



Cambridge City Council Planning

Date: Wednesday, 5 August 2020

Time: 9.00 am

Venue: This a virtual meeting and therefore there is no physical location for this meeting.

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: 9am
 - **Part Two**
Minor/Other Planning Applications
Start time: At conclusion of Part One
 - **Part Three**
General and Enforcement Items
Start time: At conclusion of Part Two

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.

- 2 Apologies
- 3 Declarations of Interest

- 4 Minutes (Pages 7 - 36)
- 21 May
 - 4 June
 - 17 June
 - 1 July

Part 1: Major Planning Applications

- 5 19/1757/FUL Buchan Street Neighbourhood Centre (Pages 37 - 80)

Part 2: Minor/Other Planning Applications

- 6 20/0010/FUL - Anglia Ruskin University, East Road (Pages 81 - 88)
- 7 20/0034/FUL - Jesus Green Moorings, Thompsons Lane (Pages 89 - 104)
- 8 19/1141/FUL - 1 Fitzwilliam Road (Pages 105 - 136)

Part 3: General Item

- 9 Committee Start Times
- Having undergone a trial period of 9am committee start times, Members to review if they prefer 9am or wish to revert back to 10am in future.

Planning Members: Smart (Chair), Baigent (Vice-Chair), Green, Lord, McQueen, Porrer, Thornburrow and Tunnacliffe

Alternates: Bird, Page-Croft and Price

Information for the public

Details how to observe the Committee meeting will be published no later than 24 hours before the meeting.

Members of the public are welcome to view the live stream of this meeting, except during the consideration of exempt or confidential items, by following the link to be published on the Council's website.

Any person who participates in the meeting in accordance with the Council's public speaking time, is deemed to have consented to being recorded and to the use of those images (where participating via video conference) and/or sound recordings for webcast purposes. When speaking, members of the public should not disclose any personal information of any individual as this might infringe the rights of that individual and breach the Data Protection Act.

If members of the public wish to address the committee please contact Democratic Services by 12 noon two working days before the meeting.

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 – Planning Policies and Guidance

(Updated January 2020)

1.0 Central Government Advice

1.1 National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) February 2019 – 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 (NPPG)

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

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

Planning Obligations

1.4 Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Regulations 2010 (as amended)

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.

The 2019 amendments to the regulations removed the previous restriction on pooling more than 5 planning obligations towards a single piece of infrastructure.

2.0 Development Plans

2.1 The Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Plan 2011

2.2 Cambridge Local Plan 2018

3.0 Supplementary Planning Documents

3.1 Sustainable Design and Construction 2020

3.2 Cambridge Flood and Water 2018

3.3 Affordable Housing 2008

3.4 Planning Obligations Strategy 2004

Development Frameworks and Briefs

3.5 The New Museums Site Development Framework (March 2016)

3.6 Ridgeons site Planning and Development Brief (July 2016)

3.7 Mitcham's Corner Development Framework (January 2017)

3.8 Mill Road Depot Planning and Development Brief (March 2017)

3.9 Land North of Cherry Hinton (February 2018)

3.10 Grafton Area of Major Change - Masterplan and Guidance (February 2018)

4.0 Use Classes

Class A1: Shops

Class A2: Financial & Professional Services

Class A3: Restaurants & Cafes

Class A4: Drinking Establishments

Class A5: Hot Food Take-away

Class B1: Business

Class B2: General Industrial

Class B8: Storage or Distribution

Class C1: Hotels

Class C2: Residential Institutions

Class C3: Dwellinghouses

Class C4: Small House in Multiple Occupation

Class D1: Non-Residential Institutions

Class D2: Assembly and Leisure

Sui Generis: A use on its own, for which any change of use will require planning permission

PLANNING

21 May 2020

10.00 am - 12.50 pm

Present:

Planning Committee Members: Councillors Sargeant (Vice-Chair, in the Chair), Baigent, Green, Lord, McQueen, Porrer, Thornburrow and Tunnacliffe

Officers:

Delivery Manager Development Management: Nigel Blazeby

Area Development Manager: Lorraine Casey

Area Development Manager: Toby Williams

Planner: Mary Collins

Planner: Sophia Dudding

Legal Adviser: Keith Barber

Committee Manager: James Goddard

Committee Manager: Sarah Steed

FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE COUNCIL**20/34/Plan Apologies**

Apologies were received from Councillor Smart. Councillor Thornburrow was present as the Alternate.

20/35/Plan Declarations of Interest

Name	Item	Interest
Councillor Baigent	All	Was a member of Extinction Rebellion and the Cambridge Cycling Campaign.

20/36/Plan Minutes

The minutes of the meeting held on 17 December 2019, 8 January 2020 and 5 February 2020 were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

20/37/Plan 19-1430-FUL report 38 Chesterton Hall Cres

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for the erection of a one bedroom, two storey house replacing an existing garage.

The Committee received a representation in objection to the application from a resident of 40 Chesterton Hall:

- i. Objected to this application from the start, on well-established planning grounds. The positive quotes attributed to him in point 7 of the Design and Access Statement were fabricated, which he regarded as objectionable.
- ii. Specific concerns:
 - a. The proposed development would not respect the character and appearance of the surrounding area. This application proposed demolishing a building that's integral to the architectural merit of the street, replacing it with one that was the opposite.
 - b. Contrary to the report summary, the proposed development would have a significant adverse impact on the amenity of the surrounding occupiers. The Objector would lose light to five windows if this proposal were to go ahead, some light would be blocked off almost completely.
 - c. The proposed development would not provide a good level of outdoor amenity for future occupants. Lowering the wall at the back of the property would not alter the size of that strip of outdoor space, which was barely wide enough for a chair. Many of the basic elements of the 2004 proposal remained, which had been refused planning permission.
- iii. Residents in thirteen local properties had submitted written objections to this development. Not one resident had written in favour of it.

Mr Corbett (Applicant) addressed the Committee in support of the application.

Councillor Thornburrow proposed amendments to the Officer's recommendation requiring:

- i. Provision of bird/bat box.
- ii. Details of front boundary wall.

These amendments were **carried unanimously**.

Councillor Sargeant proposed an amendment to the Officer's recommendation requiring details of cycle shelters and bin storage.

This amendment was **carried unanimously**.

Councillor Porrer proposed an amendment to the Officer's recommendation requiring the re-instatement of a drop kerb to the front.

This amendment was **carried unanimously**.

The Committee:

Resolved (by 7 votes to 1) to grant the application for planning permission in accordance with the Officer recommendation, for the reasons set out in the Officer's report, subject to:

- i. the planning conditions set out in the Officer's report; and
- ii. the following additional conditions with delegated authority to Officers to draft the conditions:
 - a. provision of bird/bat box.
 - b. details of front boundary wall
 - c. details of cycle shelters and bin storage.
 - d. re-instatement of the drop kerb to the front.

20/38/Plan 20-0010-FUL report ARU

Item withdrawn from agenda to enable additional consultation.

Since the officer's report was drafted, further information was provided by the applicant's agent confirming the number of lockers (65 no.) proposed within the bank of lockers. Officers have considered it necessary to consult the Environmental Health team on this additional information and have therefore withdrawn the item from the agenda.

20/39/Plan 19-0960-FUL report 440 Cherry Hinton Road

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for the erection of a one bedroom dwelling.

Councillor Porrer proposed an amendment to the Officer's recommendation for an additional condition that no vehicular access points shall be made on any boundary of the site.

This amendment was **carried unanimously**.

Councillor Sargeant proposed an amendment to the Officer's recommendation that no footpaths were blocked during construction.

This amendment was **carried unanimously**.

Councillor Thornburrow proposed amendments to the Officer's recommendation:

- i. Condition 17 amended to include hedgehog gaps in boundary treatment.
- ii. Fire engine access.

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's report, subject to:

- i. the planning conditions set out in the Officer's report;
and
- ii. the following additional conditions with delegated authority to Officers to draft the conditions:
 - a. additional condition that no vehicular access points shall be made on any boundary of the site;
 - b. Condition 17 amended to include hedgehog gaps in boundary treatment;and
- iii. informatives included on the planning permission in respect of:
 - a. Fire engine access;
 - b. That footpaths were not blocked during construction.

20/40/Plan 19-1669-FUL report 101 Perse Way

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval to change the existing use (dwelling, use class C3) to a 9-bed (10 person) House of Multiple Occupancy (sui generis use class), together with the erection of a two-storey side and rear extension, single storey front and rear extensions, rear roof extension, and detached cycle store in rear garden. The proposed cycle store, located within the rear garden, would be accessed using the existing public pedestrian footpath to the north of the site.

Councillor Baigent proposed an additional condition to the Officer's recommendation that the communal area was retained.

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's report, and subject to the conditions recommended by the Officer plus an extra condition that the communal area was retained.

The meeting ended at 12.50 pm

CHAIR

This page is intentionally left blank

PLANNING

4 June 2020
10.00 am - 2.20 pm

Present:

Planning Committee Members: Councillors Smart (Chair), Baigent (Vice-Chair), Green, Lord, McQueen, Porrer, Thornburrow and Tunnacliffe

Officers:

Delivery Manager Development Management: Nigel Blazeby
Area Development Manager: Lorraine Casey
Area Development Manager: Toby Williams
Principal Planner: Lewis Tomlinson
Planner: Mary Collins
Legal Adviser: Keith Barber
Committee Manager: Toni Birkin
Committee Manager: Sarah Steed

FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE COUNCIL

20/41/Plan Apologies

No apologies were received.

20/42/Plan Declarations of Interest

Name	Item	Interest
Councillor Baigent	All	Personal: Member of Extinction Rebellion and Cambridge Cycling Campaign

20/43/Plan Minutes - To follow

The minutes of previous meetings to follow.

20/44/Plan 18/1890/FUL - Family Centre, Malta Road

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for erection of nine residential units comprising a terrace of 4 x three bedroom houses, 4 x two bedroom flats and 1 x one bedroom flat with access, car parking, and associated landscaping, following the demolition of the existing building on site, at Malta Road, Cambridge.

The Committee noted the additional information in the Amendment Sheet including an informative regarding hedgehog friendly fencing.

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

Councillor Herbert (Coleridge Ward Councillor) addressed the Committee about the application and made the following comments:

- i. Application would be significant back land development.
- ii. Three storey height would be overbearing.
- iii. Would cause loss of light and overshadowing.
- iv. Would be inappropriate intensification.
- v. Neighbours would lose winter sunlight.
- vi. A small building was being replaced by an imposing development.
- vii. Roof gardens were unacceptable due to overlooking and impact on the privacy of neighbours.
- viii. Design does not respect local area.
- ix. Removal of trees would result in the loss of a wildlife corridor.
- x. Previous application for this site questioned the site access.
- xi. Would have a significant impact on Marmora Road.

The Committee discussed imposing additional conditions requiring solid screens to the roof garden which would address privacy concerns; a requirement to restrict garage use to vehicle storage and a Sustainable Urban Drainage System. Additional informatives regarding the use of low planting to mitigate tree loss, fire safety and hedgehog friendly fencing were also suggested.

The Committee:

Resolved (by 7 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's report, subject to:

- i. the planning conditions set out in the Officer's report; and

- ii. with delegated authority to officers to draft and include the following additional conditions in respect of:
 - a. Garages to remain for the use of vehicle storage,
 - b. Solid screening to roof gardens,
 - c. Inclusion of a Sustainable Urban Drainage System and
- iii. informatives included on the planning permission in respect of:
 - a. Fire safety (access for fire tenders),
 - b. Hedgehog friendly fencing,
 - c. Low planting to mitigate for tree loss.

20/45/Plan 18/1796/FUL - 386 Milton Road

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for a change of use to large scale HMO (sui generis), including detached annexe.

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

- i. How is it possible for the annex to be included in this application when it does not have planning permission?
- ii. Design was out of keeping with the area.
- iii. Annex is too close to neighbours.
- iv. Neighbours want to know why the annex has not been demolished.
- v. House was too small for the proposed number of occupants.

Members of the Committee raised concerns regarding the quality of life for future residents, space standards, lack of covered walkway from annex to main house, lack of amenity space and the suitability as a HMO.

The Committee:

Resolved (by 7 votes to 1) to reject the Officer recommendation to approve the application.

Resolved (by 7 votes to 1) to refuse the application contrary to the Officer recommendation for the following reasons:

- i. Amenity of future residents. (Local Plan Policy 52D)
- ii. Space standards (Local Plan Policy 52C)

- iii. Privacy of neighbours (Local Plan Policy 52C)
- iv. Unacceptable internal layout.
- v. Scale of development.

The Committee granted delegated authority to Officers in consultation with the Chair and Spokes to settle the full text of the reasons for refusal to accord with the resolution.

20/46/Plan 18/1803/FUL - 6 Sherbourne Close

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for a first-floor extension to an existing bungalow to create 2no flats and a duplex dwelling with associated parking.

The Committee received a representation in objection to the application from a local resident as follows:

- i. Development would have a negative impact on the area.
- ii. Would be part of a wider intensification of the area.
- iii. Community feel was being lost.
- iv. Previous family orientated area was become a dormitory area.
- v. Transient nature of newer residents problematic for cohesion of area.
- vi. Would result in overlooking.
- vii. Neighbours would lose morning sunlight to properties and evening light to patio.
- viii. Proposed boundary treatment inadequate.
- ix. Privacy fencing/screening needed.
- x. Parking information appears to be based on an out of date survey.
- xi. Concerned about the loss of biodiversity.

Councillor Bird (East Chesterton Ward Councillor) addressed the Committee about the application:

- i. Shares concerns about the loss of sunlight for neighbours.
- ii. Proposed build line is close to the boundary of the site.
- iii. Additional parking in the area would be dangerous.
- iv. Design was out of character with the area.
- v. Additional traffic in the area would be problematic.
- vi. Unacceptable impact on number 8 and number 4.

The Committee suggested that additional conditions regarding, biodiversity, the boundary fence treatment and the allocation of one of the parking spaces to the ground floor flat were needed.

The Committee:

Resolved (by 4 votes to 1 with 3 abstentions) to grant the application for planning permission in accordance with the Officer recommendation, for the reasons set out in the Officer's report, subject to:

- i. the planning conditions set out in the Officer's report; and
- ii. delegated authority to officers in consultation with the Chair and Spokes to settle the text of additional conditions covering;
 - a) Pre-build approval of a green buffer zone;
 - b) Allocation of a dedicated parking space for the ground floor flat; and
 - c) Privacy fence to be completed before any other work on site; and
- iii. an informative included on the planning permission:
 - a) to indicate that should this building be a new build, not an extension, further planning permission would be needed.

20/47/Plan Dates for Planning Committee June, July, August

The Committee agreed the following changes to the meeting schedule:

- 9th June 2020 cancelled
- 17th June 2020 additional Meeting

On-going dates as per existing Calendar.

The meeting ended at 2.20 pm

CHAIR

This page is intentionally left blank

PLANNING

17 June 2020

10.00 am - 5.50 pm

Present:

Planning Committee Members: Councillors Smart (Chair), Baigent (Vice-Chair), Green, Lord, McQueen, Porrer, Thornburrow and Tunnacliffe

Officers:

Assistant Director Delivery: Sharon Brown

Delivery Manager Development Management: Nigel Blazeby

Area Development Manager: Toby Williams

Principal Planning Officer: Yole Medeiros,

Principal Planner: Lewis Tomlinson

Legal Adviser: Keith Barber

Committee Manager: Toni Birkin

Committee Manager: James Goddard

Other Officers:

Principal Planner: Philippa Kelly

Environmental Quality & Growth Manager: Jo Dicks

Highways Engineer [County]: Jon Finney

Transport Manager [County]: David Allatt

Arboricultural Officer: Joanna Davies

Environmental Health Officer: Greg Kearney

Scientific Officer: Elizabeth Bruce

FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE COUNCIL

20/48/Plan Apologies

No apologies were received.

20/49/Plan Declarations of Interest

Name	Item	Interest
Councillor Baigent	All	Personal: Member of Extinction Rebellion and Cambridge Cycling Campaign

Councillor Porrer	20/52/Plan	Personal: Knows a local resident mentioned in the appeal documentation. Approaches this application with an open mind. Legal Officer satisfied that there was no conflict of interest.
-------------------	------------	--

20/50/Plan Minutes - to follow

Minutes of the previous meeting to be reviewed in future.

20/51/Plan 19/1763/FUL - Whittle Laboratory, 1JJ Thomson Avenue

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for extension of the Whittle Laboratory, including new National Centre for Propulsion and Power (4,251 sq metres of Academic (D1) Floorspace), demolition of 1,149 sq metres of D1 floorspace, and all associated infrastructure including landscaping, drainage, substation and car and cycle parking.

Rob Miller, Director of the Whittle Laboratory addressed the Committee in support of the application on behalf of Cambridge University.

The Committee noted the amendment sheet. The Committee Chair briefly lost internet connection to the meeting and the Officer repeated the relevant section of the presentation.

Members questioned some of the conditions including, green roofing, public art, long term maintenance of trees, completion date of cycle lane and the BREEAM (Building Research Establishment Environmental Assessment Method) sustainability assessment. These matters were addressed as follows:

- i. Condition 16D to be amended in read 'in perpetuity' in line with other application in the area.
- ii. Public Art would be addressed as part of a wider strategy for the wider campus.
- iii. Conditions regarding maintenance of trees to be amended to include maintenance of any trees lost from the initial planting for a further five year to ensure their long-term maintenance.

- iv. Adding a specific date for the completion of the cycle path was agreed to be problematic as it would require the cooperation of the Highways Department and road closures. It was agreed that an informative requiring the cycle lane to be completed as expediently and timely a fashion as possible.
- v. The BREEAM standards were agreed to be satisfactory.

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's report, subject to:

- i. the planning conditions set out in the Officer's report; and
- ii. the following amended conditions where the final wording of the conditions would be delegated to Officers in consultation with the Chair and Spokes:
 - a) The addition of standard condition one, requiring commencement on site within three years.
 - b) Amendment of condition regarding green roof to add the word 'in perpetuity'.
 - c) Additional condition regarding maintenance of any replacement trees for a further five year period.
and
- iii. An additional informative included on the planning permission in respect of:
 - a. the cycle lane to be completed as expediently and timely a fashion as possible.

20/52/Plan 18/1678/FUL - Station Area Development

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for the erection of two new buildings comprising 5,351sqm (GEA) of Class B1(a)/ Class B1(b) floorspace including ancillary accommodation/ facilities with associated plant, 162 cycle parking spaces, and 8 off-gauge cycle spaces for Block F2 and an Aparthotel (Class C1) comprising 125suites, terrace, ancillary accommodation and facilities with multi-storey car park for Network Rail (total GEA 12,153sqm) comprising 206

car parking spaces and 34 cycle parking spaces for Block B2 with associated plant, hard and soft landscaping, new alignment of access from Station Road into Station Square and permanent access from Devonshire Road to the Cambridge Station Car Park, utilising the existing pedestrian and cycle access, restricted to emergency access to the railway only.

The Committee received representations in objection to the application from the following:

- i. Chair of South Petersfield Residents Association.
- ii. Cambridge Cycling Campaign.
- iii. Resident of 85 Great Northern Road.
- iv. Resident of 89 Great Northern Road.

The representations covered the following issues:

- i. Where would taxis 'over rank' when they cannot fit into the car park?
- ii. Was it acceptable that the footprint of building B2 would be far bigger than in the outline application?
- iii. Building F2 would block a cycle route and encroach on a generously wide pavement.
- iv. Camcycle objected to this application under Local Plan policies 56 and 80.
 - a. Their members believed this application would exacerbate problems in the Station Square area, in large part because of the multi-storey car park, which Camcycle thought conflicted with the council's own transport plans to reduce car usage here.
 - b. Cycle parking expansion commitments were cancelled, car parking spaces should have been taken out instead.
 - c. This site contains a key link in the Chisholm Trail, which the city and the GCP have been advancing for years as a route intended to be easy enough for a 12-year old to navigate. There was still no safe and obvious cycle route through this site suitable for all ages and abilities. The proposed buildings encroach too closely on the junctions at either end of the site.
 - d. Asked the committee to refuse permission to this application because it fails to create a successful place.
 - i. It did not integrate vehicle, pedestrian or cycle access routes and spaces between buildings well.
 - ii. It did not safeguard the Chisholm Trail.

- v. Expressed concern about noise from:
 - a. Traffic.
 - b. Bin movements / refuse collection.
- vi. Requested:
 - a. Heavy traffic be limited to 09:00-17:00.
 - b. Construction traffic be limited to 09:00-16:00.
- vii. Suggested relocating the entrance nearer the loading bay.
- viii. As the City Council had declared a climate emergency, it should be mindful of the amount of carbon embedded in the development.
- ix. A pedestrian crossing was required on the eastern end of the site.
- x. Expressed concern the application would block light for nearby [existing] residents' homes and amenity spaces. There had been no light impact study.

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

Councillor Robertson (Ward Councillor) addressed the Committee about the application:

- i. Would speak on behalf of himself and County Councillor Jones.
- ii. Buildings F2 and B2 draw on the concept approved just over 10 years ago.
- iii. It was regrettable that F2 was given outline planning consent as would overshadow neighbouring buildings. It was now bigger and would be dominant, overbearing and loom over local residences.
- iv. F2 and B2 were now proposed to be located closer together than originally proposed, which would cause a canyon effect. This would negatively affect the area, and the Chisholm Trail in particular.
- v. Believed that F2 and B2 conflicted with Local Plan policies:
 - a. Overshadowing.
 - b. Creation of comfortable pedestrian areas.
 - c. Sustainability of pedestrian and cycle movements.
 - d. Creating successful places.
- vi. Asked for the application to be rejected. But if accepted, please go with option B [in officer's report] where a stakeholder group would be selected to look at people movements in the CB1 area.
- vii. Made the following points on behalf of Councillor Jones:
 - a. This development was objectionable in size and scale, and an unnecessary addition to the tightly packed blocks that are already constructed in CB1.

- b. The aparthotel would increase traffic movements and the Network Rail car park would encourage commuters in a crowded city to access the rail station by the most environmentally damaging mode of transport.
- c. The county council had objected to the proposed licensed hackney carriage access across Station Square. A new road cutting across the square runs against the design of the square, which currently enabled pedestrians to move safely from the station to the start of Station Road. It was also a reversal of the county transport hierarchy that puts pedestrians and cyclists at the top.
- d. It was claimed that taxi access across the square would relieve traffic on Great Northern Rd but, if so, this was likely to be a minor, short-term effect. Systematic traffic management in the square and better policing of delivery lorries could achieve as much. Giving priority on Great Northern Road to cyclists and installing a safe pedestrian crossing point would achieve more.
- e. Took issue with the claim that pedestrians should be persuaded to walk on the other side of Station Rd to avoid Tenison Rd.
- f. Called on the planning committee to strike out the proposal in para. 2.17. The city council should not settle for supposed short-term 'fixes' for problems created by growth but focus on strategic, whole area improvements, such as opening up an Eastern approach to the station.

Councillor Baigent briefly lost internet connection to the meeting so the Principal Planner repeated the relevant section of officer answers to councillors' questions.

Councillor McQueen proposed and Councillor Lord seconded a proposal to defer the application.

The proposal was **lost by 2 votes to 6**.

The Committee:

Before considering the substantive officer recommendation for approval of the application, Members first had to vote on whether they wished to agree:

- i. Option A (with new access).
- ii. Option B (without new access).

Voted on whether to:

- i. Accept Option A in the Officer's report - **lost by 3 votes to 0**.

- ii. Accept Option B in the Officer's report - **agreed by 5 votes to 0.**
- iii. Refuse Options A and B in the Officer's report - **lost by 2 votes to 0.**

Resolved (by 5 votes to 3) to reject the Officer recommendation to approve the application.

Adjourned 16:25-16:44 for officer discussion to quantify minded to refuse reasons.

- i. The proposed development would fail to prioritise the movement and safety of pedestrians and cyclists within the CBI area introducing conflict at Station Square and Station Road and further conflict along the car park access road connecting to Devonshire Road. In addition, the footprint of B2 would reduce the flexibility of development coming forward within this quarter of CBI to adequately respond and provide for high quality cycling (including the Chisholm Trail) and pedestrian routes that should have priority over vehicular traffic. The proposal is therefore contrary to policies 25, 56, 57, 59 and policy 80 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2018) and NPPF (Feb 2019) paragraphs 104 and 109.
- ii. By virtue of the scale, massing and footprint of building B2 in close proximity to Carter Bridge, the proposed building would appear visually cramped, overly prominent and detract from the character and appearance of the existing area. The proposal is therefore contrary to policies 55, 56 and 57 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2018) and NPPF (Feb 2019) paragraph 124.
- iii. The proposal would cumulatively exceed the anticipated hotel need for Cambridge contrary to policy 77 and is therefore unjustified.

Voted on whether to:

- i. Accept Reason 1 - **agreed by 5 votes to 3.**
- ii. Accept Reason 2 - **agreed by 5 votes to 3.**
- iii. Accept Reason 3 - **lost by 2 votes to 6.**

The Delivery Manager recommended using the Adjourned Decision Making Protocol as the reasons councilors proposed went against Highways Authority advise.

Resolved (by 4 votes to 4 and on the Chair's casting vote) not to accept the officer recommendation of approval, as the committee were minded to refuse the application, a decision on whether to approve or refuse the application was subsequently deferred under the Adjourned Decision Protocol

Under the Council's agreed Adjourned Decisions Protocol this application will be brought back to a future meeting of the Committee to allow further discussion of reasons for refusal. The following matters may form the basis for detailed reasons for refusal:

- i. The proposed development would fail to prioritise the movement and safety of pedestrians and cyclists within the CBI area introducing conflict at Station Square and Station Road and further conflict along the car park access road connecting to Devonshire Road. In addition, the footprint of B2 would reduce the flexibility of development coming forward within this quarter of CBI to adequately respond and provide for high quality cycling (including the Chisholm Trail) and pedestrian routes that should have priority over vehicular traffic. The proposal is therefore contrary to policies 25, 56, 57, 59 and policy 80 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2018) and NPPF (Feb 2019) paragraphs 104 and 109.
- ii. By virtue of the scale, massing and footprint of building B2 in close proximity to Carter Bridge, the proposed building would appear visually cramped, overly prominent and detract from the character and appearance of the existing area. The proposal is therefore contrary to policies 55, 56 and 57 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2018) and NPPF (Feb 2019) paragraph 124.

20/53/Plan 19/1375/FUL - 1 Rectory Terrace, High Street, Cherry Hinton

Councillor McQueen left after the vote on item 20/52/Plan.

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for the rebuild of the existing Tesco convenience store building (including part demolition, external works, and refurbishment) to provide the following:

- Retail unit (use class A1).
- 8 x 1 bed residential units.
- Reconfiguration of the car park and associated areas.

The Principal Planner updated his site plan from the version shown in the plans pack.

The Committee received a representation in objection to the application from a resident of 6 Chalfont Close:

- i. All objections related to the car park.
- ii. Had no issue with the proposed housing.

- iii. The proposed car park design would remove screening and enable significant overlooking of 6 Chalfont Close, by bringing people to the boundary <2.3 m from the house. This would allow views into the kitchen of 6 Chalfont Close.
- iv. Reduced parking spaces would cause overflow onto side streets and the already limited parking at Chalfont Close.
- v. The redesign of the car park to give apparent amenity (ie the small green space) reduced functionality, ultimately shifting parking into the surrounding residential streets.

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

Councillor Ashton (Ward Councillor) addressed the Committee about the application:

- i. He supported the scheme as did a majority of residents.
- ii. The Developer had been proactive in trying to keep residents informed of development.
- iii. Councillor Ashton has signposted residents to the Developer so their concerns could be addressed.

Councillor Dryden (Ward Councillor) addressed the Committee about the application:

- i. Agreed with Councillor Ashton's points.
- ii. Security of the car park would be improved as flats were located above it and could overlook it.
- iii. The streetscene would be better as a result of the application.

Councillor Smart proposed an amendment to the Officer's recommendation for landscaping at the entrance to the car park.

This amendment was **carried unanimously**.

Councillor Thornburrow proposed an amendment to the Officer's recommendation that a green roof be required, and that it should be maintained.

This amendment was **carried unanimously**.

Councillor Porrer proposed amendments to the Officer's recommendation for a:

- i. courtyard landscape plan.
- ii. buffer around car parking space 18.

This amendment was **carried unanimously**.

The Committee:

Unanimously resolved by all present (7 votes to 0) to grant the application for planning permission in accordance with the Officer recommendation for the reasons set out in the Officer's report, subject to:

- i. the planning conditions set out in the Officer's report; [and]
- ii. an additional condition requiring a green roof, and that it should be maintained in perpetuity.
[and]
- iii. informatives included on the planning permission in respect of:
 - a. landscaping at the entrance to the car park
 - b. first floor external courtyard landscape plan
 - c. buffer around car parking space 18[and]
- iv. Delegated powers for officers to finalise the wording of the new condition and informatives.

The meeting ended at 5.50 pm

CHAIR

PLANNING

1 July 2020

9.00 am - 4.30 pm

Present:

Planning Committee Members: Councillors Smart (Chair), Baigent (Vice-Chair), Green, Lord, McQueen, Porrer, Thornburrow and Tunnacliffe

Officers:

Assistant Director Delivery: Sharon Brown

Delivery Manager Development Management: Nigel Blazeby

Area Development Manager: Lorraine Casey

Principal Planner: Ganesh Gnanamoorthy

Senior Planner: Aaron Coe

Senior Planner: Andy White

Planner: Mary Collins

Legal Adviser: Keith Barber

Committee Manager: James Goddard

Meeting Producer: Tom Mears

FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE COUNCIL

20/1/Plan Apologies

No apologies were received.

20/2/Plan Declarations of Interest

Name	Item	Interest
Councillor Baigent	All	Personal: Member of Extinction Rebellion and the Cambridge Cycling Campaign.
Councillor Baigent	20/6/Plan	Had been involved with the application but considered that he would consider the application objectively and would still participate and vote on the application.
Councillor Smart	20/4/Plan	Personal: Porter at Cambridge University Hospital

20/3/Plan Minutes

The minutes of the meeting held on 4 March 2020 were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

20/4/Plan 19/1098/FUL - 121-125 Chesterton Road (Mitchams Corner)

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for the part demolition of the existing building and provision of a mixed use scheme comprising 19 no. self-contained shared residential units (4-8 bedrooms each) (within Class C4/Sui Generis). The proposal also includes 2no. 'flexible use' retail units (Units 1 and 2) (Class A1-A5 use) fronting Chesterton Road and 1no. 'flexible use' unit (Unit 3) (Class D2 (yoga studio) or Class A1-A5 use) fronting Croft Holme Lane at ground floor level. Provision of private and communal amenity space for shared residential units, with associated landscaping, cycle and refuse/recycling storage.

The Senior Planner updated his report by referring to details on the amendment sheet:

- i. Revised recommendation: APPROVE subject to: (i) the prior completion of an Agreement under s106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 with the delegated authority for officers to negotiate secure and complete such an Agreement and (ii) conditions.
- ii. Revised wording of conditions 10 and 16.
- iii. Removal of paragraph 8.64 and replacement with revised text.

The Committee received a representation in objection to the application from a resident of 2 Croftholme Lane:

- i. With the appearance of a new apart hotel in the Mitcham's Corner area, had experienced a noticeable increase in antisocial behaviour at night, with much under-age drinking, sometimes on their virtual doorstep. The new project seemed to be a further threat to the relatively peaceful life of the neighbourhood.
- ii. Their entire property would be completely overlooked by the proposed multi-storey development, leading to loss of privacy.
- iii. Significant loss of light created by the proposed multi-storey buildings would have an adverse effect on their quality of life.

- iv. Would welcome a neighbourhood-friendly residential redevelopment, comprising family accommodations, matching the height of the existing buildings in Croftholme Lane.

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

Councillor Baigent proposed an amendment to the Officer's recommendation to include an informative requesting short stay accommodation should not be used for Airbnb.

This amendment was **carried unanimously**.

Councillors Smart and Thornburrow proposed an amendment to the Officer's recommendation that the s106 agreement would be brought to Chair, Vice Chair and Spokes for approval. If they did not approve the s106 agreement, it would be brought back to committee for consideration. Members would also receive a briefing on claw back clause details.

This amendment was **carried unanimously**.

Councillor Tunncliffe proposed an amendment to the Officer's recommendation that the community should not be gated.

This amendment was **carried by 4 votes to 4 – and on the Chair's casting vote**.

Councillor Thornburrow proposed an amendment to the Officer's recommendation that postboxes should be located in the reception area.

This amendment was **carried unanimously**.

The Committee:

Resolved (4 votes to 4 – and on the Chair's casting vote) to grant the application for planning permission in accordance with the Officer recommendation, for the reasons set out in the Officer's report, subject to:

- i. the prior completion of an Agreement under s106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 with the delegated authority for officers to negotiate and secure an Agreement subject to the final details being agreed by Chair, Vice Chair and Spokes in respect of (i) a viability review

mechanism establishing for the payment of a developer's financial contribution for an off-site commuted affordable housing contribution in circumstances where the development generates a greater revenue than the viability assessment provided by the applicant with the planning application; (ii) a financial contribution covering the costs of tree planting, public realm improvements and surfacing improvements of the public highway on Croft Holme Lane and Victoria Road corner junction; and (iii) that all nineteen shared living units shall remain as rented accommodation for a period of ten years from the date of the first occupation of each unit; and

- ii. the planning conditions set out in the Officer's report; [and]
- iii. informatives included on the planning permission in respect of:
 - a. The applicant is advised to provide a facility for post-boxes to serve unit No's 1-13 within the concierge space at the entrance to the shared living accommodation.
 - b. The applicant is advised to enable access to the communal courtyard space during day time hours to promote inclusive access to outdoor spaces.
 - c. The applicant is reminded that the shared living accommodation shall not be used for Air BnB short term let accommodation.

20/5/Plan 19/1734/FUL - Clerk Maxwell Road

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for erection of 35 dwellings involving the re-positioning of existing access onto Clerk Maxwell Road, provision of new spine road, parking, cycle provision, landscaping and associated infrastructure.

The Principal Planner updated his recommendation:

Approve subject to: (1) the prior completion of a s106 Agreement under the Town & Country Planning Act 1990 to secure the planning obligations specified in para 8.86 of the Officer's report and the Amendment Sheet; and (2) the conditions contained within the Officer report

The Committee received a representation in objection to the application from the Chairman of Clerk Maxwell Road Residents Association:

- i. Specific concerns regarding:

- a. Lack of green space.
 - b. Water run off management.
 - c. Impact on animals.
 - d. Impact on neighbours.
 - e. No overspill parking.
 - f. Not enough cycle parking.
 - g. Lack of cycle path lighting.
- ii. A tree protection order and tree maintenance was required.

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

Councillor Thornburrow proposed an amendment to the Officer's recommendation that a condition should be added requiring tree maintenance/replacement for 5 years.

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's report, subject to:

- i. the prior completion of a s106 Agreement under the Town & Country Planning Act 1990 to secure the planning obligations specified in para 8.86 of this report and the Amendment Sheet;
- ii. the planning conditions set out in the Officer's report; and
- iii. the following additional condition requiring tree maintenance/replacement for 5 years.

20/6/Plan 19/1444/FUL - 51-53 Argyle Street

Councillor Thornburrow did not participate in the discussion or debate for this item as she was unable to be present for the consideration of the whole item.

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for the demolition of the existing garage and ancillary structures (Class B1) and the erection of two new dwellinghouses (Class C3).

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

- i. He had lived adjacent to the property for 40 years and had a strong personal investment in the development being done correctly.
- ii. The proposal would restore the pre-existing structure to the street.
- iii. Expressed concerns regarding height and shadowing.
- iv. Commented that shadowing from the proposal would mean that Stockwell Street would have no sunlight at all.
- v. The panelling design of the front windows was un-necessary.
- vi. Proper sound insulation should be installed.
- vii. Expressed concern about dust during construction.
- viii. Expressed concern about loss of income as they lived and worked in the house.
- ix. Stated that parking should not occur on double yellow lines.
- x. Welcomed the proposal long-term.

Ze'ev Feigis (Applicant's Agent) addressed the Committee in support of the application.

The Committee:

Resolved (by 7 votes to 0) to grant the application for planning permission in accordance with the Officer recommendation, for the reasons set out in the Officer's report, subject to:

- i. the planning conditions set out in the Officer's report; and
- ii. the following additional conditions with delegated authority to Officers to draft the conditions:
 - a. the green and brown roof condition would be in perpetuity;
 - b. a scheme for ecological enhancement.

20/7/Plan 19/1770/FUL - 32 St Andrews Street

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for the change of use of the former Cambridge Building Society branch (A2/B1) to an (A4) public house use with ancillary staff accommodation and associated development including the insertion of new openings and the relocation of the entrance.

Ed Durrant (Applicant's Agent) addressed the Committee in support of the application.

The Committee:

Resolved (by 7 votes to 1) to grant the application for planning permission in accordance with the Officer recommendation, for the reasons set out in the Officer's report, subject to:

- i. the planning conditions set out in the Officer's report;
- ii. the following amendment to condition 12 with delegated authority to Officers to draft the amended condition:
 - a. that only bedrooms 1 and 2 as shown on the plans could be used as sleeping accommodation.
- iii. informative included on the planning permission with delegated authority to Officers to draft the information in respect of:
 - a. the protected stairwell.

20/8/Plan 20/01318/FUL - 248 Coldhams Lane

Councillor McQueen left the meeting before the consideration of item 20/8/Plan.

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for the demolition of the existing single storey bungalow and the erection of a terrace of 3no. 3 bedroom houses along with new parking arrangements and associated works.

The Committee:

Resolved (by 7 votes to 0) to grant the application for planning permission in accordance with the Officer recommendation, for the reasons set out in the Officer's report, and subject to the conditions recommended by the Officer.

The meeting ended at 4.30 pm

CHAIR

This page is intentionally left blank

Application Number	19/1757/FUL	Agenda Item	
Date Received	20th December 2019	Officer	Ganesh Gnanamoorthy
Target Date	20th March 2020		
Ward	Kings Hedges		
Site	Buchan Street Neighbourhood Centre 6 Buchan Street		
Proposal	Demolition of existing community centre, shop and cafe and erection of new shop (use class A1), community cafe (use class A1/A3/D1), 28 affordable dwellings, car parking with modified vehicular access arrangements, open space, play equipment and new landscaping.		
Applicant	Cambridge Investment Partnership c/o Agent		

SUMMARY	<p>The development accords with the Development Plan for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The development would increase the amount of affordable housing that helps to meet an identified demand within the local area; - The proposed development would provide a high quality 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 positively to the surrounding built form;
RECOMMENDATION	APPROVAL

0.0 BACKGROUND

- 0.1 This is a Regulation 3 planning application that 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 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 this site includes 28 new council rented homes. This equates to 5.60% of the 500 home target.

1.0 SITE DESCRIPTION/AREA CONTEXT

- 1.1 The application site is an irregular shaped plot of land and occupies approximately 0.35 hectares in area.
- 1.2 The site comprises an existing community centre, a retail unit and a café. The site is bound by Kings Hedges Road to the north and west, Buchan Street to the south and east, and Callander Close to the south and west.
- 1.3 The site falls within the Kings Hedges Ward, is not located within a conservation area and none of the buildings on, or in close proximity to, the site are listed.

2.0 THE PROPOSAL

- 2.1 This application proposes the demolition of existing community centre, shop and cafe and erection of new shop (use class A1), community cafe (flexible use class A1/A3/D1), 28 affordable dwellings, car parking with modified vehicular access arrangements, open space, play equipment and new landscaping.
- 2.2 The proposal involves the erection of two rectangular buildings that sit at right angles to each other. The first block, referred to as Block A in the application documentation would be sited to the western part of the site and would sit parallel to Kings Hedges Road. This would be a 3-storey building which would comprise 13 flats and a cycle store. Eight of the flats would be 1-bedroom 2-person units, four would be 2-bedroom 4-person

units and one would be a 2-bedroom 3-person wheelchair accessible unit.

- 2.3 To the north of the site would be Block B. This would be a 4-storey block and would house a 159sqm retail unit and 90sqm café at ground floor level along with ancillary storage space, commercial refuse store and entrance to the upper floors. A room will be available for community use within the café, and this is ancillary to the café use. The upper floors would house 15 flats – nine 1-bed 2-person units and six 2-bed 4-person units.
- 2.4 A hard surfaced open space is provided between the blocks which would have seating for the café use, while planting, visitor cycle parking and underground refuse stores would be accommodated in this location. An area of parking (19 spaces including 2 disabled bays) is proposed to the south-east of this open space and would be accessed from Buchan Street, with a soft landscaped open space including play equipment and street furniture to the south of the site – facing Callendar Close. A further 5 parking spaces are proposed along Callendar Close. Planting of trees and shrubs are proposed to the boundary with Kings Hedges Road and Callendar Close.
- 2.5 It is worthy of note that the scheme has been through an extensive pre-application process with officers.
- 2.6 The proposal has been amended since submission to take on board comments and concerns from statutory consultees. The changes include alterations to the elevation of the cycle store and to the layout of the open spaces.
- 2.7 The application is accompanied by the following supporting information:
- Air Quality Assessment
 - Arboricultural Survey and Implications Assessment with Tree Protection Plan
 - Energy Statement
 - BREEAM Pre-assessment
 - Daylight, Sunlight and Overshadowing Assessment;
 - Design and Access Statement;
 - Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Strategy;
 - Historic Environment Desk-Based Assessment

- Noise Impact Assessment;
- Phase 1 Contaminated Land Assessment
- Phase 2 Geo-Environmental Assessment
- Planning Statement;
- Preliminary Ecological Appraisal & Bat Scoping Survey;
- Public Art Strategy & Delivery Plan
- Statement of Community Involvement
- Sustainability Statement;
- Transport Statement;
- Utility Assessment

3.0 SITE HISTORY

3.1 There is no relevant Cambridge City Council planning history on this 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 Plan 2018	Local	1, 3, 8, 28, 29, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 45, 50, 51, 55, 56, 57, 59, 68, 71, 73, 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 Circular 11/95 (Annex A)
Supplementary Planning Guidance	Greater Cambridge Sustainable Design and Construction (Jan 2020) 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 originally questioned some inconsistencies between drawings. These were rectified and the officer has no objection subject to conditions and informatives be imposed in the event of permission being granted.

Cambridgeshire County Council (Transport Assessment Team)

- 6.2 The County Officer has commented on the proposal, raising no objection.

Cambridgeshire County Council (Growth Officer)

- 6.3 The County Council have confirmed that the proposal would not provide a level of strain or harm on existing schools, libraries and waste infrastructure that would require financial mitigation. The County Officer has therefore recommended that no contributions are required.

Urban Design Officer

- 6.4 The Council's Urban Design Officer has been involved in pre-application discussions on this site.
- 6.5 The Officer has confirmed that the scheme is acceptable with regard to urban design, subject to a condition securing full details of materials.

Landscape Officer

- 6.6 The Council's Landscape Officer has been involved in pre-application discussions and is supportive of the proposal. One concern has been raised with respect to the choice of trees to be planted along Callander Close although is happy for this to be agreed by way of condition.
- 6.7 The Officer has recommended conditions in the event of permission being granted.

Tree Officer

- 6.8 The Council's Tree Officer has been consulted on the proposal but no response has been received.

Drainage Officer

- 6.9 The Council's Drainage Officer reviewed the submitted documentation and has confirmed that there are no objections to the proposal subject to conditions.

Sustainability Officer

- 6.10 The Council's Sustainability Officer has confirmed that the scheme is acceptable from a sustainability point of view subject to the imposition of conditions.

Waste Services

- 6.11 The Council's Waste Projects Officer has been consulted on the proposal and no comment has been received.

Environmental Health Officer

6.12 The Council's Environmental Health Officer has been consulted on the proposal. No objections are raised subject to the imposition of conditions.

Refuse Officer

6.13 No comment received.

Environment Agency

6.14 The Environment Agency have raised no objections to the proposal.

Lead Local Flood Authority

6.15 No objection raised subject to the imposition of conditions.

Developer Contributions Monitoring Officer

6.16 A list of contributions required to mitigate the impact of the are detailed later in this report. XXX

Enabling (Affordable Housing) Officer

6.17 The Officer raises no objection to the proposal.

Ecology Officer

6.18 No comments received.

Public Art Officer

6.19 The Officer has commented on the proposal and considers that the budget afforded for public art provision is insufficient.

Anglian Water

6.20 No objection raised subject to planning conditions and informatives.

Cadent

6.21 No objection

Marshall Airport

6.22 No objection subject to conditions.

Designing Out Crime Officer

6.23 No objection raised.

7.0 REPRESENTATIONS

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

Road Name	Property Number
Strathcarron Court	5
Roseford Road	25
Callander Close	7, 32
Haviland Way	11
Ellison Close	43
Buchan Street	7, 21, 29
Aster Way	1
Sandwick Close	18

7.2 The representations can be summarised as follows:

Concern	Officer Response
Loss of shop	8.87-8.88
Loss of community centre	8.9-8.13
Increased parking	8.44-8.51
Increased traffic	8.38-8.42
Too tall and dense	8.15-8.21
Overlooking	8.22-8.25
Loss of trees	8.59-8.63
Loss of wildlife	8.64-8.67
Increased crime	8.32-8.33
Loss of open space	8.18-8.20
Strain on health facilities	8.6-8.7, 8.81
Waste of money knocking down	8.84-8.85

a good building	
Noise and air pollution during construction	8.25
Not enough Council homes	8.73-8.76, 8.86
What will happen to the postbox?	8.89

7.3 Cambridge Past, Present and Future have commented on the proposal and have raised concerns with regard to the loss of open space, and the level of parking provision.

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
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 The proposal involves the loss of a community facility, retail unit, café, and the provision of a replacement café, retail unit and 28 residential dwellings, as well as open space.

8.3 Policies 3 and 73 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2018) are of relevance in determining the acceptability of the principle of this development proposal. Policy 3 relates to new residential

development and policy 73 is concerned with, among other things, community facilities.

- 8.4 Policy 3 of the Local Plan seeks to ensure that new residential is appropriately located, and this includes with respect to surrounding uses, accessibility, and access to facilities.
- 8.5 The proposal is in a location which has other residential uses in close proximity, has good transport accessibility to and from the City Centre, and also has nearby shops. The proposal would also provide access to a café and retail unit within the site.
- 8.6 The County Council have been consulted on the application with respect to education and lifelong learning impacts of the proposal. They have carried out an assessment of the likely occupants of the development, in conjunction with looking at the existing situation and other approved schemes. The Officer has concluded that the proposal would not have a strain on local early years childcare facilities, primary schools, secondary schools or libraries to the extent that a mitigating financial contribution would be required.
- 8.7 The National Health Service have been consulted on the proposal and although a response has not yet been received, and understandably so, the Developer has indicated a willingness to make a financial contribution towards healthcare facilities. This will be secured by way of S106 agreement, more details of which are provided later in this report.
- 8.8 With the above in mind, it is considered that the proposal is in accordance with policy 3.
- 8.9 Policy 73 seeks to protect against the loss of existing community facilities. However, it states that the loss of such facilities are acceptable where:
 - The facility/site can be replaced within the new development or relocated to at least its existing scale, range, quality and accessibility for its users. For leisure uses, it should satisfy peak period need; or
 - The facility/site is no longer needed.
- 8.10 The proposal would result in the loss of a community facility although this proposal has been designed with the planning applications at The Meadows (19/1756/FUL and S/4532/19/FL)

in mind. The Meadows scheme would result in the loss of an existing community facility within the South Cambridgeshire District Council authority. The new community centre has been designed with the needs of the existing users of both the existing Meadows and the Buchan Street community facilities. Indeed, the floor area provided is commensurate to the two existing facilities, so there is no net loss of community use floorspace as a result of these proposals.

- 8.11 The new facility at The Meadows has been designed to BREEAM excellent standards, and with significant input from the City Council's Communities Team that operate both of the existing centres. The centre has been designed with their requirements in mind, and with the hindsight of what works well, and not so well, in the existing centres. The proposed centre is considered appropriate for the needs of the end users, including a double height sports hall, meeting rooms, café, youth centre, nursery, enclosed outdoor play areas, changing facilities, showers and toilets.
- 8.12 The new community centre at The Meadows would be located less than 500 metres away from the application site. It is acknowledged that a number of users of this facility would be extremely local to the existing premises, and for these users, there will be an increase in distance. However, other users will come from slightly further afield and the new centre could be equidistant to, or even closer than, the existing facility. In any event, the short distance is considered acceptable for an alternative provision.
- 8.13 In the event of permission being granted, it is considered prudent that the S106 agreement should require the new community facility at the Meadows to be operational prior to the closure of the Buchan Street facility. This will ensure that the existing users are not left without an operable facility. It is also considered appropriate to extend the time for commencing works from 3 to 5 years given that works on this site would be restricted until the community hub on The Meadows site is operable.
- 8.14 With the above in mind, the proposal is compliant with policy 73 of the Local Plan.

Context of site, design and external spaces

- 8.15 The immediate surrounding property typology is 2-storey houses with pitched roofs. This is the prevailing character to the east, south and west of the site. To the north, building heights are more varied with the Orchard Park development introducing buildings up to 5-storeys in height. A greater number of flatted properties are evident in Orchard Park.
- 8.16 This proposal would see the introduction of 1x three and 1x four storey block of flats on this site. The buildings have been designed with flat roofs to minimise their visual bulk and mass and help them respond positively in height to the 2-storey pitched roof buildings nearby. The three storey block would be located closest to the existing residential properties to the west of the site while the 4-storey block would be located close to the junction of Buchan Street and Kings Hedges Road. This arrangement provides a comfortable, and gradual, increase in height along Kings Hedges Road.
- 8.17 The buildings would have rectangular footprints but these are separated by a hard-landscaped open space which would have outdoor seating for the café whilst the taller block would have large glazed elements to the north and east. These features help to minimise the visual dominance of the proposed buildings and provide a sense of place.
- 8.18 The hard-landscaped area would provide seating for the café as well as an area of soft landscaping. Some of the more functional elements of the development, such as car parking, underground bin stores and cycle stores are served by this area. The soft landscaped area to the south of Block A would have play equipment and a path leading from Block A to Callander Close. The play area would benefit from natural surveillance from the residential units proposed – some of which would have balconies facing onto this area. A large number of new trees and planting are proposed as part of the proposal.
- 8.19 Access to the site for vehicles would be from Buchan Street while pedestrian accesses are from Kings Hedges Road, Buchan Street and Callander Close.

- 8.20 The Council's Urban Design and Landscape Officers were both heavily involved in pre-application discussions and changes have been made both prior to the application being submitted, and during the life of the application. The Officers have been consulted on this application. No objections have been raised subject to conditions relating to materials, landscaping, green roofs, planting replacements in the event of damage/death, and future maintenance and management.
- 8.21 Officers consider that the form, height and layout of the proposed development is appropriate to the surrounding pattern of development and the character of the wider area and would not constitute overdevelopment of the site. Officers consider that the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2018) policies 55, 56, 57, and 59.

Residential Amenity

Impact on amenity of neighbouring occupiers

- 8.22 The nearest residential properties to the proposed development are on Callander Close and would be sited just over 4m away from the proposed 3-storey block. The block has been designed so that windows on the elevation facing these properties would have two windows on each upper floor. One of these would face directly onto the brick flank elevation of these properties, and these are not considered to give rise to opportunities for overlooking. The other window is further north on the elevation and would look over the amenity spaces of adjoining properties. These windows, on the first and second floor level properties are secondary bedroom windows with the main openings benefitting from a northern aspect. In the interest of protecting neighbouring amenity, it is considered appropriate to condition that these windows at first and second floor level on the western elevation should be obscure glazed and non-opening to a height of 1.70m above finished floor level. The proposal would alter the outlook from some of the windows on these properties although it is not considered that these would be particularly adverse. The proposed Block A would be sited to the north-east of the property and would not have a significant impact on either sunlight or daylight receipt.

- 8.23 The next nearest properties are on opposite sides of roads and at least 13 metres away. The proposal is considered to have an acceptable impact on these properties.
- 8.24 Officers consider that there would be no adverse impact with regards to overlooking, noise, loss of light receipt, overshadowing or a sense of enclosure.
- 8.25 Concerns have been raised about the impact on amenity during construction. It is acknowledged that any construction project of this ilk is likely to have an impact due to dust, noise and vibration creation as well as comings and goings of deliveries and collections to and from the site. The Council's Environmental Health Team have been consulted on the proposal and have recommended conditions to ensure that any potential disturbance is minimised.

Amenity for future occupiers of the site

- 8.26 Policy 50 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2018) sets out internal residential space standards. All units proposed comply with, or exceed, these standards. In this regard, Officers consider that all the new homes proposed would provide a high-quality internal living environment for the future occupants. The table below outlines the schedule of accommodation provided.

Unit Type	No. of levels	Min standard (sqm)	Min proposed (sqm)
1bed, 2person	1	50	50
2bed, 3person	2	61	73
2bed, 4person	1	70	70

- 8.27 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.
- 8.28 All of the proposed dwellings benefit from a private amenity area. These take the forms of terraces and balconies.

- 8.29 As well as the private amenity spaces, the development benefits from direct access into the hard and soft landscaped areas that are proposed.
- 8.30 It is considered that the proposal provides a high-quality living environment and an appropriate standard of residential amenity for future occupiers and is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2018) policy 50.
- 8.31 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. A condition is recommended to secure these requirements. Of the 28 dwellings proposed for the wider site, one is proposed to be M4(3) – this equates to 3.57%. Whilst it is acknowledged that policy 51 seeks to secure “5 per cent of the affordable housing component...” as M4(3) dwellings, it is considered appropriate to bear in mind that a scheme of 28 dwellings is only required to provide 12 affordable dwellings, and this would require just 1 M4(3) unit. It is not considered appropriate to require more M4(3) units as a result of over-provision of affordable housing. If permission were to be granted, a condition should be attached to ensure this provision is secured.
- 8.32 The Police’s Designing Out Crime Officer has confirmed that they have been involved in early conversations with the applicants on this scheme and have raised no objection to the proposal. The Officer also states that he is awaiting a ‘Gold’ standard application to be forthcoming from this development, meaning a high level of security would be achieved.
- 8.33 Officers consider that the layout and design would not only result in a safe standard of accommodation for future residents and users of the café and retail unit, but also for users of the open spaces provided which would benefit from a good level of natural surveillance.
- 8.34 Subject to the imposition of the condition suggested earlier, Officers are content that the proposal complies with Cambridge Local Plan (2018) policies 50 and 51.

Refuse Arrangements

- 8.35 The proposed refuse storage arrangements are shown to be of a logical layout, with underground bins being located conveniently between the block of flats, and a commercial bin store to the rear of the commercial units. 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.
- 8.36 The Council's Refuse and Recycling Officer has been consulted on the application and no comment has been received.
- 8.37 Officers consider that the proposal is compliant in this respect with Cambridge Local Plan (2018) policy 57.

Highway Safety

- 8.38 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. A Transport assessment has also been submitted. The Highway Authority was consulted as part of the application and have not raised and highway safety concerns.
- 8.39 The Officer has suggested that conditions be attached in the event of permission being granted to ensure visibility splays are provided to the parking spaces on Callander Close, water discharge and a Traffic Management Plan. Officers have no reason to disagree with these recommendations and have added these to the list of conditions at the end of this report accordingly.
- 8.40 The County Council's Transport Assessment Team have reviewed the application documents submitted, including details of likely trip generation to the site, accident data, and nearby developments which have been granted permission but have not been constructed - which also need to be considered.
- 8.41 The Officer is content that the proposal is acceptable.

8.42 Officers consider that, subject to the imposition of conditions as outlined above, the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2018) policy 81.

Car and Cycle Parking

8.43 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

8.44 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.

8.45 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)

8.46 The proposal provides a total of 20 parking spaces for the 28 dwellings – a ratio of 0.71:1, which complies with policy 82. One of these spaces would be a disabled parking bay and this would be allocated to the M4(3) unit. Four spaces are proposed for the commercial uses.

8.47 Five of the parking spaces would have active electric charge points (two of which would be fast charging) with the remainder having the infrastructure to allow for future connection.

8.48 The site is in a highly sustainable location and is in close proximity of the guided bus way and bus stops. The level of parking provided is considered to adhere to the spirit of the policy whilst also actively encouraging more sustainable forms of transport. The proposal, therefore, complies with the requirements set out above.

- 8.49 The Council's Environmental Health Officer has requested 50% of all spaces to have active slow-charge points, with all remaining spaces having passive provision.
- 8.50 Policy 82 states that where appropriate and viable charging point, or the infrastructure for these, should be provided. There is no stipulation afforded within the policy for quantum.
- 8.51 The level of provision proposed, and outlined above, is considered in accordance with Local Plan policy 82, and a condition to secure this level of provision has been recommended.

Cycle Parking

- 8.52 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.
- 8.53 The standards set out that one cycle space should be provided for dwellings of up to 3 bedrooms. It is stated that cycle parking should not, where possible, be located at basement level.
- 8.54 The scheme, in total, provides 39 residential cycle parking spaces. There are 39 bedrooms proposed and so the proposal is compliant.
- 8.55 A further 23 spaces are provided for the commercial units and visitors parking.
- 8.56 It is considered that the proposal promotes the prevalence of sustainable transport methods and provides an acceptable balance between car and cycle parking. The proposal is considered to be compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2018) policy 82.

Integrated water management and flood risk

- 8.57 The application has been designed with drainage considerations in mind, and a flood risk and drainage strategy report was submitted with the application.
- 8.58 The Drainage Team and Local Lead flood Authority have both advised that the strategy provided is acceptable. Conditions are

recommended to ensure a detailed drainage scheme and maintenance and management strategy are secured, as well as details for foul water drainage. Officers consider that 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

- 8.59 The application was accompanied by a tree survey and arboricultural impact assessment.
- 8.60 The Arboricultural Impact Assessment identifies that 15 trees would require removal in order to facilitate the proposed development. No category A trees are proposed for removal. 34 replacement trees are proposed.
- 8.61 The Council's Tree Officer has been consulted on the proposal although no comment has been received. It is considered prudent, in the event of permission being granted, to condition the provision of an Arboricultural Method Statement and a Tree Protection Plan. This would allow for Officers to ensure the development is carried out in an acceptable way with respect to the trees that are to be retained.
- 8.62 It is noted that the proposal includes a large amount of new planting with significantly more trees proposed than those lost. Officers consider this would mitigate the loss of the existing trees. The proposed landscaping conditions will allow Officers to ensure an adequate replacement planting scheme is achieved.
- 8.63 Officers consider that the proposal complies with policy 71.

Ecology

- 8.64 The application has been supported by an Ecological Impact Assessment.
- 8.65 A condition to secure a detailed scheme for on-site ecological enhancements is recommended in order to ensure the site ecology is maximised.

8.66 The Ecology Report provided with the application concludes that the site is not of high ecological importance in its current guise, and from visiting the site, Officers do not see any reason to disagree with this finding. The proposed net gain of trees and condition to secure an ecological enhancement plan will help to encourage an increase in biodiversity.

8.67 The proposal would, subject to the condition recommended, be in accordance with Policy 70 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2018).

Energy and Sustainability

8.68 A number of energy efficient and sustainability measures form part of the proposed design. These include, but are not limited to:

- PV panels
- Green roofs
- EV charging points
- Gas free development
- Electric air Source Heat Pumps
- Mechanical Ventilation with Heat Recovery (MVHR) in all buildings
- BREEAM Very Good commercial units

8.69 The application has been supported by an energy statement and a sustainability statement.

8.70 The Energy report demonstrates that the approach chosen would comply with policy 28 of the Local Plan and would significantly exceed the 19% reduction in carbon dioxide emissions target within Part L of Building Regulations – providing a 62% reduction.

8.71 The Council's Sustainability Officer has been consulted on the proposal and has raised no objections subject to the imposition of conditions relating to carbon reduction, water efficiency measures, and BREEAM certification. The Officer acknowledges that it is difficult for commercial units of the size proposed to be able to achieve greater than a BREEAM Very Good rating and considers this to be acceptable.

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

Affordable Housing

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

8.74 The proposed development is for a scheme of 28 dwellings with all of these being for Council rented accommodation. All units would be one and two bedroom.

8.75 The Council's Growth Officer has been consulted on the proposal and has raised no objections to the amount and breakdown proposed.

8.76 The securing of these dwelling for affordable housing purposes will form part of the S106 agreement in the event of a resolution to grant permission being arrived upon.

Public Art

8.77 A public art strategy and delivery plan has been provided as part of the application submission. The public Art Officer has been consulted on the proposal and has raised concerns over the £90,000 budget proposed for public art on the whole site, and a linked proposal at The Meadows. The Officer considers that an addition commission (three in total, not two) should be provided and an additional £45,000 should be made available for art.

8.78 Officers have reviewed the proposal, and whilst additional public art would be a public benefit, the other public benefits provided by the scheme need to be taken into consideration, and given the significance of these – 100% affordable housing, open space and play equipment, BREEAM Very Good rated commercial units – Officers consider that the methodology, and financial sum proposed, to be acceptable.

8.79 It is considered appropriate that, in the event of permission being granted, a condition be added securing further details of the artwork. Subject to such a condition, the proposal is

compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2018) policy 56 and the Public Art SPD 2010.

S106 Contributions

8.80 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.

8.81 In bringing forward recommendations in relation to the Planning Obligation for this development Officers 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. The Heads of Terms are summarised below.

Heads of Terms	Summary
City Council Infrastructure	
Informal open space	No contributions sought
Provision for children and teenagers	No contributions sought
Indoor sports	No contributions sought
Outdoor sports	No contributions sought
Community facilities	No contributions sought
Affordable housing	100% provision on site. All to be for Council rent
County Council – Education / Refuse	
Early years	No contributions sought

Primary School	No contributions sought
Secondary School	No contributions sought
Life Long Learning (Libraries)	No contributions sought
Strategic waste	No contributions sought
Monitoring	No contributions sought
NHS	TBC

8.82 Subject to the completion of a S106 planning obligation to secure the above infrastructure contributions and 100% affordable housing provision, Officers are satisfied that the proposal accords with Cambridge Local Plan (2018) policy 45 and the Planning Obligation Strategy 2010.

Third Party Representations

8.83 Many of the third party representations have been discussed in the above commentary. The remainder are covered below.

Loss of a perfectly good community centre

8.84 A representation has been received questioning why the existing community centre is to be demolished.

8.85 From a planning perspective, the condition of an existing building is not a material consideration and cannot form a reason for refusal. It is noted, however, that the proposed replacement facility at The Meadows would be a BREEAM Excellent rated facility.

Not enough Council Homes being provided

8.86 A concern has been raised that the development is not providing sufficient Council housing. This application is for 100% Council rented homes.

Loss of shop and café

8.87 It is acknowledged that if permission were to be granted, there would be a period of time where there would be no retail unit

and café on the site, although the development would replace these.

- 8.88 In the short term, there are other retail offerings in relatively close proximity to the site, as well as good and convenient access to public transport links that go into the City.

Loss of postbox

- 8.89 It is acknowledged that there is a postbox at present on the site which would be lost. Whilst this is not a planning consideration, the intention is for this replaced.

9.0 CONCLUSION

- 9.1 The proposal is for the development of the site involving the erection of 28 new dwellings (100% affordable), provision of replacement retail unit and café.
- 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 application has been considered against the relevant policies, and upon assessment, Officers 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 a S106 in accordance with paragraph 8.82 and the following conditions and informatives:

1. The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of five 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. Notwithstanding the plans hereby approved, 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).

4. Notwithstanding the plans hereby approved, one dwelling shall be constructed to meet the requirements of Part M4(3) '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).

5. Prior to the commencement of the development, a detailed public art strategy, developing the framework provided in the submitted Public Art Strategy and Delivery Plan dated December 2019, shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority.

The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved detail and retained as such.

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

6. 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, incorporating where practicable, a method of dispersal for hedgehogs, to be erected. The boundary treatment shall be completed before the uses hereby permitted are 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).

7. Prior to first occupation of any dwelling or the commercial units, the manoeuvring and car and cycle parking areas required for that purpose 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).

8. Prior to the commencement of works, a traffic management plan shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

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

9. Prior to first occupation of any part of the development hereby permitted, the two pedestrian visibility splays of 2m x 2m shown on drawing number 1806-57 PL04 to the proposed car parking spaces off Callander Close are to be provided. Thereafter, they shall be maintained free from obstruction exceeding 0.6m above the level of the adopted public highway in perpetuity.

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

10. The proposed driveway be constructed off Callander Close shall have falls and levels are such that no private water from the site drains across or onto the adopted public highway. 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.

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

11. No development hereby permitted shall be commenced 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 also 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 and all SuDS features;
- 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) Temporary storage facilities if the development is to be phased;
- h) A timetable for implementation if the development is to be phased;

- i) Details of overland flood flow routes in the event of system exceedance, with demonstration that such flows can be appropriately managed on site without increasing flood risk to occupants;
- j) Full details of the maintenance/adoption of the surface water drainage system;
- k) Measures taken to prevent pollution of the receiving groundwater and/or surface water
- l) Formal agreement from a third party if discharging into their system is proposed, including confirmation (and evidence where appropriate) that sufficient capacity is available.

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

Reason: To prevent an increased risk of flooding and to protect water quality.

12. Details for the long-term maintenance arrangements for the surface water drainage system (including all SuDS features) to be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to the first occupation of any of the dwellings 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 publicly adopted, in accordance with the requirements of paragraphs 163 and 165 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

13. No building hereby permitted shall be occupied until foul water drainage works have been implemented in accordance with details that have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority.

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

14. 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).

15. 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).

16. 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.

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

17. 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).

18. 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).

19. If unexpected land contamination is encountered whilst undertaking the development, works shall immediately cease on site until the Local Planning Authority has been notified and the contamination has been fully assessed and a remediation strategy has been submitted to, and approved by, the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter the development shall not be implemented otherwise than in accordance with the approved remediation scheme.

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).

20. Sound Insulation compliance condition - Ground Floor Community room

The proposed sound insulation scheme as detailed in Section 7.0 of the 'Buchan Street Neighbourhood Centre, Cambridge - Noise Impact assessment (Ref: BD/CC/P19-1767/04) - December 2019' produced by Create Consulting Engineers Ltd shall be fully implemented before the use hereby permitted is commenced and shall be maintained and retained thereafter

Reason: To protect the amenity of properties from noise. (National Planning Policy Framework, Feb 2019 - paragraph 180 a) and b) and Cambridge Local Plan 2018 - Policy 35: Protection of human health and quality of life from noise and vibration)

21. D1 Use: Community room external / third party amplification

In the event that amplification is used within the community room for music and / or voice, all musical and sound generation equipment used within the community room shall be connected to and played and channelled through an in-house limited amplification / fixed sound system. The use of any external third party independent amplification / sound systems is strictly prohibited.

Reason: To protect the amenity of properties from noise. (National Planning Policy Framework, Feb 2019 - paragraph 180 a) and b) and Cambridge Local Plan 2018 - Policy 35: Protection of human health and quality of life from noise and vibration)

22. Community room acoustic musical equipment

The use of unamplified / acoustic musical equipment and independent amplification / sound systems that are not connected to and fully played and channelled through / controlled by the in-house limited amplification / fixed sound system is prohibited or not permitted within the community centre.

Reason: To protect the amenity of properties from noise. (National Planning Policy Framework, Feb 2019 - paragraph 180 a) and b) and Cambridge Local Plan 2018 - Policy 35: Protection of human health and quality of life from noise and vibration)

23. A1 Hours of Use

The A1 use hereby permitted shall only be open to customers between the hours of 0700 and 2300 Monday to Sunday and Bank Holidays.

Reason: To protect the amenity of properties from noise. (National Planning Policy Framework, Feb 2019 - paragraph 180 a) and b) and Cambridge Local Plan 2018 - Policy 35: Protection of human health and quality of life from noise and vibration)

24. A3 Hours of Use

The A3 Class Use hereby approved shall not operate outside the hours of 08:00 to 22:00 Monday to Thursday, 08:00 to 23:00 Fridays and Saturdays and 09:00 to 20:00 on Sundays.

Reason: To protect the amenity of properties from noise. (National Planning Policy Framework, Feb 2019 - paragraph 180 a) and b) and Cambridge Local Plan 2018 - Policy 35: Protection of human health and quality of life from noise and vibration)

25. D1 Hours of Use

The D1 Class Use hereby approved shall not operate outside the hours of 08:00 to 22:00 Monday to Thursday, 08:00 to 23:00 Fridays and Saturdays and 09:00 to 20:00 on Sundays.

Reason: To protect the amenity of properties from noise. (National Planning Policy Framework, Feb 2019 - paragraph 180 a) and b) and Cambridge Local Plan 2018 - Policy 35: Protection of human health and quality of life from noise and vibration)

26. D1 Use: doors and windows

With the exception of requirements for access and egress through main front doors of the community room, all external doors and windows serving the community room shall remain closed during the playing of amplified music / voice.

Reason: To protect the amenity of properties from noise. (National Planning Policy Framework, Feb 2019 - paragraph 180 a) and b) and Cambridge Local Plan 2018 - Policy 35: Protection of human health and quality of life from noise and vibration)

27. Service Collections and Deliveries

All service collections / dispatches from and deliveries to the commercial units on the ground floor, including refuse / recycling collections during the operational phase shall only be permitted between the hours of 07:00 to 23:00 Monday to Friday and 08:00 to 13:00 on Saturdays. Service collections / dispatches from and deliveries to the approved development are not permitted at any time on Sundays or public holidays.

Reason: To protect the amenity of properties from noise. (National Planning Policy Framework, Feb 2019 - paragraph 180 a) and b) and Cambridge Local Plan 2018 - Policy 35: Protection of human health and quality of life from noise and vibration)

28. Plant noise condition (A1 / A3 / D1 Uses, excluding ASHPs)

Prior to the installation of plant associated with the ground floor occupancy of Block B, 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: To protect the amenity of properties from noise. (National Planning Policy Framework, Feb 2019 - paragraph 180 a) and b) and Cambridge Local Plan 2018 - Policy 35: Protection of human health and quality of life from noise and vibration)

29. Plant Noise Condition (ASHPs)

The Air Source Heat Pumps (ASHPs) hereby approved shall be installed / implemented fully in accordance with the operational noise levels as specified in Section 9.0 of the document "Buchan Street Neighbourhood Centre, Cambridge - Noise Impact assessment (Ref: BD/CC/P19-1767/04) - December 2019". The ASHPs shall be maintained and not altered thereafter.

Reason: To protect the amenity of properties from noise. (National Planning Policy Framework, Feb 2019 - paragraph 180 a) and b) and Cambridge Local Plan 2018 - Policy 35: Protection of human health and quality of life from noise and vibration)

30. Electric Vehicle (EV) Charge Points - Residential Developments (communal parking)

The electric vehicle charge points and associated infrastructure as detailed in and as shown on drawing BUC-EV01 (dated 17.12.2019) shall be fully installed and operational before final occupation of the residential units and shall be retained thereafter. The charge points associated with the commercial units shall be operational prior to first use.

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 82).

31. External Artificial Lighting Condition

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. (National Planning Policy Framework, Feb 2019 - paragraph 180 c) and Cambridge Local Plan 2018 - policies 34 and 59)

32. BREEAM - Condition 1

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 'Very Good' as a minimum will be met, with at least 3 credits for Wat 01 (water consumption). Where the design stage certificate shows a shortfall in credits for BREEAM 'Very Good', a statement shall also 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 and the Greater Cambridge Sustainable Design and Construction SPD 2020).

33. BREEAM - Condition 2

Prior to the use or occupation of the development 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 and the Greater Cambridge Sustainable Design and Construction SPD 2020).

34. Water efficiency

No dwelling(s) shall be occupied until a water efficiency specification for each dwelling type, based on the Water Efficiency Calculator Methodology or the Fitting Approach set out in Part G of the Building Regulations 2010 (2015 edition) has been submitted to and approved in writing by 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 and 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 and the Greater Cambridge Sustainable Design and Construction SPD 2020).

35. Energy and Carbon Reduction

The development, hereby permitted, shall not be used or occupied until, carbon reduction measures have been implemented in accordance with a Carbon Reduction Statement which shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority prior to implementation. This shall demonstrate that all new residential units shall achieve reductions in CO₂ emissions of at least 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;
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 specification, and a maintenance programme; and
- d) Details of any mitigation measures required to maintain amenity and prevent nuisance.

Where grid capacity issues subsequently arise, written evidence from

the District Network Operator confirming the detail of grid capacity and a revised Carbon Reduction Statement shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The revised Carbon Reduction Statement shall be implemented and thereafter maintained in accordance with the approved details.

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).

36. Prior to the commencement of above ground works, with the exception of demolition, 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).

37. 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.

38. 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.

39. 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.

40. 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 (or subsequent replacements), 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.

41. Development shall not commence until a Bird Hazard Management Plan has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.
The submitted plan shall include details of:
- monitoring of any standing water within the site temporary or permanent
 - sustainable urban drainage schemes (SUDS) - Such schemes shall comply with Advice Note 6 'Potential Bird Hazards from Sustainable Urban Drainage schemes (SUDS) (available at www.aoa.org.uk/policycampaigns/operations-safety/).
 - management of any flat/shallow pitched/green roofs on buildings within the site which may be attractive to nesting, roosting and "loafing" birds. The management plan shall comply with Advice Note 8 'Potential Bird Hazards from Building Design' (available at www.aoa.org.uk/policycampaigns/operations-safety/) * See next page for information *
 - reinstatement of grass areas
 - maintenance of planted and landscaped areas, particularly in terms of height and species of plants that are allowed to grow
 - which waste materials can be brought on to the site/what if any exceptions e.g. green waste
 - monitoring of waste imports (although this may be covered by the site licence)
 - physical arrangements for the collection (including litter bins) and storage of putrescible waste, arrangements for and frequency of the removal of putrescible waste
 - signs deterring people from feeding the birds.

The Bird Hazard Management Plan shall be implemented as approved on completion of the development and shall remain in force for the life of the building. No subsequent alterations to the plan are to take place unless first submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority

Reason: To ensure the development does not endanger the safe movement of aircraft or the operation of Cambridge Airport through interference with communication, navigational aids and surveillance equipment.

42. Hard and soft landscaping: No development above ground level, other than demolition, shall commence until remaining 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 (fences and walls); SUDs features in paving, minor artefacts and structures (e.g. refuse and cycle, or other storage units, signs, lighting); proposed services above and below ground (e.g. drainage, power, communications cables, pipelines indicating lines, manholes, supports). Soft Landscape works shall include: written specifications including cultivation and other operations associated with plant and grass establishment; specification/method statement for over-seeding/plug planting in existing perimeter woodland areas, specification/method statement for relaying and improving the drainage for the playing pitches, protection of new planting in existing perimeter woodland areas, 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)

43. Landscape maintenance and management plan: 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. The management plan should particular attention to maintenance of SUDs features, removal of any protection to the perimeter planting etc, management of wildflower areas and the management of green roofs.

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)

44. Green (biodiverse) Roofs:

Green roofs can be biodiverse (green/brown) extensive roofs, or intensive (roof gardens) or blue roofs. This condition focusses on biodiverse roofs. Details of the biodiverse (green) roof(s) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to any superstructure works commencing on site. 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, bio-solar 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).

45. 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, inclusive of bin and cycle stores, substations, and flat blocks, 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 55 and 57).

46. Notwithstanding the plans hereby approved, the north-most windows at first and second floor levels on the western elevation of Block A shall be fitted with obscure glass, and shall be non-openable to a height of 1.70m above the finished floor level of the rooms they serve.

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

47. Green Roofs:

All green roofs should be designed, constructed and maintained in line with the CIRIA SuDS Manual (C753) and the Green Roof Code (GRO).

48. Pollution Control:

Surface water and groundwater bodies are highly vulnerable to pollution and the impact of construction activities. It is essential that the risk of pollution (particularly during the construction phase) is considered and mitigated appropriately. It is important to remember that flow within the watercourse is likely to vary by season and it could be dry at certain times throughout the year. Dry watercourses should not be overlooked as these watercourses may flow or even flood following heavy rainfall.

49. Dust Informative

It is required that a dust management plan should reference and have regard to various national and industry best practical technical guidance such as:

- o Guidance on the assessment of dust from demolition and construction, version 1.1 (IAQM, 2016)
- o Guidance on Monitoring in the Vicinity of Demolition and Construction Sites, version 1.1 (IAQM, 2018)
- o Control of dust and emissions during construction and demolition -supplementary planning guidance, (Greater London Authority, July 2014).

50. To satisfy conditions relating to Noise Insulation, 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 noise 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 guard against any creeping background noise in the area and prevent unreasonable noise disturbance to other premises. This requirement applies both during the day (0700 to 2300 hrs over any one hour period) and night time (2300 to 0700 hrs over any one 15 minute period).

It is recommended that the agent/applicant submits a noise 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 a noise assessment as described within this informative.

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

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

PLANNING COMMITTEE

5th August 2020

Application Number	20/0010/FUL	Agenda Item	
Date Received	27th January 2020	Officer	Mary Collins
Target Date	23rd March 2020		
Ward	Petersfield		
Site	Anglia Ruskin University East Road Cambridge Cambridgeshire CB1 1PT		
Proposal	Installation of lockers adjacent to Michael Ashcroft Building (off Broad Street).		
Applicant	A.R.U.(Anglian Ruskin University Anglia Ruskin University East Road Cambridge Cambridgeshire CB1 1PT		

SUMMARY	<p>The development accords with the Development Plan for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The proposed development would respect the character and appearance of the surrounding area. - The proposed development would not have any significant adverse impact on the amenity of surrounding occupiers.
RECOMMENDATION	APPROVAL

1.0 SITE DESCRIPTION/AREA CONTEXT

1.1 The application site is situated at Anglia Ruskin University on the southern side of Broad Street and opposite the St. Matthews Primary School. Broad Street is a no through road situated off the eastern side of East Road which leads to the residential properties and to private parking for Flower Street residents.

1.2 The application site is in close proximity to the city centre and primary shopping area of The Grafton Centre and Burleigh Street and Fitzroy Street to the north west.

1.3 The application site does not all within a conservation area but is in close proximity to the Mill Road Conservation Area to the north and east and the Kite Conservation Area to the west.

2.0 THE PROPOSAL

2.1 Planning permission is sought for the installation of lockers adjacent to Michael Ashcroft Building.

2.2 These would be Amazon Drop Off Lockers and one bank is proposed, 2.7 metres wide by 0.60 metres deep and 2.10 metres high. A 2.7 width equates to 65 slots.

2.3 The lockers would be sited to the western elevation of the building facing along Broad Street towards the junction with East Road, in close proximity to the entrance to the building and existing bicycle stands.

2.4 The lockers will be primarily for students, however that is not exclusive and the public will have access to them. The lockers would be accessible to the public 24 hours a day.

2.5 The proposed location would enable Amazon to park on the application site away from the residential end of Broad Street.

2.6 The application is accompanied by the following supporting information:

1. Drawings

3.0 SITE HISTORY

None relevant

4.0 PUBLICITY

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

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 10 12 31 32 35 36 55 56 58 59 61 81

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

Central Government Guidance	National Planning Policy Framework 2019 National Planning Practice Guidance 2014 Circular 11/95 – The Use of Conditions in Planning Permissions (Annex A) Greater Cambridge Planning (2020) – Sustainable Design and Construction
-----------------------------	--

6.0 CONSULTATIONS

Cambridgeshire County Council (Highways Development Control)

6.1 No comment on the behalf of the Highway Authority.

Urban Design and Conservation team

6.2 It is considered that there are no material Conservation issues with this proposal.

Environmental Health

6.3 No comments or recommended conditions to make regarding this application.

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

7.0 REPRESENTATIONS

- 7.1 Councillor Richard Robertson has commented on this application.

Object to this application for Amazon lockers to be installed on Broad St outside the ARU.

These lockers provide a service for people who cannot be at home to receive parcels, but their location needs to be carefully thought through. Those in the Grafton Centre and at Parkside Pool are not in places where additional traffic will be added to a narrow and already congested road.

The lockers would be available for anyone to use and not just students and ARU staff, so they would attract additional traffic to Broad St. Despite its name, the road is narrow and as it leads nowhere, all traffic has to turn around to leave. I was able to have No Through Road signs erected by the county council last year as some drivers appeared to think the road went somewhere.

There is still too much traffic entering it and unfortunately there is no adequate turning head at the end. The low walls in the front gardens at this point of the street suffer from repeated damage by vehicles carrying out 3 point turns and the absence of a kerb to the pavement means that pedestrians are at risk as well as the walls. Broad St is heavily used as a throughway to and from Norfolk St by many pedestrians and cyclists. In view of these problems the applicant should be required to provide a Traffic Management report.

- 7.2 The owners/occupiers of the following addresses have made representations:
- 29 Broad Street, Cambridge
 - 10 Flower Street, Cambridge
 - 11 Flower Street, Cambridge

7.3 The representations can be summarised as follows:

- Increase the volume of traffic entering and turning at the end of Broad Street significantly. Cars constantly turn outside house and wait in the layby, often with music playing at full volume.
- Increase in noise pollution and litter problem.
- If the University really feels its students need this sort of resource, the Lockers could be placed in an internal campus location that would alleviate the impact on the local residents.
- Broad Street already has a large amount of university-driven vehicle traffic at all times. This includes large goods lorries making deliveries to the university and local school and mostly students trying to find parking in the area.
- St. Matthews Primary School children to move through the area without walking in the street which is dangerous. Students park on the sidewalks especially on Broad street right at East Road. Even though this is allowed during certain hours students and taxis do this at all times of the day. This is not safe for children or pedestrians or cyclists and makes it extremely difficult to access East Road. Often causing backup on East as drivers manoeuvre around the parked cars and cars trying to exit Broad street. This parking difficulty will only be made worse with the addition of the lockers.
- Will be sited where overspill bikes are left. No allocation for the addition of extra bike parking.
- Increase in foot and vehicle traffic, rubbish issues, and noise at all hours that the Lockers will bring, particularly without any planned addition of rubbish and recycle bins, bike parking, or car park access, will exacerbate all of this.
- There are already two sets of Amazon Lockers nearby - at Next, in the Grafton, and at Parkside Pools – so an additional set in this already high-traffic area seems unnecessary.

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

Context of site, design and external spaces, impact on the Conservation Area

- 8.1 The lockers would be located to the western elevation of the building facing along Broad Street towards its junction with East Road.
- 8.2 The proposed lockers are to be situated outside the entrance and under the overhang of this section of the building. This is in close proximity to the existing cycle parking area in this undercroft.
- 8.3 Given the set back from the Broad Street elevation and tucked under the existing building, the siting of the lockers is not considered to be detrimental to the character and appearance of the conservation area.
- 8.4 The proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2018) policies 55, 56, 58 and 61.

Residential Amenity

Impact on amenity of neighbouring occupiers

- 8.5 There are residential properties at the far end of Broad Street and Flower Street which is situated off Broad Street.
- 8.6 The proposed lockers are situated at a distance from these residential properties and a detrimental loss of amenity through disturbance through comings and goings and from people using the lockers to collect parcels is not considered to arise as a result of their siting.
- 8.7 Given the proximity to the Grafton Centre, Fitzroy and Burleigh Street shopping areas and the city centre, it is considered that the introduction of the lockers in this location is acceptable.
- 8.8 In relation to noise and disturbance from increased use of Broad Street from cars used by customers to collect parcels, given the modest scale of the proposed development it is considered unlikely that the proposal would result in a significant level of noise and disturbance to adjoining residents. As regards to

turning, given this is a public road but a no through road, cars will inevitably either need to turn at the end of the road or, in quieter periods, in the bell mouth serving ARU.

- 8.9 Officers are of the opinion, the proposal adequately respects the residential amenity of its neighbours and the constraints of the site and is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2018) policies 56, 58 and 35.

Highway Safety

- 8.10 Highways Officers have not raised any objections and as such the proposal is considered compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2018) policy 81. However the concerns raised by Councillor Robertson have been forwarded to Highways for their comments and Officers are awaiting their response and these will be reported to the committee on the amendment sheet.

9.0 THIRD PARTY REPRESENTATIONS

- 9.1 Neighbours have expressed concern regarding the impact of the University on the amenity of residents in Broad Street. The problems of litter, apparent drug use and dealing, parking of cars, vehicles, bikes and students clogging the pavements for prams/buggies etc have been highlighted and there is concern that the siting of the lockers would exacerbate these problems. The concerns raised by surrounding residential occupiers are noted however these issues are existing and are considered out of the scope of this planning application.

10.0 CONCLUSION

- 10.1 In the opinion of Officers, the proposed development would not have an adverse impact upon appearance of the area and would not be detrimental to the amenities of nearby neighbouring properties.

11.0 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.

PLANNING COMMITTEE

5th August 2020

Application Number	20/0034/FUL	Agenda Item	
Date Received	13th January 2020	Officer	Mary Collins
Target Date	25th March 2020		
Ward	Market		
Site	Jesus Green Moorings Thompsons Lane Cambridge Cambridgeshire		
Proposal Applicant	Extension of existing pontoon Mrs Emma Wynne St Lukes Church Stretten Avenue Cambridge Cambridgeshire CB4 3DZ		

SUMMARY	<p>The development accords with the Development Plan for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed development would respect the character and appearance of the conservation area. • The proposed development would not have any significant adverse impact on the amenity of surrounding occupiers. • The proposal would respect the River Cam.
RECOMMENDATION	APPROVAL

1.0 SITE DESCRIPTION/AREA CONTEXT

- 1.1 The application site is situated on the southern side of the River Cam. The punt station itself is at the end of the boardwalk from Quayside, immediately before the access gate to Jesus Green and immediately in front of La Mimosa restaurant at 1-3 Thompsons Lane
- 1.2 The punt station is approximately midway between Magdalene or Great Bridge upstream and the Jesus Lock and footbridge

downstream. La Mimosa is one of six authorised punting stations in Cambridge.

1.3 The existing pontoons are in two sections each accessed through a metal gate and a short set of steps at the side of the boardwalk.

1.4 The application site is within the Historic Core Conservation Area. The site falls within Flood Zone 2. The site falls within a County Wildlife Site (River Cam).

2.0 THE PROPOSAL

2.1 Planning permission is sought for the extension of the existing pontoon to provide a larger pontoon.

2.2 The existing pontoon would be extended widthways by 2.5 metres adjacent to the existing landing stages. It would provide separate entrances and exits from the footpath/bank and would provide a scissor lift for ambulant access. It would be securely connected to tubular piles driven into the bed of the river and is a modular system which is designed to float.

2.3 The application is accompanied by the following supporting information:

1. Drawings
2. Heritage Statement
3. Flood Risk Assessment
4. Ecology Report

3.0 SITE HISTORY

There is no relevant planning history for the site.

4.0 PUBLICITY

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

5.0 POLICY

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

5.2 Relevant Development Plan policies

PLAN	POLICY NUMBER
Cambridge Local Plan 2018	1 7 10 28 31 32 35 36 55 56 57 59 61 62 67 69 70 73 81 82

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

Central Government Guidance	National Planning Policy Framework 2019 National Planning Practice Guidance 2014 Circular 11/95 – The Use of Conditions in Planning Permissions (Annex A) Greater Cambridge Planning (2020) – Sustainable Design and Construction Biodiversity Checklist for Land Use Planners in Cambridgeshire and Peterborough (March 2001). Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (November 2010) Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (2005) Cambridge and Milton Surface Water Management Plan (2011) Cambridge Historic Core Conservation Area Appraisal (2015)
-----------------------------	--

6.0 CONSULTATIONS

Cambridgeshire County Council (Highways Development Control)

- 6.1 No significant adverse effect upon the Public Highway should result from this proposal, should it gain benefit of Planning Permission.

Urban Design and Conservation team

- 6.2 The main point of concern is the visual impact of the larger pontoons on the Conservation Area and the River Cam. Historically this part of the river has been more 'industrialised' than it seems now but the existing situation is that the views across the river, up and downstream are very important and relatively uncluttered. Objects in or on the river form the foreground of many of these views, which also form the setting for LBs & BLIs.

The park-like character of Jesus Green comes up against the more urban character of the city here [with terraced housing, more modern blocks of flats and historic college buildings], more-or-less at the point where the punt station is located. The views of these surroundings depend, to an extent, upon whether the trees are in leaf but the expectation would be that one would see boating activities on the water as well as the buildings and green spaces along the river. Hence the provision of the support systems for boating are not unexpected.

The illustrations indicate that the pontoons are quite 'low lying' and close to the water's surface but that they are noticeably larger than the existing examples. It would seem that when viewed from longer distances the larger pontoons should not have an adverse effect upon the LBs & BLIs; it seems likely that the punts tying up at the enlarged station [being at right angles to the river bank] will be more prominent. The extra pontoons are of greater size [2.5m wide] than the existing and sit outside the walled edge of the river – the current pontoons are recessed into the wall. Hence they will be more visible on the outward facing curve of the river bank but, given the lack of detail on possible/probable safety rails, the section of the piles above the water surface seems likely to be the most eye-catching element.

Taking the above into account, the proposal is not considered to adversely affect the character of the nearby Listed Buildings; and the proposal is considered to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the conservation area. The development therefore complies with Local Plan policy 61.

Any consent should be subject to the following conditions:

- Full details of safety rails, passenger lifts and any other projections above the deck of the pontoons.
- Full details [including finishes, colours, etc.] of piles projecting above the river surface.
- Full details [including finishes, colours, etc.] of new pontoon.

Environmental Health

- 6.3 In the interests of amenity, recommend the standard construction hours and piling conditions.

Nature Conservation Projects Officer

- 6.4 Content with survey details; no ecology related objection to the proposed application.

Access Officer

- 6.5 Supports the application.

Drainage

- 6.6 As these works are proposed in a Main River, an Environment Agency Permit will be required. In terms of drainage do not see any issues. With regards to flood risk, the proposed modular system is water compatible and allows for the water levels variation for 100 year return period plus Climate change but as this is a Main River, the Environment Agency would need to advise on this aspect.

Environment Agency

- 6.7 The submitted Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) states that the pontoon will be securely connected to tubular piles driven into the bed of the river. The FRA acknowledges that placing any structure in a watercourse will increase the risk of blockage.

However, residual risk at the site from extreme events is low because the pontoon extension is designed to float. It also states that during extreme events it is anticipated that sufficient time would be available to take precautionary actions to limit the potential impact of flooding, including pontoon users signing up to the EA flood warning service and being able to use safe egress from the site to Thompson Lane in FZ1.

The FRA also states that the proposed extension of the existing pontoon will increase the impermeable area of the watercourse but that there will be no net change in the run-off entering the River Cam.

Based on the above statement, the EA has no objection in principle to the proposed development providing the mitigation measures proposed in the submitted FRA are adhered to. In particular the FRA recommends that the height of the piles has an allowance of 0.5m above the estimated water level for modelling tolerance and movement associated with variations in water level. This will ensure the pontoon will be able to float to the 1% annual probability water level of 6.0mAOD including climate change.

Advice to LPA. With regard to the second part of the Exception Test, your Authority must be satisfied with regard to the safety of people using the pontoon (including those with restricted mobility), the ability of such people to reach places of safety including safe refuges and the ability of the emergency services to access such locations to rescue and evacuate those people. Therefore strongly recommend that the Authority's Emergency Planner is consulted on these issues.

Emergency Planner

- 6.8 Have no particular issues with this planning application, it is clearly in the flood risk zone but as a floating platform the risks to the actual structure would be low as long as the possible rise (and fall) are built into the holding structure and it is appropriately anchored to the ground so it does not break away in rising floodwaters and cause either a navigational issue or risk to adjoining properties.

Conservators of the River Cam

6.9 No comments received.

Wildlife Trust

6.10 No comments received.

6.11 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 Martinelli has objected to the application and requests that it be considered by Planning Committee.

The primary objection is that this planned expansion would substantially decrease local residential amenity, particularly for the occupants of Beaufort Place, but also those of the surrounding area i.e. Richmond Terrace, Thompson's Lane.

This application proposes to extend the trading footprint of the punt operators currently working from the Jesus Green Mooring Station. There have been significant and longstanding problems associated with this trade over several years. In particular:

1) Noise generated by the trade. This has been noted to be a worsening concern as punt operators seek to provide more tours with more animated accompaniment from the tour guides. This is increasingly associated with excessive alcohol consumption by punt users. Expanding the footprint of punting operations, as planned, would reasonably be expected to increase this disturbance.

2) Antisocial behaviour, including but not limited to public urination in the forecourt of Beaufort Place. This has led to the installation of gates around Beaufort PI but remains an issue. Expanding the punt station footprint would reasonably be expected to increase this issue and worsen the living experience of residents.

3) Waste. Accumulation of waste on the boardwalk, within punts and in the surrounding areas has been noted over a number of years, associated with the growth and change in character of the punting trade. This regular build-up of waste is not only

potentially detrimental to the health of nearby residents but is also untidy and detrimental to the local environment.

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

- La Mimosa Restaurant, Thompsons Lane
- 8 Lansdowne Road (owner of 38 Beaufort Place)
- 3 Beaufort Place, Thompsons Lane
- 9 Beaufort Place, Thompsons Lane
- 12 Beaufort Place, Thompsons Lane
- 13 Beaufort Place, Thompsons Lane
- 21 Beaufort Place, Thompsons Lane
- 32 Beaufort Place, Thompsons Lane
- 33 Beaufort Place, Thompsons Lane
- 35 Beaufort Place, Thompsons Lane
- 49 Beaufort Place, Thompsons Lane
- 81 North End, Meldreth (owner of 15 Beaufort Place)
- 21 Lady Jane Court, Cavendish Avenue
- 186 Huntingdon Road
- 3 Wordsworth Grove
- 7 Neath Farm Court

7.3 The representations can be summarised as follows:

- Detrimental impact on adjacent residential properties in Beaufort Place.
- Inappropriate given the residential nature of the area and the public nuisance that is already caused by drunken customers and litter of the punting company
- There are no public toilets nearby for punt operators or their customers, have had problems with people defecating in and around nearby flats
- Disruption to running of adjacent La Mimosa Restaurant. The punting company are using 'La Mimosa' as the name for their landing station which assumes the businesses are connected when there is no association with them. This in turn leads people to arrive at La Mimosa Restaurant believing they have the right to use the toilets and facilities and abusing the use of them. This contributes to anti-social behaviour including shouting, loud music late at night, foul language and rowdy behaviour

- Rubbish left behind by patrons queuing for the punts on public walkway. Health issue, attracting rodents and has impact on the enjoyment of outdoor use of restaurant for customers
- The proposed pontoon expansion does not accommodate this number of passengers waiting for the punts - therefore this will not resolve the problem of overcrowding.

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 7 (The River Cam) states that development proposals along the River Cam corridor should:

- a. include an assessment of views of the river and a demonstration that the proposed design of the development has taken account of the assessment in enhancing views to and from the river;
 - b. preserve and enhance the unique physical, natural, historically and culturally distinctive landscape of the River Cam;
 - c. raise, where possible, the quality of the river, adjacent open spaces and the integrity of the built environment in terms of its impact, location, scale, design and form;
 - d. propose, where possible and appropriate to context, enhancement of the natural resources of the River Cam and offer opportunities for renaturalisation of the river;
 - e. enable, where possible, opportunities for greater public access to the River Cam;
- and
- f. take account of and support, as appropriate, the tourism and recreational facilities associated with the river.

8.2 In the view of Officers, the proposal would accord with criterion e) which relates to access to the river and criterion f). The proposal involves the addition of ramps and specialised equipment which will improve disabled access and provide greater public access to the River Cam. The proposal aims to alleviate current issues with congestion and queuing. The pontoon would not cause any significant intensification of use of

this part of the river and as a result Officers are satisfied that the proposal is in accordance with criterion d).

- 8.3 Criteria a), b) and c) are assessed later in this report.
- 8.4 Policy 10 (The City Centre) states that Cambridge City Centre will be the primary focus for developments attracting a large number of people and for meeting retail, leisure, cultural and other needs appropriate to its role as a multi-functional regional centre. Any new development or redevelopment should:
- a. add to the vitality and viability of the city centre;
 - b. achieve a suitable mix of uses;
 - c. preserve or enhance heritage assets and their setting, open spaces and the River Cam;
 - d. be of the highest quality design and deliver a high quality public realm; and
 - e. promote sustainable modes of transport.
- 8.5 In the view of Officers, this existing use contributes to the vitality and viability of the city centre and is in a sustainable location close to public transport and therefore accords with criteria a, b and e.

Criterion c) is assessed later in this report.

- 8.6 Policy 73 states new or enhanced community, sports or leisure facilities will be permitted if, a) the range, quality and accessibility of facilities are improved; b) there is a local need for the facilities; and c. the facility is in close proximity to the people it serves.
- 8.7 This enhanced leisure facility would improve accessibility, is next to the river from where it operates and is in the city centre close to other visitor attractions and visitor footfall. It is considered that the proposal complies with this policy.
- 8.8 Policy 67 (Protection of open space) states that development proposals will not be permitted which would harm the character of, or lead to the loss of, open space of environmental and/or recreational importance.
- 8.9 The application site adjoins the protected open space at Jesus Green, however the proposal would not result in any loss of

open space as it is sited on the river and adjacent to Jesus Green.

- 8.10 Whether the proposal would harm the character of the open space of Jesus Green will be assessed later in this report.

Context of site, impact on conservation area and setting of heritage assets and impact on open space

- 8.11 The proposed larger pontoon is situated on a slight bend in the river where there is already a small pontoon. There are important views along the river from both Madgdelen Bridge to the west and from Jesus Green to the east in which this proposal can be seen.
- 8.12 The structure would project further towards the middle of the river however given the structure would be low lying close to the surface of the water with only the piles visible to a height of approximately 0.5 metres above the surface, it is considered that the larger pontoon would not have a significant greater visual impact than the existing structure and would therefore respect existing views to and from the river.
- 8.13 With regard to the impact on the character of the protected open space at Jesus Green, Jesus Green is a wide area of open space with a park-like character which is situated immediately against the more urban character and built up city centre where they meet along the western edge of the green.
- 8.14 The views across the Green towards the application site and river would not be detrimentally affected. There is the expectation that one would see boating activities on the water as well as the buildings and green spaces along the river. The pontoon and support systems for boating are not unexpected or out of place in this context and are not considered to introduce clutter or impact on the view. The proposal would not impact on the openness of this area and views of the green.
- 8.15 Officers agree with the Conservation Officer that the proposal will not adversely affect the character of the listed buildings nearby and will preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the conservation area. Conditions as recommended by the Conservation Officer will be attached.

- 8.16 The proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2018) policies 55, 56, 57, 59, 61 and 62.

Flood risk and safety

- 8.17 With regards to flood risk, the proposed modular system is water compatible and allows for the water levels variation for 100 year return period plus Climate change. Environment Agency has no objection in principle to the proposed development providing the mitigation measures proposed in the submitted Flood Risk Assessment are adhered to and a condition will be attached to secure this.
- 8.18 As the pontoon will be able to float to, risks to the actual structure would be low as long as the possible rise (and fall) are built into the holding structure and it is appropriately anchored to the ground so it does not break away in rising floodwaters and cause either a navigational issue or risk to adjoining properties.
- 8.19 The proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2018) policy 32.

Residential Amenity

Impact on amenity of neighbouring occupiers

- 8.20 The existing pontoon is alongside Quayside and residential properties in Beaufort Place are situated alongside this walkway. The forecourt to these properties is off Thompsons Lane, whilst the properties abut the footpath. The concerns of neighbours are noted. The City Council (as landowner of the landing stages and Jesus Green) licence the independent punt operators that trade from this punt station. The City Council confirm that there will no increase to punt numbers associated with the proposal to locate a pontoon adjacent to the existing landing stages. The purpose of the application is to provide an increased width to the existing landing stages to improve the loading and unloading of passengers onto punts.
- 8.21 Given this is an extension to an existing operation, it is considered that the proposed enlargement of the pontoon area would allow the waiting passengers to be managed better and would not have a detrimental impact on adjoining residential properties.

Noise and disturbance

- 8.22 With respect to disturbance through noise, there are no operating hours specified by planning condition. Environmental Health have not raised any concern in this regard. Given the location of the site close to the city centre with the linking walkway to Jesus Green, this is already a busy pedestrian route linking Bridge Street and Jesus Green and as such there is already a degree of disturbance to residential properties which adjoin the walkway.
- 8.23 As the proposal would not increase the existing capacity of the punt operation, Officers consider that aspects such as noise, littering and other anti-social behaviour are existing problems which cannot necessarily be attributed to this existing use and that the extended pontoon would not exacerbate these problems. It is noted that to deter anti-social behaviour, gates have been erected to the forecourt to Beaufort Court in Thompson Lane.
- 8.24 Officers consider the proposal adequately respects the residential amenity of its neighbours and the constraints of the site and is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2018) policies 56 (58) and 35.

Ecology

- 8.25 An ecology survey has been submitted with the application and no ecology related objections have been raised to the proposed application.
- 8.26 The proposal is therefore compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2018) policy 70.

Third Party comments

- 8.27 Many of the comments received relate to issues such as littering and anti-social behaviour. The City Council confirm that there will no increase to punt numbers associated with the proposal to locate a pontoon adjacent to the existing landing stages. Any issues already experienced could be improved through better management of customers and will be brought to the attention of the operator.

Conclusion

- 9.1 The proposed pontoon is considered to preserve and enhance the character and appearance of the conservation area and have respect for the special interest of surrounding listed buildings, views along the river and would not impact on the openness of Jesus Green. The proposal would improve access to the river for customers with disabilities and complement the waterside setting of the site. It would not have any significant adverse impact on the amenity of surrounding occupiers.

10 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. Prior to commencement of development hereby approved, full details of safety rails, passenger lifts and any other projections above the deck of the pontoons shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Projections, etc. shall be installed thereafter only in accordance with the approved details and prior to the first use of the pontoon.

Reason: To avoid harm to the special interest of the Conservation Area. (Cambridge Local Plan 2018, policy 61)

6. Prior to commencement of development hereby approved, full details [including finishes, colours, etc.] of piles projecting above the river surface are to be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Piles shall be installed thereafter 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)

7. Prior to commencement of development hereby approved, full details [including finishes, colours, etc.] of new pontoons shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Pontoons shall be installed thereafter 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)

8. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the mitigation measures proposed in the submitted Flood Risk Assessment by Ellingham Consulting Ltd, Nov 2019 (ECL0046b).

Reason: To minimise flood risk (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policy 32.)

PLANNING COMMITTEE

5th August 2020

Application Number	19/1141/FUL	Agenda Item	
Date Received	14th August 2019	Officer	Lewis Tomlinson
Target Date	9th October 2019		
Ward	Trumpington		
Site	1 Fitzwilliam Road Cambridge CB2 8BN		
Proposal	Demolition of existing building and construction of three dwellings.		
Applicant	Mr William Macdonald Compass House Vision Park Histon Cambridge CB24 9AD		

SUMMARY	<p>The development accords with the Development Plan for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposal will enhance the Conservation Area. • The proposed development would not have any adverse impact on the residential amenity of adjoining neighbours and would provide acceptable living conditions for the future occupiers. • The proposal would have an acceptable impact upon the trees within and surrounding the site. • The proposal overcomes the previous reasons for refusal on 15/1855/FUL
RECOMMENDATION	APPROVAL

1.0 SITE DESCRIPTION/AREA CONTEXT

1.1 The site is situated on the northern side of the junction of Clarendon Road and Fitzwilliam Road and comprises a 2.5 storey brick building defined on its public edges by a low-rise

brick wall and mature landscaping. In 1972, the former property on the site was acquired by Cambridgeshire & Isle of Ely County Council as a hostel for working-age boys, adapting the existing building. On the 14th September 1993, planning permission was granted to demolish the home and build a replacement hostel, which was implemented and the present building at 1 Fitzwilliam Road was constructed. The building is currently vacant and has been for the last few years.

- 1.2 The site lies in the very south eastern corner of the Brooklands Avenue Conservation Area, which was designated in 2002. The Appraisal defines Nos. 3-9 Fitzwilliam Road (which are immediately to the west of the site) as Buildings of Local Interest. It states that this group is an austere but imposing terrace that dominates the street. The impact that the subject property makes to the character of the area remains undefined, but it is fair to describe its contribution as neutral. Across the road from the site lies the substantial contemporary development of Kaleidoscope, which has been the subject of major redevelopment in recent years and is not located in a Conservation Area.
- 1.3 There are two mature sycamore trees with TPO status located at the front of the site facing the junction of Fitzwilliam Road and Clarendon Road. The site is also located within a controlled parking zone.

2.0 THE PROPOSAL

- 2.1 The proposal is for the demolition of the existing building and the erection of a terrace of 3 dwellings. Unit 1 would be 2 storey and units 2 and 3 would be 3 storey. The properties would have rear gardens and associated parking. There is also additional parking from Clarendon Road from an existing access point.
- 2.2 Amended plans have recently been received which have sought to address the recent appeal decision on the site and neighbour concerns. Unit 4 has been removed from the scheme entirely. At the time of writing this report the amended plans are subject to further re-consultation and any further comments will be reported on the amendment sheet.
- 2.3 A previous application (15/1855/FUL) for six dwellings was refused for the following three reasons:

1. The scale, bulk and design of the proposal would result in an overly dominant built form that would appear too prominent, cramped (significantly diminishing the existing space) and too deep in footprint in views from Clarendon Road and which would poorly reflect and inadequately relate to the adjacent Buildings of Local Interest along Fitzwilliam Road with regard to the detailed design but also the form and shape of the roofing elements. The result is a scheme which would constitute an overdevelopment of the site, which would neither preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Conservation Area. The proposal has not demonstrated that it has responded to its context or drawn upon key characteristics of the surroundings. For these reasons, the proposal conflicts with policies 3/4, 3/7, 3/12, 4/11 and 4/12 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2006) and guidance within paragraph 64 of the NPPF (2012).
2. The use of the rooms, position and substantial amount of glazing used on the upper floors (first to third) on the rear facade of the proposal and the increased massing and dominance of built form from that existing would all contribute to the unacceptable loss of privacy and sense of enclosure to the occupiers of No. 3 Fitzwilliam Road and No. 21 Clarendon Road which are in close proximity to the site. In addition and in the absence of information to demonstrate otherwise, the lack of adequate space for landscaping, particularly tree planting, along the boundaries with these properties due to the proposed basement structure underneath, would mean that views of the proposed building could not be adequately or partially mitigated. For these reasons, the proposal would be contrary to policies 3/4 and 3/12 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006.
3. There is insufficient evidence to suggest that the proposed development would not endanger the health of two trees with TPO status on the front of the site. These trees positively contribute towards the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. For these reasons, the proposal would be contrary to policies 4/3, 4/4 and 4/11 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2006).

2.4 The application was dismissed at appeal (APP/Q0505/W/18/3218079). The inspector upheld reason 1 (conservation area impact) and reason 2 (impact upon neighbouring properties). A copy of the appeal decision is attached to appendix 1.

3.0 SITE HISTORY

15/1855/FUL - Demolition of existing building and construction of six new dwellings and associated access and landscaping (refused, appeal dismissed)

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, 59, 61, 62, 70, 71, 80, 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 March 2014 Circular 11/95 (Annex A) Technical housing standards – nationally described space standard – published by
-----------------------------	---

	Department of Communities and Local Government March 2015 (material consideration)
Supplementary Planning Guidance	<p>Sustainable Design and Construction (2020)</p> <p>Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Waste Partnership (RECAP): Waste Management Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (February 2012)</p> <p>Planning Obligation Strategy (March 2010)</p>
Material Considerations	<p><u>City Wide Guidance</u></p> <p>Arboricultural Strategy (2004)</p> <p>Cambridge Landscape and Character Assessment (2003)</p> <p>Cambridge City Nature Conservation Strategy (2006)</p> <p>Cambridge City Wildlife Sites Register (2005)</p> <p>Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (November 2010)</p> <p>Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (2005)</p> <p>Cambridge and Milton Surface Water Management Plan (2011)</p> <p>Cycle Parking Guide for New Residential Developments (2010)</p> <p>Air Quality in Cambridge – Developers Guide (2008)</p> <p>The Cambridge Shopfront Design Guide (1997)</p>

	<p><u>Area Guidelines</u></p> <p>Brooklands Avenue Conservation Area Appraisal (2013)</p>
--	---

6.0 CONSULTATIONS

Cambridgeshire County Council (Highways Development Management)

- 6.1 No objection. Recommends the inclusion of conditions regarding visibility splays, falls and levels and bound material. Informative regarding works within the highway.

Conservation Officer

- 6.2 Supports. Recommends the inclusion of conditions regarding a sample panel, roofing materials and cladding materials (oriel window).

Environmental Health

- 6.4 No objection subject to conditions regarding construction hours, collection during construction, construction, demolition noise, vibration and piling, dust condition, electric vehicle charging points and associated informatives.

Tree Officer

- 6.5 No objection subject to conditions regarding implementation of energy statement, water efficiency, sustainable construction and green roofs.
- 6.8 The above responses are a summary of the comments that have been received. Full details of the consultation responses can be inspected on the application file.

7.0 REPRESENTATIONS

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

- 1 Clarendon Road
- 19 Clarendon Road
- 21 Clarendon Road
- 3 Fitzwilliam Road
- 5 Fitzwilliam Road
- 11a Fitzwilliam Road
- 22 Brooklands Avenue
- 3 Shaftesbury Road
- 4 Glenalmond Avenue
- 282 Glenalmond Avenue

7.2 The representations can be summarised as follows:

- The scale of the buildings is excessive and dominant
- Overdevelopment
- Result in the loss of 3 on street car parking spaces on an already congested road
- The level of parking provision is inadequate
- Loss of trees
- Materials are out of keeping
- Loss of privacy for neighbouring properties due to overlooking
- Overlooking of 21 Clarendon Road from the terrace properties
- Disturbance
- Potential high turnover of residents of the houses, could be used for rental apartments such as Airbnb
- Bikes on plot 4 being located in rear garden and access through a passageway adjacent to No.21 Clarendon Road
- Insufficient space for cycle parking
- Too many bedrooms in the houses
- Impact upon the conservation area
- Common boundary wall of 3 Fitzwilliam Road should be rebuilt to existing standard

7.3 Councillor Dan Summerbell called in the application due to the substantial change on the site. This pre-dates the removal of the 4th dwelling the scheme.

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, 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
9. Affordable Housing
10. Third party representations

Principle of Development

8.2 The former use of the site was a hostel. The building has been vacant for a number of years. The site contains an existing building, it is classed as previously developed (brownfield) land. Policy 3 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2018) states 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 principle of redeveloping the site for housing is acceptable subject to the material planning considerations discussed below.

Context of site, design and external spaces

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

- 8.3 The site falls within the Brooklands Avenue Conservation Area and is close to a number of Buildings of Local Interest. The application is accompanied by a Heritage Statement which provides an overview of the significance of nearby heritage assets and the relative impact of the scheme upon them. The statutory considerations as set out in section 66(1) and section 72(1) of the Town and Country Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, are matters to which the determining authority must give great weight to when considering schemes which have the potential to impact on heritage assets.
- 8.4 Section 72 (1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 makes it a statutory duty for a local planning authority, in the exercise of its planning powers with respect to any buildings or other land within a Conservation Area, to:
- 'Pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of that area'*
- 8.5 In respect of development proposed to be carried out within the setting of, or which may impact upon a listed building, or in a conservation area, a decision-maker must, in respect of a conservation area, give a high priority to the objective of 'preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the area', when weighing this factor in the balance with other 'material considerations' which have not been given this special statutory status.
- 8.6 The respective national policy guidance is set out in paragraphs 193-196 of the NPPF. Para. 193 of the NPPF states that when considering the impact of a proposal on the significance of a designated heritage asset, "great weight" should be given to the asset's conservation (meaning the more important the asset, the greater the weight should be). Para. 194 makes it clear that any harm to, or loss of significance of a heritage asset should require clear and convincing justification. Para. 196 of the NPPF states that where a proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, such

harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal, including its optimum viable use. Para. 200 makes it clear that local planning authorities need to look for opportunities for new development within Conservation Areas, World Heritage Sites and within the setting of heritage assets to enhance or better reveal their significance. Proposals which make a positive contribution to the asset or better reveals its significance should be treated favourably.

- 8.7 In respect of non-designated heritage assets para. 197 of the NPPF states that the effect that a proposal will have on such an asset should be taken into account in determining the application, and in considering such applications a balanced judgment is required having regards to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset.
- 8.8 The proposal is for the erection of a terrace of 3 dwellings fronting Fitzwilliam Road. The terrace would be set to generally align with the building line of 3 Fitzwilliam Road to the west. Unit 1 would be 2 storey and units 2 and 3 would be 3 storey. There would be car parking to the front of each property and gardens to the rear.
- 8.9 The Inspector states in paragraph 9: *'The built-up end of the proposed east elevation would be too close to 21 Clarendon Road and would jar with the lower, hipped two-storey forms of this property and its neighbours. Closure of the gap between No 21 to the extent proposed would effectively preclude views into the CA.'*
- 8.10 As outlined above, the proposal has taken a different design approach to the previously refused and dismissed scheme. A key part of this has been to erect a set of terrace properties fronting Fitzwilliam Road. This would not only leave the existing gap on site between the building on 1 Fitzwilliam Road and 21 Clarendon Road but would expand it, retaining the important view through the site into the Conservation Area.

- 8.11 The Inspector states in paragraph 11: *the new fourth storey within the roof would contrast significantly with the rest of the building as well as with its neighbours. Despite the set-back its essentially flat roof form with balustrading, use of glazing and metal would have an overly dominant and incongruous effect, and be out of context in relation to properties on either side of the north and east elevations.*
- 8.12 The proposed design of the terrace (plots 1 to 3) has been carefully designed to reflect more traditional aspects of the neighbouring properties along Fitzwilliam Road but in a contemporary design. It is very different to the refused scheme which incorporated a fourth storey set back, flat roof, with a heavy use of glazing and metal. The 4th storey element of plots 2 & 3 is set within a mansard roof form which would help keep the bulk of the proposal down as well ensuring the 4th storey would not appear top heavy in comparison to the rest of the building. This proposed roof form would not detract from the appearance of the adjacent BLI's.
- 8.13 The site has a number of trees on the site. The corner between Clarendon Road and Fitzwilliam Road is green in character and an important part of the Conservation Area character. The proposal retains this green corner and therefore preserves the Conservation Area. The impact of the scheme on the existing trees is discussed in further detail below. Standard conditions such as landscaping and boundary treatments are recommended to ensure the site is treated appropriately. A low wall with railing above and hedge behind will form the boundary onto Clarendon Road to help retain the green and open character of the corner. The Conservation Team support the application subject to a number of conditions requiring further details or materials and the oriel window to be submitted.
- 8.14 In officer's view, the proposal would enhance the Conservation Area and adequately respect the proximity of the adjacent BLI's. It is considered that the proposal overcomes the 1st reason for refusal on the previous scheme (15/1855/FUL). As such, the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policies 55, 56, 59, 57, 61 and 62, NPPF guidance and meets the statutory tests as set out in paragraphs 8.2 - 8.4 above.

Residential Amenity

Impact on amenity of neighbouring occupiers

- 8.15 The 2nd reason for refusal on the previous application concerned the impact upon the adjacent property No.3 Fitzwilliam Road and No.21 Clarendon Road. This reason for refusal was upheld by the Inspector at appeal. It is to be noted that the dismissed appeal scheme was for a building that wrapped round the whole site fronting both Fitzwilliam Road and Clarendon Road in comparison to the current scheme which is a terrace of 3 dwellings fronting Fitzwilliam Road only.
- 8.16 The Inspector states in paragraph 16 of the appeal decision that: *Several upper floor windows to habitable rooms would face neighbouring rear gardens at 3 Fitzwilliam Road and 21 Clarendon Road, where no direct views over them exist. Some overlooking in a new building could be expected. Most windows would be bedrooms so they would not be as extensively used as main habitable space. Nevertheless, as I saw from the rear garden of No 3, the sense of privacy enjoyed within it would be significantly compromised by the sheer number of the new openings and their position at the increased height and depth into the plot over the existing building. No 21 would be similarly adversely affected. Obscure glazing might reduce overlooking but would be undesirable in bedrooms and not overcome the sense of loss of privacy.*

3 Fitzwilliam Road

- 8.17 3 Fitzwilliam Road is a three storey plus basement end of terrace dwelling located to the west of the site. The existing building and the refused building were both in an L shape form. The proposed terrace would be set in line with the rear elevation of 3 Fitzwilliam Road which would therefore remove any potential significant overlooking opportunities. A condition is recommended to remove permitted development rights for the insertion of new windows and dormers. For these reasons, the proposal would therefore not have any significant impact upon 3 Fitzwilliam Road in terms of overlooking, overbearing or overshadowing. Unit 1 steps down in height to ensure 'right to light' on the windows on the side elevation of 3 Fitzwilliam Road is protected.

21 Clarendon Road

8.18 No.21 Clarendon Road is a two storey detached dwelling to the north of the site. The existing building is 2.5 storey in height in an L shape. The proposal would include 5 windows at first floor and above on the rear (north facing) elevation not including the 5 small rooflights. The number of windows contained with the current scheme is considerably less than the refused scheme. Unit 3 is set behind the rear elevation of 21 Clarendon Road so only unit 1 (1 first floor window and 1 second floor window) and unit 2 (1 first floor window) would be sited opposite No.21 Clarendon Road. Only 3 of the 5 windows would be opposite. All of these windows on the rear elevation are set within stepped in elements. It is to be noted that the previous scheme was for 6 dwellings, the current scheme is for 3 dwellings. The proposal is within an urban setting and a degree of overlooking of neighbouring properties is to be expected. Given the low number of windows proposed and their positioning, the proposal would not cause a significant level of overlooking of 21 Clarendon Road.

8.19 Unit 1 is only two storey in comparison to the neighbouring property No.3 Fitzwilliam Road and units 2 and 3. Unit 1 would also include low eaves at mid first floor level at the rear of the building. It is considered that this step down in height would provide a new view and relief for the garden of 21 Clarendon Road as unit 1's height would be lower than the existing 2.5 storey building. The proposed building would also be set in line with the rear elevation of 3 Fitzwilliam Road. The proposal would therefore be set further back than the existing building. The refused scheme concluded that the proposal would not significantly overshadow any of the neighboring properties. The current scheme would also not cause any significantly detrimental overshadowing impact.

Wider area

8.20 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. This advice is accepted and the conditions are recommended accordingly. The impact of additional demand for car parking spaces on residential amenity is assessed in the 'car parking' section below.

8.21 For the above reasons, it is considered that the proposal overcomes the 2nd reason for refusal on the previous scheme (15/1855/FUL) and the proposal adequately respects the residential amenity of its neighbours and the constraints of the site in accordance with Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policies 57 and 35.

Amenity for future occupiers of the site

8.22 Policy 50 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2018) sets out internal residential space standards. All the proposed units comply and exceed the standards. All units have an acceptable level of outlook. In this regard, the units would provide a high quality internal living environment for the future occupants. The floor space of the proposed units is presented in the table below against the requirements of policy 50.

Unit	Number of bedrooms	Number of bed spaces (persons)	Number of storeys	Policy Size requirement (m.)	Proposed size of unit (m.)	Difference in size
1	3	6	3+	108	180	+72
2	5	10	3+	134	235	+101
3	5	10	3+	134	235	+101

8.23 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. As stated above, all dwellings would have a generous rear garden area that would be appropriate for the proposed number of bedrooms. These private garden spaces have been significantly improved through the latest revisions to the scheme.

Accessible homes

8.24 The residential element of the development has been assessed for compliance with the requirements of Part M4 (2) of the Building Regulations and Policy 51. A condition is recommended to secure this requirement.

Refuse Arrangements

- 8.25 The bins would be located in a bin store within the rear garden of each dwelling. The proposal is therefore compliant with policy 57 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2018).

Highway Safety

- 8.26 The Highway Authority was consulted as part of the application and does not consider there would be any adverse impact upon highway safety. The proposal would therefore be compliant with policies 81 and 82 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2018).

Car and Cycle Parking

Car Parking

- 8.27 The proposal would result in the loss of 3 parking bays on Fitzwilliam Road due to the creation of driveways for the proposed 3 units. The Highway Authority has not objected to the application or the removal of the car parking bays. The proposal would provide car parking spaces to the front of each dwelling: unit 1 will have 2 spaces, unit 2 will have 1 space and unit 3 will have 1 space. The scheme also includes 3 car parking spaces accessed from Clarendon Road. These 3 spaces will be shared, as supplemental parking for the residents/visitor car parking. The site and the streets in the immediate vicinity of the site fall within the controlled parking zone. The residents of the new dwellings will not qualify for Residents' Permits within the existing Residents' Parking Schemes operating on surrounding streets. The proposed level of car parking is considered to comply with Appendix L of the Cambridge Local Plan 2018.
- 8.28 Officers acknowledge that the removal of three on-street spaces would marginally increase pressure. However, the site is located within the controlled parking zone and the proposal includes an acceptable level of car parking. Officers do not consider that the loss of the 3 on street car parking spaces would warrant a refusal of the application. The proposal would be in accordance with Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policy 82.

Cycle Parking

- 8.29 Each dwelling will have its own cycle store placed in each rear garden. It is considered the level of cycle parking provision is policy compliant with appendix L of the Cambridge Local Plan 2018 and the cycle parking arrangements are convenient in accordance with policy 82 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2018.

Integrated water management and flood risk

- 8.30 A surface water drainage strategy can be secured by condition. The proposal is compliant with the paragraph 163 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2018) and policy 31 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2018).

Trees

- 8.31 There are two mature sycamore trees with TPO status located at the front of the site facing the junction of Fitzwilliam Street and Clarendon Street. The smaller sycamore tree is proposed to be felled to allow the other sycamore to flourish. 8 smaller trees are also proposed to be removed. The application provides 5 new trees, 3 of the 5 would be larger in size to help replace the canopy cover. The retained TPO'd sycamore would be sited within unit 3's plot to the side of the dwelling. It is considered that there is ample space to the rear of unit 3 to ensure there would not be pressure in the future to significantly prune or remove the tree. Officers recommend the removal of permitted development rights in relation to side extensions and outbuildings for unit 3 to ensure any future proposals will be assessed against the impact upon trees on the site.
- 8.32 Following the amendments to the scheme, the Tree Officer now supports the application subject to conditions regarding a tree method statement, tree protection plan, pre-commencement site meeting, compliance with method statement and 5-year guarantee. Suitable replacement planting could be provided by way of the landscaping condition. Subject to the above conditions, the proposal complies with Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policy 71.

Biodiversity

- 8.33 The application is accompanied by a pre-liminary Ecological Appraisal. This concludes that there is an opportunity to enhance the biodiversity on the site. The applicant is proposing a greater number of bird and bat boxes than the ecology report recommends. An informative is recommended to encourage the inclusion of hedgehog gaps within the fencing. A condition is recommended to secure the scheme for bat and bird boxes. Subject to the above conditions, the proposal complies with Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policy 70.

Renewables and Water Use

- 8.34 Policy 28 requires ...carbon reduction and water efficiency standards for all new homes. The application is accompanied by an Energy and Water Sustainability Statement which states that a reduction in carbon dioxide emissions will be achieved through energy efficiency measures and the provision of renewable technology. Officers recommend conditions regarding a carbon reduction statement and a water efficiency scheme to ensure these policy requirements are met. The proposal therefore complies with Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policy 28.

Affordable Housing

- 8.35 The proposed development is for a scheme of 3 units. Policy 45 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2018) states that affordable housing provision should be calculated on the basis that the thresholds are to be considered against the net increase in the number of units on the site. As the proposed net increase of units on the site would be below the threshold, there is no policy basis to require affordable housing provision as part of this application. The proposal is compliant with policy 45 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2018).

Third Party Representations

- 8.36 The third-party representations have been mainly dealt with in the preceding paragraphs. An AirBnB type use would require planning permission in its own right. The existing state of the adjoining brick wall between 3 Fitzwilliam Road is a civil matter and falls under the party wall act.

9.0 CONCLUSION

- 9.1 The proposal comprehensively overcomes the previous reasons for refusal on 15/1855/FUL that were subsequently upheld at appeal and would provide a high quality development that respects the character of the area, would not have an adverse impact upon the occupiers of neighbouring properties and would provide an acceptable level of amenity for future occupiers.

10.0 RECOMMENDATION

APPROVE subject to 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. Electric Vehicle (EV) Charge Points - Residential Developments

Prior to the installation of any electrical services, a dedicated electric vehicle charge point scheme demonstrating that at least one active electric vehicle charge point will be designed and installed on site in accordance with BS EN 61851 with a minimum power rating output of 7kW for each dwelling 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 105, 110, 170 and 181, Policy 36 - Air Quality, Odour and Dust of the Cambridge Local Plan (2018) and Cambridge City Council's adopted Air Quality Action Plan (2018).

8. Before starting any brick or stonework, a sample panel of the facing materials to be used, which shall include details of the bonding, coursing and colour and type of jointing, shall be erected on site and agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved panel, which shall be maintained on site throughout the course of development.

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, 57 (for new buildings) and/or 58 (for extensions))

9. Before starting the installation of the roof, a samples of the roof materials shall be agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority via a site visit or the provision of material samples. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved panel, which shall be maintained on site throughout the course of development.

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, 57 (for new buildings) and/or 58 (for extensions)) and 61.

10. Before starting the installation of the oriel window on unit 3, full details in the form of drawings shall be submitted to and agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved panel, which shall be maintained on site throughout the course of development.

Reason: In the interests of visual amenity within the conservation amenity (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policies 55, 57 (for new buildings) and/or 58 (for extensions)) and 61.

11. No development shall take place above ground level, other than demolition, until details at a minimum scale of 1:20 (including plans, elevations and sections of IN) have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter 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, 57 (for new buildings) and/or 58 (for extensions))

12. 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.

13. Prior to the commencement of site clearance a pre-commencement site meeting shall be held and attended by the site manager and the arboricultural consultant to discuss details of the approved AMS. A record of this meeting shall be provided to the Council for approval.

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.

14. 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.

15. 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.

16. 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)

17. 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)

18. 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)

19. Notwithstanding the approved plans, the dwellings, 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)

20. No development shall take place (apart from demolition and below ground enabling works) until details regarding the specification and locations of the bird and bat boxes has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The works shall be carried out strictly in accordance with the approved details and shall be retained in that manner thereafter.

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

21. 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).

22. 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)

23. No development above slab level, apart from demolition and ground enabling works, shall commence until a Carbon Reduction Statement has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning. This shall demonstrate that all new residential units shall achieve reductions in CO2 emissions of 19 per cent 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; and
 - b) A summary table showing the percentage improvement in Dwelling Emission Rate over the Target Emission Rate for each proposed unit.

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

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

There shall be no occupation of the development until the carbon reduction measures have been implemented in accordance with the approved details. Where grid capacity issues subsequently arise, written evidence from the District Network Operator confirming the detail of grid capacity and a revised Carbon Reduction Statement shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The revised Carbon Reduction Statement shall be implemented and thereafter maintained in accordance with the approved details.

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 and Greater Cambridge Sustainable Design and Construction SPD 2020).

24. No dwelling(s) shall be occupied until a water efficiency specification for each dwelling type, based on the Water Efficiency Calculator Methodology or the Fitting Approach set out in Part G of the Building Regulations 2010 (2015 edition) has been submitted to and approved in writing by 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 and 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 and the Greater Cambridge Sustainable Design and Construction SPD 2020).

25. For the hereby approved dwellings units 1, 2 and 3 and notwithstanding the provisions of Schedule 2, Part 1, Class A and B of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 (or any Order revoking and re-enacting that order with or without modification): the enlargement, improvement or other alteration of the dwellinghouses in regards to the insertion of new windows , loft conversion including rear dormers shall not be allowed without the granting of specific planning permission.

For the hereby approved dwellings unit 3 and notwithstanding the provisions of Schedule 2, Part 1, Class A and E of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 (or any Order revoking and re-enacting that order with or without modification): the enlargement, improvement or other alteration of the dwellinghouses in regards to side extensions and the provision within the curtilage of the dwellinghouses of any building or enclosure, swimming or other pool, shall not be allowed without the granting of specific planning permission.

Reason: To ensure sufficient amenity space is retained for future occupiers of the dwelling, to protect the character of the area/trees and to protect the amenity of neighbouring occupiers (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policies 50, 55, 61 and 71)

This page is intentionally left blank

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 September 2016

by Grahame Kean B.A. (Hons), PgCert CIPFA, Solicitor HCA

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 27 October 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/Q0505/W/16/3152591

1 Fitzwilliam Road, Cambridge, Cambridgeshire CB2 8BN

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Fitzwilliam Road (Cambridge) LLP against the decision of Cambridge City Council.
 - The application Ref 15/1855/FUL, dated 2 October 2015, was refused by notice dated 3 May 2016.
 - The development proposed is demolition of existing building and construction of six new dwellings and associated access and landscaping.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues in this appeal are the effect of the proposal on the:
 - a. character and appearance of the Brooklands Avenue Conservation Area (CA) and its setting;
 - b. living conditions of occupants of adjacent properties; and
 - c. health of protected trees to the front of the appeal site.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

3. 1 Fitzwilliam Road is a large 2-3 storey late 20c building erected as a hostel, now vacant. It is in a mixed use area, inside a south-east corner of the CA at the junction of Fitzwilliam Road and Clarendon Road, surrounded by garden. Properties north of Fitzwilliam Road and west of Clarendon Road, in the CA are characterised by their large gardens and space available for soft landscaping. Outside the CA, at the southeast corner, large contemporary apartment blocks have impacted on the generally tranquil setting of this part of the CA.
4. The proposal is for four, 4 bed townhouses and two apartments with a basement parking area accessed from Clarendon Road. The townhouses would have private rear gardens and the apartments would have private balconies.
5. The existing building does not enhance 3,5,7 and 9 Fitzwilliam Road immediately to the west, which are high quality late 19c three-storey houses, included among the Buildings of Local Interest (BLI) in the CA Appraisal (CAA).

They, and several similar houses further along Fitzwilliam Road that have hipped roofs, arched windows and canted bays, make a valuable contribution to the rhythm of the street scene and character of the CA.

6. On Clarendon Road, as noted in the appraisal, the scale and bulk of the existing building is more sympathetic to neighbouring properties.¹ These are mostly large, well separated two-storey detached buildings with spacious vegetated plots. Clarendon Road is wide, tree-lined and has a generally quiet character. There are glimpsed views of mature rear gardens between the current building and No 21, which in my view contribute to this character.
7. The mix of contemporary development and historic properties is a feature of the CA and its setting and the Council has accepted the principle of a contemporary design for redevelopment of the site. I also note that the CAA, which is a material consideration cites the large office buildings on the east of Clarendon Road, and the tall blocks of flats south of Fitzwilliam Road, as conflicting in terms of materials, scale and general building form, with the more modestly-sized houses in the CA.²
8. The appeal site is therefore important in defining the appropriate relationship among the styles of development that contribute to the CA and its setting. Inspiration is said not to be drawn from buildings outside the CA but clearly the contemporary design of the proposal, its overall height, form and mass, would strongly connect it to the newer apartment blocks south-east of the junction.
9. However I have concerns that the rhythm and form of the dwellings alongside the frontages of the appeal site would not be maintained by the proposal. The built up end of the proposed east elevation would be too close to 21 Clarendon Road and would jar with the lower, hipped two-storey forms of this property and its neighbours. Closure of the gap between No 21 to the extent proposed would effectively preclude views into the CA. The gap is not referred to in the CAA but its reduction would detract from the sylvan character of the area.
10. Furthermore, whereas the roof line of the existing building is consistent with its neighbours to the north, the proposed roof storey would dominate the scene to their detriment. The accommodation in the roof of No 21, as in the existing building, is on a smaller scale, more discreet and not therefore comparable.
11. The new south elevation would reflect the height of the BLI's on Fitzwilliam Street and in comparison to the original scheme, would be more sympathetic to the consistent proportions of the fenestration on these period houses. I see no reason why a contemporary design could not stand up to, yet complement rather than compete with them. However the new fourth storey within the roof would contrast significantly with the rest of the building as well as with its neighbours. Despite the set-back its essentially flat roof form with balustrading, use of glazing and metal would have an overly dominant and incongruous effect, and out of context in relation to properties on either side of the north and east elevations. It would not successfully contrast with its neighbours because it would impose its own overbearing presence.
12. Space available for soft landscaping at the rear would be lost due to the new underground car park. Trees that are planned to be removed would not be replaced. Most are of poor quality or longevity but they have a visual amenity

¹ Paragraph 4.1.1.

² Paragraph 4.1.1.

- value as well as a screen to new development. In addition T011 and T012 are to be removed solely for purposes of the development.
13. The parties dispute whether there is duty to replace two of the trees, which is not a matter before me, nor is the question whether an alternative scheme could retain the extent of proposed accommodation but with enhanced landscaping. In my view however the proposal would take insufficient advantage of the opportunity to enhance the rear garden landscaping within this central area of combined gardens, rather than cover the majority of it with hardstanding as is proposed. This adds to my concerns that the proposal would erode the character of this part of the CA.
 14. Overall I am not convinced that the proposal would define the edge of the CA such that it would preserve or enhance the prevailing quieter and more restrained environment around its perimeter. Despite the transitional effect to the larger development nearby the character of the CA would be unacceptably diluted.
 15. I conclude that the scale, bulk and design of the new building would be incongruous and an overdevelopment of the appeal site, due to its prominent and alien built form in relation to views of properties adjoining it. It would unacceptably narrow the space between 21 Clarendon Road where its overall bulk and height would give it an overbearing presence in the street scene. The form of the new roof would also detract from the appearance of the BLI's on Fitzwilliam Road. The proposal by reason of its overdevelopment would fail to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the CA contrary to the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 (LP) Policies 4/11 and 4/12. It would also conflict with LP Policies 3/4, 3/7 and 3/12 which require new development to respond to local context and draw on key characteristics of its surroundings.

Living Conditions

16. Several upper floor windows to habitable rooms would face neighbouring rear gardens at 3 Fitzwilliam Road and 21 Clarendon Road, where no direct views over them exist. Some overlooking in a new building could be expected. Most windows would be bedrooms so they would not be as extensively used as main habitable space. Nevertheless, as I saw from the rear garden of No 3, the sense of privacy enjoyed within it would be significantly compromised by the sheer number of the new openings and their position at the increased height and depth into the plot over the existing building. No 21 would be similarly adversely affected. Obscure glazing might reduce overlooking but would be undesirable in bedrooms and not overcome the sense of loss of privacy.
17. Some morning light would be lost to the rear gardens of 21 Clarendon Road and 3 Fitzwilliam Road, but from what I have seen and read would not be so severe as to justify dismissal for that reason alone. Windows in the stairwell to the side of No 3 would lose some daylight as would a glazed side door and obscurely glazed bathroom window at No 21. The loss of daylight to these non-habitable spaces would however not be unacceptably oppressive.
18. On this issue therefore I conclude that the use of and position of the rooms, and the substantial amount of glazing used on the upper floors of the new rear elevations would cause a serious loss of privacy and a sense of enclosure to occupiers of 3 Fitzwilliam Road and 21 Clarendon Road. Substantial harm would result to living conditions enjoyed within those properties, contrary to LP

Policy 3/10 which states that residential development should not have an unduly adverse impact on neighbouring properties including by loss of privacy or overbearing sense of enclosure.

Protection of trees

19. There are two mature sycamores subject to a tree preservation order (TPO) to the front of the site. Their root protection area (RPA) would be potentially affected by the proposal. Evidence from trial pits undertaken by the appellant suggests that the encroachment into the RPA of both trees of the proposed basement line is negligible. There is no reason to suggest that a suitably worded condition may not ensure that trees to be retained to the front of the site are protected by barriers, temporary ground protection and root sensitive demolition and construction methods. I am therefore satisfied from what I have read that the proposal would not have a detrimental impact on the protected trees. The proposed scheme would therefore retain and protect the TPO trees and to that extent would comply with LP Policies 4/3, 4/4 and 4/11.

Planning Balance

20. I have had regard to the statutory duty to pay special attention to whether the proposed scheme would preserve or enhance the CA.
21. There would be several public benefits to the proposal. It would be a windfall development contributing to housing provision and re-use a vacant plot for larger units for family housing, all acknowledged benefits. Further economic benefits would accrue due to the construction process and subsequent occupation. Basement parking would ease on-street parking, the location is highly sustainable, and the proposal would reflect the aims in the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) to secure low energy and low carbon homes. TPO'd trees would be adequately protected although this in itself would be a neutral factor rather than a positive benefit.
22. However the proposal would clearly conflict with LP Policy 3/10 in causing serious loss of privacy and a sense of enclosure to adjacent occupiers. The proposal would also fundamentally fail to comply with key development plan policies in that it would not preserve or maintain the character or appearance of adjacent properties in the CA, or the tranquil character of the wider street scenes in which it would be viewed. This would have a diluting and harmful effect on the CA as a whole, contrary to the development plan.
23. The CA is a designated heritage asset as defined in the Framework. Under Paragraph 132 great weight should be given to its conservation and setting. In light of my reasoning above I have concluded the proposal would harm the CA contrary to the expectations of paragraph 132. The proposal would cause harm that would be less than substantial under the Framework but still serious such that the harm would significantly and demonstrably outweigh its benefits.

Conclusion

24. For the above reasons and having regard to all other matters raised the appeal is dismissed.

Grahame Kean

INSPECTOR