectural Liaison Officer)

- 6.39 No objection: The area generally has a low level of crimes but bicycle and car theft were predominant over the past 2 years. There is only one mention of security within the Design and Access Statement. Understand the colleges wish for an open site but suggest resident only controls, CCTV, a lighting plan and secure mail delivery.

Cambridgeshire County Council (Archaeology)

- 6.40 No objection: A condition is recommended requiring a written scheme of investigation.

Cadent Gas

- 6.41 No objection: Cadent have identified operational gas apparatus within the application site boundary. This may include a legal interest (easements or wayleaves) in the land which restricts activity in proximity to Cadent assets in private land. The Applicant must ensure that proposed works do not infringe on Cadent's legal rights and any details of such restrictions should be obtained from the landowner in the first instance.

South Newnham Residents Association

First comment

- 6.42 Objection: The South Newnham Residents Association were not invited to participate in any pre-application discussions. At the time of public consultation ahead of the submission of the application the development proposals were complete and there was no opportunity for the community to influence the proposals. This is contrary to the principles of the NPPF. Ask the officers, including the Conservation and Urban Design Team, to confirm that, having examined all relevant matters

(including the current visibly poor state of maintenance), they believe it is definitely the case that refurbishment is not a viable option, and that demolition of this BLI would not go against the Local Plan and Council policy. Request the council to require a comprehensive Environmental Impact Statement. Retention of no 27 is positive but the loss of the green area to the front is regrettable and avoidable. Unclear if the community use proposed for the building is for students or the wider community. Request a condition requiring details of how the community facility will operate. Welcome the wholly student use of the site and the retention of the wooded area to the rear. Two frontage blocks should maintain the existing building line. Request confirmation that occupiers of the site would not be eligible for parking permits under the emerging residents parking scheme.

Second comment

- 6.43 The South Newnham Residents Association's comments are not referenced in the applicants response to consultee comments document. The South Newnham Residents Association were not involved in any pre-application discussions and the local community had no meaningful opportunity to shape the scheme. One of the key objections of the Forum about moving the building line forward was only addressed by stating another conclusion was reached in the pre-app discussions. The proposal for demolition of the BLIs should require consultation with the Forum. Feel that when members of the community and developers engage through the forum agreements can be reached.

Third comment

- 6.44 The Forum is currently drafting a Neighbourhood Plan (NP) for South Newnham, and we are statutory consultees on planning matters. As part of research for the NP the forum has consulted with the community to understand improvements which would be welcomed in the locality. A great deal of money was spent on play equipment in Lammas Land 4 years ago to mixed reaction. Student accommodation does not require further play equipment. The proposal results in a loss of green space. The forums appraisal has identified areas for public realm improvement nearby which would be eligible for S106 funding.

Design and Conservation Panel (Meeting of 10 October 2018)

6.45 The conclusions of the Panel meeting were as follows:

The Panel welcomed the detailed design developments and felt that the changes made since they had last seen the proposal constituted a great improvement. Subject to the acceptance of the case for demolition, the Panel consider that these proposals have the potential to make a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the conservation area.

VERDICT – GREEN (7 – unanimous)

The relevant section of the minutes of the panel meeting are attached to this report as Appendix A.

Disability Consultative Panel (Meeting of)

6.46 Communal areas. The Panel welcomed the fact that the new communal space would have level thresholds. They suggested that the inclusion of a hearing induction loop in this space would also be beneficial.

WCs. The inclusion of accessible WCs on the ground floor for use by disabled visitors was welcomed. The fact that the WCs would be unisex, according to Kings College policy, was thought appropriate from an Equalities standpoint.

Landscaping. Paths between the Fellows' accommodation buildings are broadly according to desire lines with only very gentle level changes which is welcomed. The Panel also noted that materials across the site create a ready surface for mobility access.

Room layout. Although design of kitchen spaces in the Grad Building was yet to be fully detailed, the inclusion of wheelchair accessible surfaces and sinks was strongly recommended. The space provision in the Fellows Apartments, allowing sufficient manoeuvring and turning circle for wheelchairs was praised.

Fire Safety. The Panel were informed that fire safety plans for the buildings have yet to be finalised, but that there were no plans to include sprinklers or evacuation lifts. There will be fire

evacuation plans in place that will likely include the onsite warden and staff from the Porter's Lodge, which is manned 24/7. The Panel reiterated the idea of having the fire alarm only audio/visual within the necessary evacuation area, and silent elsewhere.

Wayfinding. It is noted that building entrances and exits will be well delineated by lighting, colour contrasts and other strong markers. The vibrant rain gardens will also help in this regard. Any internal areas will also have suitably high-contrast features to aid any visually impaired residents.

Transport. There are 2 accessible parking bays proposed for the site out of 11 bays total, with storage provided for non-standard bicycles. The inclusion of a space for the storing and charging of mobility scooters was recommended – the charging facility need not necessarily be free, but could be metred. Further consideration should be given to allowing delivery vehicles access to the Graduate Building.

Conclusion: The Panel considered this a good scheme, and welcome in particular the conversion of the communal building back into accessible use.

Developer Contributions Monitoring Unit

- 6.47 This proposed development is within 600m of Lammas Land play area. Given the scale of the proposed development on this site, and in line with the funding formula set out in the Council's Planning Obligations Strategy 2010, a specific S106 contribution of £7,584.00 (including indexation) is requested toward the provision of and/or improvement of the play area equipment and facilities at Lammas Land play area.
- 6.48 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:

- 18 Bedford Street, Bath

- 95 Burnside
- Camcycle
- Cambridge Past, Present and Future
- 19 Chamney's Walk x 2
- Church Rate Corner Malting Lane
- 19 Churchfield Court, High Street, Girton
- 19 Clarkson Road
- 10 Earl Street
- 26 Eltisley Avenue
- 2 Grange Road
- 106 Grantchester Meadows
- 16 Grantchester Road
- 45 Herbert Street
- 5A Herschel Road
- 5 Kings Road
- 5 Merton Street
- 2 Millington Road x 2
- 2A Millington Road x 3
- Barker Storey Matthews for 4C Millington Road x 3
- 20 Millington Road x 2
- 30 Millington Road x 2
- Newnham Croft Conservation Group
- 13 St Marks Court
- 5 Selwyn Gardens
- 29 Selwyn Gardens
- 10 Summerfield
- 4 West View

7.2 The representations can be summarised as follows:

Design/conservation area/loss of BLIs

- The applicant has not made a credible case for the loss of Croft Gardens which are landmark buildings and harmonious in the street.
- The buildings are BLIs and should be preserved.
- Existing accommodation should be retained and improved
- Loss of greenery and characterful topiary hedges
- Suggest land behind Croft Gardens could be developed and existing buildings retained
- The replacement buildings are too high and out of character with the surrounding area

- Any replacement buildings should retain art deco features/should have white render
- The replacement buildings are sited too close to Barton Road
- The narrow inset windows are austere and out of keeping
- The crescent shape is out of keeping and bulky. The buildings should be rectangular.
- Replacement buildings are too institutional/urban. The surrounding character is predominantly domestic/residential
- Although the replacement buildings are better than the previous application they remain harmful to the Conservation Area
- Request a high hedge and further planting to the front of the development to screen from the street
- 29 Barton Road should not be used as precedent as this is an anomaly in the street
- Retention and reuse of no 27 is positive
- Removal of plans to demolish nursery is positive
- Wild garden surrounding no 27 and how the garden and building relate to one another is of great importance

Residential amenity

- Will overlook 2 Grange Road
- Noise disturbance from student use/increased density
- Increase traffic, noise and dust during construction
- Concerned about removal of hazardous materials/waste during construction
- Rear student block will overlook 4C Millington Road
- Noise and disturbance from use of rear amenity space will disturb 4C Millington Road

Ecology/Trees

- Loss of trees and wildlife
- 4C Millington Road is a unique and natural site which is a habitat for many plants and animals. This habitat flows into the application site and there are concerns about the ecology studies provided with the application
- Wooded boundary with 4C Millington Road should be retained for ecology and privacy purposes.
- Light from the new buildings will impact bats and amenity of 4C Millington Road which uses only minimal external lighting.

- The garden absorbs CO2

Traffic/parking/highway safety

- Increased density of the site would increase traffic and pollution
- Insufficient car parking spaces
- Insufficient cycle parking space for the flats
- Double stacker cycle spaces are not permitted for residential development
- Inadequate circulation space for deliveries

Other

- Contrary to the South Newnham Residents Plan
- Feel the buildings have been wilfully neglected
- Request evidence that Kings College has invested in the upkeep of Croft gardens over the years
- Lack of community consultation about the project
- Survey regarding condition of Croft gardens were commissioned by the college so are not independent
- Buildings will not meet BREEAM Excellent in line with policy 28
- The amendments make no improvement
- Site should be used to house key workers rather than transient students who do not contribute to the community
- There are significant numbers of post grad rooms available at Eddington which the college should be able to utilise.
- Would set a precedent for further development in the area
- A village concept is suggested whereby Croft Gardens set piece is repeated 3 to 5 times within the grounds.
- Having lived in Croft Gardens in the past feel that they could easily be made into adequate accommodation

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. Principle of development
2. Affordable Housing
3. Context of site, design and external spaces and impact on heritage assets
4. Trees and ecology
5. Public Art
6. Carbon reduction and sustainable design
7. Water management and flood risk
8. Light pollution, noise, vibration, air quality, odour and dust
9. Inclusive access
10. Residential amenity
11. Refuse arrangements
12. Highway safety
13. Car and cycle parking
14. Third party representations
15. Planning Obligations (s106 Agreement)

Principle of Development

8.2 The site is currently used as graduate family accommodation with storage to the south of the site. The proposal continues the student accommodation use of the site with ancillary social facilities in the retained and extended 27 Barton road.

8.3 Policy 46 Of the Cambridge Local Plan 2018 relates to the development of new student accommodation. This states that student accommodation developments will be permitted if they meet identified needs of an existing educational institution to provide housing for students attending full-time courses of one academic year or more. The application will need to:

- a. Demonstrate there is a proven need for student accommodation to serve the institution
- b. Demonstrate no loss of market or affordable housing as part of the proposal
- c. Be in a location which is appropriate to the institution it serves

- d. Being close to sustainable transport links
- e. Having appropriate management arrangements to prevent student bringing cars into Cambridge
- f. The rooms and facilities being adequate
- g. Where appropriate, being warden controlled to minimize anti-social behavior

8.4 The college has submitted a Housing Need Assessment as part of the application which clearly demonstrates the need for additional student accommodation. The site currently houses Kings College students and is easily accessible to the college. The site lies within close proximity to public transport links and is well connected by pedestrian and cycle infrastructure. Students are subject to proctoral controls to prevent students bringing cars into Cambridge. The room sizes and facilities proposed are considered acceptable (further assessment below). The site would house a mixture of graduate students and graduate students with families. As a result there would be no requirement for a warden and there is unlikely to be any significant anti-social behavior associated with the additional student rooms on site.

Affordable Housing

8.5 The application proposed student accommodation and as such does not require any affordable housing provision.

Context of site, design and external spaces and impact on heritage assets

Principle of demolition

8.6 The first element to address is the principle of demolition of 1-12 Croft Gardens as well as the other garage and storage buildings on site. 1-12 Croft Gardens and 27 Barton Road are BLIs. These buildings are also identified as having a positive contribution to the Conservation Area within the West Cambridge Conservation Area Appraisal. No 27 Barton Road is proposed to be retained, renovated and extended. This is supported in principle and I will address the details of the works below. The storage building and garages are of no architectural or historical interest and their loss is supported.

- 8.7 The primary concern is the demolition of 1-12 Croft Gardens. Many of the representations object to their loss and request that the buildings are retained and refurbished. As part of the previous application the applicant provided a structural report from Andrew Firebrace and Partners which looked at the structural condition of the buildings but was relatively limited in scope. As part of the current application the applicant has provided a further appraisal from Smith and Wallwork which is more detailed. A report from Faithful and Gould assess the level of repairs and refurbishment required to bring the buildings up to standard.
- 8.8 All three blocks suffered from subsidence of foundations. Further evidence of cracking since the original 2015 report shows subsidence is ongoing. The subsidence has caused doors to drop, cracking and uneven floors. All of the three buildings would need to be underpinned which would require extensive and disruptive works which would result in significant loss of internal fabric. Internally there is mold and dampness in many areas which suggests a thermal insulation upgrade is required as well as heating and ventilation systems throughout. Cracks would need to be repaired and external wall insulation would be required to improve thermal performance. The report states that internal wall insulation could in theory be provided but this would have thermal bridging issues and would reduce the size of rooms. Doors and windows are in a poor state of repair and would need to be replaced. Additional ventilation systems would need to be provided to meet with Building Regulations Standards. The original stairs would need to be removed and rebuilt. The existing head heights are below the standard minimum requirement and this would reduce even further if the flats were fitted with adequate acoustic separation. The internal layout of the flats could not be adapted to be suitable for wheelchair users and none of the units are wheelchair accessible. The only way to make the units accessible would be to totally remodel the interiors resulting in major loss of fabric and a reduction to floor area.
- 8.9 The heritage statement submitted with the application makes the case that the works required to bring Croft Gardens up to current Building Regulation Standards would result in significant loss of fabric and extensive alterations. The resulting buildings would not retain their original plan form. The work to repair and insulate the walls would result in the loss of detailing and

change the appearance of the building. There would need to be external ramps to provide level access. The loss of historic fabric and replacement with modern replicas would reduce the significance of the buildings. The works would also result in very small amount of floor space; much of which would not be wheelchair accessible. The Heritage Statement goes on to argue that a quality building could provide a modern landmark development in the Conservation Area which would make an equal or greater contribution to the character of Barton Road.

- 8.10 The Conservation Officer has reviewed the case made in the heritage statement which, as outlined above, argues that with the upgrades that would be necessary to bring the buildings up to the required standards to meet Building Regulations, the character and profile details would be changed and the original style and some of the details of the buildings would be lost. The Conservation Team considers that the changes would have a negative impact on their appearance and on some of the reasons for designation as BLIs.

Replacement buildings

- 8.11 In considering whether the loss of Croft Gardens would be acceptable, the Conservation Team has assessed the appropriateness of the replacement buildings and whether they would preserve or enhance the Conservation Area. This is in line with the NPPF (2019) which states (paragraph 197) that a 'balanced judgement will be required having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset.

Building A, B and C

- 8.12 The proposed replacement buildings (Buildings A, B and C) would also be a set piece around a central garden space. The height of the frontage buildings would be a transition between the two storeys of 19 and 21 and the three storeys of nos. 29 and 31. The set piece formation and curved nature of the proposal would create a replacement landmark on the street. The central garden space would be communal open space with a grass amphitheatre to the southern end. It would retain the greenery to the front of the property and the semi-formal garden feel that currently existing. Topiaries are shown around seating areas in this garden which picks up on the existing topiaries which are referenced numerous times in the representations.

The curved nature of the buildings will draw the eye into the site. In my view the proposed curved nature will reduce the massing when viewed from the street. The buildings do sit further forward than the existing Croft Gardens but have a building line which would transition; being further forward than 21 but not as far forward as no 29. The buffer of trees to the rear would be retained albeit with some trees being removed and replaced and as a result the verdant backdrop to the site would remain. The Conservation Officer is satisfied that subject to careful detailing and use of quality materials, that the pair of frontage buildings would have a positive impact on the streetscene. I share this view.

Building E

- 8.13 No 27 Barton Road (Building E) is proposed to be retained as part of the proposal. The proposal is to refurbish and extend the property providing level access to the rear. This building is proposed to be used as a communal space for occupiers of the site and as a result the works required are not as significant as those needed to bring the buildings into an acceptable standard for residential use. Many of the architectural features which contribute to the significance of the building will be retained including the shutter boxes to the French doors, the covings, and some of the doors and their architraves. The extension to the property would be to the rear which is the least sensitive elevation as it already has a large incongruous extension. The proposed extension will provide level access and ensure the building is retained and reused. The extension is a lightweight timber and glazed structure which would clearly read as a subservient later addition to the property. The positioning of the frontage buildings will guide glimpsed views towards no 27 from Barton Road.

Building D

- 8.14 No 27A (Building D) is proposed to sit adjacent to no 29 Barton Road. It would be a three storey building which would take its cues in terms of scale and massing from the adjacent 29. The Conservation Team is satisfied that its siting on the currently open part of the site would not be harmful to the conservation area. The building would have a more simple architectural form than the ornate no 29. It would have a gable end with a hardwood flat roof projecting bay facing Barton Road. The

primary windows face east into the application site. The Conservation Team note that the materials and detailing will need to take their cues from the other buildings on site to ensure they work together and have a positive impact on the Conservation Area. Further brick and roof details are recommended to be required by condition.

8.15 The Conservation Team have assessed the replacement scheme and considered the harm from the loss of the BLIs. They consider that the replacement buildings, although larger in scale, would preserve the character and appearance of the conservation area subject to details of brickwork and roofs. The new buildings will also be distinctive and have a landmark quality similar to Croft Gardens. Historic England has also reviewed the application and, having recommended refusal on the previous application, are satisfied that the current application is acceptable. They note that the applicant has made a compelling case for the demolition of Croft Gardens and that the proposed replacement buildings in terms of design, massing and materials would be complementary to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. The scheme was presented at Design and Conservation Panel and received unanimous green lights. The Landscape proposals work well with the buildings and retain much greenery on the site. The retention and reuse of no 27 is positive and the new buildings will help reveal glimpsed views of it from Barton Road due to their shape and siting which draws the eye into the site. The new building adjacent to no 29 is considered to be acceptable in terms of design in principle subject to details of materials to ensure it ties in with the other new buildings on site. In my view the development would preserve and enhance the character and appearance of the Conservation Area and I am satisfied that the replacement buildings would justify the loss of the BLIs given the level of work required to bring these up to standard.

8.16 In my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2018) policies 55, 56, 57, 58, 61 and 62.

Trees and Ecology

8.17 The Tree Officer reviewed the application as submitted. She noted that the amount of trees proposed to be removed was not ideal but that she had no objection subject to the retained trees

being suitably protected and replacement planting being provided. Initially the area to the south of the site was proposed to be a wooded external amenity space for students. Due to concerns about the amenity of 4C Millington Road, which are discussed in more detail below, this area is no longer proposed to be used as external amenity space and a condition is proposed to prevent this area being used other than for maintenance and up keep. Further trees have also been proposed in this area due to concerns about overlooking; this is also discussed in greater detail below. As a result the area to the back of building C will now have an even greater amount of trees which will provide a green backdrop for the buildings and retain the green buffer at the back of the site.

8.18 The Ecology Officer initially had no objection to the proposal subject to condition. Following an objection from 4C Millington Road, he undertook a site visit to the neighbouring property and noted its ecological value. He requested further survey work to be undertaken by the applicant's ecology consultant. This survey work has been undertaken and an updated report has been provided. The Ecology Officer has no objection to the proposal in light of the additional information subject to conditions.

8.19 In my opinion the proposal, subject to conditions is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2018) policies 70 and 71.

Public Art

8.20 No information has been provided up front regarding public art. I am satisfied that it will be possible to include an element of public art within the site. A condition requiring a public art delivery plan is recommended to ensure the delivery of public art to comply with policy.

8.21 In my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2018) policy 56 and the Public Art SPD 2010

Carbon reduction and sustainable design

8.22 I note one of the representations raises concerns that the building would not meet BREEAM excellent in line with policy 28. In paragraph 4.8 of the supporting text to policy 28, it states that the Council will be supportive of innovative approaches to

meeting and exceeding the standards. It goes on to confirm that the Passivhaus Standard is supported. The Senior Sustainability Officer has confirmed that the proposal meets with policy 28 and recommended two conditions regarding Passivhaus and implementation of the sustainability matrix.

- 8.23 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 (2018) policy 28 and the Sustainable Design and Construction SPD 2007.

Integrated water management and flood risk

- 8.24 Both the City Council's Sustainable Drainage Officer and the Lead Local Flood Authority Officer have reviewed the submission and are satisfied that the drainage detail is acceptable. A condition requiring compliance with the information submitted is recommended.

- 8.25 In my opinion the applicants have suitably addressed the issues of water management and flood risk, and the proposal is in accordance with Cambridge Local Plan (2018) policies 31 and 32.

Light pollution, air quality, noise, vibration and dust

- 8.26 The Environmental Health Officer has reviewed the submission and has no objection to the proposal subject to conditions. Conditions to manage noise, vibration and dust during construction are recommended. Conditions are also recommended to restrict the hours of construction and hours for deliveries and collections from the site during construction. An EV Charging point is requested to be provided through condition. Details of artificial lighting are also recommended to be dealt with by condition. Artificial lighting is also relevant to the Ecology Officer and the Architectural Liaison Officer.

- 8.27 In my opinion, subject to the conditions I have recommended, the applicants have suitably addressed the issues of noise, vibration dust, light pollution and air quality, and the proposal is in accordance with Cambridge Local Plan (2018) policies 34, 35 and 36.

Inclusive access

- 8.28 The application is for student accommodation and as a result policy 51 is not relevant. The application proposes to provide 6 accessible bedrooms within the Graduate block. 48 of the 60 rooms would be wheelchair accessible. The proposed flats are designed to exceed London Housing Design Guide standards and factor in maneuvering and turning circles. Building 3 has lifts to provide access to all floors. The ground floor flats have level access.
- 8.29 In my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2018) policies 56 and 57.

Residential Amenity

Impact on amenity of neighbouring occupiers

- 8.30 27A Barton Road (Building D) would sit broadly in line with no 29. There is an element of the building which would protrude beyond the rear building line with no 29 but this is set well away from the boundary. As a result I do not consider that 27A would cause any significant enclosure or overshadowing to no 29 Barton Road. There are no windows proposed in the side elevation looking towards no 29. There are windows in the end wall but these serve the corridor and as a result would not have any significant impact on the privacy of the garden space to the rear of 29.
- 8.31 Building B runs in close proximity to 21 Barton Road. The building would be set off the boundary with 21 Barton Road by between 6.5 and 7m. The building will result in some enclosure to the garden space but given the distance from the boundary and the lower height at the eaves nearest the boundary I do not consider this to be significantly harmful to warrant refusal. No shadow studies have been provided but the building is likely to result in some minor overshadowing of the garden of no 21 when compared with the existing situation. This would be minor given the distance from the boundary and due to the orientation would only be for a limited time. There are a number of windows which would look towards the garden of no 21. This garden space is already overlooked by no 19 and although the proposal will result in additional windows looking towards the garden given the separation distance and as the property is within the

ownership of Kings College I do not consider this to be a significantly harmful impact on the privacy of the garden to warrant refusal.

8.32 The primary concern is the impact of Building C on the amenity of 4C Millington Road. 4C Millington Road is a unique site within Cambridge. It comprises a number of pavilion buildings in a natural setting with a large amount of trees, shrubs and a body of water. The buildings are all pavilion type structures with accommodation at first and second floor and external walkways. Due to the orientation of the plot with 4C being south of the site, there would be no overshadowing from the development. The existing riding school building is proposed to be removed. Building C would be sited further east on the site than the riding school building which is being demolished but would sit broadly in the same building line. At the closest point (at the south east of the site) the building is 10m to the boundary and there is 15m between the nearest point of Building C and the annex building at 4C Millington Road. At the furthest points the building would be 17.5m from the boundary.

8.33 Having visited 4C Millington Road I was concerned about the impact of the proposal on the amenity of the occupiers of the site as it is currently very tranquil and secluded. The primary concern was noise and disturbance from the use of the wooded area to the rear and overlooking from Building C. The applicant has provided a revised plan which removes all seating from the woodland area and confirmed they are willing to accept a condition to prevent this space being used other than for maintenance and upkeep. The revised plan also provides a significant amount more trees to the rear. This is acceptable in principle but further details of proposed tree planting are recommended to be dealt with by condition. A condition is also recommended regarding boundary treatment and this should provide detail of how the woodland area would be fenced off to prevent student access.

8.34 I am satisfied that fencing off the area to the rear and including a condition to prevent it being used as amenity space and only accessed for upkeep would overcome concerns about noise disturbance from the use of this space. I will recommend a condition where by the applicant will need to provide a plan showing the extent of the area to the rear to be fenced off and the condition will refer to this plan and prohibit its use except for

upkeep. I will provide an update on this condition on the amendment sheet. The additional tree planting will provide further screening to obscure views into 4C Millington Road from Building C. The additional trees combined with the distance of the building from the boundary are considered to adequately protect the privacy of 4C. The additional trees will also help retain the wooded buffer which currently exists and is important for wildlife which moves between the sites.

- 8.35 In terms of enclosure impact, building C will result in some enclosure to the annex building at 4C Millington Road as it is a tall structure which runs near to a significant portion of the boundary between the two sites (approx. 50m). However the provision of further tree planting will help screen the building from the site. The majority of 4C Millington Road will not be enclosed by the building and as a result I do not consider the proposal would have a significant impact in terms of enclosure to no 4C.
- 8.36 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 (2018) policies 35, 55 and 56.

Amenity for future occupiers of the site

- 8.37 The flats and rooms are proposed to be used as student accommodation and as a result policy 50 which sets minimum space standards is not relevant as this relates to C3 residential units whereas the proposed use would fall within the C2 Student Accommodation use. The proposed rooms and flats are considered to provide adequate amenity for the future student users of the site. Building C provides en-suite graduate rooms whereas Building D will provide cheaper rooms with shared bathrooms. Both are considered to be adequate for future occupiers. The reuse of no. 27 (Building E) to provide communal facilities is positive and will help create a sense of community amongst students who live on site. The woodland amenity area originally proposed is now conditioned to be fenced off and not be accessible by students. However, in my view, the remaining outdoor space on site between Building A and B and around no 27 would be sufficient to provide a good level of amenity to future students living on site.

- 8.38 In my opinion the proposal provides a high-quality living environment and an appropriate standard of amenity for future student occupiers, and I consider that in this respect it is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2018) policy 46.

Refuse Arrangements

- 8.39 The Waste Officer initially queried the refuse collection arrangement. The college has confirmed that refuse lorries would not need to enter the site and that bins would be moved adjacent to the highway on collection day by management. The Waste Officer has confirmed this is acceptable.
- 8.40 In my opinion the proposal is compliant in this respect with Cambridge Local Plan (2018) policy 57.

Highway Safety

- 8.41 The Highway Engineer initially raised concerns about inadequate visibility splays but the applicant has provided revised plans and further information and visibility splays are now considered adequate and he has no objection to the proposal subject to conditions including a construction traffic management plan. The major development team has reviewed the transport impact of the proposal. Students would be subject to proctoral controls and as the students are graduates, move ins and leaving will be spread over a period of time rather than all at once. The Transport Assessment Team is satisfied that they have no objection to the development subject to a travel plan condition and mitigation package requiring improvements to the two nearest bus stops on Barton Road.
- 8.42 In my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2018) policy 81.

Car and Cycle Parking

- 8.43 The application proposes 12 car parking space including 4 disabled bays. The occupiers of the site will be subject to proctoral control and the car free nature of the occupiers can as a result be realistically enforced. The Transport Assessment Team has reviewed the proposal and have no objection subject to mitigation as noted above. The Transport Officer does note that the car ownership exercise shows that 15 car parking

spaces would be required for a development of this size in this location for the apartment's element of the site. This assumes a C3 use rather than a C2 use so is not relevant. In my view, the level of car parking is acceptable and it should be noted that although the car parking numbers were noted to be below C3 standards the Transport Assessment Team has no objection to the proposal.

8.44 The application proposes to provide a total of 164 cycle spaces. These are a mixture of short stay uncovered space and secure covered spaces. The cycle parking spaces are a mixture of Sheffield stands and double stackers. 4 Cargo bike spaces have been provided. The provision would exceed the Local Plan's minimum standards, which requires a total of 2 spaces per 3 bed spaces and 1 visitor space per 5 bed spaces which would require a total of 84 spaces. Camcycle state that double stackers are inappropriate but as the use is for student accommodation it is acceptable to have a mixture of both double stackers and Sheffield Stands. The provision of spaces for cargo bikes is welcomed for the family units.

8.45 In my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2018) policy 82.

Third Party Representations

8.46 I have addressed the majority of the issues raised by the third party representations within the body of my report but will cover any outstanding matters in the below table:

Representation	Response
The applicant has not made a credible case for the loss of Croft Gardens which are landmark buildings and harmonious in the street.	See paragraphs 8.6-8.10
The buildings are BLIs and should be preserved.	See paragraphs 8.6-8.10
Existing accommodation should be retained and improved	There are many issues with the retention and refurbishment of the scheme. The works required to bring the buildings up to modern building regulation standards would result in a significant loss

	of historic fabric which would impact on the significance of the building. See paragraphs 8.6-8.10
Loss of greenery and characterful topiary hedges	Much greenery is retained on site. Topiary is proposed within the new semi-formal garden to the front of the site.
Suggest land behind Croft Gardens could be developed and existing buildings retained	I can only assess the application in hand.
The replacement buildings are too high and out of character with the surrounding area	Although of a greater scale than the existing Croft Gardens, the replacement buildings are considered to preserve and enhance the character and appearance of the conservation area subject to conditions. See paragraphs 8.11-8.15
Any replacement buildings should retain art deco features/should have white render	The new buildings would be of a high design quality and details of brickwork and roofing are recommended to be required by condition. I do not consider it necessary to retain art deco features as part of the new development. Where feasible to green roof tiles will be reused on the proposed garages.
The replacement buildings are sited too close to Barton Road	Although the new buildings sit further forward than the existing buildings, I consider they would read well in the streetscene. See paragraphs 8.11-8.15
The narrow inset windows are austere and out of keeping	The replacement buildings are considered to be acceptable in terms of design. See paragraph 8.11-8.15
The crescent shape is out of keeping and bulky. The buildings should be rectangular.	The crescent shape is not typical in the street but in my view would have a positive impact on the streetscene and would direct views into the site.

Replacement buildings are too institutional/urban. The surrounding character is predominantly domestic/residential	The proposed replacement buildings are considered to preserve and enhance the character and appearance of the conservation area. See paragraphs 8.11 – 8.15
Although the replacement buildings are better than the previous application they remain harmful to the Conservation Area	The proposed replacement buildings are considered to preserve the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.
Request a high hedge and further planting to the front of the development to screen from the street	A hedge is proposed to the front of the site.
29 Barton Road should not be used as precedent as this is an anomaly in the street	No 29 is harmonious in the street. Building D is considered to have a positive impact on the street. See paragraph 8.14
Retention and reuse of no 27 is positive	Noted.
Removal of plans to demolish nursery is positive	Noted.
Wild garden surrounding no 27 and how the garden and building relate to one another is of great importance	The proposal does retain a garden for no 27. A lawn is proposed to the front of the building with raised beds, which would be used by students for growing fruit and vegetable, to the rear.
Will overlook 2 Grange Road	2 Grange Road is at the other side of the road and set a significant distance away from the nearest building proposed on site (building D).
Noise disturbance from student use/increased density	In my view the use of the site would not give rise to any significant noise disturbance to nearby occupiers
Increase traffic, noise and dust during construction	Conditions are proposed to manage construction hours, noise, dust and construction traffic management

Concerned about removal of hazardous materials/waste during construction	Removal of asbestos is a building regulations matter. The Environmental Health Officer has no concerns regarding contaminated land.
Noise and disturbance from use of rear amenity space will disturb 4C Millington Road	See paragraph 8.32 – 8.34
Rear student block will overlook 4C Millington Road	See paragraph 8.34
Loss of trees and wildlife	The Ecology Officer and Tree Officer have no objection to the development subject to conditions.
4C Millington Road is a unique and natural site which is a habitat for many plants and animals. This habitat flows into the application site and there are concerns about the ecology studies provided with the application	Further ecology studies have been provided. The Ecology Officer is satisfied with the information provided subject to conditions.
Wooded boundary with 4C Millington Road should be retained for ecology and privacy purposes.	Further planting has been proposed to the rear of the site.
Light from the new buildings will impact bats and amenity of 4C Millington Road which uses only minimal external lighting.	A condition is proposed requiring ecologically sensitive lighting details to be approved
The garden absorbs co2	Noted. A large amount of greenery and trees are proposed to be retained as part of the development.
Increased density of the site would increase traffic and pollution	Students would not be permitted to bring cars into the city and as a result there would be no significant increase in traffic to the site
Insufficient car parking spaces	I consider the proposed car parking numbers to be adequate given the nature of the use and

	proctoral controls in place.
Insufficient cycle parking space for the flats	The cycle parking levels proposed on site exceed policy standards. See paragraph 8.44
Double stacker cycle spaces are not permitted for residential development	The proposal is for student accommodation and as a result a mixture of cycle stands types are permitted.
Inadequate circulation space for deliveries	I am satisfied that there is adequate space for deliveries to access and manoeuvre around the site
Contrary to the South Newnham Residents Plan	This is not yet adopted.
Feel the buildings have been wilfully neglected	There is no evidence to suggest the wilful neglect of the buildings.
Request evidence that Kings College has invested in the upkeep of Croft gardens over the years	This is not considered reasonable as there is no evidence of wilful neglect.
Lack of community consultation about the project	The applicant has provided a statement of community involvement which details a public exhibition held prior to submission of the application.
Survey regarding condition of Croft gardens were commissioned by the college so are not independent	I am satisfied with the surveys provided.
Buildings will not meet BREEAM Excellent in line with policy 28	The buildings are designed to be Passivhaus rather than meet BREEAM excellent. Passivhaus buildings are constructed in a way to be low-energy buildings. This approach is supported by policy 28 and has been confirmed as acceptable by the Senior Sustainability Officer. See paragraph 8.22.
The amendments make no improvement	Noted. I consider the amendments to provide further planting to the rear and

	agreement to prohibit student access to this area would overcome my concerns regarding the impact to 4C Millington Road.
Site should be used to house key workers rather than transient students who do not contribute to the community	This does not form part of the application. The proposal includes an assessment of need in line with the requirements of policy 45. See paragraph 8.2-8.4
There are significant numbers of post grad rooms available at Eddington which the college should be able to utilise.	The college has demonstrated a need for further accommodation. See paragraph 8.4
Would set a precedent for further development in the area	Every application is assessed on its own merits
A village concept is suggested whereby Croft Gardens set piece is repeated 3 to 5 times within the grounds.	This does not form part of the application
Having lived in Croft Gardens in the past feel that they could easily be made into adequate accommodation	The studies put forward by the applicant detail the level of work required to bring the buildings up to standard. This would be costly and result in a loss of fabric and many features which are important to the significance of the buildings.

Planning Obligations (s106 Agreement)

8.47 The Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Regulations 2010 have introduced the requirement for all local authorities to make an assessment of any planning obligation in relation to three tests. Each planning obligation needs to pass three statutory tests to make sure that it 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.

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

- 8.48 In line with the CIL Regulations, councils can pool no more than five S106 contributions towards the same project. The new 'pooling' restrictions were introduced from 6 April 2015 and relate to new S106 agreements. This means that all contributions now agreed by the city council must be for specific projects at particular locations, as opposed to generic infrastructure types within the city of Cambridge.

City Council Infrastructure (Open spaces and Community facilities)

- 8.49 The Developer Contribution Monitoring team has recommended that a contribution of £7,584.00 (including indexation) be made toward the provision of and/or improvement of the play area equipment and facilities at Lammas Land play area.
- 8.50 I note the South Newnham Residents Association have objected to the contributions going towards play equipment at Lammas Lane. The contributions are based on the city council's SPD and reflect a need for additional money for play equipment at Lammas Land. The South Newnham Residents Association also suggests that the money would be better spent on public realm improvements on Barton Road. The proposal attracts a contribution for children play equipment as some family student flats are proposed. A contribution towards public realm improvements is not required to make the development acceptable and would not be CIL compliant.
- 8.51 The County Councils Transport Assessment Team has requested that the maintenance of the RTP1 for the two bus stops, as recommended by condition, be included as a S106 obligation. I consider this to be reasonable and justified.
- 8.52 I agree with the reasoning set out in paragraph 6.47 above that the contribution towards Lammas Land meets the requirements of the CIL regulations. The maintenance of the bus stops, as outlined in paragraph 8.51 is also considered to meet with CIL regulations. 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 (2018) policies 68 and 85 and the Planning Obligation Strategy 2010.

Planning Obligations Conclusion

- 8.53 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. Delegated powers are requested to deal with the S106 agreement.

9.0 CONCLUSION

- 9.1 The applicant is considered to have made a compelling case for the demolition of Croft gardens. The replacement buildings on site are considered to be appropriate in terms of scale and design and subject to conditions are considered to preserve and enhance the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. The proposal is not considered to have any significant adverse impact on surrounding neighbouring properties subject to conditions, in particular about planting to the rear and prohibiting the use of the rear of the site as amenity space. The ecological and tree impacts of the proposal are considered acceptable subject to conditions. Delegated powers are requested to deal with the S106 agreement.

10.0 RECOMMENDATION

APPROVE subject to the prior completion of the s106 Agreement 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 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended by 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 construction work or demolition work shall be carried out or plant operated other than between the following hours: 0800 hours and 1800 hours on Monday to Friday, 0800 hours and 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 2018 policy 35).

4. There shall be no collections from or deliveries to the site during the demolition and construction stages outside the hours of 0800 hours and 1800 hours on 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 2018 policy 35).

5. No development shall commence (including any pre-construction, demolition, enabling works or piling), until a written report, regarding the demolition / construction noise and vibration impact associated with this development, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning 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. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details only.

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 nearby properties (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policy 35).

6. 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: To protect the amenity of nearby properties (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policy 36).

7. Prior to occupation of the proposed development, information demonstrating that an electric vehicle charge point has been installed in 50% of the proposed development shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In the interests of encouraging more sustainable forms of travel/transport and to reduce the impact of development on local air quality, in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), Policy 36 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2018) and in accordance with Cambridge City Councils adopted Air Quality Action Plan (2018).

8. Prior to the installation of plant, a scheme for the insulation of the plant in order to minimise the level of noise emanating from the said 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: In the interest of amenity (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policy 35).

9. Prior to the installation of any artificial lighting, an artificial lighting scheme shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The scheme shall include details of any artificial lighting of the site and an artificial lighting impact assessment with predicted lighting levels at proposed and existing residential properties shall be undertaken. Artificial lighting on and off site must meet the Obtrusive Light Limitations for Exterior Lighting Installations contained within the Institute of Lighting Professionals Guidance Notes for the Reduction of Obtrusive Light - GN01:2011 (or as superseded). The lighting scheme shall also be ecologically sensitive and shall:
- a) identify those areas/features on site that are particularly sensitive for bat species and that are likely to cause disturbance along important routes used to access key areas of their territory, for example, for foraging; and
 - b) show how and where external lighting will be installed (through the provision of appropriate lighting contour plans and technical specifications) so that it can be clearly demonstrated that areas to be lit will not disturb or prevent the above species using their territory or having access to their breeding sites and resting places.

The approved lighting scheme shall be installed, maintained and operated in accordance with the approved details / measures.

Reason: In the interest of amenity and to protect the foraging and commuting route for bat species (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policies 34 and 70).

10. The surface water drainage scheme shall be constructed and maintained in full accordance with the Flood Risk Assessment and Foul and Surface Water Drainage Strategy Report as submitted (ref: KCG-SW-SI-XX-RP-C-0007) dated 13th December 2018.

Reason: To prevent an increased risk of flooding and protect water quality (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policies 31 and 32).

11. The development shall be designed and constructed in accordance with the Passivhaus Standard. Prior to occupation, or as soon as practicable after occupation, evidence of Passivhaus certification shall be submitted to and approved 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 2018 Policy 28).

12. All buildings on site, with the exception of ancillary buildings, shall be constructed to meet the criteria set out in the approved Sustainability Statement and Sustainability Matrix (Max Fordham, 6th December 2018). Any subsequent amendment to the credits contained within the Sustainability Matrix shall be in accordance with a revised Matrix submitted to and approved 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 2018 Policy 28).

13. Prior to commencement and in accordance with BS5837 2012, a phased tree protection methodology in the form of an Arboricultural Method Statement (AMS) and Tree Protection Plan (TPP) shall be submitted to the local planning authority for its written approval, before any tree works are carried and before equipment, machinery or materials are brought onto the site for the purpose of development (including demolition). In a logical sequence the AMS and TPP will consider all phases of construction in relation to the potential impact on trees and detail tree works, the specification and position of protection barriers and ground protection and all measures to be taken for the protection of any trees from damage during the course of any activity related to the development, including supervision, demolition, foundation design, storage of materials, ground works, installation of services, erection of scaffolding and landscaping.

Reason: To satisfy the Local Planning Authority that trees to be retained will be protected from damage during any construction activity, including demolition, in order to preserve arboricultural amenity in accordance with section 197 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and Cambridge Local Plan 2018 Policy 71: Trees.

14. Prior to the commencement of site clearance a pre-commencement site meeting shall be held and attended by the site manager, the arboricultural consultant and Local Planning Authority Tree Officer to discuss details of the approved AMS.

Reason: To satisfy the Local Planning Authority that trees to be retained will not be damaged during any construction activity, including demolition, in order to preserve arboricultural amenity in accordance with section 197 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and Cambridge Local Plan 2018 Policy 71: Trees.

15. The approved tree protection methodology will be implemented throughout the development and the agreed means of protection shall be retained on site until all equipment, and surplus materials have been removed from the site. Nothing shall be stored or placed in any area protected in accordance with approved tree protection plans, and the ground levels within those areas shall not be altered nor shall any excavation be made without the prior written approval of the local planning authority. If any tree shown to be retained is damaged, remedial works as may be specified in writing by the local planning authority will be carried out.

Reason: To satisfy the Local Planning Authority that trees to be retained will not be damaged during any construction activity, including demolition, in order to preserve arboricultural amenity in accordance with section 197 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and Cambridge Local Plan 2018 Policy 71: Trees.

16. If any tree shown to be retained on the approved tree protection methodology is removed, uprooted, destroyed or dies within five years of project completion, another tree shall be planted at the same place and that tree shall be of such size and species, and shall be planted at such time, as may be specified in writing by the local planning authority.

Reason: To satisfy the Local Planning Authority that arboricultural amenity will be preserved in accordance with section 197 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and Cambridge Local Plan 2018 Policy 71: Trees.

17. No development above ground level, other than demolition, shall commence until full details of both hard and soft landscape works have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The 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); 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.

All hard and soft landscape works shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details. The works shall be carried out prior to the occupation of any part of the development or in accordance with a programme agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The maintenance shall be carried out in accordance with the approved schedule. Any trees or plants that, within a period of five years after planting, are removed, die or become in the opinion of the Local Planning Authority, seriously damaged or defective, shall be replaced as soon as is reasonably practicable with others of species, size and number as originally approved, unless the Local Planning Authority gives its written consent to any variation.

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 2018 policies 55, 57 and 59).

18. No development above ground level, other than demolition, shall commence until there has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority a plan indicating the positions, design, materials and type of boundary treatments to be erected. Boundary treatments to adjoining gardens should include sufficient gaps (150mm X 150mm) to allow access for hedgehogs. The boundary treatment shall be completed in accordance with the approved details prior to the first occupation or the bringing into use of the development (or other timetable agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority) and retained as approved thereafter.

Reason: To ensure an appropriate boundary treatment is implemented in the interests of visual amenity and privacy and to ensure it allows movement of hedgehogs (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policies 55, 57, 59 and 70).

19. Prior to first occupation or the bringing into use of the development, hereby permitted, a landscape management plan, including long term design objectives, management responsibilities and maintenance schedules for all landscaped areas, other than small privately owned domestic gardens, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The landscaped areas shall thereafter be managed in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: In the interests of visual amenity and to ensure that suitable hard and soft landscape is maintained as part of the development (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policies 55, 57 and 59).

20. The driveway hereby approved shall be constructed so that its falls and levels are such that no private water from the site drains across or onto the adopted public highway. Once constructed the driveway shall thereafter be retained as such.

Reason: To prevent surface water discharging to the highway, in the interests of highway safety (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policy 81).

21. The driveway hereby approved shall be constructed using a bound material for the first 6m from the back of the adopted public highway, to prevent debris spreading onto the adopted public highway. Once constructed the driveway shall thereafter be retained as such.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policy 81).

22. No demolition or construction works shall commence on site until a traffic management plan has been submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 Policy 81).

23. Prior to the occupation of the development, works shall be carried out to the two nearest bus stops to the development on Barton Road to provide Real Time Passenger Information (RTPI) and raised kerbs.

Reason: To mitigate the transport impact of the development (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policy 81).

24. No occupation of the building shall commence until a Travel Plan has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The Travel Plan shall specify the methods to be used to discourage the use of the private motor vehicle and the arrangements to encourage use of alternative sustainable travel arrangements such as public transport, car sharing, cycling and walking. The Travel Plan shall be implemented as approved upon the occupation of the development and monitored in accordance with details to be agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In the interests of encouraging sustainable travel to and from the site (Cambridge Local Plan 2018, policies 80 and 81).

25. No development above ground level, other than demolition, shall commence (or in accordance with a timetable agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority), until a Public Art Delivery Plan (PADP) has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The PADP shall include the following:
- a) Details of the public art and artist commission;
 - b) Details of how the public art will be delivered, including a timetable for delivery;
 - c) Details of the location of the proposed public art on the application site;
 - d) The proposed consultation to be undertaken;
 - e) Details of how the public art will be maintained;
 - f) How the public art would be decommissioned if not permanent;
 - g) How repairs would be carried out;
 - h) How the public art would be replaced in the event that it is destroyed;

The approved PADP shall be fully implemented in accordance with the approved details and timetabling. Once in place, the public art shall not be moved or removed otherwise than in accordance with the approved maintenance arrangements.

Reason: To accord with the provisions of Cambridge City Council Public Art SPD (2010) and policies 55 and 56 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2018.

26. 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 to 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 2018 policy 61).

27. 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 2018 policies 57 and 61).

28. No roofs shall be constructed until full details of the type and source of roof covering materials and the ridge, eaves and hip details, if appropriate, have been submitted to the Local Planning Authority as samples and approved in writing. Roofs shall thereafter be constructed only in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To avoid harm to the special interest of the Conservation Area (Cambridge Local Plan 2018, policy 61).

29. Demolition of the rear Barn shall not commence until the following detail has been submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority:

- a) a licence issued by Natural England pursuant to Regulation 53 of The Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010 authorizing the specified activity/development to go ahead; or
- b) a statement in writing from Natural England to the effect that it does not consider that the specified activity/development will require a licence.

Demolition shall thereafter be in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure the protection and appropriate mitigation for the proposed loss of the identified Brown Long Eared Bat and Pipistrelle day roost within the barn (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policy 70).

30. No above ground works shall commence until a plan has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority detailing the proposed specification, number and locations of internal and / or external bird and bat boxes on the new buildings. The bird and bat boxes shall be installed prior to the commencement of the proposed uses and subsequently maintained in accordance with the approved plans.

Reason: To provide ecological enhancements for protected species on the site (Cambridge Local Plan (2018) policy 70).

31. Prior to commencement of the development, a site wide Construction Management Plan shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The Construction Management Plan shall identify the presence of protected species on the site and/or adjacent sites and explicitly detail how their presence will be mitigated.

Reason: To ensure the protection species present will be protected during construction (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policy 70).

32. Prior to the commencement of above ground works, full details of the proposed tree planting to the rear woodland area to the south of the site shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Development shall thereafter be in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure adequate planting is provide to act as a green buffer between the application site and 4C Millington Road (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policies 56, 57, 59 and 71).

33. Prior to the commencement of development a plan shall be provided detailing the full extent of the woodland area to the rear of the site. This agreed area of the site shall be fenced off from the rest of the site and shall not be accessible other than for occasional maintenance and upkeep purposes. Details of the fence and gate shall be submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. This fenced off area shall not be available as amenity space in perpetuity and shall only be accessed for upkeep and maintenance. The gate and fence shall be installed in accordance with the approved details prior to the occupation of the development and retained thereafter.

Reason: To prevent noise, disturbance and loss of privacy to 4C Millington Road (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policies 56 and 57).

This page is intentionally left blank

18/1993/FUL - Appendix 1

Cambridge City Council

Design & Conservation Panel

Notes of the meeting Wednesday 10th October 2018

Attendees:

David Grech	formerly Historic England, co-opted member (Vice Chair)
Russell Davies	RTPI
Jon Harris	Architectural historian, draughtsman, co-opted member
Ian Steen	Retired architect, co-opted member
Zoe Skelding	RIBA
Robert Myers	Landscape Institute (Item 1 only)
Stacey Weiser	Cambridge PPF (Item 2 only)
Jo Morrison	Landscape Institute (Item 2 only)

Officers:

Christian Brady	City Council
Mairead O'Sullivan	City Council (item 2)

Observers:

Cllr Martin Smart	City Council

Presenters – item 2:

Hugo Marrack	Feilden Clegg Bradley Studios
Robert Myers	Robert Myers Associates
Jon Burgess	Beacon Planning
Shane Alexander	Kings College

Apologies – Di Haigh (Chair) and Tony Nix

2. Presentation – Croft Gardens, Barton Road, Cambridge.

This was first seen by the Panel in July 2016. Following the withdrawal of a planning application incorporating those proposals a revised design was presented to the Panel in July 2018 (minutes re-circulated). This second pre-application presentation focussed on the design issues raised in the previous meeting.

The Panel welcomed the serious consideration and response that had been given to the issues raised at their last review, and there was

general agreement that the scheme has benefited from these design developments. In more detail the Panel's comments were as follows:

Buildings A, B and C

While the original 'horseshoe' arrangement has been retained, the detailed design of these three buildings has been developed, including greater consideration of the entrances, detailing of the brickwork, and the introduction of a pitched roof to Building C. The treatment of the gables to Buildings A and B facing on to Barton Road has also been revised to incorporate bays to the first and second floors, and a more animated treatment facing on to the road. The Panel were supportive of all these changes.

27A Barton Road

The new building adjacent to the Edwardian house at No 29 Barton Road has been re-designed so that the communal kitchens now overlook the street and incorporate bay windows to provide a more active frontage. The Panel welcomed this development, while at the same time noting that the detailed design of this building could provide a transition between the Edwardian house and the rest of the development. The suggestion that the roof form might be revised to remove the gable onto Barton Road was thought to be worth further consideration, since the current gable 'dilutes' the impact of the twin gables on Blocks A and B. Consideration might also be given to a slate roof for this building (No 29 has a slate roof) to further differentiate it from Buildings A, B and C, whilst still retaining the feeling of a 'family' of buildings.

Landscaping

The overall concept of three gardens for all residents was welcomed, along with the detailed development of the landscaping, including the revised location for the allotments. However, the scheme might benefit from further refinement of the landscaping, including provision of a creeper or pleached tree to the blank east elevation of the retained No 27, and also to soften some of the brickwork on the new buildings.

Materials

While a number of buildings in the area are of red brickwork, the Panel supported the decision to use gault brick on this development, subject to the detailed choice of brick. The proposed 'corduroy' detailing of the brickwork to differentiate between the convex and concave elevation was again welcomed. The re-use of the best of the salvaged green glazed pantiles for the bike stores was also seen as an enhancement of

the proposals. The final material selection and detailing of the scheme will be key to the overall success of the development.

Justification for demolition

At the last meeting the Chair sought clarification on the case for demolition. Dr Jon Burgess (Beacon Planning) advised the Panel that a detailed justification in support of the demolition has now been prepared, and he outlined a brief summary of the case. While the Panel welcomed this additional information, they felt that they would need a more detailed consideration in order to comment on the merits of the case. The Panel were advised that the City Council have only just received a copy of this report, and have not had the opportunity to consider it in detail. The Panel's support of the current proposals is therefore on the assumption that the case for demolition has been adequately made, and should not be seen as prejudging that aspect of the proposal.

Conclusion:

The Panel welcomed the detailed design developments and felt that the changes made since they had last seen the proposal constituted a great improvement. Subject to the acceptance of the case for demolition, the Panel consider that these proposals have the potential to make a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the conservation area.

VERDICT – GREEN (7 – unanimous)

3. Notes of the last meeting – Wednesday 12th September 2018

Notes agreed.

4. Any Other Business

Officers, presenters and Panel members said farewell and thanks to Jon Harris for his many years of service and wished him well ahead of his move to King's Lynn.

5. Date of next meeting – Wednesday 14th November 2018

Reminder

CABE 'traffic light' definitions:

GREEN: a good scheme, or one that is acceptable subject to minor improvements

AMBER: in need of *significant* improvements to make it acceptable, but not a matter of starting from scratch

RED: the scheme is fundamentally flawed and a fresh start is needed.

This page is intentionally left blank

Application Number	18/1245/FUL	Agenda Item	
Date Received	19th September 2018	Officer	Mairead O'Sullivan
Target Date	19th December 2018		
Ward	West Chesterton		
Site	Former Hamilton Lodge Hotel 156 - 160 Chesterton Road And Land Rear Of 162 Chesterton Road Cambridge		
Proposal	Proposed serviced apartments (sui generis) comprising 32 x studio and 14 x 1 bed units together with hard and soft landscaping, an external garden room, cycle and refuse stores, basement car parking spaces and visitor cycle parking		
Applicant	Mr Neil Robinson 2 Hills Road Cambridge CB2 1JP		

SUMMARY	The development accords with the Development Plan for the following reasons: - The proposed use complies with policy 77 - The scale, mass and design are considered appropriate for the site
RECOMMENDATION	APPROVAL

1.0 SITE DESCRIPTION/AREA CONTEXT

- 1.1 The application site is located on the southern side of Chesterton Road close to the junction with Elizabeth Way roundabout. To the west on the opposite side of the road is a parade of commercial units which includes a café and a Spar convenience shop. The area is predominantly in residential use ranging from private housing to hotels and B&Bs. To the west of the site is a hotel and to the east is a private house. The scale of development along Chesterton Road is varied and ranges from two storey semi-detached and detached properties to three storey flatted buildings. The built form of the area is characterised mainly by two storey Victorian villas, which have

projecting gables with pitched roofs and bay windows and a varied ridge line. Many of the buildings along Chesterton Road have been extended to the side and rear although there are also examples of front extensions.

- 1.2 The site formerly comprised two existing two storey buildings which formed Hamilton Lodge Guest House. Both buildings were detached with rooms in the loft space and appeared to have been built at different times. They were attractive buildings and contributed to the street scene.
- 1.3 The site backs onto Sandy Lane which serves many of the existing outbuildings/garages to the rear of the properties along Chesterton Road. The application site formerly contained a 1 ½ storey detached outbuilding to the rear of the site which was used for additional accommodation serving the hotel use. Planning permission has been granted for residential development on vacant land to the south of the application site but this has not seen any development of the houses granted planning permission. Sandy Lane is not an adopted public highway according to the County Council's adopted highway register.
- 1.4 The site is not located within a Conservation Area but is located within a Controlled Parking Zone. There are no Listed Buildings, Buildings of Local Interest or protected trees within close proximity of the site or that would be affected by the proposed development.

2.0 THE PROPOSAL

- 2.1 The application seeks full planning permission for the construction of two blocks with basement car park comprising 46 serviced apartments (Sui Generis use); 32 x studio units and 14 x one bed units. Hard and soft landscaping including a garden room, and cycle and refuse storage associated with the use are proposed.
- 2.2 The development is arranged in two blocks one of which fronts Chesterton Road at 2.5 storeys over basement and the other fronts Sandy Lane at 1.5 storeys. In the centre of the site between the two plots a garden room is proposed which will provide amenity space for users of the serviced apartments. The basement car park would be accessed from Sandy Lane

with two car lifts to provide access. Some cycle parking and refuse storage is also provided in the basement.

- 2.3 The proposal, in scale and design terms, is similar to the two most recent applications on site detailed in the table in 3.0 of the report. The site edged red has been expanded slightly to include the end of the rear garden of 162 Chesterton Road. A winter garden is also proposed between the two proposed blocks within the site. The proposed use of the development is for short-term accommodation as serviced apartments.
- 2.4 Throughout the course of the application amendments and further information has been submitted to overcome objections from the City Council's Drainage Officer, The Lead Local Flood Authority and the Senior Sustainability Officer.

3.0 SITE HISTORY

Reference	Description	Outcome
17/1032/FUL	Proposed residential (C3) dwellings comprising 27 x studio and 14 x 1 bed units together with hard and soft landscaping, cycle and refuse stores, 2No x disabled car parking spaces and visitor cycle parking on land at 156 - 160 Chesterton Road	Refused
14/2051/FUL	Proposed student accommodation (sui generis) comprising 27 x studio and 14 x 1 bed units together with hard and soft landscaping, cycle and refuse stores, 2no. Disabled car parking spaces and visitor cycle parking following the demolition of all existing buildings and structures on site.	Permitted

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 2018 policies, Supplementary Planning Documents and Material Considerations.

5.2 Relevant Development Plan policies

PLAN	POLICY NUMBER
Cambridge Local Plan 2018	1 28 31 32 33 34 35 36 55 56 57 58 59 71 77 81 82

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

Central Government Guidance	National Planning Policy Framework February 2019 National Planning Policy Framework – Planning Practice Guidance from 3 March 2014 onwards Circular 11/95 (Annex A)

Previous Supplementary Planning Documents (These documents, prepared to support policies in the 2006 local plan are no longer SPDs, but are still material considerations.)	Sustainable Design and Construction (May 2007) Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Waste Partnership (RECAP): Waste Management Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (February 2012) Public Art (January 2010)
Material Considerations	<u>City Wide Guidance</u> Air Quality in Cambridge – Developers Guide (2008) Arboricultural Strategy (2004) Cambridge and Milton Surface Water Management Plan (2011) Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (November 2010) Cambridge City Council Waste and Recycling Guide: For Developers. Cycle Parking Guide for New Residential Developments (2010)

6.0 CONSULTATIONS

Cambridgeshire County Council (Highways Development Management)

- 6.1 No objection: The site lies within, but on the edge of the De Freville Residents' Parking Scheme. The residents of the development would not be eligible for Residents Permits (other than visitor permits). A construction traffic management conditions is requested.

Environmental Health

- 6.2 No objection: five contaminated land conditions are recommended. Further conditions regarding construction hours, collections/deliveries during construction, dust, piling and noise insulation (traffic noise).

Refuse and Recycling

- 6.3 No comments received.

Urban Design and Conservation Team

- 6.4 No objection: The Urban Design Team has previously been involved in the approved application for the site (14/2051/FUL). The proposals are consistent with approved scheme 14/2051/FUL in terms of the overall scale and massing. Accordingly it is considered acceptable in overall scale, massing and design terms. The scheme states that 81 cycle parking spaces will be provided but only 57 are shown on the submitted plans. Given that the use is sui generis it is unclear how the need for 81 spaces has been derived. Access to the basement cycle store will be through the lift cores or car lifts. Space for off gauge cycles and charging points need to be provided. Access to the basement car park is via two car lifts. These are space efficient and the provision of two creates some flexibility and resilience. EV charging points should be included in the basement.

Planning Policy

- 6.5 No objection: The proposal is considered to be acceptable from a policy perspective, assuming the maximum lengths of stay

(typically 90 days) and a restriction on return visits is conditioned. The site itself is considered to be a suitable location for serviced apartments, subject to there being no adverse local amenity issues.

Senior Sustainability Officer (Design and Construction)

- 6.6 Further information is required: While a sustainability checklist has been submitted, many of the requirements are marked as to be confirmed at the detailed design stage. In light of the requirements of the Cambridge Local Plan 2018 (For Adoption), a water efficiency condition is recommended.
- 6.7 No objection: Following my original comments dated 16 October 2018, the applicant has now submitted a revised Energy Strategy for the site, which demonstrates that through the use of an air to water source heat pump, the proposed building will meet, and indeed exceed, the requirements of policy 28 in relation to a 44% reduction in carbon emissions compared to Part L 2006 (equivalent to a 19% reduction in emissions compared to Part L 2013), reducing emissions by 29.47% compared to the Part L 2013 compliant baseline. This approach is supported, subject to the imposition of the conditions referenced above. A condition requiring implementation of the carbon reduction strategy is recommended as well as the water efficiency condition previously requested.

Access Officer

- 6.8 No objection: One Blue Badge parking space and one Blue Badge visitor space should be provided. Double doors will need to be powered or be asymmetrical with one leaf being at least 900mm and having an opening force of less than 20N. The outdoor flagstones should have as smooth a surface as possible. They said two rooms were suitable for wheelchair users, I could only identify 1. All other rooms should meet Code 2 of Part M Housing.

Head of Streets and Open Spaces (Tree Team)

- 6.9 No comments received.

Head of Streets and Open Spaces (Landscape Team)

- 6.10 Objection: The proposal does not comply with policy 50 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2018) as all units do not have private external amenity space. The cycle parking would not comply with policy. The garden room is not adequate for the entirety of external amenity space. A sunlight and shadow study is required to assess light to the private and communal amenity areas as there is a concern that the proposal would not comply with BRE guidance.

Cambridgeshire County Council (Lead Local Flood Authority)

First comment

- 6.11 Objection: Inadequate information has been provided. A flood risk assessment and surface water strategy, containing the information set out in the consultation response, are required.

Second comment

- 6.12 Objection: The applicant has provided additional information but inadequate infiltration testing has been carried out.

Third comment

- 6.13 No objection: The applicant has submitted further information in response to previous comments from the LLFA. Based on this additional information the LLFA can remove their objection subject to a condition and informative relating to surface water drainage details.

Head of Streets and Open Spaces (Sustainable Drainage Officer)

- 6.14 Further information required: Insufficient surface water drainage information has been provided.
- 6.15 No objection: The proposed surface water drainage strategy is acceptable, however the detailed design of the system is required by condition to ensure that it is fully delivered in the construction of the development.

Environment Agency

- 6.16 No objection: The application falls within Flood Risk Standing Advice. The City Council's Drainage Officer should be consulted. Three conditions are requested regarding contamination and infiltration drainage.

Anglian Water

- 6.17 No comments received.

Cambridgeshire County Council (Archaeology)

- 6.18 No objection: 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 secured through the inclusion of a negative condition

Cambridge Constabulary (Designing Out Crime Officer)

- 6.19 Accepting the West Chesterton ward is a large area, there are fairly high reports of vehicle and bicycle thefts. Disappointed that security measures are not mentioned in the Design and Access Statement. Happy with conditioning external lighting but would like to see plans and a lux plan. Suggest the applicants submit a Secured by Design application.

Developer Contributions Monitoring Unit

- 6.20 The Developer Contributions Monitoring Unit has requested contributions towards community facilities, indoor/outdoor sports and informal open space.
- 6.21 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 in objection to the application:

- Camcycle x 2
- 13 Chesterton Hall Crescent

- 126 Chesterton Road
- 140 Chesterton Road
- 144 Chesterton Road
- 152 Chesterton Road (Worth House managers accommodation)
- 168A Chesterton Road (labelled as support but text reads as objection)
- 259 Chesterton Road
- 2 De Freville Avenue
- 45 Herbert Street
- 6 Luard Road (freeholder of 128b Chesterton Road and 99 Sandy Lane)
- 18 Mill Road (Saint Andrews Bureau Ltd) – on behalf of 148 Chesterton Road
- 98 Sandy Lane
- 107 Sandy Lane
- 109 Sandy Lane
- Murfitts Patch, Sandy Lane

7.2 The representations objecting to the application can be summarised as follows:

- Increased noise and disturbance from traffic and intensification of use of the site.
- More comings and goings at all times of the day
- Sandy Lane currently has issues with congestion and on-street parking meaning it is regularly impassable.
- Vehicular access during and after construction will be difficult. Concerned about pedestrian/cyclist safety and damage to cars by construction vehicles and increased traffic levels.
- Insufficient car parking spaces for the number of flats proposed
- Sandy Lane cannot cope with heavy construction traffic
- Drop off, loading and parking will impact on residential amenity
- Granting of planning permission should be conditional on requiring environmental improvements such as improving visibility splays and the surface of the road.
- One of the cycle store rooms is not well laid out and should be amended
- Request a condition guaranteeing cyclists access to the lifts
- Wheel bending stands are not policy compliant.
- The development will cover the whole site so concerned about soakaway/drainage matters.
- More cars parking on Sandy Lane will restrict fire engine access

- Request that Sandy Lane is adopted by the Council and that double yellow lines are added and that this should be funded through S106 agreement
- Would prefer affordable housing on site
- Similar development to nearby student castle which has had to apply for a change of use as it is unable to fill all beds. Concerned that something similar will happen here.
- The site should be used for residential purposes to be in keeping with the surrounding character

7.3 The owner/occupier of 162 Chesterton Road has made two neutral representations which can be summarised as follows:

- Concerned about noise disturbance from drop-offs/pick-ups using slip road to the front of 162-172 Chesterton Road.
- A neutral representation has been submitted following discussions with the developer about the provision of a drop-off point in front of the aparthotel.

7.4 The owner/occupier of 66 Humberstone Road has made a representation in support of the application. The representation can be summarised as follows:

- Welcome plans for an aparthotel which is more suited to the site than previous uses
- Users will be more mature and likely to contribute to the local economy
- Users are likely to travel to site using public transport.
- Will fit with the De Freville Conservation Area

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

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. Carbon reduction and sustainable design

5. Water management and flood risk
6. Noise, vibration and dust
7. Inclusive access
8. Residential amenity
9. Refuse arrangements
10. Highway safety
11. Car and cycle parking
12. Third party representations
13. Planning Obligations (s106 Agreement)

Principle of Development

- 8.2 The proposed use as serviced apartments is a sui generis use but would have many of the characteristics of a C1 hotel use including having a reception and a restriction on length of stay. This type of use is covered by policy 77 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2018) which relates to visitor accommodation.
- 8.3 Policy 77 supports proposals for high-quality visitor accommodation as part of mixed-use developments in certain specific locations: the Old Press/ Mill Lane site; around Parker's Piece; around Cambridge and Cambridge North stations; and other large windfall sites in the city centre. The policy also supports proposals for visitor accommodation in other city centre locations, stating that the new accommodation should be on the frontages of main roads, or in areas of mixed use, or within walking distance of bus route corridors.
- 8.4 The site has a frontage onto Chesterton Road and is in close proximity to public transport, pedestrian and cycle infrastructure. The Hawthorn Way Neighbourhood Centre is at the other side of the road and within walking distance of the site.
- 8.5 The applicant has provided further information about the proposed use. They have confirmed that the buildings will be leased to a serviced apartment operator. They are willing to accept a condition to restrict occupancy of the units to a maximum of three months. The condition will also need to restrict return guests to ensure that the units are used on a short term basis rather than as permanent accommodation. The applicant has confirmed that there will be an office/reception with staff on site during the day. Users will be able to book units from a single night to the maximum of 3 months and will use the flats similar to a hotel.

- 8.6 The Planning Policy Officer has reviewed the application and has confirmed the principle to be acceptable in policy terms subject to consideration of the impact on local amenity. I share his view and consider that subject to a condition restricting length of stay the proposal is acceptable and compliant with policy 77 and that the development would provide high quality living arrangements for short term visitors.

Context of site, design and external spaces

- 8.7 In terms of scale and design the proposal is similar to the two previous recent applications on site. The current application has a larger site area as the site edged red has been expanded to include an element of land at the end of the garden of 162 Chesterton Road. A garden room is also proposed in the middle of the site between the two blocks. For clarity, I have included much of the assessment from 14/2051/FUL below and I will also comment on any changes and the additional elements.
- 8.8 All the buildings on the site have been demolished and the site is currently surrounded by hoarding. The architectural character and scale of development along Chesterton Road is varied but has a strong Victorian influence. The proposed front block in terms of its symmetrical and proportionate bays and window arrangement in the front façade, and detailed elevation treatment would introduce a form of development that would be of high quality and revitalise the tired appearance of the site whilst sympathetically assimilating into the architectural setting of the area. The proposed front block would enhance the visual appearance of this part of Chesterton Road and make a positive contribution to the street scene.
- 8.9 In the previous approval, I note that a wall with railings was proposed to the front of the site. No details have been provided as part of the current application and a boundary treatment condition is recommended to ensure the front boundary with Chesterton Road is treated in a way which would be sympathetic to the streetscene.
- 8.10 The rear elevation facing the Courtyard presents a more functional appearance compared to the front. The canopy originally proposed in 14/2051/FUL has been removed and the doors to the rear now open out at ground level. This improves

accessibility through the site and reduces clutter on the rear elevation. A further chimney has been added to this elevation. The removal of the canopy is a positive change and results in clean lines and less clutter to the courtyard elevation

- 8.11 I am satisfied that the front block in terms of its design, scale and appearance would result in a form of development that is of high quality.
- 8.12 The scale of development along Sandy Lane is modest and predominantly 1½ storey with rooms in lofts defined by dormer windows and rooflights. There are gaps between buildings along Sandy Lane that offer views towards the rear elevations of the more dominant buildings fronting Chesterton Road. The proposed rear block from Sandy Lane would maintain the modest/subservient appearance with garage and double timber doors along the ground floor and small pitched roof dormers within the roofscape breaking up the eaves line. The additional element of building at the rear of 162 Chesterton Road would be of the same height as the rest of the Sandy Lane elevation of the development but with a curved window to the dormers and a zinc roof. The roof form is hipped on the west side to reduce its scale. Whilst the rear block would be one of the largest single buildings within Sandy Lane in terms of its width, the height of the block would be lower than the building previously on site (since demolished) and lower than the outbuilding to the west but taller than the outbuilding to the east. The treatment of the element to the rear of 162 in a different style helps to break up the mass and retains the feeling of the plot sizes. I am therefore satisfied that the elevation of the rear block from Sandy Lane would be in keeping with the prevailing character and appearance of development in this area.
- 8.13 The rear elevation facing into the site would read as 2 ½ storey due to the lower ground level. Levels have been rationalised on site since the previous approval (14/2051/FUL) and as a result the lower level of flats are now accessed from the courtyard rather than down steps. Similar to the Sandy Lane elevation, the element to the rear of 162 will also have a more contemporary finish than the main part of the site. There will be hit and miss brick detailing and a zinc projecting gable at first and second floor. The treatment of this elevation, as with the elevation to Sandy Lane, helps break up the length and mass of block B and retains a sense of plot sizes.

8.14 In the previous proposals the centre of the site was to be a landscaped courtyard. This space is now proposed to be enclosed and used as a winter garden/garden room. The structure will occupy the majority of the middle of the site. It is proposed to be a glazed structure with a sedum roof. The space would serve as indoor/outdoor break out space for users of the serviced apartments. This central structure will mean that most of the site will become enclosed however in my view this winter garden space due to its materials, glazing and green roof, will retain the sense of it being a garden and will mean this part of the site will still feel relatively open. The structure would not be visible from outside of the site and in my view would provide year round usable space for guests.

8.15 In my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2018) policies 55, 56, 57, 58 and 59.

Public Art

8.16 The proposal has not provided a draft public art proposal as part of the application. I note that in the previous 2014 application, a public art scheme on the Chesterton Road elevation was proposed. I recommend a condition requiring a Public Art Delivery Plan and associated maintenance plan/regime to ensure an element of public art is delivered on site to comply with policy.

8.17 In my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2018) policy 56 and the Public Art SPD 2010

Carbon reduction and sustainable design

8.18 The applicant provided additional information in response to comments from the Senior Sustainability Officer. The Senior Sustainability Officer is satisfied with the details provided and has recommended a condition requiring compliance with the carbon reduction detail provided and a condition regarding water efficiency to ensure compliance with policy 28.

8.19 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 (2018) policy 28 and the Sustainable Design and Construction SPD 2007.

Integrated water management and flood risk

- 8.20 Both the City Council's Sustainable Drainage Engineer and the Lead Local Flood Authority objected to the application as submitted. Further information was provided and both officers are now satisfied that their objections can be removed subject to conditions.
- 8.21 In my opinion the applicants have suitably addressed the issues of water management and flood risk, and subject to condition, the proposal is in accordance with Cambridge Local Plan (2018) policies 31 and 32.

Noise, vibration and dust

- 8.22 The Environmental Health Officer has reviewed the proposal and has recommended conditions regarding construction hours, piling and dust to protect the amenity of surrounding occupiers during construction. A number of conditions are also requested regarding contaminated land. A condition requiring details of noise insulation to protect occupiers from traffic noise is also requested. The Designing Out Crime Officer has noted that details of external lighting should be conditioned for security reasons.
- 8.23 In my opinion, subject to the conditions I have recommended, the applicants have suitably addressed the issues of noise, vibration and dust, and the proposal is in accordance with Cambridge Local Plan (2018) policies 35 and 36.

Inclusive access

- 8.24 The current proposal improves accessibility through the site when compared to 14/2051/FUL. There would be steps up to the front building from Chesterton Road but there would also be a Part M compliant ramp. Building A which fronts onto Chesterton Road would have a lift to provide access to the upper floors and basement. The courtyard area and garden room and lower ground level of building B are all accessed at one level. The Access Officer has reviewed the application and his comments will be included as an informative. The Access Officer has flagged up that only one of the rooms is shown as being accessible while the documentation states there would be

two accessible rooms. I will clarify this with the applicant and provide an update on the amendment sheet.

- 8.25 In my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2018) policies 56 and 57.

Residential Amenity

Impact on amenity of neighbouring occupiers

- 8.26 As with the design and impact on the character of the area section above, much of the assessment in terms of residential amenity echoes the assessment from 14/2051/FUL. The two most impactful changes are the addition of the winter garden and the extension of the site to incorporate the end of 162 Chesterton Road.

Impact on 162 Chesterton Road

- 8.27 The area is characterised by buildings fronting Chesterton Road and buildings at the rear fronting Sandy Lane with gardens, courtyards or car parking areas in between. To the east of the site is no.162 which is a two storey semi-detached dwelling. The dwelling has been extended at the rear and there are small timber sheds in the garden. The end of the garden has been fenced into the application site and included in the site edged red.
- 8.28 The front block would project beyond the main rear elevation of no.162 by 6.8m. This element would also be 3.6m off the boundary and stepped back from the adjacent part of the rear elevation. Having carried out a 45 degree test (from the approximate position of the first floor window in no.162), the line of sight would clip the corner section of the rear projection. However, I do not consider this would have a significant adverse impact on the outlook from no.162 and this impact was accepted under 14/2051/FUL. The shadow study, provided as part of the previous application, indicated that the proposed front block would not significantly overshadow the rear garden of no.162 over and above the existing. The main impact from shadowing is likely to be in the late afternoon in the summer months.

- 8.29 No windows are proposed in the eastern elevation that would enable direct overlooking of the private amenity space. Two false windows have been proposed at ground and first floor but this is to add interest into the side elevation.
- 8.30 The proposed rear block would now extend along the end of the rear garden of 162. The new element adjacent to Sandy Lane would be sited at the very end of the garden of 162 Chesterton Road. This will result in some enclosure to the end of the garden but I do not consider this to be significantly harmful given building would be set off the boundary and as the height will read lower due to the difference in levels. The proposal would also result in some overshadowing of the end of the garden of 164 but again, given the set away from the boundary and relatively low height due to the change in levels, and as it is the end of the garden which would be impacted I do not consider this to be significantly harmful to warrant refusal. The proposal would introduce windows at upper ground floor and first floor levels that would face back into the site. This was accepted as part of the previous application given the level of separation from the rear elevation of the rear block to the rear elevation of no.162 would be over 20m. The new building at the end of the garden would have oriel windows which would direct views into the site and prevent any further overlooking.
- 8.31 The proposed winter garden would occupy much of the centre of the site. This is a relatively low structure at 3.2m in height which would read as substantially lower given the site would be dug down. This structure would read as approx. 2m in height from the garden of 162 and as a result would be no higher than the boundary fence. It would be a lightweight building with glazed walls and a predominantly green/sedum roof. The proposal would be set off the boundary and would not protrude above the boundary fence with no 162. As a result, I do not consider it would unduly enclose or overshadow the garden of 162.

154 Chesterton Road

- 8.32 In terms of the adjacent hotel site, the sensitivity of amenity impacts is not the same as a private dwelling because of the short term nature of the occupation. In relation to the rear projection of the front block, this would not extend beyond the rear protection of the hotel building and would be set off the

boundary by between 1.7m and 2.6m. The proposed rear block would bring the built form closer to the rear elevation of the adjoining hotel. The rear block would be set 2.4m off the western boundary and separated approx. 6.4m from the nearest point of the hotel building. The previous report references a shadow study which has not been provided as part of the current application. This found the rear block cast a shadow across the car park of the hotel for part of the year. I have no concerns about overshadowing of the car park. I am therefore satisfied that the proposed development would not have a significant adverse impact on the hotel use in terms of scale and overlooking.

- 8.33 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 (2018) policies 55, 56 and 57.

33 Sandy Lane/ 164 Chesterton Road

- 8.34 The extended rear block would lie adjacent to an annex associated with 164 Chesterton Road. This building seems to be an independent residence but there is no planning history of the subdivision of the plot. The internal mapping system gives this building an address of 33 Sandy Lane. The proposal would run hard on the boundary with this building and then would step away from the boundary by approx. 1.5m as it extends beyond the rear building line of no.33. The building would extend approx. 5m beyond the rear building line of no. 33 at first floor level but given the site would be dug down the overall height of the block would not be wholly perceptible from the garden of 164/33 Sandy Lane. Due to the hipped roof and difference in levels the height would read as 3.8m to the eaves and then 7.6m to the ridge. Block B would result in some enclosure to no.33 but given the difference in site levels and the step away from the boundary, I do not consider this to be significantly harmful to warrant refusal. There would also be some overshadowing of the garden area to the rear of the building but this is likely to be limited to late afternoon sun and the garden would retain light for much of the day. As a result I do not consider this overshadowing to be significantly harmful to warrant refusal.

Other amenity concerns

- 8.35 The site had been vacant for a number of years and as a result the proposal will result in a more intensive use. However the site was previously used as a hotel. The Transport Statement provided with the application notes that normally users of serviced apartments keep similar hours to local residents and normally result in movements at the traditional AM and PM times. Normally users of serviced flats are unlikely to be coming and going late at night when neighbours may be sensitive to noise disturbance. The proposal to provide a winter garden as amenity space for users of the apartments will contain external noise. In my view the proposal will not result in any significant noise and disturbance to nearby occupiers.
- 8.36 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 (2018) policies 35, 55 and 56.

Amenity for future occupiers of the site

- 8.37 The proposed use is for short term letting rather than permanent residential flats. The proposed use is a sui generis use and occupiers would use the spaces similar to hotel rooms. As a result policy 50 and the nationally described space standards are not relevant to the consideration of the application. In my view the proposal would provide high quality accommodation for short term occupiers.
- 8.38 In my opinion the proposal provides a high-quality short term accommodation for future occupiers, and I consider that in this respect it is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2018) policies 55, 56 and 77.

Refuse Arrangements

- 8.39 Waste from the site will be managed by the operator who will arrange collection from each of the units and ensure that bins are put out for collection. The refuse stores are within Building B fronting Sandy Lane and refuse is proposed to be collected from Sandy lane. The Waste Team have not commented on the current application but did provide comments on the previous approval and recommended a management plan condition. I

have also requested this condition to ensure the waste management arrangement will be acceptable.

- 8.40 In my opinion the proposal is compliant in this respect with Cambridge Local Plan (2018) policy 57.

Highway Safety

- 8.41 The Highway Authority has no objection to the proposal on highway safety grounds. I note that many of the representations express concern about the use of Sandy Lane for access to the car park. The site is currently vacant and the proposal would result in more activity on Sandy Lane as it would be the only way for guests to access the basement car park. The Transport Statement provided with the application compares the proposal to the extant student scheme and finds an increase of 4 trips per day which is not considered significant. However given the lack of objection from the Highway Authority, I am satisfied that this impact would be acceptable and would not give rise to any significant adverse impacts on highway safety. I note that a number of the representations request that Sandy Lane is formally adopted by the City Council and that this be funded through S106 contributions. The City Council does not normally manage roads and this would be a function of the Highway Authority (County Council). The adoption of Sandy Lane is not required to make the development acceptable and could not be justified as being a requirement of the application. I recommend the Construction Traffic Management plan requested by the Highway Authority be included.

- 8.42 In my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2018) policy 81.

Car and Cycle Parking

- 8.43 The site lies within a Controlled Parking Zone. Without details of staff numbers it is not possible to fully calculate required car parking but the proposal would appear to meet with, and potentially exceed, the standard set out in appendix L of the Cambridge Local Plan (2018). This requires 1 space per 10 guests and 1 space per 2 staff members. A disabled bay should be provided but I am satisfied that details can be provided through condition. I note a number of representations raise concerns about increased parking pressure on Sandy Lane as

although within the controlled parking zone, is a private road and therefore not controlled. In my view the proposal provides an adequate level of off-street car parking and would be compliant with policy 82.

8.44 The applicant proposes to provide 46 covered and secure cycle parking spaces which are a mix of Sheffield Stands, double stackers and off-gauge spaces. These are to be provided both at ground floor and basement level in both building A and B. 8 visitor cycle spaces are available at the front of the property. The cycle parking provision would exceed the minimum standards set out in appendix L for a hotel use which requires 2 spaces per every 10 bedrooms and 2 spaces per every 5 staff. The level of cycle parking would provide 1 space per every flat. I am satisfied that this exceeds the minimum policy requirement and that the proposed cycle parking provision would be acceptable. Camcycle has requested a condition to ensure that cyclists will have access to the lifts to the basement in perpetuity. I consider this to be reasonable to ensure that the basement cycle store is adequately accessible and have recommended a condition.

8.45 In my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2018) policy 82.

Third Party Representations

8.46 I have addressed the majority of the third party representations within the body of my report but I will cover any outstanding matters in the below table:

Representation	Response
Increased noise and disturbance from traffic and intensification of use of the site.	See paragraph 8.35 and 8.41
More comings and goings at all times of the day	See paragraph 8.41
Sandy Lane currently has issues with congestion and on-street parking meaning it is regularly impassable.	Noted. See paragraph 8.41 and 8.43

Vehicular access during and after construction will be difficult. Concerned about pedestrian/cyclist safety and damage to cars by construction vehicles and increased traffic levels.	A construction traffic management plan condition has been recommended.
Insufficient car parking spaces for the number of flats proposed	The level of car parking is considered adequate. See paragraph
Sandy Lane cannot cope with heavy construction traffic	This is not relevant to the consideration of the planning application
Drop off, loading and parking will impact on residential amenity	See paragraphs 8.35 and 8.41. The proposal is not considered to give rise to any significant noise disturbance and drop offs are unlikely to be significantly greater than the extant student use which was deemed acceptable.
Granting of planning permission should be conditional on requiring environmental improvements such as improving visibility splays and the surface of the road.	This would not be CIL compliant. See paragraph 8.41
One of the cycle store rooms is not well laid out and should be amended	In my view the cycle parking is adequate and complies with policy.
Request a condition guaranteeing cyclists access to the lift	See paragraph 8.44. The condition is recommended.
Wheel bending stands are not policy compliant.	The applicant now proposes a mixture of Sheffield stands, double stackers and some off gauge provision in line with appendix L.

The development will cover the whole site so concerned about soakaway/drainage matters.	The applicant has provided further detailed information to both the City Council's Sustainable Drainage Officer and the Lead Local Flood Authority. Both are satisfied that the proposal would be acceptable subject to a condition requiring details of surface water drainage. See paragraph 8.20
More cars parking on Sandy Lane will restrict fire engine access	The off-street car parking provision is considered to be acceptable.
Request that Sandy Lane is adopted by the Council and that double yellow lines are added and that this should be funded through S106 agreement	This is not CIL complaint. See paragraph 8.41
Would prefer affordable housing on site	This does not form part of the application and is not required as part of the proposed sui generis use.
Similar development to nearby student castle which has had to apply for a change of use as it is unable to fill all beds. Concerned that something similar will happen here.	The proposal is for short term lets. Student Castle is a student accommodation scheme which applied for change of use to short term lets.
The site should be used for residential purposes to be in keeping with the surrounding character	The area although predominantly residential has a number of other commercial use. The adjacent site at 154 Chesterton Road is a hotel (C1 use)

Planning Obligations (s106 Agreement)

8.47 The Development Contributions Monitoring Unit has recommended contributions towards community facilities, indoor/outdoor sports and informal open space. Given the nature of the use, as serviced apartments rather than as permanent residential accommodation, there is no requirement

to contribute to any of the areas suggested and these contributions could not be argued to be necessary to make the development acceptable. As a result, it is not recommended to seek any contributions in this instance.

9.0 CONCLUSION

- 9.1 The proposed built form is similar in terms of scale and massing to the approved scheme (14/2051/FUL). The proposal is considered to be acceptable in terms of design. The proposal is considered to respect the amenity of surrounding occupiers. The proposed use is considered to comply with policy 77 and would provide high quality short term accommodation for future users. Car and cycle parking provision are considered to be acceptable.

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 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended by 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 construction work or demolition work shall be carried out or plant operated other than between the following hours: 0800 hours and 1800 hours on Monday to Friday, 0800 hours and 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 2018 policy 35).

4. There shall be no collections from or deliveries to the site during the demolition and construction stages outside the hours of 0800 hours and 1800 hours on 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 2018 policy 35).

5. In the event of the foundations for the proposed development requiring piling, prior to the development taking place, other than demolition, 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 from 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.

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 (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policy 35).

6. 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: To protect the amenity of nearby properties (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policy 36).

7. Prior to the commencement of above ground work, a noise insulation scheme detailing the acoustic noise insulation performance specification of the external building envelope of the short term let units (having regard to the building fabric, glazing and ventilation) to reduce the level of noise experienced in the short term let 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 internal noise levels recommended in British Standard 8233:2014 "Guidance on sound insulation and noise reduction for buildings". The scheme as approved shall be fully implemented before the use hereby permitted is commenced and shall thereafter be retained as such.

Reason: To protect the amenity of future occupants of this property from the high ambient noise levels in the area (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policy 35).

8. Submission of Preliminary Contamination Assessment:

Prior to the commencement of the development (or phase of) or investigations required to assess the contamination of the site, the following information shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority:

- (a) Desk study to include:
- Detailed history of the site uses and surrounding area (including any use of radioactive materials)
 - General environmental setting.
 - Site investigation strategy based on the information identified in the desk study.
- (b) A report setting set out what works/clearance of the site (if any) is required in order to effectively carry out site investigations.

Reason: To adequately categorise the site prior to the design of an appropriate investigation strategy in the interests of environmental and public safety in accordance with Cambridge Local Plan 2018 Policy 33.

9. Submission of site investigation report and remediation strategy:

Prior to the commencement of the development (or phase of) with the exception of works agreed under condition 3 and in accordance with the approved investigation strategy agreed under clause (b) of condition 3, the following shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority:

- (a) A site investigation report detailing all works that have been undertaken to determine the nature and extent of any contamination, including the results of the soil, gas and/or water analysis and subsequent risk assessment to any receptors
- (b) A proposed remediation strategy detailing the works required in order to render harmless the identified contamination given the proposed end use of the site and surrounding environment including any controlled waters. The strategy shall include a schedule of the proposed remedial works setting out a timetable for all remedial measures that will be implemented.

Reason: To ensure that any contamination of the site is identified and appropriate remediation measures agreed in the interest of environmental and public safety in accordance with Cambridge Local Plan 2018 Policy 33.

10. Implementation of remediation.

Prior to the first occupation of the development (or each phase of the development where phased) the remediation strategy approved under clause (b) to condition 4 shall be fully implemented on site following the agreed schedule of works.

Reason: To ensure full mitigation through the agreed remediation measures in the interests of environmental and public safety in accordance with Cambridge Local Plan 2018 Policy 33.

11. Completion report:

Prior to the first occupation of the development (or phase of) hereby approved the following shall be submitted to, and approved by the Local Planning Authority.

- (a) A completion report demonstrating that the approved remediation scheme as required by condition 4 and implemented under condition 5 has been undertaken and that the land has been remediated to a standard appropriate for the end use.
- (b) Details of any post-remedial sampling and analysis (as defined in the approved material management plan) shall be included in the completion report along with all information concerning materials brought onto, used, and removed from the development. The information provided must demonstrate that the site has met the required clean-up criteria.

Thereafter, no works shall take place within the site such as to prejudice the effectiveness of the approved scheme of remediation.

Reason: To demonstrate that the site is suitable for approved use in the interests of environmental and public safety in accordance with Cambridge Local Plan 2018 Policy 33.

12. Material Management Plan:

Prior to importation or reuse of material for the development (or phase of) a Materials Management Plan (MMP) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The MMP shall:

- a) Include details of the volumes and types of material proposed to be imported or reused on site
- b) Include details of the proposed source(s) of the imported or reused material
- c) Include details of the chemical testing for ALL material to be undertaken before placement onto the site.
- d) Include the results of the chemical testing which must show the material is suitable for use on the development
- e) Include confirmation of the chain of evidence to be kept during the materials movement, including material importation, reuse placement and removal from and to the development.

All works will be undertaken in accordance with the approved document.

Reason: To ensure that no unsuitable material is brought onto the site in the interest of environmental and public safety in accordance with Cambridge Local Plan 2018 Policy 33.

13. Prior to the installation of any external artificial lighting, an artificial lighting scheme shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The scheme shall include details of any external artificial lighting of the site and an external artificial lighting impact assessment with predicted lighting levels at proposed and existing residential properties shall be undertaken. External lighting on the development must meet the Obtrusive Light Limitations for Exterior Lighting Installations contained within the Institute of Lighting Professionals Guidance Notes for the Reduction of Obtrusive Light - GN01:2011 (or as superseded).

The approved lighting scheme shall be installed, maintained and operated in accordance with the approved details / measures.

Reason: To protect the amenity of nearby properties and ensure adequate lighting for security purposes (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policies 34, 55 and 56).

14. No development above ground level, other than demolition, shall commence until full details of both hard and soft landscape works have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The 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); 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.

All hard and soft landscape works shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details. The works shall be carried out prior to the occupation of any part of the development or in accordance with a programme agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The maintenance shall be carried out in accordance with the approved schedule. Any trees or plants that, within a period of five years after planting, are removed, die or become in the opinion of the Local Planning Authority, seriously damaged or defective, shall be replaced as soon as is reasonably practicable with others of species, size and number as originally approved, unless the Local Planning Authority gives its written consent to any variation.

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 2018 policies 55, 57 and 59).

15. No development above ground level, other than demolition, shall commence until there has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority a plan indicating the positions, design, materials and type of boundary treatments to be erected. The boundary treatment shall be completed in accordance with the approved details prior to the first occupation or the bringing into use of the development (or other timetable agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority) and retained as approved thereafter.

Reason: To ensure an appropriate boundary treatment is implemented in the interests of visual amenity and privacy (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policies 55, 57 and 59).

16. No demolition or construction works shall commence on site until a traffic management plan has been submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 Policy 81).

17. Prior to the commencement of development, other than demolition, a scheme for surface water drainage works shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The details shall include an assessment of the potential for disposing of surface water by means of a sustainable drainage system in accordance with the principles set out in the National Planning Policy Framework and the National Planning Policy Guidance, and the results of the assessment provided to the Local Planning Authority. The system should be designed such that there is no surcharging for a 1 in 30 year event and no internal property flooding for a 1 in 100 year event + an allowance for climate change. The submitted details shall include the following:

- 1) Information about the design storm period and intensity, the method employed to delay and control the surface water discharged from the site and the measures taken to prevent pollution of the receiving groundwater and/or surface waters;
- 2) A management and maintenance plan for the lifetime of the development which shall include the arrangements for adoption by any public authority or statutory undertaker and any other arrangements for adoption by any public authority or statutory undertaker and any other arrangements to secure the operation of the scheme throughout its lifetime.

The approved details shall be fully implemented on site prior to the first use/occupation and shall be retained thereafter.

Reason: To ensure appropriate surface water drainage (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policies 31 and 32).

18. Prior to the occupation of the development, hereby permitted, or the commencement of the use, the arrangements for the disposal of waste detailed on the approved plans shall be provided and information shall be provided on the management arrangements for the receptacles to facilitate their collection from a kerbside collection point. The approved arrangements shall be implemented prior to the occupation of the development or the commencement of the use and retained thereafter.

Reason: To protect the amenities of nearby residents/occupiers and in the interests of visual amenity (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policies 35, 36 and 57).

19. 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 to 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 2018 policy 61).

20. Prior to the occupation of the building hereby permitted, a water efficiency specification based on the Water Efficiency Calculator Methodology or the Fitting Approach sets out in Part G of the Building Regulations 2010 (2015 edition) shall be submitted to the local planning authority. This shall demonstrate that all apartments are able to achieve a design standard of water use of no more than 110 litres/person/day and that the development shall be carried out in accordance with the agreed details.

Reason: To ensure that the development makes efficient use of water and promotes the principles of sustainable construction (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 Policy 28).

21. The approved approach to meeting a 19% reduction in carbon emissions compared to Part L 2013 shall be fully implemented prior to the first occupation of the development. Any associated renewable and/or low carbon technologies shall thereafter be retained and remain fully operational in accordance with a maintenance programme, which shall be submitted to and agreed in writing by the local planning authority.

No review of this requirement on the basis of grid capacity issues can take place unless written evidence from the District Network Operator confirming the detail of grid capacity and its implications has been submitted to, and accepted in writing by, the local planning authority. Any subsequent amendment to the level of renewable/low carbon technologies provided on the site shall be in accordance with a revised scheme submitted to and approved in writing by, the local planning authority.

Reason: In the interests of reducing carbon dioxide emissions (Cambridge Local Plan 2018, Policy 28).

22. No development above ground level, other than demolition, shall commence (or in accordance with a timetable agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority), until a Public Art Delivery Plan (PADP) has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The PADP shall include the following:
- a) Details of the public art and artist commission;
 - b) Details of how the public art will be delivered, including a timetable for delivery;
 - c) Details of the location of the proposed public art on the application site;
 - d) The proposed consultation to be undertaken;
 - e) Details of how the public art will be maintained;
 - f) How the public art would be decommissioned if not permanent;
 - g) How repairs would be carried out;
 - h) How the public art would be replaced in the event that it is destroyed;

The approved PADP shall be fully implemented in accordance with the approved details and timetabling. Once in place, the public art shall not be moved or removed otherwise than in accordance with the approved maintenance arrangements.

Reason: To accord with the provisions of Cambridge City Council Public Art SPD (2010) and policies 55 and 56 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2018.

23. No development shall take place above ground level, other than demolition, until samples of the external materials to be used in the construction of the development have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Development shall thereafter be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure that the external appearance of the development does not detract from the character and appearance of the area (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policies 55, 57 (for new buildings) and/or 58 (for extensions)).

24. Prior to the occupation of the development, a disabled parking bay will be provided within the basement car park. The space shall be thereafter retained.

Reason: To ensure adequate disabled access to the serviced flats (Cambridge Local Plan (2018) policies 56 and 57).

25. The lifts which provide access to the basement as shown on drawing 3886/CR-HL/15/010 REV P7 shall be accessible in perpetuity to cyclists with bikes.

Reason: To ensure that the secure cycle parking is easily accessible (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policies 56, 57 and 82).

26. The maximum cumulative stay in the serviced apartments by any individual occupier shall be 90 days in any twelve months.

Reason: To ensure that the serviced apartments are not used as permanent residential accommodation or student accommodation, which would give rise to substantially different impacts and because the scheme may otherwise require the need for affordable housing, or a formal agreement to occupy with an educational institution (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policies 45, 46, 50, 51, 77 and 78).

27. Prior to commencement of serviced apartments, a register shall be established and maintained at all times when the building is occupied. The register shall contain information regarding the names of occupiers of the units within the aparthotel and the duration of their stay. The register shall be made available to the Council in response to all reasonable requests for information about occupancy of the aparthotel.

Reason: To ensure that use of the proposed building only as visitor accommodation can be satisfactorily monitored (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policy 77).

Application Number	18/1930/FUL	Agenda Item	
Date Received	7th January 2019	Officer	Tony Collins
Target Date	8th April 2019		
Ward	Market		
Site	Redevelopment Area Of Mill Lane Cambridge Cambridgeshire		
Proposal	Redevelopment of site to form expansion of Pembroke College comprising repurposing of existing buildings, demolition and erection of new buildings for a mix of uses comprising 94no. student residential units, 1478sqm B1 College office floorspace, 1773sqm D1 teaching space, 1004sqm D2 College leisure and community floorspace, 363sqm commercial A1, A2, A3, A4 retail, food and drink floorspace; and ancillary uses comprising landscaping and hard surfacing, formation of new courtesy crossing at Trumpington Street, highways, vehicular and cycle parking, and associated works and infrastructure.		
Applicant	Pembroke College		

SUMMARY	The development accords with the Development Plan for the following reasons: • It would enhance the character of the conservation area and secure the future of locally and statutorily listed buildings within the site through adaptive reuse and new buildings of high quality • It provides 94 additional student rooms in accordance with site-specific policy 26 of the local plan. • Buildings, routes and spaces would be arranged to make the site attractive accessible and safe

	• It would contribute to the improvement of the public realm
RECOMMENDATION	APPROVAL

1.0 SITE DESCRIPTION/AREA CONTEXT

- 1.1 The site, close to the city centre, between Trumpington Street and the River Cam, is part of an area designated U1 in the Proposals Schedule of the Cambridge Local Plan (2018), and subject to a site-specific policy in the plan (Policy 26). The capacity of the U1 site is described as 'Student accommodation (indicative capacity of 350 student rooms), up to 6,000 m² commercial use, up to 75 bedroom hotel and up to 1,000 m² other uses.'
- 1.2 The site falls within the Historic Core conservation area. There are, on and adjacent to the site, a number of statutorily and locally listed buildings, and buildings identified in the conservation area appraisal as 'positive'. These are shown in Tables 1 and 2 below. The site occupies the major part of the irregular quadrilateral formed by Trumpington Street, Mill Lane, Little St Mary's Lane and Granta Place. It has extensive frontages on the first two of those streets and minor frontages on Little St Mary's Lane. Mill Lane and Granta Place are described as 'significant' streets in the Historic Core Conservation Area Appraisal, while Little St Mary's Lane is accorded 'high' significance in the appraisal, and Trumpington Street 'very high' significance.
- 1.3 The surrounding area contains mixed uses, but College sites predominate. Pembroke College is immediately opposite the site on the east side of Trumpington Street; Peterhouse lies to the south beyond Little St Mary's church. The site to the north on the other side of Mill Lane is in University use. Some of the buildings are not fully occupied, but there are a number of administrative functions. There are a small number of houses immediately adjacent to the southern boundary of the site. Some of these are owned by colleges and used as student accommodation.
- 1.4 There are four trees within the site. The first, termed T001 in the application, is a 13m high honey locust in the centre of the

Millers Yard courtyard. The other three (T002, T0003 and T004) are sycamores, 18m, 18m and 20m high respectively, grouped closely together in the extreme south-west corner of the site, between 13 Little St Mary's Lane and the rear of the University Centre. T004 is the subject of a TPO. The other three trees are not, but are protected by their conservation area location.

1.5 The site falls within the controlled parking zone.

1.6 Part of the Millers Yard building within the site formerly housed the Old Orleans restaurant. This is designated (PH057) as a protected public house site under Policy 76 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2018.

Table 1: existing buildings within the application site

Name	Status	Position
1 Mill Lane	Grade II listed	On the corner of Mill Lane and Trumpington Street; NE corner of site
4 Mill Lane	'positive building' in the conservation area	Abuts No.1, west of it on the Mill Lane frontage
Stuart House	Building of Local Interest	In the centre of the site; paved space in front faces Mill Lane
Mill Lane Lecture Rooms	'positive building' in the conservation area	West of Stuart House, east of Millers' Yard. Abuts the Mill Lane footway between these buildings.
Millers Yard	Building of Local Interest	West of the Lecture Rooms. Abuts the Mill Lane footway. Has a courtyard element to the rear.
Bailey Grundy Barratt building	'positive building' in the conservation area	South of Millers' Yard. Accessed from an opening off Little St Mary's Lane

Emmanuel United Reformed Church	Grade II listed	Corner of Trumpington Street and Little St Mary's Lane. SE corner of site.
Emmanuel URC Church Hall	Building of Local Interest	To the rear of the URC church.
Kenmare House, 74 Trumpington Street	Grade II listed	Faces Trumpington Street
74a Trumpington Street	Grade II listed	Faces Trumpington Street, to the north of No.74

Table 2: existing buildings adjacent to the application site

Peterhouse Library	'positive building' in the conservation area	South of the site, across Little St Mary's Lane
University Centre	Grade II listed	West of the site, facing the river.
The Mill PH	Grade II listed	Adjacent to the NW corner of the site, facing Mill Lane.
11 Mill Lane	Grade II listed	
12 Mill Lane	Grade II listed	
1-4 Little St Mary's Lane	Grade II listed	Immediately adjacent to the south side of the site, between the site and Little St Mary's Lane.
5-7 Little St Mary's Lane	'positive building' in the conservation area	
8-11 Little-St Mary's Lane	Grade II listed	
12 and 13 Little St Mary's Lane	Grade II listed	
16 Mill Lane	'positive building' in the conservation area	On the opposite side of Mill Lane
17 Mill Lane	'positive building' in the conservation area	On the opposite side of Mill Lane
Old Court, Pembroke College	Grade I listed	On the opposite side of Trumpington Street

2.0 THE PROPOSAL

2.1 The proposal is most easily described by considering the application site in three parts: west, centre and east.

- 2.2 In the western section of the site, it is proposed to demolish the Mill Lane Lecture Rooms building, the Bailey Grundy Barratt building, and all of Millers' Yard except for the section of the building which faces Mill Lane. In the rectangular space thus created, a new college court (Dolby Court), providing postgraduate accommodation for Pembroke College, would be created. The court would have four-storey residential blocks on the west and north sides, and a lower block on the south side.
- 2.3 The north block of this court would be 16m high, and the south elevation facing the courtyard would be 27.5m long (7 bays). The building would be faced in red brick, chosen to echo the predominant material of the existing Pembroke College site. The ground floor would form a cloister along the courtyard with two floors of student rooms above, their 1.9m x 2.2m windows framed in reconstituted stone. The uppermost floor would be set slightly back behind a low parapet at 11m above ground, with a series of brick bays reaching forward to the plane of the elevation below. The windows at this level would be narrower, again framed in stone, but to a different pattern. The pitched roof would be covered in copper.
- 2.4 The north elevation, facing Mill Lane, would be of a similar design, but would have retail space on the ground floor. There would be two such units, with shop windows and doors set into the brick façade, and five bays of student room windows above on each floor.
- 2.5 At its south end, this block would be joined to, and linked internally with, the existing frontage building at Millers' Yard. Within the Millers' Yard building, the ground floor areas would be retained as retail space, while the office space which currently occupies the first floor would be reconfigured as student rooms forming part of the proposed new Dolby Court. The present added second floor would be demolished and replaced with a new second floor within a metal-clad mansard roof containing further student rooms. The existing metal gates closing the southern archway would be refurbished, while those in the central archway would be replaced by a glazed screen.
- 2.6 The west block would be of a very similar design to the new north block, and the same height, but with student rooms on the courtyard side of the ground floor rather than an arcade. It would stretch 31m along the west side of the court (8 bays), and

would be joined to the retained Millers Yard frontage building by a short, glazed and copper-clad link

- 2.7 On the south side of the court would be a third postgraduate accommodation block, 32m in length (9 bays). The design of this block would be related to, but distinct from, the other two blocks, and on a smaller scale. The block, which would abut directly the high brick wall forming the northern boundary of residential properties in Little St Mary's Lane, would be of three storeys, with the uppermost storey set into a pitched roof and served by dormer windows. The apex of the roof would be at 10m above ground, the eaves at 6.6m. The block would have the same reconstituted stone dressings and copper roof as the other two blocks, but would be faced in reclaimed gault brick. A passageway through the ground floor of the building would provide a pedestrian link from the court out to Little St Mary's Lane.
- 2.8 The room and stairwell windows on the south elevation of the south block would all be obscure glazed, and the third storey rooms on this side would be served by rooflights rather than dormers.
- 2.9 The centre of the proposed new court would be landscaped, with a lawn, trees and other planting, including climbing plants on the building elevations.
- 2.10 In the central part of the site, the existing Stuart House building would be retained. It would now form an eastern side to the proposed new student accommodation court (Dolby Court). The building, currently used by the University Careers Service, would be reconfigured internally to serve Pembroke College purposes. It would have social spaces and a reading room on the first floor, a café on the ground floor, and kitchens, staff rooms, storage and study spaces of different types in the basement. The exterior of the building would be unaltered. To the north of the building, the area currently occupied by cycle storage would be re-landscaped, with pollarded lime trees. The wrought-iron gates at the northern edge of the site here would be relocated further back from the highway, and extended to fill the whole space between the new north block of Dolby Court and the retained buildings on the east part of the site.

- 2.11 The eastern part of the site is currently occupied by a complicated group of buildings. In the north-east corner are Kenmare House (74 Trumpington Street) and its north-eastward extension (74a), and Nos. 1 and 4 Mill Lane. It is proposed to demolish the two-storey, twentieth-century extension at the south-west corner of Kenmare, and the two-storey south-western extension to No.4 Mill Lane, and to remove the dwarf wall separating the paved area in front of Kenmare from the highway. All of the remainder of these buildings, which lie outside the application site boundary would be retained: their interiors reconfigured for College use, but their external appearance unaltered.
- 2.12 In the south-east corner of the site is Emmanuel United Reformed Church which dates from 1874. It has ancillary buildings and spaces on its north side and to the rear: the School Hall, to the rear, built at the same time as the church; the additional schoolroom, east of the Hall, added in 1897, and the single-storey narthex at the northeast corner of the church, and the corridor linking it to the schoolroom, which were added in the 1990s. Between the church and Kenmare are two three-storey buildings facing Trumpington Street (Nos. 75 and 76), until recently linked to Kenmare, and used with it by the University Estate Management Service.
- 2.13 It is proposed to retain the original church building (which lies outside the application site), No.76 Trumpington Street, and the southernmost section of the Church Hall building, including the whole of its south gable, but to demolish the remainder of the buildings in this group: No.75 Trumpington Street, the later rear extension of No.76, the modern narthex and northern corridor of the church, the 'schoolroom' building to the north of the church, and all of the northern part of the church hall.
- 2.14. On the site of the present No.75, a new College gatehouse would be erected. This building, faced in a red brick, with stone dressings, would replicate the height and mass of No.75 on Trumpington Street, and would, as No.75 does, fill the space between Kenmare and No.76. The new building would have a porters' lodge on the ground floor, alongside which a wide pedestrian passageway would lead into the interior of the site. A canted additional arch would lead into this passageway from the Kenmare forecourt. This lodge and passageway would form the

main entrance to the proposed new Pembroke College site. The upper floor of this building would house an exhibition gallery.

- 2.15 No.76 would be retained, but the interior would be converted to offices toilets and a lift shaft to serve the porters' lodge and the gallery above. To the rear of the new gatehouse, a long single-storey space (8m x 17m) would be created, with glazing all along the north wall facing the proposed new Kenmare garden. This space would serve as the principal entrance to, and foyer for, a proposed new performance space in the URC church building. The church would be retained largely unaltered. No changes to it at all are proposed in the present application, but a future listed building consent application is expected to make relatively minor alterations to the interior. The foyer would connect the gatehouse to a bar and toilets contained within the footprint of the present Church Hall. The existing south gable, and part of the fabric of the west wall of the Hall would be retained, a new pitched roof would be constructed at a similar height to the present roof, and a new north gable added, with doors leading out to the Kenmare garden. A new single-storey link, faced in stone, would replace the existing narthex.
- 2.16 The proposals would create three new outdoor spaces, a central garden in the residential Dolby Court, which would have substantial planting, and paved spaces in front of Stuart House and to the rear of Kenmare, which would both be mainly paved, with some trees.
- 2.17 It is expected that the proposed development would be delivered in two phases: the Trumpington Street buildings in Phase 1 and the Stuart House and residential court areas in Phase 2

3.0 SITE HISTORY

- 3.1 This is a large and complex site, with a lengthy planning history. I have limited the list below to applications made in the two decades prior to the present application. I do not consider that any of the earlier applications on the site are of relevance.

3.2

Ref.	Site	Description	Outcome
98/0186	Stuart House	Platform lift	Approved with conditions
98/0309	Kenmare	Internal alterations to reception area	Approved with conditions
01/0314	4 Mill Lane	Fire escape door	Approved with conditions
01/0315	4 Mill Lane	Fire escape door	Approved with conditions
01/0625	Kenmare	Security cameras	Approved with conditions
02/0067	Kenmare	Security cameras	Withdrawn
02/0068	Kenmare	Security cameras	Approved with conditions
04/0054	Kenmare and 4 Mill Lane	Cycle parking stands and shelter; installation of fire escape door.	Approved with conditions
04/0859	Bailey Grundy Barrett Building	Forming of new opening and installation of window.	Approved with conditions
05/0431	Mill Lane Lecture Rooms	External fire exit staircase and air handling unit.	Approved with conditions
12/0078	Kenmare	Internal alterations to ground floor and first floor.	Approved with conditions
14/0150	Millers' Yard	Proposed change of use of premises from a mixed use Class (B1(a) office) and Class A3 (restaurant use) to a sui-generis graduate student accommodation development, including alterations and extensions to provide a total of 97 study bedrooms including ancillary facilities.	Withdrawn

16/0011	Bailey Grundy Barrett Building	Vary condition 2 of C/98/0433 to allow the building to be used for general office (B1a) use rather than being limited to University use.	Approved with conditions
18/1011	Kenmare	External repairs and re-decorations and internal refurbishments.	Approved with conditions
18/1931	Whole block south of Mill Lane	Demolition of rear two storey extension to Kenmare House, dwarf wall of Kenmare House fronting Trumpington Street, narthex, foyer spaces, lobby, two storey school rooms and north gable end of Emmanuel United Reformed Church; and alterations to 1 Mill Lane, Kenmare House, and Emmanuel United Reformed Church, in connection with expansion of Pembroke College.	Under consideration

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 2018 policies, Supplementary Planning Documents and Material Considerations.

5.2 Relevant Development Plan policies

PLAN	POLICY NUMBER
Cambridge Local Plan 2018	1 26 28 31 32 33 34 35 36 46 55 56 57 58 59 60 61 62 63 64 68 69 70 71 76 80 81 82 85

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

Central Government Guidance	National Planning Policy Framework July 2018 National Planning Policy Framework – Planning Practice Guidance from 3 March 2014 onwards Circular 11/95 (Annex A)
Supplementary Planning Documents	Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Flood and Water SPD
Previous Supplementary Planning Documents (These documents, prepared to support policies in the 2006 local plan are no longer SPDs, but are still material considerations.)	Sustainable Design and Construction (May 2007) Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Waste Partnership (RECAP): Waste Management Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (February 2012) Planning Obligation Strategy (March 2010) Public Art (January 2010) Old Press/Mill Lane Supplementary Planning Document (January 2010)

Material Considerations	<u>City Wide Guidance</u> Air Quality in Cambridge – Developers Guide (2008) Arboricultural Strategy (2004) Biodiversity Checklist for Land Use Planners in Cambridgeshire and Peterborough (March 2001). Buildings of Local Interest (2005) Cambridge and Milton Surface Water Management Plan (2011) Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (November 2010) Cambridge City Council Draft Air Quality Action Plan 2018-2023 Cambridge City Council Waste and Recycling Guide: For Developers. Cambridge City Nature Conservation Strategy (2006) Cambridge Walking and Cycling Strategy (2002) Cambridgeshire County Council Transport Assessment Guidelines (2017) Cambridgeshire Design Guide For Streets and Public Realm (2007)
	<u>Area Guidelines</u> Cambridge Historic Core Conservation Area Appraisal (2015)

6.0 CONSULTATIONS

Cambridgeshire County Council (Highways Development Management)

First advice (31.01.2019)

6.1 Principle of providing an additional pedestrian crossing to Trumpington Street south of its junction with Pembroke Street and Mill Lane is acceptable. However, the Highway Authority requests that the application be refused on the grounds of highway safety in its present format, for the following reasons:

- Stage One Road Safety Audit must be undertaken and all problems that the audit may identify must be satisfactorily resolved.
- No guarantee that the applicants' interpretation of pre-application discussions matches that of the Highway Authority.
- Confusion as to whether proposed crossing is to be a 'courtesy' crossing or a Zebra Crossing. It must be made absolutely clear what type of crossing is being proposed.
- The proposed 'median strip' has the potential to create a sense of 'lane ownership' by drivers and thus increase vehicular speeds
- The proposed introduction of granite sett banding across the carriageway creates a potentially significant slip hazard

6.2 Additionally:

- descriptions of the proposed materials to be used within the highway are too generic
- the plans show private water draining onto the adopted public highway
- natural York stone should be laid with a cross fall of 1:30 and not 1:41 as shown

Second comments, following submission of revised crossing design (20.05.2019)

6.3 I would still seek a Stage One Road safety audit for the proposal as per my original comments of 31st Jan.2019.

- 6.4 I am concerned that the build outs are quite steep and given the level of cycle usage that Trumpington Street experiences this may easily lead to cyclists being 'pushed' into the path of cars traveling adjacent or behind them, creating 'side swipe' conflicts. There may be a requirement for some lining to create a more gentle integration movement.
- 6.5 The use of brass studs will not be acceptable. They have been used in the City Centre and have proven to be very slippery when wet and a significant hazard.
- 6.6 The use of any strips at right angles to the carriageway will not be acceptable as this could be read as a formal crossing.
- 6.7 I note there is no indication of the proposed materials.

Cambridgeshire County Council (Transportation)

- 6.8 The site is within Central Cambridge and is well connected to City cycle network, and key walking routes. The site is well connected to the City bus network.
- 6.9 The traffic and pedestrian surveys provided by the applicant are agreed.
- 6.10 The applicant has provided the 60 month road traffic accident record for the period January 2012 to January 2017. However, the applicant should update the road traffic accident record to the latest available date in summer 2018.
- 6.11 The number of cycle parking provision and location complies with the Cambridge City Council minimum cycle parking standards. However, consideration should be given for the cycle parking to be covered, and provisions should be made to enhance publicly accessible cycle parking. The applicant should provide further detail showing the type and the location of the cycle parking spaces, including details of any cycle parking to be covered.
- 6.12 The disabled car parking provision complies with the Cambridge City Council's standards and is recommended to be agreed.
- 6.13 The trip generation rates and mode provided by the applicant are agreed.

- 6.14 The Transport Statement includes a new pedestrian crossing to improve the pedestrian connection between the new student accommodation and the main Pembroke College site, on Trumpington Street. These improvements should be secured via a condition should approval be given. The proposed mitigation is agreed as being appropriate. Provision of loading space for servicing vehicles on Mill Lane outside Stuart House is appropriate. These improvements should be secured via a condition should approval be given. The proposals for the enhancement to the surfacing of Mill Lane and river are supported. These improvements should be secured via a condition should approval be given.

Environmental Health

- 6.15 This service has no objection in principle to this application providing the following environmental health issues and any associated effects / impacts are controlled by the imposition of the recommended conditions to protect the health and quality of life of existing and proposed residential units / premises and in particular residential close to the application site boundary and other premises in the area:

- Construction Phase Environmental Impacts / Pollution
- Noise and Vibration – Operational
- Habitable Rooms – Noise Insulation
- Air Quality – Operational
- Ventilation Extraction, Filtration and Abatement Scheme – Odour Operational
- Artificial Lighting – Operational
- Contaminated Land

- 6.16 The eighteen conditions recommended for these impacts will ensure that either no significant environmental health adverse impacts will arise or where there is the potential for any residual adverse impacts to arise they will be mitigated and reduced to a minimum and acceptable level.

Urban Design

75 Trumpington Street

- 6.17 In urban design and townscape terms the replacement building that forms the new gatehouse into new Pembroke College site is considered to be a well-designed and sensitive insertion into the existing streetscape.
- 6.18 The scale is not overly assertive and does not compete with the gatehouse of the existing College on the opposite side of Trumpington Street. At pre-application discussions, the junction with Kenmare House and No.76 Trumpington Street were discussed at length. The new gatehouse attaches itself to Kenmare House to maintain the continuity of the street frontage and containment of its threshold space. At the parapet level, the new gatehouse subtly asserts itself over the retained No. 76.
- 6.19 In terms of materials, the palette is well chosen with the predominant use of red brick. The textural quality of the brickwork will be crucial to the success of this building and the detailed bay studies provide a promising indication of the intent. The use of stone to accent the first floor windows is considered successful and helps to highlight the prominence of the new entrance in view looking up and down Trumpington Street. All materials will need to be covered by condition should the application be approved.

Trumpington Street crossing

- 6.20 With the addition of the new Pembroke College site on the west side of Trumpington Street, it is imperative that an easy connection is achieved between both sides of the street. The proposal for an informal crossing that reduces motor vehicle speeds through changes to carriageway materials and visual narrowing is supported in design terms if a below 20mph design speed can be achieved. We would have significant concerns about the impact of a signalised crossing in this location on the quality of the streetscape.

Stuart House public realm

- 6.21 The proposals introduce a significant improvement to the threshold and setting of Stuart House. The changes are supported in urban design terms and will provide an enhanced approach to Stuart House and a de-cluttered setting. The effective College management of this space will be needed to ensure that this remains the case. At a detailed level, the repaved footway on Mill Lane needs to be constructed to allow vehicle overrun because it will be used by delivery and refuse vehicles.

Mill Lane and Dolby Court (new buildings)

- 6.22 The replacement of the Lecture Block with the student accommodation and retail units is a significant change to the street but is considered to be acceptable in urban design terms. The materials palette goes some way to ensuring that the new building maintains a more muted quality. The new retail units will introduce a level activity to Mill Lane and have the potential to add to the vibrancy of the street. It is crucial that the signage for new units is sensitively handled and intended signage zones should be shown on the elevations. The proposed rendered stall risers should be changed to a more robust finish such as glazed bricks. The transparency of the glazed shop windows also needs to be maintained. We would suggest that the applicant devise a tenant-landlord strategy to maintain the quality of shopfront and ensure a consistency of approach.
- 6.23 At pre-application discussions we encouraged a subtly different approach to the south building in Dolby Court. The proposals have taken this approach and accordingly are supported in the urban design terms. All materials will need to be covered by condition should the application be approved.

Conservation Team

Introduction

- 6.24 The significance of establishing a Pembroke College court at Mill Lane should not be overlooked. For over 650 years the College, has contained its growth to the Trumpington Street/ Downing Street/ Tennis Court Road block. The current proposals represent a historic leap across Trumpington Street.

To the street's West side, the city block down to the river has equally historically, been an area of distinctly different character to the college sites. It is the only remaining large block of the city centre that retains a former industrial/commercial character and reminders of commercial links to the river.

- 6.25 The particular qualities of the streets comprising the Mill Lane locality are noted in the Council's street by street "Historic Core Conservation Area Appraisal" adopted on 27th June 2017.
- 6.26 The Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires special attention be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of a conservation area. (Section 72(1)).

SPD, NPPF & Conservation Area Appraisal

- 6.27 An SPD for the wider Old Press/Mill Lane area including this site was prepared from 2007 and adopted in 2010 includes that, "Buildings of Local Interest (BLI), together with other buildings identified as making a positive contribution to the Conservation Area, while not statutorily listed, will normally be retained unless there are clear public benefits arising from their redevelopment." (SPD 6.2.4). The proposals do not appear to be in line with the SPD in this respect (see SPD page 46, Plan 12a "Development Potential").
- 6.28 Whilst statutory Listed buildings are of course retained and the alterations proposed to various of the buildings on the site are acceptable, several of the demolitions proposed are of buildings of interest in the conservation area. Buildings that would be demolished are The Mill Lane Lecture Halls; Miller's Yard (except the front building); The Bailey Grundy Barrett (BGB) Building; most of the United Reformed Church school rooms.
- 6.29 In terms of justification for demolition in the submitted Heritage Statement, the BGB building is said to produce only a limited number of student units and would compromise the creation of a court. The lecture theatres, high ceilings and tall windows of the Lecture block are said to prevent its conversion to other uses. It is also said to be out of scale with the site. Conversion of Miller's Yard to student rooms it is said would result in sub-standard rooms and retaining the rear blocks would also compromise the proposed court.

- 6.30 The Heritage Statement considers the “harms” to be of the Less Than Substantial level. Loss of e.g. The Lecture Block and the BGB building are said to be minor Less Than Substantial harm. The proposed Dolby Court building is said to be an enhancement. Overall, it considers there would be a low level of harm to the conservation area (p.48).
- 6.31 The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) makes clear that conservation areas are designated heritage assets. When considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, the NPPF advises that *great weight* should be given to the asset’s conservation. “Positive buildings” make a positive contribution to the character or appearance of the Conservation Area, and therefore merit consideration in accordance with clause 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.

The Historic Core Conservation Area Appraisal

- 6.32 Following public consultation, the Historic Core Conservation Area Appraisal was approved by the Executive Councillor on the 27th June 2017. The appraisal uses a “street by street” format. Each has a section in the appraisal and a grade (in the range of significance: Very High/High/Significant/Low) for its importance in the Central Conservation Area.
- 6.33 The Trumpington Street (significance: Very High) section notes the Emmanuel United Reformed Church at the corner of Little St Mary’s Lane as a landmark building of importance; that “Scattered along the street are remaining groups of townhouses, many of which are now in college ownership”; and “The open channels of Hobson’s Conduit and crossings over in stone, cast iron, etc. help to emphasise this important historic feature of the street”. Notably, it does not assign any particular status to no75 Trumpington Street. The Mill Lane (Significant) section indicates nos.4 and 8 (The Lecture Halls) as Positive Buildings and Stuart House and Millers Yard as BLIs. The Little St Mary’s Lane section (High) identifies the Bailey Grundy Barrett Building as a Positive Building. It also notes nos.5,6, and 7 within the otherwise Listed run of cottages as Positive Buildings. The Granta Place (Significant) section notes the various Listed Buildings (including The University Centre) and the Peterhouse Ward Library/former Museum of Classical Archaeology as Positive. The Coe Fen & Sheep’s Green (Very

High) section map indicates key positive views across the fen towards Mill Lane.

- 6.34 Beyond the Trumpington Street frontage, the character of the Mill Lane part of the conservation area is markedly different from the College dominated or the retail or housing dominated parts of the conservation area. This difference originates from Mill Lane's history as a commercial area related principally, both to the Mills and granaries, but also the 19th/early 20th century development of Cambridge University Press, and to still later University facilities of the first half of the 20th century. Its different character is exhibited in the appearance of the buildings that remain and is derived from these former uses.

Conservation Team Assessment

- 6.35 There are then, instances of conflict between the Historic Core Appraisal and the proposals i.e. the demolition of The Bailey Grundy Barrett Building and the Mill Lane Lecture Halls and much of the Miller's Yard buildings. Local Plan Policy 61: states: "(b) retain buildings and spaces, the loss of which would cause harm to the character or appearance of the conservation area;" and Policy 62: "The Council will actively seek the retention of local heritage assets,"
- 6.36 In terms of *appearance*, the Mill Lane Lecture Halls is clearly a prominent building in the street but simply because the Bailey Grundy Barrett Building is somewhat removed and Miller's Yard's off-street buildings are around a yard should not, in a City like Cambridge with many yards, lanes and courts, imply a lack of importance. In terms of *character* of the conservation area, the Mill Lane Lecture block is representative of the University's piecemeal 20th Century development in the conservation area. The Bailey Grundy Barrett Building and Miller's Yard are representative of the commercial uses that were part of the area's character. In SPD they were envisaged as suitable for re-use given sympathetic conversion. They also have associations with the wider conservation area:

In 1896, Addenbrooke's Hospital commissioners looked into lighting the hospital by electricity and engaged Bailey, Grundy & Barrett to install it (Bailey, Grundy & Barrett Co were electrical and mechanical engineers whose dynamo supplied the first public electricity in the town centre).

Similarly, the Lecture Halls building's significance in the CA is partly a link to the Fitzwilliam Museum via the same architects practice. The Miller's Yard buildings date from the mid-19th century, but part of the rear blocks to be demolished appear to be of earlier construction (and may reflect a building layout characteristic of the Custance 1798 map). These building's significance to the conservation area is not simply about visual contribution.

- 6.37 The contribution of these buildings to the varied grain and gradual development of the Mill Lane blocks has arguably not been fully considered and contrasts with courts on the scale and character of traditional college court layouts - which are uncharacteristic of the Mill Lane area, which has had a finer grain of development. The College presence on Trumpington Street would be signalled by a new entrance building/lodge. The resultant Mill Lane frontage would carry a prominent new college building where the Lecture Halls currently stand. At Little St Mary's Lane, the new college halls would be apparent behind and beside the Listed cottages and the University Centre. Much of the Mill Lane southern block would become a college site and therefore have a more homogenous character than currently or historically.

Impacts on the settings of Listed Buildings

- 6.38 University Centre: The setting to the rear would alter following demolitions with the new range of Dolby Court being taller than the buildings to be replaced (though slightly further back), comparable in scale to the University Centre; and due to tree removal. Nevertheless, this scale is unlikely to be apparent from the surroundings.
- 6.39 Little St Mary's Lane: The tall wall behind the houses is to be retained. Beyond this the existing tall Lecture Rooms building would be removed, the new south range buildings being much lower. Massing in the settings of the Listed houses would effectively be "relocated" further to the west by the new west range building.
- 6.40 12 & 13 Mill Lane and The Mill PH: No.12 adjoins Miller's Yard, the roof of which is to be remodelled. This new roof would not be characteristic of the existing buildings in the frontage setting and changes the relationships in this run of buildings (in which

No 12, the three story former town house, has been dominant). As it is immediately adjoining, I consider this will create some harm to the significance of no.12. The taller new north range building will also arise behind this building.

Summary

- 6.41 The overall character of the conservation area would undoubtedly be altered. With substantial demolitions of buildings identified as “positive”, in the Core Appraisal and for sympathetic conversion in the SPD there would be a considerable amount of demolition overall.
- 6.42 Even if the application’s assessment of the level of that harm was accepted at face value, that assessment is then subject to the NPPF statement that even Less Than Substantial harm must be balanced against the “great weight” to be afforded to the conservation of the heritage asset. This must be considered in comparison to what the Planning Committee consider are the public benefits of the proposals (see 1.32 page 4 of the submitted Planning Statement). In doing so, NPPF guidance should be recognised requiring the balancing exercise to be a weighted balance (“great weight should be given to the asset’s conservation”) towards conservation of designated heritage assets (including the conservation area).
- 6.43 Should Planning Committee be minded to approve the application 18/1930/FUL with the extent of greater than expected demolitions in Mill Lane site South side, it is recommended that in order to help conserve the character of the conservation area across the mill Lane site as a whole, the committee resolve that when proposals for the North side of the wider Mill Lane site come forward these will be expected to incorporate greater retention and conversion of Positive and BLI buildings than the University’s masterplan framework currently indicates.
- 6.44 Conditions are recommended to require submission of:
- a demolition method statement for 75 Trumpington St to ensure support to adjoining buildings
 - samples of new roof covering for Stuart House.
 - the detailed design of grates over Hobsons Conduit

Senior Sustainability Officer (Design and Construction)

6.45 The proposed scheme integrates a number of approaches related to sustainable design and construction including:

- Designing Dolby Court to achieve the Building Research Establishment Environmental Assessment Method (BREEAM) 'excellent' standard. The BREEAM pre-assessment shows a predicted score of 75.59%, with a potential score of 88.05%.
- Implementation of a range of measures in existing buildings being refurbished to enhance their energy performance including improved insulation where appropriate, use of secondary glazing or replacement double glazing, LED lighting, Mechanical Ventilation with Heat Recovery (MVHR) and connection of buildings to a site wide heating and cooling network connected to the air source heat pumps being provided as part of the Dolby Court development.
- The use of air source heat pumps, and potentially photovoltaic panels, to reduce carbon emissions by up to 30% compared to baseline carbon emissions.
- Deep window reveals to reduce solar gain, alongside natural ventilation and high thermal mass through plastered concrete soffits. It will be important to ensure that night purge ventilation takes place and that windows facing Mill Lane and the UC yard can be opened as MVHR alone is not usually designed to help deal with overheating.

6.46 The measures above are all supported.

6.47 The one area where the proposals do not currently meet adopted policy requirements is in relation to water efficiency within Dolby Court. Policy 28 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2018 requires maximum credits from BREEAM Wat 01 to be achieved, an approach that normally requires the use of water reuse or rainwater harvesting. However, it is noted from the BREEAM pre-assessment that the scheme is currently only on target to achieve 2 Wat 01 credits, with a third credit possible. Given the level of water stress facing Cambridge, further information is required as to whether it is feasible or viable for the scheme to achieve maximum Wat 01 credits and if this is not the case, whether more confidence could be given that 3 credits, which would equate to a 40% reduction in baseline water use, could be achieved, which would get the scheme a

little closer to the 5 credits required by policy. I would suggest that condition wording be used to secure at least 3 credits, with wording suggested above.

Head of Streets and Open Spaces (Tree Team)

6.48 No comments made.

Head of Streets and Open Spaces (Landscape Team)

6.49 There is concern about the loss of the two large trees along Little Saint Mary's Lane. While only one has a Tree Protection Order, they all have a significant public presence and their loss would change the feel of this area dramatically. We would seek a solution which might retain more of the trees. Tree planting strategy should also seek to mitigate with the use of at least two large growing trees. There is scope within the design to achieve this and it would aid in mitigating the canopy loss incurred by the loss of 3 trees with wide and impactful canopies.

6.50 The landscape proposals on the whole are acceptable and sensitively considered. The resultant landscape is likely to provide a charming setting for the redeveloped area. Conditions recommended on landscape details and landscape maintenance and management.

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

6.51 Agree with County Highways comments regarding the need for additional visitor cycle parking given the lack of such parking in the area, and the demand from University buildings such as the University Centre.

6.52 This area is difficult for pedestrians and cyclists to negotiate, particularly those wanting to cross from Pembroke St to Mill Lane. The crossing should be a zebra, not a courtesy crossing which has no status and in this heavily trafficked environment is unlikely to be very effective unless the nature of the whole area is changed to create more of a shared space feel similar to the Oxford Frideswide Square scheme. The position of the zebra is set back a long way from the junction and does not serve the crossing of Pembroke St to Mill Lane and so if possible should be moved nearer to the junction.

6.53 Cyclists leaving the development, heading north have to negotiate a very difficult junction with Silver St coming into conflict with most of the traffic which is turning left. Consideration should be given to a change in priority at this junction to improve safety for cyclists.

6.54 Mill Lane footways are very narrow and any increase in numbers accessing the development will make the situation worse. Footways should be widened and passing spaces provided for vehicles or a shared space environment considered which increases space available to pedestrians.

Cambridgeshire County Council (Flood and Water Management)

6.55 At present we object to the grant of planning permission for the following reasons:

6.56 The proposals are not in accordance with policy 31 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2018 because:

- a) no surface drainage methods have been employed, only underground traditional drainage techniques.
- b) no green features have been proposed, despite the landscape areas offering opportunities for bio-retention features.
- c) no rainwater harvesting is proposed.
- d) drainage features do not contribute to making places for people.
- e) there are no multi-functional drainage features.
- f) there are small areas of flat roof that have not employed green or brown roofs.
- g) because of the use of traditional hard surfaces and absence of SuDs techniques, there will be discharge for all rainfall events.
- h) no treatment of run-off to minimise pollution has been proposed.
- k) none of the hard surfaces are permeable.

6.57 It is not clear what the overall discharge rate from the site will be. Table 1 within the submitted Drainage Feasibility Study indicates that the discharge from Phase 1 will be 28.87 l/s. However the drainage layout drawing indicates that the hydrobrake within manhole FCMH2 is restricting flow to 3 l/s as

do the flow control calculations. This should be clarified within the report.

Head of Streets and Open Spaces (Sustainable Drainage Officer)

- 6.58 The Drainage Feasibility Study for the proposed development was written in November 2017, since then the Cambridge Local Plan 2018 has been adopted. This has changed the requirements for the management of surface water run-off. Previously developed sites must now go back to greenfield run-off rates and substantive SuDs must be used throughout the development. It appears that only underground attenuation is proposed. This is traditional drainage as there is no water quality, biodiversity or amenity benefit provided by the SuDs. This was explained to the applicant in early pre-application meetings in 2017. The proposals do not meet the new planning policy requirements specifically:
- 6.59 The proposals are not in accordance with policy 31 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2018 because:
- a) no surface drainage methods have been employed, only underground traditional drainage techniques.
 - b) no green features have been proposed, despite the landscape areas offering opportunities for bio-retention features.
 - c) no rainwater harvesting is proposed.
 - d) drainage features do not contribute to making places for people.
 - e) there are no multi-functional drainage features.
 - f) there are small areas of flat roof that have not employed green or brown roofs.
 - g) because of the use of traditional hard surfaces and absence of SuDs techniques, there will be discharge for all rainfall events.
 - h) no treatment of run-off to minimise pollutions has been proposed.
 - k) none of the hard surfaces are permeable.

6.60 The proposals are not in accordance with policy 32 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2018 because:

- a) the peak rate of run-off is greater for the developed site than it was for the undeveloped site;
- b) given the above, the alternative of limiting discharge to 2 litre/s/ha for all events up to the 100-year return period event has not been achieved.
- c) the development has not been designed to avoid the flooding of property in and adjacent to the development for a 1 in 100 year event, plus an allowance for climate change and in the event of local drainage system failure;
- d) the discharge locations do not have the capacity to receive all foul and surface water flows from the development, including discharge by infiltration, into water bodies and into sewers;
- e) no management and maintenance plan for the lifetime of the development (including the arrangements for adoption by any public authority or statutory undertaker and any other arrangements to secure the operation of the scheme throughout its lifetime) has been submitted.

6.61 In conclusion, the proposals are a traditional surface water drainage strategy that is not compliant with current planning policy and may increase flood risk in certain areas due to an incorrect method of calculation existing discharge rates. There are no SuDs features employed and no biodiversity, water quality or amenity benefits to the scheme.

6.62 The proposals should be reviewed in the light of current planning policy.

Head of Streets and Open Spaces (Nature Conservation Officer)

6.63 Peregrine Falcons regularly use the Emmanuel United Reformed Church as a perch and feeding post. My understanding is that they have recently been nesting just offsite, but the church should be considered part of their immediate nesting territory. The submitted ecological report suggests protection of peregrine and redstart nests by survey and if necessary delay to demolition, and also suggests provision of bird boxes for redstarts and peregrines. These provisions should be secured by condition.

- 6.64 The report also recommends the installation of a Biodiverse roof. This would achieve biodiversity net gain, and is supported.
- 6.65 I have reviewed the submitted bat surveys and am content with the survey effort and recommendations. No bat roosts were discovered on site. The submitted ecology report suggests that should the works planned not commence before 2020 then, update surveys take place prior to the commencement of works. This is to account for the fact that bats are mobile species and the pattern of use of buildings and other structures for roosting can vary over time. Recommend a condition to secure this.
- 6.66 An opportunity is available to update the lighting scheme at this site to reduce current light spillage. The ecology report suggests that artificial lighting is only directed where necessary for health and safety reasons, that lighting should not illuminate any trees and lighting should only be used for the period of time for which it is required. This can be achieved by following accepted best practice. Recommend this be demonstrated prior to determination or via condition.

Historic England

Background

- 6.67 The existing buildings and their layout reflect the evolution of this edge of historic town area. The earliest structures appear to date from the Georgian era, although clearly plot divisions and other evidence reflect the earlier history of this area of the town, traditionally associated with the mills on the Cam, and lying outside the King's Ditch. Rebuilding schemes in the past have erased some aspects of the site's former character.

The Lecture Rooms Block

- 6.68 The Mill Lane Lecture Rooms building of 1931-3 is an interesting example of inter-war neo-Georgian design. The style, often to be found in civic buildings of the period, is here carried out with considerable finesse, including a frontispiece feature formed from a classical doorcase and linked first floor window, and stone first floor window surrounds. The quality of brickwork detailing is high, and the building makes a notable contribution to the varied street scene of Mill Lane, not least due to its remarkable proportions, having a storey height that is

nearly twice that of some of the earlier buildings on the street.

- 6.69 The scale and overall form of the Lecture Rooms block have been shown to be key elements in preventing it being incorporated into the new accommodation for Pembroke College. While noting its contribution to the conservation area, we accept that a case has been made for its loss. The proposed new block of accommodation on its site, facing both Mill Lane and Dolby Court, has the potential to make a positive contribution to the street scene. It has been designed to address the street, and the Mill Lane front, and particularly the key corner and side elevation towards Stuart House are well thought out and fully articulated.

75 Trumpington Street

- 6.70 Considerable thought and design focus has been given to the major issue of how Dolby Court will be accessed, and the appropriate status of such an entrance. Pembroke College have made clear in the course of negotiations the importance of an appropriate status to such an entrance, and their desire as client that it should be clear that this forms part of the wider college group of buildings, the main entrance to which is on the opposing side of Trumpington Street.
- 6.71 Following extensive analysis and design option appraisal we accept that a strong case has been made that the replacement of the existing late-nineteenth century former commercial premises at 75 Trumpington Street with a new entrance block is an appropriate approach to the challenges of providing the college's desired new entrance while respecting the character of this diverse block of the historic street. The existing building has been shown to be of little or no historical interest, and is undoubtedly the weakest building in the group in visual terms. Its partially rebuilt blank gable to the north, facing the forecourt of Kenmare House, is unattractive and has a negative impact on Kenmare's setting. Retention of parts of the existing building might have been possible but it was shown that such an approach would have little or no benefit, while only providing compromised accommodation.
- 6.72 The design of the proposed new Trumpington Street elevation for the entrance block has been the subject of design revision since our last pre-application meeting and we welcome the

revisions made. Both elevations of the entrance pavilion, both towards Trumpington Street and to the forecourt of Kenmare, are now more carefully scaled and articulated. Within a varied historic streetscape such as this, with diverse architectural styles and no consistent scale to the existing buildings, there exists the opportunity for a new intervention to complement the existing, while making a clear architectural statement of its own. That said, the success of any intervention will be highly dependent on its context, as it will be judged as part of the wider street scene. We believe that the design has now achieved an appropriate balance between new design intervention and contextual response.

Former United Reformed Church

- 6.73 The incorporation of the United Reformed Church within the Pembroke scheme gives the opportunity for considerable public benefits, which have been embraced by the evolving proposals. The location of the proposed entrance pavilion at 75 Trumpington Street also allows its facilities to be incorporated into the support spaces for the reuse of the URC building. Although intervention to the listed church itself would be minimal, the proposals include the replacement of almost all of its secondary buildings. Most of these are modern and of little or no heritage value. The former school block to the north-west corner of the URC site does, however, have some significance. Under the proposals this building would be largely demolished, with the exception of the southern gable and part of the side wall. The main historic interest is undoubtedly in the gable, and the powerful presence it has when seen from the south, from Little St Mary's Lane. The information supporting the scheme has shown that the remainder of the building has been heavily altered, to the point that what significance it might have had can be said to have been seriously compromised. In our opinion this level of demolition has been justified.

The wider scheme

- 6.74 The design of the main buildings of the new Dolby Court has been carried out in such a manner as to respect and enhance the key elements of the site and its wider context. The southern range of the court is stepped down in scale to respect the existing domestic buildings on Little St Mary's Lane, which lie outside the scheme. As noted above, we particularly note the

care with which the handling of the elevations of the block that will replace the Lecture Rooms building has been handled. This elevation, and particular its corner, are prominent in views down Mill Lane from Pembroke Street due to the shape of the street. The incorporation of Stuart House as the east side of the new court is also to be welcomed, as well as the conversion of Kenmare House and other Trumpington Street buildings and their conversion to appropriate new uses.

- 6.75 National policy as set out in the NPPF makes clear the government's commitment to sustainable development (para 7 & 8). Heritage assets are an irreplaceable resource, and should be conserved in a manner appropriate to their significance (para 184). When considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated asset, great weight should be given to the assets conservation (para 193). Harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal, including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use (para 196).

Summary

- 6.76 The proposed new Dolby Court and related facilities provide an opportunity to enhance this extensive site within the conservation area, involving both new buildings and the re-use of existing historic buildings, several of which are listed. The new build elements of the proposals are potentially a major addition to the distinguished group of buildings that make up Pembroke College, and should enrich the conservation area while respecting its character and grain. Although some buildings will be lost, most notably the Lecture Rooms block, we have considered the justification provided, and the evidence of the options explored for potential retention, and believe that a convincing case has been made for their removal.
- 6.77 Historic England has no objection to the application on heritage grounds.
- 6.78 We consider that the application meets the requirements of the NPPF, in particular paragraph numbers 184, 193 & 196.

Environment Agency

6.79 The Agency has no objection in principle to the proposed development. It offers the following recommendations and informatives.

6.80 Surface Water:

- All surface water from roofs shall be piped direct to an approved surface water system using sealed downpipes. Open gullies should not be used.
- Only clean, uncontaminated surface water should be discharged to any soakaway, watercourse or surface water sewer.

6.81 Pollution Control:

- Surface water from roads and impermeable vehicle parking areas shall be discharged via trapped gullies.
- Prior to being discharged into any watercourse, surface water sewer or soakaway system, all surface water drainage from lorry parks and/or parking areas for fifty car park spaces or more and hardstandings should be passed through an oil interceptor designed compatible with the site being drained. Roof water shall not pass through the interceptor.
- Site operators should ensure that there is no possibility of contaminated water entering and polluting surface or underground waters.

6.82 Foul Water Drainage:

- Foul water drainage should be discharged to the public foul sewer, with the prior approval of Anglian Water.
- Anglian Water Services Ltd. should be consulted by the Local Planning Authority and be requested to demonstrate that the sewerage and sewage disposal systems serving the development have sufficient capacity to accommodate the additional flows, generated as a result of the development, without causing pollution or flooding. If there is not capacity in either of the sewers, the Agency must be reconsulted with alternative methods of disposal.

6.83 Contaminated Land:

- Proposal not considered High Risk. No site-specific advice. The developer should address risks to controlled waters from contamination at the site, following the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework and the Environment Agency Guiding Principles for Land Contamination.
- 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.
- The water environment is potentially vulnerable and there is an increased potential for pollution from inappropriately located and/or designed infiltration (SuDS). The proposals will need to comply with EA Groundwater protection position statements G1 and G9 to G13.

6.84 General:

- Any oil storage tank shall be sited on an impervious base and surrounded by oil tight bunded walls. The installation must comply with Control of Pollution Regulations 2001, and Control of Pollution (Oil Storage) Regulations 2001.

Anglian Water

- 6.85 The surface water strategy/flood risk assessment submitted with the planning application relevant to Anglian Water is acceptable. We request that the agreed strategy is reflected in the planning approval [by means of a condition].

Greater Cambridge Shared Waste Service

Student accommodation element

- 6.86 Scheme proposes daily collection of:

4 x 1100 refuse
1 x 1100 recycling

1 x 240 green waste

- 6.87 On the other buildings the submission indicates refuse and recycling will be a 50/50 split; this should also apply to the residential units, so 4 x 1100 recycling are required.

Commercial element (retail + college admin, teaching, social and cultural elements)

- 6.88 This is a very comprehensive waste management plan, which is good to see. The application is a mixture of domestic and commercial uses. This plan covers everything I'd expect to see and can be agreed – as with all city centre sites the key to a successful waste scheme is the frequency of collection. The material mixture of bins can be changed easily as required by site users – the important thing is there being enough space to suitably store them in good and safe order.
- 6.89 The developer should be aware that for domestic collections – which are provided once fortnightly per material type – if there is not the capacity to last the fortnight then commercial rates are applied for any additional collections. These could quickly become a significant cost to the College.

Cambridgeshire Constabulary (Architectural Liaison Officer)

- 6.90 This office was contacted in December 2017 re BREEAM Security Needs Assessment and this was completed. The submitted documents and drawings accord with all our recommendations in relation to community safety and vulnerability to crime.

Cambridgeshire County Council (Archaeology)

- 6.91 The site is located in an area of high archaeological potential in the medieval core of the historic City of Cambridge. Archaeological research undertaken in support of this application indicates the potential for surviving archaeological remains from at least the 11th – 12th centuries. Of particular relevance is the projected line of the 12th century King's Ditch and its relationship with the southern access to the medieval town. Previous investigations in the vicinity are limited to observations during construction of the Pitt Press building in

1893. Although limited in scope, the investigation identified an intensive archaeological sequence of medieval and post-medieval date.

- 6.92 We have held discussions with the CAU, acting for the applicant, regarding the approach to the mitigation of the archaeological impacts of the proposed development. The results of these discussions are included in the document South Archaeology Deposit Model & Mitigation Discussion. We are in broad agreement with the approach described in this document and we would recommend that this programme of work is secured by a condition of planning permission.

Design and Conservation Panel

- 6.93 A Masterplan for the whole Mill Lane area, in line with which this proposal has been drawn up, was brought before Panel in November 2017 and again after further development in May 2018, at which time more specific details about proposals for the present application site were set out. A more detailed proposal for the present application site only was brought to Panel in October 2018. The conclusions of the Panel meetings were as follows:

(Reminder - CABE 'traffic light' definitions: GREEN: a good scheme, or one that is acceptable subject to minor improvements. AMBER: in need of *significant* improvements to make it acceptable, but not a matter of starting from scratch. RED: the scheme is fundamentally flawed and a fresh start is needed.)

November 2017

- 6.94 This Masterplan presents a 'once in a generation' opportunity to transform and enliven a part of the city long in need of investment. There are however a number of questions that remain unanswered.
- 6.95 The emerging Draft Local Plan stipulates the need to provide 350 student rooms within this site. How those rooms are to be provided, the extent of demolition and re-building, and the impact of any consequential gentrification of the area require further investigation to ensure the area's 'gritty' character is retained.

- 6.96 Although in general terms the Panel feel the design team are heading in the right direction, from this initial examination of the emerging Masterplan the Panel concluded that there should be greater retention of some of the older buildings
- 6.97 This would help preserve the character and appearance of the area and enhance the experience of those visiting it. Further work is clearly needed and the Panel would look forward to re-visiting these proposals at a future meeting.
- 6.98 VERDICT – GREEN (1), AMBER (5)

May 2018

- 6.99 The Panel applaud what in their view, is a thoughtful response to a challenging brief. The introduction of new courtyard spaces and the sacrificing of buildings for collegiate functions is a significant change but, in the Panel's view, that change was not necessarily harmful to the character or appearance of this part of the Conservation Area. The Panel felt it is more important for the northern parts of the Mill Lane development to retain its existing 'gritty' character, and there is scope for the internal parts of this site to adopt a more 'collegiate' character. Therefore, while this is considered an appropriate solution for the southern side of Mill Lane, it is not one that should be continued across onto the northern side of the lane.
- 6.100 At a future presentation, the Panel would welcome the inclusion of a fully developed landscape plan so that the interrelationship of the various elements of the new public realm, and the use of materials and planting can be fully understood.
- 6.101 VERDICT – GREEN (unanimous) subject to further development.

October 2018

- 6.102 The Panel generally welcomed the design developments that had taken place since their last consideration of these proposals, and in particular regarding their previous concerns about site access and cycle parking provision. The Panel also welcomed the interaction of the development with the public realm on Trumpington Street. However, the Panel considered that the proposals would benefit from further design

development for the top floor of Dolby Court and 75 Trumpington Street, together with refinement of the landscaping to Kenmare House forecourt.

6.103 VERDICT – GREEN (4), AMBER (2)

6.104 The full relevant sections of the minutes of the panel meetings are attached to this report as Appendices A, B and C

Disability Consultative Panel (Meeting of 26th February 2019)

6.105 The creation of more accessible rooms for the college is very positive, as is the scheme's approach of keeping the spaces flexible. The inclusion of rooms that might be readily converted to adjoining rooms for student and carer was encouraged.

6.106 The Panel greatly supported the inclusion of a crossing, especially as the pavements in that area can be treacherous for wheelchair users. With the majority of accessible rooms planned for the new scheme but the main college over the road, it is vitally important that students with disabilities have a safe crossing place. Safe drop-off from taxis will also need to be carefully considered.

6.107 The Panel was very interested in the scheme, and pleased by the design features included so far to enable accessibility. Plans to improve pedestrian crossing of Trumpington Street were especially welcome. The scheme was invited to return to Panel to discuss specific design aspects further when the scheme's design reaches the required level of detail.

Developer Contributions Monitoring Unit

6.108 On the basis that the accommodation is for Cambridge University students and they already provide IOS and Sports facilities there would be no City Council s106 financial contributions.

6.109 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 occupiers of the following addresses have made representations:

6 Dane Drive (owner of 6 Little St Mary's Lane)
15 Latham Close
2 Little St Mary's Lane
6 Little St Mary's Lane (two representations)
7 Little St Mary's Lane (two representations)
8 Little St Mary's Lane
9 Little St Mary's Lane
4 Pearce Close
4 Russell Street
52 Ealing Village, Ealing, W5

7.2 The representations can be summarised as follows:

Neighbour amenity

- Overlooking
- Overshadowing
- Loss of daylight
- Visual domination and sense of enclosure
- Impact of lighted rooms at night
- Views obscured
- Noise from student activity (exacerbation of existing issue)
- Odours from extracts
- Closeness of existing flue to proposed buildings would restrict existing residents' use of cooking facilities
- Loss of informal agreement for 'cherry-picker' access for roof maintenance
- Loss of opportunity to bring bulky items over the rear wall
- Loss of informal agreement for parking contractors and utility service vehicles
- Loss of access route through the site
- Loss of informal agreement allowing use of University cycle parking
- Unclear how access rights would be protected
- Narrow gap between boundary wall and South block would harbour rubbish
- Gap would harbour vermin
- Gap would make wall maintenance impossible

- Access point from Little St Mary's Lane might be used for smoking, drug abuse or rough sleeping
- Loss of tranquillity in lane
- Increased intrusion from greater pedestrian flows

Heritage

- Damage to listed buildings
- Damage to boundary wall
- Out of proportion

Construction process

- Disturbance and noise
- Need to ensure weekends are quiet
- Need to ensure phasing of development is adhered to
- Difficulty of enforcing time restrictions on construction

Traffic and parking

- Increased vehicle traffic and congestion in Little St Mary's Lane
- Loss of informal Parking agreement for Little St Mary's church

Highway safety

- Proposed new crossing is not safe because it is not a formal 'zebra'
- Proposed medial granite strip would increase vehicle speeds
- No improvement to junction at Pembroke St/Trumpington Street

Fire safety

- Loss of opportunity to use route over boundary wall for emergency rescue and evacuation

7.3 Representations have also been received from Camcycle. These representations can be summarised as follows:

- Median granite strip in Trumpington Street would be detrimental to highway safety

- Junction at Pembroke Street / Trumpington Road not improved
- Insufficient cycle parking
- Prediction of trip generation too low

7.4 Representations have also been received from Cambridge Past Present and Future. These representations can be summarised as follows:

- no objection to the general principle of the proposals
- quality of the design and materials must be high
- support the University's effort to make their sites more permeable to the public.

Concerns

- disappointed that there is no finalised Masterplan
- new pedestrian crossing does not address the major traffic issue at this junction: already unacceptable traffic situation will be made worse by the additional crossings generated by the redevelopment and also because of additional buses along Silver Street
- If the intention is to address these transport issues via the application for the northern part of the site, there would need to be reassurance that this would be forthcoming.
- insufficient cycle parking provision
- quality of design in Dolby Court is not ambitious enough.
- understand the reasons provided for the demolition of 75 Trumpington Street, but need reassurance that structural engineering advice on which this was based is correct.

7.5 Representations have also been received from the Trustees of Hobson's Conduit. These representations can be summarised as follows:

- The two wide bridges, both incorporating a long "taxi drop-off" will be very difficult to keep clear of obstructions and will add considerably to the cost of maintenance and the risk of flooding when the water is unable to flow freely.
- The appearance of all these bridges has not yet been specified. In earlier discussion with the college, the idea of metallic grids / grills / covers was mentioned, with a

dedicated pattern, design and possibly inscription about the Conduit. This should be considered further.

- Any approval for the “taxi drop-offs” may set an unfortunate precedent for other businesses and premises along Trumpington Street. Once it is admitted that the runnels can be covered over for convenience, rather than purely for access, we anticipate further proposals to do something similar, thereby weakening the status of these historic structures. We do not believe that this should be allowed; the runnels themselves should be visible and accessible over as great a distance as is possible.
- The latest drawing of the proposal for the new road crossing appears to show the “embedded granite kerb” crossing each runnel four times. That cannot happen, as it would interfere with the flow of water. We are also not clear if the proposed build-out into the road will require excavation of the runnels themselves; if so, then their status as a listed building must be very carefully taken into account.

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. Masterplan
3. Demolition
4. Context of site, design and external spaces (and impact on heritage assets)
5. Public Art
6. Carbon reduction and sustainable design
7. Light pollution, noise, vibration, air quality, odour and dust
8. Inclusive access
9. Fire safety
10. Residential amenity
11. Water management and flood risk
12. Refuse arrangements
13. Highway safety

14. Car and cycle parking
15. Trees
16. Archaeology
17. Third party representations
18. Planning Obligations (s106 Agreement)

Principle of Development

- 8.2 Because of its location and the nature of the buildings within and adjoining the site, the 'principle' of this development involves two distinct elements: the proposed uses, and the nature of the impact on the conservation area.

- 8.3 The Proposals Schedule of the Cambridge Local Plan 2018 identifies the area enclosed by Silver Street, Trumpington Street, Little St Mary's Lane and the river as site U1, which is the subject of site-specific policy 26 in the plan. The allocation of that site is for:

Student accommodation (indicative capacity of 350 student rooms), up to 6,000 m² commercial use, up to 75 bedroom hotel and up to 1,000 m² other uses.

- 8.4 The present application covers the southern half of site U1. It proposes 94 student residential units, 1478m² B1 College office floorspace (B1), 1773 m² D1 teaching space (D1), 1004 m² College leisure and community floorspace (D2), and 363 m² commercial retail, food and drink floorspace. This proposal is broadly in line with the allocation above, but it provides considerably more space for College use, and considerably less commercial space than the allocation might expect (recognizing that it is only approximately half of the allocated site). This is partly because the present application site includes the URC church and its associated buildings, and the buildings on the Trumpington Street frontage, which neither the 2010 SDP, nor the 2018 local plan anticipated coming forward in a comprehensive proposal of this sort.

- 8.5 The application proposes a total of student rooms well below half of the total envisaged in the allocation. However, in my view, the remaining part of the allocated site U1 has the potential to accommodate more units than the present site. The scale and layout of the student accommodation proposed here is appropriate to the context, and I do not consider that it

represents an underdevelopment of this part of the site. In my opinion, the uses proposed here are complementary and compatible with each other and the site constraints, and are in accordance with policy 26 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2018.

- 8.6 The proposed partial demolition and conversion of Millers Yard involves the removal of the building on a protected public house site (PH057 – former Old Orleans). Policy 76 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 prohibits the loss of protected public house sites except where it has been proved that the need for such use no longer exists. However, the policy allows for interchangeability between Class A4 use and A1 A2 and A3 retail uses on the basis that the potential for public house use in the future is thus retained. The present application proposes a number of new units for a range of A1/A2/A3/A4 uses facing onto Mill Lane. At least one of these units is considered large enough for a viable A4 public house use. This equivalent alternative unit in A1/A2/A3/A4 use replaces the former Old Orleans space. There is no loss of a safeguarded public house site, and the proposal is in accordance with policy 76 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2018.
- 8.7 The Emmanuel URC church is a building in use as a place of worship. The building is therefore defined as a community sports and leisure facility by policy 73 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2018. Policy 73 prohibits the loss of such facilities unless they are either replaced, relocated in full equivalence, or no longer needed. The Emmanuel congregation will be relocating to join the St Columba's URC congregation at the other end of Downing Street, but this relocation of the users does not meet the policy requirement to relocate the facility.
- 8.8 The proposal would use the existing church building as a performance and events space, enlarging the facility and improving its quality and accessibility by creating a new access and foyer to the north of the existing church. The application states that this building will provide a new shared space which can serve the College, the University and the wider city with a range of potential uses including concerts, recitals, speaker events and panel discussions. In my view, this would represent a retention of the existing community facility provided that the opportunity exists for people and organizations from 'the wider city' to make use of the facility in its new form. I recommend a condition requiring the submission of (and future adherence to)

a management plan for the new space in the URC building. This plan will be expected to make provision for outside bodies to use this space. Subject to such a condition, the proposal is in my view, in accordance with Policy 73 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2018.

- 8.9 The application involves significant demolition, including that of locally listed buildings. It also includes substantial new building within the conservation area, demolition and new building within the setting of listed buildings, and the felling of trees within the conservation area. It will therefore have an impact on heritage assets, both designated (listed buildings and the conservation area) and non-designated (locally listed buildings and unlisted buildings within the conservation area, including those designated as 'positive' in the conservation area appraisal). Neither local plan policy nor the NPPF prohibit development which would have such impacts, but they both make it clear that great weight should be given to the conservation of heritage assets, and that any harm to heritage assets requires clear and convincing justification. I set out my view about the extent of harm caused and the weight of benefit which can be set against such harm in the next two sections.

Masterplan

- 8.10 The 2010 Old Press/Mill Lane SPD calls for the first main planning application on the Old Press/Mill Lane site, which broadly corresponds to the allocated site U1 in the 2018 local plan, to be accompanied by a masterplan for the whole SPD area. This requirement is reiterated in the site-specific policy 26. Discussions on a masterplan have been continuing between the University of Cambridge (as the landowner of almost all of the SPD area) and the City Council for several years. A Masterplan Framework has emerged from these discussions, and has been subject to public consultation. The Masterplan Framework has been submitted with this application.
- 8.11 In my view, most elements of the submitted Masterplan Framework are in accordance with the aspirations of the SPD, and with the site allocation U1 in the Cambridge Local Plan 2018 and policy 26 of that plan. Generally, I consider that the masterplan responds appropriately to the challenge of reconciling the aim of enabling viable and appropriate development on the site with the heritage constraints. Although

there is one part of the wider Mill Lane area, outside the present application site, where differences between the Masterplan Framework's aspirations and Council officers' views are still the subject of continuing discussion, I do not consider that these differences pose any risk to the coherence between the present proposal and any future developments on the block to the north. That part of the masterplan which addresses the present application site is an appropriate response to the site's constraints and opportunities, and the present application is fully in accordance with the masterplan framework.

8.12 The physical cost of the framework for development which is set out in the masterplan, however, is a substantial amount of demolition, a level markedly greater than envisaged in the 2010 Old Press/Mill Lane SPD. On the present application site, the masterplan and the present application propose the demolition of the Bailey Grundy Barrett building, the rear section of Millers Yard, the extension to 4 Mill Lane, the rearmost extension of Kenmare, the Emmanuel Church Hall, and 75 Trumpington Street, none of which were considered to be appropriate subjects for demolition in the 2010 SPD, as well as the Mill Lane Lecture Rooms, which were considered as possibly appropriate for demolition. I have set out in the next section why I consider that demolition of these buildings is acceptable.

8.13 The fact that a masterplan has been submitted with this application does not mean, and should not be taken to mean, that the Council supports every element of the Masterplan Framework as it applies to the remaining part of the masterplan site. If and when an application for the adjacent site to the north of Mill Lane (which is also within the SPD and Masterplan areas) comes forward, it will need to be considered in the context of any demolition which has already taken place and the cumulative impact of demolition on the significance of the conservation area.

Demolition

8.14 The application proposes significant demolition on the site: the Bailey Grundy Barrett building, the rear section of Millers Yard, the extension to 4 Mill Lane, the rearmost extension of Kenmare, the Emmanuel Church Hall, 75 Trumpington Street, and the Mill Lane Lecture Rooms. I assess these separately below.

Bailey Grundy Barrett Building

- 8.15 This low two-storey brick building, erected sometime between 1899 and 1903 as a warehouse for an electrical company, is not statutorily or locally listed. It is labelled in the conservation area appraisal as a positive building. It was extended and probably partly rebuilt in 1926. The Historic Environment Analysis carried out in 2008 in preparation for the Old Press / Mill Lane SPD 2010 classifies the building as of 'moderate' significance, and the applicants' Design and Access Statement makes the same assessment, except for the western extension, which it classifies as of 'low' significance.
- 8.16 The building was vacated by the electrical company in 1973 and later acquired by the University who used it as offices from 1998 to 2016. The building was altered internally in the late twentieth century: internal partitions and a spiral staircase were added. It is currently let as offices to a pharmacology company.
- 8.17 In my view, the demolition of the Baily Grundy Barrett building would cause some harm to the conservation area, but that harm would be less than substantial. (I do not consider that the demolition would have any impact on the setting of any of the nearby listed buildings.) I agree with the conservation officer that the building is representative of the area's commercial and industrial past. I also agree with the conservation officer that its relatively 'hidden' location does not mean that the significance of its contribution to the character of the conservation area should be downgraded.
- 8.18 However, I consider that the harm caused to the conservation area by its demolition would be limited. Although the building has interesting features, and a distinctive industrial quality, it is neither architecturally distinguished, nor particularly unusual. It has also been extensively altered. I accept the applicants' argument that it would be difficult to convert to a residential building, and also that its position means that its retention would very severely compromise the possibility of developing the wider site. In my view, the harm caused to the conservation area by the demolition of this building would be outweighed by the public benefit of providing a substantial quantity of additional post-graduate student accommodation in the centre of the city, and securing a viable and efficient use of this part of the site. In my view the harm would also be mitigated by the erection of a

well-designed replacement building, which I discuss later in this assessment.

Mill Lane Lecture Rooms

- 8.19 This building, designed in neo-Georgian style by Dunbar Smith and erected in the early 1930's, is not statutorily or locally listed. It is labelled in the conservation area as a positive building. The Historic Environment Analysis carried out in 2008 in preparation for the Old Press / Mill Lane SPD 2010 classifies the building as of 'moderate' significance, and the applicants' Design and Access Statement concurs with this judgement. The Old Press / Mill Lane SPD labels the building as having 'the potential for either development or substantial alteration'. The building, which remains in use for teaching by the University, retains much of its interior detail, although there have been a number of modifications.
- 8.20 I accept the applicants' submission that the building does not have any discernible archaeological significance. The architectural significance of the building lies mainly in three elements: its origins as the work of Dunbar Smith; its Neo-Georgian architectural vocabulary, especially the heavy reticulated plinth and the pedimented central doorway; and its strong presence in the street, forming a key part of the definition of that space. I do not consider any of these three elements as being of major importance. I accept that it is a plain and generally utilitarian building, less distinctive than other works from the Smith and Brewer practice, and its visual role in the street is one which could be replicated by a replacement. (I discuss this later in my assessment). Its Neo-Georgian proportions and detailing are characteristic of the era and are generally regarded as well-executed, but its high parapet and the scale of its lower two storeys cause it to read awkwardly against its immediate neighbours. The historical significance of the building lies in the way it represents part of the great wave of new buildings erected to serve the growth of the University in the first half of the twentieth century, but it does not have any particular connections to individuals, academic developments or discoveries.
- 8.21 In my view, the demolition of the Mill Lane Lecture Rooms would cause some harm to the conservation area, but that harm would be less than substantial. (I do not consider that the

demolition would have any impact on the setting of any of the nearby listed buildings.) I concur with the view of Historic England that the applicants have made a convincing case that the specialised design of the building would make conversion to retail uses or residential accommodation or a combination of the two, very difficult. I also agree with the advice of Historic England that the limited harm caused to the conservation area by the demolition of this building would be outweighed by the public benefit of providing a substantial quantity of additional post-graduate student accommodation in the centre of the city, and securing a viable and efficient use of this part of the site. In my view the harm would also be mitigated by the erection of a well-designed replacement building, which I discuss later in this assessment.

Millers' Yard

- 8.22 Millers' Yard has two conjoined components: a two-storey buff brick building with additional space within dormers in a mansard roof, which abuts the footway on the south side of Mill Lane, and three connected three-storey ranges to the south, which surround a courtyard which can be reached via two archways in the frontage building.
- 8.23 The Millers' Yard buildings are a Building of Local Interest, and the conservation area appraisal states that the frontage building contributes to the atmosphere of a historic commercial area. The appraisal also identifies the view into the western of the two archways as a key view. The Historic Environment Analysis carried out in 2008 in preparation for the Old Press / Mill Lane SPD 2010 places the building in the middle or 'significant' category. The applicants' Design and Access Statement, which subdivides the building into several components, retains the 'significant' grading for the older, eastern, section of the frontage building, but grades the rear courtyard section and the western part of the frontage as of 'moderate' significance, and the external galleries and stairwell in the courtyard as of 'low' significance.
- 8.24 The history of the building is difficult to establish from available evidence. It seems that the courtyard element predates the frontage building. There is no satisfactory evidence of any connection to the milling activities which took place on the riverside and elsewhere nearby. There is apparently

considerable nineteenth-century fabric in the three ranges surrounding the courtyard, although it is obscured by the late twentieth-century walkways of the courtyard elevations, and much of it is hidden under recent interior finishes. It appears that almost all of the fenestration is relatively modern. The frontage element contains a limited amount of nineteenth-century fabric, but most of the eastern part of the street elevation dates from 1903, and all of the western part from the 1980s.

8.25 Apart from the elements of nineteenth-century fabric, the significance of the Millers Yard buildings lies in:

- The reference to earlier commercial uses suggested by the street elevation
- The remnant of nineteenth-century courtyard form remaining in the configuration of the rear ranges
- The historical association with the Eaden Lilley department store

8.26 In my view, the demolition of the rear part of Millers Yard would cause some harm to the conservation area, but that harm would be less than substantial. Although the building is locally listed, I am of the view that its limited architectural interest has largely been obscured by modern alterations, and that its historical significance is largely limited to its layout. I acknowledge that the courtyard form is an interesting link to the area's industrial past, but the fact that the 1980's conversion of this building was successful for only a very limited period underlines the case that a successful further conversion of this building for viable purposes would be difficult. I also recognize that the position of this building, like that of the Bailey Grundy Barrett building, makes viable redevelopment of the wider site very difficult

8.27 In my view the limited harm caused to the conservation area by the demolition of this building would be outweighed by the public benefit of providing a substantial quantity of additional post-graduate student accommodation in the centre of the city, and securing a viable and efficient use of this part of the site. In my view the harm would also be mitigated by the erection of a well-designed replacement building, which I discuss later in this assessment.

75 Trumpington Street

- 8.28 This three-storey brick building dates from 1897. It was either newly built, or almost wholly rebuilt, at that date as a furniture warehouse. It is not statutorily or locally listed, and the conservation area appraisal is silent about its merits. The Historic Environment Analysis carried out in 2008 in preparation for the Old Press / Mill Lane SPD 2010 classifies the building as of 'high' significance, but this is because that analysis did not disaggregate the group of buildings around Kenmare into its separate parts, and made no detailed separate analysis of No.75. The applicants' Design and Access Statement marks it as being of 'low' significance.
- 8.29 The building was requisitioned as a meat store after the first world war and used as a café from 1925 until 1950. At that time the University converted the building into offices for its Estate Management and Building Service (EMBS) as part of the Kenmare group. The front door was eliminated at this point, access being created through Kenmare itself. No.75 remained in use by EMBS until 2017.
- 8.30 The building is not a designated heritage asset in its own right, but it is part of the conservation area, which is a designated heritage asset. In my view, the contribution which the building makes is limited, and arises largely from its single plot width, its role in the group of buildings between Mill Lane and the church, and the limited traces of its commercial past visible on the frontage. The significance of its contribution is eroded in my view by its much-altered ground-floor façade, which is neither congruent with the rest of the building or its neighbours, nor readily legible.
- 8.31 In my view, the demolition of 75 Trumpington Street would cause some harm to the conservation area, but that harm would be less than substantial. (Subject to appropriate replacement, I do not consider that the demolition would cause harm to the setting of any of the nearby listed buildings.) I consider that the harm caused to the conservation area by this demolition would be limited. It would be outweighed in my view by the public benefit of providing appropriate access to additional student accommodation and a performance space which would be used by the public as well as the College, and securing a viable and efficient use of this part of the site. In my view the harm would

also be mitigated by the erection of a well-designed replacement building, which I discuss later in this assessment.

Emmanuel Church Hall

- 8.32 The Church Hall or School Hall to the rear of the URC church runs at right angles to the church building. It was erected at the same time as the church (1874) and was designed by the same architect, James Cubitt, but is architecturally far more limited. It has been altered on a number of occasions since; these alterations included severing the original roof trusses and probably altering the whole roof profile. The building is a Building of Local Interest.
- 8.33 In my view the significance of this building lies chiefly in two features: its conception and design as part of the original church project by James Cubitt, and the role of its southern gable in closing the view along the entrance alleyway from Little St Mary's Lane. The proposed scheme would retain and de-clutter this southern gable, but demolish most of the remainder of the building, incorporating some of the fabric of the east and west walls into a new building which would form an adjunct to the foyer of the new performance space.
- 8.34 In my view, the demolition of the Church Hall would cause some harm to the conservation area, but that harm would be less than substantial. (The loss of most of the building would cause a very limited harm to the listed church, by depriving it of part of its original outbuilding, but in my view the enhancement given to the setting of the church by the completion of the proposed foyer buildings on the same site would more than outweigh this loss). I consider that the harm caused to the conservation area by this demolition would be limited. It would be outweighed in my view by the public benefit of providing appropriate access to a performance space which would be used by the public as well as the College, and securing a viable and efficient use of this part of the site.

Other buildings and extensions associated with Emmanuel Church

- 8.35 The scheme also proposes the demolition of the 1897 Schoolroom inserted in the angle between the church and the hall, and the 1990's corridor and narthex which link the

Schoolroom to the street. With the exception of the street elevation, none of these elements is visible from the public realm, or even from the interior of the application site in its present form. The Schoolroom is a simple building, which has been amended on a number of occasions, It is not of great architectural interest, and little of the original fabric is visible in the interior. The narthex has features distinctive to its late-twentieth-century origin, but its dark timber frame and glazing read uncomfortably against both its neighbours, and in my view it does not make a positive contribution to the conservation area. I do not consider that the demolition of these elements would cause any harm to the conservation area, and the elimination of the narthex would in my view enhance the setting of the listed URC church.

Rear addition to Kenmare

- 8.36 The application proposes the demolition of the small westernmost extension to Kenmare. This two-storey, gable-roofed extension was added to the building in 1906. It is not architecturally distinguished, and reads against the earlier Victorian single-storey rear extension slightly awkwardly. I concur with the applicants' assessment that it is a component of low significance. I do not consider that its demolition would cause any harm to the conservation area. Although it is technically part of the listed Kenmare building, it is my view that it detracts from rather than adding to the significance of the building as a whole, and its demolition would not cause harm to the listed building.

Extension to 4 Mill Lane

- 8.37 4 Mill Lane, built in 1886 to designs by W M Fawcett, and extended eastwards by the same architect in 1893, is not statutorily or locally listed. It is labelled in the conservation area as a positive building. The Historic Environment Analysis carried out in 2008 in preparation for the Old Press / Mill Lane SPD 2010 classifies the building as 'significant' (the middle of the five categories). The applicants' Design and Access Statement also counts the main building as significant, but notes the small flat-roofed extension to the south, added in 1939 (basement and ground floor) and 1946 (first floor), as being of 'low' significance.

8.38 It is the mid-twentieth century south extension to this building which is proposed for demolition. This section was designed by a different architect, and although it uses a similar brick and loosely emulates the fenestration of the original building, its flat roof reads oddly against the gables of the original, and it is of lower architectural quality. It has no special part in the historic interest of this building as the home of the Local Examinations Syndicate. I concur with the applicants' assessment that it is a component of low significance. I do not consider that its demolition would cause any harm to the conservation area. Although it is part of a building considered to be 'positive' in the conservation area, it is my view that it detracts from rather than adding to the quality of the building as a whole, and its demolition would not detract from the positive quality of the original building.

Summary

8.39 In my view, the demolitions proposed would cause some harm to the conservation area, although that harm would in no case be substantial, and in most cases would be very limited. I have given full consideration to the instruction in Paragraph 193 of the National Planning Policy Framework ('the Framework') that great weight should be given to the conservation of any designated heritage asset (which includes a conservation area), and the instruction in Paragraph 194 of the Framework that any harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset should require clear and convincing justification.

8.40 I consider that the benefit of securing a viable and efficient use of this site by the creation of a student residential court, which would be impossible without the demolition of the majority of the demolitions proposed, and the conversion of other buildings to College purposes, is a significant public benefit for these reasons:

- It ensures effective and appropriately intensive use of this parcel of land which is in a highly sustainable location
- It enables the further development of an institution which makes a significant contribution to the city's economy and culture
- It creates the opportunity for the adaptive reuse of retained buildings on the site (as required by policy 26), securing appropriate use, care and maintenance of a significant group

of buildings; a group which includes statutorily listed buildings, locally listed buildings and buildings considered to be 'positive' elements of the conservation area. It would thereby protect the significance of the conservation area and the individual buildings into the long-term future

- It achieves development in accordance with the designation of this site in the Cambridge Local Plan 2018.
- As I explain further in the next section, it enables development which is of high quality, and which would maintain and enhance the significance of the conservation area, and improve the setting of statutorily- and locally-listed buildings.

8.41 For these reasons, it is my view that all the demolition proposed in the application is acceptable, and in accordance with policies 26, 58, 61 and 62 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006, and government advice in paragraphs 192, 193, 194, 196, 197 and 200 of the Framework.

Context of site, design and external spaces (and impact on heritage assets)

Response to context

8.42 In my view the proposed new buildings respond in a positive and appropriate manner to their context.

Dolby Court

8.43 The scale and massing of the proposed new student residential buildings are appropriate to this location. The mixture of three-storey and two-storey form is respectful of the surrounding buildings, including Stuart House and the terraced houses in Little St Mary's Lane. In my view, the design, which closely emulates the traditional college courtyard, but uses crisp and distinctive detailing in a modern idiom, is successful. The proposed materials make an appropriate reference to the character of buildings elsewhere on the Pembroke site and would enhance the setting of Stuart House as the 'fourth side' of the court. The design incorporates a number of features which would add to the distinctiveness of the new courtyard, contribute incident to the townscape, and create an attractive and functionally successful space. These include the rooftop chimneys, the curved stairwell corners, the colonnade, and the

strongly articulated bays. The opportunity to create attractive landscaping is indicated. Conditions are necessary to ensure appropriate bricks, stone and external metal finishes, and to control the details of the proposed landscaping, including paving materials. I do not accept the view put forward in representations that the design quality of these buildings is insufficient.

Stuart House area

- 8.44 At present, the area in front of Stuart House confused in appearance, and cluttered, and functions poorly. The proposed relocation and extension of the railings and radically revised landscaping would considerably enhance the setting of Stuart House, improve the quality of this section of the street frontage, and create a space which would be attractive and function well as a secondary entrance to the site which could enable deliveries and taxi drop-offs.

Mill Lane elevation

- 8.45 The scale and proportions of the new frontage to Mill Lane between Millers Yard and the opening to Stuart House would be respectful of the existing buildings to the west and east. The proposed shop/café fronts are of an unobtrusive design, which would signal their function without interrupting the subtle profile and curve of the south side of Mill Lane. In my view, although the present Lecture Rooms building has a very distinctive character, and is of some architectural and historic interest, the proposed new buildings, which relate more sympathetically to the scale of the rest of the street and are in my view well-detailed would enhance the street scene and the appearance of this part of the conservation area.
- 8.46 In my view, the retention of the Millers Yard frontage building is also a positive feature of the scheme. Although this building has existed for less than 40 years in its present form, and its apparent role in the architectural history of the street is therefore something of an illusion, it does contain a fragment of the built form of the area's commercial past, and contributes to that element of the street's distinctive character. I note the concern expressed in representations about the dormers on the proposed third storey, but in my view, this roof extension, although not wholly congruent with the lower storeys, is an

improvement on the present form, and given its low prominence at street level, would not cause any discernible harm to the conservation area.

Trumpington Street

8.47 The proposed new gatehouse is respectful of its context in scale, detailing and materials. It would successfully replicate the closure to the south side of the Kenmare forecourt provided by the existing building, and it would act as a balanced partner for the retained building at No.76. It would be a clearly legible entrance to the proposed new section of the Pembroke College campus, but it would do this without creating an aggressive visual statement on the Trumpington Street frontage. The ground floor of the existing building on this site is an anomalous feature, which does not make a positive contribution to the conservation area; by comparison the new gatehouse would enhance this section of the street frontage.

8.48 The proposed new foyer area to the rear of the gatehouse and north of the church building is a simple and elegant design which would create a satisfying enclosure to the south side of the proposed Kenmare garden space, and lead the eye towards Stuart House. It would contrast with the existing buildings in a positive manner. In my view it would function very effectively as a part of the proposed performance space.

Movement and Access

8.49 The decision to create a new entrance to the application site on Trumpington Street facing the existing Pembroke site is a sound one. The two areas would thus be visually and functionally linked, and the existence and role of the application site as an extension to the Pembroke campus would be highly legible.

8.50 The safe and efficient functioning of the new site, which would generate a very large number of pedestrian movements across Trumpington Street, depends on the creation of a satisfactory route for pedestrians to make the crossing. A signalised crossing here would have a negative impact on the conservation area and the setting of listed buildings on both sides of the street, so an informal crossing is a preferable solution.

- 8.51 I agree with third party comments and the highway authority's advice that the original design for this crossing might have led to an increase in vehicle speeds and would not have been conducive to highway safety. The revised proposal seeks to address these concerns by eliminating the resemblance to a zebra crossing, avoiding granite setts on the crossing surface, dispensing with the median strip, and narrowing the carriageway at the crossing point.
- 8.52 The highway authority continues to have concerns about the crossing, despite this revision. The four principal areas of concern are the absence of the necessary safety audit, lack of clarity about materials, the unacceptability of transverse lines across the carriageway, and the shape of the build-out to narrow the carriageway. In my view, these concerns are all justified, but can all be addressed by conditions which require:
- The completion of the necessary audit and the satisfactory addressing of any issues which it reveals
 - The submission of a further revision to the crossing design which resolves the issues raised about materials and layout
 - The implementation of an approved revised crossing design before any occupation of the proposed student accommodation.
- 8.53 It is my view that the principle of a new highway crossing is acceptable, and I have confidence that an acceptable revised design which will meet the concerns of the highway authority, the conservation team and the drainage officer can be arrived at. In these circumstances, I do not consider the shortcomings of the present crossing proposal to be a reason for refusal, but I do recommend the conditions I have referred to in the previous paragraph.
- 8.54 The conservation officer, the sustainable drainage officer, and the Conduit Trustees are all critical of the revised proposal, because the proposed taxi drop-off points associated with it involve excessive covering over of Hobson's Conduit, which would be harmful to the listed conduit and the character of the conservation area, and make maintenance of the conduit more difficult. I concur with this view. Taxi access can be achieved elsewhere on both the existing and proposed new Pembroke sites, and I do not consider that drop-off points on Trumpington Street are necessary. This issue can in my view be resolved by

the condition requiring a redesign of the crossing which I refer to in paragraph 8.52, and via the separate listed building consent which would be required for any works on the Conduit. This condition (and the listed building application) will also address the Conduit Trustees' concerns about the design of proposed Conduit covers and the impact of new kerbs, both of which I share.

- 8.55 The cycling officer is also critical of the revised proposal, which she considers to be less acceptable than the original. This is a problematic area, because the solution favoured by the cycling officer (a formalised crossing) is incompatible with the advice of the conservation and urban design teams, who both consider that solution to be unacceptably harmful to the significance of the conservation area, a view which I share.
- 8.56 In this particular situation, it is my view that the preferences (but not the safety) of cyclists must be considered a lower priority than pedestrian safety and the character of the conservation area. Restricting the width of the carriageway at this point will be unwelcome to cyclists, but the highway authority considers that it would enhance highway safety, by reducing speeds, which would improve pedestrian safety. I consider it to be the preferable solution, but the revised design of the crossing necessary to meet the condition I have recommended will need to satisfy the highway authority that cyclist safety is adequately protected.
- 8.57 The retention of routes into the proposed new College site from Mill Lane in front of Stuart House, from Little St Mary's Lane through a pedestrian passage, and from Mill Lane through one of the Millers Yard archways is welcome, as is the College commitment to keep the Trumpington Street, Stuart House and south block passage entrances open to the public during the day most of the time, as the entrances on the main College site are. This would retain a degree of the permeability which exists on the site at present.
- 8.58 The application demonstrates a presumption in favour of walking and cycling and reduces the amount of vehicle parking space on the site

Open Space and Landscape

- 8.59 The three open spaces proposed in the scheme are well-proportioned and are linked in a way which would make them visually attractive and functionally successful. The decluttering of the space in front of Stuart House would enhance its setting, and the opening up of a 'Kenmare garden' space to the rear of the gatehouse would create interesting views to and from Trumpington Street, enable a new focus on the east side of Stuart House, and permit a number of the Trumpington Street buildings to be seen from a new angle. The space would also link well with the proposed new foyer alongside the performance space in the existing church.
- 8.60 The landscaping proposals would create an attractive environment, but in my view they have two significant defects. They do not take the opportunities available to manage surface water in a sustainable way, and they do not include sufficiently large-scale trees to replace those lost in Little St Mary's Lane and Millers Yard. In my view, a condition is necessary to ensure that a more sustainable set of landscaping proposals is submitted for these important spaces.
- 8.61 In my opinion the proposal is compliant in design terms with Cambridge Local Plan (2018) policies 55, 56, 57, 58, and 59.

Public Art

- 8.62 The Planning Statement submitted with the application indicates an expectation that all or some of the following elements will make up a contribution to public art by this development: sculpture in the new Kenmare Garden, new arts infrastructure in the form of a new gallery and a new performance space, new gates to Stuart House, new gratings to Hobson's Conduit, and new lighting within the development.
- 8.63 The Planning Statement asserts that the College is committed to the provision of public art, and its identification early on in the proposals. The Statement also expresses a commitment that the public art to be provided will be accessible; will be embedded into the design proposals and will help the scheme enhance the area's distinctive identity. I am concerned that the proposals for this site have reached planning application stage without more substantial progress along the public art route set

out in the Council's SPD, and I do not consider that all the suggestions made in the Planning Statement would readily fulfil the requirements of the SPD.

8.64 However, I do not doubt the applicants' commitment to public art, and I acknowledge that several of the items identified on the applicants' list could become elements of an appropriate public art contribution. At this stage, I would have hoped to see more progress towards realisation of a public art contribution on the site, but this is not a reason to refuse the application; the application documents demonstrate both the intention and the capacity of the proposal to provide public art. In my view, a condition to secure a Public Art Strategy and its implementation should be worded in such a way as to accelerate the process.

8.65 Subject to such a condition, which I recommend, the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2018) policy 56 and the Public Art SPD 2010

Carbon reduction and sustainable design

8.66 The proposal includes a number of significant measures to improve sustainability and reduce carbon emissions, including:

- Meeting BREEAM 'excellent' standard in the proposed Dolby Court buildings
- Glazing, lighting, and ventilation improvements in retained buildings, together with connection to a site-wide heating and cooling network
- Using air-source heat pumps and photovoltaic panels to reduce carbon emissions by 30% compared to baseline
- Deep window reveals
- Natural ventilation
- High thermal mass

8.67 I concur with the sustainability officer that these are all positive aspects of the scheme. The sustainability officer also advises that the original proposals do not include sufficient measures on water efficiency, and requests a condition to ensure this aspect of the scheme is improved. I concur with this and recommend the suggested condition, along with the other conditions she advises, to secure achievement of BREEAM criteria and the implementation and maintenance of the proposed renewable

energy technologies

- 8.68 In my opinion, subject to conditions, the applicants have suitably addressed the issues of sustainability and renewable energy and the proposal is in accordance with Cambridge Local Plan (2018) policies 28, 29 and 3, and the Sustainable Design and Construction SPD 2007.

Light pollution, air quality, noise, vibration, odour and dust

- 8.69 I note the advice of the environmental health team that the implications of the scheme for air quality, noise, vibration, odour and dust are acceptable, subject to a number of conditions. I accept this advice and recommend such conditions. I also note the environmental health officer's concerns about the impact of noise from external plant at the University Centre on occupiers of rooms on the west side of the west block of Dolby Court. This issue can be resolved by a condition requiring sealed windows in these rooms, but a preferable solution would be to secure mitigation of the plant noise at the University Centre via a clause in a Section 106 agreement.
- 8.70 In my opinion, subject to the conditions I have recommended, the applicants have suitably addressed the issues of air quality, noise, vibration, odour and dust, and the proposal is in accordance with Cambridge Local Plan (2018) policies 34, 35, 36.

Inclusive access

- 8.71 The scheme would create more accessible rooms for the college. The creation of the proposed gatehouse and foyer would improve the accessibility of the site. I agree with the panel's view that a satisfactory crossing is a key requirement for the safety of both disabled and non-disabled users of the site, and I am confident that the essential design of the revised crossing scheme provides this. I concur with the view of Disability Panel that the scheme as a whole is positive in terms of disabled access
- 8.72 In my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2018) policies 56 and 57.

Fire safety

- 8.73 I note that the Fire and Rescue Service are satisfied with the application, and do not consider that additional fire hydrants are required. I also note their concern that all existing hydrants be retained, kept in good condition and kept available both during and after development. I recommend a condition accordingly.
- 8.74 In my opinion the proposal is compliant in terms of fire safety with Cambridge Local Plan (2018) policies 56 and 57.

Residential Amenity

- 8.75 There is a row of houses the curtilages of which directly abut the southern boundary of the application site. These houses, Nos. 1-14 Little St Mary's Lane, are the only residential properties adjacent to the application site, and currently the only residential accommodation in the quadrilateral area enclosed by Silver Street, Trumpington Street, Little St Mary's Lane, and the river. The majority of these curtilages are separated from the application site by an existing brick wall, which is 2m high to the rear of No.11, rises to 2.5m high behind No. 10 and part of No.9, and then steps sharply up to be 5m high along the common boundary between the application site and the curtilages of Nos. 1-8. These houses all have very small rear yards, which are all differently configured. Typically they measure 2m x 2m or 2m x 2.5m, but some are smaller. No.12 and No.13/14 do not have any rear yard; the building abuts the application site directly.
- 8.76 There is some variation between these houses in terms of scale, footprint and fenestration. The impact of the proposed development on these houses will vary considerably, determined by these characteristics, and the precise relationship between each of the houses and the proposed new buildings.
- 8.77 Nos. 1-6 Little St Mary's Lane back on to Stuart House and the space around that building. The proposed development would not alter the mass or exterior of Stuart House, and would not insert any building or structure into the existing space which surrounds it to the south. There would therefore be no significant change to the relationship between these houses and the buildings adjacent to them.

- 8.78 Nos. 8-11 Little St Mary's Lane currently back on to the rear elevation of the Mill Lane Lecture Rooms building, and No.7 backs on to the space immediately to the east of that building. Under the proposals, the Lecture Rooms would be demolished, and the curtilages of Nos 8-11 would abut directly the south elevation of the south block of student accommodation. This block would also extend part-way along the rear boundary of No.7.
- 8.79 No.12 and No.13/14 currently back on to the Bailey Grundy Barratt building, across the driveway/parking space attached to that building. Under the proposals, No 11 would back on to the south block of Dolby Court, at a distance of 2.5m, and No. 12/13 would back on to the link between the south and west blocks and part of the south elevation of the west block, at a distance of 3.5m.

Sunlight

- 8.80 The proposed development lies to the north of the adjacent residential neighbours, and consequently, it is clear that the impact on sunlight is likely to be very limited. The applicants have submitted sunlight assessment data for all the windows in Nos. 7-12 Little St Mary's Lane which are not at an angle more than 90° from due south (These are all WSW-facing side windows). There are seven such windows: one in No.12, two in No.11, and four in No.9. Sunlight to three of these windows would not be affected by the proposed development at all. The windows which would be affected (living room and bedroom at No.11, and two bedrooms at No.9) would experience a reduction in summer sunlight of 19%, 15%, 13% and 4% respectively. There would be no reduction in winter hours.
- 8.81 BRE guidelines on protecting sunlight to the windows of existing dwellings (which are normally only applied to principal living rooms) suggest that a reduction in sunlight is acceptable if that window retains 80% of its previous level. All four of these windows would retain 80% of their existing level. I do not consider that there would be any unacceptable impact on sunlight to neighbouring occupiers.

Daylight

- 8.82 BRE guidelines on daylight to habitable rooms affected by development uses the measure Visible Sky Component (VSC). The guidelines suggest that where the VSC to a window is at 27% or more (the maximum possible is 40%), then daylight levels are acceptable. The guidelines also suggest that reductions below this level should be kept to a minimum, but reductions are only likely to be noticeable if the VSC after the development would be less than 80% of the VSC in the existing situation.
- 8.83 The application provides VSC data for all the 37 rear windows in Nos 6-13 Little St Mary's Lane. Because of the small yards, the proximity of the high boundary wall, and the position of the existing surrounding buildings, the existing VSC levels to these windows are low. Only six of the 37 windows have an existing VSC of 27% or more. Of the 37 windows, there are only three which would experience a reduction in VSC of more than 20%. They are all at No.13/14. Two ground-floor rooms would experience a 22% and 30% reduction in VSC, although the second of these has a second window, which would experience a very much smaller reduction in VSC. The westernmost of the first-floor bedrooms at No.12/13 would experience a 40% reduction in VSC, because of the height of the west block of Dolby Court in comparison with the existing buildings.
- 8.84 These reductions at No.13/14 exceed the BRE guidelines. I do not, however, consider that in any of these three cases, the reduction is unacceptable. The 22% reduction is only marginally in excess of the guideline. The 30% reduction is to a window serving a room which has an additional source of daylight. The 40% reduction is to a window serving a bedroom, not a living room. This would make the room noticeably less light, but in a context where the constrained urban environment already limits light to many surrounding rooms, including this one, I do not consider this reduction to be unacceptable. The BRE Guidelines indicate that a degree of flexibility should be used in interpreting the thresholds in any particular context, and that in highly built-up city-centre contexts, a lower level of daylight might be expected than in a more open suburban context.
- 8.85 In contrast, eighteen of the windows, including five of the seven at No.12, both of the first-floor windows at No.10, four of the

seven at No.9, two of the three at No.8 and all four rear windows at No.6, would experience an improved VSC (i.e. more daylight)

Enclosure/loss of outlook

- 8.86 It is not possible to use a numerical measure to judge the extent to which neighbours might experience an unacceptable degree of enclosure; it depends not only on the height and extent of proposed new buildings, but also on their proximity and on the existing context. All of the neighbouring houses experience a very strong sense of enclosure to the rear at present, because of the small size of their yards, the height of the rear boundary wall, and the size and position of the existing buildings on the application site, especially the Mill Lane Lecture Rooms, which are 19m high at the apex of the south gable and 16m high at the 'shoulders' on either side.
- 8.87 In my view, the only houses where the limited existing outlook is likely to be further restricted are those where the new south block would be sited directly against the common boundary between their curtilage and the application site (Nos. 8, 9, 10 and 11) and the western windows in No.13/14. The impact is likely to be greater at No.8 and No.11 than at Nos. 9 and 10, because the latter two houses are aligned with the highest point of the existing Mill Lane Lecture Rooms. The proposed new building, although much closer to windows in these houses, is also much less high; the angle above the horizontal at a rear ground-floor window of a line of sight to the apex of the Mill Lane Lecture rooms would be greater than the angle of a line of sight to the roof ridge of the proposed south block. Occupiers at No.13/14 already experience a considerable sense of enclosure from the proximity and bulk of the University Centre. Although views out of the western windows of No.13/14 would feel more enclosed if the proposal were implemented than they do at present, the eastern windows in this house would be much less affected.
- 8.88 In my view, occupiers of Nos. 8-11 and No.13/14 Little St Mary's Lane would experience an increased sense of enclosure, those at Nos. 8, 11, and 13/14 more than those in Nos. 9 and 10. In what is already a very tightly constrained and enclosed context however, where all occupiers have limited

outlook, I do not consider the degree of this increased enclosure to be so severe as to merit refusal of the application.

- 8.89 Some representations refer to the loss of views to particular buildings or elements of roofscape. The views available from most of the rear house windows in Little St Mary's Lane would be altered in some way by the proposal. There is no entitlement to retain a particular view however, and changes to views cannot be a reason for refusal of the application.

Overlooking

- 8.90 All of the proposed windows which face towards the neighbouring properties would be obscure-glazed and fixed shut (except for maintenance purposes). I do not consider that there would be any impact on the privacy of neighbouring occupiers.

Noise and disturbance

- 8.91 Representations are concerned about noise from two main sources: noisy student activities in the south block, and increased pedestrian and cycle traffic in the Lane. I do not consider the second of these to be well-founded. At present, the access point between Nos. 11 and 12 Little St Mary's Lane is open all the time, and provides a route for students and staff coming from the south to cycle parking areas, the University Careers Service, and the heavily-used Mill Lane Lecture Rooms. Were the development to go ahead, this access would only be open during the day, and would probably be by far the least-used of the three potential routes into the College residential court (although those 'in the know' could use it as a through route). In my view it is likely that the change would result in a reduction in pedestrian and cycle traffic in the Lane, rather than an increase.
- 8.92 As far as student activity noise is concerned, I accept that such noise could be generated in the south block, because it cannot be assumed that graduate students will automatically be quieter and more considerate than undergraduates. However, there are only six student rooms on each floor in this block, and the windows facing neighbouring houses will not be openable. In my view, the likelihood of unacceptable noise from these rooms causing loss of residential amenity to neighbours is limited. In

addition, as this block would be an integral part of the College site, it would be much easier for the College to monitor and control noise than it is at present in the Little St Mary's Lane houses, such as No.5, which are in use as College accommodation, and have apparently given rise to neighbour amenity issues in the recent past. I do not consider that the proposed development is likely to lead to an loss of amenity to neighbours through noise.

- 8.93 Representations also express concern that the entrance passageway from Little St Mary's Lane to the courtyard would attract smokers, people abusing drugs and alcohol, and rough sleepers. In my view, the opening between Nos. 11 and 12 would be less likely to attract anti-social behaviour after the development than it is now, as there would be a modest increase in the degree of natural surveillance. The College is not intending to leave the covered passageway open at night, so it would not be available to rough sleepers

Artificial light

- 8.94 Representations have raised concerns that the spillage of light from lighted windows in the south elevation of the south block would produce unacceptable glare. I do not consider this to be likely. Nos. 9, 10, and 11 Little St Mary's Lane would each have a first-floor student room window facing towards their windows. However, these windows would be obscure-glazed, which would diminish the glare. They would also be narrow windows (600mm wide), with deep reveals (500mm), which would further limit the emission of light. In my view the occupiers of these rooms would be very likely to close the blinds during the hours of darkness.

- 8.95 The stairwell windows, of which there would be four, are smaller still, with the same deep reveals. The level of lighting in the spaces within these windows would be less intense. I do not consider that the light from any of these windows is likely to result in a significant loss of amenity to neighbours.

Odours

- 8.96 There would be kitchens on the ground floor of the south block of Dolby Court, but these would be of a domestic type, not generating high levels of odour. I am satisfied that the condition

on ventilation and extraction which I have recommended is sufficient to ensure no loss of amenity to neighbours through odours.

- 8.97 One representation suggests that the proximity of the Dolby Court south block to the hoses to the rear would mean that existing kitchen equipment in those house could not be used, or would be subject to limitation. I do not consider this likely. The environmental health team have not raised concerns, and there would be no openable windows in the south elevation of the south block which could be affected by odours from existing extracts.

Problems arising from the very narrow space between the south elevation of the Dolby Court south block and the existing high boundary wall

- 8.98 This space, 21m long, would be approximately 150mm wide along the western half of its length, and at the eastern end would be divided by brick piers into three bays, which would be up to 600mm wide. I accept that this space would accumulate litter and tree debris. I would not expect it to accumulate significant food waste, however, and I do not consider it to be particularly attractive to rats. Any issues resulting from accumulations in this space would be likely to affect the College much more than neighbouring residents, and it would have a strong incentive to resolve them. I do not consider that this aspect of the development is likely to be harmful to neighbour amenity

Informal arrangements

- 8.99 Representations have pointed to informal arrangements which apparently exist at present, allowing residents in Little St Mary's Lane to:
- use University cycle parking
 - use University land off the Lane for contractors utility engineers and delivery drivers to park
 - use the land behind Stuart House to accommodate a cherry-picker for roof maintenance
 - bring bulky goods and appliances into houses over the rear boundary wall

8.100 The representations also indicate that residents walk through the application site as an access route, and that churchgoers at Little St Mary's are able to park on the application site at present.

8.101 I recognize that the loss of these arrangements would be inconvenient for residents and in some cases seriously problematic, but none of these arrangements is an entitlement; they could all be terminated at any point, regardless of this planning application, and their loss cannot be a reason to refuse the application nor to attach conditions to any permission.

Construction activities

8.102 I accept that construction activities would cause noise and disturbance for neighbours. This is unavoidable in almost any construction project, no matter what its size. The impact of construction can be mitigated however, by conditions to control working hours, the hours of deliveries and collections, construction noise levels, piling, and dust. I recommend such conditions. I do not accept the argument made in representations that it would not be possible to enforce these conditions, because they have been successfully enforced in many instances in the past. In my view, conditions are sufficient to ensure that the inevitable adverse impact of construction on neighbours is not at an unacceptable level.

8.103 Any damage to property caused by construction would be a civil matter between the applicants and other property owners. I note that representations urge the speedy carrying out of any works, and I recognize the benefit of this, but planning control does not enable the planning authority to impose a timescale on applicants, other than the deadline for commencement

8.104 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 (2018) policies 35, 55 and 56.

Amenity for future occupiers of the site

8.105 The proposed student rooms would be arranged around an open space and would be easily accessed. Rooms overlooking the courtyard would have a particularly attractive outlook, but

those overlooking Mill Lane would have interesting street views. The rooms on the west side of the west block, which would face out over the cycle storage towards the University Centre would have a less advantageous aspect, but I do not consider that they would have levels of daylight or enclosure which would be unacceptable.

8.106 I note that the environmental health team do not have concerns about the amenity of any future occupiers except for those in the west-facing rooms opposite the University Centre. These rooms would have mechanical ventilation, which would enable them to keep windows closed, but if they elected to open their windows, they might be subject to unacceptable levels of noise from plant at the rear of the University Centre. The environmental health officer has recommended a condition to require the windows to be sealed, to avoid this possibility, which might otherwise compel the local authority to take action to force the University Centre to limit its commercial activities.

8.107 I am reluctant to recommend the imposition of this condition, because it would deprive all future occupiers of these rooms of access to fresh air, and would increase the use of mechanical ventilation. A legal agreement which secured mitigation of the existing plant noise would be preferable for this reason, but if it cannot be achieved, then the condition recommended by the environmental health team will be necessary.

8.108 In my opinion, subject to conditions, the proposal provides a high-quality (and accessible) 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 (2018) policy 46.

Integrated water management and flood risk

8.109 The sustainable drainage officer's initial advice was that the scheme relied on traditional underground attenuation, using methods which fail to provide any water quality, biodiversity or amenity benefits. The officer indicated that the submitted Drainage Feasibility Study (DFS) failed to incorporate sufficient sustainable drainage measures to be in accordance with policy. This advice was echoed by the drainage officer at the Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA), Cambridgeshire County Council. A first revision to the DFS was submitted, but neither drainage

officer considered that the issues of concern had been resolved. Negotiations between the applicants' drainage team and the sustainable drainage officer are continuing, and I anticipate that additional measures will be brought forward before the date of Committee which will address the concerns of the sustainable drainage officer and the LLFA. I will report these measures and the drainage officers' advice on them on the amendment sheet or at the Committee meeting

- 8.110 At present the applicants have not suitably addressed the issues of water management and flood risk, but I anticipate that they may be able to do so by bringing forward additional drainage measures. Subject to such measures being provided in a manner satisfactory to the sustainable drainage officer and the LLFA, I am of the view that the proposal will be in accordance with Cambridge Local Plan (2018) policies 31 and 32.

Refuse Arrangements

- 8.111 The Shared Waste service are content with the application proposal but have raised some concerns about the exact configuration of bins. They have also alerted the applicants to the possibility that the residential element of the proposal might require supplementary collections, which would incur a cost. I recommend a condition to ensure that their concern is resolved, and an informative to relay the issue about extra collections to the applicants.

- 8.112 In my opinion, subject to condition, the proposal is compliant in respect of waste storage and collection with Cambridge Local Plan (2018) policy 57.

Highway Safety

- 8.113 The increase in pedestrian movements across Trumpington Street generated by this proposal makes it essential that a safer route for pedestrians is created. I concur with the urban design and conservation officers that to install a formalised zebra or light-controlled crossing here would cause significant harm to the conservation area. It is also very close to the existing light-controlled crossing outside the Pitt Building. The highway authority, the cycling officer and a number of respondents criticised the original proposal submitted for a crossing in front

of Kenmare both because of the confusion it would cause by giving the crossing an ambiguous appearance which might have misled pedestrians into treating it as a zebra, and also because the proposed median strip might have induced an increase in vehicle speeds rather than the opposite. I accept this advice. The applicants have submitted a revised proposal, in which the crossing is clearly not marked like a zebra, the median strip is eliminated and the carriageway is narrowed. The highway authority remains concerned about the revised proposal, as does the cycling officer. I share this view. I have indicated in my discussion of context and design in paragraphs 8.50-8.56 above why I consider that the remaining highway safety concerns can be addressed by conditions.

- 8.114 The proposed crossing needs to be secured by a Section 106 agreement and a Section 278 Agreement. In my opinion, subject to these, the proposal is compliant in highway safety terms with Cambridge Local Plan (2018) policy 81.

Car and Cycle Parking

- 8.115 The application proposal would reduce the number of car parking spaces available on site, leaving four disabled spaces. The proposal includes five rooms suitable for occupation by disabled users, and the level of disabled car parking is therefore technically in conflict with policy 82 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006. In my view, however, this is acceptable. Policy 46 does not require a specific proportion of disabled-occupation rooms in student accommodation, so the applicants could bring the application into accordance with policy 82 by reducing the number of rooms of this type to four. That outcome would be perverse; it is clearly preferable to retain the additional disabled-occupation room in the scheme. Disability panel do not criticise the scheme on these grounds, and in addition I accept the applicants' submission that not all disabled students require the use of a car.

- 8.116 The reduction in car parking space overall is in accordance with policy and the principles of sustainability.

- 8.117 In my opinion, although the proposal is not technically compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2018) policy 82 in terms of car parking, it is in accordance with the aspirations of that policy and should be considered effectively compliant.

8.118 The application proposes 136 cycle parking spaces. The City Council's cycle parking standards require one cycle parking space for every two bedspaces in student accommodation. 94 student rooms would therefore require 47 cycle parking spaces. Given that the development proposal eliminates the Mill Lane Lecture Rooms, which are currently a major inward destination for cycle journeys, and changes the use of Stuart House from a University-wide service to a College social and study area this reducing the likely number of cycle journeys towards it, it is my view that the cycle parking provision in the application is well above the level which policy would require, even allowing for people working in the proposed College administrative spaces. I do not accept the view of the cycling officer and County Transport that additional visitor parking spaces should be provided. I do share the concern of those consultees about the proportion of cycle parking space which would not be under cover, and I recommend a condition on cycle parking spaces to ensure that the proportion of covered spaces is increased.

8.119 Subject to such a condition, I am of the view that the proposal is compliant with policy 82 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2018 in terms of cycle parking.

Trees

8.120 The proposal involves the removal of three existing mature trees, one in the Millers Yard courtyard, and two in Little St Mary's Lane. The latter two trees have been discussed at length in pre-application meetings. I am satisfied that, because of UK Power Network requirements, it would be very difficult to provide the substation necessary for this development in a position which did not require the removal of trees.

8.121 I would have welcomed advice from the arboricultural officer on this application, but it has not been given. I concur with the landscape officer that the three existing trees in Little St Mary's Lane are of moderate amenity value, but in my view, the retention of the best of these three trees as proposed in the application would ensure that the harm to the conservation area is only limited; the glimpse of green in views up and down the Lane, and the shade, which the trees provide, would be retained, albeit reduced from their present extent. I concur with the landscape officer that the removal of three substantial trees calls for mitigation by the planting of trees of a mature scale

greater than those shown in the submitted proposals. The landscaping condition which I recommend enables such planting to be secured.

Archaeology

8.122 The advice of the county archaeology team is that there are likely to be significant archaeological remains on the site and that a condition to investigate this is necessary. I recommend such a condition.

Third Party Representations

8.123 I have addressed almost all the issues raised in representations in the paragraphs indicated below. In the cases where I have not, I indicate the reason in the table below

Amenity issues	
Overlooking	8.90
Overshadowing	8.80-8.81
Loss of daylight	8.82-8.85
Visual domination and sense of enclosure	8.86-8.89
Impact of lighted rooms at night	8.94-8.95
Views obscured	8.89
Noise from student activity (exacerbation of existing issue)	8.92
Disturbance and noise	8.91
Need to ensure weekends are quiet	8.102
Need to ensure phasing of development is adhered to	8.104
Difficulty of enforcing time restrictions on construction	8.102
Odours from extracts	8.96
Closeness of existing flue to proposed buildings would restrict existing residents' use of cooking facilities	8.97
Loss of informal agreement for 'cherry-picker' access for roof maintenance	8.99/8.101
Loss of opportunity to bring bulky items over the rear wall	8.99/8.101
Loss of informal agreement for parking contractors and utility service vehicles	8.99/8.101
Loss of access route through the site	8.100

Loss of informal agreement allowing use of University cycle parking	8.99/8.101
Unclear how access rights would be protected	8.100
Loss of opportunity to use route over boundary wall for emergency rescue and evacuation	8.73
Narrow gap between boundary wall and South block would harbour rubbish	8.98
Gap would harbour vermin	8.98
Gap would make wall maintenance impossible	8.98
Access point from Little St Mary's Lane might be used for smoking, drug abuse or rough sleeping	8.93
Loss of tranquillity in lane	8.91
Increased intrusion from greater pedestrian flows	8.91
Increased vehicle traffic and congestion in Little St Mary's Lane	8.91
Loss of informal Parking agreement for Little St Mary's church	8.100
Damage to boundary wall	8.104
Design and heritage issues	
Out of proportion	8.43
Design quality of Dolby Court not high enough	8.43
Questions about justification for demolition of 75 Trumpington Street	8.28-8.31
Insufficient cycle parking	8.118
Excessive taxi drop-off areas	8.54
Design of Conduit bridging covers	8.54
Impact of new kerbs on Conduit	8.54
Highways issues	
Proposed new crossing is not safe because it is not a formal 'zebra'	8.51-8.53 and 8.56
Proposed medial granite strip would increase vehicle speeds	8.51-8.53 and 8.56
No improvement to junction at Pembroke St/Trumpington Street	8.51-8.53 and 8.56
Other issues	
Damage to listed buildings	Addressed in report on 18/1931LBC
No finalised Masterplan	8.11

Planning Obligations (s106 Agreement)

8.124 The Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Regulations 2010 have introduced the requirement for all local authorities to make an assessment of any planning obligation in relation to three tests. Each planning obligation needs to pass three statutory tests to make sure that it 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.

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

8.125 In line with the CIL Regulations, councils can pool no more than five S106 contributions towards the same project. The new 'pooling' restrictions were introduced from 6 April 2015 and relate to new S106 agreements. This means that all contributions now agreed by the city council must be for specific projects at particular locations, as opposed to generic infrastructure types within the city of Cambridge.

City Council Infrastructure (Open space and sports facilities)

8.126 The Developer Contribution Monitoring team has confirmed that the College provides sufficient open space and sports facilities for its students and that therefore no contributions for this purpose are required.

Public Realm

8.127 Because of the increased activity and movements which will result from the proposed new uses on the site, the development would have an impact on the public realm. Improvements to the public realm are therefore required in order to mitigate this impact. The improvements required are as follows.

1. Works to the highway in Trumpington Street to reduce traffic speeds, create a safe route for pedestrians between the

main Pembroke site and the proposed new gatehouse, and enhance the appearance of the conservation area.

2. New street lighting attached to proposed new and retained buildings in Mill Lane, to eliminate 'dark spots' in the Lane, and create a less cluttered highway surface.
3. Improvements to the footway/carriageway in Mill Lane to make the Lane more accessible and safer for pedestrians and cyclists.

8.128 The applicants have agreed that these elements should be included in a Section 106 Agreement. The agreement would require items 1 and 2 above to be completed in connection with the present application scheme. It would not be appropriate for the works in item 3 above to be carried out in connection with the present proposal, because the demolition and construction works which are likely to occur if a development scheme for the site on the north side of Mill Lane is brought forward in the near future, would cause damage to the highway.

8.129 The agreement would require the works in item 3 above to be carried out after and in connection with a development scheme on the north side of Mill Lane, but must also include a fallback provision, so that if such a scheme is not brought forward within a reasonable time, the works are carried out anyway.

8.130 In my view, subject to the completion of an agreement as indicated above, appropriate mitigation of the impact of the development will be achieved. All of these works will also require the completion of a Section 278 Agreement with the highway authority. The works in item 1 above will also require listed building consent, because they will involve intervention in the fabric of the Grade II listed Hobson's Conduit.

Planning Obligations Conclusion

8.131 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 proposal integrates well-designed new buildings with the sensitive adaptation and alteration of existing buildings on the site. The intensity of use is appropriate to the context, and the proposal is in accordance with the site-specific policy, 26, in the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 and with the Old Press/ Mill Lane SPD 2010. The proposal would enhance the conservation area and improve the setting of the listed buildings within it.

10.0 RECOMMENDATIONS

- 10.1 **APPROVE** subject to completion of the s106 Agreement 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 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended by 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. Submission of Preliminary Contamination Assessment:

Prior to the commencement of the development (or phase of) or investigations required to assess the contamination of the site, the following information shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority:

- (a) Desk study to include:
 - Detailed history of the site uses and surrounding area (including any use of radioactive materials)
 - General environmental setting.

- Site investigation strategy based on the information identified in the desk study.
- (b) A report setting out what works/clearance of the site (if any) is required in order to effectively carry out site investigations.

Reason: To adequately categorise the site prior to the design of an appropriate investigation strategy in the interests of environmental and public safety in accordance with Cambridge Local Plan 2018 Policy 33.

4. Submission of site investigation report and remediation strategy:

Prior to the commencement of the development (or phase of) with the exception of works agreed under condition 3 and in accordance with the approved investigation strategy agreed under clause (b) of condition 3, the following shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority:

- (a) A site investigation report detailing all works that have been undertaken to determine the nature and extent of any contamination, including the results of the soil, gas and/or water analysis and subsequent risk assessment to any receptors
- (b) A proposed remediation strategy detailing the works required in order to render harmless the identified contamination given the proposed end use of the site and surrounding environment including any controlled waters. The strategy shall include a schedule of the proposed remedial works setting out a timetable for all remedial measures that will be implemented.

Reason: To ensure that any contamination of the site is identified and appropriate remediation measures agreed in the interest of environmental and public safety in accordance with Cambridge Local Plan 2018 Policy 33.

5. Implementation of remediation.

Prior to the first occupation of the development (or each phase of the development where phased) the remediation strategy approved under clause (b) to condition 4 shall be fully implemented on site following the agreed schedule of works.

Reason: To ensure full mitigation through the agreed remediation measures in the interests of environmental and public safety in accordance with Cambridge Local Plan 2018 Policy 33.

6. Completion report:

Prior to the first occupation of the development (or phase of) hereby approved the following shall be submitted to, and approved by the Local Planning Authority.

- (a) A completion report demonstrating that the approved remediation scheme as required by condition 4 and implemented under condition 5 has been undertaken and that the land has been remediated to a standard appropriate for the end use.
- (b) Details of any post-remedial sampling and analysis (as defined in the approved material management plan) shall be included in the completion report along with all information concerning materials brought onto, used, and removed from the development. The information provided must demonstrate that the site has met the required clean-up criteria.

Thereafter, no works shall take place within the site such as to prejudice the effectiveness of the approved scheme of remediation.

Reason: To demonstrate that the site is suitable for approved use in the interests of environmental and public safety in accordance with Cambridge Local Plan 2018 Policy 33.

7. Material Management Plan:

Prior to importation or reuse of material for the development (or phase of) a Materials Management Plan (MMP) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The MMP shall:

- a) Include details of the volumes and types of material proposed to be imported or reused on site
- b) Include details of the proposed source(s) of the imported or reused material

- c) Include details of the chemical testing for ALL material to be undertaken before placement onto the site.
- d) Include the results of the chemical testing which must show the material is suitable for use on the development
- e) Include confirmation of the chain of evidence to be kept during the materials movement, including material importation, reuse placement and removal from and to the development.

All works will be undertaken in accordance with the approved document.

Reason: To ensure that no unsuitable material is brought onto the site in the interest of environmental and public safety in accordance with Cambridge Local Plan 2018 Policy 33.

8. Unexpected Contamination:

If unexpected contamination is encountered whilst undertaking the development which has not previously been identified, works shall immediately cease on site until the Local Planning Authority has been notified and the additional contamination has been fully assessed and remediation approved following steps (a) and (b) of condition 4 above. The approved remediation shall then be fully implemented under condition 5.

Reason: To ensure that any unexpected contamination is rendered harmless in the interests of environmental and public safety in accordance with Cambridge Local Plan 2018 Policy 33.

9. The phases of the development shall be Phases 1 and 2 as defined in the submitted drawing 1609_HT_P_71600 'Phasing Diagram G+0 College wide site' (enabling works for Phase 2 being part of Phase 2 for this purpose). No changes to the boundaries between Phase 1 and Phase 2 shall be permitted unless they have been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority.

Reason: To ensure appropriate thing for the discharge of other conditions. (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policies 35, 37, 55, 57, 59 and 70)

10. Prior to commencement of any phase of the development hereby permitted, details of the following matters for that phase shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority:
- 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.

The development shall be undertaken only in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To protect the amenity of the adjoining properties during the construction period (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policies 35 and 36).

11. No construction work or demolition work shall be carried out or plant operated other than between the following hours: 0800 hours and 1800 hours on Monday to Friday, 0800 hours and 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 2018 policy 35).

12. There shall be no collections from or deliveries to the site arising from demolition or construction of the development hereby approved outside the hours of 0800 hours and 1800 hours on 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 2018 policy 35).

13. No development in any phase shall commence (including any pre-construction, demolition, enabling works or piling), until a written report, regarding the demolition / construction noise and vibration impact associated with that phase of the development, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning 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. The phase of development concerned shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details only.

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 nearby properties (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policy 35).

14. No development in any phase shall commence until a programme of measures to minimise the spread of airborne dust from the site during the demolition / construction period of that phase has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. That phase of the development shall be implemented in accordance with the approved scheme.

Reason: To protect the amenity of nearby properties (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policy 36).

15. Demolition of No.75 Trumpington Street shall not commence until a method statement for this element of the proposal has been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority. Demolition shall take place thereafter only in accordance with the approved method statement.

Reason: To protect the fabric of the adjoining buildings and avoid a harmful impact on the conservation area (Cambridge Local Plan policy 61).

16. Prior to the installation of any plant and equipment associated with the approved development, on a phased unit by unit basis if necessary, a noise impact assessment of plant, equipment and associated plant rooms (including all mechanical and electrical building services, combustion appliances / flues, air source heat pumps, ventilation systems / louvres, , refuse / recycling equipment within waste storage areas / rooms and electricity substations) and details of a noise insulation scheme as appropriate, in order to minimise the level of noise emanating from the said plant and equipment and associated rooms shall be submitted in writing for approval by the Local Planning Authority .

The noise insulation / mitigation scheme as approved shall be fully implemented before the use hereby permitted is commenced and shall be maintained and retained thereafter.

Reason: To protect the amenity of nearby properties (National Planning Policy Framework 2019 paragraphs 170, 180, 182 and Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policy 35).

17. Prior to commencement of superstructure works in Phase 2, a noise insulation scheme detailing the acoustic / noise insulation performance specification of the external building envelope of habitable rooms (having regard to the building fabric elements - including glazing and alternative ventilation provision) to reduce the level of noise experienced in these rooms as a result of external ambient noise levels in the area, shall be submitted in writing for approval by the local planning authority. Any alternative ventilation provision required shall be capable of achieving a minimum of 2 air changes per hour (ACH) and internal ventilation operational noise levels shall be considered. The scheme as approved shall be fully constructed and implemented before the use hereby permitted is commenced and shall be retained thereafter.

The noise insulation / mitigation scheme shall be in accordance with the principles, mitigation measures and recommendations detailed in the submitted 'Old Press Mill Lane South Noise Impact Assessment, November 2018 (Issue B - 09.11.18: ISSUED FOR PLANNING - MINOR CORRECTIONS, Max Fordham LLP)' apart from (i) below which shall form part of the noise insulation scheme:

- (i) With the exception of the need to open external windows / doors for cleaning and maintenance, under a building management regime, all external openings that is windows and doors or similar to the 18 x habitable rooms (bedrooms R.03W.1.04 to 09, R.03W.2.04 to 09, R.03W.1.04 to 07 plus 2 set study area rooms as detailed on drawing nos: 1609_HT_P_03101 (G+1), 1609_HT_P_03102 (G+2) and 1609_HT_P_03103 (G+3) respectively) on the West Elevation of the Dolby Court West Block directly facing / in the direct line of sight of The University Centre shall be locked in a fully fixed / closed position and shall not be openable by occupiers. No other openings in the facades of these rooms will be permitted.

Reason: To protect the amenity of properties (National Planning Policy Framework Feb, 2019 paragraphs 170, 180, 182 and Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policy 35).

18. Prior to any superstructure works (including any refurbishment works) commencing on site in any phase for any D1 - Non-residential Institutions and D2 - Assembly and Leisure class uses hereby approved, a noise impact assessment of these uses on neighbouring premises (to include existing residential premises in the area and the proposed habitable rooms of the development itself) and a noise insulation scheme or other noise control measures as appropriate, in order to minimise the level of noise emanating from the said D1 and D2 uses and associated internal and external spaces (having regard to nature / type of uses and events to be held, hours of use, typical noise generation - sound system setup with consideration of in system noise limiting devices / independent noise limiters, noise egress and airborne and flanking sound via building structural elements - fabric, glazing, openings and ventilation systems acoustic performance, premises entrances / acoustic lobbies and any associated external spaces and patron noise) shall be submitted in writing for approval by the Local Planning Authority.

The noise insulation / mitigation scheme as approved shall be fully constructed and implemented before the D1 and D2 uses hereby permitted are commenced and shall be retained thereafter.

Reason: To protect the amenity of nearby properties (National Planning Policy Framework 2019 paragraphs 170, 180, 182 and Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policy 35).

19. All service collections / dispatches from, and deliveries to, the approved development in the operational phase (including refuse / recycling collections) shall take place only between the hours of 0700 hrs and 2100 hrs Monday to Saturday and 0800 hrs and 1900 hrs on Sundays and any Bank / Public Holiday.

Reason: To protect the amenity of nearby properties (National Planning Policy Framework 2019 paragraphs 170, 180, 182 and Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policy 35).

20. All refuse, waste, and recycling material shall be deposited into receptacles inside the ground floor refuse and recycling storage rooms. Refuse and recycling receptacles shall only be taken outside, presented for collection or moved around the external area of the site between 0700 to 2100 hrs Monday to Saturday and 0800 hrs and 1900 hrs on Sundays and any Bank / Public Holiday.

Reason: To protect the amenity of nearby properties (National Planning Policy Framework 2019 paragraphs 170, 180, 182 and Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policy 35).

21. Prior to the installation of any electrical services, an electric vehicle charge point scheme demonstrating that at least one operational active electric vehicle charge point will be installed to 50% of the communal parking spaces (2 of 4 proposed), shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

The active electric vehicle charge point scheme as approved shall be fully installed prior to first occupation and maintained and retained thereafter.

Reason: In the interests of encouraging more sustainable modes and forms of transport and to reduce the impact of development on local air quality, in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF, 2019) paragraphs 110, 170 and 181, Policy 36 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2018) Cambridge City Council's adopted Air Quality Action Plan (2018).

22. Prior to the installation of any ventilation systems to buildings used for the provision and cooking of hot food (A3, A4 planning class uses) and on a phased basis as necessary, a ventilation scheme to include details of equipment and systems for the purpose of extraction / discharge, filtration, abatement and control of odours and smoke / fumes to discharge at an appropriate outlet level, including details of sound attenuation for any associated plant / equipment and the standard of dilution / dispersion expected, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The ventilation scheme details as approved shall be installed before the uses hereby permitted is commenced and shall be retained thereafter.

Any approved scheme or system installed shall be regularly maintained in accordance with the manufacturer's specifications / instructions to ensure its continued satisfactory operation to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To protect the amenity of nearby properties from odour and smoke / fumes or noise impacts. (National Planning Policy Framework, Feb 2019 - National Planning Policy Framework Feb, 2019 paragraphs 170, 180, 182 and Cambridge Local Plan 2018 - policy 36.

23. Prior to the installation of any artificial lighting an external and internal artificial lighting scheme with detailed impact assessment shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The scheme shall include details of any artificial lighting of the site (external and internal building lighting) and an artificial lighting impact assessment with predicted lighting levels at existing residential properties shall be undertaken (including horizontal / vertical isolux contour light levels and calculated glare levels). Artificial lighting on and off site shall meet the Obtrusive Light Limitations for Exterior Lighting Installations for an Environmental Zone - E2 in accordance with the Institute of Lighting Professionals - Guidance Notes for the Reduction of Obtrusive Light - GN01:2011 (or as superseded) and any mitigation measures to reduce and contain potential artificial light spill and glare as appropriate shall be detailed.

The artificial lighting scheme as approved shall be fully implemented before the use hereby permitted is commenced and shall be retained thereafter.

Reason: To protect the amenity of nearby properties (National Planning Policy Framework, Feb 2019 - paragraph 180 c and Cambridge Local Plan 2018 - policies 34 and 59).

24. Prior to the commencement of any phase of the development hereby approved, with the exception of below ground works, full details including samples of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of that phase shall be 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 2018 policies 55 and 57).

25. Prior to the commencement of any phase of the development hereby approved, with the exception of below ground works, full details of glass type(s) to be used in curtain walling/windows/doors or other glazed features in that phase 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 ensure that the appearance of the external surfaces is appropriate (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policies 55 and 57).

26. Before starting any brick/stone work in any phase of the development, a sample panel of the facing materials to be used in that phase shall be erected on site to establish the detail of bonding, coursing and colour and type of jointing. The erection of the panel shall be notified to the local planning authority and its details 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 of that phase.

Reason: In the interests of 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 2018 policies 55 and 57).

27. No rooftop plant in any phase shall be constructed on the building hereby approved until such time as full details, to a large scale, of rooftop plant screening systems to be installed in that phase, where relevant, have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. This may include the submission of samples of mesh/louvre types and the colour(s) of the components. Colour samples should be identified by the RAL or BS systems. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure that the details of development are acceptable (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policies 55 and 57).

28. Full details of proposed signage in any phase of the development shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority before any works above ground in that phase commence. 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 2018 policies 55 and 57).

29. New roof coverings shall not be erected on Stuart House until details of the proposed material (including a sample) have been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority. Work shall proceed on this element only in accordance with the agreed details.

Reason: To avoid harm to the significance of the conservation area (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policy 61).

30. No development above ground level in any phase, other than demolition or alteration of existing buildings, shall commence until full details of both hard and soft landscape works for that phase 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; proposed and existing functional services; 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 2018; Policies 55, 57 and 59).

31. Prior to first occupation of any phase of the development, a landscape maintenance and management plan for that phase, including long term design objectives, management responsibilities and maintenance schedules for all landscape areas shall be submitted to and approved by the local planning authority in writing. The landscape plan shall be carried out as approved. Any trees or plants that, within a period of five years after planting, are removed, die or become in the opinion of the local planning authority, seriously damaged or defective, shall be replaced as soon as is reasonably practicable with others of species, size and number as originally approved.

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 2018; Policies 55, 57 and 59).

32. No new construction above ground floor level shall take place until a scheme for the installation of a black redstart box and a peregrine box within the site has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The approved scheme shall be implemented before occupation of the first phase in which either of these boxes is to be placed.

Reason: To conserve biodiversity and protect priority species (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policy 70).

33. If demolition works are to be undertaken within the bird nesting season, a black redstart survey and pre-works check for nesting peregrine falcons shall be carried out to establish whether any active nests could be subject to disturbance during the works. If active nests are present and liable to be disturbed, the demolition and construction works within the proximity of the nests must be undertaken once breeding has ceased and all young have fledged.

Reason: To conserve biodiversity and protect priority species (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policy 70).

34. If development of any phase does not commence before 1st May 2020, a further bat survey shall take place, and if additional bat roosts are revealed by this survey, no demolition in that phase shall take place until a scheme of mitigation for bats has been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority. The approved mitigation scheme shall be implemented in full before any occupation of buildings in that phase.

Reason: To conserve biodiversity and protect priority species (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 Policy 70).

35. Within 6 months of commencement of development, a BRE issued Design Stage Certificate shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority demonstrating that BREEAM 'excellent' as a minimum will be met, with at least 3 credits for Wat 01 (water consumption). Where the interim certificate shows a shortfall in credits for BREEAM 'excellent', a statement shall be submitted identifying how the shortfall will be addressed. In the event that such a rating is replaced by a comparable national measure of sustainability for building design, the equivalent level of measure shall be applicable to the proposed development.

Reason: In the interests of reducing carbon dioxide emissions and promoting principles of sustainable construction and efficient use of buildings (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 Policy 28).

36. Prior to the occupation of the student accommodation hereby approved, or within 6 months of occupation, a BRE issued post-Construction Certificate shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, indicating that the approved BREEAM rating has been met. In the event that such a rating is replaced by a comparable national measure of sustainability for building design, the equivalent level of measure shall be applicable to the proposed development.

Reason: In the interests of reducing carbon dioxide emissions and promoting principles of sustainable construction and efficient use of buildings (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 Policy 28).

37. The approved renewable energy technologies and associated heating and cooling network infrastructure shall be fully installed and operational prior to the first occupation of the development and shall thereafter be retained and remain fully operational in accordance with a maintenance programme, which shall be submitted to and agreed in writing by the local planning authority.

No review of this requirement on the basis of grid capacity issues can take place unless written evidence from the District Network Operator confirming the detail of grid capacity and its implications has been submitted to, and accepted in writing by, the local planning authority. Any subsequent amendment to the level of renewable/low carbon technologies provided on the site shall be in accordance with a revised scheme submitted to and approved in writing by, the local planning authority

Reason: In the interests of reducing carbon dioxide emissions (Cambridge Local Plan 2018, policy 28).

38. Prior to occupation, a water efficiency specification based on the Water Efficiency Calculator Methodology or the Fitting Approach set out in Part G of the Building Regulations 2010 (2015 edition) shall be submitted to the local planning authority. This shall demonstrate that all student rooms are able to achieve a design standard of water use of no more than 110 litres/person/day and that the development shall be carried out in accordance with the agreed details.

Reason: To ensure that the development makes efficient use of water and promotes the principles of sustainable construction (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 Policy 28).

39. Prior to the occupation of any part of Phase 2 of the development hereby permitted, the windows identified as having obscured glass on drawing No. 1609_HT_E_03405 REV P1 shall be obscure glazed to a minimum level of obscurity to conform to Pilkington Glass level 3 or equivalent and shall be locked completely shut in such a manner as they cannot be opened by occupiers. The windows shall be unlocked and opened only by the building's managers in accordance with a reasonable schedule of cleaning and maintenance. The glazing shall thereafter be retained in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: In the interests of residential amenity (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policies 55, 57/58).

40. Existing fire hydrants on the site must be retained. The hydrants must be kept in good condition and be available for emergency use during the development and after its completion, regardless of any works in the vicinity.

Reason: To ensure adequate resources to fight fires (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policy 56).

41. No occupation of any student rooms in the development hereby permitted shall take place until the proposed loading / drop-off area between the Mill Lane highway and the Stuart House gates has been laid out and completed.

Reason: To ensure satisfactory loading and unloading space at the site (Cambridge Local Plan policy 56).

42. No hard-standing areas in any phase shall be constructed until works have been carried out for that stage in accordance with the submitted surface water strategy.

Reason: To prevent environmental and amenity problems arising from flooding (Cambridge Local Plan policy 32).

43. Notwithstanding the approved drawings, no occupation of the student accommodation hereby approved shall take place until revised details of cycle parking which maximise the proportion of spaces under cover, have been submitted to and approved in writing by, the local planning authority. The approved details shall be implemented before occupation.

Reason: To ensure appropriate cycle parking (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policy 82).

44. Waste and recycling bins for the student accommodation hereby approved shall be provided so that there are equal numbers of recycling and residual waste bins.

Reason: To ensure appropriate storage for waste and recycling (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policy 57).

45. Within 90 days of the date of this approval, a Preliminary Public Art Plan shall be submitted to the local planning authority for approval. The Preliminary Plan shall include proposals for consultation with stakeholders, and a timetable for the submission of a final Public Art Strategy. Once approved, the timetable for the Public Art Strategy shall be adhered to unless the local planning authority agrees to a variation in writing. No part of the development shall be occupied until a timetable for full implementation of the agreed Public Art Strategy has been agreed, and that timetable shall then be implemented.

Reason: To ensure appropriate public art (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policy 56).

46. No development shall take place until an archaeological written scheme of investigation (WSI) has been submitted to and approved by the local planning authority in writing. For land that is included within the WSI, no demolition/development shall take place other than in accordance with the agreed WSI which shall include:

- a) the statement of significance and research objectives;
- b) The programme and methodology of site investigation and recording and the nomination of a competent person(s) or organisation to undertake the agreed works
- c) The programme for post-excavation assessment and subsequent analysis, publication & dissemination, and deposition of resulting material. This part of the condition shall not be discharged until these elements have been fulfilled in accordance with the programme set out in the WSI.

Developers will wish to ensure that in drawing up their development programme, the timetable for the investigation is included within the details of the agreed scheme.

Reason: To protect archaeological remains (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policy 61).

47. No occupation of the former URC church building shall take place until an Access and Management Plan for the use of the building which sets out the opportunities for, and systems for the management of, community use of the building, has been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority. Use of the building shall take place thereafter in accordance with the approved Plan.

Reason: To ensure satisfactory replacement of the existing community sports and leisure facility (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policy 73).

48. No development shall take place until a Stage One Road Safety Audit has taken place, the results submitted to the highway authority, and any issues revealed by the audit resolved to the satisfaction of the highway authority.

Reason: To ensure highway safety (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policy 81).

49. Notwithstanding the drawings submitted with the application, no development shall take place until a revised design for an informal pedestrian crossing of Trumpington Street between the application site and the main Pembroke College porters' lodge has been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority. The approved crossing design shall be implemented prior to any occupation of the student accommodation hereby approved.

Reason: To ensure highway safety, to avoid harm to the conservation area, and to ensure the satisfactory operation of Hobson's Conduit (Cambridge Local Plan policies 31, 32, 61 and 81).

50. No demolition or construction works shall commence on site until a Traffic Management Plan (TMP) has been agreed in writing with the local planning authority

The TMP shall address:

- i. Movements and control of muck away lorries (all loading and unloading shall be undertaken off the adopted public highway.)

- ii. Contractor parking; provide details and quantum of the proposed car parking and methods of preventing on street car parking.
- iii. Movements and control of all deliveries (all loading and unloading shall be undertaken off the adopted public highway).
- iv. Control of dust, mud and debris, in relationship to the operation of the adopted public highway.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policy 81).

INFORMATIVE: 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.

INFORMATIVE: The applicant is advised that the following considerations have been identified in relation to gas pipeline/s identified on site:

Cadent have identified operational gas apparatus within the application site boundary. This may include a legal interest (easements or wayleaves) in the land which restricts activity in proximity to Cadent assets in private land. The Applicant must ensure that proposed works do not infringe on Cadent's legal rights and any details of such restrictions should be obtained from the landowner in the first instance.

If buildings or structures are proposed directly above the gas apparatus then development should only take place following a diversion of this apparatus. The Applicant should contact Cadent's Plant Protection Team at the earliest opportunity to discuss proposed diversions of apparatus to avoid any unnecessary delays.

If any construction traffic is likely to cross a Cadent pipeline then the Applicant must contact Cadent's Plant Protection Team to see if any protection measures are required.

All developers are required to contact Cadent's Plant Protection Team for approval before carrying out any works on site and ensuring requirements are adhered to. Email: plantprotection@cadentgas.com Tel: 0800 688 588.

INFORMATIVE: The site investigation, including relevant soil, soil gas, surface and groundwater sampling should be carried out by a suitably qualified and accredited consultant/contractor in accordance with a quality assured sampling, analysis methodology and relevant guidance. The Council has produced a guidance document to provide information to developers on how to deal with contaminated land. The document, 'Contaminated Land in Cambridge- Developers Guide' can be downloaded from the City Council website on <https://www.cambridge.gov.uk/land-pollution>.

Hard copies can also be provided upon request

INFORMATIVE: A premises licence may be required for this development in addition to any planning permission. A premises licence under the Licensing Act 2003 may be required to authorise:

- The supply of alcohol
- Regulated entertainment e.g.
- Music (Including bands, DJ's and juke boxes)
- Dancing
- The performing of plays
- Boxing or wrestling
- The showing of films
- Late Night Refreshment (The supply of hot food or drink between 23:00-05:00)

A separate licence may be required for activities involving gambling including poker and gaming machines.

The applicant is advised to contact The Licensing Team of Environmental Health at Cambridge City Council on telephone number (01223) 457899 or email Licensing@cambridge.gov.uk for further information.

INFORMATIVE: As the premises is intended to be run as a business The applicant is reminded of their duty under the Construction (Design and Management) Regulations 2007 to ensure that the that all significant risks related to the design and operation of the premises are minimised. Contact the Commercial Team at Cambridge City Council on telephone number (01223) 457890 for further information.

INFORMATIVE: As the premises is intended to be run as a food business the applicant is reminded that under the Food Safety Act 1990 (as amended) the premises will need to be registered with Cambridge City Council. In order to avoid additional costs it is recommended that the applicant ensure that the kitchen, food preparation and food storage areas comply with food hygiene legislation, before construction starts. Contact the Commercial Team at Cambridge City Council on telephone number (01223) 457890 for further information.

INFORMATIVE: Dust condition informative

To satisfy the condition requiring the submission of a program of measures to control airborne dust above, the applicant should have regard to:

- Council's Supplementary Planning Document - "Sustainable Design and Construction 2007":

<http://www.cambridge.gov.uk/public/docs/sustainable-design-and-construction-spd.pdf>

- Guidance on the assessment of dust from demolition and construction:

http://iaqm.co.uk/wp-content/uploads/guidance/iaqm_guidance_report_draft1.4.pdf

- Air Quality Monitoring in the Vicinity of Demolition and Construction Sites 2012:

http://www.iaqm.co.uk/wp-content/uploads/guidance/monitoring_construction_sites_2012.pdf

- Control of dust and emissions during construction and demolition - supplementary planning guidance:

https://www.london.gov.uk/sites/default/files/Dust%20and%20Emissions%20SPG%208%20July%202014_0.pdf

INFORMATIVE: Demolition/Construction noise/vibration report

The noise and vibration report should include:

- a) An assessment of the significance of the noise impact due to the demolition/construction works and suitable methods for this are to be found in BS 5228:2009 Part 1 Annex E - Significance of noise effects. It is recommended that the ABC method detailed in E.3.2 be used unless works are likely to continue longer than a month then the 2-5 dB (A) change method should be used.
- b) An assessment of the significance of the vibration impact due to the demolition/construction works and suitable methods for this are to be found in BS 5228:2009 Part 2 Annex B - Significance of vibration effects.

If piling is to be undertaken then full details of the proposed method to be used is required and this should be included in the noise and vibration reports detailed above.

Following the production of the above reports a monitoring protocol should be proposed for agreement with the Local Planning Authority. It will be expected that as a minimum spot checks to be undertaken on a regular basis at site boundaries nearest noise sensitive premises and longer term monitoring to be undertaken when:-

- Agreed target levels are likely to exceeded
- Upon the receipt of substantiated complaints
- At the request of the Local Planning Authority / Environmental Health following any justified complaints.

Guidance on noise monitoring is given in BS 5228:2009 Part 1 Section 8.4 - Noise Control Targets and in Annex G - noise monitoring.

A procedure for seeking approval from the Local Planning Authority (LPA) in circumstances when demolition/construction works need to be carried out at time outside the permitted hours. This should incorporate a minimum notice period of 10 working days to the Local Planning Authority and 5 working days to neighbours to allow the Local Planning Authority to consider the application as necessary. For emergencies the Local Planning Authority should be notified but where this is not possible the Council's Out of Hours Noise service should be notified on 0300 303 8389.

Contact details for monitoring personnel, site manager including out of hours emergency telephone number should be provided.

INFORMATIVE: Notwithstanding the provision of the Town and Country Planning General Permitted Development Order 1995 (or any order revoking or re-enacting that Order), any oil storage tank shall be sited on an impervious base and surrounded by oil tight bunded walls with a capacity of 110% of the storage tank, to enclose all filling, drawing and overflow pipes. The installation must comply with Control of Pollution Regulations 2001, and Control of Pollution (Oil Storage) Regulations 2001.

INFORMATIVE: The water environment is potentially vulnerable and there is an increased potential for pollution from inappropriately located and/or designed infiltration (SuDS). We consider any infiltration (SuDS) greater than 2.0 m below ground level to be a deep system and are generally not acceptable. All infiltration SuDS require a minimum of 1.2 m clearance between the base of infiltration SuDS and peak seasonal groundwater levels. All need to meet the criteria in our Groundwater Protection: Principles and Practice (GP3) position statements G1 to G13 which can be found here:

<https://www.gov.uk/government/collections/groundwater-protection>

In addition, they must not be constructed in ground affected by contamination and if the use of deep bore soakaways is proposed, we would wish to be re-consulted. The proposals will need to comply with our Groundwater protection position statements G1 and G9 to G13.

INFORMATIVE: Foul water drainage (and trade effluent where appropriate) from the proposed development should be discharged to the public foul sewer, with the prior approval of Anglian Water Services, unless it can be satisfactorily demonstrated that a connection is not reasonably available.

Anglian Water Services Ltd. should be consulted by the Local Planning Authority and be requested to demonstrate that the sewerage and sewage disposal systems serving the development have sufficient capacity to accommodate the additional flows, generated as a result of the development, without causing pollution or flooding. If there is not capacity in either of the sewers, the Agency must be reconsulted with alternative methods of disposal.

INFORMATIVE: Surface water from roads and impermeable vehicle parking areas shall be discharged via trapped gullies.

Prior to being discharged into any watercourse, surface water sewer or soakaway system, all surface water drainage from lorry parks and/or parking areas for fifty car park spaces or more and hardstandings should be passed through an oil interceptor designed compatible with the site being drained. Roof water shall not pass through the interceptor.

Site operators should ensure that there is no possibility of contaminated water entering and polluting surface or underground waters

INFORMATIVE: Notification to the Environmental Growth and Quality team will be required under the Environmental Permitting Regulations if an onsite concrete crusher will be used during the demolition stage.

INFORMATIVE: It is a requirement of the Clean Air Act 1993 that no relevant furnace shall be installed in a building or in any fixed boiler or industrial plant unless notice of the proposal to install it has been given to the local authority. Details of any furnaces, boilers or plant to be installed should be provided using the Chimney Height Calculation form (available here: <https://www.cambridge.gov.uk/chimney-height-approval>).

INFORMATIVE: Asbestos containing materials (cement sheeting) may be present at the site. The agent/applicant should ensure that these materials are dismantled and disposed of in the appropriate manner to a licensed disposal site. Further information regarding safety issues can be obtained from the H.S.E.

INFORMATIVE: Any material imported into the site shall be tested for a full suite of contaminants including metals and petroleum hydrocarbons prior to importation. Material imported for landscaping should be tested at a frequency of 1 sample every 20m³ or one per lorry load, whichever is greater. Material imported for other purposes can be tested at a lower frequency (justification and prior approval for the adopted rate is required by the Local Authority). If the material originates from a clean source the developer should contact the Environmental Quality Growth Team for further advice.

INFORMATIVE: To satisfy the plant sound insulation condition, the rating level (in accordance with BS4142:2014) from all plant, equipment and 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 sound frequencies should be eliminated or at least considered in any assessment and should carry an additional correction in accordance with BS4142:2014. This is to prevent unreasonable 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 15 minute period).

It is recommended that the agent/applicant submits an acoustic prediction survey/report in accordance with the principles of BS4142:2014 "Methods for rating and assessing industrial and commercial sound" 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.

It is important to note that a full BS4142:2014 assessment is not required, only certain aspects to be incorporated into an acoustic assessment as described within this informative.

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

- 10.2 **(In the event that the application is refused) RESOLVE that, if an Appeal is lodged against the decision to refuse this application, delegated authority is granted to officers to negotiate and complete the Planning Obligation required in connection with this development.**

18/1930/FUL - Appendix A

(In Appendix A the sections of the main text (other than the conclusion) relevant to the present application are underlined)

Cambridge City Council

Design & Conservation Panel

Notes of the site visit and meeting – Old Press Mill Lane Masterplan Wednesday 8th November 2017

Impact on the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.

Overall, the Panel are supportive of the aspirations of the Masterplan to secure the longer term future for this important part of the city. However the Panel has concerns over certain key aspects of the proposal. Some of these concerns result from the uncertainties that any Masterplan has in respect of the detail design issues and the design of individual buildings. In a Conservation Area these uncertainties make it much harder to determine whether or not a proposed Masterplan would *preserve or enhance the character or appearance* of that Conservation Area.

The appearance of this part of the Conservation Area will necessarily change as a result of implementing these proposals; but that change could be beneficial, neutral or harmful. The character of the area is currently quite ‘gritty,’ reflecting its largely industrial past and over-gentrification of the area could be harmful to this character.

In the discussion it was agreed that at least some of these concerns might be addressed through more detail being added in key areas to provide a greater degree of certainty.

Proposed demolitions.

The Masterplan includes for the demolition of all or part of a number of existing buildings. The buildings identified for full or partial demolition were originally assessed as being of low or moderate significance in the 2008 Beacon Planning ‘Historic Environment Analysis’ that informed the SPD, though parts of three buildings identified as significant are also now included for demolition. The analysis and understanding of the area has also moved forward since the preparation of the SPD, and the updated Conservation Area appraisal for Central Cambridge identifies many of these buildings as either Buildings of Local Interest (BLIs) or buildings that contribute positively to the Conservation Area. Furthermore - and as noted by the design team - when considering

buildings for demolition, a holistic overview is required to fully understand the cumulative impacts that such demolitions might have on the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. In the Panel's opinion, while there is scope for some selective demolitions, the current proposals are out of balance, and the proposed demolitions are too extensive, and therefore likely to result in harm to the character of this part of the Conservation Area.

The Anchor Public House

The Panel are supportive of the proposal to demolish the early C20 northern section of this building. Any harm would be more than outweighed by the improved public realm at the eastern end of Silver Street Bridge and the opening up of views of the gable and corner turret to 16 Silver Street.

Laundress Lane Building

The current Masterplan proposes total demolition of the Laundress Lane Building and replacing it with an extended public realm that would provide improved access to the river, plus a small extension to the Anchor PH to compensate for the floor area lost through the demolitions on its north side. The existing Laundress Lane building is of some interest, particularly through its former role as a granary in association with the now lost watermill. The Panel acknowledges that the building's significance has suffered as a result of changes over time, but the building continues to have some positive townscape value through providing enclosure to the east side of the Mill Pond and defining the west side of Laundress Lane.

The Panel therefore recommends that the decision to demolish this building be reconsidered.

There would be scope for incorporating an extension to the Anchor PH within the northern end of the existing building, while the remaining ground floor might then be opened up to provide improved pedestrian access to the river in conjunction with a new pontoon on the east side of the Mill Pond. The upper floors could be used for student accommodation. The Panel also noted the fine views that can be enjoyed over the Mill Pond and Laundress Green from this building.

15 Laundress Lane (Bicycle Shop)

The Panel welcomed the decision to now retain the existing Bicycle Shop building on Laundress Lane. Whilst this is again a relatively modest structure, unlike its neighbour it retains its original segmental brick arches to the window and door openings and it contributes positively to the character of Laundress Lane

16 Mill Lane

This is a complex building and the section fronting onto Mill Lane comprises an older central section that is flanked by two 'wings' dating from the 1920s. This Mill Lane frontage is the part that is of greatest interest, and where the industrial character of the existing structure contributes positively to both the character and appearance of the area. The current Masterplan proposes to retain the façade of this Mill Lane section, and to construct a new building behind this façade that incorporates commercial space at ground level and student accommodation above; the latter set around two raised courtyards.

The Panel were informed that the existing building is a framed structure, but the constrained floor-to-ceiling heights and the poor relationship of the floors to the street make it difficult to reuse. Whilst this may be the case, the Panel would wish to see further work done on the possible retention and adaptive reuse of a greater element of that part of the existing building fronting Mill Lane. It may be possible for commercial uses to be accommodated in 1 ½ storey height elements that incorporate street level access on mezzanine levels that then lead down into semi-basement areas. The retention of just the Mill Lane façade should only be as a last resort.

The Panel acknowledges that there is then scope for demolition and new building(s) to be constructed north of this Mill Lane section, and the Panel has no concerns over the demolition and replacement of the late C20 infill element fronting onto Silver Street; noting also the opportunity that this would afford for improving permeability through the site.

Millers Yard

The Panel were informed that under the current Masterplan only the front section of Miller's Yard facing onto the south side of Mill Lane is to be retained. The rear section is to be demolished and replaced by a new building providing student accommodation for Pembroke College. Whilst

the Panel are not too concerned over the loss of the rear element of Miller's Yard, they would wish to see further work done on the possible retention and incorporation of the Bailey Grundy Barratt Building into the southern wing of the new courtyard.

Mill Lane Lecture Rooms

The Masterplan proposes that the existing Mill Lane Lecture Rooms building be demolished and its site incorporated into the new Pembroke College student accommodation set around a new courtyard. Although this building is the work of Dunbar Smith, who were architects of some note and who also designed the extensions to the Fitzwilliam Museum; the Panel are fairly relaxed concerning the fate of this building, which they regard as contributing less to the character of Mill Lane than its neighbours.

75 Trumpington Street

The Masterplan proposes that a major pedestrian link be created from the existing Pembroke College to the new student accommodation on the south side of Mill Lane through the demolition and replacement of 75 Trumpington Street. The Panel acknowledges that No 75 is the least significant of the older buildings along this part of Trumpington Street, but nevertheless it contributes to the setting of the Grade II listed Kenmare House at 74 Trumpington Street.

Kenmare House is quite different from its neighbours; a double-fronted symmetrical composition containing four Venetian windows and with its front elevation set back from the pavement behind a dwarf wall that once incorporated railings. Part of this building's significance is derived from this hierarchical relationship with its neighbours, and it would be important for any replacement building to continue to provide enclosure to both the forecourt of Kenmare House and Trumpington Street. Furthermore, when considering the Masterplan proposals for this area, the Panel has concerns that the suggestion to incorporate the forecourt of Kenmare House into the street might dilute the linear nature of Trumpington Street, whereas reinstating the lost railings to the dwarf walls might greater reveal the significance of Kenmare House.

Therefore, while the Panel are not opposed to the principle of demolition and replacement of No 75, further work is required so as to clearly demonstrate that it would not result in harm to the character of this part of the conservation area, nor would it adversely impact on the

significance of Kenmare House. The Panel would however, resist the demolition of No 76 and/or the construction of a wider frontage replacement building that failed to acknowledge the historic plot widths along this part of Trumpington Street.

Finally, on this matter, the Panel considers that further work is required on how the pedestrian circulation is to be handled between the existing Pembroke College and the new court. It might be more fitting for a raised table type crossing to be constructed at the junction of Mill Lane and Trumpington Street rather than outside No 74, while the impact on Hobson's Conduit will also need to be carefully considered.

The Panel notes that access to the existing college might also utilise the gateway immediately south of the college chapel rather than channelling all students via the gateway at the Porters' Lodge.

Syndics Building.

Some discussion took place amongst the Panel over the merits of retaining the Syndics Building in its current form or returning it to its original single storey form. The Panel concluded that, on balance, it would be preferable to retain the Syndics Building in its current two storey form, but to remove the rather awkward 'S' shaped first floor link from the Syndics Building to the Pitt Building. Retention in its current form would retain the sense of enclosure to both Mill Lane and the courtyard at the rear of the Pitt Building.

New pedestrian routes and permeability.

The improved permeability of this area will be crucial to the public benefit derived from the proposals. The Panel broadly welcomes the proposed new pedestrian circulation within the site and the linking to routes beyond the area, but it will be important that these remain open and are not closed off by colleges. In particular, the Panel are concerned that the through routes on the north side of Mill Lane remain ungated.

The re-purposing of buildings.

The Panel were informed that the majority of the retained buildings would be adapted for new uses, and that in most cases this would include an element of commercial use at ground floor level. Some concern was expressed as to whether high commercial rents would result in a level of 'sanitising' at street level that would rid this area of its

quasi-industrial feel. This concern is likely to be compounded if the level of demolition and new build is too high; leading to the loss of smaller, quirky spaces that might otherwise command a lower rent, and thereby encouraging a more diverse usage that in turn might engender a new and unique character for this part of the city.

Such diversity might be further encouraged if the evolving Masterplan allowed for a greater degree of flexibility in the size and use of the ground floor spaces, and if the University adopts a flexible approach when setting rents and avoids relentlessly pursuing the highest returns.

Public realm, the riverfront, landscape treatment and street furniture.

The Panel would like to know more about how the public realm is to be treated within the proposals. The Panel appreciate that it is still early days in the design process and with limited time available, it was not possible to explore all aspects in detail. Amongst other issues, the Panel are keen to know if Mill Lane would become a shared surface or if pavements are to be retained, and how the river frontage is to be detailed. The treatment of the public realm will be a key component in defining the character of the area, along with associated street furniture and the provision of new street lighting. Given the tight nature of the spaces, the Panel would encourage the use of good quality street lighting that is mounted on the buildings, rather than cluttering the public realm with new lighting columns.

The proposed re-modelling of the ground floor of the University Centre, along with the treatment of the space between that building and the river, are also important aspects of the project that require further work.

The opportunity to re-site the boathouse building so as to open up views of the river from along Little St Mary's Lane would be worth exploring as part of a detailed reconsideration of this space.

Silver Street.

Although beyond the parameters of the Masterplan, pedestrian circulation along Silver Street is a real issue, compounded by the existing narrow pavements and the number of tour buses that drop off day visitors at the west end of Silver Street. The Panel wish to encourage the City Council to work with the University to explore how the scope of the Masterplan might be expanded to help address this

problem, and to examine what opportunities might exist for widening the pavements along Silver Street. The City Council's emerging work on City Centre Access and the Spaces and Movement SPD could play a significant role here and the Panel will look forward to seeing the results.

Conclusion.

This Masterplan presents a 'once in a generation' opportunity to transform and enliven a part of the city long in need of investment. There are however a number of questions that remain unanswered.

The emerging Draft Local Plan stipulates the need to provide 350 student rooms within this site. How those rooms are to be provided, the extent of demolition and re-building, and the impact of any consequential gentrification of the area require further investigation to ensure the area's 'gritty' character is retained.

Although in general terms the Panel feel the design team are heading in the right direction, from this initial examination of the emerging Masterplan the Panel concluded that there should be greater retention of some of the older buildings. This would help preserve the character and appearance of the area and enhance the experience of those visiting it.

Further work is clearly needed and the Panel would look forward to re-visiting these proposals at a future meeting.

VERDICT – GREEN (1), AMBER (5)

This page is intentionally left blank

18/1930/FUL - Appendix B

Cambridge City Council Design & Conservation Panel Notes of the meeting Wednesday 9th May 2018

Presentation – Old Press Mill Lane, South Block (Pembroke College)

A presentation on the emerging proposals to include an explanation of the opportunities, vision and brief for Pembroke Mill Lane; a description of the proposed site strategy in terms of Collegiate activity and movement as well as landscape and form; as well as the detailed proposals for each area of the site, including consideration of specific heritage constraints and opportunities.

The Panel's comments were as follows:

The Panel broadly welcomed these proposals and the strategy adopted for redeveloping this part of the Mill Lane site, although time constraints prevented a full examination of all aspects of the proposals, such as the internal alterations to Kenmare House (Grade II Listed).

• Stuart House (BLI)

Stuart House takes the form of a pavilion building, intended to be seen 'in the round', and the proposal to improve the setting of Stuart House through the demolition and redevelopment of the Mill Lane Lecture Rooms building to the west, and partial demolition of buildings to the east was broadly welcomed, though the Panel acknowledged that there was a degree of trade-off between reducing the curtilage-listed School Hall building by one bay and the opportunity that afforded to use Stuart House to terminate the vista from the new entrance off Trumpington Street. The Panel also supported the decision to set back the railings on Mill Lane in front of Stuart House, since this would provide an opportunity to pause on Mill Lane, and to better appreciate Stuart House. The one concern that the Panel had on this issue was that the resulting space created on Mill Lane should not be occupied by delivery vehicles. The Panel were also pleased to see that the existing front door to Stuart House facing onto Mill Lane is to be retained, even if the primary access to the building might now be on the east elevation, accessed from the newly created Kenmare Court.

The south side of Stuart House faces onto a narrow space enclosed by an existing high brick boundary wall, and the Panel felt that there might be an opportunity to further enhance the setting of Stuart House through some additional planting on this wall.

- **Dolby Court.**

The new postgraduate residential accommodation is to be provided in the form of a new three-sided court, to be known as Dolby Court, located to the west of Stuart House. This new court retains and re-uses the Mill Lane section of Miller's Yard, but all the other parts of the building are new structures. The Panel accepted the strategy adopted by the architects for delivering this new accommodation, and welcomed the slight reduction in scale of the new element fronting Mill Lane that will replace the existing Mill Lane Lecture Rooms building. The sunken lawn, coupled with the arcade screening the commercial elements on the north side (that are to be accessed from Mill Lane), and the varied treatment of the west and south blocks all added a richness to the proposal that has the potential to deliver a scheme of real quality. The Panel had some concern over the detailing of the dormers to the new attic floor on the retained Miller's Yard building and urged the architects to revisit this so that the dormers might be less dominant in the streetscape.

- **School Hall (Curtilage listed)**

The Panel were informed that this building had suffered extensive alterations and change over its life. Notwithstanding the consequential erosion of its historic fabric, the current proposals now seek to retain a significant portion of the building, though the northern most bay is to be demolished so as to open up the new Kenmare Court to Stuart House. The Panel acknowledged that the resulting loss of part of the School Hall would need appropriate justification, but there was support amongst the Panel for the townscape benefits that would result through the development of Kenmare Court, and the ability to use Stuart House to terminate the new vista that will be created from the new access into this part of the college from Trumpington Street.

- **Kenmare House, new gatehouse building at 75 Trumpington Street and 76 Trumpington Street.**

The Panel accepted the argument for the demolition and replacement of 75 Trumpington Street so as to create a new gateway to the development that will also include a new gallery space at first floor level.

The Panel were also comfortable with the scale, form and massing of the replacement building and welcomed the retention of the building line so as to preserve the forecourt to Kenmare House. Whilst the Panel had some concerns over the introduction of a diagonal pedestrian route over the forecourt to Kenmare House, the benefits that this would deliver were understood and accepted, but the Panel requested further work to be undertaken on this forecourt area so as to better reveal the significance of Kenmare House, and recommended the reintroduction of traditional railings (rather than just a dwarf wall), albeit set back in line with the steps leading to the front door of Kenmare House. The materials for the floorscape and any planting in this area will also require careful consideration.

The retention of 76 Trumpington Street was again welcomed by the Panel, and the proposed internal remodelling to provide a new entrance to the performance space within the former church again appeared well thought through. The new 1 ½ storey foyer building flanking the south side of the new Kenmare Court, and linking to the retained element of the School Hall, also has the potential to be a space of quality and appropriate for its use.

- **Pedestrian crossing and shared surfacing.**

A key aspect of these proposals will be the solution adopted for the crossing of Trumpington Street to link the new Pembroke Mill Lane facilities back to the original college. This part of the proposals is still under development and subject to consultations with County Highways. The Panel would support a shared surface option as a measure to slow down vehicle speeds on Trumpington Street, and would welcome the opportunity to review and comment on the eventual solution that is to be adopted.

- **Cycle parking, disabled parking and servicing strategy.**

The Panel were not convinced that the cycle parking arrangements, along with disabled parking provision and the servicing strategy for the new facilities, have been adequately thought through. In particular, the Panel had concerns that the space between the west block of Dolby Court and the University Centre should not become a 'negative space' and be seen as a convenient dumping ground for cycles and disabled parking. If this space is to be used intensively for cycle parking, incorporating double racks for bikes, then consideration might need to be given to enclosing the bike storage with a grass roof, so as to provide

a positive outlook from the bedrooms that overlook the space. The careful integration of visitor cycle parking into the forecourt of Stuart House might also prevent the casual parking of

cycles on the relocated railings to Mill Lane. The new commercial facilities fronting onto Mill Lane, together with the new facilities within Stuart House and those created within the buildings fronting onto Trumpington Street, will all require servicing, and a clear servicing strategy will therefore be needed for the whole site, rather than risk an ad-hoc solution that is likely to erode the quality of the new public realm created by the development.

Conclusion.

The Panel applaud what in their view, is a thoughtful response to a challenging brief. The introduction of new courtyard spaces and the sacrificing of buildings for collegiate functions is a significant change but, in the Panel's view, that change was not necessarily harmful to the character or appearance of this part of the Conservation Area. The Panel felt it is more important for the northern parts of the Mill Lane development to retain its existing 'gritty' character, and there is scope for the internal parts of this site to adopt a more 'collegiate' character. Therefore, while this is considered an appropriate solution for the southern side of Mill Lane, it is not one that should be continued across onto the northern side of the lane.

At a future presentation, the Panel would welcome the inclusion of a fully developed landscape plan so that the interrelationship of the various elements of the new public realm, and the use of materials and planting can be fully understood.

VERDICT – GREEN (unanimous) subject to further development.

18/1930/FUL - Appendix C

Cambridge City Council

Design & Conservation Panel

Relevant notes of the meeting Wednesday 10th October 2018

1. Presentation – Old Press Mill Lane South Block.

This was first seen by the Panel in November 2017 and then again in May 2018. This latest consideration of the scheme focused on the main areas of design development that had taken place since May.

Cycle parking and servicing arrangements

Further development has taken place on the area between the University Centre and the west end of the new Dolby Court. This area will provide a major component on of the cycle parking for the proposals, including residents of Dolby Court. The Panel were generally supportive of the changes in this area, though some concern was expressed that the restrictive nature of the space might have implications for the longer term wellbeing of the proposed sedum roofs to the two enclosed cycle stores. The two trees to be planted within this space would also need to be carefully selected to ensure they did not grow too large for the space.

A total of 4 disabled parking bays are to be provided to serve Dolby Court and accessed off Little St Mary's Lane. These will service the 5 disabled access study-bedrooms (the experience of the college is that not all students requiring accessible study-bedrooms will need cars and therefore a 1:1 ratio of car parking to accessible study-bedrooms is not necessary). The parking is to be provided within a space that will also contain a relocated electricity substation. The site for the substation has been revised so as to allow the retention of one of a group of three sycamore trees on Little St Mary's Lane, and the new substation has been designed to read as part of a new boundary wall facing on to Little St Mary's Lane and the south-east boundary of the University Centre. The Panel were again supportive of these changes, and in particular welcomed the retention of the sycamore tree which would help soften the impact of the new Dolby Court. They also noted that the brickwork for the boundary wall and substation should respond to the context of Little St Mary's Lane rather than the Dolby Court.

The new commercial units on the ground floor to the Mill Lane wing to Dolby Court will all be serviced from Mill Lane. Additional provision for servicing off Mill Lane is to be made by setting back the gates in front of Stuart House. The Panel were generally supportive of the proposed detailing for the re-sited gates, though noted that the new stone paving on the Mill Lane side of these gates will need to be appropriately sized and carefully detailed so as to be able to take high point loadings from vehicles (the size and weight of vehicles parking in this area cannot be controlled).

Dolby Court

Further design development has taken place on the proposals for the new Dolby Court. The dormers to the retained section of Miller's Yard (fronting on to Mill Lane) have been revised so as to reduce their bulk and impact in the streetscape, which was welcomed by the Panel. Elsewhere, and in particular on the internal courtyard elevations to the new Court, the set-back mansard roof to the top floor has been revised to incorporate dormers that are an integral part of the masonry elevations. These dormers have thick stone surrounds which appear visually 'heavier' than the narrow surrounds to the windows on the lower floors, and the Panel found this apparent reversal of historic precedent to be somewhat uncomfortable, and recommended further review and development of this element of the design.

Further design development has also taken place on the architectural treatment of the commercial units fronting on to Mill Lane. Two alternative solutions were put forward, one involving a more traditional timber shopfront design and an alternative solution incorporated recessed glazed shopfronts that attempted to respond to the more to the 'industrial' context of the buildings on the north-side of Mill Lane. The Panel did not have a particular strong view on which approach should be pursued, but noted that if the recessed glazed option is to be adopted there might be scope to have some 'fun' with the detailing of the recessed glazing.

Kenmare Garden

The new Kenmare Garden will be created through selective demolition of less significant elements on the rear of the range fronting on to Trumpington Street and also removing two bays from the School House. The works to the School House also include replacing the roof where the timber ties on the original trusses were cut through and the roof

reformed to allow the insertion of a first floor. While the south elevation, which incorporates a rose window, is to be retained, the Panel noted that the proposals would effectively result in a new building replacing the School House.

Trumpington Street

The proposals for linking the new College accommodation across Trumpington Street to the existing College have been developed in consultation with the Highway Authority and include granite setts in bands across the road to provide a degree of traffic calming either side of a new pedestrian crossing that is to be formed on the axis of Kenmare House, and will be formed in light and dark granite setts. The Panel were generally supportive of these proposals, and were keen to see them developed further so as to better reveal the significance of Hobson's Conduit at the points where the crossing will intersect with the Conduit. The proposals would also need to incorporate blister paving to help blind people identify the crossing, which might be achieved through brass studs in the stone paving at either end of the crossing. The Panel were pleased to learn that the design team are working closely with the Trustees of the Conduit.

The forecourt to Kenmare House is to be opened up to provide adequate space for circulation and movement across Trumpington Street. This will require the removal of the existing dwarf wall at the back of the current pavement. The forecourt is to be paved in natural stonework that will be different to the colour of the pavement, and incorporating a narrow band of planting immediately in front of Kenmare House. Consideration had been given to incorporating railings or a dwarf wall in front of this planting, but this was felt to be too close to Kenmare House to work successfully. The Panel felt that the depth of the planting was rather tokenistic and that it would benefit from being made deeper. A deeper depth to this planting might also allow the possible use of railings in front of Kenmare House to be re-visited.

75 Trumpington Street

The design of the new building to replace 75 Trumpington Street and provide access through to Kenmare Garden has also been re-visited. The first floor window to the gallery is now to be in two separate elements; a larger window fronting on to Trumpington Street and a smaller window on the return wall overlooking the forecourt to Kenmare House. While noting these changes, the Panel consider that this part of

the scheme would benefit from further design development, which might also consider incorporating the college crest to signal this new entrance (a well-established practice amongst Cambridge Colleges).

Conclusion:

The Panel generally welcomed the design developments that had taken place since their last consideration of these proposals, and in particular regarding their previous concerns about site access and cycle parking provision. The Panel also welcomed the interaction of the development with the public realm on Trumpington Street. However, the Panel considered that the proposals would benefit from further design development for the top floor of Dolby Court and 75 Trumpington Street, together with refinement of the landscaping to Kenmare House forecourt.

VERDICT – GREEN (4), AMBER (2)

Application Number	18/1931/LBC	Agenda Item	
Date Received	7th January 2019	Officer	Tony Collins
Target Date	4th March 2019		
Ward	Market		
Site	Redevelopment Area Of Mill Lane Cambridge Cambridgeshire		
Proposal	Demolition of rear two storey extension to Kenmare House, dwarf wall of Kenmare House fronting Trumpington Street, narthex, foyer spaces, lobby, two storey school rooms and north gable end of Emmanuel United Reformed Church; and alterations to 1 Mill Lane, Kenmare House, and Emmanuel United Reformed Church, in connection with expansion of Pembroke College.		
Applicant	Pembroke College		

SUMMARY	The development accords with the Development Plan for the following reason: It would enhance the setting of, and secure the future of, listed buildings within the site.
RECOMMENDATION	APPROVAL

1.0 SITE DESCRIPTION/AREA CONTEXT

- 1.1 The site, close to the city centre, between Trumpington Street and the river, is part of an area designated U1 in the Proposals Schedule of the Cambridge Local Plan (2018), and subject to a site-specific policy in the plan (Policy 26).
- 1.2 The site falls within the Historic Core conservation area. There are on the site, a number of listed buildings. These are shown in Table 1 below. The site occupies the major part of the irregular quadrilateral formed by Trumpington Street, Mill Lane, Little St Mary's Lane and Granta Place. It has extensive frontages on the first two of those streets and minor frontages on Little St Mary's Lane. Mill Lane and Granta Place are described as 'significant' streets in the Historic Core Conservation Area

Appraisal, while Little St Mary's Lane is accorded 'high' significance in the appraisal, and Trumpington Street 'very high' significance.

Table 1: existing listed buildings within the application site

Name	Status	Position
1 Mill Lane	Grade II listed	On the corner of Mill Lane and Trumpington Street; NE corner of site
Emmanuel United Reformed Church	Grade II listed	Corner of Trumpington Street and Little St Mary's Lane. SE corner of site.
Kenmare House, 74 Trumpington Street	Grade II listed	Faces Trumpington Street
74a Trumpington Street	Grade II listed	Faces Trumpington Street, to the north of No.74
Hobson's Conduit	Grade II listed	Runs alongside Trumpington Street, on both east and west sides

2.0 THE PROPOSAL

- 2.1 The elements of the proposal which require listed building consent are confined to the eastern part of the site.
- 2.2 The eastern part of the site is currently occupied by a complicated group of buildings. In the north-east corner are Kenmare House (74 Trumpington Street) and its north-eastward extension (74a), and Nos. 1 and 4 Mill Lane, which are all interconnected. 74, 74a and No.1 Mill Lane are listed, but No.4 Mill Lane is not. It is proposed to demolish the two-storey, twentieth-century extension at the south-west corner of Kenmare, and to remove the dwarf wall separating the paved area in front of Kenmare from the highway. All of the remainder of these buildings, which lie outside the application site would be retained: their interiors reconfigured for College use, but their external appearance unaltered.

- 2.3 In the south-east corner of the site is Emmanuel United Reformed Church which dates from 1874. It has ancillary buildings and spaces on its north side and to the rear: the School Hall, to the rear, built at the same time as the church; the additional schoolroom, east of the Hall, added in 1897, and the single-storey narthex at the northeast corner of the church, and the corridor linking it to the schoolroom, which were added in the 1990s. Between the church and Kenmare are two three-storey buildings facing Trumpington Street (Nos. 75 and 76), until recently linked to Kenmare, and used with it by the University Estate Management Service.
- 2.4 It is proposed to retain the church building, No.76 Trumpington Street, and the southernmost section of the Church Hall building, including the whole of its south gable, but to demolish the remainder of the buildings in this group: No.75 Trumpington Street, the later rear extension of No.76, the modern narthex and northern corridor of the church, the 'schoolroom' building to the north of the church, and all of the northern part of the church hall.
- 2.5. On the site of the present No.75, a new College gatehouse would be erected. This building would replicate the height and mass of No.75 on Trumpington Street, and would be physically attached, as No.75 is, to Kenmare. No.76 would be retained
- 2.6 To the rear of the new gatehouse, a long single-storey space (8m x 17m) would be created, with glazing all along the north wall facing the proposed new Kenmare garden. This space would serve as the principal entrance to, and foyer for, a proposed new performance space in the URC church building, and would be attached to it. The church would be retained largely unaltered. No changes to it at all are proposed in the present application, but a future listed building consent application is expected to make relatively minor alterations to the interior. The foyer would connect the gatehouse to a bar and toilets contained within the footprint of the present Church Hall. The existing south gable, and part of the fabric of the west wall of the Hall would be retained, a new pitched roof would be constructed at a similar height to the present roof, and a new north gable added, with doors leading out to the Kenmare garden. A new single-storey link, faced in stone, would replace the existing narthex.

- 2.7 The full scheme as proposed in 18/1930/FUL, would involve alterations to Hobson's Conduit. The Conduit is listed in its own right, but changes to it are not sought in this listed building application. A future listed building application seeking consent for works to the Conduit is anticipated.

3.0 SITE HISTORY

- 3.1 This is a large and complex site, with a lengthy planning history. I have limited the list below to applications made in the two decades prior to the present application. I do not consider that any of the earlier applications on the site are of relevance.

3.2

Ref.	Site	Description	Outcome
98/0186	Stuart House	Platform lift	Approved with conditions
98/0309	Kenmare	Internal alterations to reception area	Approved with conditions
01/0314	4 Mill Lane	Fire escape door	Approved with conditions
01/0315	4 Mill Lane	Fire escape door	Approved with conditions
01/0625	Kenmare	Security cameras	Approved with conditions
02/0067	Kenmare	Security cameras	Withdrawn
02/0068	Kenmare	Security cameras	Approved with conditions
04/0054	Kenmare and 4 Mill Lane	Cycle parking stands and shelter; installation of fire escape door.	Approved with conditions
04/0859	Bailey Grundy Barrett Building	Forming of new opening and installation of window.	Approved with conditions
05/0431	Mill Lane Lecture Rooms	External fire exit staircase and air handling unit.	Approved with conditions
12/0078	Kenmare	Internal alterations to ground floor and first floor.	Approved with conditions

14/0150	Millers' Yard	Proposed change of use of premises from a mixed use Class (B1(a) office) and Class A3 (restaurant use) to a sui-generis graduate student accommodation development, including alterations and extensions to provide a total of 97 study bedrooms including ancillary facilities.	Withdrawn
16/0011	Bailey Grundy Barrett Building	Vary condition 2 of C/98/0433 to allow the building to be used for general office (B1a) use rather than being limited to University use.	Approved with conditions
18/1011	Kenmare	External repairs and re-decorations and internal refurbishments.	Approved with conditions
18/1930	Whole block south of Mill Lane	Redevelopment of site to form expansion of Pembroke College comprising repurposing of existing buildings, demolition and erection of new buildings for a mix of uses comprising student residential units, office floorspace, teaching space, College leisure and community floorspace, commercial retail and food and drink floorspace; and ancillary uses.	Under consideration

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 2018 policies, Supplementary Planning Documents and Material Considerations.

5.2 Relevant Development Plan policies

PLAN	POLICY NUMBER
Cambridge Local Plan 2018	61

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

Central Government Guidance	National Planning Policy Framework July 2018 National Planning Policy Framework – Planning Practice Guidance from 3 March 2014 onwards Circular 11/95 (Annex A)
Previous Supplementary Planning Documents (These documents, prepared to support policies in the 2006 local plan are no longer SPDs, but are still material considerations.)	Old Press/Mill Lane Supplementary Planning Document (January 2010)
Material Considerations	<u>City Wide Guidance</u> Air Quality in Cambridge – Developers Guide (2008)

	Arboricultural Strategy (2004) Biodiversity Checklist for Land Use Planners in Cambridgeshire and Peterborough (March 2001). Cambridge and Milton Surface Water Management Plan (2011) Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (November 2010) Cambridge City Council Draft Air Quality Action Plan 2018-2023 Cambridge City Nature Conservation Strategy (2006) Cambridge Walking and Cycling Strategy (2002) Cambridgeshire Design Guide For Streets and Public Realm (2007)
	<u>Area Guidelines</u> Cambridge Historic Core Conservation Area Appraisal (2015)

6.0 CONSULTATIONS

Cambridgeshire County Council (Highways Development Management)

6.1 No comment made.

Conservation Team

6.2 74 Trumpington Street – The rear two storey extension (extreme western gault brick addition of 1906) is not of importance to the significance of the Listed building and so its demolition is considered acceptable. Demolition of dwarf wall to street frontage represents a low level of less than substantial harm.

- 6.3 Emmanuel United Reformed Church. This 19th century church was Grade listed Grade II in August 1996. The narthex and the lobby within the tower are 1990s additions. The proposals would create a new gallery/foyer space along the north side of the church, attached to the existing building. These alterations are considered acceptable. The demolition of the two storey classroom additions of c.1897 (not considered a significant element) is also acceptable.
- 6.4 The Sunday schoolroom however, was an original part of the church building and though it has been previously substantially altered, still has significance and residual historic fabric (internally - the original upper roof trusses). Its substantial demolition is a negative impact and is to suit the forming of the proposed gallery/foyer.
- 6.5 Overall the proposals for the church building re-purpose it from its current (but reportedly shortly to cease) ecclesiastic use and this is preferable to the building becoming redundant.
- 6.6 Summary of impact the Listed Buildings. The low degree of harm involved needs to be seen against the benefits to the Listed Buildings concerned. In terms of the NPPF, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use. NPPF para 196. These would appear to be chiefly associated with the reuse of the church.

Historic England

Background

- 6.7 The existing buildings and their layout reflect the evolution of this edge of historic town area. The earliest structures appear to date from the Georgian era, although clearly plot divisions and other evidence reflect the earlier history of this area of the town, traditionally associated with the mills on the Cam, and lying outside the King's Ditch. Rebuilding schemes in the past have erased some aspects of the site's former character.

Former United Reformed Church

- 6.8 The incorporation of the United Reformed Church within the Pembroke scheme gives the opportunity for considerable public

benefits, which have been embraced by the evolving proposals. The location of the proposed entrance pavilion at 75 Trumpington Street also allows its facilities to be incorporated into the support spaces for the reuse of the URC building. Although intervention to the listed church itself would be minimal, the proposals include the replacement of almost all of its secondary buildings. Most of these are modern and of little or no heritage value. The former school block to the north-west corner of the URC site does, however, have some significance. Under the proposals this building would be largely demolished, with the exception of the southern gable and part of the side wall. The main historic interest is undoubtedly in the gable, and the powerful presence it has when seen from the south, from Little St Mary's Lane. The information supporting the scheme has shown that the remainder of the building has been heavily altered, to the point that what significance it might have had can be said to have been seriously compromised. In our opinion this level of demolition has been justified.

The wider scheme

- 6.9 The design of the main buildings of the new Dolby Court has been carried out in such a manner as to respect and enhance the key elements of the site and its wider context. The southern range of the court is stepped down in scale to respect the existing domestic buildings on Little St Mary's Lane, which lie outside the scheme. As noted above, we particularly note the care with which the handling of the elevations of the block that will replace the Lecture Rooms building has been handled. This elevation, and particular its corner, are prominent in views down Mill Lane from Pembroke Street due to the shape of the street. The incorporation of Stuart House as the east side of the new court is also to be welcomed, as well as The conversion of Kenmare House and other Trumpington Street buildings to appropriate new uses is welcomed.

Summary

- 6.10 The proposal provides an opportunity to enhance this extensive site within the conservation area, including the re-use of existing historic buildings, several of which are listed. Although some buildings will be lost, we have considered the justification provided, and the evidence of the options explored for potential retention, and believe that a convincing case has been made for their removal.

- 6.11 Historic England has no objection to the application on heritage grounds. We consider that the application meets the requirements of the NPPF, in particular paragraph numbers 184, 193 & 196.

Design and Conservation Panel

- 6.12 Following two presentations of a masterplan for the whole Mill Lane site, a detailed proposal for the present application site was brought to Panel in October 2018. The conclusions of the Panel meeting were as follows:

(Reminder - CABE 'traffic light' definitions: GREEN: a good scheme, or one that is acceptable subject to minor improvements. AMBER: in need of *significant* improvements to make it acceptable, but not a matter of starting from scratch. RED: the scheme is fundamentally flawed and a fresh start is needed.)

- 6.13 The Panel generally welcomed the design developments that had taken place since their last consideration of these proposals, and in particular regarding their previous concerns about site access and cycle parking provision. The Panel also welcomed the interaction of the development with the public realm on Trumpington Street. However, the Panel considered that the proposals would benefit from further design development for the top floor of Dolby Court and 75 Trumpington Street, together with refinement of the landscaping to Kenmare House forecourt.

- 6.14 VERDICT – GREEN (4), AMBER (2)

- 6.15 The full relevant sections of the minutes of the panel meeting is attached to this report as Appendix A.

- 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 The occupiers of the following addresses have made representations about the scheme proposed in this application and its linked planning application 18/1930/FUL

- 6 Dane Drive (owner of 6 Little St Mary's Lane)
- 15 Latham Close
- 2 Little St Mary's Lane
- 6 Little St Mary's Lane (two representations)
- 7 Little St Mary's Lane (two representations)
- 8 Little St Mary's Lane
- 9 Little St Mary's Lane
- 4 Pearce Close
- 4 Russell Street
- 52 Ealing Village, Ealing, W5

7.2 The majority of the representations concerned issues outside the scope of this listed building application, but the following issue was raised.

- Damage to listed buildings

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 The main issues are:

1. Impact on the Kenmare group of buildings
2. Impact on the listed URC church
3. Third party representations

Kenmare group

8.2 I concur with the conservation officer that the demolition of the later rear extension is acceptable because this element is not important to the significance of the listed building.

8.3 The dwarf wall across the front of the Kenmare forecourt plays a small role in the setting of this building, establishing it as a building of stature, with its own defined separate space in front,

distinct from the highway. The loss of the wall would diminish this significance slightly. However, the application proposes new paving, which would draw a clear distinction between the street footway and the forecourt. In my view this would restore much of the limited lost significance. A condition is necessary to control the precise details of this paving.

Emmanuel Church

- 8.4 Most of the original church building lies outside the application site, and will be the subject of a later listed building consent application for minor changes to the interior.
- 8.5 In my view, the removal of the 1990's narthex, the internal entrance lobby beneath the tower, the connecting corridor, and the 1897 schoolroom and toilets would enhance the significance of the listed building, revealing more of its original appearance and eliminating clutter and elements whose form reads awkwardly against the original design.
- 8.6 I accept the view of the conservation officer that the original School Hall is an element of greater significance, and that some of the church's significance will be lost as a result of the demolition of the majority of this element. However, in my view, the loss of significance is relatively minor, both because the most significant part of the Hall, its south gable, is proposed for retention, and because previous alterations to the building have compromised its significance, especially by completely altering the roof structure.
- 8.7 Furthermore, I consider that the limited harm caused by the partial demolition of the Hall would be outweighed by the following factors.
- It would provide a secure, active and viable future for the church building, avoiding its becoming redundant.
 - It would considerably enhance the setting of the church by revealing its presently hidden north and west sides, enabling them to be appreciated from a well-designed open space, and by enabling the construction of an appropriate new addition to the building which would provide an appropriate entrance route to it.

Third party representations

- 8.8 I do not consider that any of the proposed demolitions and alterations would cause unacceptable harm to the listed buildings.

9.0 CONCLUSION

- 9.1 In my view, the very limited loss of significance to the listed buildings in this application is outweighed by the wider public benefits of improving the setting of the church and the rear elevation of Kenmare, and facilitating long-term secure and viable use of the listed buildings.

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 consent.

Reason: To comply with the requirements of Section 18 of the Planning (Listed Building & Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (as amended by 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 and for the avoidance of doubt.

3. No work on the resurfacing of the Kenmare forecourt shall take place until full details of the proposed paving, additional step and granite dividing strip adjacent to the footway have been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority. Paving shall take place only in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To protect the significance of the Listed Building (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policy 61).

4. Work shall not commence on the demolition of the rear extension to Kenmare, until a demolition method statement has been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority. Demolition shall proceed in accordance with the approved method statement.

Reason: To protect the significance of the Listed Building (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policy 61).

5. No work shall be join the new gatehouse building to Kenmare shall be commenced until details of the junctions between these two buildings have been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority. Construction shall take place only in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To protect the significance of the Listed Building (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policy 61).

18/1931/LBC - Appendix A

Cambridge City Council

Design & Conservation Panel

Relevant notes of the meeting Wednesday 10th October 2018

1. Presentation – Old Press Mill Lane South Block.

This was first seen by the Panel in November 2017 and then again in May 2018. This latest consideration of the scheme focused on the main areas of design development that had taken place since May.

Cycle parking and servicing arrangements

Further development has taken place on the area between the University Centre and the west end of the new Dolby Court. This area will provide a major component on of the cycle parking for the proposals, including residents of Dolby Court. The Panel were generally supportive of the changes in this area, though some concern was expressed that the restrictive nature of the space might have implications for the longer term wellbeing of the proposed sedum roofs to the two enclosed cycle stores. The two trees to be planted within this space would also need to be carefully selected to ensure they did not grow too large for the space.

A total of 4 disabled parking bays are to be provided to serve Dolby Court and accessed off Little St Mary's Lane. These will service the 5 disabled access study-bedrooms (the experience of the college is that not all students requiring accessible study-bedrooms will need cars and therefore a 1:1 ratio of car parking to accessible study-bedrooms is not necessary). The parking is to be provided within a space that will also contain a relocated electricity substation. The site for the substation has been revised so as to allow the retention of one of a group of three sycamore trees on Little St Mary's Lane, and the new substation has been designed to read as part of a new boundary wall facing on to Little St Mary's Lane and the south-east boundary of the University Centre. The Panel were again supportive of these changes, and in particular welcomed the retention of the sycamore tree which would help soften the impact of the new Dolby Court. They also noted that the brickwork for the boundary wall and substation should respond to the context of Little St Mary's Lane rather than the Dolby Court.

The new commercial units on the ground floor to the Mill Lane wing to Dolby Court will all be serviced from Mill Lane. Additional provision for servicing off Mill Lane is to be made by setting back the gates in front of Stuart House. The Panel were generally supportive of the proposed detailing for the re-sited gates, though noted that the new stone paving on the Mill Lane side of these gates will need to be appropriately sized and carefully detailed so as to be able to take high point loadings from vehicles (the size and weight of vehicles parking in this area cannot be controlled).

Dolby Court

Further design development has taken place on the proposals for the new Dolby Court. The dormers to the retained section of Miller's Yard (fronting on to Mill Lane) have been revised so as to reduce their bulk and impact in the streetscape, which was welcomed by the Panel. Elsewhere, and in particular on the internal courtyard elevations to the new Court, the set-back mansard roof to the top floor has been revised to incorporate dormers that are an integral part of the masonry elevations. These dormers have thick stone surrounds which appear visually 'heavier' than the narrow surrounds to the windows on the lower floors, and the Panel found this apparent reversal of historic precedent to be somewhat uncomfortable, and recommended further review and development of this element of the design.

Further design development has also taken place on the architectural treatment of the commercial units fronting on to Mill Lane. Two alternative solutions were put forward, one involving a more traditional timber shopfront design and an alternative solution incorporated recessed glazed shopfronts that attempted to respond to the more to the 'industrial' context of the buildings on the north-side of Mill Lane. The Panel did not have a particular strong view on which approach should be pursued, but noted that if the recessed glazed option is to be adopted there might be scope to have some 'fun' with the detailing of the recessed glazing.

Kenmare Garden

The new Kenmare Garden will be created through selective demolition of less significant elements on the rear of the range fronting on to Trumpington Street and also removing two bays from the School House. The works to the School House also include replacing the roof where the timber ties on the original trusses were cut through and the roof

reformed to allow the insertion of a first floor. While the south elevation, which incorporates a rose window, is to be retained, the Panel noted that the proposals would effectively result in a new building replacing the School House.

Trumpington Street

The proposals for linking the new College accommodation across Trumpington Street to the existing College have been developed in consultation with the Highway Authority and include granite setts in bands across the road to provide a degree of traffic calming either side of a new pedestrian crossing that is to be formed on the axis of Kenmare House, and will be formed in light and dark granite setts. The Panel were generally supportive of these proposals, and were keen to see them developed further so as to better reveal the significance of Hobson's Conduit at the points where the crossing will intersect with the Conduit. The proposals would also need to incorporate blister paving to help blind people identify the crossing, which might be achieved through brass studs in the stone paving at either end of the crossing. The Panel were pleased to learn that the design team are working closely with the Trustees of the Conduit.

The forecourt to Kenmare House is to be opened up to provide adequate space for circulation and movement across Trumpington Street. This will require the removal of the existing dwarf wall at the back of the current pavement. The forecourt is to be paved in natural stonework that will be different to the colour of the pavement, and incorporating a narrow band of planting immediately in front of Kenmare House. Consideration had been given to incorporating railings or a dwarf wall in front of this planting, but this was felt to be too close to Kenmare House to work successfully. The Panel felt that the depth of the planting was rather tokenistic and that it would benefit from being made deeper. A deeper depth to this planting might also allow the possible use of railings in front of Kenmare House to be re-visited.

75 Trumpington Street

The design of the new building to replace 75 Trumpington Street and provide access through to Kenmare Garden has also been re-visited. The first floor window to the gallery is now to be in two separate elements; a larger window fronting on to Trumpington Street and a smaller window on the return wall overlooking the forecourt to Kenmare House. While noting these changes, the Panel consider that this part of

the scheme would benefit from further design development, which might also consider incorporating the college crest to signal this new entrance (a well-established practice amongst Cambridge Colleges).

Conclusion:

The Panel generally welcomed the design developments that had taken place since their last consideration of these proposals, and in particular regarding their previous concerns about site access and cycle parking provision. The Panel also welcomed the interaction of the development with the public realm on Trumpington Street. However, the Panel considered that the proposals would benefit from further design development for the top floor of Dolby Court and 75 Trumpington Street, together with refinement of the landscaping to Kenmare House forecourt.

VERDICT – GREEN (4), AMBER (2)

PLANNING COMMITTEE

11th June 2019

Application Number	17/2265/FUL	Agenda Item	
Date Received	10th January 2018	Officer	Mairead O'Sullivan
Target Date	11th April 2018		
Ward	Queen Ediths		
Site Proposal	Homerton College Hills Road Cambridge CB2 8PH Demolition of existing conference reception building and construction of a new Dining Hall, buttry area, kitchens and associated facilities and new areas of hard and soft landscaping.		
Applicant	Ms Deborah Griffin Homerton College, Hills Road Cambridge CB2 8PH		

SUMMARY	The development accords with the Development Plan for the following reasons: - The proposal would be acceptable in terms of design and would respect the special interest of the listed Ibberson Building - The proposal is not considered to give rise to any significant adverse impact to residential amenity
RECOMMENDATION	APPROVAL

1.0 SITE DESCRIPTION/AREA CONTEXT

- 1.1 The application site falls within the main campus of Homerton College. The site lies on the southern side of Harrison Drive. Harrison Drive is a private road and was until recently a back lane predominantly used for servicing. The character has begun to change over recent years with the construction of a mix of student and market housing on the western end of the lane.
- 1.2 There are a number of other live applications in the vicinity, within Homerton College, which are under consideration by the council. A number of other applications have also been

considered over the past two years. Many of these proposals are tied into the dining hall application

- 1.3 The site does not fall within a conservation area. The Ibberson Building which forms part of the application site is a Grade II Listed Building. The area to the rear of the site is Protected Open Space. The site lies within a TPO area.

2.0 THE PROPOSAL

- 2.1 The application seeks full planning permission for the demolition of the existing conference reception building and construction of a new Dining Hall, with buttry area, kitchens and associated facilities and new landscaping. The application is accompanied by a listed building consent application to cover the demolition of the reception building which is attached to the Grade II Listed Ibberson Building.
- 2.2 The application has been revised since submission to overcome concerns raised by the Conservation Officer and Tree Officer. Further information was also provided to address comments from the Lead Local Flood Authority.
- 2.3 The proposed development results from a need to modernise the college's kitchen and to deal with an increased student population (the number of students within the college has doubled since its last kitchen installation). The Dining Hall will be used to meet the college's daily dining needs as well as college events/celebratory meals. It will free up the Great Hall, which is currently used for dining but not adequately large to accommodate all users, for use for lecturers. The proposal is to meet existing needs and is not proposed to increase student or staff numbers.
- 2.4 Following the demolition of the existing conference reception building which is attached to the Listed Ibberson building, a new building is proposed adjacent to Harrison Drive. Further details of brickwork finish have been provided for the element which abuts the listed building. A glazed linking element, which contains a reception and the buttry, is proposed to run from Harisson Drive into the site which connects to the Dining Hall. The element which abuts the listed building provides meeting rooms and toilets. The kitchen is housed in the western part of the ground floor. A lay-by is proposed adjacent to the kitchen to

accommodate deliveries. A glazed corridor is provided above the buttry which is shown to provide seating. Offices and staff changing rooms are proposed above part of the kitchen.

- 2.5 The Dining Hall is proposed to be set behind these buildings. This building was amended through the course of the application due to concerns from the fire officer. Following an objection from the Conservation Officer the building has reverted to its original design; this has been agreed in principle with the Fire Officer. The Dining Hall has a ground floor colonnade and viewing gallery at first floor. It is proposed to have a concrete base with a large amount of glazing looking over the college lawns. It would be clad in faience which takes the form of fins which taper towards the top of the building with glazing in between.

3.0 SITE HISTORY

Reference	Description	Outcome
19/0237/LBC	Fire safety compliance work, including an improvement to an existing staircase to form a secure fire escape route, and providing a second means of escape from a second-floor conference room via a new external staircase.	Pending consideration
18/1769/S73	Section 73 application to remove condition 28 of 18/0173/FUL (Demolition of two existing single storey extensions and construction of a four storey extension incorporating a finishing kitchen, plant room and multi-purpose space (auditorium) at ground floor and conference hotel quality bedrooms for conference delegates and students of Homerton college on the upper floors.) to remove the restriction on who can occupy the hotel quality rooms.	Pending consideration

18/1116/FUL	Erection of a new children's day nursery on the existing Faculty of Education car park, with associated outdoor playspace, alterations to the car park, provision of new bicycle and buggy parking, landscaping and ancillary works.	Permitted
18/0174/LBC	Demolition of two existing single storey utility buildings, making good of external wall where extensions were removed and insertion of new window to match existing.	Permitted
18/0173/FUL	Demolition of two existing single storey extensions and construction of a four storey extension incorporating a finishing kitchen, plant room and multi-purpose space (auditorium) at ground floor and conference hotel quality bedrooms for conference delegates and students of Homerton college on the upper floors.	Permitted
17/2266/LBC	Demolition of existing conference reception building to create new Dining Hall.	Pending consideration
17/2247/FUL	Construction of two storey rear and side extension to grounds maintenance building and insertion of dormers and velux roof lights	Permitted
17/1855/FUL	Construction of small infill extension on Biology Block and demolition of existing Lecture Theatre & Dance Studio buildings. New hard standing for cycle storage and new accessible path to link extension to car park and footpath on Harrison Drive.	Permitted

17/0274/LBC	Internal remodelling including the relocation of the existing oak staircase and continuation to second floor via a new oak stair and widening of the central circulation concourse with improved access to the Combination Room. Addition of new external fire escape door to the East elevation, and a new first floor east-west corridor between the existing roof structures.	Permitted
17/0273/FUL	New first floor east-west corridor between the existing roof structures.	Permitted
17/0097/FUL	Three storey extension to rear to form new stair enclosure to DE Block. Construction of three storey extension to rear to West Wing. Extension to K Block above first floor level to enclose the stairwell and provide new staircase and in-filling of an existing external courtyard. Raised parapet and new windows, doors and rooflights to Paupers Walk and associated hard landscaping.	Permitted

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 2018 policies, Supplementary Planning Documents and Material Considerations.

5.2 Relevant Development Plan policies

PLAN	POLICY NUMBER
Cambridge Local Plan 2018	1 28 31 32 33 34 35 36 55 56 57 58 59 61 67 70 71 74 81 82

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

Central Government Guidance	National Planning Policy Framework 2019 National Planning Policy Framework – Planning Practice Guidance from 3 March 2014 onwards Circular 11/95 (Annex A)
Previous Supplementary Planning Documents (These documents, prepared to support policies in the 2006 local plan are no longer SPDs, but are still material considerations.)	Sustainable Design and Construction (May 2007) Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Waste Partnership (RECAP): Waste Management Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (February 2012) Public Art (January 2010)

Material Considerations	<u>City Wide Guidance</u> Arboricultural Strategy (2004) Cambridge and Milton Surface Water Management Plan (2011) Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (November 2010) Cambridge City Council Waste and Recycling Guide: For Developers. Cycle Parking Guide for New Residential Developments (2010)

6.0 CONSULTATIONS

Cambridgeshire County Council (Highways Development Management)

6.1 No comment.

Environmental Health

6.2 No objection: Two informatives are requested. Conditions are recommended to cover the following:

- Construction hours
- Collections/deliveries during construction
- Dust
- construction/demolition noise/vibration & piling
- Artificial lighting
- Odour filtration
- Plant noise insulation
- Contaminated land

Refuse and Recycling

6.3 No comments received.

Urban Design and Conservation Team

Conservation Officer

First comment

- 6.4 Objection: The Dining Hall is the best element of the proposal. The design is interesting without being overbearing or trying too hard to outshine the nearby Listed Building. Subject to materials and detailing, it has good potential to work well with the rest of the college campus and to provide the facilities required. The internal space should be quite dramatic and the exterior eye-catching. Getting the faience cladding right will be a significant concern and the proposed use of *in situ* concrete also of some concern. Concrete can be a remarkable material but if cast poorly, mix design inappropriate and not properly weather-detailed it can deteriorate rapidly and appear awful. This element of the scheme could be supported subject to Conditions.
- 6.5 The kitchen is, by comparison with the dining hall, rather bland and fails to provide an interesting companion to it and doesn't present a very appetising façade to Harrison Drive. The entrance doors & surrounds give no real 'sense of arrival' to the foyer of the main building behind. The characterless patio doors proposed underplay the visual importance of this area. The patterned brickwork around the kitchen windows helps uplift the kitchen block somewhat and, if well executed, could give this element a bit more character. The proposed artificial stone band course and copings, if well chosen, could also help render this block less box-like.
- 6.6 The element that links the Listed Building (LB) to the proposed entrance and foyer to the main building [the Dining Hall] behind is of great importance to the overall scheme in both its relationship – physical and visual – to the older parts of the college campus and its contribution to the fairly long façade to Harrison Drive, which is how passers-by will perceive the project.
- 6.7 The proposal to demolish the Conference Reception wing of the Listed Building is unacceptable and unjustified. It is particularly

inappropriate when the proposed replacement building is merely to house toilets and meeting rooms and the access passage from the adjacent Listed Building. There is no reason why the existing building could not be incorporated into the scheme to better illustrate the further evolution of the architecture of the college. It is certainly capable of having the interior altered to incorporate toilets and it should be possible to raise the roof to accommodate some meeting rooms and the First Floor passage. The Ground Floor access passage could be either incorporated into the existing (behind the French doors) or by creating a further element of colonnade in front of the South elevation. This option does, in fact, offer much more opportunity for creative design than is suggested by the token effort illustrated on Page 6 of the Heritage Statement. There is an opportunity for an interesting roof solution and reflecting the glazing design of the existing Listed Building and the new Dining Hall and kitchen block in the passage and the meeting rooms at First Floor.

Second comment

- 6.8 Objection: amendments have been made to the linking building and kitchen. Following the submission of further information about the finish of the linking block the Conservation team were willing to support the demolition of part of the listed building subject to conditions. However during the course of the application amendments were also made to the dining hall due to concerns regarding means of escape raised by the Fire Officer. The changes dilute the design of the Dining Hall. It is of concern that the fire escape issues appear so late in the design process rather than being included in the original design approach. None of the options put forward are wholly acceptable. However the escape stair within the spine wall and external escape stair appear to have some merit.
- 6.9 The deletion of the ground floor colonnade and the first floor gallery is unacceptable. These were important features in the strong support for the scheme originally and the quality of the dining hall design was one reason why the demolitions around the LB were very reluctantly agreed. If the quality of the main

element of the scheme is to be downgraded then this brings the whole scheme into doubt and would change the assessment of positives against negatives with the scheme which is finely balanced in terms of justification for the loss of part of the listed building.

- 6.10 The relationship of the colonnade to the outdoor space [Eastern Courtyard] is an important element to the assemblage of buildings – particularly including the LB – around the space and the transparency / accesses of the buildings into this constrained space that then flows out into the wider campus is vital. To blank off the ‘gable’ end of the dining hall fronting this space is unacceptable. The “civic approach” CGI is particularly telling in that it clearly shows the dining hall seemingly ‘closed off’ and unwelcoming when viewed from that direction – the opposite of what it should be.
- 6.11 The value of the gallery to the internal space of the dining hall is immense and it appears to be significant to the good functioning of the space for many college events. The interior CGIs showing “development image – proposed hall interior” are convincing arguments for the visual contribution the gallery makes to the way the hall might look and work.

Third comment

- 6.12 No objection: The scheme has been revised to reflect more the original concept of the main dining hall and to return the important elements that formed part of the setting of the Listed Building.
- 6.13 Dining Hall: This has now reverted to an acceptable design. This should be the centrepiece of the development but will only be so if the detailing, choice of materials and execution are exemplary. Conditions are recommended as before but should now include one to refer to the external window glazing, framing & surrounds. The Eastern Courtyard colonnade provides a good setting for the Listed Building (subject to the detailed landscaping) and the internal gallery provides an excellent connection with traditional college forms. It is understood that

the earlier fire escape problems can now be dealt with in an acceptable way. The roofing of this hall (and other elements) should be the subject of a Condition.

- 6.14 Kitchen: The kitchen block is the more functional element of the scheme but it has an important street façade which will be the ‘public face’ of the design from Harrison Drive. Good, detailed, large-scale drawings have been produced showing how decorative brick detailing and surface modelling can raise this above its functional status. These should form part of the ‘approved drawings’ aspect of any consent granted to ensure that they are included as part of the final build.
- 6.15 Foyer: This is vitally important in showing first-time visitors (for conferences, etc.) how to use the building. A well-designed entrance is central to the success of this group from the Harrison Drive perspective. The serious underplaying of the doors and entrance is very disappointing and has been raised before. This should be the subject of a condition. Likewise the way in which the top edge of the building is terminated needs proper consideration and should also be the subject of a condition. Perhaps a good landscaped front area (including the tree) can help overcome the lack of visual impact.
- 6.16 Link Block: This does not appear to have changed radically since the demolition and so on were agreed earlier. Getting the materials and detailing right will be important. In this, and other, areas where there is floor-to-ceiling glazing the agents will need to demonstrate that the lower portions of glazing are translucent rather than transparent to avoid the sight of office or other junk being piled against glass and visible from the outside.
- 6.17 Listed Building: Since the demolition of the current reception area and its replacement by the Link Block [see above] has been informally accepted it will be important to understand how the later construction is removed from the LB and how the new-build element is attached to the former gymnasium. This will require a demolition Method Statement which should include any aspect of making good and then describe how the new work is constructed and built-in (or otherwise fixed) to the

historic fabric. It should be noted that joints involving visible mastic will not be acceptable. These items should be the subject of a condition.

Urban Design Officer

- 6.18 No objection: The proposed dining hall is a positive addition to the collection of buildings on the site. Its location is prominent within the site and has long views from across the lawns. The design responds well to this, allowing the hall to become a celebratory element. The activities of the hall (formal and celebratory events, among others), are well matched to the building. The remaining built elements of the scheme are more subservient to the Dining Hall which is supported in design terms. These house different functions from the kitchen, meeting rooms and a reception area. The elevation along Harrison Drive has a more subtle contemporary finish with brick patterning, which addresses the drive in a sensitive way.
- 6.19 The refuse and recycling store has been rearranged to gain access from a side entrance rather than the initially proposed front entrance. This is supported in design terms. A lay-by has been designated for deliveries, which serves the building directly and does not appear to impact on the main entrance to the reception area. Cycle parking has been proposed as part of an adjacent scheme (17/1855/FUL). This is acceptable and should be delivered in time to serve this proposal. It is noted that there will not be an uplift in staff or student numbers and therefore additional cycle parking is not required. There are concerns that cutaway for the lay-by could impose on the tree roots – a better solution would be to continue the raised ramp west along the road, including the lay-by in this raised section.
- 6.20 There were some concerns that the northern elevation did not have a sense of ‘front’ about it. The nature of the scheme means that there are two front elevations, which needed to be addressed as such. This current submission includes a brick pattern across the elevations which helps link the two elements either side of the reception area and the entrance is clearly

defined by the glazing and bronze material. The window sizes have been rationalised, and large floor to ceiling glazing has been removed from the meeting rooms on the first floor. This is supported in design terms. The entrance signage and lighting should be conditioned.

Senior Sustainability Officer (Design and Construction)

- 6.21 No objection: The application is acceptable subject to a condition requiring implementation of the energy strategy.

Access Officer

- 6.22 No comments received.

Head of Streets and Open Spaces (Tree Team)

- 6.23 No comments received.

Head of Streets and Open Spaces (Landscape Team)

- 6.24 No objection: Conditions are recommended regarding hard and soft landscape, tree pits and green roof details.

Cambridgeshire County Council (Lead Local Flood Authority)

First comment

- 6.25 Objection: Insufficient information has been provided.

Second comment

- 6.26 No objection: Two conditions are recommended requiring surface water drainage details and long term maintenance of the surface water drainage measures.

Head of Streets and Open Spaces (Sustainable Drainage Officer)

- 6.27 No objection: Two conditions requiring surface water drainage details and compliance with these details are recommended.

Historic England

6.28 No comment.

Environment Agency

6.29 No objection: The site lies within Flood Risk Standing Advice. A number of informatives are requested.

Anglian Water

6.30 No objection: An informative is requested.

Public Art

6.31 No objection: A condition is requested requiring on site provision of public art. A previous application on site did not provide the public art which was required by condition so the budget is requested to be included in the proposed public art for the dining hall.

Cambridgeshire County Council (Archaeology)

6.32 No objection: A condition is recommended requiring the submission of a Written Scheme of Investigation (WSI).

Developer Contributions Monitoring Unit

6.33 The Developer Contributions Monitoring Unit (DCMU) does not propose to seek specific S106 financial contributions under the council's Planning Obligation Strategy SPD 2010, as Cambridge City Council does not seek S106 financial contributions from such developments.

6.34 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 5 Harrison Drive has made 4 representations.

7.2 The representations can be summarised as follows:

- Object to the loss of four mature trees which have amenity value.
- Consider that T006 can be easily retained
- The proposed removal of trees has not been transparent as there are inconsistencies in the plans submitted as part of this application and application 17/1855/FUL
- Currently deliveries occur from 6am and are noisy and frequent – concerned that unmanaged early hours will continue. Deliveries cause noise disturbance to residents.
- Object to service bay in residential area as an existing layby is causing highway safety issues. Request servicing is done from the main car park. Concerned about manoeuvring of vehicles servicing the Dining Hall.
- Concerned about noise from plant and the use of the dining hall
- Question whether dining hall should be relocated to ensure adequate public art can be provided.
- Doors to the bin store are likely to be noisy and due to their size are likely to be left open

7.3 Councillor McGerty has commented on the application and requested that it be determined at planning committee on the grounds that it seriously impacts the residential amenity for residents of Harrison Drive.

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. Principle of development
2. Context of site, design and external spaces and impact on heritage assets
3. Public Art
4. Carbon reduction and sustainable design
5. Water management and flood risk
6. Light pollution, noise, vibration, air quality, odour and dust

7. Inclusive access
8. Residential amenity
9. Refuse arrangements
10. Highway safety
11. Car and cycle parking
12. Third party representations

Principle of development

- 8.2 The site is allocated as Protected Open Space. The proposed development lies at the edge of the college's lawns and is on an already developed part of the site. As a result the proposal will not impact on the openness of the site and the proposal is considered compliant with policy 67 of the Cambridge Local Plan.
- 8.3 Policy 74 relates to new education facilities. It states that new or enhanced education facilities will be permitted if:
- a) The scale, range, quality and accessibility of education facilities are improved
 - b) They are located in the area they are expected to serve
 - c) They mitigate the impact of any associated residential development
 - d) They comply with the objectives of the Children's Service authority.

Criteria c and d are not relevant. The proposal creates a larger dining area for day to day use as well as special occasion dining for the college to meet with a need for larger dining space due to an increase in student numbers over recent years. The Dining Hall would be accessible to wheelchair users. It would provide a high quality space for staff and student dining and would not result in the loss of any educational facilities as all of the existing uses in this part of the site are being relocated or re-provided elsewhere. The Dining Hall is within the college campus. As a result the proposal is considered

Context of site, design and external spaces and impact on heritage assets

- 8.4 The primary concern in heritage terms when the application was submitted was the demolition of the conference reception of the Listed Building. The Conservation Officer did not consider

the demolition to be justified given the new replacement building was to provide toilets and meeting rooms, the Conservation Officer felt the existing reception wing could be amended to provide the elements needed and shown in the new block. Following extensive discussions with the applicant, additional detail was provided about the finish of the linking block. The additional detail shows flint work detailing on the replacement building which would tie in with the Listed Ibberson Building. Highlight bricks picking out a pattern on the Harrison Drive elevation are proposed and a concrete band lintel which picks up on the Dining Hall materials. These additional details were considered sufficient in principle to overcome the Conservation Officer's concerns about the loss of the reception building as the detailing is considered to provide a sufficiently high quality finish to justify the loss of the reception building. Further details are recommended to be required by condition.

- 8.5 The design of the Dining Hall as originally submitted was considered to be high quality. Both the Urban Design and Conservation Officer supported this element of the proposal. The Conservation Officer notes that the high quality of the design of the Dining Hall was important in balancing the impact of the loss of the reception wing to the Listed Building. However, the assessment of the quality of the Dining Hall changed following an amendment where the colonnade and first floor gallery were removed from the plans. The Conservation Officer feels that these elements are important features of the building which make it successful in design terms. The colonnade plays an important role in the way that the Dining Hall relates to the open lawn space and surrounding building. The removal of the colonnade and gallery changes the appearance of the building giving it a flat gable end which in turn changes the way the building relates to the surrounding spaces and listed building. Both elements were removed due to concerns raised by the Fire Officer regarding means of escape. Following comments from the Conservation Officer, the applicant spent some time reviewing the proposal and submitted a document to analyse different options to overcome the fire officer's concern. The Conservation Officer agreed with parts of the document but felt that some of the options, put forward and discounted by the applicant, which involved the retention of the colonnade and gallery had potential. As a result the applicant has done further work with Building Control to establish acceptable protocol for means of escape.

- 8.6 The applicant has provided revised plans which retain the gallery and colonnade. I have reviewed these with the Conservation Officer and we are satisfied that the retention of these elements overcomes his concerns. The revised Dining Hall building, retaining the ground floor colonnade and the first floor viewing gallery is considered to be a high quality design subject to the approval of detailed design elements including material, faience detail, and glazing detail. The loss of part of the listed building is accepted subject to further detail about the brickwork detailing and material.
- 8.7 Although there are no formal comments from the Tree Officer as part of this application, she has been involved in several meetings and has confirmed that she has no objection to the current proposal in terms of tree impact. I will provide her comments on the amendment sheet. T006 which is referenced in the objection as being removed is not proposed to be retained. Four trees are proposed to be removed as part of the application; two trees to facilitate development and two on the recommendation of the applicant's tree specialist. Only one of these trees is on Harrison Drive. In my view the loss of this small tree will have minimal impact as it is currently very close to T008 which will be retained. I will update the amendment sheet with recommended conditions regarding trees once I have received formal comments from the Tree Officer.
- 8.8 In my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2018) policies 55, 56, 57, 58, 59 61 and 71.

Public Art

- 8.9 The Public Art Officer requests that a condition for on-site provision of public art is included. She also notes that a previous application (14/1951/FUL) was supposed to provide public art, through condition 22 of the permission, but no details were ever provided. The contribution identified under the previous application should be added to the current proposal to make up for the lack of compliance with condition 22 of 14/1951/FUL.
- 8.10 In my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2018) policy 56 and the Public Art SPD 2010

Carbon reduction and sustainable design

- 8.11 The Senior Sustainability Officer has reviewed the plans and notes that the proposal has a strong focus on passive design measures which is fully supported. The proposal delivers a 34% reduction in carbon emissions; which is over what is required to comply with the Part L baseline. A ground source heat pump (gshp) has been chosen to deliver heating and, when needed, cooling for the scheme. The use of the gshp is predicted to reduce carbon emissions by 18%. An implementation condition is recommended. I have also recommended a water efficiency condition.
- 8.12 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 (2018) policy 28 and the Sustainable Design and Construction SPD 2007.

Integrated water management and flood risk

- 8.13 The City Council's Sustainable Drainage Engineer and the Lead Local Flood Authority reviewed the application and have no objection subject to conditions requiring details of surface water drainage measures and maintenance of Suds.
- 8.14 In my opinion the applicants have suitably addressed the issues of water management and flood risk, and the proposal is in accordance with Cambridge Local Plan (2018) policies 31 and 32.

Light pollution, noise, vibration, odour and dust

- 8.15 The Environmental Health Officer has reviewed the application and requested conditions to deal with noise, vibration and dust during construction; including conditions to limit construction hours and collections/deliveries during construction. An odour filtration condition and a plant noise insulation condition are recommended to control odour and plant noise when the development is occupied.
- 8.16 In my opinion, subject to the conditions I have recommended, the applicants have suitably addressed the issues of light pollution, noise, vibration and dust, and that the proposal is in

accordance with Cambridge Local Plan (2018) policies 34, 35, 36.

Inclusive access

- 8.17 The application rationalises levels and results in improved access along Harrison Drive. There would also be level access to the Dining Hall.
- 8.18 In my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2018) policies 56 and 57.

Residential Amenity

Impact on amenity of neighbouring occupiers

- 8.19 The replacement reception building replaces an existing building to the front of the site and although greater in height it is not considered to give rise to any enclosure or overshadowing of nearby residents given the distance between it and the adjacent flats. The Dining Hall is within the College site and thus would not overshadow or enclose any residential properties.
- 8.20 The representations raise concerns about noise disturbance from deliveries as there are existing problems with noisy deliveries to the college. The college has responded to this point by stating that there will be less frequent deliveries as the new kitchen has more storage space for food. This is an important environmental target for the college. The Environmental Health Officer has not raised concerns about delivery noise and there are currently no restrictions to delivery hours on site so it would be unreasonable to impose a condition to limit hours for deliveries. The Dining Hall and associated kitchens are proposed to meet an existing need to serve students and staff and do not result in an increase in student numbers. The Dining hall itself is set within the site, well back from the residential development on Harrison Drive and as a result I do not consider its use to give rise to any significant noise and disturbance to these occupiers.
- 8.21 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 (2018) policies 35, 55 and 56.

Refuse Arrangements

- 8.22 The representations raise concern about the proposed refuse store on Harrison Drive. The store would have concertina doors which would shield views of bins from the street. The representation raises concerns that the doors are likely to be left open all of the time. The college has responded to this point reassuring the neighbour that the doors will be kept closed and will only need to be opened during collections as the bins will otherwise be accessed internally. The college has confirmed their willingness to accept a condition requiring the bin store doors to be kept closed when not in use. I have recommended the condition.
- 8.23 In my opinion the proposal is compliant in this respect with Cambridge Local Plan (2018) policy 57.

Highway Safety

- 8.24 Harrison Drive is a private road and is not adopted highway so the Highway Authority has no comments regarding highway safety.
- 8.25 In my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2018) policy 81.

Car and Cycle Parking

- 8.26 The proposal is to serve an existing need on site and is not proposed to increase student or staff numbers. As a result there is no need to provide additional car or cycle parking as part of the proposal. Some additional cycle parking is proposed along the western side of the site and this is supported.
- 8.27 In my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2018) policy 82.

Third Party Representations

8.28 I have addressed the majority of the third party representations within the body of my report but I will respond to any outstanding points in the below table.

Representation	Response
Object to the loss of four mature trees which have amenity value.	The tree loss is considered to be acceptable. See paragraph 8.7
Consider that T006 can be easily retained	This tree is now proposed to be retained
Currently deliveries occur from 6am and are noisy and frequent – concerned that unmanaged early hours will continue. Deliveries cause noise disturbance to residents.	See paragraph 8.20
Object to service bay in residential area as an existing layby is causing highway safety issues. Request servicing is done from the main car park. Concerned about manoeuvring of vehicle servicing the Dining Hall.	See paragraph 8.20
Concerned about noise from plant and the use of the dining hall	Details of plant noise insulation are required by condition. The Dining Hall itself is well set back from nearby residential properties and as a result would not result in any significant noise disturbance.
Question whether dining hall should be relocated to ensure adequate public art can be provided.	I am satisfied that a public art scheme can be achieved around the current proposal.
Doors to the bin store are likely to be noisy and due to their size are likely to be left open	See paragraph 8.22.

9.0 CONCLUSION

9.1 The revised proposal including detailing and ornate brickwork to the linking building which replaces the conference reception wing of the listed building and retaining the colonnade and gallery to the dining hall is considered to be of high quality

design and to protect the special interest of the listed building. The proposal is to serve existing students and staff and would not give rise to any highway safety concerns. The proposed kitchen and servicing arrangements would reduce the frequency of deliveries needed to the kitchen and in my view would not result in any significant adverse impact to the amenity of adjacent residents on Harrison Drive. The impact on trees is considered acceptable but further comments and conditions from the Tree Officer will be reported on the amendment sheet.

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 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended by 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 construction work or demolition work shall be carried out or plant operated other than between the following hours: 0800 hours and 1800 hours on Monday to Friday, 0800 hours and 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 2018 policy 35).

4. There shall be no collections from or deliveries to the site during the demolition and construction stages outside the hours of 0800 hours and 1800 hours on 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 2018 policy 35).

5. In the event of the foundations for the proposed development requiring piling, prior to the development taking place, other than demolition, 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 from 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.

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 (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policy 35).

6. 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: To protect the amenity of nearby properties (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policy 36).

7. Unexpected Contamination:

If unexpected contamination is encountered whilst undertaking the development which has not previously been identified, works shall immediately cease on site until the Local Planning Authority has been notified and the additional contamination has been fully assessed and remediation approved following steps (a) and (b) of condition 4 above. The approved remediation shall then be fully implemented under condition 5.

Reason: To ensure that any unexpected contamination is rendered harmless in the interests of environmental and public safety in accordance with Cambridge Local Plan 2018 Policy 33.

8. Prior to the occupation of the development or the commencement of the use, a noise assessment detailing noise levels emanating from all plant, equipment and vents, relative to background levels, shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority.

If the assessment demonstrates that noise levels exceed the background level at the boundary of the premises, having regard to adjacent noise sensitive premises, a mitigation scheme for the insulation of the plant in order to minimise the level of noise emanating from the said 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 nearby properties (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policy 35).

9. Prior to the first occupation/use of the development, 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 and shall thereafter be retained as such.

Reason: To protect the amenity of nearby properties (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policy 36).

10. Prior to the installation of any artificial lighting, an artificial lighting scheme shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The scheme shall include details of any artificial lighting of the site and an artificial lighting impact assessment with predicted lighting levels at proposed and existing residential properties shall be undertaken. Artificial lighting on and off site must meet the Obtrusive Light Limitations for Exterior Lighting Installations contained within the Institute of Lighting Professionals Guidance Notes for the Reduction of Obtrusive Light - GN01:2011 (or as superseded). The approved lighting scheme shall be installed, maintained and operated in accordance with the approved details / measures.

Reason: To protect the amenity of nearby properties (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policy 34).

11. The approved renewable energy technology shall be fully installed and operational prior to the first occupation of the development and shall thereafter be retained and remain fully operational in accordance with a maintenance programme, which shall be submitted to and agreed in writing by the local planning authority.

No review of this requirement on the basis of grid capacity issues can take place unless written evidence from the District Network Operator confirming the detail of grid capacity and its implications has been submitted to, and accepted in writing by, the local planning authority. Any subsequent amendment to the level of renewable/low carbon technologies provided on the site shall be in accordance with a revised scheme submitted to and approved in writing by, the local planning authority

Reason: In the interests of reducing carbon dioxide emissions and to ensure that the development does not give rise to unacceptable pollution (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policy 28).

12. Prior to the occupation of the building hereby permitted, a water efficiency specification based on the Water Efficiency Calculator Methodology or the Fitting Approach sets out in Part G of the Building Regulations 2010 (2015 edition) shall be submitted to the local planning authority. This shall demonstrate that all apartments are able to achieve a design standard of water use of no more than 110 litres/person/day and that the development shall be carried out in accordance with the agreed details.

Reason: To ensure that the development makes efficient use of water and promotes the principles of sustainable construction (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 Policy 28).

13. Prior to the commencement of development, other than demolition, a scheme for surface water drainage works shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The details shall include an assessment of the potential for disposing of surface water by means of a sustainable drainage system in accordance with the principles set out in the National Planning Policy Framework and the National Planning Policy Guidance, and the results of the assessment provided to the Local Planning Authority. The system should be designed such that there is no surcharging for a 1 in 30 year event and no internal property flooding for a 1 in 100 year event + an allowance for climate change. The submitted details shall include the following:

- 1) Information about the design storm period and intensity, the method employed to delay and control the surface water discharged from the site and the measures taken to prevent pollution of the receiving groundwater and/or surface waters;
- 2) A management and maintenance plan for the lifetime of the development which shall include the arrangements for adoption by any public authority or statutory undertaker and any other arrangements for adoption by any public authority or statutory undertaker and any other arrangements to secure the operation of the scheme throughout its lifetime.

The approved details shall be fully implemented on site prior to the first use/occupation and shall be retained thereafter.

Reason: To ensure appropriate surface water drainage (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policies 31 and 32).

14. No development above ground level, other than demolition, shall commence (or in accordance with a timetable agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority), until a Public Art Delivery Plan (PADP) has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The PADP shall include the following:

- a) Details of the public art and artist commission;
- b) Details of how the public art will be delivered, including a timetable for delivery;
- c) Details of the location of the proposed public art on the application site;
- d) The proposed consultation to be undertaken;
- e) Details of how the public art will be maintained;
- f) How the public art would be decommissioned if not permanent;
- g) How repairs would be carried out;
- h) How the public art would be replaced in the event that it is destroyed;

The approved PADP shall be fully implemented in accordance with the approved details and timetabling. Once in place, the public art shall not be moved or removed otherwise than in accordance with the approved maintenance arrangements.

Reason: To accord with the provisions of Cambridge City Council Public Art SPD (2010) and policies 55 and 56 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2018.

15. Prior to the commencement of above ground works, full details of the faience cladding system for the Dining Hall are to be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter faience elements are to be installed in accordance with the approved details. This may include the submission of samples.

Reason: To ensure that the appearance of the external surfaces is appropriate (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 Policy 61).

16. Prior to the commencement of above ground works, full details of the in situ concrete plinth shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter concrete elements are to be installed in accordance with the approved details. This may include the submission of samples.

Reason: To ensure that the appearance of the external surfaces is appropriate (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 Policy 61).

17. Prior to the commencement of above ground works, full details of the artificial stone or other lintels, sills, copings, band course elements, etc. shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter artificial stone or similar elements are to be installed in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure that the appearance of the external surfaces is appropriate (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 Policy 61).

18. Prior to the commencement of above ground works, full details of patterned, decorative or other non-standard brickwork (brick specials) are to be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter non-standard brickwork is to be installed in accordance with the approved details. This may include the submission of samples.

Reason: To ensure that the appearance of the external surfaces is appropriate (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 Policy 61).

19. Prior to the commencement of above ground works, full details of the colonnade around the Dining Hall [including paving & soffits] are to be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter colonnade elements are to be installed in accordance with the approved details. This may include the submission of samples.

Reason: To ensure that the appearance of the external surfaces is appropriate (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 Policy 61).

20. Prior to the commencement of installation of glass/glazing/glass walling systems, full details of all glass to be installed in doors / windows / screens, etc. (including framing, fixing, tinting, solar control, fritting, etching, etc), shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Mirrored, reflective, metallic coated or other non-transparent glass are unlikely to be approved. Floor-to-ceiling transparent glazing is unlikely to be acceptable. All glass to desktop / waist height should be obscure / translucent or otherwise rendered non-transparent. 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 2018, policy 61).

21. No boiler flues, soil pipes, waste pipes or air extract trunking, etc. shall be installed until the means of providing egress for all such items from the new or altered bathrooms, kitchens and plant rooms has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Flues, pipes and trunking, etc. shall be installed thereafter only in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To avoid harm to the special interest of the Listed Building (Cambridge Local Plan 2018, policy 61).

22. No metal-clad or other non-traditional roofs shall be erected until full details of such roofs including materials, colours, surface finishes and relationships to rooflights or other rooftop features 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 avoid harm to the special interest of the Listed Building (Cambridge Local Plan 2018, policy 61).

23. No development above ground level, other than demolition, shall commence until full details of both hard and soft landscape works have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The 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); 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.

All hard and soft landscape works shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details. The works shall be carried out prior to the occupation of any part of the development or in accordance with a programme agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The maintenance shall be carried out in accordance with the approved schedule. Any trees or plants that, within a period of five years after planting, are removed, die or become in the opinion of the Local Planning Authority, seriously damaged or defective, shall be replaced as soon as is reasonably practicable with others of species, size and number as originally approved, unless the Local Planning Authority gives its written consent to any variation.

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 2018 policies 55, 57 and 59).

24. All manhole or similar covers are to be of the infilled type (i.e. a steel or other tray containing paving materials to match the surroundings) and if the cover crosses a boundary between two paving material types, the infill shall include both types to match.

Reason: To avoid harm to the special interest of the Listed Building (Cambridge Local Plan 2018, policy 61).

25. No development shall take place above ground level, other than demolition, until samples of the external materials to be used in the construction of the development have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Development shall thereafter be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure that the external appearance of the development does not detract from the character and appearance of the area (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policies 55, 57 (for new buildings) and/or 58 (for extensions)).

26. No development shall take place above ground level, other than demolition, until 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 have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. This may consist of large-scale drawings and/or samples. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: In the interests of visual amenity and to ensure that the quality and colour of the detailing of the non-masonry walling systems/cladding panels/other external screens is acceptable and maintained throughout the development (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policies 55 and 57).

27. Before the installation of any windows or doors, full details of all windows and doors, as identified on the approved drawings, to include design, materials, colours, and surface finishes/textures shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. This may consist of large-scale drawings and/or samples. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details and shall thereafter be retained unless the Local Planning Authority agrees to any variation in writing.

Reason: To ensure that the appearance of the development accords with the surroundings (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policies 55 and 57).

28. Prior to the commencement of above ground works, full details of all tree pits, including those in planters, hard paving and soft landscaped areas shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and these works shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

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 2018; Policies 55, 57 and 59).

29. No development above ground level, other than demolition, shall commence until full details of green roofs have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority and these works shall be carried out as approved. The details shall include details of build-ups, make up of substrates, planting plans for biodiverse roofs, methodologies for translocation strategy and drainage details where applicable.

Reason: In the interests of responding suitably to climate change and water management (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 Policy 31).

30. The bin store doors fronting onto Harrison Drive, as shown on drawing no. 216 REV F, shall be kept in the closed position other than when bins are being emptied.

Reason: In the interest of visual amenity (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policies 56, 57 and 61).

INFORMATIVE: To satisfy the plant sound insulation condition, the rating level (in accordance with BS4142:2014) from all plant, equipment and 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 sound frequencies should be eliminated or at least considered in any assessment and should carry an additional correction in accordance with BS4142:2014. This is to prevent unreasonable 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 15 minute period).

It is recommended that the agent/applicant submits an acoustic prediction survey/report in accordance with the principles of BS4142:2014 "Methods for rating and assessing industrial and commercial sound" 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.

It is important to note that a full BS4142:2014 assessment is not required, only certain aspects to be incorporated into an acoustic assessment as described within this informative.

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

To satisfy the condition requiring the submission of a program of measures to control airborne dust above, the applicant should have regard to:

-Council's Supplementary Planning Document - "Sustainable Design and Construction 2007":
<http://www.cambridge.gov.uk/public/docs/sustainable-design-and-construction-spd.pdf>

-Guidance on the assessment of dust from demolition and construction:
http://iaqm.co.uk/wp-content/uploads/guidance/iaqm_guidance_report_draft1.4.pdf

- Air Quality Monitoring in the Vicinity of Demolition and Construction Sites 2012:
http://www.iaqm.co.uk/wp-content/uploads/guidance/monitoring_construction_sites_2012.pdf

-Control of dust and emissions during construction and demolition - supplementary planning guidance:
https://www.london.gov.uk/sites/default/files/Dust%20and%20Emissions%20SPG%208%20July%202014_0.pdf

This page is intentionally left blank

PLANNING COMMITTEE

11th June 2019

Application Number	17/2266/LBC	Agenda Item	
Date Received	10th January 2018	Officer	Mairead O'Sullivan
Target Date	7th March 2018		
Ward	Queen Ediths		
Site	Homerton College Hills Road Cambridge CB2 8PH		
Proposal	Demolition of existing conference reception building to create new Dining Hall.		
Applicant	Ms Deborah Griffin Homerton College, Hills Road Cambridge CB2 8PH		

SUMMARY	The development accords with the Development Plan for the following reasons: - The proposed development would protect the special interest of the Listed Ibberson Building
RECOMMENDATION	APPROVAL

1.0 SITE DESCRIPTION/AREA CONTEXT

- 1.1 The application site falls within the main campus of Homerton College. The site lies on the southern side of Harrison Drive. Harrison Drive is a private road and was until recently a back lane predominantly used for servicing. The character has begun to change over recent years with the construction of a mix of student and market housing on the western end of the lane.
- 1.2 There are a number of other live applications in the vicinity, within Homerton College, which are under consideration by the council. A number of other applications have also been considered over the past two years. Many of these proposals are tied into the dining hall application
- 1.3 The site does not fall within a conservation area. The Ibberson Building which forms part of the application site is a Grade II Listed Building. The area to the rear of the site is Protected Open Space. The site lies within a TPO area.

2.0 THE PROPOSAL

- 2.1 The application seeks Listed Building Consent for the demolition of the existing conference reception building and construction of a new Dining Hall. The application is accompanied by an application for full planning permission which will be heard concurrently at planning committee.
- 2.2 The application has been revised since submission to overcome concerns raised by the Conservation Officer. Amendments have also been made to the full planning application to overcome concerns from the Tree Officer and the Lead Local Flood Authority.
- 2.3 The proposed development results from a need to modernise the college's kitchen and to deal with an increased student population (the number of students within the college has doubled since its last kitchen installation). The Dining Hall will be used to meet the college's daily dining needs as well as college events/celebratory meals. It will free up the Great Hall, which is currently used for dining but not adequately large to accommodate all users, for use for lecturers. The proposal is to meet with existing needs and is not proposed to increase student or staff numbers.

3.0 SITE HISTORY

Reference	Description	Outcome
19/0237/LBC	Fire safety compliance work, including an improvement to an existing staircase to form a secure fire escape route, and providing a second means of escape from a second-floor conference room via a new external staircase.	Pending consideration
18/1769/S73	Section 73 application to remove condition 28 of 18/0173/FUL (Demolition of two existing single storey extensions and construction of a four storey extension incorporating a finishing kitchen, plant room and	Pending consideration

	multi-purpose space (auditorium) at ground floor and conference hotel quality bedrooms for conference delegates and students of Homerton college on the upper floors.) to remove the restriction on who can occupy the hotel quality rooms.	
18/1116/FUL	Erection of a new children's day nursery on the existing Faculty of Education car park, with associated outdoor playspace, alterations to the car park, provision of new bicycle and buggy parking, landscaping and ancillary works.	Permitted
18/0174/LBC	Demolition of two existing single storey utility buildings, making good of external wall where extensions were removed and insertion of new window to match existing.	Permitted
18/0173/FUL	Demolition of two existing single storey extensions and construction of a four storey extension incorporating a finishing kitchen, plant room and multi-purpose space (auditorium) at ground floor and conference hotel quality bedrooms for conference delegates and students of Homerton college on the upper floors.	Permitted
17/2265/FUL	Demolition of existing conference reception building and construction of a new Dining Hall, buttry area, kitchens and associated facilities and new areas of hard and soft landscaping.	Pending consideration
17/2247/FUL	Construction of two storey rear and side extension to grounds maintenance building and insertion of dormers and velux roof lights	Permitted

17/1855/FUL	Construction of small infill extension on Biology Block and demolition of existing Lecture Theatre & Dance Studio buildings. New hard standing for cycle storage and new accessible path to link extension to car park and footpath on Harrison Drive.	Permitted
17/0274/LBC	Internal remodelling including the relocation of the existing oak staircase and continuation to second floor via a new oak stair and widening of the central circulation concourse with improved access to the Combination Room. Addition of new external fire escape door to the East elevation, and a new first floor east-west corridor between the existing roof structures.	Permitted
17/0273/FUL	New first floor east-west corridor between the existing roof structures.	Permitted
17/0097/FUL	Three storey extension to rear to form new stair enclosure to DE Block. Construction of three storey extension to rear to West Wing. Extension to K Block above first floor level to enclose the stairwell and provide new staircase and in-filling of an existing external courtyard. Raised parapet and new windows, doors and rooflights to Paupers Walk and associated hard landscaping.	Permitted

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 2018 policies, Supplementary Planning Documents and Material Considerations.

5.2 Relevant Development Plan policies

PLAN	POLICY NUMBER
Cambridge Local Plan 2018	61

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

Central Government Guidance	National Planning Policy Framework July 2019 National Planning Policy Framework – Planning Practice Guidance from 3 March 2014 onwards Circular 11/95 (Annex A)

6.0 CONSULTATIONS

Historic England

6.1 No objections.

Urban Design and Conservation Team

Conservation Officer

First comment

6.2 Objection: The Dining Hall is the best element of the proposal. The design is interesting without being overbearing or trying too hard to outshine the nearby Listed Building. Subject to materials and detailing, it has good potential to work well with the rest of the college campus and to provide the facilities required. The

internal space should be quite dramatic and the exterior eye-catching. Getting the faience cladding right will be a significant concern and the proposed use of *in situ* concrete also of some concern. Concrete can be a remarkable material but if cast poorly, mix design inappropriate and not properly weather-detailed it can deteriorate rapidly and appear awful. This element of the scheme could be supported subject to Conditions.

- 6.3 The kitchen is, by comparison with the dining hall, rather bland and fails to provide an interesting companion to it and doesn't present a very appetising façade to Harrison Drive. The entrance doors & surrounds give no real 'sense of arrival' to the foyer of the main building behind. The characterless patio doors proposed underplay the visual importance of this area. The patterned brickwork around the kitchen windows helps uplift the kitchen block somewhat and, if well executed, could give this element a bit more character. The proposed artificial stone band course and copings, if well chosen, could also help render this block less box-like.
- 6.4 The element that links the Listed Building (LB) to the proposed entrance and foyer to the main building [the Dining Hall] behind is of great importance to the overall scheme in both its relationship – physical and visual – to the older parts of the college campus and its contribution to the fairly long façade to Harrison Drive, which is how passers-by will perceive the project.
- 6.5 The proposal to demolish the Conference Reception wing of the Listed Building is unacceptable and unjustified. It is particularly inappropriate when the proposed replacement building is merely to house toilets and meeting rooms and the access passage from the adjacent Listed Building. There is no reason why the existing building could not be incorporated into the scheme to better illustrate the further evolution of the architecture of the college. It is certainly capable of having the interior altered to incorporate toilets and it should be possible to raise the roof to accommodate some meeting rooms and the First Floor passage. The Ground Floor access passage could

be either incorporated into the existing (behind the French doors) or by creating a further element of colonnade in front of the South elevation. This option does, in fact, offer much more opportunity for creative design than is suggested by the token effort illustrated on Page 6 of the Heritage Statement. There is an opportunity for an interesting roof solution and reflecting the glazing design of the existing Listed Building and the new Dining Hall and kitchen block in the passage and the meeting rooms at First Floor.

Second comment

- 6.6 Objection: Amendments have been made to the linking building and kitchen. Following the submission of further information about the finish of the linking block the Conservation team were willing to support the demolition of part of the listed building subject to conditions. However during the course of the application amendments were also made to the dining hall due to concerns regarding means of escape raised by the Fire Officer. The changes dilute the design of the Dining Hall. It is concerning that the fire escape concerns appear so late in the design process rather than being included in the original design approach. None of the options put forward are wholly acceptable. However the escape stair within the spine wall and external escape stair appear to have some merit.
- 6.7 The deletion of the ground floor colonnade and the first floor gallery is unacceptable. These were important features in the strong support for the scheme originally and the quality of the dining hall design was one reason why the demolitions around the LB were very reluctantly agreed. If the quality of the main element of the scheme is to be downgraded then this brings the whole scheme into doubt and would change the assessment of positives against negatives with the scheme which is finely balanced in terms of justification for the loss of part of the listed building.
- 6.8 The relationship of the colonnade to the outdoor space [Eastern Courtyard] is an important element to the assemblage of buildings – particularly including the LB – around the space and

the transparency/accesses of the buildings into this constrained space that then flows out into the wider campus is vital. To blank off the 'gable' end of the dining hall fronting this space is unacceptable. The "civic approach" CGI is particularly telling in that it clearly shows the dining hall seemingly 'closed off' and unwelcoming when viewed from that direction – the opposite of what it should be.

- 6.9 The value of the gallery to the internal space of the dining hall is immense and it appears to be significant to the good functioning of the space for many college events. The interior CGIs showing "development image – proposed hall interior" are convincing arguments for the visual contribution the gallery makes to the way the hall might look and work.

Third comment

- 6.10 No objection: The scheme has been revised to reflect more the original concept of the main dining hall and to return the important elements that formed part of the setting of the Listed Building.
- 6.11 Dining Hall: This has now reverted to an acceptable design. This should be the centrepiece of the development but will only be so if the detailing, choice of materials and execution are exemplary. Conditions are recommended as before but should now include one to refer to the external window glazing, framing & surrounds. The Eastern Courtyard colonnade provides a good setting for the Listed Building (subject to the detailed landscaping) and the internal gallery provides an excellent connection with traditional college forms. It is understood that the earlier fire escape problems can now be dealt with in an acceptable way. The roofing of this hall (and other elements) should be the subject of a Condition.
- 6.12 Kitchen: The kitchen block is the more functional element of the scheme but it has an important street façade which will be the 'public face' of the design from Harrison Drive. Good, detailed, large-scale drawings have been produced showing how decorative brick detailing and surface modelling can raise this

above its functional status. These should form part of the 'approved drawings' aspect of any consent granted to ensure that they are included as part of the final build.

- 6.13 Foyer: This is vitally important in showing first-time visitors (for conferences, etc.) how to use the building. A well-designed entrance is central to the success of this group from the Harrison Drive perspective. The serious underplaying of the doors and entrance is very disappointing and has been raised before. This should be the subject of a condition. Likewise the way in which the top edge of the building is terminated needs proper consideration and should also be the subject of a condition. Perhaps a good landscaped front area (including the tree) can help overcome the lack of visual impact.
- 6.14 Link Block: This does not appear to have changed radically since the demolition and so on were agreed earlier. Getting the materials and detailing right will be important. In this, and other, areas where there is floor-to-ceiling glazing the agents will need to demonstrate that the lower portions of glazing are translucent rather than transparent to avoid the sight of office or other junk being piled against glass and visible from the outside.
- 6.15 Listed Building: Since the demolition of the current reception area and its replacement by the Link Block [see above] has been informally accepted it will be important to understand how the later construction is removed from the LB and how the new-build element is attached to the former gymnasium. This will require a demolition Method Statement which should include any aspect of making good and then describe how the new work is constructed and built-in (or otherwise fixed) to the historic fabric. It should be noted that joints involving visible mastic will not be acceptable. These items should be the subject of a condition.
- 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 There are no representations relating to the listed building consent. There are a number of representations from 5 Harrison Drive on the full planning application. These are summarised and addressed as part of the committee report which accompanies the full application.

8.0 ASSESSMENT

- 8.1 From the consultation responses and from my inspection of the site and the surroundings, I consider that the main issue to be considered as part of the listed building consent application is the impact on the Grade II Listed Ibberson Building. Other matters are considered as part of the accompanying full planning application.
- 8.2 The primary concern in heritage terms when the application was submitted was the demolition of the conference reception of the Listed Building. The Conservation Officer did not consider the demolition to be justified given the new replacement building was to provide toilets and meeting rooms; the Conservation officer felt the existing reception wing could be amended to provide the elements needed and shown in the new block. Following extensive discussions with the applicant, additional detail was provided about the finish of the linking block. The additional detail shows flint work detailing on the replacement building which would tie in with the Listed Ibberson Building. Highlight bricks picking out a pattern on the Harrison Drive elevation are proposed and a concrete band lintel which picks up on the Dining Hall materials. These additional details were considered sufficient in principle to overcome the Conservation Officer's concerns about the loss of the reception building as the detailing to the replacement building is considered to provide a sufficiently high quality finish to justify the loss of the reception building. Further details are recommended to be required by condition on the full planning application.
- 8.3 The design of the Dining Hall as originally submitted was considered to be high quality. Both the Urban Design and Conservation Officer supported this element of the proposal. The Conservation Officer notes that the high quality of the design of the Dining Hall was important in balancing the impact of the loss of the reception wing to the Listed Building.

However, the assessment of the quality of the Dining Hall changed following an amendment where the colonnade and first floor gallery were removed from the plans. The Conservation Officer feels that these elements are important features of the building which make it successful in design terms. The colonnade plays an important role in the way that the Dining Hall relates to the open lawn space and surrounding building. The removal of the colonnade and gallery changes the appearance of the building giving it a flat gable end which in turn changes the way the building relates to the surrounding spaces and listed building. Both elements were removed due to concerns raised by the fire officer regarding means of escape. Following comments from the Conservation Officer, the applicant spent some time reviewing the proposal and submitted a document to analyse different options to overcome the fire officer's concern. The Conservation Officer agreed with parts of the document but felt that some of the options, put forward and discounted by the applicant, which involved the retention of the colonnade and gallery had potential.

- 8.4 The applicant has provided revised plans which retain the gallery and colonnade. I have reviewed these with the Conservation officer and we are satisfied that the retention of these elements overcomes his concerns. The revised Dining Hall building, retaining the ground floor colonnade and the first floor viewing gallery is considered to be a high quality design subject to the approval of detailed design elements including material, faience detail, and glazing detail. This changes the planning balance in terms of the assessment of harm from the loss of the element of the listed building and this is now accepted subject to further detail about the brickwork detailing and material. Conditions are recommended on the full application.

9.0 CONCLUSION

- 9.1 The amendments to the proposal since submission to provide further detail of the quality of ornate brickwork detailing to the linking block, which is the replacement to the Conference Reception wing of the Listed Building, and the reinstatement of the ground floor colonnade and first floor gallery of the Dining Hall have overcome the Conservation Officer's concerns. The revised proposal is considered to preserve and enhance the

special interest of the listed Ibberson building 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 consent.

Reason: To comply with the requirements of Section 18 of the Planning (Listed Building & Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (as amended by 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 and for the avoidance of doubt.

3. Prior to the commencement of development, a Method Statement describing the means of demolition and making good shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The following item(s) may be demolished in a careful & controlled manner in order to avoid damage to any underlying historic fabric / feature: Conference Reception wing of the Listed Building

Once the underlying historic feature / fabric has been revealed, all work in the vicinity shall cease and the Local Planning Authority shall be afforded reasonable notice and opportunity to inspect. Following the site visit further information including detailed drawings, materials samples or construction information may be required to be submitted to discharge the condition. Work shall thereafter be in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To avoid harm to the special interest of the Listed Building (Cambridge Local Plan 2018, policy 61).

4. Prior to commencement of above ground works, full details of the means of attaching to or abutting the Listed Building with new construction shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter new work shall be undertaken adjacent to the Listed Building only in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To avoid harm to the special interest of the Listed Building (Cambridge Local Plan 2018, policy 61).

This page is intentionally left blank

Application Number	18/1807/FUL	Agenda Item	
Date Received	20th November 2018	Officer	Lorraine Casey
Target Date	15th January 2019		
Ward	Newnham		
Site	India House 31 Newnham Road Cambridge CB3 9EY		
Proposal	Erection of new building comprising of a single A1 or A3 (in the alternative) unit at ground floor and seven self contained flats above.		
Applicant	GCR Camprop Five Ltd		

SUMMARY	The development accords with the Development Plan for the following reasons: - The proposal will preserve the character and appearance of the conservation areas and will not harm the setting of nearby listed buildings. - The proposal will not adversely harm the amenity of neighbouring occupiers.
RECOMMENDATION	APPROVAL

1.0 SITE DESCRIPTION/AREA CONTEXT

- 1.1 The application site is located on a bend on Newnham Road along the south-eastern side of the street. The Mill Pond lies to the north. It borders No. 2 and 3 Anderson Court which are located to the south and to the west lies Nos. 35 and 37 Newnham Road which are occupied by restaurants known as Sala Thong and Rice Boat. An access road lies to the east and beyond that is Newnham Mill which is a Grade II Listed Building.
- 1.2 The site is located within the Newnham Croft Conservation Area and is adjacent to West Cambridge Conservation Area.

Newnham Road is a Local centre. It is within Flood Zones 2 and 3. It requires height referrals for structures over 15m high and is in an air quality management area. The site falls within the controlled parking zone.

2.0 THE PROPOSAL

- 2.1 The proposal is for the demolition of the existing building and its replacement with a new building comprising of a single A1 or A3 unit at ground floor and seven x one bedroomed self-contained flats above. This is a net increase of six residential units on the site.
- 2.2 The amended drawings show the proposed A1 or A3 unit will provide 113sq.m of internal floorspace which is a reduction of 39sq.m compared to existing. It will provide the equivalent of 6 full time jobs. The opening times are unknown.
- 2.3 The roof ridge of the proposed building would extend between 7.8m and 10.6m above ground level. The annotations on the drawings detail the height above sea level. Due to the irregular shaped site the building would narrow at the rear to 7.3m wide and towards the front of the building measure around 13.5m wide. Its length would extend up to 26m.
- 2.4 The proposal seeks to demolish the existing building which has been affected by fire damage. Its last use was as a restaurant known as India House, with a flat at first floor. The Heritage Impact Assessment suggests that prior to 1981, it was used as a pub known as the Jolly Miller.
- 2.5 The application is accompanied by the following supporting information:
 1. Covering letter
 2. Amended drawings – 12th March 2019
 3. Amended Flood Risk Assessment – Rev No.1.2
 4. Environment Agency letter dated 19th November 2018
 5. Flood Map
 6. Planning Statement
 7. Design and Access Statement
 8. Heritage Impact Assessment - Rev.5
 9. Acoustic Design Note Rev-01
 10. Bat Report – March 2018

11. Phase I Desk Study Report – No.C14398
12. Email with Sustainability and Car Parking information – 18th March 2019

3.0 SITE HISTORY

Reference	Description	Outcome
C/77/0307 (listed building application)	Demolition of existing buildings, Cambridge.	Refused
C/77/0359	Extension to Public House Yard and car park - Cambridge.	Approved
C/81/0039	Alterations and extensions to existing Public House	Approved
C/00/0215	Demolition of existing shed at rear and replacement with longer storage shed.	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 2018 policies, Supplementary Planning Documents and Material Considerations.

5.2 Relevant Development Plan policies

PLAN	POLICY NUMBER
Cambridge Local Plan 2018	1, 3 28, 29, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36 50, 51, 55, 56, 57

	61, 62, 69, 70, 71, 72 80, 81, 82, 85

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

Central Government Guidance	National Planning Policy Framework February 2019 National Planning Policy Framework – Planning Practice Guidance March 2014 Circular 11/95 (Annex A)
Supplementary Planning Guidance	Sustainable Design and Construction (May 2007) Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Flood and Water Biodiversity Checklist for Land Use Planners in Cambridgeshire and Peterborough (2001). Cambridge and Milton Surface Water Management Plan (2011) Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Level 1 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (2010) Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Waste Partnership (RECAP): Waste Management Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (February 2012) Cycle Parking Guide for New Residential Developments (2010) Cambridge Historic Core Conservation Area Appraisal (2015)

	Newnham Croft Conservation Area Appraisal (2013)
	West Cambridge Conservation Area Appraisal (2011)

6.0 CONSULTATIONS

Cambridgeshire County Council (Highways Development Control)

Comments dated 21st March 2019:

- 6.1 The amended documents as submitted do not change the Highway Authority's comments of 6th December 2018.

Comments dated 6th December 2018:

- 6.2 Please add the following condition to any permission that the Planning Authority is minded to issue in regard to this application requiring that no demolition or construction works shall commence on site until a traffic management plan has been agreed with the Planning Authority.

Urban Design and Conservation team

Comments dated 1st April 2019:

- 6.3 The development proposed is acceptable subject to the imposition of the following conditions: Non masonry walling systems, Window details 1:10, Roof Details.
- 6.4 Having looked at the revisions to the height presented in these amendments I consider that the reduction in height is on balance a positive move in terms of the buildings' impact on the views looking along Newnham Road. I understand the concerns about the reduction changing the balance of forms when viewed from the Mill Pond however I do not consider this change to be detrimental to the development overall which will have a positive impact on the character of the conservation area.

Comments dated 17th December 2018:

- 6.5 The scale of this proposal will not preserve or enhance the character of the Newnham Croft Conservation Area or comply with Policy 55 of the Cambridge Local Plan.
- 6.6 This proposal is for the demolition of India House and replacement with a larger building with commercial on the ground floor and flats above. There has been some dispute over the status of this building within the historic core conservation area appraisal in comparison to the Newnham Croft conservation area appraisal.
- 6.7 As part of the 2016 review of the Sheep's Green and Coe Fen section of the Historic Core conservation area appraisal, India House was noted for the positive role it makes to the character of this part of the conservation area and was marked as a positive unlisted building and a focal point on the revised map. This assessment has been made on the basis of the building's focal position at the top of Newnham Road as it opens out to the Mill Pit and the role it plays in views across the Mill Pit.
- 6.8 The character of Newnham Road is of a domestic scale with harmonious elements of slate or plain tile roofs, dormer windows and prominent chimneys. The building materials are a mixture of buff brick sometimes with red brick detailing and white painted render. Looking south within Newnham Road the form and detailing of India House continues this domestic scale and it is seen standing slightly forward of the building line with its steep red tile roof and prominent white painted chimney providing an end stop to the buildings with views of the trees of Sheep's Green beyond.
- 6.9 In views north down Newnham Road India House acts as a focal point in the street. Its biaxial gables turn the corner in the road effectively and the rendered and half-timbered façade and steep red clay tiled roof act as a contrast to the scale and buff brick of the Mill and the Malting House. From views across the Mill Pit from Sheep's Green the building's scale, roof scape and double chimneys add to the attractive collection of building

forms and materials which form the character of this special view within the conservation area.

- 6.10 When demolishing a building within the conservation area the significance of the contribution of the existing building must be assessed and any proposed replacement building needs to protect or enhance the character or appearance of the conservation area.
- 6.11 The positive elements of India House have been discussed throughout the pre-application process especially the way that the front gables turn the corner and the positive impact this has on views north down Newnham Road. Another important factor in the acceptance of any new building on the site was the need to respect and be subservient to the mass and scale of the listed Mill adjacent and similarly to the listed Maltings building which can both been seen in the same view with India House.
- 6.12 The building when viewed from the north is interesting with its canted gables and pitched roof forms. The proposed use of terracotta tiles in a variety of colours could act as a successful counterpoint to the buff and red brick of the surrounding buildings. The view from the Mill Pit respects the massing of the Mill which is still the dominant building.
- 6.13 The problem is in terms of the impact on the Newnham Croft conservation area of the western part of the building when viewed from the southern approach along Newnham Road. The height of this part of the building which at three storeys is considerably taller than the shops and houses along Newnham Road which are all a consistent scale of two storeys. The heritage statement with the application makes the point that this change to the height will have an impact on the street scene and will change its character, however that this change is reflected on the opposite side of the road and marks an intensification of scale reflective of the approach into central Cambridge.
- 6.14 Whilst I acknowledge that there is some scope for a larger building to act as an end stop to this part of Newnham Road the height of the proposed roof form even when clad in a light material does overly dominate the end of a domestic scaled street. The ridge has been reduced to create a visual gap between the new building and the roofs of the shops which was

asked for at pre-application stage and there were discussions about the placement and materiality of the chimney which were resolved. However when looking at the height of this section in relation to the built context I do not consider that this will preserve or enhance the conservation area.

- 6.15 Overall I think that the building could be an exciting addition to the conservation area but the western element is too tall and dominates Newnham Road when viewed from the south.

Environmental Health

Comments dated 26th March 2019:

- 6.16 I have no comments or recommended conditions to make regarding the amendments. My comments and recommendations within my previous memo dated 13th December 2018 are pertinent to this application.

Comments dated 13th December 2018:

- 6.17 The development is acceptable subject to the imposition of conditions and informatives requested in relation to:
- plant noise insulation
 - construction hours
 - collection during construction
 - construction/demolition noise/vibration & piling
 - dust condition
 - CONT6 (all six) - contaminated land conditions
 - Hours of use
 - Deliveries/ collections – A1/A3
 - Alternative ventilation scheme
 - Noise insulation
 - A1/A3 building insulation
 - Kitchen extraction discharge
 - Odour filtration/extraction
 - Combustion appliances – low emissions

Sustainable Drainage

Comments dated 23rd March 2019:

- 6.18 Drainage has no further comments to make.

Comments dated 19th January 2019:

- 6.19 The development proposed is acceptable subject to the imposition of the conditions requested.
- 6.20 The proposals are for a replacement building. The existing building is located within flood zone 3 and the proposed building is located within flood zone 3. There will be practicably no difference in the post development flood risk locally caused by the proposals due to the ground floor footprint being similar to the existing. Flood resilient construction should be employed and a flood emergency plan be written for the development.
- 6.21 Although the proposed development does not strictly meet policy 31 and 32 of the adopted Cambridge Local Plan, because of the shape and form of the proposed development there are limited interventions that can be used for surface water drainage management. The proposals employ a blue roof in the only area that this can be achieved and are therefore acceptable.
- 6.22 The following conditions are therefore recommended: Scheme for flood resilient/resistant construction and flood emergency plan.

Comments dated 15th December 2018:

- 6.23 The development is acceptable subject to the imposition of the condition outlined.
- 6.24 The comments and views of the Environment Agency are fully supported.

Environment Agency

Comments dated 14th March 2019:

- 6.25 Our response dated 10th January remains pertinent.

Comments dated 10th January 2019:

- 6.26 Flood risk: The revised Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) dated 18 December 2018 indicates that it will not be possible to raise finished floor levels of the building above the 1 in 100 year flood level including an allowance for climate change (i.e. above 7.48mAOD) as the building needs to have compliant access from the street level of approximately 7.0mAOD. However, the proposed ground floor level of the building is not stated in the FRA. Your Authority should be satisfied that finished floor levels will be raised as high as practicable to reduce the risk of flooding to the proposed development.
- 6.27 The revised FRA states that flood resistant construction methods will be used to 'prevent the entrance of water into the building' and a flood level of 7.48mAOD will be used to determine the scope of the work required. Although we consider this to be acceptable in principle, please note that flood resistant measures are unlikely to prevent flood waters entering the building – their main aim is to minimise flood water entry. Please also note that no details of proposed flood resistant measures have been included in the FRA. We consider that flood *resilient* measures should also be used to reduce the impact of any flooding on the building.
- 6.28 Providing your Authority is satisfied that finished floor levels will be raised as high as practicable, we are able to *withdraw our objection* to the proposed development but strongly recommend that the mitigation measures proposed in the FRA are adhered to. It will not be necessary for your Authority to consult the Agency, in respect of flood risk, further.

Advice for LPA:

- 6.29 The following issues are not within our direct remit or expertise, but nevertheless are important considerations for managing flood risk for this development. Prior to deciding this application we recommend that consideration is given to the issues below. Where necessary, the advice of relevant experts should be sought.
- Details and adequacy of a flood emergency plan.
 - Details and adequacy of flood resistant and resilient measures.

- 6.30 Section 6.2.4 of the FRA indicates that the proposed building occupies the same footprint as the existing building and therefore there will be no loss of floodplain or increase in flood risk elsewhere. However, this is not very clear in the submitted plans. Your Authority should be satisfied that there will be no loss of floodplain as a result of the proposed development.
- 6.31 In all circumstances where flood warning and emergency response is fundamental to managing flood risk, we expect local planning authorities to formally consider the emergency planning and rescue implications of new development in making their decisions. As such, we recommend you consult with your Emergency Planners to determine whether the proposals are safe, in accordance with the guiding principles of the planning practice guidance.
- 6.32 The planning practice guidance states that, in determining whether a development is safe, the ability of residents and users to safely access and exit a building during a design flood and to evacuate before an extreme flood needs to be considered.
- 6.33 Advice is provided for the applicant which can be dealt with by way of informatives.

Comments dated 5th December 2019:

- 6.34 In the absence of an acceptable Flood Risk Assessment (FRA), we object to the granting of planning permission and recommend refusal.

Disabled Access

Comments dated 2nd January 2019:

- 6.35 Ensure flat threshold to shop. Flats need a lift. Bathrooms need to be designed so can be wet rooms with showers.

Waste

Comments from 19th December 2018:

- 6.36 This is what's stated for the bins: Black bin > 1x770-litre bin, Dry mixed bin > 1x770-litre bin, Compostable waste bin > 1x770-litre bin for 7 studio flats, that could have a couple in each = 14 people x 50 litres per person = 700 litres for refuse, and 700 for recycling.
- 6.37 We don't have 770 litre bins, the 2 sizes we do are 660 and 1100 litres. As there are no gardens, there will only be small amounts of food waste so a 140 litre bin will be enough. Having a smaller green bin means that an additional 240 litre black and blue bin would fit bringing the capacity up to 900 for refuse, and recycling.
- 6.38 Please make sure there are no locks on the bin store doors (unless it's the standard FB2 lock) and any doors have door hooks to keep them open while crews make their collections.

Biodiversity

Comments dated 22nd January 2019:

- 6.39 I have reviewed the Bat Report, prepared by Applied Ecology Ltd and am content with the survey effort and recommendations, including the proposed specification and location of two internal bat roost features.
- 6.40 I would be cautious of any intensification of the existing external lighting over the adjacent Mill Pond, known to support foraging bat species. I cannot see any proposals to this effect, but may be worth protecting against via a condition. Recommends an Ecologically Sensitive Lighting Scheme condition.

Cadent Gas

Comments dated 5th December 2018:

- 6.41 Should you be minded to approve this application please can the requested notes be included as an informative note for the Applicant in relation to gas pipelines identified on the site.
- 6.42 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 Councillor Gehring commented on this application on the 14th December 2018:

- I would like to call this application in to the committee if you are minded to recommend approval. This house is in the most sensitive location in Newnham. The current proposal changes the street scape fundamentally. It is disproportionate to the other buildings and in very close proximity to a waterbody. It also destroys a heritage building in that sensitive part of Newnham.

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

- 11 and 19 Clarkson Road (objects)
- 66 Cavendish Avenue (objects)
- 7 Clare Road (objects)
- Brook Lodge 113 Grantchester Meadows (supports)
- 16 Grantchester Road (supports)
- 13 Hardwick Street (supports)
- 5 Merton Street (objects)
- East Downing House, Fox Road, Bourn – runs Sala Thong at 35 Newnham Road (neutral)
- 10 Champneys Walk – part owner of 35-37 Newnham Road – (objects)
- 20 Millington Road (objects)
- Church Rate Corner, Malting Lane (supports)
- Cambridge Past Present and Future (objects)
- South Newnham Neighbourhood Forum (supports)
- Newnham Croft Conservation Group (objects)

7.3 The representations can be summarised as follows:

Comments to the revised drawings:

Support from South Newnham Neighbourhood Forum:

- Support changes in the distribution of material colour across the scheme and the reduction in height of the western gable element.

Objection from 19 Clarkson Road:

- The building is too large. The height of the three stories does not fit the street scene of Newnham Road.
- The change in colours proposed does little to reduce the impact of the structure. The spindly stilts look completely out of place. The projection of the building, seen from the South, disrupts the view of the row of houses in Newnham Road.

Comments on the original drawings:

Support

- India House is dilapidated and needs to be replaced.
- Support the contemporary development -brave, modern and interesting design and takes inspiration from its surroundings.
- High-quality materials.
- Acceptable in terms of scale and massing.
- The design opens up the view of the Mill pond by setting back the ground floor and its clever use of glazing.
- Compliment the developers on their involvement of Residents' Association of Old Newnham and SNNF.

Object

- Fails to conserve or enhance the character of conservation areas or historic buildings by the mill pond.
- Too tall, appears top-heavy, and the white exterior clashes with houses along Newnham Road.
- Excessive amount of glazing.
- Concerned with the harm on the setting of nearby listed buildings.
- Height, density and massing of the building seems out of proportion to the surrounding buildings.
- Materials contrast with nearby iconic buildings.

- Discrepancy between two conservation area appraisals. The Conservation Officer should address this.
- Flats are quite small bedsits and none are affordable.
- Lack of outdoor amenity space.
- Lack of car parking.
- Object to design and materials. Question whether a contemporary design is appropriate.
- Overdevelopment.
- It appears threatening, overpowering and unstable.
- No attempt to blend in with its surroundings.
- Have they permission to demolish the building? Shouldn't restoration be considered first?
- Concerned that any piling and foundation works will adversely affect restaurants at 35 Newnham Road.

Neutral

- Sala Thong, 35 Newnham Road - concerned with noise affecting lunch diners (12-3pm). What safeguarding measures are proposed through demolition/construction? It proposes building up directly to our store. Our air ventilation would be blocked by the proposal. How will this be mitigated?
- Believe that the revised colour palette is an improvement and revoke our request that the height be reduced.

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

Principle of Development

- 8.1 Policy 1 of the Local Plan 2018 explains *'when considering development proposals, the Council will take a positive approach that reflects the presumption in favour of sustainable development contained within the National Planning Policy Framework.'*
- 8.2 The first point is whether the principle of demolition of the building is accepted. As highlighted by the Conservation team *'when demolishing a building within the conservation area the*

significance of the contribution of the existing building must be assessed and any proposed replacement building needs to protect or enhance the character or appearance of the conservation area.' This is in line with paragraph 193 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2019. I consider this is satisfactorily addressed as set out within paragraphs 8.7-8.13 below.

- 8.3 Secondly, whether the proposed uses comply with policy. The proposal seeks permission for A1/A3 uses at ground floor with residential above. The previous use of India House was as a restaurant so A3 use has been established. Policy 72 of the Local Plan 2018 is of relevance. The proposal complies with this policy. Table 8.1 explains that A1 and A3 uses are suitable at ground floor in district and local centres. It would also not involve the loss of A1, rather the possible introduction which is supported.
- 8.4 Paragraph 118 c) of the National Planning Policy Framework (2019) explains how decisions should *'give substantial weight to the value of using suitable brownfield land within settlements for homes and other identified needs, and support appropriate opportunities to remediate despoiled, degraded, derelict, contaminated or unstable land'*
- 8.5 Policy 3 of the Local Plan 2018 explains *'The overall development strategy is to focus the majority of new development in and around the urban area of Cambridge, creating strong, sustainable, cohesive and inclusive mixed-use communities, making the most effective use of previously developed land, and enabling the maximum number of people to access services and facilities locally'*. I consider the proposal for residential flats satisfies the requirements of this policy.
- 8.6 The restaurant previously had one flat on the first floor level. The proposal is for a total of seven flats. In my view, the proposed flats on the upper floor would comply with both the NPPF 2019 and Policy 3 of the Local Plan 2019.

Impact on the Conservation Areas and nearby Listed Buildings

- 8.7 The site is located within Newnham Croft Conservation Area. Properties on the opposite side of Newnham Road fall under

the West Cambridge Conservation Area. The neighbouring Newnham Mill, located to the east, is a Grade II Listed Building. On the western side of Newnham Road lies Malting House a Grade II listed building, Clare Court, 34-38a Newnham Road which are Grade II listed buildings. There are also Buildings of Local Interest at 26-32 Newnham Road. The site is also highly visible from views across the Mill Pond and Sheep's Green.

- 8.8 The Heritage Impact Assessment notes discrepancies between how India House is viewed in the Newnham Croft Conservation Area Appraisal (2013) and on the map of the Sheeps Green and Coe Fen Conservation Area Appraisal (2016) which is part of the Central Conservation Area. In the Newnham Croft appraisal the building is referred to twice: *'Next door, and terminating the terrace, are Nos. 33, 35 and 37 Newnham Road, which appear to date to the 1920s or even later. No. 37 (The Rice Boat) is a flat-roofed single storey structure of little merit. Nos. 35 and 37 are two storeys high, with neo-Tudor details including false timber framing to the first floors. No. 33 retains more prominent gables which face down the street and are therefore relatively prominent, but none of these buildings can be said to make a particularly positive contribution to the street scene. The current Conservation Area boundary cuts through Nos. 37 and 39 and returns towards the mill leat, again bisecting the former mill, now the Bella Italia restaurant. The principal visual feature at this point is the outstanding view over the Mill Pit pond towards the open water meadows of Sheep's Green and the River Cam'*. India House is also referred to in the key negative features listed: *'Nos. 33, 35 and 37 Newnham Road are poor quality 1920s (or later) buildings.'* On the map of Sheeps Green and Coe Fen the building is highlighted as a positive building and focal point with key positive view.
- 8.9 The Conservation team responded to this discrepancy and explain in their comments dated 17th December 2018 that *'as part of the 2016 review of the Sheep's Green and Coe Fen section of the Historic Core conservation area appraisal, India House was noted for the positive role it makes to the character of this part of the conservation area and was marked as a positive unlisted building and a focal point on the revised map. This assessment has been made on the basis of the building's focal position at the top of Newnham Road as it opens out to the Mill Pit and the role it plays in views across the Mill Pit'*.

- 8.10 The positive elements of India House highlighted by the Conservation team includes *'the way that the front gables turn the corner and the positive impact this has on views north down Newnham Road. Another important factor in the acceptance of any new building on the site was the need to respect and be subservient to the mass and scale of the listed Mill adjacent and similarly to the listed Maltings building which can both been seen in the same view with India House'*.
- 8.11 Revised drawings received 12th March 2019 addressed the Conservation team's comments in relation to the height and dominance of the proposed building. Their latest comments support the scheme.
- 8.12 In my view, the amended drawings have improved the massing and design of the building. The 0.5m reduction in height of the front section of the building helps to reduce its dominance along Newnham Road and avoids it competing with nearby listed buildings. The original drawings saw the front section of the building extend up to 10.7m above ground level, whereas the amended proposal sees it extend up to 10.2m. The amendment to the colour palette also has greatly improved the appearance of the building, in my opinion. Rather than detracting from, it now harmonises with neighbouring properties and complements the street scene. The mix of colours and the step down of part of the front of the building at two stories high, helps to break up the building's mass. There has been a variety of comments from third parties in relation to the design, scale and appearance of this proposed modern building, some supportive and others against. However, I consider that this interesting and modern designed building, manages to be a focal point along the street, like the existing building, without detracting from the nearby listed buildings and it would preserve the character and appearance of the conservation areas.
- 8.13 In my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2018) policy 61.

Context of site, design and external spaces

- 8.14 The existing building incorporates Tudor design elements with black timber detailing on the front elevation, with two front gables. The proposed building is gable fronted with the building

partially dropping in height towards Newnham Mill. The windows give a modern appearance because of their positioning and extent of glazing. Columns are located at ground floor level which assists in breaking up the building's massing. The existing building is quite unique along the street in terms of its design and the replacement building again offers something different in this setting. I consider the proposal does not compete with the nearby more traditional listed buildings and in my view successfully contrasts with these buildings. I consider it responds positively to the surrounding area and its context. In my view, the proposal positively fits within its setting in terms of its height, scale and form, materials and detailing.

- 8.15 In my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2018) policies 55, 56, 57, 59.

Residential Amenity

Impact on amenity of neighbouring occupiers

- 8.16 The existing two storey building is positioned at the front of the site with a courtyard behind. The proposed building extends further into the courtyard area and extends to between two and three storeys high. Its neighbours to the south-west are No.35 and 37 Newnham Road which are occupied by restaurants Sala Thong and Rice Boat and properties in Andersons Court. On the opposite side of an access route to the east lies Newnham Mill which was granted planning permission (reference 17/1303/FUL) for the change of use of the first and second floor to flats.
- 8.17 Shadow studies were submitted within the Design and Access Statement which illustrates the impact of the original taller scheme on neighbours amenities. In my view these are acceptable. The orientation of the proposed building to the north, north-east and west of neighbouring properties helps to lessen its impact on neighbouring properties.
- 8.18 The first floor windows facing the application site, on the approved residential scheme (reference 17/1303/FUL) at Newnham Mill serve a stairwell and landing areas and the second floor windows serve a stairwell and study area. The bedroom window of flat 6 would face towards this window. There is a 4m gap between the buildings. The windows are at slightly staggered heights, however the proposed bedroom

window is a long vertical window. I recommend the lower section of this window is obscure glazed to offer some privacy to the occupant of this flat. This can be dealt with by way of a planning condition.

- 8.19 The first floor rear of No.35-37 Newnham Road contains operational elements such as air conditioning units for the commercial units. Proposed flat 5 has a rear balcony. This is opposite a first floor high level obscure glazed window at No.3 Anderson Court. I do not consider there would be any loss of privacy to this neighbouring building. The front of the western elevation contains windows. These face towards the street and would not directly face neighbouring properties. In my view there will not be an unreasonable loss of privacy to neighbours as a result of the proposal due to window placements.
- 8.20 The proposal involves replacing an existing building. The proposed building will be taller. However, in my view it would not adversely harm the outlook or lead to a sense of enclosure to neighbouring properties due to the combination of the commercial use of buildings to the west and position of windows on nearby residential buildings.
- 8.21 Environmental Health has requested a number of planning conditions in relation to plant noise, construction hours, collection during construction, dust, piling, demolition, contaminated land, hours of use, deliveries and collections, ventilation scheme, noise insulation, building insulation, extraction discharge, odour, combustion appliances. I consider that all these conditions are appropriate and will avoid harm to neighbour's and future occupier's amenities.
- 8.22 Third party comments were received from Sala Thong at No.35 Newnham Road which is a neighbouring site. They were concerned that construction and demolition noise over their lunch period would disrupt diners. I recommend a construction/demolition hours condition however it would not be reasonable in my view, to prevent works during this dinner period. The proposed building abuts their store area and ventilation. I have contacted Environmental Health in relation to this but this appears a party wall issue that both sides would need to address themselves.

- 8.23 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 (2018) policies 55 and 35.

Amenity of future occupiers

- 8.24 The gross internal floor space measurements for units in this application are shown in the table below:

Unit	Number of bedrooms	Number of bed spaces (persons)	Number of storeys	Policy Size requirement (m ²)	Proposed size of unit	Difference in size
1	1	1	1	37	40	+3
2	1	1	1	37	37	0
3	1	1	1	37	37	0
4	1	1	1	37	37	0
5	1	1	1	37	40	+3
6	1	1	1	37	37	0
7	1	1	1	37	44	+7

- 8.25 The development provides a lift which serves all floors which complies with policy 51 of the Local Plan 2019.

- 8.26 A third party has questioned the small size of the units and the lack of affordable housing. Due to the size of the scheme (less than 10 units) affordable housing cannot be sought through planning. The size of the units complies with the internal space standards in policy 50 of the Local Plan 2018 as set out in the table above.

Size of external amenity space:

- 8.27 Policy 50 states that all new residential units will be expected to have direct access to an area of private amenity space. The one bedroom units each have a balcony of between 3m² and 5m² in size. These would offer a small space for sitting outside for these one bedroom units. The site is also in close proximity to Sheep's Green which offers some recreation space. Although the outdoor amenity space provided for the flats is

small, I consider it acceptable for these one person flats which are close to the City Centre and an area of public amenity space.

- 8.28 In my opinion the proposal provides an adequate level of residential amenity for future occupiers and I consider that it is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2018) policies 50, 51 and 56.

Highway Safety

- 8.29 The Local Highways Authority does not object to the proposal. They have requested a traffic management condition, which I consider to be appropriate. The proposal does not propose car parking and I do not consider there to be any highway safety concerns as a result of the proposal.
- 8.30 In my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2018) policies 80 and 81.

Car and Cycle Parking

Car parking

- 8.31 An email from the agent received 18th March 2019 explains why the development is car free. It highlights the site is within a District/Local Centre which means there are shops and services nearby. It is also around 160m from the edge of the City Centre and therefore has easy access into the centre. It is also well served by public transport links with bus stops nearby on Causewayside and Cambridge railway station is around 25minutes walk or 10 minutes cycle ride away). The site is within a controlled parking zone and further afield within Newnham, the County Council has resolved to introduce a residents parking scheme and clearly parking restrictions in the area will only be increased.
- 8.32 There are double yellow lines in Newnham Road so the car-free status can be enforced through existing on street restrictions. I consider this site which is constrained and cannot easily accommodate car parking, is appropriate as a car-free development because of its location and the size of the units offered.

Cycle parking

- 8.33 Twelve cycle parking spaces are proposed and eight of these are located in a secure area. Seven cycle parking spaces are required for the residential units along with some visitor spaces. Food retail and non-food retail requires 2 spaces for every 5 members of staff, there will be 6 members of staff and therefore just under 3 spaces are needed. 1 visitor space is required per 50sq.m which equates to just under 3 spaces needed. I argue a total around 5/6 spaces are needed for the retail. Therefore I consider the cycle parking would just meet this requirement.
- 8.34 For food and drink uses, the requirements are 2 spaces for every 5 members of staff 1 short stay space for every 15 sq m of dining area. The commercial space has a total floorspace of 113sq m. The specific dining space has not been specified and is unknown. The amount of cycle parking needed therefore may exceed the amount provided. I therefore recommend a cycle parking condition is included to finalise the cycle parking provision.
- 8.35 In my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2018) policy 82.

Disabled Access

- 8.36 The amended drawings received includes a lift that serves all levels. The Council's Access Officer requested that the shop requires level access and bathrooms need to be designed so they can be wet rooms with showers. The amended drawings indicate that the bathrooms accommodate a shower and turning space for wheelchairs. The flood risk assessment highlights the need for level access to the ground floor.
- 8.37 In my view, it satisfies the requirements of policy 51 of the Local Plan 2018.

Waste

- 8.38 An informative has been requested by the Waste team which I recommend be included. There is sufficient space to provide the necessary bins required. I consider the proposal to be acceptable and would comply with policy 57 of the Local Plan 2018.

Sustainable Drainage and Flooding

- 8.39 The site is within flood zone 3. The Sustainable Drainage Engineer notes in their comments from 19th January 2019 that *'there will be practically no difference in the post development flood risk locally caused by the proposals due to the ground floor footprint being similar to existing'*. Both the Environment Agency and Sustainable Drainage Officer have requested a scheme for flood resilient/resistant construction and details of a flood emergency plan. Conditions in relation to these have been suggested by the Sustainable Drainage Officer which I recommend be included if the application were to be recommended for approval.
- 8.40 The Sustainable Drainage Officer notes that the proposed development does not strictly meet policy 31 and 32 of the Local Plan 2018, however they observe that because of the shape and form of the proposed development there are limited interventions that can be used for surface water drainage management. The proposal includes a blue roof in the only area this can be achieved and therefore they find the scheme to be acceptable.
- 8.41 The Environment Agency withdrew its original objection pending finished floor levels will be raised as high as practicable, but strongly recommend the mitigation measures proposed in the Flood Risk Assessment are adhered to. They also highlight there should not be a loss of floodplain. The existing site is either occupied by a building or hardstanding. The proposed ground floor building line of the proposal is set back from the original building line which helps reduce its footprint at the front of the building as it pushes back towards the rear. Paragraph 6.2.4 of the amended Flood Risk Assessment explains that *'The proposed building occupies the same foot print as the existing building'*. The Council's Sustainable Drainage Officer is satisfied with the scheme and has recommended conditions which I also suggest be included if it were to be approved.

8.42 I consider the proposal satisfies the requirements of policy 31 and 32 of the Local Plan 2018 and the National Planning Policy Framework 2019 as far as is possible on this constrained site.

Biodiversity

8.43 The Council's Nature Conservation Officer is satisfied with the submitted Bat Report and the survey effort and recommendations, including the proposed specification and location of two internal bat roost features.

8.44 The Nature Conservation Officer would be cautious of any intensification of any external lighting over the adjacent Mill Pond, known to support foraging bat species. They have requested a condition in case external lighting is needed. I recommend this be included.

8.45 I consider the proposal satisfies the requirements of policies 69 and 70 of the Local Plan 2018.

Gas

8.46 Cadent Gas has identified operational gas apparatus within the application site boundary. They have recommended a planning informative in relation to this. I recommend this be included if the application were to be approved.

Sustainability

8.47 Policies 28 and 29 of the Local Plan 2019 are of relevance to this scheme. Sustainable design and construction information is discussed in an email received on 18th March 2019. It summarises the key sustainability principles:

- Proposing to exceed Building Regulation Requirements in terms of thermal performance and hence achieve reductions in energy consumption and CO₂ emissions from that baseline.
- This approach will provide a scheme that gives excellent environmental performance and comfort levels- reducing

both heating and cooling loads for the building and creating comfortable occupied spaces.

- Any ventilation that is required will be achieved with simple, secure opening lights and vents.
- Intend to use the new chimney stacks as routes for extracting air from the bathroom and kitchen spaces- these may have some mechanical assistance.
- Proposing a Cross Laminated Timber ('CLT') superstructure for the building that is sustainably sourced and can deliver embodied carbon savings over a standard concrete or steel framed solution.
- The CLT superstructure will contribute to ensuring high levels of air tightness for the building envelope and consequential energy efficiency.
- All water and sanitary appliances will incorporate water conservation features and the project will incorporate a small area of 'blue roof' to provide attenuation and reduce the rate of storm water run-off.
- The appointed contractor will be required to produce and adhere to a Site Waste Management Plan (SWMP). The design team will be required to generate construction proposals that will minimise material wastage.

8.48 It is considered these measures are acceptable for a scheme of this size and would comply with policies 28 and 29 of the Local Plan 2019.

Third Party Representations

8.49 The third party comments have been addressed in the report above.

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 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended by 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. Submission of Preliminary Contamination Assessment:

Prior to the commencement of the development (or phase of) or investigations required to assess the contamination of the site, the following information shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority:

- (a) Desk study to include:
 - Detailed history of the site uses and surrounding area (including any use of radioactive materials)
 - General environmental setting.
 - Site investigation strategy based on the information identified in the desk study.
- (b) A report setting set out what works/clearance of the site (if any) is required in order to effectively carry out site investigations.

Reason: To adequately categorise the site prior to the design of an appropriate investigation strategy in the interests of environmental and public safety in accordance with Cambridge Local Plan 2018 Policy 33.

4. Submission of site investigation report and remediation strategy:

Prior to the commencement of the development (or phase of) with the exception of works agreed under condition 3 and in accordance with the approved investigation strategy agreed under clause (b) of condition 3, the following shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority:

- (a) A site investigation report detailing all works that have been undertaken to determine the nature and extent of any contamination, including the results of the soil, gas and/or water analysis and subsequent risk assessment to any receptors
- (b) A proposed remediation strategy detailing the works required in order to render harmless the identified contamination given the proposed end use of the site and surrounding environment including any controlled waters. The strategy shall include a schedule of the proposed remedial works setting out a timetable for all remedial measures that will be implemented.

Reason: To ensure that any contamination of the site is identified and appropriate remediation measures agreed in the interest of environmental and public safety in accordance with Cambridge Local Plan 2018 Policy 33.

5. Implementation of remediation.

Prior to the first occupation of the development (or each phase of the development where phased) the remediation strategy approved under clause (b) to condition 4 shall be fully implemented on site following the agreed schedule of works.

Reason: To ensure full mitigation through the agreed remediation measures in the interests of environmental and public safety in accordance with Cambridge Local Plan 2018 Policy 33.

6. Completion report:

Prior to the first occupation of the development (or phase of) hereby approved the following shall be submitted to, and approved by the Local Planning Authority.

- (a) A completion report demonstrating that the approved remediation scheme as required by condition 4 and implemented under condition 5 has been undertaken and that the land has been remediated to a standard appropriate for the end use.

- (b) Details of any post-remedial sampling and analysis (as defined in the approved material management plan) shall be included in the completion report along with all information concerning materials brought onto, used, and removed from the development. The information provided must demonstrate that the site has met the required clean-up criteria.

Thereafter, no works shall take place within the site such as to prejudice the effectiveness of the approved scheme of remediation.

Reason: To demonstrate that the site is suitable for approved use in the interests of environmental and public safety in accordance with Cambridge Local Plan 2018 Policy 33.

7. Material Management Plan:

Prior to importation or reuse of material for the development (or phase of) a Materials Management Plan (MMP) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The MMP shall:

- a) Include details of the volumes and types of material proposed to be imported or reused on site
- b) Include details of the proposed source(s) of the imported or reused material
- c) Include details of the chemical testing for ALL material to be undertaken before placement onto the site.
- d) Include the results of the chemical testing which must show the material is suitable for use on the development
- e) Include confirmation of the chain of evidence to be kept during the materials movement, including material importation, reuse placement and removal from and to the development.

All works will be undertaken in accordance with the approved document.

Reason: To ensure that no unsuitable material is brought onto the site in the interest of environmental and public safety in accordance with Cambridge Local Plan 2018 Policy 33.

8. Unexpected Contamination:

If unexpected contamination is encountered whilst undertaking the development which has not previously been identified, works shall immediately cease on site until the Local Planning Authority has been notified and the additional contamination has been fully assessed and remediation approved following steps (a) and (b) of condition 4 above. The approved remediation shall then be fully implemented under condition 5.

Reason: To ensure that any unexpected contamination is rendered harmless in the interests of environmental and public safety in accordance with Cambridge Local Plan 2018 Policy 33.

9. Prior to the occupation of the development or the commencement of the use, a noise assessment detailing noise levels emanating from all plant, equipment and vents, relative to background levels, shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority.

If the assessment demonstrates that noise levels exceed the background level at the boundary of the premises, having regard to adjacent noise sensitive premises, a mitigation scheme for the insulation of the plant in order to minimise the level of noise emanating from the said 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 nearby properties (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policy 35).

10. No construction work or demolition work shall be carried out or plant operated other than between the following hours: 0800 hours and 1800 hours on Monday to Friday, 0800 hours and 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 2018 policy 35).

11. There shall be no collections from or deliveries to the site during the demolition and construction stages outside the hours of 0800 hours and 1800 hours on 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 2018 policy 35).

12. No development shall commence (including any pre-construction, demolition, enabling works or piling), until a written report, regarding the demolition / construction noise and vibration impact associated with this development, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning 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. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details only.

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 nearby properties (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policy 35).

13. 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: To protect the amenity of nearby properties (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policy 36).

14. The A1/A3 use shall not be open outside the hours of 07:00 and 23:00 hrs.

Reason: To protect residential amenities and to comply with policy 35 of the Local Plan 2018.

15. All servicing and delivery to or collections from the A1/A3 uses shall not be made outside the hours of 0700-2300hrs on Monday to Friday, 0800-1300hrs on Saturday or at any time on Sundays or public holidays.

Reason: To protect residential amenities and to comply with policy 35 of the Local Plan 2018.

16. Prior to the commencement of development/construction, details of an alternative ventilation scheme for the residential habitable rooms to negate / replace the need to open windows, in order to protect future occupiers from external noise shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The ventilation scheme shall source air from the rear of the development away from Newnham Road. The ventilation scheme shall achieve at least 2 air changes per hour. Full details are also required of the operating noise level of the alternative ventilation system.

The scheme shall be installed before the use hereby permitted is commenced and shall be fully retained thereafter.

Reason: To protect residential amenities and to comply with policy 35 of the Local Plan 2018.

17. Prior to the commencement of development/construction, a noise insulation / attenuation scheme as appropriate, 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) and other mitigation to reduce the level of noise experienced internally at the residential units as a result of high ambient noise levels in the area shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The scheme shall have regard to the external and internal noise levels recommended in British Standard 8233:2014 "Guidance on sound insulation and noise reduction for buildings".

The scheme as approved shall be fully implemented before the use hereby permitted is commenced and shall be retained thereafter.

Reason: To protect residential amenities and to comply with policy 35 of the Local Plan 2018.

18. Before the development hereby permitted is commenced, a scheme for the insulation of the commercial ground floor building in order to minimise the level of noise emanating from the said building shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The scheme as approved shall be fully implemented before the building hereby permitted is occupied and shall be thereafter retained as such.

Reason: To protect residential amenities and to comply with policy 35 of the Local Plan 2018.

19. Before the development hereby permitted is commenced, details of the location of associated duct work, for the purpose of extraction and/or filtration of fumes and or odours shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The approved ductwork shall be installed before the use hereby permitted is commenced, maintained and not altered.

Reason: To protect residential amenities and to comply with policies 35 and 36 of the Local Plan 2018.

20. Prior to the occupation/use of the A3 development, 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 and shall thereafter be retained as such. The scheme shall have regard to design recommendations within EMAQ's "Control of Odour and Noise from Commercial Kitchen Exhaust Systems (update to the 2004 report prepared by NETCEN for DEFRA)" dated September 2018.

Reason: To protect residential amenities and to comply with policies 35 and 36 of the Local Plan 2018.

21. i) The development hereby approved shall utilise low NO_x boilers, i.e. Boilers that meet a dry NO_x emission rating of 40mg/kWh. If the proposals will include any gas fired Combined Heat and Power System, that system shall meet an emissions standard of:

- Spark ignition engine: less than 150 mgNO_x/Nm³
- Compression ignition engine: less than 400 mgNO_x/Nm³

- Gas turbine: less than 50 mgNO_x/Nm³

ii) Details of all combustion appliances shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority for approval prior to installation demonstrating compliance with the agreed emissions limits.

iii) All combustion appliances shall be fully installed and operational prior to the occupation of any approved buildings and shall thereafter be maintained in accordance with a maintenance programme, which shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to the commencement of development.

Reason: To protect local air quality and human health by ensuring that the production of air pollutants such as nitrogen dioxide and particulate matter are kept to a minimum during the lifetime of the development, to contribute toward National Air Quality Objectives and accords with the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), Policies 36 and 82 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2018 and in accordance with Cambridge City Councils adopted Air Quality Action Plan (2018).

22. No development shall commence until a scheme for flood resilient /resistant construction has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Development shall take place in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To comply with requirements of policies 31 and 32 of the Local Plan 2018 and the NPPF 2019.

23. Prior to occupation a flood emergency plan shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Development shall take place in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To comply with requirements of policies 31 and 32 of the Local Plan 2018 and the NPPF 2019.

24. The approved development shall be built in accordance with the Flood Risk Assessment Rev. No.1.2 dated 18th December 2018.

Reason: To comply with requirements of policies 31 and 32 of the Local Plan 2018 and the NPPF 2019.

25. No demolition or construction works shall commence on site until a traffic management plan has been agreed in writing by the Planning Authority.

The principle areas of concern that should be addressed are:

- i. Movements and control of muck away lorries (wherever possible all loading and unloading should be undertaken off the adopted public highway)
- ii. Contractor parking, for both phases (wherever possible all such parking should be within the curtilage of the site and not on street).
- iii. Movements and control of all deliveries (wherever possible 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 comply with policy 81 of the Local Plan 2018.

26. Prior to the installation of any non-masonry walling systems, cladding panels or other external screens full details including structural members, infill panels, edge, junction and coping details, colours, surface finishes/textures and relationships to glazing and roofing shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. This may consist of large-scale drawings and/or samples. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To avoid harm to the special interest of the Conservation Area (Cambridge Local Plan 2018, policy 61).

27. No new windows shall be constructed in the existing building, nor existing windows altered until drawings at a scale of 1:10 of details of new or altered sills, lintels, jambs, transoms, and mullions have been 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 Conservation Area (Cambridge Local Plan 2018, policy 61).

28. No roofs shall be constructed until full details of the type and source of roof covering materials and the ridge, eaves and hip details, if appropriate, have been submitted to the Local Planning Authority as samples and approved in writing. Roofs shall thereafter be constructed only in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To avoid harm to the special interest of the Conservation Area (Cambridge Local Plan 2018, policy 61).

29. The development hereby approved shall be in compliance with the submitted Bat Report by Applied Ecology Ltd dated March 2018.

Reason: In order to comply with requirements of policies 69 and 70 of the Local Plan 2018.

30. Should external lighting be proposed then prior to occupation, an Ecologically Sensitive Lighting Scheme shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The scheme shall:

- a) show where external lighting will be installed (through the provision of appropriate lighting contour plans and technical specifications) so that it can be clearly demonstrated that areas to be lit will not disturb or prevent the bat species from foraging over the adjacent Mill Pond.

All external lighting shall be installed in accordance with the specifications and locations set out in the scheme, and these shall be maintained thereafter in accordance with the strategy. Under no circumstances should any additional external lighting be installed without prior consent from the local planning authority.

Reason: In order to comply with requirements of policies 69 and 70 of the Local Plan 2018.

31. Prior to the occupation of the development, hereby permitted, the bottom half of the second floor flank bedroom window for flat 6 shall be obscure glazed to a minimum level of obscurity to conform to Pilkington Glass level 3 or equivalent. The glazing shall thereafter be retained in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: In the interests of residential amenity (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policies 55, 57/58).

32. No development shall commence until details of facilities for the covered, secure parking of bicycles for use in connection with the development hereby permitted have been 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 satisfactory provision for the secure storage of bicycles (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policy 82).

33. In order to create accessible homes all residential developments shall be of a size, configuration and internal layout to enable Building Regulations requirement M4(2) 'accessible and adaptable dwellings' to be met.

Reason: To comply with policy 51 of the Local Plan 2018.

INFORMATIVE: 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.

INFORMATIVE: Any material imported into the site shall be tested for a full suite of contaminants including metals and petroleum hydrocarbons prior to importation. Material imported for landscaping should be tested at a frequency of 1 sample every 20m³ or one per lorry load, whichever is greater. Material imported for other purposes can be tested at a lower frequency (justification and prior approval for the adopted rate is required by the Local Authority). If the material originates from a clean source the developer should contact the Environmental Quality Growth Team for further advice.

INFORMATIVE: Asbestos containing materials (cement sheeting) may be present at the site. The agent/applicant should ensure that these materials are dismantled and disposed of in the appropriate manner to a licensed disposal site. Further information regarding safety issues can be obtained from the H.S.E.

INFORMATIVE: Environment Agency's Informative

Any proposed flood resistant / resilient measures should follow current Government Guidance. For more information on flood resilient techniques, please see the Department for Communities and Local Government (DCLG) guidance document "Improving the Flood Performance of New Buildings - Flood Resilient Construction, 2007", which is available on the following website: <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/flood-resilient-construction-of-new-buildings>

Advice should be sought from the emergency services and the Local Authority's emergency planners when producing a flood evacuation plan.

The applicant is advised of his responsibility to ensure that adequate residual capacity exists within the 'existing' surface and foul water drainage systems, to accept any additional discharge from the development without detriment to either the land drainage regime or water environment.

INFORMATIVE: Please make sure there are no locks on the bin store doors (unless its the standard FB2 lock) and any doors have door hooks to keep them open while crews make their collections.

INFORMATIVE: Cadent have identified operational gas apparatus within the application site boundary. This may include a legal interest (easements or wayleaves) in the land which restricts activity in proximity to Cadent assets in private land. The Applicant must ensure that proposed works do not infringe on Cadent's legal rights and any details of such restrictions should be obtained from the landowner in the first instance.

If buildings or structures are proposed directly above the gas apparatus then development should only take place following a diversion of this apparatus. The Applicant should contact Cadent's Plant Protection Team at the earliest opportunity to discuss proposed diversions of apparatus to avoid any unnecessary delays.

If any construction traffic is likely to cross a Cadent pipeline then the Applicant must contact Cadent's Plant Protection Team to see if any protection measures are required.

All developers are required to contact Cadent's Plant Protection Team for approval before carrying out any works on site and ensuring requirements are adhered to. Email: plantprotection@cadentgas.com Tel: 0800 688 588

INFORMATIVE: To satisfy the plant sound insulation condition, the rating level (in accordance with BS4142:2014) from all plant, equipment and 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 sound frequencies should be eliminated or at least considered in any assessment and should carry an additional correction in accordance with BS4142:2014. This is to prevent unreasonable 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 15 minute period).

It is recommended that the agent/applicant submits an acoustic prediction survey/report in accordance with the principles of BS4142:2014 "Methods for rating and assessing industrial and commercial sound" 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.

It is important to note that a full BS4142:2014 assessment is not required, only certain aspects to be incorporated into an acoustic assessment as described within this informative.

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

To satisfy the condition requiring the submission of a program of measures to control airborne dust above, the applicant should have regard to:

-Council's Supplementary Planning Document - "Sustainable Design and Construction 2007":

<http://www.cambridge.gov.uk/public/docs/sustainable-design-and-construction-spd.pdf>

-Guidance on the assessment of dust from demolition and construction:

http://iaqm.co.uk/wp-content/uploads/guidance/iaqm_guidance_report_draft1.4.pdf

- Air Quality Monitoring in the Vicinity of Demolition and Construction Sites 2012:

http://www.iaqm.co.uk/wp-content/uploads/guidance/monitoring_construction_sites_2012.pdf

-Control of dust and emissions during construction and demolition - supplementary planning guidance:

https://www.london.gov.uk/sites/default/files/Dust%20and%20Emissions%20SPG%208%20July%202014_0.pdf

PLANNING COMMITTEE

11th June 2019

Application Number	18/1859/FUL	Agenda Item	
Date Received	3rd December 2018	Officer	Ganesh Gnanamoorthy
Target Date	28th January 2019		
Ward	Arbury		
Site	39 Akeman Street Cambridge CB4 3HE		
Proposal	Temporary change of use of 39 Akeman Street as a Community Centre Office for a period of 55 weeks involving the widening of a rear door and the installation of an access ramp.		
Applicant	Mrs Allison Conder Cambridge City Council PO Box 700 Cambridge CB1 0JH		

SUMMARY	The development accords with the Development Plan for the following reasons: - The development would help to facilitate a much needed increase in the amount of affordable housing within the City - The proposed development would be for a temporary period only and would not have any significant adverse impact on the residential amenity of the neighbouring occupiers; - The proposal would ensure an existing community facility is re-provided in the short term while the existing site is redeveloped. The new site would include a new, purpose built community facility. - The proposed development is unlikely to give rise to any significant adverse impact upon on-street car parking capacity on the surrounding streets.
RECOMMENDATION	APPROVAL

0.0 BACKGROUND

- 0.1 This planning application has been submitted by Cambridge Investment Partnership (CIP) which is a joint venture company set up by Cambridge City Council and Hill Investment Partnership. The purpose of the partnership is to deliver 500 net new council rented homes across the City using mainly council owned sites/assets. The City Council has received £70 million support from central government as part of the Devolution Deal to help achieve this target.

1.0 SITE DESCRIPTION/AREA CONTEXT

- 1.1 The application site hosts a 2-storey semi-detached property on the northern aspect of Akeman Street. The property benefits from two off-street parking spaces to the front of the site.
- 1.2 The property is currently vacant, although is a residential (use class C3) property.
- 1.3 The property is not located within a designated conservation and the property is not a listed building.
- 1.4 The property is not situated within a controlled parking zone.

2.0 THE PROPOSAL

- 2.1 This application proposes a temporary change of use of the property for use as a community centre (Use Class D1) and associated office for a period of 55 weeks.
- 2.2 The proposal would involve some minor external alterations to the rear of the site, with a doorway being widened and the installation of an access ramp.
- 2.3 A separate planning application has been submitted for the redevelopment of 74-82 Akeman Street for the erection of 3 no. retail units (2 x use class A1 and 1 x use class A5), 1no. Community Centre (use class D1) and provision of 14 no. dwellings (8 flats and 6 maisonettes) following demolition of existing units and flats).

- 2.4 The temporary change of use at 39 Akeman Street would ensure that the existing community use at 82 Akeman Street is not lost during the proposed wider redevelopment.
- 2.5 An amended plan has been submitted to show the extent of the proposed access ramp to the rear of the site. At the time of writing this report, the consultation period was in progress and so an update to this report will be provided to the committee with respect to any additional responses received.
- 2.6 The application is accompanied by the following supporting information:
- Existing and proposed floor plans
 - Site location plan
 - Design and Access Statement
 - Sound Insulation Prediction sheet by Create Consulting Engineers Ltd dated 25/04/2019

3.0 SITE HISTORY

- 3.1 There is no relevant planning history on this site.

4.0 PUBLICITY

- 4.1 Advertisement: No
 Adjoining Owners/Occupiers: Yes
 Site Notice Displayed: No

5.0 POLICY

- 5.1 See Appendix 1 for full details of Central Government Guidance, Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policies, Supplementary Planning Documents and Material Considerations.
- 5.2 Relevant Development Plan policies

PLAN		POLICY NUMBER
Cambridge Local Plan 2018		1, 3, 55, 56, 59, 73, 81, 82

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

Central Government Guidance	National Planning Policy Framework February 2019 National Planning Policy Framework – Planning Practice Guidance March 2014 Circular 11/95 (Annex A)
Supplementary Planning Guidance	Sustainable Design and Construction (May 2007) Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Waste Partnership (RECAP): Waste Management Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (February 2012) Planning Obligation Strategy (March 2010)
Material Considerations	<u>City Wide Guidance</u> Cycle Parking Guide for New Residential Developments (2010) Public Art SPD 2010.

6.0 CONSULTATIONS

Cambridgeshire County Council (Highways Development Management)

- 6.1 The Highways Officer has commented and states that the proposal would be unlikely to cause a significant impact on the public highway.

Environmental Health Officer

- 6.2 No objection has been raised subject to noise mitigation measures being secured by way of condition.

7.0 REPRESENTATIONS

- 7.1 One letter of representation has been received from an occupier at 41 Akeman Street.

7.2 The concerns raised can be summarised as follows:

- A house is not fit for purpose for use as a community centre
- The property would not be accessible to wheelchair and disabled users
- Garden needs landscaping to be suitable for wheelchair users
- How would large furniture required get in to the property
- Costings have not been provided
- Can the property be insured outside of its built purpose?

7.3 Officer response: The proposal includes the widening of a door to the rear and the installation of an access a ramp to allow for wheelchair users. Whilst it is accepted that the stairs within the dwelling could limit use by some users, the operator would need to consider what activities are held in which space.

7.4 The garden could be looked after to make this accessible, although not all community activities require garden space. It would also fall out of the control of the Local Planning Authority to ensure such a space is regularly maintained.

7.5 The concerns regarding furniture delivery, costings and insurances are not material planning considerations.

7.6 The proposal is for a temporary use only, and is not intended to be a permanent solution. The proposal would allow for existing activities to continue, to the benefit of the local community.

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. Residential amenity
4. Highway safety
5. Car and cycle parking

Principle of Development

- 8.2 Policy 73 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2018) seeks to ensure that community facilities are only lost where it is demonstrated that there is no requirement for the use, or where it can be replaced elsewhere.
- 8.3 Although this proposal does not involve the loss of a community facility, it seeks to ensure that an existing, and active, community use is able to continue operating on a temporary basis whilst a more permanent upgrade to the existing facility is secured.
- 8.4 Policy 3 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2018) resists the loss of residential uses, except in exceptional circumstances. This proposal would result in the loss of a residential use although it would be for a temporary period of time, and would be to facilitate the provision of an overall increase in housing, and affordable housing, in the City Council's boundaries.
- 8.5 With the above in mind, the proposal is considered to comply with policies 3 and 73, and the principle of development is considered acceptable subject to the material considerations discussed below being satisfactorily met.

Context of site, design and external spaces (and impact on heritage assets)

- 8.6 The site is located within a predominantly residential area with some commercial uses present. The site is not located within a conservation area, and the building is not listed.
- 8.7 The proposed development would result in no external alterations to the front of the building. The proposal would not, therefore, have an impact on the streetscene.
- 8.8 To the rear of the site, two alterations are proposed. One is for the widening of a door, and the other is to install a ramped access. These alterations are both to allow for greater accessibility to the premises.
- 8.9 The applicant has provided an amended floor plan showing the extent of the ramp to the rear whilst the new width of the door is shown. These would both appear to be acceptable although it is

considered appropriate to attach a condition requiring specifications of the ramp, as well as a proposed rear elevation drawing showing the door and ramp.

- 8.10 It is my opinion that the changes proposes are of a minor nature and, subject to the imposition of a condition, would be appropriate to the surrounding pattern of development and the character of the area and would not constitute overdevelopment. In my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2018) policies 55, 56, and 59.

Residential Amenity

Impact on amenity of neighbouring occupiers

- 8.11 With regard to the external alterations, these are considered to be of a minor enough scale so as to ensure that there would not be an adverse impact on the amenity of neighbouring properties with regard to sunlight/daylight receipt, overlooking, overshadowing, loss of privacy and outlook.
- 8.12 The change of use does, however, create the possibility for the property to have a different impact on neighbouring properties with regard to noise creation than the existing situation.
- 8.13 The application has been supported by a Sound Insulation Prediction data sheet
- 8.14 The conclusions of the document are that the proposed use could have an impact at ground floor level to the adjoining property, and that sound insulation should be added to this wall.
- 8.15 The Council's Environmental Health Team have been consulted on the proposal, and have raised no objection subject to the imposition of a condition restricting the hours of operation of the premises, number of users per room, insulation being provided to the shared party wall at ground floor level, and controls on music/amplified noise.
- 8.16 I consider it important to mitigate against potential noise, and restricting hours of use (09:00 to 18:00 Monday to Friday) and the provision of insulation at the ground floor party wall are supported. Requests to condition the number of users per room are not supported however, as this would not be enforceable

and would, therefore, fail the tests which all conditions must meet as set out in Circular 11/95. The request to prohibit music and amplified voice would also be unenforceable, and given the heavily restricted hours of operation this is not considered to be necessary.

- 8.17 I have assessed the potential impact on the residential amenity of the surrounding occupiers in terms of sunlight, daylight, overlooking, overbearing sense of enclosure and overshadowing. I am satisfied that the proposal, due to its siting, layout and distance from existing dwellings and boundaries, would not have a significant adverse impact on the residential amenity of the neighbouring occupiers such that it would warrant refusal.

Highway Safety

- 8.18 The property does not propose any alterations to site access and egress.
- 8.19 The Highways Authority has been consulted on the proposal and they do not consider that the proposal would have an adverse impact on highways safety.
- 8.20 In my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2018) policy 81.

Car Parking

- 8.21 I consider that the proposed hours of operation means that the likely demand for parking would be during hours when parking demand would likely be at its lowest. In addition, the site benefits from two off street parking spaces and there are no nearby parking restrictions. In addition, likely users of the facility would be people in close proximity of the site and so car reliance would likely be minimal.
- 8.22 In my opinion the proposal provides an acceptable level of car parking. I consider the proposal to be compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2018) policy 82.

9.0 CONCLUSION

- 9.1 The proposed is for a temporary change of use to provide a community facility, including the widening of a rear door and the installation of an access ramp to the rear.
- 9.2 The proposal would allow for the continued provision of a community use while a redevelopment of an existing site would provide an upgraded community facility, new retail premises and new housing.
- 9.3 The application has been considered against the relevant policies, and upon assessment, I consider that the application complies with national and local policies, and should, therefore, be granted planning permission subject to appropriate planning conditions.

10.0 RECOMMEDATION

APPROVE subject to the following conditions:

- 1. The community use hereby permitted shall expire after 55 weeks from first use of the premises in this use. The applicant shall inform the Local Planning Authority, in writing, of the intended date of first occupation (which shall not be more than three years from the date of this decision notice) prior to the use commencing. The premises shall then revert back to residential use after the expiry of 55 weeks from this date.

Reason: In accordance with the requirements of section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, and to protect the amenity of the adjoining properties (Cambridge Local Plan 2018, Policy 35).

- 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 D1 use hereby permitted shall be operational between 09:00 and 18:00 Monday to Friday only.

Reason: To protect the amenity of the adjoining properties (Cambridge Local Plan 2018, Policy 35).

4. Prior to first use, sound insulation shall be provided to the shared party wall of the ground floor in accordance with the specifications within the Create Consulting Engineers Ltd - Sound Insulation Prediction data sheet dated 25/4/1.

Reason: In the interests of residential safety (Cambridge Local Plan 2018, Policy 35).

5. Notwithstanding the plans hereby approved, details of the access ramp and door shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority prior to installation.

Reason: In the interests of the visual amenity (Cambridge Local Plan 2018, Policies 55, 56 and 59).

PLANNING COMMITTEE

11th June 2019

Application Number	18/1520/FUL	Agenda Item	
Date Received	1st October 2018	Officer	Mary Collins
Target Date	26th November 2018		
Ward	Market		
Site	11 Napier Street Cambridge CB1 1HR		
Proposal	Change of use of existing first floor staff accommodation to bed and breakfast (11no rooms)		
Applicant	Mr Songlin Guo		
	11 Napier Street Cambridge CB1 1HR		

SUMMARY	The development accords with the Development Plan for the following reason: The proposal accords with policy 76 as the Safeguarded Public House would be protected. The proposal accords with policy 12 as the proposal retains A3 use at ground floor level. The proposal would not have a detrimental impact on residential amenity.
RECOMMENDATION	APPROVE

1.0 SITE DESCRIPTION/AREA CONTEXT

- 1.1 The application site is a restaurant at the end of Napier Street, close to the Grafton Shopping Centre. The building is one-and-a-half storeys, detached, and has been extended at roof level by way of zinc clad box dormers. Napier Street is predominantly residential in character although there are commercial premises within close proximity along Fitzroy Street and within the Grafton Centre.
- 1.2 It is not Listed or a Building of Local Interest but is located just outside the Central Conservation Area. The site falls within the

controlled parking zone and the City Centre. The building is the former Ancient Druids Public House which was constructed around 1984 and is identified as a Protected Public House by the Cambridge Local Plan 2018.

- 1.3 The building is next to the cycle route which follows the service road at the back of the Grafton Centre (from Fitzroy Lane, across the bottom of Christchurch Street to the bottom of Napier Street) and after the pinch point between 11 Napier Street and the Grafton Centre, crosses the yard at the end of Wellington Street and emerges on East Road next to the vehicle entry to the Grafton Car Park.

2.0 THE PROPOSAL

- 2.1 Planning permission is sought for change of use of existing first floor staff accommodation to bed and breakfast (11no rooms). This would be used in conjunction with the current use of the ground floor as a restaurant.
- 2.2 The application originally proposed to also change the use of the ground floor restaurant to B & B use. During the course of the planning application, the proposal has been revised to retain the existing restaurant use at ground floor level and the proposed manager's flat in the basement has been removed from the proposal.
- 2.3 A vertical jet cowl will be fitted to the flue termination point to the eastern elevation of the building to serve the new extract equipment to the kitchen.
- 2.4 The application is accompanied by the following supporting information:

1. Design and Access Statement
2. Drawings

3.0 SITE HISTORY

Reference	Description	Outcome
18/1295/FUL	Wooden bin store, wooden cladding to front and rear entrances, glass canopy,	Permitted

	handrails and associated landscaping, including trellis.	
17/1395/FUL	Installation of dormers to front and rear elevations, insertion of additional roof windows to south and north elevations and new window and door to basement office. External basement access stair and guarding's/balustrading. Sub division of existing staff accommodation to form nine bedrooms. Installation of extract flue on rear elevation (Part retrospective).	Permitted
17/1386/S73	Section 73 application to vary condition 2 of 16/1951/FUL (removal of fenestration at low level and replacement with masonry wall) to show retrospective changes in fenestration of the ground-floor west elevation including door positions, window design and additional zinc cladding only.	Permitted
16/1951/FUL	Removal of fenestration at low level and replacement with masonry wall.	Permitted

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 2018 policies, Supplementary Planning Documents and Material Considerations.

5.2 Relevant Development Plan policies

PLAN	POLICY NUMBER
Cambridge Local Plan 2018	1 12, 35, 36 55, 56, 58, 59, 76, 77, 81, 82

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

Central Government Guidance	National Planning Policy Framework 2019 National Planning Policy Framework – Planning Practice Guidance from 3 March 2014 onwards Circular 11/95 (Annex A)
Material Considerations	<u>City Wide Guidance</u> Cycle Parking Guide for New Residential Developments (2010)
	<u>Area Guidelines</u> Cambridge City Council (May 2007) – Sustainable Design and Construction: Grafton Area of Major Change SPD (December 2018)

6.0 CONSULTATIONS

Cambridgeshire County Council (Highways Development Control)

- 6.1 Demonstrate that a disabled space can be provided within the location shown clear of the adopted public highway. This has

since been demonstrated through the submission of amended plans.

Following implementation of any Permission issued by the Planning Authority in regard to this proposal the residents of the site will not qualify for Residents' Permits (other than visitor permits) within the existing Residents' Parking Schemes operating on surrounding streets. This should be brought to the attention of the applicant, and an appropriate informative added to any Permission that the Planning Authority is minded to issue with regard to this proposal.

The amended drawings submitted on 17th April 2019 do not change the Highway Authority response of 29th November 2018.

Conservation team

- 6.2 It is considered that there are no material Conservation issues with this proposal.

Environmental Health

- 6.3 The development proposed is acceptable subject to conditions relating to:

- Construction hours
- Fume filtration/extraction
- Noise insulation scheme
- Collections and deliveries
- Plant design and installation controlled by a compliance condition requiring that works are carried out in accordance with the details provided in the Noise Impact Assessment.

Waste

- 6.4 Suggest at the very minimum a 360l bin for general and another for recycling, both collected weekly, on-top of the bins above for the resident/manager. These would need to be presented on the road for collection on the day/s agreed as the bin store is too far from the road for the refuse operators to access.

Access Officer

- 6.5 Double doors will need to be powered or be asymmetrical with one leaf being at least 900mm and having an opening force of less than 20N.
Plan for accessible room required
Needs a blue badge marked parking space
A lift serving all floors would be preferable.
Hearing loop where appropriate
Colour contrast décor and signage to help visually impaired visitors

CAMRA

- 6.6 Object. The former Ancient Druids could once again be viable as a pub. The application to convert it to a bed and breakfast facility would deprive the local community of this possibility.

Cadent

- 6.7 Cadent have identified operational gas apparatus within the application site boundary. Recommend an informative note for the Applicant is attached if minded to approve this application.

Policy Team

National Policy (NPPF)

- 6.8 National policy in the NPPF includes the presumption in favour of sustainable development at the heart of the planning system. This sets a clear expectation on planning authorities to plan positively to promote development and create sustainable communities.

Public Houses

- 6.9 Public houses support the social and economic roles of sustainable development. They are a unique part of British culture and help support social and cultural well-being by providing a place for social interaction within a community as well as creating local employment opportunities. A thriving local pub sector is therefore important to achieving sustainable development.

- 6.10 Paragraph 20 of the NPPF sets the strategic priorities for the area in the local plan including the provision of community facilities and cultural infrastructure.
- 6.11 Paragraph 81 of the NPPF supports policies that set out a clear economic vision and strategy which positively and proactively encourages sustainable economic growth and other local policies for economic development and regeneration. While paragraph 85 encourages policies and decisions which support the role that town centres play at the heart of local communities, by taking a positive approach to their growth, management and adaptation.
- 6.12 Paragraph 91 of the NPPF supports places that promote the opportunity for meetings between members of the community who might not otherwise come into contact with each other. The public house has long been an established part of the community, one that people want to have access to and one that promotes social interaction. It is therefore a valid local planning policy objective to retain public houses in order to provide such places for social interaction.
- 6.13 The NPPF, para 92, encourages a positive approach towards the delivery and “use of community facilities (such as local shops, meeting places, public houses and places of worship) ... to enhance the sustainability of communities and residential environments;”
- 6.14 In summary, the NPPF seeks to support sustainable communities. In this context, public houses may be valued for their role in supporting local economies; in providing a local facility for social interaction; and in retaining an intrinsic part of the settlement’s cultural and historic heritage. The NPPF states that local authorities should plan positively for the provision of community facilities such as public houses, guard against their unnecessary loss, and ensure that policies are flexible enough to allow such facilities to modernise and be retained for the benefit of the community (paragraph 92).

Tourism development

- 6.15 The Bed and Breakfast proposal is considered to be tourism development and hence is considered a main town centre use.

As the site is within the city centre, it's location for Bed and Breakfast use is considered to be acceptable in principle.

The Cambridge Local Plan 2018

Loss of a Safeguarded Public House Site

- 6.16 The recently adopted (18 October 2018) Cambridge Local Plan 2018 contains: Policy 76: 'Protection of public houses'; the list of protected public houses sites applicable to Policy 76 in Appendix C; and the accompanying guidance in Appendix K: 'Marketing, Local Needs Assessment and Viability'. The former Ancient Druids public house site on Napier Street is included on the list of protected public houses sites.
- 6.17 Policy 76 allows for safeguarded public house sites to oscillate amongst 'A' and 'D1' Class Use Types when it has been proven that the site is no longer needed for public house use. Any proposal that involves the loss of an A4 use must first satisfy a number of tests to demonstrate the site is no longer viable/needed, capable of diversification and the local community have been properly consulted with the potential loss of the public house. The tests are as follows:
1. The site needs to be properly marketed for A4 use at a commensurate market rent/price as explained in Appendix K.
 2. An assessment of realistic diversification options need to be provided where the site offers some form of diversification potential. This may include ancillary B&B which is linked to the A4 pub business.
 3. Adequate consultation with local people within the vicinity of the public house site.

No information has been provided explaining how the proposal complies with Policy 76. Alternatively, if the proposal was amended to include an A4 use with an operator in place to run it as such, the revised proposal would comply with Policy 76. The proposal already includes a manager's flat for the bed and breakfast proposal; this could be used by the same manager to operate the public house business subject to any other requirements to make the proposal acceptable in planning terms.

New visitor accommodation

- 6.18 The Cambridge Local Plan 2018 also contains Policy 77: 'Development and expansion of visitor accommodation'. The Bed and Breakfast would also apply to this policy; and while the type of visitor accommodation (i.e. Bed and Breakfast) is not specifically supported by Policy 77, the site's location is support in that it is in an area of mixed-use and is within walking distance of bus route corridors with good public transport accessibility.

The former Ancient Druids Public House site

- 6.19 The pub site is located within the north eastern periphery of the city centre adjacent to the Grafton Shopping Centre. The site is located within the Fitzroy/Burleigh Street/Grafton Area of Major Change designated by Policy 12 in the Cambridge Local Plan. The site is a safeguarded site, which has the intention of allowing the site's use to oscillate amongst 'A' and 'D1' Class Use Types when it has been proven that the site is no longer needed for public house use. The public house itself has in recent years been used as a restaurant.
- 6.20 Since the pub closed, there has been substantial new development built along Newmarket Road which has helped to reinvigorate the area's appeal. Examples include: Anglia Ruskin University's recent acquisition of Compass House on the corner of Elizabeth Way roundabout; two new hotels built along Newmarket Road totalling 340 rooms, with another 90 room hotel proposed close by to these. More residential and student accommodation units have been granted planning permission and built in and around Newmarket Road, nearby. Other developments under construction include new office space at 122 - 128 Newmarket Road (Planning ref. 17/1225/FUL) involving the re-opening of the Five Bells public house for A4 use as a gaming bar.
- 6.21 While there are other public houses in the area, each public house provides a variation in local service and therefore caters to different parts of the community while providing a degree of competition for local people. This means they create a vibrant and appealing destination by providing a competitive range of local facilities. This is exemplified by The Corner House public house hosting a small, performance venue and The Wrestlers

providing Thai food. The rebuilt Five Bells is expected to have gaming theme to it. The Burleigh Arms is currently a gastro pub with a large beer garden.

- 6.22 These public houses help the area retain its attractive and vibrant appeal as a location to visit throughout the day and evening for people to meet and socialise in. The site's retention as a viable public house site is essential to ensure this area is able to serve and support the day-to-day needs of a growing local community.

Fitzroy/Burleigh Street/Grafton Area of Major Change

- 6.23 The recently adopted Grafton Area of Major Change SPD also highlights the substantial investment expected in this part of the city centre outlined in Local Plan Policy 12: Fitzroy/Burleigh Street/Grafton Area of Major Change. This area is supported as a location for expansion and/or redevelopment for retail and leisure use (A1, A2, A3, A4 and D2), with residential and student accommodation on upper floors.

- 6.24 The SPD, available from the City Council's website¹ identifies three key objectives which sit above the statements of guidance, development parameters and illustrative guidance in Chapter 5 of the SPD. There are:

1. Integration and permeability through better streets and spaces
2. A balanced and successful destination - the SPD encourages the strengthening of the area for retail, and greater diversification as a destination for the city - for residents, visitors, workers and students.
3. Flexibility and phasing - In practical terms, it is vital that any proposals for the area are set in context of the longer-term strategy for the area.

There should be evidence from the owners of the Grafton Shopping Centre that the proposal will not conflict with the longer term proposals for the area's reconfiguration.

¹ <https://www.cambridge.gov.uk/grafton-area-of-major-change-masterplan-and-guidance-spd>

Proposed Bed and Breakfast use (C1 class use)

- 6.25 A number of public houses provide 'Bed and Breakfast' type accommodation as a means of diversifying and supporting the main public house/A4 use. These include The Carpenter's Arms on Victoria Road, the recently refurbished The Waterman on Mitcham's Corner, The Earl of Derby on Hills Road. The mix of public house and Bed and Breakfast uses are considered compatible.

Conclusion

- 6.26 No information has been provided explaining how the proposal complies with Policy 76. CAMRA should be notified about this planning application because the site is a safeguarded public house with potential for its use to be re-introduced.
- 6.27 The site has significant potential to re-introduce a public house use, based upon its proximity to a recently rejuvenated Newmarket Road and its location within the Grafton Area of Major Change. However, evidence should be provided from the owners of the Grafton Shopping Centre that any proposal will not conflict with the longer term proposals for the area's reconfiguration.
- 6.28 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 Councillor Tim Bick has commented on the application.
- Concerned that the cycle route bordering the south of the building is respected and maintained uncluttered in the event of any approval.
 - Consider that the following proposed features are inconsistent with continuation of the cycle way and should be removed by amendment or specifically conditioned against:
 - Cycle racks along this southern frontage or to obstruct it at either end.

- Waste/recycling bin storage along this southern frontage or to obstruct it at either end.
- Use of the southernmost vehicle parking space on the east side of the frontage (which has until now been prohibited for parking and should continue that way)

7.2 The owner/occupier of the following addresses has made a representation:

- 17 Christchurch Street

7.3 The representation can be summarised as follows:

- Public right of way and cycle access between 11 Napier Street and rear of the Grafton should not be obstructed.
- Parking spaces to rear should not obstruct this route.
- Bin storage location and arrangements need to be clarified.
- The parking bay that obstructs the pedestrian and cycle route should be removed. The route may not have been adopted by the Highways Authority, but it was an integral part of the Planning process when the Grafton was under consideration. This section of the route is in place of that part of Fitzroy Street and Blucher Row that disappeared under the Grafton. The Council's Access Officer ought to be concerned about this too. The parking space, combined with the adjacent ramp constructed when the Grafton was altered, make a pinch point very difficult for wheel chair use.

8.0 ASSESSMENT

Principle of development

- 8.1 The application site is located within the north eastern periphery of the city centre adjacent to the Grafton Shopping Centre. It is located within the Fitzroy/Burleigh Street/Grafton Area of Major Change designated by Policy 12 in the Cambridge Local Plan.
- 8.2 Policy 76 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2018 relates to the 'Protection of public houses' and includes a list of protected

public houses sites in Appendix C. The property is the former Ancient Druids public house site on Napier Street and is included on the list of protected sites.

8.3 Policy 76 states that the loss of any part of a public house, or its curtilage will be permitted if it can be demonstrated that:

- the viability of the public house use will not be adversely affected, sufficient cellarage, beer garden, parking and dining/kitchen areas will remain to retain a viable public house operation; and
- the loss including associated development will not detract from the prevailing character and appearance of the area, including where the building is of merit or has any distinctive architectural features.

8.4 The existing building has been in restaurant use since circa 2008. At this time there was a permitted change of use from Class A4 Drinking establishments to A3 restaurant, so the established and permitted use of the existing building is as a restaurant rather than a pub.

8.5 Given that the lawful use of the site is as a restaurant, the proposal does not therefore result in the loss of a public house. Notwithstanding this, I consider that there would be sufficient dining and kitchen areas and potentially basement areas for cellarage to retain a viable public house operation in the future.

8.6 Policy 77 relates to the Development and expansion of visitor accommodation'. Whilst the type of visitor accommodation (i.e. Bed and Breakfast) is not specifically referred to in Policy 77, the site's location is in an area of mixed-use and is within walking distance of bus route corridors with good public transport accessibility.

8.7 The Grafton Area of Major Change SPD highlights the substantial investment expected in this part of the city centre outlined in Local Plan Policy 12: Fitzroy/Burleigh Street/Grafton Area of Major Change. This area is supported as a location for expansion and/or redevelopment for retail and leisure use (A1, A2, A3, A4 and D2), with residential and student accommodation on upper floors.

The continued use of the ground floor as restaurant use which was secured as an amendment to the original proposal would be in accordance with this policy as A3 use is appropriate within this area.

- 8.8 In my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policies 12, 76, 55, 56 and 58.

Residential Amenity

Impact on amenity of neighbouring occupiers

- 8.9 The use of the first floor of the premises for bed and breakfast accommodation would not be detrimental to the amenities of surrounding properties. Environmental Health Officers are satisfied that subject to compliance, the proposed extraction system to the kitchen and associated would not adversely impact on surrounding properties.
- 8.10 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 2018 policies 35, 36, 56 and 58.

Parking and highway safety

- 8.11 Bed and Breakfasts require one cycle parking space for every 2 members of staff and 2 spaces for every 10 bedrooms.
- 8.12 There has been conflict between the requirement for the provision of a disabled parking space and keeping the cycle way, which is in close proximity to the southern side and eastern end of the existing restaurant building, clear of obstructions. Revised drawings have been received showing no cycle parking to the southern side of the building which removes the obstruction to the cycle way.
- 8.13 The Access Officer has requested that a Blue Badge parking space is provided. I will attach a condition regarding the final layout of the cycle and parking spaces.

9.0 CONCLUSION

- 9.1 The continued use of the ground floor as restaurant use would protect the site of the safeguarded public house and sufficient dining and kitchen areas and basement. The associated use at first floor level of Bed and Breakfast accommodation would be one which would be a compatible with the ground floor restaurant use and acceptable at first floor level within the city centre.

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 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended by 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 construction work or demolition work shall be carried out or plant operated other than between the following hours: 0800 hours and 1800 hours on Monday to Friday, 0800 hours and 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 2018 policy 35).

4. The plant and associated equipment as stated within the Noise Impact Assessment, (Reference 11NS180928), prepared by MAS Environmental Ltd and dated 28th September 2018 shall be fully implemented prior to the bring into use of the first floor and shall be maintained in accordance with the approved details thereafter.

Reason: To protect the amenity local amenity in accordance with Cambridge Local Plan 2018 Policy 35.

5. Collections from and deliveries to the premises shall not be made outside the hours of 0700-2100 Monday-Saturday and 0900-1700 on Sundays and Bank/Public Holidays.

Reason: To protect the amenity local amenity in accordance with Cambridge Local Plan 2018 Policy 35.

6. Prior to first use, details of the final scheme of noise insulation including:

- Glazing specifications per room based on the results of the Noise Impact Assessment and
- Proposals for and details of the alternative ventilation system to be installed in the noise impacted rooms. The alternative ventilation scheme will need to be capable of providing at least 2 air changes per hour in the individual rooms.

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 occupiers (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policy 35).

7. Prior to the first occupation/use of the development, 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 and shall thereafter be retained as such.

Reason: To protect the amenity of nearby properties (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policy 36).

8. Prior to the first use of the development hereby permitted, an accessible car parking space shall be provided to allow a car to park free of the highway and the cycle route. The parking area shall be laid out in accordance with the approved details and retained thereafter.

Reason: To ensure satisfactory provision for the parking of vehicles (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policies 56 and 82).

9. Prior to the first use of the development hereby permitted, details of the bin store facilities shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. The bin store shall be provided in accordance with the approved details and retained thereafter.

Reason: To ensure satisfactory provision for the secure storage of bins (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policy 56).

10. Prior to commencement of the use, full details of facilities for the covered, secure parking of bicycles for use in connection with the development shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The facilities shall be provided in accordance with the approved details before the development is occupied or the use commences and shall be retained in accordance with the approved details thereafter.

Reason: To ensure appropriate provision for the secure storage of bicycles (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policy 82).

INFORMATIVE: A premises licence may be required for this development in addition to any planning permission. A premises licence under the Licensing Act 2003 may be required to authorise:

- The supply of alcohol
- Regulated entertainment e.g.
- Music (Including bands, DJ's and juke boxes)
- Dancing
- The performing of plays
- Boxing or wrestling
- The showing of films
- Late Night Refreshment (The supply of hot food or drink between 23:00-05:00)

A separate licence may be required for activities involving gambling including poker and gaming machines.

The applicant is advised to contact The Licensing Team of Environmental Health at Cambridge City Council on telephone number (01223) 457899 or email Licensing@cambridge.gov.uk for further information.

INFORMATIVE: To satisfy the plant sound insulation condition, the rating level (in accordance with BS4142:2014) from all plant, equipment and 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 sound frequencies should be eliminated or at least considered in any assessment and should carry an additional correction in accordance with BS4142:2014. This is to prevent unreasonable 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 15 minute period).

It is recommended that the agent/applicant submits an acoustic prediction survey/report in accordance with the principles of BS4142:2014 "Methods for rating and assessing industrial and commercial sound" 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.

It is important to note that a full BS4142:2014 assessment is not required, only certain aspects to be incorporated into an acoustic assessment as described within this informative.

Such a survey / report should include: a large scale plan of the site in relation to neighbouring premises; sound sources and measurement / prediction points marked on plan; a list of sound sources; details of proposed sound sources / type of plant such as: number, location, sound power levels, sound frequency spectrums, sound directionality of plant, sound levels from duct intake or discharge points; details of sound mitigation measures (attenuation details of any intended enclosures, silencers or barriers); description of full sound calculation procedures; sound 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: As the premises is intended to be run as a food business the applicant is reminded that under the Food Safety Act 1990 (as amended) the premises will need to be registered with Cambridge City Council. In order to avoid additional costs it is recommended that the applicant ensure that the kitchen, food preparation and food storage areas comply with food hygiene legislation, before construction starts. Contact the Commercial Team at Cambridge City Council on telephone number (01223) 457890 for further information.

INFORMATIVE: Cadent have identified operational gas apparatus within the application site boundary. This may include a legal interest (easements or wayleaves) in the land which restricts activity in proximity to Cadent assets in private land. The Applicant must ensure that proposed works do not infringe on Cadent's legal rights and any details of such restrictions should be obtained from the landowner in the first instance.

If buildings or structures are proposed directly above the gas apparatus then development should only take place following a diversion of this apparatus. The Applicant should contact Cadent's Plant Protection Team at the earliest opportunity to discuss proposed diversions of apparatus to avoid any unnecessary delays.

If any construction traffic is likely to cross a Cadent pipeline then the Applicant must contact Cadent's Plant Protection Team to see if any protection measures are required.

All developers are required to contact Cadent's Plant Protection Team for approval before carrying out any works on site and ensuring requirements are adhered to.

PLANNING COMMITTEE

11th June 2019

Application Number	18/1887/FUL	Agenda Item	
Date Received	3rd December 2018	Officer	Mairead O'Sullivan
Target Date	28th January 2019		
Ward	Abbey		
Site	57 Peverel Road Cambridge CB5 8RN		
Proposal	Erection of a detached 3-bed dwelling to the side of 57 Peverel Road.		
Applicant	Mrs Coutts 57 Peverel Road Cambridge CB5 8RN		

SUMMARY	The development accords with the Development Plan for the following reasons: - The proposal would provide a quality living environment for future occupiers - The proposal would not harm the amenity of surrounding occupiers - The proposal is acceptable in design terms
RECOMMENDATION	APPROVAL

1.0 SITE DESCRIPTION/AREA CONTEXT

- 1.1 The application site is a two storey rendered semi-detached dwelling on Peverel Road. Peverel Road is a residential circuit road to the east of Barnwell Road. The site lies next to a corner plot opposite to an area of Protected Open Space. Peverel Road is characterised by semi-detached dwellings many of which have garages to the side. All of the houses are set back from the street with either parking or small gardens to the front. There has been some other infill development within the street.
- 1.2 The site lies outside of the Conservation Area. The site lies within a Minerals and Waste Consultation Area. The site lies

within Cambridge Airport safeguarding zone. The site lies outside the Controlled Parking Zone.

2.0 THE PROPOSAL

- 2.1 The application seeks full planning permission for the erection of a detached three bedroom house to the side of 57 Peverel Road. The plans have been amended since submission to increase the gap between the proposed and existing house to ensure the rear gardens would be adequately accessible for bikes and bins.
- 2.2 The proposed new house would sit in line with no. 57. One off street car parking space is shown to be retained to the front of each dwelling. Bin and bike storage for both dwellings is shown in the rear gardens.
- 2.3 The proposed house would have a gable end to the street with a flat roof element at single storey to the side rising up to first floor towards the rear. A pitched roof canopy is proposed over the front door.

3.0 SITE HISTORY

Reference	Description	Outcome
C/80/0771	Erection of single-storey extension to existing dwelling house	Permitted

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 2018 policies, Supplementary Planning Documents and Material Considerations.

5.2 Relevant Development Plan policies

PLAN		POLICY NUMBER
Cambridge Plan 2018	Local	1 3
		31 32 33 34 35 36 37
		50 51 52
		55 56 57 59
		81 82

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

Central Government Guidance	National Planning Policy Framework February 2019
	National Planning Policy Framework – Planning Practice Guidance from 3 March 2014 onwards
	Circular 11/95 (Annex A)
	Technical housing standards – nationally described space standard – published by Department of Communities and Local Government March 2015 (material consideration)

Previous Supplementary Planning Documents (These documents, prepared to support policies in the 2006 local plan are no longer SPDs, but are still material considerations.)	Sustainable Design and Construction (May 2007) Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Waste Partnership (RECAP): Waste Management Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (February 2012)
Material Considerations	<u>City Wide Guidance</u> Cambridge and Milton Surface Water Management Plan (2011) Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (November 2010) Cambridge City Council Waste and Recycling Guide: For Developers. Cycle Parking Guide for New Residential Developments (2010)

6.0 CONSULTATIONS

Cambridgeshire County Council (Highways Development Management)

- 6.1 No objection: three conditions are requested which require adequate drainage to the driveway, visibility splays and to ensure that no unbound material is used on the driveway.

Environmental Health

- 6.2 No objection: Conditions are recommended regarding piling and construction hours.

Ministry of Defence (Defence Infrastructure Organisation)

- 6.3 No objection: A construction management strategy is required by condition.

Cambridge Airport

- 6.4 No objection: Any consent should be subject to a condition removing PD rights for cranes and construction equipment.

Head of Streets and Open Spaces (Landscape Team)

- 6.5 Further information needed: It is not clear where cycle storage provision will be achieved for either the new or the retained dwelling. Upon receipt of this information, landscape would be in a position to support this application.

Drainage

- 6.6 No objection: A condition and informative are requested to require further infiltration testing to be undertaken and submitted with a surface water strategy.

Minerals and Waste

- 6.7 No comments received.
- 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 occupier of the following addresses have made representations:
- Camcycle x2
 - 59 Peverel Road x3

7.2 The representations can be summarised as follows:

- Cycle parking is small and accessed from a narrow passage
- Revised cycle store is too small
- Cycle store is accessed across grass
- Concerned that the dwelling would be rented/used by students
- Concerned about car parking
- Noise and disturbance from additional house
- Concerned about disturbance during construction and request that builders are prevented from parking to front of no. 59

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. Principle of development
2. Context of site, design and external spaces
3. Water management and flood risk
4. Noise and vibration
5. Inclusive access
6. Residential amenity
7. Refuse arrangements
8. Highway safety
9. Car and cycle parking
10. Third party representations

Principle of Development

8.2 Policy 52 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2018) is relevant as it relates to the protection of garden land and subdivision of existing dwelling plots. This states that proposals that subdivide an existing residential dwelling plot will only be permitted where a) the form, height and layout is appropriate to the surrounding

character, b) there is sufficient garden space for existing and proposed dwellings and that any trees worth retaining are kept, c) the amenity of the existing and new properties would be acceptable, d) there is adequate provision for amenity space, vehicular access and car parking for existing and proposed properties and e) there is no detrimental impact on potential comprehensive redevelopment of the wider area. Criterion e is not relevant. I will assess the proposal against the other criteria under the relevant headings below.

Context of site, design and external spaces

- 8.3 Although the area is characterised by semi-detached dwellings, there has been some in fill development on the street. This is mainly in the form of side extensions to existing dwellings to create a small terrace. The proposal is for a detached dwelling to the side of no 57. Although this is not a common feature on the street, I consider the dwelling would infill a large void between no 57 and 59 and would read well in the streetscene.
- 8.4 The footprint of the building has been reduced to ensure adequately wide access to the rear gardens for bikes and bins. The building would have a simple architectural form with a pitched roof gable end facing the street. The entrance would have a simple pitched roof canopy. The building is proposed to be finished in buff brick. Material samples are required by condition. Subject to details of materials the proposal would be of high quality design.
- 8.5 In my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2018) policies 52, 55, 56, 57 and 59.

Integrated water management and flood risk

- 8.6 The Drainage Officer notes that additional infiltration tests are required. This information as well as a final drainage strategy are required by pre-commencement condition.
- 8.7 In my opinion the applicants have suitably addressed the issues of water management and flood risk, and the proposal is in accordance with Cambridge Local Plan (2018) policies 31 and 32.

Noise and vibration

- 8.8 A construction hours and piling condition are recommended by the Environmental Health Officer. Subject to these conditions I consider the proposal would not harm the amenity of surrounding occupiers during construction.
- 8.9 In my opinion, subject to the conditions the proposal is in accordance with Cambridge Local Plan (2018) policy 35.

Inclusive access

- 8.10 The applicant has confirmed that it would be possible for the proposed dwelling to meet with part M4(2) of Building Regs. A condition requiring compliance is recommended.
- 8.11 In my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2018) policy 51.

Residential Amenity

Impact on amenity of neighbouring occupiers

- 8.12 The proposed dwelling sits in line with the existing house at no. 57. As a result I am satisfied that it would not enclose or overshadow this occupier. There would be first floor windows to the rear of the property which would have views into the garden of no 57. The windows serve a bedroom and a bathroom and the bathroom window is likely to be obscure glazed. The garden is already overlooked by the first floor windows of 59 Peverel Road and this is a typical suburban relationship. I am therefore satisfied that the proposal would not have an unacceptable impact on the privacy of no 57.
- 8.13 The building is located adjacent to the side passage and garage of 55 Peverel Road. The building is set away from the rear windows and broadly in line with the building line of 55. As a result I am satisfied that it would not enclose or overshadow this occupier. The first floor bedroom window nearest to no 55 is angled away from this neighbour and would only allow for very oblique views. As with no 57, the garden of 55 is already overlooked by neighbouring windows and I do not consider this relationship harmful to the privacy of this occupier.

8.14 The application is for one additional dwelling which would result in an intensification of use of the site however I do not consider this would give rise to any significant noise or disturbance to surrounding neighbours.

8.15 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 (2018) policies 35, 55 and 56.

Amenity for future occupiers of the site

8.16 The proposed dwelling meets with the minimum internal floor space requirements of policy 50. A large rear garden is proposed for the new dwelling which would be adequate for the new dwelling. I am also satisfied that the garden retained by the host dwelling would be acceptable. In my view the proposed new dwelling would provide a good standard of amenity to future occupiers. Occupiers of the retained dwelling would also enjoy a good standard of amenity.

The gross internal floor space measurements for units in this application are shown in the table below:

Unit	Number of bedrooms	Number of bed spaces (persons)	Number of storeys	Policy Size requirement (m ²)	Proposed size of unit	Difference in size
1	3	5	2	93	99	+6

8.17 In my opinion the proposal provides a high-quality (*and accessible*) 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 (2018) policies 50, 51 and 52.

Refuse Arrangements

8.18 Bin storage for both dwellings on the revised plans is shown within the gardens. This is accessible through a 1.2m gap between the houses. In my view the provision is acceptable. Details of bin stores for both properties are required by condition.

- 8.19 In my opinion the proposal is compliant in this respect with Cambridge Local Plan (2018) policy 57.

Highway Safety

- 8.20 The Highway Engineer has not raised concerns about any impact on highway safety as a result of the proposal. Three conditions are requested relating to visibility splays, drainage to the driveway and use of unbound materials. I share his view and recommend all three conditions.
- 8.21 In my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2018) policy 81.

Car and Cycle Parking

- 8.22 One off street car parking space is proposed for each dwelling. The site is located in a sustainable location close to cycle and public transport links. As a result I am satisfied that this provision is acceptable. I note one of the representations raises concerns about parking however in my view the level of parking proposed for the new dwelling and retained by the existing dwelling would be adequate and in compliance with policy 82.
- 8.23 Cycle parking is shown in the rear garden. This is acceptable in principle but details of the stores are required by condition. I note that Camcycle have raised concerns that the stores shown would not be adequately large to hold three bicycle parking spaces. I am satisfied that an adequately large store can be accommodated on site. The stores will need to be accessed over a path rather than grass and details of this can be provided through the landscape condition.
- 8.24 In my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2018) policy 82.

Third Party Representations

8.25 I will address any outstanding matters raised by the third party representations in the below table:

Representation	Response
Cycle parking is small and accessed from a narrow passage	The building footprint has been reduced to ensure the path is adequately wide for bikes access
Revised cycle store is too small	Noted. Details of a store are required by condition. See paragraph 8.23
Cycle store is accessed across grass	Details of a path to access the store are required to be dealt with through a landscape condition.
Concerned that the dwelling would be rented/use by students	The proposal is for a C3 dwelling. This could be rented by students but this is not a material planning consideration.
Concerned about car parking	See paragraph 8.22
Noise and disturbance from additional house	See paragraph 8.14
Concerned about disturbance during construction and request that builders are prevented from parking to front on no. 59	See paragraph regarding construction disturbance. It is not possible to prohibit builders parking outside no 59 through the planning consent and this would be a civil matter.

9.0 CONCLUSION

9.1 The proposed dwelling is considered to be a good quality design and to sit well in the streetscene. The proposal is not considered to harm the amenity of surrounding occupiers. The proposed level of car parking is considered acceptable. The proposal would provide a good standard of amenity for future occupiers.

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 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended by 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 construction work or demolition work shall be carried out or plant operated other than between the following hours: 0800 hours and 1800 hours on Monday to Friday, 0800 hours and 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 2018 policy 35).

4. In the event of the foundations for the proposed development requiring piling, prior to the development taking place, other than demolition, 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 from 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.

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 (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policy 35).

5. No development above ground level, other than demolition, shall commence until full details of both hard and soft landscape works have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The works shall be carried out as approved. These details shall include details of paths to reach the proposed bike and bin stores, 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); 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.

All hard and soft landscape works shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details. The works shall be carried out prior to the occupation of any part of the development or in accordance with a programme agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The maintenance shall be carried out in accordance with the approved schedule. Any trees or plants that, within a period of five years after planting, are removed, die or become in the opinion of the Local Planning Authority, seriously damaged or defective, shall be replaced as soon as is reasonably practicable with others of species, size and number as originally approved, unless the Local Planning Authority gives its written consent to any variation.

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 2018 policies 55, 57 and 59).

6. Prior to the occupation of the dwelling, details of cycle stores for the proposed and existing dwellings shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The details shall include location of the stores, and dimensioned floor plans and elevations. The stores shall thereafter be installed and retained in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure adequate cycle storage for both dwellings (Cambridge Local Plan (2018) policy 82).

7. Prior to the occupation of the dwelling, details of the bin stores for the proposed and existing dwellings shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The bin stores shall be constructed in accordance with the approved details prior to the occupation of the dwelling.

Reason: To ensure adequate bin storage is provided for both dwellings (policy 52 and 57 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2018).

8. The driveway hereby approved shall be constructed so that its falls and levels are such that no private water from the site drains across or onto the adopted public highway. Once constructed the driveway shall thereafter be retained as such.

Reason: To prevent surface water discharging to the highway, in the interests of highway safety (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policy 81).

9. Prior to the first occupation or bringing into use of the development, hereby permitted, visibility splays shall be provided each side of the vehicular access in full accordance with the details indicated on the submitted plan No 18PL101 REV 01. The splays shall thereafter be maintained free from any obstruction exceeding 0.6m above the level of the adjacent highway carriageway.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policy 81).

10. The driveway hereby approved shall be constructed using a bound material for the first 6m from the back of the adopted public highway, to prevent debris spreading onto the adopted public highway. Once constructed the driveway shall thereafter be retained as such.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policy 81).

11. Prior to the commencement of development, other than demolition, a scheme for surface water drainage works shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The details shall include an assessment of the potential for disposing of surface water by means of a sustainable drainage system in accordance with the principles set out in the National Planning Policy Framework and the National Planning Policy Guidance, and the results of the assessment provided to the Local Planning Authority. The system should be designed such that there is no surcharging for a 1 in 30 year event and no internal property flooding for a 1 in 100 year event + an allowance for climate change. The submitted details shall include the following:

- 1) Information about the design storm period and intensity, the method employed to delay and control the surface water discharged from the site and the measures taken to prevent pollution of the receiving groundwater and/or surface waters;
- 2) A management and maintenance plan for the lifetime of the development which shall include the arrangements for adoption by any public authority or statutory undertaker and any other arrangements for adoption by any public authority or statutory undertaker and any other arrangements to secure the operation of the scheme throughout its lifetime.

The approved details shall be fully implemented on site prior to the first use/occupation and shall be retained thereafter.

Reason: To ensure appropriate surface water drainage (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policies 31 and 32).

12. Development shall not commence until a construction management strategy has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority covering the application site and any adjoining land which will be used during the construction period. Such a strategy shall include the details of cranes and other tall construction equipment (including the details of obstacle lighting). The approved strategy (or any variation approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority) shall be implemented for the duration of the construction period.

Reason: To ensure that construction work and construction equipment on the site and adjoining land does not obstruct air traffic movements or otherwise impede the effective operation of air traffic navigation transmitter/receiver systems (Cambridge Local Plan 2019 policy 37).

13. The dwelling, hereby permitted, shall be constructed to meet the requirements of Part M4(2) 'accessible and adaptable dwellings' of the Building Regulations 2010 (as amended 2016).

Reason: To secure the provision of accessible housing (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policy 51).