



## Cambridge City Council Planning

**Date:** Wednesday, 24 March 2021

**Time:** 10.00 am

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

**Contact:** [democratic.services@cambridge.gov.uk](mailto:democratic.services@cambridge.gov.uk), tel:01223 457000

### Agenda

1 Order of Agenda

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

- **Part One**  
Major Planning Applications  
Start time: 10am
- **Part Two**  
Minor/Other Planning Applications  
Start time: 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 - 22)

## **Part 1: Major Planning Applications**

- |   |  |                   |
|---|--|-------------------|
| 5 | 20/03429/FUL 104 - 112 Hills Road Cambridge Cambridgeshire | (Pages 23 - 186)  |
| 6 | 20/04514/FUL - St Matthews Centre                          | (Pages 187 - 240) |

## **Part 2: Minor/Other Planning Applications**

- |   |                                 |                   |
|---|---------------------------------|-------------------|
| 7 | 20/01609/FUL - 25B Bishops Road | (Pages 241 - 266) |
|---|---------------------------------|-------------------|

## **Part 3: General and Enforcement Items**

- |   |   |  |
|---|---|--|
| 8 | Planning Advisory Service Review Report to follow |  |
|---|---|--|

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

**Alternates:** Bird and Herbert

## 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:

- Guidance for how to join virtual committees run via Microsoft Teams: <https://www.cambridge.gov.uk/have-your-say-at-committee-meetings>
- Website: <http://democracy.cambridge.gov.uk>
- Email: [democratic.services@cambridge.gov.uk](mailto:democratic.services@cambridge.gov.uk)
- Phone: 01223 457000

# Appendix 1 – Planning Policies and Guidance

(Updated September 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

Use	Previous Use Class	New Use Class (Sept 2020)
Shops	A1	E
Financial and Professional Services	A2	E
Café and Restaurant	A3	E
Pub/drinking establishment	A4	Sui Generis
Take-away	A5	Sui Generis
Offices, Research, Light industry	B1	E
General Industry	B2	B2
Storage and Distribution	B8	B8
Hotels, Guest Houses	C1	C1
Residential Institutions	C2	C2
Gymnasiums	D2	E

Clinics, health centres	D1	E
Cinemas, concert halls, dance halls, bingo	D2	Sui Generis

**PLANNING**

6 January 2021

10.00 am - 4.50 pm

**Present:**

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

**Officers:**

Assistant Director Delivery: Sharon Brown

Area Development Manager: Toby Williams

Principal Planner: Lewis Tomlinson

Planner: Phoebe Carter

Planner: Mary Collins

Planner: Saffron Loasby

Planner: Dean Scrivener

Legal Adviser: Keith Barber

Committee Manager: James Goddard

Meeting Producer: Gary Clift

**FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE COUNCIL****21/1/Plan Apologies**

No apologies were received.

**21/2/Plan Declarations of Interest**

<b>Name</b>	<b>Item</b>	<b>Interest</b>
Councillor Baigent	All	Personal: Member of Extinction Rebellion and the Cambridge Cycling Campaign.
Councillor Green	21/6/Plan	Personal and prejudicial: Knows the neighbour to this application.  Withdrew from discussion and did not vote.
Councillor Thornburrow	21/6/Plan	Personal: Spoke for a resident last time this item came to committee.

		Comes to Committee today with an open mind, not pre-determined.
Councillor Thornburrow	21/6/Plan 21/7/Plan 21/10/Plan	Personal: Applications in Trumpington Ward where she is a councillor. Discretion unfettered.

### **21/3/Plan Minutes**

The minutes of the meeting held on 16 October 2020 and 2 December 2020 were approved as a correct record.

### **21/4/Plan 20/03651/S73 - 6-18 King Street**

The Committee received an application for a section 73 variation of Condition 2 (Approved Drawings) of planning permission 17/1497/FUL (Erection of 64 student rooms, 7 student kitchens, 4 college offices, music practice room and seminar rooms, commercial unit (386 sqm) provision of a connection to the Todd Building and associated landscaping and cycle parking (includes demolition of later structure of 6-10 with facade retention, demolition of 12 to 16 and alterations to 18)) to enable alterations to the design and allow for internal adjustments for fire precautions, plant and renewable energy features.

The Planner updated her report by referring to updated details and the removal of condition 21 on the amendment sheet.

The Committee received a representation in objection to the application from a resident of King Street. The written statement was read by the Committee Manager:

- i. Wrote as the lessee (for the last 15) years of this project's adjoining neighbour. A business now called the Stolen Liquor Loft and Restaurant, previously under my care as d'Arry's restaurant.
- ii. Asked the determination of the application be adjourned and remains adjourned until Objector's neighbours demonstrated that they were trust worthy applicants by meeting the planning conditions previously placed upon them and disregarded to date.
- iii. The applicants were granted consent to demolish and rebuild 6 - 18 Kings Street but proceeded to demolish without fulfilling the planning conditions placed upon them.
- iv. They had not agreed noise management or mitigation measures prior to demolition commencement. Despite the demolition being broadly



complete, critical planning conditions (from perspective as a neighbour), relating to the management of the site remained unapproved.

Ms Page (Applicant's Agent) addressed the Committee in support of the application.

Members were asked if they wished to defer this item or continue to consider it at today's Committee. They **resolved (by 4 votes to 4 and on the Chair's casting vote)** to determine the item at this Committee.

Councillor Porrer proposed amendments to the Officer's recommendation to include informatives to:

- i. mitigate the noise of air source heat pumps. The intention is to make the Applicant aware of this issue now as air source heat pumps are the subject of a separate application; and
- ii. restrict the hours of music playing and amplification late into the evening. The intention is to ensure the Applicant aware that noise from the music room could disturb neighbours.

The amendments were **carried unanimously**.

In response to Councillor Thornburrow request to include reference to condition 12G, the Area Development Manager offered Committee an amendment to the Officer's recommendation:

Condition 33. Notwithstanding the approved plans, prior to any development above slab level the installation of any roof top plant or PV panels, details of their height and proposed screening, including external appearance, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The submission shall include reference to condition 12G in terms of the location of service risers and the location of the plant location. The rooftop plant and its screening shall be installed thereafter only in accordance the approved details.

Reason: To avoid harm to the special interest of the listed building and Conservation Area and in order to minimise the impact on residential amenity (Cambridge Local Plan 2018, policies 35, 61).

This offer as an amendment to the condition was **carried unanimously**.

Councillor Smart proposed an amendment to the Officer's recommendation to include an informative advising that issues with neighbours should be resolved

at an earlier stage in the process ie planning conditions should be discharged promptly.

This amendment was **carried unanimously**.

The Assistant Director proposed an amendment to the Officer's recommendation to include an informative to use appropriate methods to clean the glazing.

The Committee:

**Unanimously resolved** to grant the section 73 application 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 the amendment sheet;
- ii. the removal of condition 21;
- iii. delegated authority to officers, in consultation with the Chair, Vice Chair and Spokes, to draft and include the amended condition 33 (set out above);
- iv. informatives included on the planning permission in respect of:
  - a. air source heat pumps;
  - b. noise from the music room;
  - c. discharge of planning conditions;
  - d. cleaning of glazing.

**21/5/Plan 20/03626/LBC - 6-18 King Street**

The Committee received an application for Listed Building Consent for provision of connection to the Todd Building.

Councillor Thornburrow proposed an amendment to the Officer's recommendation that condition 3 should be amended so that details were discussed before work took place above slab/ground level.

This amendment was **carried unanimously**.

The Assistant Director proposed an amendment to the Officer's recommendation to include an informative to use appropriate methods to clean the glazing.

This amendment was **carried unanimously**.

The Committee:

**Resolved (by 7 votes to 0)** to grant the application for Listed Building Consent 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. delegated authority to officers, in consultation with the Chair, Vice Chair and Spokes, to draft and include the amended condition 3;
- iii. an informative included on the on the Listed Building Consent to use appropriate methods of cleaning the glazing.

**21/6/Plan 20/03038/S73 - 60 Trumpington Road**

Councillor Green withdrew from the meeting for this item and did not participate in the discussion, the decision making nor did she vote.

The Committee received a Section 73 application for variation of condition 2 (approved plans) of planning application 18/1058/FUL.

The Principal Planner updated his report by stating condition 1 should refer to condition 30 not 40.

The Committee received a representation in objection to the application from a resident of North Cottages:

- i. In the course of the ongoing dispute regarding the width of the right of way, the Police have required undertakings from both the developer and me (the resident) that there will be no activity on the building site until the legal issues regarding the right of way to which neighbours are entitled have been resolved. Until that resolution has been achieved to the satisfaction of both parties any discussion of this Section 73 Notice is premature, if not irrelevant.
- ii. The original planning application was approved with a condition that the only window on the south elevation was to be of limited size, of obscured glass, as a bathroom window. It had been the concern of the owner of the house opposite the proposed development that any further windows would allow the invasion of her privacy.
- iii. The Objector caught the Developer taking photographs from his building site of that neighbour. Allowing him to use today's Section 73 variation to

add a further window or windows on that South elevation Would enable him or others to intrude even more on to her privacy, the very thing the original condition was intended to prevent. If you decide to approve further windows, I suggest that that they be of obscured glass, with no opening lights.

Councillor Porrer proposed an amendment to the Officer's recommendation that a 1.1m obscure glazing strip be used on the balcony (front of house, second floor).

This amendment was **carried (by 6 votes to 1)**.

The Committee:

**Resolved (by 5 votes to 2)** to grant the Section 73 application 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. condition 1 wording be amended as above;
- iii. delegated authority to officers, in consultation with the Chair, Vice Chair and Spokes, to draft and include an additional condition relating to a 1.1m obscure glazing strip to be used on the balcony with Chair, Vice Chair and Spokes to be consulted on details regarding the glazing.

**21/7/Plan 20/03327/FUL - Rose Cottage, Trumpington**

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for erection of one two storey dwelling with basement for additional living space.

Councillor Porrer proposed amendments to the Officer's recommendation that informatives be added regarding:

- i. adding electric vehicle charging points;
- ii. being mindful of party wall legislation when undertaking work in the basement.

The amendments were **carried unanimously**.

Councillor Thornburrow proposed amendments to the Officer's recommendation that conditions be added regarding:

- i. the removal of permitted development rights for the detached garage to ensure it was ancillary to the house and not used as accommodation;
- ii. the basement should not be used as a bedroom without a second stairway due to fire regulations.

The amendments were **carried unanimously**.

Councillor Baigent proposed an amendment to the Officer's recommendation that an informative be included discouraging the property being used as AirBnB.

This amendment was **lost by 3 votes to 2**.

The Committee:

**Resolved (by 6 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 additional conditions, with delegated authority to Officers to draft the conditions in consultation with the Chair and Spokes:
  - a. the removal of permitted development rights for the detached garage;
  - b. the basement shall not be used as a bedroom;
  - c. a construction management plan
- iii. informatives in respect of:
  - a. electric vehicle charging points;
  - b. party wall legislation.

**21/8/Plan 20/03418/FUL - 14-17 Regent Terrace**

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for demolition of existing garages and erection of a new 4 storey building containing 7 apartments (6 no. 1 bed and 1 no. 2 bed).

Dr Burgess (Applicant's Agent) addressed the Committee in support of the application.

Councillor Porrer proposed amendments to the Officer's recommendation that informatives be added regarding:

- i. residents of the proposed property would not benefit from the resident's parking scheme;
- ii. the protection of Hobson's Conduit;
- iii. post boxes should be located outside the building.

The amendments were **carried unanimously**.

Councillor Thornburrow proposed an amendment to the Officer's recommendation that the green roof should be maintained in perpetuity.

This amendment was **carried unanimously**.

The Committee:

**Resolved (by 7 votes to 0)** to grant the application for planning permission in accordance with the Officer recommendation (save for the removal of requirement of a s106 Agreement linked to the planning permission), for the reasons set out in the Officer's report, subject to:

- i. the planning conditions set out in the Officer's report and the amendment sheet;
- ii. delegated authority to officers, in consultation with the Chair, Vice Chair and Spokes, to draft and include an additional condition that the green roof shall be maintained in perpetuity;
- iii. informatives in respect of:
  - a. residents of the proposed property would not benefit from the resident's parking scheme;
  - b. the protection of Hobson's Conduit;
  - c. post boxes should be located outside the building.

**21/9/Plan 19/1408/FUL - 45 Highworth Avenue**

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for a residential redevelopment comprising three link detached dwellings to the rear and one detached dwelling on the site frontage along with car and cycle parking and associated infrastructure following demolition of existing building on the site.

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

- Resident of Hurst Park Avenue.
- Resident of Highworth Avenue.

The representations covered the following issues:

- i. Following the death of the last owner, the property was in the hands of a developer who wanted to develop a garden that overlooked neighbours.
- ii. The design was out of style with the character of the area.
- iii. Expressed concern about the:
  - a. Impact on wildlife in the area.
  - b. Impact on neighbours' amenity.
  - c. The oppressive indoor living environment for residents and unattractive outlook for neighbours.
- iv. Many neighbours had objected to the development:
  - a. Loss of privacy.
  - b. Parking concerns.
  - c. Not a covid friendly development.
- v. Asked for the developer to come back with a scheme that responded to the area, prioritised family housing and had fewer units on site.

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

- i. Supported the recommendation and the reasons for refusal.
- ii. Requested an additional reason for refusal: Highworth Avenue was a residential area not a city centre development as the Agent stated.
- iii. There was a lack of amenity space as this was a garden development and people could not play in the road as they may have done in the past.
- iv. The site could set an unsustainable precedent for demolition of houses and development of gardens in the area.
- v. Negative impact on biodiversity.
- vi. Highworth Avenue had highly individual properties that cumulatively made an arts and craft design style. The modern design style of the application failed to respond to context.

Councillor Thornburrow proposed amendments to the Officer's recommendation:

- i. reason for refusal 4 should reference additional vehicle movements;
- ii. [New reason 5] The proposal has failed to demonstrate that it would not result in a net loss of biodiversity or that through mitigation no net loss or

net gain is possible. As such, the proposal is contrary to policy 70 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2018 and NPPF 2019 guidance, paragraph 170.

The amendments were **carried unanimously**.

The Committee:

**Resolved (by 7 votes to 0)** to refuse the application for planning permission in accordance with the Officer recommendation, for the reasons set out in the Officer's report, and amendments as follows:

- i. reason for refusal number 4 should reference additional vehicle movements;
- ii. [New reason 5] The proposal has failed to demonstrate that it would not result in a net loss of biodiversity or that through mitigation no net loss or net gain is possible. As such, the proposal is contrary to policy 70 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2018 and NPPF 2019 guidance, paragraph 170.

**21/10/Plan 20/01967/FUL - 6 Chaucer Road**

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for change of use of the site to use Class D1 (Education); alterations to existing greenhouse to facilitate use as a classroom, erection of a single storey teaching/toilet block, and alterations to boundary treatment.

The Planner updated her report by referring to amended drafting for condition 7 wording on the amendment sheet.

Mr Giarlis (Architect) addressed the Committee in support of the application.

Councillor Thornburrow proposed amendments to the Officer's recommendation:

- i. to include a flat roof condition;
- ii. the 'Reason' in condition 6 should be amended as follows:

Reason: To ensure that the external appearance of the development does not detract from the character and appearance of the area **and ensure energy efficient materials are used to provide a sustainable building**.

The amendments were **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 amendment sheet;
- ii. the following additional/amended conditions, with delegated authority to Officers to draft the conditions in consultation with the Chair, Vice Chair and Spokes:
  - a. to include a flat roof condition;
  - b. reason in condition 6 should be amended to meet the resolution above.

The meeting ended at 4.50 pm

**CHAIR**

This page is intentionally left blank

# Public Document Pack

Planning	Plan/1	Wednesday, 3 March 2021
----------	--------	-------------------------

## PLANNING

3 March 2021  
10.00 - 11.40 am

### Present:

**Planning Committee Members:** Councillors Smart (Chair), Bird, Green, McQueen, Page-Croft, Porrer, Thornburrow and Tunnacliffe

### Officers:

Delivery Manager Development Management: Nigel Blazeby

Area Development Manager: Lorraine Casey

Area Development Manager: Toby Williams

Planner: Sophia Dudding

Planner: Sumaya Nakamya

Legal Adviser: Keith Barber

Committee Manager: James Goddard

Meeting Producer: Liam Martin

## FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE COUNCIL

### 21/23/Plan Apologies

Apologies were received from Councillor Baigent. Councillor Bird attended as the Alternate.

### 21/24/Plan Declarations of Interest

Name	Item	Interest
Councillor Thornburrow	21/27/Plan	Personal: Knows, and used to work with, one of the objectors to 81 Barton Road. Did not discuss application and discretion remained unfettered.

### 21/25/Plan Minutes

No minutes were presented to committee for consideration.

**21/26/Plan 20/04103/FUL - 1 Adkins Corner, Perne Road**

The Committee received an application for change of use of unit 3 from A1/A2 (retail /financial & professional use) to sui generis (hot food takeaway/restaurant) and installation of external extract duct and AC unit.

The Committee Manager read a statement on behalf of the Applicant's Agent to the Committee in support of the application.

Councillor Tunnacliffe proposed an amendment to the Officer's recommendation to amend the takeaway operating hours from 11pm to 10:30pm.

This amendment was **lost by 5 votes to 3**.

Councillor Bird proposed an amendment to the Officer's recommendation to include an informative regarding a privacy screen between the toilet door and nearest table.

This amendment was **carried unanimously**.

The Committee:

**Unanimously resolved** to grant the application for change of use 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 including the informative relating to a privacy screen between the toilet door and nearest table with delegated authority to officers to settle the text of the Informative.

**21/27/Plan 20/04188/HFUL - 81 Barton Road**

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for a roof extension to include rear and side roof dormers including a Juliet balcony and two roof lights.

The Planner updated her report by referring to the amendment sheet. Additional neighbour comments were received from No.79 Barton Road after the Officer's committee report was completed.

The Committee Manager read a statement on behalf of the Applicant's Agent to the Committee in support of the application.

Councillor Thornburrow proposed an amendment to the Officer's recommendation to include an informative that additional rainwater should not be directed towards the neighbouring roof.

This amendment was **carried unanimously**.

Councillor Thornburrow queried details shown in the plans circulated to committee. Two versions were available. The Planner asked for delegated powers to show the correct chimney details on the rear elevation.

Councillor McQueen asked for the minutes to note her concerns regarding sustainability of the site. The Chair said planning applications could be submitted at the owner's discretion.

#### The Committee:

**Resolved (by 4 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. delegated authority to officers, in consultation with the Chair, Vice Chair and Spokes, to draft and include:
  - a. an additional informative that additional rainwater should not be directed towards the neighbouring roof;
  - b. revised plans detailing the chimney correctly (approval was dependent on this).

The meeting ended at 11.40 am

**CHAIR**

This page is intentionally left blank

# Agenda Item 5

## PLANNING COMMITTEE

24th March 2021

<b>Application Number</b>	20/03429/FUL	<b>Agenda Item</b>	1M
<b>Date Received</b>	10th August 2020	<b>Officer</b>	Phil McIntosh
<b>Target Date</b>	9th November 2020		
<b>Ward</b>	Trumpington		
<b>Site</b>	104 - 112 Hills Road Cambridge Cambridgeshire		
<b>Proposal</b>	1) The demolition of Betjeman House, Broadcasting House, Ortona House, Francis House, and the rear multi-storey carpark to Francis House, together with existing refuse and cycle stores; to allow for construction of two new commercial buildings of five and seven storeys respectively, providing flexible B1(a), B1(b), A1, A2, A3 uses on the ground floor and Class B1(a) and B1(b) on the upper floors. 2) The construction of basement with mezzanine level to provide for building services, cycle parking and car parking for the proposed commercial buildings, cycle and car parking spaces for Botanic House and services for Flying Pig Public House. 3) The refurbishment of the Flying Pig Public House at 106 Hills Road, including demolition of part single/part two storey outrigger and single storey store, alterations to elevations, construction of extension to enable level access and layout pub garden. 4) Creation of new public realm and landscaping, incorporating segregated vehicular and cycle access from Hills Road, a new access to service areas and substations, and taxi drop off for both the development proposed and existing Botanic House.		
<b>Applicant</b>	C/o Agent		

SUMMARY	<p>The development accords with the Development Plan for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- The proposed development provides additional employment floorspace in a location where there is strong demand and which results in a significant benefit to jobs in Cambridgeshire</li></ul>
---------	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The design and scale of the proposed development responds positively to the surrounding built form and removes existing buildings which detract from the Conservation Area</li> <li>- The proposed development will not adversely impact upon the character and quality of the Cambridge skyline</li> <li>- The proposed development retains the Flying Pig public house as its own entity and will not adversely affect its viability</li> <li>- The proposed development would not have a significant adverse impact on the setting of the Botanic Gardens</li> <li>- The proposed development is acceptable in highways terms in the context of mitigations secured</li> <li>- The proposed development would provide BREEAM Outstanding rated office buildings which exceed Development Plan requirements</li> <li>- The proposed development will deliver an increase in biodiversity net gain (570%)</li> </ul>
RECOMMENDATION	<b>GRANT PLANNING PERMISSION</b> subject to planning conditions and completion of a Section 106 Agreement

## 2.0 SITE DESCRIPTION/AREA CONTEXT

- 2.1 The application site currently consists of 5 buildings; Betjeman House, Francis House, Ortona House, the Flying Pig public house and a multi-storey car park. There is also some car parking at ground level at the northern end of the site. Betjeman House is a 3 storey buff brick building which is set back from the road frontage bordering the western boundary. In contrast, the Flying Pig public house, Ortona House and Francis House all front Hills Road with minimal setback from the street. Francis House is a 3 storey 'U' shaped red brick office building with grey profiled metal



mansard roof. The multi-storey car park sits to the rear of Francis House and is constructed of similar materials. Adjoining Francis House to the north is Ortona House which is 4 storeys. The first and second floor consist of a yellow brick mix whilst the upper and lower ground floor are clad in stone. There is also a lead porch roof along the ground floor. The Flying Pig is a modest 2 storey Victorian pub built in circa 1840 with slate roof, blue rendered frontage and walled beer garden to the rear.

- 1.2 There are 3 vehicle access points into the application site, one along the southern boundary serving the multi-storey car park, one for the Flying Pig and one to the ground level car park which is shared by Botanic House and Betjeman House.
- 1.3 Hills Road is a primary distributor single carriageway road and is one of the major radial routes into Cambridge. The carriageway includes a mandatory (northbound) and advisory (southbound) cycle lane in each direction. The junction with Station Road and Hills Road is in close proximity to the north-east of the application site.
- 1.4 The character of the area is mixed in terms of land use and built form. The scale of buildings in the immediate context of the application site ranges from 2 to 7 storeys. The terraces opposite are of a finer urban grain and domestic scale however, this quickly transitions to the coarser grain of a larger scale such as Kett House and Botanic House which is directly adjacent to the application site. The area east of the application site contains the more recent development known as CB1. Areas to the north are predominantly traditional residential terrace housing, save for the development along Hills Road which varies in character. The open space of the Botanic Garden adjacent to the application site spreads to the west as far as Trumpington Road and south of the application site where it abuts Hills Road. Beyond the Botanic Gardens to the south is predominantly a pocket of residential development, although this is interspersed with some commercial offices towards Hills Road.
- 1.5 The application site lies within the New Town and Glisson Road Conservation Area and adjacent to the Cambridge University Botanic Gardens which is a Grade II\* registered park and garden.
- 1.6 The application site is located approximately 500m walk from Cambridge railway station and guided busway and is 1km walk

from the city centre. The application site is well connected with cycle paths and footways and there are also bus stops within 50m of it northbound and southbound along Hills Road, as well as Station Road. It is therefore a sustainable location.

- 1.7 The application site is situated within a Controlled Parking Zone and there are other residents parking schemes surrounding it. The closest on street parking available (pay and display) is in Shaftesbury Road which is approximately 500m walking distance south-west of the site.

## 2.0 THE PROPOSAL

- 2.1 The proposed development includes the complete demolition of Betjeman House, Ortona House, Francis House and the multi-storey car park. In place of these structures, two new commercial buildings (5 storeys and 7 storeys respectively) are proposed with mixed uses at ground floor and office space on the upper floors. The buildings are proposed to meet BREEAM Outstanding accreditation, certified WELL Platinum capable (health and wellbeing) and WIRED Platinum certified (digital connectivity).
- 2.2 The office accommodation is proposed to provide floorspace which can be occupied flexibly from start-ups through to established companies. The floorspace breakdown is provided in table 1 below. The Net Internal Area consists of 1,566m<sup>2</sup> of proposed food and beverage space and 26,674m<sup>2</sup> of office space. Flexible use is sought for A1, A2, A3 and B1(a) and B1(b) use on the ground floor and B1(a) and B1(b) on the upper floors. The application is required to be determined on the basis of the former use classes as these were in place at the time the application was submitted.

Table 1: Floorspace

Building	Proposed GIA (m <sup>2</sup> )	Proposed NIA (m <sup>2</sup> )
Building B	21,024	15,342
Building C	17,250	12,820
Basement	15,538	78
<b>Total</b>	<b>53,812</b>	<b>28,240</b>

- 2.3 The ground floor proposes to include space for co-working and food and beverage use, although flexibility is sought regarding the mix of uses. The office floorspace will allow for flexible tenancies ranging from start-up/micro businesses through to

larger established companies. The buildings also include outdoor terraces and a roof garden which can be used for a range of activities from outdoor workspaces through to exercising. The proposals also include a basement over 2 levels to provide car parking (200 spaces, including 58 spaces with electric vehicle charging points), cycle parking (1,374 spaces), scooters (82 spaces), motorcycles (9 spaces) and associated services and facilities. A further 56 visitor cycle parking spaces are provided at street level. A network of open space is provided at ground level, some of which forms part of the public realm and other private spaces for occupants of the buildings. The Flying Pig public house will be retained other than a section to the rear which will be demolished and replaced with a part single/part two storey rear extension and basement. The existing pub garden will also be replaced and positioned to the south of the public house.

- 2.4 Segregated access to the basement for cars and cyclists will be at the southern end of the application site where the existing multi-storey car park access is positioned. Servicing will take place from the centre of the application site in the form of a new access to a mews between the 2 commercial buildings across a public square. The existing accesses to the rear of Botanic House and adjacent to the Flying Pig are proposed to be removed.
- 2.5 In terms of highways improvements, it is proposed to relocate the southbound bus stop approximately 40m north of its existing location. This will facilitate the provision of a new Toucan crossing on Hills Road, providing a safe crossing point for pedestrians and cyclists directly to the application site. The western footway will be expanded to further accommodate pedestrian and cyclist access to the application site. The existing southbound cycle lane will be upgraded from advisory to mandatory.
- 2.6 The application is accompanied by the following supporting information:

Location Plan	Archaeological Impact Assessment
Site Plan	Sustainability Statement
Floor Plans	Design and Access Statement
Elevations	Construction Management Plan
Sections	Drainage Strategy
Environmental Statement	Flood Risk Assessment
Planning Statement	Economic Benefits Statement
Transport Statement	Heritage Statement

## Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA)

- 2.7 The proposed development has been assessed as falling within the remit of the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) (EIA) Regulations 2017 (as amended) (the EIA Regulations). This is because of the characteristics, location and potential impacts of the proposed development. The EIA process ensures that any potentially significant effects of the development are considered and, where appropriate, mitigated by measures to prevent/avoid, reduce and where possible offset. The Government's Planning Policy Guidance highlights that the Environmental Statement (ES) should focus on the 'main' or 'significant' environmental effects only, and that the ES should be proportionate.
- 2.8 The National Planning Practice Guidance notes; *the aim of EIA is to protect the environment by ensuring that a local planning authority when deciding whether to grant planning permission for a project, which is likely to have significant effects on the environment, does so in the full knowledge of the likely significant effects, and takes this into account in the decision making process.*
- 2.9 An EIA is undertaken to inform planning application decisions for particular projects, based on the requirements set out in the EIA Regulations. The ES reports the findings of an independent assessment of environmental effects, which presents the environmental effects objectively from any planning argument for the proposed development. The test of consent for a planning application is whether the proposals are an acceptable use of the land, in terms of and measured against relevant planning policies – at national and local levels.

## Scope

- 2.10 The applicant voluntarily entered the EIA process however, the proposal was subject to a scoping opinion prior to submission in accordance with the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017 (ref.: 19/1722/SCOP).

The Council was supportive of the scope of the EIA covering the matters of Transport, Ecology and Nature Conservation, Economy and Employment, Climate Change, Microclimate (Wind), Townscape and Visual Amenity and Heritage; and was of the opinion that the matter of arboriculture should also be included in the EIA. The applicant confirms (and officers are satisfied) that the submitted ES is based on the advice set out in the EIA Scoping Opinion and the EIA Regulations.

## Methodology

- 2.11 The ES considers the likely significant effects of the proposed development during its construction and once it is complete and operational. An ES Addendum was subsequently submitted in response to the Council's request for further information. Having assessed the submitted application, officers are satisfied that the ES and other additional information provided complies with the 2017 EIA Regulations and that sufficient environmental information has been provided to assess the environmental impacts of the proposed development.
- 2.12 Regulation 26 of the EIA Regulations states that when determining an application in relation to which an ES has been submitted, the relevant planning authority, the Secretary of State or an inspector, as the case may be, must—
- a) examine the environmental information;
  - b) reach a reasoned conclusion on the significant effects of the proposed development on the environment, taking into account the examination referred to in sub-paragraph (a) and, where appropriate, their own supplementary examination;
  - c) integrate that conclusion into the decision as to whether planning permission or subsequent consent is to be granted; and
  - d) if planning permission or subsequent consent is to be granted, consider whether it is appropriate to impose monitoring measures. This requirement is dealt with throughout the report.

## 3.0 PLANNING HISTORY

- 3.1 05/0847/FUL - Redevelopment to provide mixed use scheme comprising 188 residential units; B1 office use; retail/food and drink (Classes A1; A3 and A4 uses), together with associated basement car parking and servicing; and two new public open

spaces with associated hard and soft landscaping; including re-location of the war memorial. Refused and appeal withdrawn.

- 3.2 06/0552/FUL - Redevelopment to provide mixed use scheme comprising 156 residential units (including 40% affordable housing); B1 office use; retail / food and drink (Classes A1; A3 and A4 uses, including retention of 'Flying Pig' Public House), and new community use, together with associated basement car parking and servicing; amenity space (external and internal) with associated hard and soft landscaping; including re-location of the war memorial and provision of public art respectively. Granted August 2007.
- 3.3 08/1058/S73 - Variation of conditions 2, 5, 6, 7, 10, 11, 12, 14, 16, 17, 18, 20, 21, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 34 and 37 for planning permission 06/0552/FUL to allow the office element of the approved scheme to be constructed as the first phase of the development. Granted October 2008.
- 3.4 09/1177/EXP - Extension of time for implementation of 06/0552/FUL - redevelopment to provide mixed use scheme only. Granted June 2010.
- 3.5 19/1722/SCOP – Scoping Opinion for EIA development. Issued February 2020.

#### **4.0 PUBLICITY**

- 4.1 Advertisement: Yes  
Adjoining Owners/Occupiers: Yes  
Site Notices Displayed: Yes
- 4.2 Prior to the submission of the application, the applicant held a series of exhibitions and workshops to seek public/stakeholder views on the proposed development.
- 4.3 The proposals have also been discussed with officers as part of comprehensive pre-application work, as well as presentations to the Design and Conservation Panel and Disability Panel.

## **5.0 PLANNING POLICY, GUIDANCE AND OTHER MATERIAL CONSIDERATIONS**

### **EIA Directives and Regulations – EIA Regulations**

- 5.1 European Union legislation with regard to environmental assessment and the planning regime remains unchanged despite the UK leaving the European Union on 31 January 2020. The Government passed secondary legislation in October 2018 to ensure the continued operation of the EIA regime.

### **The Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017**

- 5.2 Consideration has been given to the application of the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 ('the Habitats Regulations'). Regulation 63 of the Habitats Regulations requires that the decision making authority before deciding to...give permission...for a plan or project which is likely to have a significant effect on a European site and is not directly connected with or necessary to the management of that site, must make an '*appropriate assessment*' of the implications of the plan or project for that site in view of the site's conservation objectives.
- 5.3 The application site is not in the vicinity of any designated (European) sites of nature conservation importance and is not within such a designation. The Council is satisfied that the application is unlikely to have a significant effect on a European designated site, either on its own or in combination with other projects and would not result in likely significant effects on European designated sites.

### **Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 (as amended)**

- 5.4 Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires that applications are determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. The development plan for the LPA is the Cambridge Local Plan 2018.

## **Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010 (as amended)**

- 5.5 The Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010 (as amended) (the CIL Regulations) generally set out regulations relating to the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL). Part 11 refers specifically to planning obligations and is relevant to the consideration of this application and will influence the final content of Section 106 Agreement, in the event that planning permission is granted.
- 5.6 CIL Regulation 122 imposes limitations on the use of planning obligations. It states (where there is no CIL charging regime), a planning obligation may only constitute a reason for granting planning permission for the development if the obligation is:
- (a) necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms;
  - (b) directly related to the development, and
  - (c) fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development.

## **Equalities Act 2010**

- 5.7 The application has been assessed against the relevant sections of the Equalities Act 2010. It is not considered that the application discriminates against people with protected characteristics (age, gender reassignment, being married or in a civil partnership, being pregnant or on maternity leave, disability, race including colour, nationality, ethnic or national origin, religion or belief, sex, sexual orientation) specified in this Act.

## **Use Classes Order Change**

- 5.8 From 1st September 2020 the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) (Amendment) (England) Regulations 2020 (2020 No. 757) came into force.
- 5.9 Three new use classes have been created by this change: Class E (Commercial, business and service), Class F.1 (Learning and non-residential institutions) and F.2 (Local community).
- 5.10 Class E creates a new commercial, business and service use class which subsumes retail (A1), financial and professional



services (A2), restaurants and cafes (A3) and business (B1a/b/c) use classes. Uses such as gyms, nurseries/creches and health centres (previously in use classes D1 Non-residential institutions and D2 Assembly and leisure) and other uses which are suitable for a town centre area are also included in Class E. Since 1st September 2020 planning permission is not required for changes between these, what were until recently, different kinds of uses. This is because they are now grouped into the same use class and therefore will not constitute development.

- 5.11 For example, a retail shop can change to a restaurant, or an office building could change to a retail supermarket without needing planning permission for a change of use (providing there are no conditions, section 106 obligations restricting the existing use).
- 5.12 Uses which can have potential amenity impacts on neighbouring properties will become sui generis and any material change of use will require planning permission. This includes pubs/bars, takeaways, cinemas, concert, dance, and bingo halls.
- 5.13 For any planning applications submitted before 1 September 2020, the Use Classes in effect when the application was submitted are to be used to determine the application.

### **Relevant Development Plan policies**

PLAN		POLICY NUMBER
Cambridge Plan 2018	Local	1, 2, 14, 21, 25, 28, 29, 31-37, 40, 42, 55-62, 67, 71, 76, 80-82 and 85

### **Relevant Central Government Guidance, Supplementary Planning Documents and Material Considerations**

Central Government Guidance	National Planning Policy Framework February 2019  National Planning Practice Guidance  Circular 11/95 (Annex A)
-----------------------------------	--

Supplementary Planning Guidance	<p>Greater Cambridge Sustainable Design and Construction (Jan 2020)</p> <p>Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Waste Partnership (RECAP): Waste Management Design Guide (February 2012)</p> <p>Planning Obligation Strategy (March 2010)</p> <p>Cambridge Flood and Water (2018)</p> <p>Public Art (2010)</p>
---------------------------------	---

## 6.0 CONSULTATIONS

### **Cambridgeshire County Council (Highways Development Management)**

- 6.1 The Highways Officer supports the principle of the proposed highways. Conditions are recommended regarding highways works to be carried out in accordance with the details provided and a traffic management plan.

### **Cambridgeshire County Council (Transport Assessment Team)**

- 6.2 The County Officer issued a holding objection as they sought more information prior to issuing a full consultation response.
- 6.3 Additional information was provided and the objection has been removed subject to the imposition of a Travel Plan condition, highways works as agreed and a financial payment of £500,000 to be secured by a S106 legal agreement for improvements to the Station Road/Hills Road junction.

### **Urban Design Officer**

- 6.4 There has been a positive response to the urban design comments made during the pre-application process, which has resulted in substantial reductions to the scale and massing; the retention, refurbishment and integration of the Flying Pig public house; and changes to the materials and detailed design of the buildings. In urban design terms, the scheme has been well considered and it is an improvement on the extant consented

scheme. There are a few points of clarification, some of these could be addressed through a condition and others require additional information to be submitted.

- 6.5 Amendments were sought regarding provision of a raised table across the vehicle entrance, clarification of servicing for Botanic House and provision of shadow studies. An amended plan showing a raised table has been provided. The officer was reconsulted and has confirmed that the scheme is acceptable in urban design terms, subject to conditions in relation to materials and roof top plant.

### **Conservation Officer**

- 6.6 The main impacts are on the Botanic Garden, on the appearance of the Conservation Area, and on the integrity of the Flying Pig. Clearly the proposed buildings will have a marked scale and setting impacts. The level of harm to the significance of the New Town and Glisson Road Conservation Area and the Botanic Garden would be at a moderate level of less than substantial harm. Comparison to the consented scheme (albeit that was not of the same site boundary) means a considerably reduced degree of harm to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area than if that scheme was fully implemented.
- 6.7 With regard to the Flying Pig, the officer considers it is a significant improvement on the extant consented scheme, that the Flying Pig is now to be retained. However, does not see the retention of it as a mitigation factor however, but more as an appropriate response given the extension of the conservation area since the earlier planning permission granted in 2007.
- 6.8 The proposed removal of the rear outrigger of the building, the small stores and the right boundary wall (the right hand rear boundary wall is of brick and flint which could be salvaged and reused in the new boundary) would harm the integrity of the nineteenth century building as an entity. It is appreciated though that the reconfiguration proposed seeks to integrate the building and importantly, its current use within the overall development.
- 6.9 Part of the proposed basement would underlie the Flying Pig. For the scheme to be approved, a condition should require that no demolition of elements of the Flying Pig occurs until the proposed basement is in place and the parts of the Flying Pig to be retained have been structurally secured.

- 6.10 The statutory registered garden is of national significance (described in the Historic England response to this application). The setting of the Garden will be impacted by the two substantial blocks being clearly visible all year round in views from within the eastern part of the Botanic Garden. There is an existing presence of buildings on the boundaries of that end of the Garden although the proposed scheme will increase that presence. From the west, the proposed buildings would appear in the backdrop to Cory Lodge, i.e. part of the latter's setting will be affected. Rather than to set this out in more detail, in summary, the Historic England assessment of the impact of the proposals on the Garden and on Cory Lodge is agreed.
- 6.11 This current scheme would still have a strong impact on the streetscene along Hills Road, with difficult comparisons to the almshouses at the junction of Hills Road and Brooklands Avenue, and to the BLI terraced buildings opposite. The latter is a sharp contrast though there is a distance involved rather than a side by side contrast and this relationship is not as sensitive as the views up and down the west side of Hills Road. Though this amounts to harm, the differences in height of the proposed Buildings B and C help with the transition towards the Lens Building and their differing elevational treatment and materials palette add definition.
- 6.12 Conditions are recommended regarding materials and structural support for the Flying Pig.

### **Historic England**

- 6.13 The site has an extant planning consent dating from 2008 for redevelopment to provide a mixed use scheme comprising 156 residential units, office use, retail/food and drink, façade retention of the Flying Pig Public House, relocation of the Grade II listed war memorial and new community use. The first phase of that scheme, the seven-storey lens shaped building Botanic House, was completed in 2012. Historic England recommended that planning permission should be not granted for the application due to the detrimental impact the scale of development then proposed would have had on the historic environment.
- 6.14 Historic England were involved in detailed discussions with applicants Pace Investments and their Design Team at pre-

application stage commencing December 2019 regarding alternative proposals to provide office accommodation on the site. The scheme has evolved significantly during the past few months. The changes to the scale, massing, materials and detailed design that have been incorporated have resulted in a high quality sustainable development comprising two curvilinear blocks.

- 6.15 Consider the proposed commercial use more contextually appropriate in this sensitive location than the extant residential scheme. The overall scale - one block at six storeys and one at four storeys in height, plus setback at roof level - remains taller than much of the surrounding streetscape in this important location. However, Historic England are satisfied that the scheme in its current form would be more complementary to the adjacent Botanic Garden and to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area than the extant consented scheme.
- 6.16 Consider the proposals would cause a moderate level of harm to the significance of both the Cambridge Botanic Garden and the New Town and Glisson Road Conservation Area and that the harm would be less than substantial. On balance, in light of the extant consent, Historic England have no objections on heritage grounds to the proposals for commercial development in their current form.

### **Landscape Officer**

- 6.17 The proposed development has been through an extensive pre-application process and taken multiple iterative design adjustments as a result of collaborative feedback. The landscape team has had extensive discussions regarding the content and viewpoint selections for the LVIA/TVIA and consider that the quality of the LVIA to be high and the conclusions fair and correct.
- 6.18 The conclusions of the LVIA identify that the bulk of adverse graded effects of the development are upon the Botanic Garden. Consideration of these effects have to take into account not only previous iterations which would have been significantly more harmful, due to the mass, height and scale of previous versions but also the potential impacts of the extant permissions. In this light, it is considered that the impacts of the architecturally interesting and attractive buildings are an acceptable imposition. Whilst the scheme cannot be 'hidden' by vegetation, the verified

views and other visualisations show that the buildings, in part, will be screened in many places by trees and vegetation in the summer months and their materiality does not present stark differences but is warm in tone.

- 6.19 The scheme presented within the application is a substantially reduced scheme in both height and mass that that first presented in early pre-application meetings and this has been in direct response to officer feedback about the potential for impacts a very large building could have on views both from the Botanic Garden but also those around the site, near and far. The reductions in height, and set backs of upper stories in particular has created a building that is now subservient, when viewed from distant views to those around it, but not so subservient when viewed from nearby as to affect its own presence on the street. It is considered that the buildings have struck the right balance between harm and positive contribution to the street and the City which the Landscape Team find acceptable.
- 6.20 The Council's Landscape Officer also sought clarification on some elements of the scheme, particularly in relation to tree pits and the impact of the basement. The applicant has provided updated information to address these concerns.
- 6.21 The Landscape Team was reconsulted and has raised no objections, with conditions recommended in the event of permission being granted to secure details of hard and soft landscaping including a management plan, tree pits, green roofs and boundary treatments.

### **Tree Officer**

- 6.22 Notes there are no trees of value on the site and that any new planting is positive. Officer raised concerns regarding space within tree pits for street trees due to proximity of the basement. Also concerned about the proximity of the buildings to trees in the Botanic Gardens and that works are required to allow construction activity, although acknowledges encroachment into the root protection areas is minor. Considers the verdant boundary will be detrimentally impacted by the required works.

## **Drainage Officer**

- 6.23 Concerns regarding ground water displacement and water proofing of the basement. The applicant provided an additional technical note which addressed the officer's concerns. It has recently been confirmed that pumping of the attenuation tanks is required due to their location in the lower basement. Modelling of a pump failure has therefore been requested.

## **Lead Local Flood Authority**

- 6.24 See Drainage officer comments above.

## **Sustainability Officer**

- 6.25 The approach being taken to integrate sustainability aspirations into the design of the two new office buildings is supported. Driven by the clients aims to achieve BREEAM 'outstanding' the design team have taken considerable steps to ensure that the façade design of the proposals respond to environmental design considerations, notably the role of the enhanced floor to ceiling height in enabling daylighting to penetrate the building and to allow for stratification of air. The approach to solar load and orientation, with horizontal projections to the south and a transition to vertical projections to the east and west to minimise internal solar gain in the summer and shoulder months is also welcomed.
- 6.26 The scheme is targeting a range of sustainable construction standards, most notably BREEAM 'outstanding', which exceeds the requirements of the Local Plan. The WELL Standard, which focuses on health and wellbeing, is being targeted with a WELL Platinum enabled building. In terms of provision of smart buildings and digital connectivity, the building intends to achieve a WiredScore Platinum rating. With regard to BREEAM, the submitted pre-assessment shows a baseline score of 91.87% against a threshold of 85%, giving the site a buffer to achieve outstanding. This approach is supported, and condition wording is recommended to ensure submission of BREEAM certification.
- 6.27 With regard to water use, the proposals utilise both rainwater harvesting and greywater reuse to achieve the requirements of policy 28 of the Local Plan to achieve maximum BREEAM credits related to water use. This equates to a 55% reduction in water

use compared to an average office. Both the Lower Basement Plan and the Mezzanine Basement Plan show the location of the rainwater and greywater tanks. This approach is welcomed.

- 6.28 Turning to carbon reduction, the proposals take a fossil fuel free approach, following the energy hierarchy to reduce emissions by 43.3% using current SAP, and rising to 53.5% using the new SAP 10 approach, which includes more accurate carbon intensity figures. Passive design measures are the first approach, with the use of the cooling hierarchy reducing cooling demand by 29%. This is followed by energy efficiency measures and then the use of renewable technologies, with air source heat pumps providing for both heating and cooling and hot water, and the use of photovoltaic panels, with a 450m<sup>2</sup> array on Building B and a 480m<sup>2</sup> array on Building C. In terms of BREEAM credits, this approach achieves 6 credits under Ene01. This approach, which is an integral element of achieving BREEAM outstanding is supported. Consideration is also given to lifecycle emissions, with 30 year lifecycle operational carbon emissions 75% less than an average office.
- 6.29 Proposals to reduce the amount of parking of conventionally fuelled vehicles over time are also welcomed, as is the adaptability built in to allow for parking spaces to be converted to other uses over time as private car use reduces. As well as replacing spaces with those reserved for electric vehicles, I would welcome monitoring of the usage of car parking spaces to determine whether the number of spaces could be reduced gradually over time. Supported by cycle parking and the provision of an e-bike hire scheme, this approach is welcomed.

### **Cambridge Past Present and Future**

- 6.30 After careful consideration of the pros and cons of this development, consider that it is a significant improvement on the 2007 permission and likely to be the best scheme proposed for this site. We hope that the Planning Committee will approve subject to very specific conditions that require the important aspects of the design to be implemented and not compromised. When a building does not live up to expectations it is sometimes because the proposals that received planning permission were not adequately covered by the conditions on which the approval was granted. If it lives up to its potential this development could,



as Pace claim, set a new higher standard for office developments and encourage others to follow.

### **Waste Services**

- 6.31 The Council's Commercial Waste Manager has been consulted raising advisory comments in relation to waste management across the site.

### **Wind Consultant**

- 6.32 Initial consultation; noted the general methodology is reasonable for a development of this size but requested clarification on some information and assessment of additional locations offsite.

Comments on ES Addendum; Clarification still sought on data within the assessment but considered wind conditions on site are likely to remain generally suitable for the intended pedestrian activities with the proposed mitigation which consists of soft landscaping. Windiness within Botanic Gardens would remain suitable for pedestrian activities. Increased windiness levels around southern and western perimeter may have some impact on adjacent trees.

Further Comments; Outstanding information on data within the assessment clarified and satisfied landscape mitigation required has been presented in the landscape scheme. Comment regarding possible wind impact on adjacent trees falls outside scope of the EIA.

### **Environmental Health Officer**

- 6.33 The Council's Environmental Health Officer has been consulted on the proposal. No objections have been raised subject to the imposition of conditions in relation to the following matters;

- Material Management Plan to be agreed
- Demolition and Construction Environmental Management Plan (DCEMP) to be agreed
- Plant/Machinery Equipment to be agreed
- Flying Pig - Noise Assessment/Insulation for external noise pollution in relation to new habitable rooms
- Residential use above public house only occupied by person/s who are the landlords

- Delivery/collection hours restriction
- Hours of use restriction of external seating area of pub
- Amplified music restriction in external seating area
- Odour filtration/extraction equipment to be agreed
- Artificial lighting scheme to be agreed
- Unexpected contamination
- Completion report for Material Management Plan
- EV Charging point provision
- EV Charging points to increase by 10% per year

### **Environment Agency**

6.34 No objections.

### **Natural England**

6.35 No objection

### **Developer Contributions Monitoring Officer**

6.36 No planning obligations required from this type of development

### **Ecology Officer**

6.37 No objection raised subject to conditions regarding a construction management plan covering noise, lighting and dust emissions from demolition and construction activity and a landscape management plan including bird and bat boxes.

### **Access Officer**

6.38 Made a number of observations that could improve accessibility. These include;

- Blue badge parking to be as near to lift core as possible (parking layout amended)
- External and reception seating needs to be of varying heights and with and without arms
- Reception needs hearing loop, dropped section of counter
- Good colour contrast of décor and signage
- Manifestations on glazing and shading to prevent glare
- Firefighting lifts to serve all floors in all buildings (included within floor plans)

- A changing places toilet needed in main buildings (ground floor layout amended to include within Building B)
- Other accessible toilets should vary in lefthand, righthand and central positioning (floor plans amended)
- Accessible shower needs changing bench
- Access to Flying Pig must be regular use door
- Gates to Flying Pig must have clear opening leaf of 900mm

### **Public Art Officer**

6.39 The Officer has been in discussions with the applicant regarding their draft public art strategy but has not yet agreed to the proposals.

### **County Archaeologist**

6.40 No objections subject to condition for written scheme of investigation

### **Camcycle**

6.41 The applicant appears to have addressed issues of access via ramps in a satisfactory matter. Recognise Cambridge Local Plan allows two-tier cycle parking if at least 20% Sheffield stands are provided. Two tier cycle parking should have gas-lifting strut assistance and locking loops welded to the stand.

### **Fire and Rescue**

6.42 Raised no objection raised subject to fire hydrants being secured. After further consultation has confirmed that based on position of the existing hydrant (Hills Road carriageway outside Flying Pig) and the location of the dry risers for each building, it meets requirements (within 90m) however, if the dry risers were to move then it would need to be reviewed.

### **Anglian Water**

6.43 No objection raised subject to condition regarding no hard standing to be constructed until surface water strategy has been implemented.

## **Cadent**

6.44 No objection

## **Marshall Airport**

6.45 No objection subject to conditions regarding a bird hazard management plan, removal of PD rights for cranes and construction equipment, obstacle lighting during the construction period, control of lighting on the proposed development and assessment of glare from PV cells.

## **MOD**

6.46 No objection subject to condition regarding a bird hazard management plan, and details of cranes/lighting through a construction management strategy.

## **Designing Out Crime Officer**

6.47 While security measures have obviously been considered this location does suffer from reports of cycle theft and antisocial behaviour including rough sleeping, begging and drug offences. This office would like to consult with the applicant to discuss Secured by Design Commercial accreditation, which could be achieved. No objection.

## **The Gardens Trust**

6.48 No comments received

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

## **7.0 REPRESENTATIONS**

- 7.1 Cllr McGerty has raised concerns regarding the viability of the Flying Pig and Cllr Robertson has raised concerns that housing is no longer proposed and is to be replaced with offices.
- 7.2 A Development Control Forum was held on 11 November 2020. Minutes of the meeting are provided at Appendix 1.
- 7.3 A list of addresses from within and outside Cambridge containing representations objecting (183), supporting (4) or a neutral position (1) are provided in Appendix 2
- 7.4 There is also an online petition created by Change.org in 2012. This was to request that if an application for Conservation Area Consent is to be submitted to demolish The Flying Pig public house that it be refused. At the time this was received there were 9 signatures which had been received after the application was submitted. There is also a Facebook page title "Save the Flying Pig".
- 7.5 The following objections have been raised;

### **Principle**

- There is no masterplan for the Betjeman House site which is required by Local Plan policy.
- Concerns whether the extant planning permission (06/0552/FUL) can continue to be implemented
- Demolishing and rebuild, rather than adapting and refurbishing existing office buildings, is not sustainable practice
- Demolition of Ortona House not appropriate and should be retained. This is all that is remaining of the old bus depot.

### **Scale, massing, design and townscape**

- Amoeba shape is inefficient use of space. Stated curved structure is more expensive to build therefore, should use cheaper design to mitigate problem of bulk and overdevelopment.
- Office blocks out of character and visually dominant/overbearing due to scale, height and massing and do not respond positively to the context, including the retained pub and surrounding area.

- Overdevelopment of the site. Botanic House is fairly slim line but the new blocks are the same height but have massive elevations. The design (curved) is doubtful in architectural merit, lacks context (particularly with the pub) and is visually bland. Proposed public space is miserly and inhospitable
- Overhanging design will encourage anti-social behaviour and rough sleeping
- The design, appearance and materials used in this concept will cause harm to the area, it is not appropriate to have such an unwelcome sight next to our war memorial.
- The proposal misses an opportunity to enhance the area between the station and the Botanic Garden that is already blighted by anonymous boring recent buildings.
- Development should be no more than 4 stories in height.
- Appropriate materials such as natural stone, wood, bricks and glass should be used.
- Proposed materials do not appear to have been properly considered environmentally sound sourcing (eg: timber).
- Brownfield development is appropriate but the proposed office buildings should be pushed back a few metres so the pub can be kept intact.
- Lack of separation between the pub and commercial buildings.
- The plan ignores, disregards and reduces the value and quality of the residential identities of the immediately surrounding environment, which have already suffered from other corporate ventures contiguous to the Flying Pig.

#### Amenity

- Loss of amenity (overshadowing and dominance) to the Botanic Gardens due to size of office blocks. Should be kept below the tree line.
- Concerned about impact upon the health of the Winter Garden. As the Botanic Garden is a scientific resource containing many rare plants the number of storeys is worrying.
- Overshadowing of pub, pub garden and Hills Road streetscene, including properties opposite.
- Omission of housing (extant planning permission) which is not in accordance with the development plan particularly as there is a pressing need for good quality affordable housing.

## Land Use

- The biggest challenge for future development is housing provision. The site should be reserved for housing of the kind that Cambridge needs, including affordable homes and accommodation for older residents.
- Would prefer to see more affordable housing or community growing space
- Residential to commercial change is suspicious following the 2015 GPDO amendment (conversion of offices to residential using prior approval), especially considering continued changes to work habits due to Covid.
- No need for more offices. Pandemic has shown that city centre locations for office work will become increasingly less necessary as people can work from home. The developer's own economic benefit study makes clear that the impact of Covid-19 means that it isn't possible to forecast future demand.
- Green space for residents to exercise is extremely limited
- Proposal should be to demolish existing offices, provision of more green space/trees and the Flying Pig retained with a larger garden.
- Proposed office buildings would not be easily adapted to sustainable living spaces in the future as there is too little access to natural light and fresh air in the building's core

## Impact upon Flying Pig

- In conflict with policy 76 of the Local Plan
- The Flying Pig is part of the local community and important for people's quality of life being a hub for local people (artists, workers, students) and tourists. It does a great deal to promote and support the arts and music, which is currently in crisis and should be retained as it is to preserve part of Cambridge's history. The changes proposed including partial demolition and shifting services to the basement, reduction in floorspace and size of the beer garden, will result in the loss of capacity (covers) and make the pub unviable. The landlord accommodation must not be reduced, a real ale pub requires a cellar with easy access and outdoor space for barrel storage, the garden requires a high wall for security and maintenance of good order and a secure defensible space for customers. Any development will inevitably involve the closure of the Flying Pig and deprive a family of their livelihood and home.

- Insufficient storage space for operation and living for landlords. No proper storage at ground level.
- Loss of the garden space for this venue will mean that social distancing cannot take place effectively.
- Use of space for pub patrons between the buildings would help particularly in good weather and developer should allow current landlords to return after closure.
- No reference to existing tables and chairs being retained
- One parking space allocated to the Flying Pig, nothing for musicians/tradesman.
- Disabled access to Flying Pig toilets appear to be downstairs
- Toilets in the basement presents a security and health and safety issue
- Position of the pub garden will increase noise and disturbance for hotel and residents opposite and would restrict outside performances due to noise and also impact upon audience due to traffic noise. Pub garden will be noisier, more polluted and permanently overshadowed reducing its attractiveness.
- What is to happen to the landlords, customers and staff during construction period? It is understood this could take 2 years or more. Closing the pub would put enormous pressure on the Pig as a business to the point where it may not survive.
- The venue has a reputation for developing new talent in the local area as part of a grassroots music venue circuit. However, concerned that the lease is not secure for the existing tenants.
- Build programme of 4 years will mean the pub is unlikely to survive which was stated by developer representative.
- Imposes a material impact upon the footprint of the Flying Pig, changing its flow which is considered to result in an unviable performance space.
- Flying Pig is an old building which may require reinforcing of existing structure. This should not impact upon space required to keep business viable.

#### Heritage/Historic Environment

- Proposal does not enhance Cambridge's historic environment
- Request that archaeology be taken into consideration



## Transport and Highways

- Additional traffic congestion on surrounding roads including congestion at nearest junctions. Detrimental to journey times and safe movement for pedestrians and cyclists.
- Suspect increase in number of cyclists will result in an increase in accidents
- Inadequate public transport infrastructure to accommodate additional persons travelling to the site
- Would expect them to make some significant contribution to improve the nearby junction, but can't see any commitment to that.
- Cycle parking provision should be at grade and double stack parking is inconvenient for many users
- On site parking levels is completely inappropriate for this site given its location near the station, cycle and bus routes. Should be car free or only be provided for disabled spaces and car sharing.
- No thought has been given as to how proposed offices will get their workers to and from the site

## Microclimate

- The building of Botanic House has created a dangerous wind tunnel effect which impacts upon cycling and pedestrian movement in this part of Hills Road. Wind tunnel effect will worsen if further tall buildings are allowed.

## Ecology/Trees

- What of nature conservation and loss of trees, is it the intention to surround the entire Botanical Gardens with buildings at a height that interferes with the natural surrounding light at the cost of the trees and wildlife in the area.
- Proposed underground excavation of the site will involve disturbance of soil, threatening the remaining building and potentially root systems within the Botanic Gardens
- Demolition and construction will cause significant harm to the local wildlife and its habitat, especially within the Botanic Gardens

## Air Quality

- Increase in pollution

## Construction

- Construction programme is too long and should only be allowed over 18 month period
- If allowed there need to be very stringent conditions both to limit disruption during the build phase and to provide infrastructure improvements including better provision for cyclists and pedestrians using Brooklands Ave

## Other Matters

- In light of the pandemic, question how responsible it is to build something like this at this point in time. By accepting this proposal it will send the wrong message to local businesses that Cambridge is not a safe place to bring their trade.
- The development is not in the public interest, it is purely for developer profit
- East elevations are missing (The Hills Road streetscene drawing is inadequate as a substitute
- Orientation arrows (north) are missing from all the main plans and cannot be inferred from the small location insets on many of them
- May not be quite relevant but Article 8 of the Human Rights Act protects the right to respect for one's family life. Destroying part of someone's home limits their family life.
- Only support coming from a company renting office space from the developer
- Loss of the Flying Pig for such time will significantly affect my mental health and wellbeing.
- Upgrades to water and sewerage networks will be required, particularly water supply
- What is the quantification of embodied energy?
- Extant permission and proposed development would infringe on right to light as set out in Title Deeds

7.6 A neutral representation has been made by the University of Cambridge as adjacent landowner of the Botanic Garden raising the following observations:

- Minded to agree with Historic England that the way the proposed buildings address the CUBG is more resolved and arguably less harmful than the extant permission

- The design appears more articulated than previous, although the scale is considerably increased over the existing development
- The scheme includes a number of visual breaks between buildings but are not convinced the scheme would bring the Garden to the street, nor should it be necessary to do so, given views will be largely glimpsed whilst the current landscape is designed to form a screen to neighbouring buildings
- Concern regarding impact upon the “Dell” within the CUBG designed for children’s play which sits adjacent to the southern boundary. Presently there is a blank wall from the existing car parking structure and therefore benefits from a significant degree of seclusion. The office will be quite close and therefore consideration should be given as to how the amenity and security of this space can be secured.
- Welcome the findings of the arboricultural impact assessment.
- No Lighting and Environment Management Plan has yet been prepared but would welcome production of such an assessment in due course to control light spill.
- One of the principle concerns is the changes to the microclimate of the Garden. Welcome the wind assessment which shows a moderate improvement in wind effect to the Garden, although the assessment does mention the Scented Garden and Autumn Garden we did not find the assessment helpful clarifying the absolute effect on the Garden.
- Welcome the noise impact assessment which adopts a reasonable approach and the imposition of conditions as necessary if permission is granted.

#### 7.7 The following points in support are made;

- Provision of high quality, environmentally friendly offices will attract companies to Cambridge whilst responding to the climate emergency. It is an attractive well thought out proposal which is an improvement on the current situation and this potential significant investment should be welcomed as part of the post Covid 19 recovery
- The tech sector in Cambridge is fast congregating around Hills Rd/Station Rd: It's high time it looked the part.

- Pace Investments have put a strong case forwards for their vision, which seems very well thought through. The historical centre of Cambridge will always be there, but it's not on Hills Rd.
- Let's move on and evolve our "business district" so it's more suited for the modern age. The disruption and cost to my business is a more-than acceptable trade-off to see this progress.

## **8.0 ASSESSMENT**

8.1 From the consultation responses and from my inspection of the site and the surroundings, the main issues are:

1. Fallback position of planning permission 06/0552/FUL
2. Principle of development
3. Urban Design
4. Townscape and Visual Impacts
5. Public Realm, Landscaping and Inclusive Access
6. Historic Environment
7. Transport and Highways
8. Carbon Reduction and Sustainable Construction
9. Flood Risk and Drainage
10. Ecology and Trees
11. Environmental Considerations
12. Responding to Climate Change
13. Residential Amenity
14. Cumulative Impacts
15. Third Party Issues
16. Planning Obligations
17. Material Considerations
18. The Planning Balance

### **Fallback position of extant planning permission 06/0552/FUL**

8.2 Planning permission (06/0552/FUL) was granted in August 2007 for a mixed use development consisting of offices (Botanic House), Class A uses, community use, retention of the Flying Pig public house and 156 dwellings. At the time planning permission was granted the site was not included within a Conservation Area. This planning permission included the Flying Pig as part of the redevelopment albeit, the premises would be demolished, apart from the front façade of the building. Planning permission was granted in October 2008 to vary a number of conditions to allow phasing of the development, with Phase 1 being construction of Botanic House and Phase 2 being construction of the remainder of the scheme. The construction of Botanic House concluded in June 2012.

8.3 The site was included in the New Town and Glisson Road Conservation Area in March 2012, after the implementation of the planning permission. Furthermore, as of 1 October 2013, the conservation area consent regime (within England) was

abolished and replaced with a requirement to gain planning permission for “relevant demolition” within a conservation area (i.e. demolition of an unlisted building). The Flying Pig is not a listed building.

- 8.4 The applicant has sought legal advice on the matter of the implementation of phase 2 of planning permission 06/0552/FUL, which included the substantial demolition of the Flying Pig public house. The advice refers to planning case law resulting from a Court of Appeal decision in 2006 (Orange Personal Communications Services Ltd and Others v London Borough of Islington). The case related to the grant of prior approval for telecommunications equipment and a subsequent designation of the site in a Conservation Area. Islington took the view the installation of the telecommunications equipment was unlawful as it has been carried out *after* the designation of the Conservation Area which included the property on which the proposed installations were to be installed. However, the Court of Appeal, held that the grant of prior approval was crystallised at the time of the decision by the Council to grant prior approval. Lord Justice Laws cited the strong parallel between the prior approval process and the process of the grant of planning permission stating in his judgement:

- *“there was a strong parallel between the prior approval process and the process of the grant of planning permission by the local planning authority in the ordinary way, and then stated that: “In that latter case, as far as I can see, it is beyond contest that the planning permission once granted cannot be undermined by a later change in the status of the land save, I suppose, where there is expressly retrospective legislation or something of the kind,”*

- 8.5 The applicant’s advice also notes that: *the position has been strengthened further since that case by the abolition of Conservation Area Consent regime which had duplicated, and added nothing to, the need to secure planning permission for the demolition of a building in a Conservation Area. The only remaining requirement for a building which is not Listed is the “required planning permission” (pursuant to section 196 D of the TCPA 1990).*

- 8.6 The Council's Legal advisers have reviewed the applicant's position and also considered the matter afresh. In summary their advice is; planning permission 06/0552/FUL granted in August 2007 and extended by virtue of planning permission 09/1177/EXP in June 2010, remains extant for the applicant to build out. No conservation area consent is needed in furtherance to the demolition of the Flying Pig under any permission because the regime has been abolished. Planning permission is now necessary (other than in reliance of what the 06/0552/FUL permission authorises) for the partial demolition of The Flying Pig as an unlisted building in a Conservation Area. The need for planning permission comes about as a direct result of the abolition of the conservation area consent regime. The extant planning permission therefore, provides a realistic fallback position for the applicant and is a material consideration in the determination of this new planning application.

### **Principle of Development**

- 8.7 The NPPF identifies that planning decisions should promote an effective use of land in meeting the need for homes and other uses including giving substantial weight to the value of using suitable brownfield land for homes and other identified needs. Paragraph 104 of the NPPF also recognises that planning policy should support an appropriate mix of uses across an area, and within larger scale sites, to minimise the number and length of journeys needed for employment, shopping, leisure, education and other activities. Policy 1 of the Local Plan states that when considering development proposals, *the Council will take a positive approach that reflects the presumption in favour of sustainable development within the NPPF. It will always work proactively with applicants to jointly find solutions, so that proposals can be approved wherever possible, and to secure development that improves the economic success and quality of life and place in Cambridge.*
- 8.8 The application site is located within an Area of Major Change (AOMC) and an Opportunity Area. Policy 14 identifies the general principles of these areas and advises; *"AOMCs are extensive areas of development comprising defined and known sites collectively shaping the spatial structure of Cambridge. Development within the AOMCs and Opportunity Areas should be of the highest quality design and incorporate the principles of sustainable design and construction."* They are identified as

contributing to the spatial strategy for additional employment and residential growth in Cambridge. Such areas should be developed comprehensively where multiple landowners are involved, make effective use of land, deliver the necessary infrastructure and create active, vibrant places to foster a sense of community.

- 8.9 Policy 25 relates to the Cambridge Railway Station, Hills Road Corridor Opportunity Area within which the site sits. The policy identifies a number of objectives for development proposals to deliver a series of coordinated streetscape and public realm improvements. These include emphasis on place making over vehicle movement and to create a more comfortable and simplified pedestrian environment including more generous pavements and more direct crossings that respond to key desire lines. One of the key projects identified is in relation to Station Approach to improve the public realm and linkages to CB1 Station Square from Tenison Road through to Hills Road.
- 8.10 Policy 21 relates to the Station Area West and Clifton Road AOMC within which the site is also located. The application site is identified as Station Area West (2) - Site M44. The policy states that the application site will include; employment use, residential use and a mix of uses falling with Class A of the Use Classes Order. It also states Station Area West 2 will be subject to a masterplan and detailed transport assessment before any new planning application comes forward.
- 8.11 Allocation M44 has already been subject to partial development in the form of Botanic House (occupied by Mills and Reeve and others) on its northern portion. The remainder of the allocation is the subject of this planning application. At the time the Local Plan was being prepared, the applicant did not own all the land within the allocation. Therefore, to safeguard against potential piecemeal development by the respective landowners, the requirement for a masterplanned approach was set out in the policy. This was to ensure a comprehensive and cohesive approach to redevelopment. As the applicant is now the sole landowner, the planning application demonstrates a comprehensive approach to the redevelopment of the remainder of the allocation. A Transport Assessment has been submitted in support of the application and is discussed later in this report. As such the application is not considered to conflict with this part of the policy.



## *Land Use*

- 8.12 The site allocation (M44) is for mixed use development to include offices (former Class B1), residential and retail (Class A) uses. This largely reflects the extant planning permission from 2007 on part of the allocated land. As set out above, the offices (Botanic House) have been completed however, the remaining Phase 2 has not come forward which proposed retail, residential and community use elements. The main variation to the proposals is that 156 residential dwellings are no longer proposed to form part of the redevelopment of the site and therefore, in this respect, the application does not meet the requirement of the mix of land uses as set out in the policy for Station Area West 2.

## *Dwellings versus Employment*

- 8.13 The NPPF (paragraph 80) recognises that *“planning decisions should help create the conditions in which businesses can invest, expand and adapt. Significant weight should be placed on the need to support economic growth and productivity and allow each area to build on its strengths”*. Equally, in order to meet *“the Government’s objective of significantly boosting the supply of homes, a sufficient amount and variety of land should come forward where it is needed and land with planning permission should be developed without unnecessary delay”* (paragraph 59). In reflecting the requirements of the NPPF, the Cambridge Local Plan 2018 sets out a minimum number of homes to be provided based on a local housing needs assessment, as well as economic forecasting to provide a direction of travel for jobs growth, over the plan period to 2031.
- 8.14 The extant planning permission includes 156 dwellings of which 63 are affordable homes. In terms of housing provision, the Cambridge Local Plan is required to deliver at least 14,000 homes over the plan period to 2031. The Greater Cambridge housing trajectory published on 1 April 2020 demonstrates that the two planning authorities (Cambridge City and South Cambridgeshire District Council), jointly, have a deliverable supply of housing land of 5.4 years. Furthermore, 14,468 dwellings are expected to be delivered within the plan period in Cambridge City. This trajectory excludes the housing within the extant planning permission on the site. Whilst the proposal, if implemented, would remove the availability of land for housing, the current housing trajectory demonstrates that there is

sufficient housing land available to meet the objectively assessed needs over the plan period.

- 8.15 Although the original extant planning permission intended for housing to be provided and policy 21 is largely predicated on this basis, the policy was drafted in 2013 and planning permission was granted 13 years ago. During this time the Station Road area has been transformed, particularly in relation to provision of high quality employment space. It has resulted in an environment which is attractive to businesses on a variety of scales and plays a significant role in contributing to the economy of Cambridge. In particular, it has become a hub for Science and Technology based companies with a focus in Machine Learning and Artificial Intelligence (AI), including Microsoft, Amazon and Samsung. Therefore, although the original planning permission included housing, the passage of time means that the market, local environment and opportunities have fundamentally changed.
- 8.16 The NPPF recognises that *“policies and decisions need to reflect changes in the demand for land. They should be informed by regular reviews of both the land allocated for development in plans and of land availability. Where the local planning authority considered there to be no reasonable prospect of the an application coming forward for the use allocated in a plan they should, as part of plan updates, reallocate the land for a more deliverable use that can help address identified needs or support applications for alternative uses where the proposed use would contribute to meeting an unmet need for development in the area”* (paragraph 120). In this instance, the applicant is seeking to bring forward a revised proposal for the comprehensive redevelopment of the remainder of site M44, which would contribute to the economic growth of Cambridge in terms of a mixed use employment led campus.
- 8.17 The jobs target (22,000) within the Local Plan which includes nearly 10,000 jobs within Class B1(a) and (b) uses. This is expected to be delivered through provision of around 115,000m<sup>2</sup> of net additional floorspace. The proposed development is contributing approximately 26,000m<sup>2</sup> of net additional office space.
- 8.18 In supporting the economy the Local Plan states that Cambridge’s excellence in the fields of research, higher education and high technology uses will be promoted and that

maintaining a good supply of employment land is essential for Cambridge's economy. Policy 40 supports the development and expansion of business space particularly around the two railway stations. The supporting text notes that *employment proposals in B use class that are situated in sustainable locations will be supported. Evidence suggests that over the past few years demand for office space has contracted to the city centre and down Hills Road to Cambridge Station..... This policy seeks to meet the demand for new office space by supporting the development of business space in areas where there is strong demand.* This is one such location.

- 8.19 An Employment Land and Economic Development Study 2020 (ELEDs) led by GL Hearn commissioned by the Councils, has recently been published to support the emerging Greater Cambridge Local Plan. This identifies 4 office submarkets within Cambridge (Prime Central, City Centre Periphery, Northern Cluster and South Cambridgeshire). The site lies within the Prime Central submarket area. It is acknowledged that the data provided within the report relates to a pre-Covid market however, it identifies that the Prime Central submarket faces the most severe supply pressures in Greater Cambridge with an available notional supply of 0.31 years. For the plan period to 2041, taking account of the committed land supply, it identifies an expected shortfall in B1a/b provision of 50,000-100,000m<sup>2</sup> and that this type of accommodation is lacking in the City and around North East Cambridge. The outcome of the ELED Study strongly supports the need to develop the site for employment use.
- 8.20 The ES includes a technical chapter in relation to the Economy and Employment noting that the proposed development will result in a number of beneficial effects to the Cambridge and Cambridgeshire economy, recognising that the pandemic may have an impact on demand and values in the short to medium term (1-3 years). Therefore, the analysis and conclusions should be considered potentially relevant to the situation once the UK economy recovers from the most severe impacts of Covid19. The following key benefits arising from the scheme will, in time, help contribute to delivering the economic aspirations for both Cambridge City and the wider region include;
- 2,600 additional office jobs in Cambridge City and 4,700 additional in Cambridgeshire

- 300 new construction jobs per annum for 5 years (Cambridgeshire)
- Increase in economic activity/gross value added (GVA) by £100m annually
- Retention of intellectual talent in Cambridge

8.21 The Cambridge office market is underpinned by its world class R&D specialisation. In order to remain competitive (locally, nationally and globally) in this market, it is imperative that high quality new office space is delivered in the right locations to allow expansion of established companies and to attract new ones. The layout of the office accommodation (including provision of co-working space on the ground floor) would allow for flexible size rental tenure for different company sizes to facilitate this.

8.22 The applicant's analysis is consistent with the Council's ELEDs in that it also identifies a supply constrained Prime Central submarket with analysis from Bidwell in November 2020 indicating approximately 3000m<sup>2</sup> of floorspace was available which is less than 3 months average annual take-up. The constraint on supply limits the opportunity for existing businesses to expand or attract new businesses into the locality.

8.23 The ELEDs recognises that occasional homeworking is highly prevalent particularly in the office based sectors. However, there is currently no evidence to indicate that office densities (persons per m<sup>2</sup>) are decreasing. This demonstrates that homeworking was taking place on a regular basis prior to the pandemic and that having an office base with sufficient capacity was the preferred way of working.

## Conclusion

8.25 Although there is an extant planning permission for residential use on part of the site and a policy requirement to include housing, the supply of housing land within Cambridge City remains robust and buoyant with overall housing numbers capable of being delivered without inclusion of those granted on this site. Spatially, the positioning of the site adjacent to a main road and integrated with a public house is not conducive to a residential environment, particularly in terms of exposure to noise. Historic England also note the proposal for commercial use would be more complementary to the Botanic Garden. The evidence above demonstrates there is strong demand for office

space within the Prime Central submarket area of Cambridge where there is a constrained supply. The Station Road/Hills Road precinct has become a hub for innovation, particularly in relation to the Science and Technology industries. The application seeks to further consolidate this area of Cambridge as an employment hub which attracts the best businesses ranging from start-ups through to established companies and retain Cambridge's homegrown talent.

- 8.26 Whilst the pandemic will have an impact in the short to medium term, there is clearly strong demand for high quality office space in this locality. The continuing prevalence of homeworking remains unknown however, will no doubt be part of flexible working arrangements in a post-pandemic world.
- 8.27 The economics assessment within the ES has identified temporary (construction) and permanent (operational) beneficial effects to the Cambridge and Cambridgeshire economy through jobs growth and increased economic activity. It also identifies a significant cumulative beneficial effect to jobs in Cambridgeshire. Therefore, in order to facilitate further employment growth in the Station Areas West, particularly in times of economic recovery, the principle of an employment focused development is supported.
- 8.28 Whilst there is some conflict with the specific land uses identified for site M44 in policy 21, it is part of an Area of Major Change and an Opportunity Area. The general thrust of these designations is to deliver high quality urban regeneration, including necessary infrastructure, as well improvements to the public realm. As such the principle of the proposal is considered to accord with the NPPF and Cambridge Local Plan policies 2, 14 and 25.

#### Re-provision of Public House (Flying Pig)

- 8.29 The NPPF recognises the importance of valued local community facilities, particularly where they promote social interaction and that planning decisions should guard against their loss. Policy 76 of the Local Plan recognises the importance of protecting public houses. The policy advises that the loss of any part of a public house or its curtilage will be permitted if it can be demonstrated that;

*“the viability of the public house use will not be adversely affected, sufficient cellarage, beer garden, parking and dining/kitchen areas will remain to retain a viable public house operation; and*

*The loss including associated development will not detract from the prevailing character and appearance of the area, including where the building is of merit or has any distinctive architectural features”.*

8.30 The Flying Pig public house comprises a cellar, bar/lounge area, back (pool) room, toilets, kitchen, licensee accommodation (adapted to national space standards), walled pub garden, storage buildings and 1 off street car parking space. Although the pub is set over 2 floors, there is a variation in the finished ground floor levels between the front section of the pub and outrigger to the rear. The existing facilities are replicated in the proposed remodelling of the pub however, they are configured differently due to partial demolition of the building and repositioning of the pub garden. The remodelling introduces a basement to provide the upgraded kitchen, toilets and storage facilities. The licensee accommodation is also proposed to be split across the first floor and roof space (i.e. maisonette). An off street parking space and 2 cycle spaces will be provided in the basement of the commercial buildings. Table 2 below provides a comparison of floorspace (existing, extant and proposed) of facilities within the Flying Pig. It is understood the pub benefits from a diverse clientele which includes residents, workers, visitors and students over a wide age range.

Table 2: Floorspace comparison for Flying Pig

Facilities	Flying Pig Public House				
	Existing (m2)	Extant (m2)	Proposed (m2)	Difference	
				Ext	Pro
Kitchen	12	30	24	18	12
Open Storage	16	-	-	-16	-16
Enclosed Storage	18	35	30	17	12
Bar/lounge	72	100	72	28	0
Garden	172	55	172	-117	0
Toilets	10	25	32	15	22
Cellar	21	21	21	0	0
Accommodation	90	60	96	-30	6

- 8.31 The proposed internal floorspace and outdoor garden space is at least equal to or greater than that which currently exists. As such there will be no loss of facilities which contribute to the pub's existing operations. The proposal will also provide level access into the pub and includes provision of an accessible w/c. The construction phase will result in a period of closure (circa 3-3.5 years). Therefore, once re-opened, the pub's clientele may take some time to be re-established. Nevertheless, the re-provision of existing facilities is considered to provide the pub with the opportunity to continue to operate in a viable manner.
- 8.32 In terms of the impact upon the character and appearance of the area, The Flying Pig is a building which is identified as being important to the local character in the New Town and Glisson Road Conservation Area Appraisal (2012). Nevertheless, the proposal will result in removal of some of the existing building. However, of the elements to be demolished, none are of particular architectural merit. The Flying Pig will remain as a standalone building, with its own identity and presence in Hills Road. The proposal will also result in the removal of existing buildings which do not contribute positively to the local urban setting and detract from the Conservation Area (i.e. Francis House, Betjeman House and the multi-storey car park). This is discussed in more detail below in relation to the Historic Environment.
- 8.33 It is also relevant to refer to the extant planning permission which included a more significantly remodelled Flying Pig public house. The extant planning permission proposed only the retention of the façade of the pub, surrounded by a new building. Whilst retaining the public house facility and its façade, it was not a standalone building with its own identity. Therefore, the current proposal is considered a significant improvement.
- 8.34 However, it is not just the "bricks and mortar" which make the pub what it is. The pub is much loved and cherished by the local community, not least because of its contribution to the Cambridge arts scene; particularly music. This is largely due to the ongoing efforts of the existing tenants since 1997. Whilst the understated interior of the bar and front room creates a warm and unpretentious impression, the tenants have embraced the local community, providing a venue that successfully mixes socialising over a pint with an appreciation of artistic talent. This connection with the community has kept people coming back. Through

support of the arts and operation as a real ale freehouse, the pub delivers a unique ambience and atmosphere. Whilst the existing tenants have been successful, planning should not intervene with respect to a landowner's commercial interests (i.e. the permission cannot require that the same tenants be reinstated). The following are therefore considered necessary to ensure the viability of the Flying Pig;

- Fixtures and fittings, apart from personal belongings of the existing tenants, shall be surveyed/recorded, protected and where necessary reinstated, to maintain the internal character of Flying Pig public house
- The Flying Pig is constructed and fitted out internally by the applicant to allow full commercial operation including residential occupation

8.35 A phasing condition (condition 45) is proposed for the demolition and construction works. This will allow consideration to be given to securing the least disruption to the operations of the pub. The demolition and construction phase is set to run from January 2022 to December 2026. Building B is scheduled to be completed first in April 2025 and then Building C in December 2026. The Flying Pig is impacted by the construction of the basement and is more directly influenced by the construction of Building B. Timing of the works to the Flying Pig have not been outlined in the construction programme and therefore, will be required to be set out in the phasing condition. However, a worst-case scenario is that the pub is likely to be closed for 3-3.5 years whilst the basement is constructed and Building B is completed. It is therefore, considered that prior to the first occupation of Building B; all pub refurbishment works shall be substantially completed. This will be secured by condition (condition 46). A scheme to ensure the structural integrity of the public house during the demolition and construction phases shall also be sought by condition (condition 7). As the Flying Pig is an established use, it appears the lawful use of the building now falls within Class E (previously Class A3) of the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes)(Amendment)(England) Regulations 2020. As such it is considered reasonable to ensure it is only used for purposes within Schedule 2 Part A Class E(b) (i.e. the sale of food and drink principally to visiting members of the public where consumption of that food and drink is mostly undertaken on the premises).



- 8.36 Subject to the above conditions and planning obligations, the proposal is not considered to adversely affect the viability of the pub and is therefore, in accordance with policy 76 of the Cambridge Local Plan. The heritage and townscape impacts are discussed further below.

### **Urban Design**

- 8.37 The NPPF identifies, as part of the “social” objective of sustainable development, to foster a well designed and safe built environment. It also states that development which make efficient use of land should be supported taking into account the importance of securing well-designed, attractive and healthy places (para 122). Paragraph 127 of the NPPF requires developments to be sympathetic to local character and history, including the surrounding built environment and landscape setting, whilst not preventing or discouraging appropriate innovation or change (such as increased densities). It goes on to advise that development proposals should be visually attractive as a result of good architecture, layout and effective landscaping. This is supported by policies 55, 56 and 57 of the Local Plan which require new development to respond positively to its context in order to create distinctive, high quality, inclusive and safe places. New development should also be constructed in a sustainable manner using high quality materials with integrated landscaping and enhanced biodiversity.

### **Urban Context**

- 8.38 The site is located at a nodal point on the busy transport route of Hills Road, identified by the adjacent contemporary 7 storey landmark building of Botanic House. The buildings on site consist of two 3 storey office blocks, a multi-storey car park and the Flying Pig public house. These are an eclectic mix of buildings which, apart from the Flying Pig, are considered to detract from the character of the area. The wider surroundings are characterised by 2-3 storey traditional terraced dwellings to the north, save for the variation in built form which has developed along Hills Road. The more recent development of CB1 lies to the east with a mixture of modern office and residential buildings up to 9 storeys. Immediately adjacent to the west and south of the site are the Botanic Gardens whilst, on the opposite side of Hills Road is Kett House a 5 storey office block and Eastbourne Terrace, a row of 2 storey traditional modest gault brick terrace

houses some of which have been converted to flats or other uses. This contrast in townscape forms the character of the New Town and Glisson Road Conservation Area.

### Siting, Scale and Massing

- 8.39 The Proposed Development comprises; the remodeled Flying Pig public house and two new curvilinear commercial buildings (Building B to the north and Building C to the south). Building B is 7-storeys plus rooftop plant, with the top floor set back from the north, west and east elevations. Building C is 5-storeys plus rooftop plant, with the top floor which is set back from the south, west and east elevations. The existing 7-storey lens shaped Botanic House (Building A) is immediately north of the application site. A comparison of building heights is set out in table 3 below.

Table 3: Building Heights

Building	Height to parapet line	Height to top of upper floor	Overall Height (including plant)
Building A (Botanic House)	28m	28m	30m
Building B	25m	29m	32m
Building C	17m	21m	24m

- 8.40 The siting, scale and massing of the commercial buildings has been considered in the context of its surroundings and the extant planning permission. Francis House, Ortona House and the Flying Pig are set close to the back edge of pavement, with Betjeman House set behind these buildings. The extant planning permission proposed a limited setback continuing a similar building line to Francis House. This created a hard edge with little relief to the built form along Hills Road. In comparison, the proposal introduces a central mews to break up the built form and greater setbacks to Hills Road. Whilst taller, the curvilinear edge with undulating facades adds visual interest and articulates the massing. This is further assisted by the set back upper floor, reducing the perceived height. The parapet line continually steps down to Building C providing a reducing in scale of the built form where it meets the Botanic Gardens to the south. The curved elements and variation in setback between Building B and C mean they read as 4 buildings which reference the rhythm of built form along Hills Road. Botanic House is identified as a landmark building within the Local Plan and is most prominent when viewed

from Hills Road to the north and at the junction with Station Road. Importantly, the siting and scale of both buildings retains Botanic House as the landmark. The curved form also responds positively to the original layout of the Botanic Garden (western side) and Botanic House. The Flying Pig, in its forward position, retains its prominence in the streetscene.

8.41 The frontage to the Botanic Gardens has also been carefully considered throughout the design process, particularly in relation to scale and massing. The visibility of the building varies within the Botanic Gardens, although is confined to the eastern half of the Gardens. The visual impact is also influenced by the presence of foliage and therefore, will vary during the seasons. Throughout the pre-application discussions, there has been a particular focus on ensuring the buildings did not appear as a wall of development protruding significantly above the tree line. The height of Building C is such that there are only limited viewpoints where the building protrudes above the tree line, coinciding with gaps or lower height vegetation. This is confined to the easternmost section of the Gardens. Building B is taller and is more consistently visible above the tree line. The undulating built form and set back upper floor, which is reinforced by an appropriate materials palette and detailed elevational design, references the original (western side) layout of the Botanic Gardens. This softens the elevations of Buildings B and C by creating an interesting balance of light and shade across the façade. The height of Building C, which is predominantly viewed below the tree line, prevents a wall of development along the eastern boundary. The scale and massing of the buildings are therefore, considered to be appropriately resolved in urban design terms.

8.42 In terms of materials, a slightly different approach has been applied to the colour and pattern of the brick cladding of Buildings B and C. Building B is clad in buff brick with a vertical emphasis, whereas Building C is clad in a red brick with a horizontal emphasis. The result is that the two buildings read as pair while also respecting the varied material palette of the other buildings along Hills Road and within the 'campus' of the site. Brick samples, including a bay-wide panel, will be sought by condition (conditions 3, 4, 5 and 6).

8.43 The application has been presented to the Council's Design and Conservation Panel in March 2020 and June 2020. Minutes of

these meetings are provided at Appendices 3 and 4. In June, the Panel noted that the reduction in scale was a significant step forward however, raised some queries regarding a number of matters. It is considered that the proposal satisfactorily addresses the queries raised by the Panel and a response to these matters is set out in Appendix 5.

- 8.44 The overall design and built form is considered to respond appropriately to the local context and surroundings and is therefore, in accordance with the NPPF and policies 55, 56 and 57 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2018.

### **Townscape and Visual Impacts**

- 8.45 Policy 55 supports new development which responds positively to existing features of natural, historic or local importance and which integrates with the immediate locality and wider city. Policy 57 supports high quality new buildings which have a positive impact upon the wider townscape, landscape and available views. Policy 60 requires new tall buildings to demonstrate through visual assessments that they respect Cambridge's historic environment, deliver a high quality addition to the skyline without any adverse impact and not cause an adverse impact upon amenity. Policy 67 recognises the importance of protecting the character of open spaces within Cambridge.
- 8.46 The ES includes a Townscape Visual Impact Assessment (TVIA) which assesses a worst-case scenario of the proposed development in terms of its townscape and visual impact, including the Cambridge skyline, as required by policy 60. This considers the sensitivity of the townscape (fabric, character and quality of the urban landscape) and visual (specific changes in views) environment to change. The TVIA considers impacts of the proposed development during construction, completion and 15 years post-completion, as well as cumulative impacts with other development. The visual assessment is based on a series of visualisations from 21 location viewpoints and associated view types which were agreed by the Council's Landscape Officer. The Landscape Officer considers the methodology to be acceptable, the quality of the assessment to be high and the conclusions fair and correct.
- 8.47 The residential terraces (east and west of Hills Road) and wider New Town and Glisson Road Conservation Area form part of the

valued townscape character and will have a beneficial effect from the proposed development. Although the proposed development contrasts with aspects of the Conservation Area such as the residential terraces, it will be a prominent, modern addition to the historic and residential areas which is comparable to more recent development such as Botanic House and CB1. Buildings of low visual quality which detract from the townscape value would also be removed and replaced with buildings of high quality set within an improved public realm. This also improves the setting of the Flying Pig in townscape terms. However, there would be some impacts upon the townscape value such as a reduced appreciation of tree cover from the Botanic Garden within Hills Road and loss of openness to the setting of the Botanic Garden.

- 8.48 In terms of location viewpoints, the TVIA identifies those most likely to be affected are visitors to the Botanic Gardens where a major adverse permanent impact is identified, although this is confined to the eastern half of the garden. A series of views demonstrate due to the scale and proximity of the proposal there would be a partial loss of open sky and increased sense of enclosure, both qualities of the visual amenity of the Botanic Garden. No mitigation measures are proposed within the site for this impact due to the site constraints, however the impacts identified relate to a 'worst case scenario' (i.e. winter months) and during the summer, the visual impacts would be substantially alleviated by the existing tree cover.
- 8.49 The proposed development has also been considered in the context of the Cambridge skyline whose character is defined by a city of spires and towers emerging above the established tree line. Appendix F of the Local Plan identifies important viewpoint locations within the wider landscape where views of the Cambridge skyline are available. The proposed development has been assessed from a number of these viewpoint locations within the TVIA.
- 8.50 Of the viewpoint locations assessed, the proposed buildings would be most visible from Lime Kiln Road. From this location they would be viewed in the context of the existing compact cluster of buildings around CB1 which are particularly prominent. The proposed buildings would also partly obscure the Cambridge University Library tower which is a characteristic feature of the Cambridge skyline, although would not pierce the wooded horizon beyond. The proposed materials would fit with the colour

palette of more modern development visible in the skyline. Nevertheless, officers accept that there would be some visual harm described as moderate adverse in the ES. Views of the city are also available from a similar direction (south-east) along Shelford Road. However, due to the greater distance from the City, this visual impact is reduced. The remaining viewpoints considered would have neutral or no effect on the Cambridge skyline.

- 8.51 During the construction phase there will be temporary adverse townscape and visual effects due to the installation of cranes, scaffolding and demolition works. These would only be for a temporary period. In terms of townscape and visual effects at year 15, although the landscaping at street level and on the terraces will mature and soften the proposal's appearance, this will not be sufficient to change the proposal's overall magnitude of effects. As such the significance of the effects at year 1 would be the same at year 15.
- 8.52 The impacts upon the townscape and viewpoint locations must also be considered in the context of the extant planning permission. Whilst the permitted scheme would replace a building of low visual quality (Betjeman House), it would also introduce built form which is of rudimentary design contributing little in terms of enhancing the overall townscape quality of the locality. There would also remain, an awkward juxtaposition of "old" and "new" with the retained Francis House and Ortona House. The permitted scheme does not include any public realm and therefore, creates a stark edge to Hills Road, negating the contribution of tree cover from the Botanic Garden to the streetscene. Importantly, it would not retain any semblance of the Flying Pig public house as a standalone building. Instead, the façade is awkwardly stitched into the new building. Whilst not as tall as the proposed development, the siting and scale would still result in a loss of openness within Hills Road although, would not protrude above the tree canopy of the Botanic Garden. Nevertheless, it would also retain the multi-storey car park and Francis House which detract from the townscape value and setting of the Botanic Garden.

## Conclusion on Townscape and Visual Impacts

- 8.53 The removal of existing low-quality buildings is beneficial and the introduction of contemporary large scale buildings is reflective of more recent modern development such as the adjacent Botanic House and nearby CB1. Retention of the Flying Pig public house, an important historic building, set within an enhanced public realm contributes further to the townscape character and quality.
- 8.54 The Botanic Gardens are set within an urban context (a garden within a city) and therefore, views of the surrounding built form contribute to its character and setting. In terms of Hills Road, the proposed development will transform the townscape introducing buildings of a markedly increased scale and height but also of high quality, ensuring that the overall townscape effects are positive.
- 8.55 The scale of the proposed buildings will have a significant visual impact upon certain viewpoints within the eastern half of the Botanic Garden. However, this is a worst-case scenario (winter months) and one which will be alleviated in the summer months due to the substantial tree cover. The scale of the buildings will reduce the openness experienced within the Garden and therefore, also impact upon its setting and contribution to the townscape. Nevertheless, this is confined to part of the eastern boundary.
- 8.56 Tree cover from the Botanic Gardens currently contributes to the Hills Road streetscape. The layout of the site separates the built form to provide vistas of the Botanic Gardens, together with soft landscaping in the public realm.
- 8.57 The height of the buildings will result in additional buildings being visible on the Cambridge skyline. However, taking policy 60 into consideration and the skyline as a whole, it is not considered the proposal will compromise its character as of a city of spires and towers. Finally, the proposal will result in a significant improvement to the townscape value of Hills Road over and above the extant planning permission, particularly in terms of architectural quality of the built form, landscaping and public realm improvements and retention of the Flying Pig, an important historic building of community value. The Built Environment Team are also supportive. On balance, the townscape impacts of the development are considered to be in accordance with the

NPPF and policies 55, 56, 57, 60 and 67 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2018.

### **Public Realm, Landscaping, Inclusive Access**

- 8.58 Policy 59 states that external spaces, landscape and public realm must be designed as an integral part of new development proposals.
- 8.59 At street level, a significantly enhanced public realm wraps around the re-modelled Flying Pig public house providing a series of inter-connected landscaped private and public spaces. The proposal also includes terraces (5<sup>th</sup> floor of Building B and 4<sup>th</sup> floor of Building C) as well as a living green roof incorporating an outdoor terrace on each building. These spaces are designed with wellbeing in mind, embrace nature and enhance the biophilic design. The active uses at ground floor level will spill into the public realm and coupled with the more modest scale of the Flying Pig and soft landscaping, provide an appropriate human scale at street level.
- 8.60 Between the buildings fronting Hills Road is a public space which allows people to dwell, whilst also providing a vista to the Botanic Garden. Whilst servicing will also occur through this space, its primary function is a space for people. Benches and soft landscaping have been carefully integrated in strategic locations to avoid the requirement for obtrusive bollards. The surfaces will provide a seamless apron of paving along the Hills Road frontage, with different size paving units to subtly delineate the areas where vehicles are permitted for taxis and servicing. Therefore, it is not considered there will be significant conflict between vehicles and pedestrians. A raised table is also proposed at the top of the vehicle access ramp to prioritise pedestrian movement along Hills Road.
- 8.61 The provision of a series of street trees along the Hills Road frontage softens the built form and continues a line of existing trees within the Botanic Garden at the boundary of Hills Road. Details of hard and soft landscaping including a maintenance and management plan will be secured by condition (conditions 12 and 13). Integral to the landscaping is ensuring appropriate boundary treatments, particular at the interface with the Botanic Garden however, this can be resolved as part of the landscaping conditions.



- 8.62 Policy 34 of the Local Plan will support schemes with external lighting where light spill is minimized, does not materially impact residential amenity or wildlife. A ground floor lighting strategy has been submitted by the applicant to demonstrate how the public realm and private outdoor areas can be enhanced through artificial lighting. Environmental Health has recommended that further details are agreed through submission of a lighting impact assessment. This can be secured by condition (condition 28).
- 8.63 Public art can make a significant contribution to the cultural wellbeing of a community and the physical landscape. The social dimension of sustainable development identified by the NPPF includes social wellbeing. The NPPF's core planning principles include a requirement that developments take account of and support local strategies to improve cultural wellbeing for all, delivering sufficient community and cultural facilities and services to meet local needs. Policy 56 of the Local Plan encourages development proposals to embed public art as an integral part of the proposals.
- 8.64 A draft public art strategy has been provided by the applicant and discussions have been ongoing with the Council's public art officer. The applicant is committed to provision of public art as part of the development and it is considered that this can be secured through a suitable condition (condition 11) requiring agreement of a public art strategy and public art delivery plan.

#### Safe and Inclusive Access

- 8.65 The NPPF recognises create places that are safe, inclusive and accessible and which promote health and well-being.....and where crime and disorder, and the fear of crime, do not undermine the quality of life or community cohesion and resilience. Local Plan policy 56 seek to secure high quality, accessible and inclusive development which allow for future changes in needs and lifestyles. Policy 57 requires new buildings to demonstrate accessibility for all users.
- 8.66 The development was presented to the Council's Disability Panel on 27 October 2020. The minutes of the meeting are attached at Appendix 6. The Panel welcomed the general approach taken to provide accessibility for all users noting that it was one of the most impressive proposals brought before the Panel in recent years. The panel in particular were impressed with the inclusion

of accessible WCs throughout the development, fire fighting lifts and high quality external spaces. Level access onto the roof terraces was also welcomed although identified that an appropriate surface treatment should be provided for wheelchair users. The Panel did identify concerns regarding the distance from accessible parking bays to access the offices.

8.67 Following the meeting a number of amendments were made by the applicant which picked up on comments by the Panel and Access Officer. The amendments included provision of a changing places WC in Building B, accessible WCs within office cores handed to provide right and left transfer per floor, reconfiguration of accessible parking spaces and increased width of basement access corridor to Building C. Provision has also been made for accessible cycle parking in the basement, These further improve the building's accessibility credentials in line with Local Plan requirements.

8.68 In terms of providing a development which is safe and ensuring crime and disorder do not undermine the quality of life, the Police Designing Out Crime Officer notes that the applicant has consulted a security consultant in relation to the BREEAM Security Needs Assessment and will be using Secured by Design products where necessary. The application is therefore considered to meet the requirements of the NPPF.

8.69 As part of the commitment to wellbeing the applicant is targeting a WELL Platinum enabled development. This standard is focussed solely upon occupant health and wellbeing and demonstrates a holistic approach to sustainability.

### **Historic Environment**

8.70 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.

8.71 Section 66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 sets out the legislative context for development that affects the setting of listed buildings:

- 8.72 In considering whether to grant planning permission for development which affects a listed building or its setting, the Local Planning Authority or, as the case may be, the Secretary of State, shall have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possess.’
- 8.73 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”.
- 8.74 The Court of Appeal has determined that, in order to give effect to the statutory duties under section 66 (1) and section 72 (1), 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 a) in respect of listed buildings accord considerable importance and weight to the 'desirability of preserving the listed building, or its setting' and b) 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.
- 8.75 Officers have had regard to the statutory duties set out in section 66(1) and section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 and in considering this application have given considerable weight and importance to the desirability of preserving the setting of the affected listed buildings and to preserving or enhancing the character and appearance of the Newtown and Glisson Road Conservation Area.
- 8.76 Furthermore, officers have as they must, taken into account as a material consideration, the policy guidance in paragraphs 193-197 of the NPPF 2019. 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). Conservation (for heritage policy) is defined in the NPPF as; “*the process of maintaining and*

*managing change to a heritage asset in a way that sustains and, where appropriate, enhances its significance.”*

- 8.77 Para. 194 makes it clear that any harm to, or loss of significance of a heritage asset should require clear and convincing justification. Paragraph 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.
- 8.78 In respect of non-designated heritage assets para. 197 of the NPPF states that the effect of a proposal on the significance of such an asset should be taken into account in determining the application. In considering such applications a balanced judgment is required having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset.
- 8.79 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.
- 8.80 The Council’s Local Plan policies 61 and 62 seek to ensure that new development proposals give due consideration to the impact on heritage assets, including local heritage assets.
- 8.81 The ES includes a technical chapter regarding the likely significant effects on heritage assets which considers the assessment set out within the supporting heritage statement. The heritage statement considers the significance of the asset and the potential impact upon its significance and/or its setting, concluding with an assessment of less than substantial harm. The conclusions of the ES are that there would not be any significant effects on heritage assets from the proposed development.
- 8.82 The heritage assets which are considered likely to be affected by the proposed development are set out below. A description of their significance is contained in Appendix 7.

## Designated Assets

- New Town and Glisson Road Conservation Area
- Botanic Garden (Grade II\* Registered Park and Garden)
- Cory Lodge, Botanic Garden (Grade II)
- Church of Our Lady and the English Martyrs(Grade II\*)
- Highsett and front retaining wall (Grade II)
- Milestone outside 100 Hills Road (Grade II)
- Royal Albert Homes (Grade II)
- War Memorial (Grade II)

## Non-designated Assets

- Flying Pig Public House (Building Important to Character)
- Nos 55-59 (odd) Hills Road (with 1-7 Station Road) (Locally Listed)
- Nos 63-99 Eastbourne Terrace, Hills Road (Locally Listed)
- Nos 101-123 College Terrace, Hills Road (Locally Listed)
- 125 Hills Road (Locally Listed)
- Nos 9-15 Station Road (Locally Listed)

## Assessment of Harm – Designated Assets

8.83 There is consistency in the assessments by the applicant, Historic England and Council's Conservation Officer in that the proposed development will result in less than substantial harm to the setting of the Botanic Garden and the Conservation Area. However, the conclusions on the level of harm differ in that the applicant considers it to be of a low level, whilst Historic England and the Conservation Officer assess it at a moderate level. Officers have no reason to contradict the conclusions of Historic England and the Conservation Officer.

8.84 Cory Lodge has a strong visual connection with the application site, being located within the Botanic Garden. It lies approximately 130m to the west of the application site and its setting is characterised by the openness of the Botanic Garden, although there is also some influence from the built form of Sainsbury Laboratory. Nevertheless, the increased massing and scale of Building B results in a reduction of visible skyline and sense of openness to its setting. This is demonstrated through the visualisations in the TVIA (viewpoint 21), which is a worst-case scenario. In the summer months, there is a significant

contrast to its setting, as Building B is much less discernible. However, the proposal is considered to result in less than substantial harm of a moderate level.

- 8.85 Royal Albert Homes lies approximately 100m to the south of the application site but also has a strong visual connection with it due to the openness of the Botanic Garden in between. Although the Botanic Garden contributes to the setting of Royal Albert Homes, it is not all encompassing, as the buildings are set within an urban context fronting both Hills Road and Brooklands Avenue. However, the increase in scale and massing of Building C will result in a loss of openness to its setting. It is considered that this results in less than substantial harm of a low level.
- 8.86 With respect to other designated heritage assets such as Highsett, the War Memorial, the Milestone outside 100 Hills Road and Church of Our Lady and the English Martyrs (Catholic Church), these are all north of the application site along Hills Road. Whilst the war memorial and milestone are in close proximity to the application site, there is no inter-visibility due to the positioning and scale of Botanic House. There are some views in the proximity of the war memorial to the south, however these would capture part of the new buildings, the Flying Pig and the public realm. As such it is not considered that the proposal will materially harm the setting of these heritage assets. Highsett is approximately 150m north along Hills Road on its eastern side. There are some glimpsed oblique views of the application site however, this is in the context of the existing built form along Hills Road. Whilst the scale of the buildings will increase, they are setback from the road frontage and therefore, will not influence the setting of Highsett to an extent which would result in any harm. The Catholic Church is 500m to the north on the western side of Hills Road. Its setting will not be influenced by the proposed development and accordingly there is no harm.

#### Assessment of Harm – Non-designated Assets

- 8.87 The Flying Pig public house is identified as a building important to local character within the Conservation Area Appraisal and makes a positive contribution to this part of the Conservation Area. The building will be directly affected through the proposed demolition and extension works and also indirectly to its setting due to the introduction of large scale office buildings. There will be some harm to the Flying Pig through the direct works in

removing the rear outrigger however, the reconfiguration seeks to integrate the building as part of the wider site campus and importantly, retain its use, which contributes to the communal value of its significance. The extension is considered to be appropriately resolved, responding to the curved built form which is a distinctive feature across the campus, whilst remaining subservient to the retained frontage. The re-orientation of the pub garden to the south of the building will increase the pub's visual presence within the streetscape and enhanced public realm. The large scale offices will create a greater degree of enclosure however, this is balanced against its location at the heart of the public realm and the removal of existing buildings which detract from its setting and the wider Conservation Area. It is considered the proposed development will result in a low level of less than substantial harm to the Flying Pig and its setting.

8.88 Eastbourne Terrace (63-99 odd Hills Road) and College Terrace (101-122 odd Hills Road) and no.125 Hills Road are non-designated heritage assets within the Conservation Area and identified as Buildings of Local Interest in the Conservation Area Appraisal. The setting of the northern half of Eastbourne Terrace is most affected as it is directly opposite the site although, as the Conservation Officer notes, there is a distance involved and therefore, is not as sensitive as the views on the western side of Hills Road. The impact on the setting is considered to gradually diminish as the terraces stretch further to the south along Hills Road. There will be an improvement to the setting through removal of detracting buildings, although there will also be a reduction in the sense of openness due to the marked increase in scale and height. However, the proposed buildings are setback, so the skyline is broadly comparable. On this basis, it is considered there will be less than substantial harm of a low level.

8.89 Nos 55-59 (odd), Hills Road (with 1 to 7 Station Road) and 9-15 Station Road are non-designated heritage assets within the Conservation Area and identified as Buildings of Local Interest in the Conservation Area Appraisal. Their setting is largely influenced by Botanic House, Kett House, the public square and entrance to the Botanic Gardens. However, there are oblique views of the application site which will capture the Flying Pig, public realm and frontages of the new office buildings. Given the distance and intervening built form, it is not considered the proposed development will harm the setting of these buildings.

## Assessment of Harm – Conclusion

- 8.90 The less than substantial harm identified to the Conservation Area and respective settings of the listed registered park and garden (Botanic Garden) and listed buildings (Cory Lodge and Royal Albert Homes) must be given considerable importance and weight. The existence of harm conflicts with policy 61 of the Local Plan and the statutory duties of the desirability to preserve the setting of listed buildings and the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. However, where less than substantial harm is identified, paragraph 196 of the NPPF states this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal. A balanced judgement is required with regard to the scale of harm and significance of non-designated heritage assets. Importantly, the Conservation Officer and Historic England raise no objections to the proposal.
- 8.91 The proposed development will remove buildings which detract from the Conservation Area and deliver a comprehensive redevelopment of the application site making effective use and regeneration of the land with an enhanced townscape and public realm. The proposal will also provide economic benefits, including jobs growth in the construction and operational phase for Cambridge and Cambridgeshire. A significant cumulative beneficial effect is identified for operational jobs in Cambridgeshire. The proposed development would also achieve a net gain in biodiversity, improve surface water run-off and secure improvements to the local highway network for sustainable travel, particularly walking and cycling. These public benefits are considered to outweigh the less than substantial harm to designated and non-designated heritage assets.

## Archaeology

- 8.92 The County Council's Archaeologist notes the site is located in an area of high archaeological potential in the historic City of Cambridge. There is no objection in principle to the development and a condition (condition 47) is recommended with regard to securing a programme of archaeological work to investigate and record the archaeology of the site.



## Transport and Highways

- 8.93 Hills Road is a primary distributor single carriageway road and is one of the major radial routes into Cambridge. In the vicinity of the site the highway width is approximately 3.5m in each direction for vehicles. A 1.5m wide mandatory cycle lane is present northbound and a 1.5m wide advisory cycle lane southbound. The footpaths are at least 2m wide on both sides of the road. There are a number of bus stops within a short walk of the site located in Hills Road and Station Road. The Cambridge railway station is approximately 500m to the east down Station Road. There are 2 main access points into the site. The southern site access is a priority junction with Hills Road and provides access to the existing multi-storey car park and other surface parking areas. The northern site access is a priority junction with Hills Road which provides access to a shared surface car park with Botanic House. There is also a vehicle access point for the Flying Pig public house.
- 8.94 The ES includes a technical chapter regarding the likely significant effects on transport. The guidelines for the Environmental Assessment of Road Traffic (1993) by the Institute of Environmental Management and Assessment (IEMA) have been used to inform the technical scope of the assessment. No objections have been raised by the County Highways transport team in relation to the methodology of the transport impact assessment in EIA terms. The applicant has also submitted a transport assessment which assesses the operational traffic impact of the proposed development.

### Access

- 8.95 The proposal includes provision of a basement car park and cycle park which will be accessed in the same location, although with segregated access, at the southern end of the site. The cycle access is in the form of a low gradient (1:14) ramp which wraps around the vehicle access ramp into the basement. A cycle lift is also provided within each building to the basement. As part of improving pedestrian and cycle movement in this location, a toucan crossing will be provided across Hills Road, outside Building C. In terms of service vehicles, the central mews between Building B and Building C will be the access point. Each building is served by loading bays either side of the shared space. Swept path analysis has been provided to demonstrate

that refuse vehicles are able to turn within the site in order to exit in a forward gear. Servicing for the Flying Pig is proposed from the pick up/drop off bays adjacent to the pub garden. The Highway Authority has raised no objections in relation to the proposed access points and associated highways works to facilitate access for vehicles and cyclists into the basement. Details of the proposed highways works presented by the applicant, including a toucan crossing, relocation of the bus stop and upgraded southbound cycle lane, are acceptable in principle to the highway authority. These can be secured by a planning condition (condition 19), with specific engineering details agreed through the Section 278 process with the highway authority. The central mews will also provide a set down area for taxis or smaller service vehicles. Again, safe access to these spaces is appropriate resolved in the site layout. A separate service vehicle/taxi set down area has also been provided outside Building B. The Highway Authority note that this could potentially create conflict with cyclists however, it will reduce the potential for vehicles stopping in the cycle lane and is therefore, considered an acceptable solution.

- 8.96 With regard to construction traffic, a framework construction traffic management plan has been provided by the applicant. This provides details of the general strategy for managing the movement of construction vehicles within the highway. The construction traffic route is set out in the applicant's construction traffic management plan. This includes Hills Road (A1307) and Trumpington Road (A1134), which run along the eastern and western boundaries of the Botanic Garden. No construction traffic is expected along Brooklands Avenue or Bateman Street, which are North and South of the Garden. Further details of the Traffic Management Plan (TMP) will be sought by condition (condition 15). The highway authority have also requested that a condition (condition 18) be imposed regarding vehicles in excess of 3.5 tonnes associated with the demolition and/or construction phases are to only enter or leave the site between the hours of 09:30 and 15:30 seven days a week. This is considered reasonable to ensure larger vehicles are kept off the network during the AM and PM peaks.

## Car Parking

- 8.97 Policy 82 of the Local Plan states planning permission will not be granted for developments that would be contrary to the parking standards in Appendix L. The policy applies the parking standards as maximum standards, with a ratio of 1 space per 100m<sup>2</sup> for B1 floorspace located within a controlled parking zone.
- 8.98 The proposed development will include a basement car park containing 200 car parking spaces. This includes provision of replacement car parking (50 spaces) for Botanic House which are already committed due to existing lease arrangements. The proposed development therefore, includes an additional 150 car parking spaces (ratio 1:260m<sup>2</sup>), including 10 accessible spaces (see Table 4 below). The basement has been designed for future flexibility with the upper level mezzanine being removable to respond to changing demands for car use. The basement could, ultimately, be repurposed with single and double height spaces for alternative uses.

Table 4: Car parking allocation

Building	Number of spaces
Botanic House	50*
Building B	84
Building C	65
Flying Pig	1
Total	200

*\*existing committed spaces*

- 8.99 The proposed level of on site parking is significantly less than currently exists and what has previously been granted under the extant planning permission (see Table 5 below). The parking ratio is also consistent with other recent office developments in Station Road.

Table 5: Comparison of car parking provision

	Existing car spaces	Extant permission car spaces	Proposed car spaces
Numbers	304	404*	200

*\* combination of approved and retained spaces*

- 8.100 Whilst it is acknowledged that the proposed development includes on site parking in a sustainable location, it is compliant

with the maximum standards within policy 82 and also reduces the level of on site car parking in terms of what is existing and what could be built out under the extant planning permission. It is therefore, not considered that a reason for refusal could be sustained regarding the proposed level of on site parking.

8.101 Policy 82 also recognises that provision of electric vehicle charging points should be achieved where reasonable and proportionate. The application proposes provision of 52 x 7kW charging points and 6 x 24kW (fast) charging points, providing a total of 58 EV charging points. Infrastructure provision capable of supporting EV charging points for the remaining spaces will also be provided. The proposed EV charging strategy is supported by Environmental Health and will be secured by condition (condition 33).

8.102 The applicant has also advised that it is proposed, over time, for on site car parking spaces to be exclusively available for electric vehicles. This is welcomed particularly in terms of promoting use of more sustainable vehicles and improving air quality. It is therefore, proposed to secure a car parking management strategy for vehicle access to be via electric vehicles only. The car parking management strategy can be secured as a planning obligation through the s106 agreement.

### Cycle Parking

8.103 Policy 82 requires cycle parking provision as a minimum standard. For office use the requirement is for 2 spaces for every 5 members of staff or 1 space per 30m<sup>2</sup> of gross floor area and visitor parking provision on merit. Therefore, the minimum requirement for cycle parking is 1,300 spaces. The proposed cycle parking allocation is set out in the table 6 below. This will be secured by condition through a Car and Cycle Parking Management Plan (condition 44).

Table 6: Cycle Parking Provision

	Sheffield	Stackers	Total
Botanic House	50	n/a	50
Building B	156	564	720
Building C	130	450	580
Flying Pig	2	n/a	2
Visitor	78	n/a	78
Total			1,430

8.104 All staff cycle parking will be located in the basement. In terms of visitor cycle parking, 56 spaces are at grade and 22 in the basement. 22% of cycle parking will be provided as Sheffield stand, which meets Local Plan requirements. Other facilities include space for a bike doctor within the basement along with 516 lockers and 55 showers. A speed gate is also proposed on the ramp which will allow cyclists to “swipe in” registering their arrival. This will provide a useful monitoring for the Travel Plan, details of the appearance of the gate can be secured as part of the landscaping condition (condition 12).

8.105 To further encourage sustainable transport, the applicant proposes to provide an electric bike scheme with 50 electric bikes to be made available for occupants of the building, free of charge. The electric bike scheme can be secured as a planning obligation through the s106 agreement.

#### Other parking facilities

8.106 The basement also contains provision for parking for electric scooters (82) and motorcycles (9).

8.107 Subject to the proposed conditions and planning obligations set out above, the level of cycle parking is considered acceptable and is therefore in accordance with the NPPF and policy 82 of the Local Plan.

#### Trip Generation

8.108 The NPPF advises that; *“development should only be prevented or refused on highways grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or the residual cumulative impacts on the road network would be severe.”*

8.109 CB1 trip rates have been used as they are considered more robust than TRICS data which is agreed by County transport team. The mode share of employees of 22 Station Road nearby has been applied to these trip rates. This applies a car driver mode share of 17% and walking (13%), cycling (40%) and public transport (27%) mode share totaling 80%. Again, this is accepted by the County Highways transport team.

8.110 The proposed office will generate 1474 inbound and 114 outbound person trips in the AM peak, and 1190 outbound and

255 inbound person trips in the PM peak, applying the CB1 trip rates.

#### Vehicles

8.111 Surveys of the existing car parks were undertaken in March 2020 which noted the car park was underutilised. Vehicle trip rates have also been adjusted in accordance with the capacity of the proposed car park, as the site is located within and adjacent to controlled parking zones. The assessment demonstrates the development could generate a maximum of 30 additional two-way vehicle trips in the AM peak hour and 17 in the PM peak hour. However, this is based on observed vehicle trips of an underutilised car park. A sensitivity test was undertaken assuming full occupancy of the existing car park. This demonstrated an overall net reduction in car trips within the AM and PM peak. However, overall, there is anticipated to be a net increase of 93 vehicles entering and 55 vehicles exiting the site over the 24 hour period during operation. This is negligible (less than 1% increase) in the context of the average annual daily traffic flow of 14,441 on Hills Road.

8.112 In terms of service vehicle trips, the number of trips expected across a 12 hour weekday period (0700-1900) is 44. On average, this is just under 4 per hour or 1 every 16 minutes.

8.113 The highway authority consider the above forecast trip rates to be robust and demonstrates that the level of vehicle movements associated with the proposed development will not materially impact upon the local highway network.

#### Pedestrian and Cycle trips

8.114 Of the total person trips predicted, 594 are forecast to cycle and 768 forecast to walk in the AM peak, and 479 forecast to cycle and 621 forecast to leave the site on foot in the PM peak. This has been analysed by the highway authority and it is considered to result in an intensification of movements upon the Station Road/Hills Road junction, although the provision of a toucan crossing in Hills Road will alleviate some of this impact. Discussions have taken place with the highway authority who acknowledge that the junction could be improved to better support cycling and pedestrian movement. This also aligns with aspirations for improving the pedestrian environment within the

Hills Road corridor identified within policy 25. As a result of these discussions, the highway authority has committed to carrying out improvements to the junction and consider that a financial contribution of £500,000 from the proposed development is a reasonable and proportionate level of mitigation. This is accepted by the applicant.

8.115 It should also be noted that the applicant has previously carried out highways works and public realm improvement works at the junction and paid financial contributions in relation to strategic highway improvements as part of the extant planning permission, although the full impact of this development on the highway network has not been realised due to its partial implementation.

8.116 A framework Travel Plan has been submitted by the applicant which is supported in principle by the highway authority. However, conditions (conditions 16 and 17) will be imposed regarding submission of a detailed Travel Plan for each building, including monitoring, during the operational phase.

8.117 Subject to the proposed highways works including provision of a toucan crossing in Hills Road, financial contribution of £500,000 for Station Road/Hills Road junction improvements and implementation of a Travel Plan, the proposed development is considered to be in accordance with the NPPF and policy 81 of the Cambridge Local Plan.

#### **Transport Environmental Effects**

8.118 In terms of transport, no significant environmental effects have been identified in either the construction or operational phase. Mitigation is proposed for the construction phase through provision of a Traffic Management Plan (TMP) and Demolition and Construction Environment Management Plan (DCEMP) to manage temporary impacts. Once operational, the proposed development is anticipated to benefit pedestrian movement due to proposed highway improvements.

#### **Carbon Reduction and Sustainable Construction**

8.119 The NPPF notes that the planning system should support the transition to a low carbon future and great weight should be given to outstanding or innovative designs which promote high levels of sustainability (paragraph 131). Policy 28 of the Local Plan

advises that all development should take opportunities to integrate principles of sustainable design and construction into the design. The Sustainable Design and Construction SPD provides further guidance on implementation of relevant Local Plan policies regarding sustainable design.

8.120 Policy 28 requires non-residential development to achieve a BREEAM “Excellent” accreditation however, the applicant has committed to achieving BREEAM “Outstanding”, which is currently only achieved by 1% of buildings in the UK. The BREEAM pre-assessments submitted with the application demonstrate a baseline score of just under 92% against a threshold of 85%, which provides a buffer to achieve “outstanding”.

8.121 In terms of fabric performance, the objective for the façade design for the buildings is to achieve the optimum balance between providing ample natural daylighting to reduce the use of artificial lighting, the provision of passive solar heating to limit the need for space heating in winter and to limit summertime solar gains to reduce space cooling demands. A framework of vertical fins combined with varied depths of horizontal overhangs, depending on orientation, ensures a balance between the benefits of passive solar heating in winter months whilst limiting the likelihood of high internal temperatures in summer. The Council’s Sustainability Officer is supportive of the approach subject to as it will exceed Local Plan BREEAM requirements. Conditions regarding BREEAM outstanding accreditation are recommended (conditions 34 and 35).

#### Water Consumption

8.122 With regard to water use, the proposals utilise both rainwater harvesting and greywater reuse to achieve the maximum BREEAM credit requirements of policy 28 of the Local Plan in relation to water use.. This will serve the WC cisterns, irrigation and wash down points as an additional conservation measure. Highly efficient sanitaryware will also be utilised. The measures to be installed equate to a 55% reduction in water use compared to an average office. This approach is supported and is policy compliant.



## Carbon Reduction

- 8.123 The proposal is for a fossil fuel free development which follows the energy hierarchy and uses a combination of passive design and renewable technologies. The proposed development will reduce emissions by 43% using current Building Regulations Standard Assessment Procedure (SAP). Using the new SAP 10 approach (recognition of a greener electricity grid), this rises to 53%. SAP is used to assess energy use and carbon emissions in Part L2A of the Building Regulations.
- 8.124 The passive design measures such as optimised façade design, high performance glazing and high efficiency building services will reduce cooling demand by 29% against Part L parameters of the Building Regulations. The building also proposes use of renewable technologies including air source heat pumps (heating and cooling and hot water) and an array of photovoltaic panels on both buildings. The approach to energy consumption and reducing carbon emissions is an integral element of achieving BREEAM outstanding. The approach is anticipated to result in a 75% reduction in carbon emissions compared to a typical office building with gas fired heating.
- 8.125 Consideration has also been given to the overall life cycle impact of the development, with embodied carbon of the proposed building materials quantified in line with BREEAM criteria. This included an appraisal of different design options to better understand the impact of certain materials. A high level embodied carbon estimate for Buildings B and C has been made against industry benchmarks. This assesses the kilograms of CO<sub>2</sub> per 1m<sup>2</sup> of GIA. The RICS and Greater London Authority (GLA) have identified current benchmarks as well as future targets for embodied carbon. RICS 2025 target is 650 kg/m<sup>2</sup> with a target of 500kg/m<sup>2</sup> by 2050. The GLA have an aspirational target of 800kg/m<sup>2</sup>. Buildings B and C are estimated to achieve 543 kg/m<sup>2</sup> and 545 kg/m<sup>2</sup> respectively. This demonstrates that the proposed development is expected to deliver a low embodied carbon solution.
- 8.126 The ambitions to achieve BREEAM “outstanding” exceeds Local Plan requirements and is therefore, compliant with the NPPF and policies 28 and 31 of the Local Plan.

## **Flood Risk and Drainage**

- 8.127A flood risk assessment and drainage strategy has been submitted in support of the application. The site is located within flood zone 1 and is a “less vulnerable” use. The development therefore meets national flood risk guidance with regard to being an appropriate location for the nature of the development.
- 8.128 Sustainable drainage systems are proposed as part of the development including rainwater harvesting (stored in basement tanks), blue roofs and green roofs. Attenuation at roof level reduces the capacity requirement for the basement tanks. Run-off rates have been reduced to greenfield rates which is a betterment across the site. The proposed SuDs design ensures that sufficient surface water storage is provided during the 1 in 100 (1%) Annual Probability plus 40% climate change events. Surface water will drain to the public sewer, as per existing, which is accepted by the Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) and Drainage Officer. Anglian Water have confirmed that the sewerage system has capacity to accommodate these flows. The attenuation tanks will require a pumped system to discharge water into the sewer. Preference is for a gravity discharge however, where a pumping system is required, an assessment of the residual risk of flooding as a result pump failure is necessary. Further information has been requested in this regard.
- 8.129 The LLFA and Council’s Drainage Officer raised initial concerns regarding waterproofing (of the basement) and the potential for groundwater displacement due to the scale of the basement, which could potentially increase flood risk elsewhere. The applicant subsequently produced a technical note which demonstrates the potential for an increase in groundwater levels is minimal (0.08m) and that appropriate waterproofing of the basement will be achieved. The note also advises that during construction of the basement, dewatering (pumping out water) will only take place within the basement and therefore, will not affect any groundwater outside of the basement due to the sealing providing by the existing Gault Clay in which the basement will be set. The LLFA and Council’s Drainage Officer are satisfied in this regard.
- 8.130 With regard to foul drainage, Anglian Water note that the development is in the catchment of Cambridge WRC which

currently does not have capacity to treat flows from the development. However, in the event permission is granted and the developer submits their formal application to connect to public sewers, Anglian Water will plan accordingly to accommodate the flows from this development.

- 8.131 Further information is required to ensure there are no significant residual flooding risks from the scenario of a pump failure. Further details regarding this matter will be provided in the amendment sheet.

## **Ecology and Trees**

- 8.132 National planning policies seek to ensure that biodiversity is conserved and enhanced. At a local level, planning policies 69, 70 and 71 seek to ensure the provision of achievable mitigation and the enhancement of the nature conservation value of sites, through habitat creation, linkage and management and the appropriate protection of trees. Impacts on likely significant effects to ecology and trees have been considered within the ES.

### **Ecology**

- 8.133 The Council's ecologist has reviewed the ES and raised no objections in relation to the methodology or conclusions of the ecological assessments. Biodiversity enhancements will be delivered as an integral part of the design proposals. A biodiversity net gain assessment demonstrates a 570% increase in overall biodiversity. This includes increased planting at ground floor level and at upper levels on the terraces and a living green roof on each building. Planting will include preference for nectar rich flowering species and prioritisation of local drought tolerant and climate adaptable species. Provision will also be made for bird and bat boxes throughout the scheme.
- 8.134 A preliminary ecological appraisal (PEA), preliminary roost assessment, nocturnal bat survey and biodiversity net gain assessment have been undertaken by the applicant. The PEA identified potential impacts upon bat roosts within buildings, active birds nests and the adjacent Botanic Garden which is a non-statutory designated County Wildlife Site. Cambridge Airport and the MOD have also requested a Bird Management Plan in relation to site attracting additional bird life on the proposed roofs. This can be secured by condition (condition 42).

- 8.135 With regard to bats, a nocturnal survey was carried out in 2020 as there is some evidence bats have used parts of Betjeman House in the past. The surveys recorded low levels of bat activity, primarily focussed on the Botanic Garden but did not reveal any roosting bats in the buildings. However, as precautionary mitigation, to ensure no bats have started to roost in Betjeman House prior to demolition, a pre-work inspection of buildings on the site shall be conducted. If demolition works are proposed to take place during the active season for bats (March-October inclusive) a further nocturnal survey shall be carried out to confirm the presence/absence of any bats. This will be secured through the DCEMP condition (condition 22).
- 8.136 Artificial lighting has the potential to impact upon bats both during the construction and operational phase. Appropriate mitigation can be achieved in relation to lighting for the construction phase through the DCEMP. In terms of the operational phase, a Lighting and Ecological Management Plan will be sought by condition (condition 36) due to the proximity to the Botanic Garden and the potential impact on wildlife, particularly bats.
- 8.137 In relation to breeding birds, the vegetation on site has the potential support some breeding birds although due to the nature and scale, populations are not considered significant. Active birds nests are protected under the Wildlife and Countryside Act (1981). In terms of mitigation, any clearance of vegetation would avoid the active nesting season (March to August inclusive). Where this is not possible, any proposed clearance should be checked by a qualified ornithologist immediately prior to the works.
- 8.138 Construction activity could result in accidental damage to the neighbouring Botanic Garden, or indirect impacts such as light, noise, dust and vibration. Measures will be set out within the DCEMP to ensure risks of such impacts are minimised. No likely significant effects are predicted and therefore, no monitoring is required during the construction or operational phase.
- 8.139 The existing site is of low ecological value therefore, the biodiversity net gain during the operational phase is welcomed. Provision of biodiversity enhancements will be sought by condition and appropriate conditions can be secured to ensure biodiversity within the Botanic Gardens is suitably protected

during the construction and operational phases of the development. The proposed development is therefore in accordance with policies 69 and 70 of the Cambridge Local Plan. Trees

8.140A Tree Survey, Arboricultural Impact Assessment, Preliminary Arboricultural Method Statement and Tree Protection Plan is provided in support of the Development. The purpose of this work is to provide consideration of the arboricultural impacts of the Development in accordance with the feasibility and planning sections of BS 5837: 2012 Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction.

8.141 The tree survey has inspected 87 individual trees, 11 groups of trees, 2 areas of trees and 2 hedges within and adjacent to the site. The proposal requires felling of 3 low quality trees in order to achieve the proposed layout. Three additional low quality trees have also been identified for removal irrespective of the proposed development as they are nearly dead or dead. There are no trees of value on the application site as such their removal is considered acceptable.

8.142 Existing trees adjacent to the application site in the Botanic Garden are to be retained and protected. The tree office has raised concerns about lack of space for existing trees and that pruning works are proposed to facilitate construction and access, although acknowledges the potential incursion into root protection areas is minor. An AIA has been submitted which demonstrates how the impact on existing trees will be mitigated during the demolition and construction phases to ensure their long term protection. The significance of the trimming and pruning is considered to be minor adverse and therefore, not significant. Subject to the imposition of an arboricultural method statement and tree protection plan to be secured by condition (conditions 37, 38 and 39), the impact upon existing trees is considered to be acceptable.

8.143 In terms of new trees, concerns were raised with regard to the space available for new planting, particularly due to the basement. The applicant has therefore, amended the proposal to improve the shape of the tree pits proposed for the street trees. The landscape team consider this to be appropriate subject to further details of the tree pits being secured by condition (condition 10).

8.144 The proposed is not considered to result in significant effects to existing trees and therefore, is in accordance with policy 71 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2018.

## **Environmental Considerations**

8.145 Decisions on planning applications should prevent new and existing development from contributing to, being put at unacceptable risk from, or being adversely affected by, unacceptable levels of soil, air, water or noise pollution.

### *Noise*

8.146 The NPPF recognises that new development proposals should mitigate and reduce to a minimum, potential adverse impacts from noise. Policy 35 also recognises new development should not lead to significant adverse effects from noise during either construction or once operational. The site is located in an environment where existing noise levels are relatively high, primarily due to its location adjacent to Hills Road. An acoustic assessment has been undertaken to establish baseline background noise levels and the performance requirements of the façade of the proposed buildings in line with BS8233 guidance. The survey confirms that the buildings will be fully mechanically ventilated and cooled so the opening of windows for ventilation is not required (although manual ventilation will be possible for comfort cooling). The assessment indicates that the façade sound insulation performance requirements should be achievable with an acoustic double glazed system for the eastern facades and standard double glazing for the remaining areas. Environmental Health support this approach.

8.147 With regard to plant and equipment noise, the rating level (in accordance with BS4142) for all plant and equipment should be less than or equal to the existing background noise level at the boundary of premises. There is potential for noise outbreak, particularly from plant located at roof level. Mitigation measures identified are a solid acoustic screen around the roof top plant as well as in-duct attenuators to the inlet and outlet of ventilation plant. Environmental Health have requested a condition to ensure appropriate mitigation is achieved with regard to plant and equipment noise (conditions 20 and 21).

8.148 With regard to the Flying Pig, it has operated in the current location for a significant period of time where background noise levels are elevated due to the proximity to Hills Road. As such the existing pub garden is already influenced by road noise levels. It is proposed to re-orientate the pub garden to the south of the existing building. This will include a wall along its eastern edge. Environmental Health note there is the potential for this reconfiguration to have a more significant impact upon local amenity of nearby residents (noise outbreak) and also subject customers to higher traffic noise levels. Amendments were therefore, requested to the proposed pub garden boundary wall. To this end, the height of the pub garden wall on the Hills Road side has been increased to 1.6m with a further barrier on top resulting in a total height of 2.25m. The increase in height will provide some acoustic benefits both in terms of break out noise and also to mitigate traffic noise. In order to ensure the wall forms an appropriate acoustic barrier, details of the wall's construction will be requested by condition (condition 52). Additional conditions requested by Environmental Health are discussed further below.

8.149 Environmental Health also recommended a number of conditions to control part of the pub's day to day operations, in the interests of residential amenity. The closest neighbour to the pub is the Centennial Hotel (opposite), which occupies the northernmost section of Eastbourne Terrace. Residential properties exist beyond the hotel to the south, although these are not immediately opposite the pub. The pub currently operates in an unrestricted manner, in planning terms, without complaint. Environmental Health have requested conditions which would restrict hours of use of the pub garden, amplified music in the pub garden and deliveries.

8.150 It is important that the pub's future operations are not jeopardised by unnecessary and unreasonable conditions. The opening hours allowed by the license are 11:00-00:30 Monday to Saturday and 12:00-00:00 Sunday, although it is understood the pub is usually open until 11pm. There is currently no restriction on the hours of use of the pub garden. Environmental Health have requested that the pub garden only be used between 09:00-23:00 daily. Although the location of the pub garden is changing, the design of the associated wall will seek to minimise noise outbreak therefore, it is not considered necessary to restrict hours of use of this outdoor space. Environmental Health have

requested that amplified music and voice is prohibited in the pub garden between the hours of 19:00-23:00 daily. Outdoor space has become increasingly important during the pandemic for social distancing measures and staging events. Live music is currently an important element of the character of the Flying Pig and it is considered this should be able to continue unencumbered, if so desired, by future tenants. Controls would still exist through environmental protection legislation. As such it is not considered necessary to control amplified music and voice in the pub garden.

8.151 With regard to deliveries it is proposed that the pub will be serviced off street via the adjacent pick up/drop off bays within the central mews. There are currently no delivery restrictions in place and the pub is currently serviced from the street. Given there are currently no restrictions in place, only a small number of deliveries would take place across the week and the pub will benefit from an off-street servicing strategy, restrictions on deliveries for the public house are not considered necessary. However, restrictions on the hours deliveries/collections can take place for the proposed office buildings is considered reasonable and will be secured by condition (condition 54).

8.152 Environmental Health have recommended a condition with respect to ensuring “habitable rooms” are appropriately protected from noise. There is already an existing licensee’s flat at first floor level and the proposal is to refurbish the existing building in this regard. Although new habitable rooms (bedrooms) will be formed within the roof space it is not considered reasonable to require a noise assessment for the creation of these rooms.

8.153 Environmental Health have also requested a condition regarding the flat within the pub only be occupied by person/s associated with the operation of the pub. The flat is ancillary (not a standalone dwelling) to the primary use of the building as a public house therefore, it is not necessary to attach a condition requiring this restriction.

8.154 Subject to conditions recommended above, the proposed development is considered to be in accordance with policy 35 of the Cambridge Local Plan.



### *Air Quality, Odour and Dust*

- 8.155 Policy 36 of the Local Plan advises that new development will be permitted where it can be demonstrated that no significant adverse effects on health, the environment or amenity will arise from air quality, odour or dust emissions.
- 8.156 The site is located within the Cambridge City Air Quality Management Area (AQMA). The AQMA has been declared upon the basis of recorded and modelled exceedances of Nitrogen Dioxide (NO<sup>2</sup>) with the main source in Cambridge being from vehicle emissions. The Air Quality Annual Status Report (Cambridge City Council 2020) reviewed the air quality in Cambridge in 2019 and reflects activities up to the end of March 2020. The report does not include a discussion on air quality relating to the pandemic, although acknowledges that levels of NO<sub>2</sub> have fallen by 50% in the city centre during lockdown. The general trend noted that levels of NO<sup>2</sup> in 2019 were slightly lower than in 2018 however, recorded levels of particulate matter have remained the same. Levels of all measured pollutants are currently below their respective national air quality objectives levels.
- 8.157 The proposed development will deliver a net reduction in car parking spaces from the existing and will be a fully electric powered/heated development. 58 Electric Vehicle (EV) charging points will be provided within the development as well as over 1,400 cycle parking spaces. The applicant is also committed to ensuring only EVs will, ultimately, only be allowed access to the building which is to be secured through a parking management strategy.
- 8.158 An Air Quality Assessment has been submitted as part of the application documents. This screened out the need for a detailed assessment given the reduction in car parking spaces and no combustion emission to air. The assessment concludes that the location is suitable for its proposed end use. Environmental Health is in agreement with this conclusion.
- 8.159 With respect to odour, the permission seeks flexible use of ground floor space in Building's B and C. This could potentially include food and beverage outlets. As such, Environmental Health has requested that details of extraction and ventilation equipment is to be agreed by condition (conditions 29, 30, 31 and

32) to ensure appropriate discharge of fumes and odours. This includes the proposed new kitchen for the Flying Pig.

8.160 Environmental Health note that a construction environmental management plan has been submitted by the applicant, which provides a general overview on the methodology for demolition and construction. A condition (condition 22) is recommended regarding submission of a DCEMP which include requirements for dust management/monitoring, noise monitoring and vibration monitoring during the construction phase.

8.161 Subject to the imposition of conditions it is not considered the proposed development will adversely impact upon local air quality and is therefore in accordance with the NPPF and policy 36 of the Local Plan.

#### *Ground Conditions and Contamination*

8.162 Policy 33 of the Local Plan requires applicants to demonstrate there will be no adverse health impacts to surrounding occupiers or end users from ground contamination. The application is accompanied by a Phase I and Phase II investigation report as the site does have significant history of potentially contaminative usage.

8.163 However, a key element of the application is the construction of a 7m deep basement. This will require the removal of surface soils across the whole site. In a contaminated land context, this bulk removal acts as de facto remediation strategy for any contamination that may exist due to the significant quantities, and depth, of soil that will have to be dug out. It is highly likely that all of the Made Ground (typically the main source of residual industrial/commercial contamination) will be dug out and removed off-site. Environmental Health accept that no remediation is required. However, a Material Management Plan and Completion Report is required to be submitted and agreed by condition (conditions 23, 24 and 25) to ensure the construction pile/mat and landscaped area use suitable uncontaminated material. A condition (condition 26) will also be imposed with regard to assessment of any unexpected contamination during the course of construction.

## *Wind Microclimate*

8.164 A technical chapter within the ES assessed the likely impacts of the proposed development on the wind microclimate. The Council employed the services of an external consultant (Arup) in order to assess this chapter of the ES. The consultant advised that further environmental information was required and an addendum to the ES was produced. A number of locations within the development and offsite were assessed with regard to potential impacts from wind. Mitigation through the provision of soft landscaping at ground floor level and balustrades to terraces on upper levels is proposed to reduce the impact from windiness. These can be secured through respective landscaping (conditions 12 and 13) and materials (condition 3) conditions. Subject to the mitigation identified, the conclusions are that wind conditions are likely to remain generally suitable for intended pedestrian activities in and around the site.

## **Responding to Climate Change**

8.165 The consideration of climate change resilience and adaptation in this EIA has been integrated throughout the technical chapters. As demonstrated through the Design and Access Statement and Sustainability Statement, climate change has been a key consideration in the design of the project and includes embedded mitigation through passive design and use of renewable technologies. Consideration, in particular, has been given to following the cooling hierarchy in order to mitigate the risk of overheating. Measures include reducing solar gains in the summer through a framework of vertical fins and horizontal spandrels, appropriate ratio of glazing and opaque curtain walling depending on orientation (efficient thermal envelope), low g-values for all glazing and low fabric air permeability. Provision of energy efficient lighting (LED), insulation to heating and hot water pipework and energy efficient equipment will also minimise internal heat generation. The development will significantly improve upon the requisite standards of Part L 2013 of the Building Regulations. Furthermore the development demonstrates a low embodied carbon design.

8.166 Biodiversity enhancements will be delivered as an integral part of the design proposals. A biodiversity net gain assessment demonstrates a 570% increase in overall biodiversity. Water storage is also proposed at roof level for re-use and to reduce

surface water run-off. This is part of a SuDS strategy which will see surface water run-off reduced to green field rates taking into account potential increases due to climate change.

- 8.167 The development includes 58 electric vehicles charging points with a further commitment by the applicant to, ultimately in time, only allow parking on site by electric vehicles.
- 8.168 The development is considered to demonstrate an appropriate response to climate change adaptation and as such it is not considered there are likely to be any significant environmental effects.

### **Residential Amenity**

- 8.169 The NPPF recognises the importance of creating places with a high standard of amenity for existing and future users. Policy 35 of the Local Plan requires new development not to adversely effect human health and quality of life through noise and vibration.
- 8.170 There are residential properties in the terrace opposite the site and also further to the south along Hills Road. Those properties most directly affected are opposite Building C. Consideration of residential amenity has already been touched on in relation to noise impacts, particularly regarding operations at the Flying Pig. However, it is not considered there will be material harm to residential amenity from noise outbreak from the pub garden, particularly given the long term existing use.
- 8.171 Francis House, which is currently opposite these properties, is approximately 12m high and is set up to the back edge of pavement. The existing separation distance between these properties (wall to wall) is around 22m. Building C will be 17m tall to the parapet line (top of the 3<sup>rd</sup> floor) ,with the 4<sup>th</sup> floor set back 3m from the building's frontage. Due to the undulating façade, the building will have a setback from the back edge of pavement of between 3m and 8m. The increase in scale of Building C will be noticeable, although the separation distance (wall to wall) will be between 27m and 31m. Given this separation, it is not considered to cause an unreasonable sense of enclosure to these properties.

8.172 The increase in scale will also cause an additional degree of overshadowing to these properties. The front of the properties have a predominantly westerly aspect. Shadow studies have been provided which demonstrate that at the equinox the properties receive good levels of direct sunlight up until approximately 4pm. Given there is already overshadowing experienced as a result of the existing buildings, it is not considered that the overshadowing will cause material harm to the amenity of these properties.

8.173 In terms of overlooking, although the composition of buildings on the site is changing, it is not considered this results in a material change to the degree of overlooking already experienced.

### **Cumulative Impacts**

8.174 The EIA Regulations include the requirement to identify the full range of environmental effects that are likely to result from a development which includes cumulative environmental effects. EIA practice recognises two major sources of cumulative effects: intra-project effects and inter-project effects

8.175 Intra-project effects occur when an effect from one environmental discipline may affect another environmental discipline, for example an increase in traffic flows will also result in a change to the noise levels at a particular receptor.

8.176 The Botanic Garden is the most sensitive to potential cumulative impacts. Whilst there is the potential for intra-project cumulative effects during the construction phase from, noise, dust, lighting and traffic movements, these will be temporary and can be appropriately managed and mitigated through the DCEMP and TMP. There is the potential for interactive ecological impacts on the Botanic Garden during construction arising from accidental damage, dust, light, vibration and noise. Officers agree with the conclusion of the ES that these will be negligible with the implementation of a DCEMP condition.

8.177 There is the possibility of ecological, arboricultural, lighting, wind, glare/light, visual, townscape and heritage impacts on the Botanic Garden from the proposed development once it is operational. The relevant chapters within the ES demonstrate that wind, lighting, ecological and arboricultural impacts will not result in significant impacts.

8.178 There is potential for the proposed development to increase glare within the Gardens, although the existing mature tree coverage will minimise this impact. Details of glass reflectivity can be secured through a planning condition (condition 3) to further reduce this potential impact. Additional overshadowing will occur in the mornings however, given the orientation of the gardens they will still receive direct sun for the majority of daylight hours. Whilst there is some harm identified to heritage assets and views within the Botanic Gardens due to the scale of the proposed buildings, they will replace low quality buildings with high quality architecture.

8.179 Officers are satisfied with the conclusions of the ES that cumulative impacts on the Botanic Garden will not interact to create additional significant impacts.

8.180 Inter-project effects occur resulting from the likely impacts of the proposed development interacting with the impacts of other reasonably foreseeable or committed developments in the vicinity. In total, 6 developments were identified in the cumulative site search;

- 32-38 Station Road (15/0906/FUL)
- 30 Station Road (15/1522/FUL)
- Murdoch House 40-44 Station Road (15/1759/FUL)
- 20 Station Road (15/0864/FUL and 15/0865/FUL)
- 10 Station Road (15/2271/FUL)
- Cambridge Biomedical Campus (16/0176/OUT)

This was expanded to include land north and south of Wort's Causeway (19/1168/OUT and 20/01972/OUT), land between Coldham's Lane and Airport Way (18/0481/OUT) and West Cambridge (16/1134/OUT) to assess cumulative visual effects from longer distance views however, these are too far to contribute to a cumulative effect.

8.181 The assessment finds that each of the technical chapters has considered the worst case scenario and with mitigation in place, no likely significant adverse cumulative effects are anticipated with other reasonably foreseeable major developments within the study area. The economic assessment identifies a significant beneficial effect on operational jobs for Cambridgeshire.

8.182 Officers have considered the cumulative impact assessment and are in agreement with the conclusions reported in the ES and ES Addendum, that no significant cumulative impacts will arise at either the construction or operational stage.

## 9.0 THIRD PARTY ISSUES

<b>Issue</b>	<b>Officer Response/Report Section</b>
<b>Principle of Development including whether housing should be provided, provision of additional office space and whether policy requirements have been met and effect of previous planning permission 06/0552/FUL</b>	See paragraphs 8.2-8.28
<b>Impact upon operations and viability of Flying Pig</b>	See paragraphs 8.29-8.36
<b>Scale, Massing and Design and townscape impacts</b>	See paragraphs 8.37-8.57
<b>Impacts on historic environment (Conservation Area, Listed Buildings etc.)</b>	See paragraphs 8.70-8.91
<b>Transport and Highways Issues</b>	See paragraphs 8.93-8.118
<b>Impact upon ecology/biodiversity</b>	See paragraphs 8.132-8.144
<b>Impact on Residential Amenity (eg: overshadowing, noise)</b>	See paragraphs 8.169-8.173
<b>Impact on wind microclimate</b>	See paragraph 8.164
<b>Impact on air quality</b>	See paragraphs 8.155-8.161
<b>Impact of construction phase</b>	Conditions proposed to mitigate impacts of construction
<b>Impact upon existing pub landlords (lease/human rights) and employees</b>	Impact on lease is not a material planning consideration. Loss of lease is not an infringement on human rights
<b>Plan drawings don't include north points</b>	Location Plan, Site Plan and floor plans include north point
<b>East elevations missing</b>	Amended plans with separate elevations provided
<b>Proposal is only about profit</b>	Not a material planning consideration
<b>Design will encourage anti-social behaviour</b>	No objection from Police Design Out Crime officer.
<b>Should be used for additional green space and larger garden for the Flying Pig</b>	This is not the proposal put forward by the applicant

<b>Consideration of embodied carbon</b>	See paragraph 8.125
<b>Only support is from existing tenant of the developer</b>	Allowed to express views on the proposed development
<b>Shouldn't be building development like this in a pandemic</b>	Not a material planning consideration and if permission granted developer has 3 years to commence
<b>Loss of pub for long period will impact upon mental health and wellbeing</b>	Not a material planning consideration however, closure will be for a temporary period
<b>Rights to Light Easement for Flying Pig</b>	This is not a material planning consideration but a civil matter between property owners
<b>Impact on water and sewerage supply</b>	See paragraph 8.130 and comments from Anglian Water



## **10.0 PLANNING OBLIGATIONS**

10.1 The NPPF states that LPAs should consider whether otherwise unacceptable development could be made acceptable through the use of conditions or planning obligations. Policy 85 of the Local Plan states that planning permission for new developments will only be supported where there are suitable arrangements for the improvement or provision and phasing of infrastructure, services and facilities necessary to make the scheme acceptable in planning terms.

10.2 The following matters are proposed to be secured through a Section 106 agreement;

- Fixtures and fittings, apart from personal belongings of the existing tenants, shall be surveyed/recorded, protected and reinstated, to maintain the internal character of Flying Pig Public House
- The Flying Pig is to be fitted out internally by the applicant to allow full commercial operation including residential occupation
- Provision of a free to use electric bicycle (minimum 50 bicycles) scheme for tenants within the building
- Car Parking Management Strategy to secure access by Electric Vehicles only
- Secure a financial contribution of £500,000 towards Station Road/Hills Road junction improvements

## **11.0 MATERIAL CONSIDERATIONS**

11.1 The extant planning permission is a material consideration in the determination of this application. It is a fallback position which can be implemented at any time. The proposed development is a significant improvement over the extant planning permission, particularly in its architectural quality, its contribution to the townscape, the removal of buildings which detract from the character of the Conservation Area and its response to the retention of the Flying Pig public house. Both the Conservation Officer and Historic England acknowledge the considerably reduced degree of harm to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area compared to the extant planning permission.

## **12.0 THE PLANNING BALANCE**

- 12.1 Planning decisions must be taken in accordance with the development plan unless there are material considerations that indicate otherwise (section 70(2) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and section 38[6] of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004). The NPPF is a material consideration which must be taken into account where it is relevant to a planning application. This includes the presumption in favour of sustainable development found in paragraph 11 of the NPPF, which requires approving development proposals that accord with an up-to-date development plan without delay.
- 12.2 The NPPF lists the three dimensions to sustainable development: economic, social and environmental. These dimensions are interdependent and need to be pursued in mutually supportive ways to achieve sustainable development. The benefits and dis-benefits of the proposed development have been evaluated against the objectives of the NPPF and the presumption in favour of sustainable development, as summarised below.
- 12.3 The submitted environmental information has been examined and the reasoned conclusion is that the development will have impacts on the environment. No significant adverse impacts are predicted within the construction phase. Impacts from matters such as noise, dust, vibration, lighting, construction traffic will be temporary and can be mitigated through conditions with appropriate monitoring. During the operational phase, the only significant adverse impact identified is to certain viewpoints on the eastern side of the Botanic Garden. This is based on the worst-case scenario of winter. Townscape and heritage impacts from the increased scale of the proposed buildings are outweighed by the public benefits including removal of low quality existing buildings, improved public realm, biodiversity improvements and jobs growth. Appropriate mitigation can be achieved by condition in relation to matters such as wind.
- 12.4 The three dimensions of sustainable development as defined in the NPPF are addressed in the paragraphs below

## Economic Role

- 12.5 The NPPF places a clear emphasis on the importance of economic growth and delivering economic benefits as a key component of sustainable development. The proposed development demonstrates beneficial impacts to both the Cambridge and wider Cambridgeshire economies both in terms of jobs growth and economic activity (GVA), during the construction and operational phases.
- 12.6 It is estimated that the development will deliver the following economic benefits:
- Create 100 permanent construction jobs per annum for 5 years in Cambridge and 300 in Cambridgeshire.
  - Create 2,600 net additional office jobs in Cambridge and 4,700 net additional office jobs in Cambridgeshire.
  - Contribute over £100 million net additional Gross Value Added (GVA) to the local economy in the operational phase.
  - Increase in business rates of £3.9million per annum
  - Increase in cumulative additional income to local Government to 2040 of £44 million
- 12.7 A significant cumulative beneficial effect is identified within the ES to operational jobs in Cambridgeshire. Officers consider that the temporary and permanent beneficial economic impacts to be very high and therefore carry significant weight. The proposal would strengthen the existing and emerging high tech cluster in this part of Cambridge.

## Social Role

- 12.8 In terms of the social role, the proposal retains an important local community facility, the Flying Pig public house. Whilst the pub will be altered, the retention of a standalone building allows its presence to be retained as part of the townscape and thereby remain readily identifiable within the community. It's on-going viability as a public house is strengthened and the proposal is a significant improvement over the consented scheme. The proposed office buildings will have a striking impact upon the townscape due to their scale and massing however, it is considered to respond appropriately to local context in combination with an enhanced public realm and landscaping.

The proposed development will result in a well designed and safe built environment.

- 12.9 Officers consider that the social benefits arising from the development carry significant weight.

#### Environmental Role

- 12.10 In relation to the environmental role of sustainability, the proposal has a number of beneficial and negative impacts. Importantly, the proposal makes effective use of land responding to its location in an Opportunity Area and Area of Major Change in the Local Plan.

- 12.11 The proposed office buildings are designed to be energy efficient employing a fossil fuel free approach, utilising a combination of passive design and renewable energy sources, as well as conserving the use of water through a sustainable drainage strategy. This approach underpins the objective of achieving BREEAM outstanding certification which will be secured by condition and demonstrates how the proposed development will adapt to climate change.

- 12.12 The proposed development will contribute to improvements in habitat quality and a net gain in biodiversity (570%) through provision of bird and bat boxes as well as species of plants aimed to attract local fauna.

- 12.13 The development also responds positively to climate change by providing 58 EV charging points, with an ultimate commitment to restrict vehicle access to electric vehicles only, through a s106 agreement. Furthermore, person trips to and from the application site are forecast to be dominated by sustainable transport, particularly walking and cycling. This will be enhanced through improvements to the local highway network for pedestrian and cycle movements and provision of a Travel Plan secured through conditions and planning obligations. Officers consider, the environmental benefits generated by the development to be high and carry significant weight.

- 12.14 Whilst significant adverse visual impacts have been identified from some locations within the Botanic Gardens, these are limited to the eastern side of the gardens and based on a worst-case scenario (winter). These impacts will be reduced through seasonal changes due to the significant tree coverage and due

to the improved architectural quality of the buildings adjacent to the Gardens, this carries moderate weight. In terms of effects on the historic environment, less than substantial harm is identified to designated and non-designated heritage assets however, this is outweighed by the public benefits the proposal will bring forward as set out in paragraph 8.91 of this report.

### Summary

12.15 The proposed development would bring significant public benefits that accord with and meet the necessary three strands of sustainable development set out in the NPPF. The extant planning permission (as has previously been said in this report) is also a material consideration which carries considerable weight as a developer's fallback position. The proposed development is a significant improvement compared to the extant planning permission through its comprehensive redevelopment of the application site, improved townscape value and retention of the Flying Pig public house in a manner which befits its identity within the community. Having taken into account the provisions of the development plan as a whole, the statutory requirements of section 66(1) and section 72(1) of the Town and Country Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, the NPPF and associated planning practice guidance, the views of statutory consultees and wider stakeholders, as well as all other material planning considerations, it is recommended the proposed development is granted planning permission subject to planning conditions and a S106 agreement.

## 13.0 RECOMMENDATION

### **GRANT PLANNING PERMISSION subject to:**

- (i) The prior completion of an Agreement under s106 of the Town and Country Planning Act (1990) with delegated authority to officers to negotiate, secure and complete such an Agreement on the terms set out below and any others considered appropriate and necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms;
  - Fixtures and fittings, apart from personal belongings of the existing tenant/s, shall be surveyed/recorded, protected and reinstated, to maintain the internal character of the Flying Pig Public House
  - The Flying Pig Public House is to be fitted out internally by the applicant to allow full commercial operation including residential occupation
  - Provision of a free to use electric bicycle (minimum 50 bicycles) scheme for tenants within the building
  - Car Parking Management Strategy to secure access by EVs only
  - Secure a financial contribution of £500,000 towards Station Road/Hills Road junction improvements
- (ii) delegated authority to officers to include as part of the decision notice and in accordance with the Town and Country Planning (EIA) Regulations 2017, Regulation 29 'information to accompany decisions' a reasoned conclusion of the significant effects of the development on the environment and to carry out appropriate notification under Regulation 30 accordingly; and
- (iii) with delegated authority to officers to include any minor drafting changes thereto, subject to the following conditions:
  - 1 The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.

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

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

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

- 3 With the exception of demolition, no development shall take place above ground level in respect of the construction of each building, until details of the materials for the external surfaces of the building under construction have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The details shall include brick façade system including precast concrete horizontal shading overhang and vertical shading fins, windows (including the level of reflectiveness), balustrades, brick, roof tiles, metal louvred screen and doors, metal louvred plant enclosure. Unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority, the development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

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

- 4 No brickwork above ground level shall be laid until a sample panel [1.5m x 1.5m] has been prepared on site detailing the choice of brick, bond, coursing, special brick patterning, mortar mix, design and pointing technique for the relevant brickwork. The details shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved sample panel is to be retained on site for the duration of the works for comparative purposes, and works will take place only in accordance with approved details unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority.

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

- 5 No construction works shall commence above ground level until a large scale, bay-wide panel for the Hills Road façade of Building B to demonstrate and detail materials; set-backs/reveals; junctions. The panel shall be constructed on or off site and approved in writing by the local planning authority.

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

- 6 No construction works shall commence above ground level until a large scale, bay-wide panel for the Hills Road façade of Building C to demonstrate and detail materials; set-backs/reveals; junctions. The panel shall be constructed on or off site and approved in writing by the local planning authority.

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

- 7 Prior to the construction of the basement, details of a structural monitoring system to ensure the structural integrity of the Flying Pig shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority and subsequently installed and maintained. Save to the extent permitted by the phasing plan approved pursuant to Condition 49, no demolition of elements of the Flying Pig shall take place until the proposed basement has been constructed and the parts of the Flying Pig to be retained have been structurally secured.

Reason: To ensure appropriate protection of the public house in accordance with policies 61 and 62 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2018.

- 8 The roof-mounted plant/equipment shown on drawing no 18059-PA-00-P110-P03 shall not be installed on Building B until details of the plant/equipment have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The details shall include the type, dimensions, materials, location, and means of fixing. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority.



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

- 9 The roof-mounted plant/equipment shown on drawing no 18059-PA-00-P110-P03 shall not be installed on Building C until details of the plant/equipment have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The details shall include the type, dimensions, materials, location, and means of fixing. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority.

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

- 10 Notwithstanding the submitted plans, no development other than demolition shall take place until full details of all tree pits, including those in planters, hard paving and soft landscaped areas have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority and these works shall be carried out as approved.

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

- 11 Prior to the commencement of construction works above ground level, a detailed Public Art Strategy and Delivery 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 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).

- 12 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 and these works shall be carried out as approved. These details shall include proposed finished levels or contours; means of enclosure (incorporating where necessary and practicable, a method of dispersal for hedgehogs); car parking layouts, other vehicle and pedestrian access and circulation areas; hard surfacing materials; minor artefacts and structures (e.g. furniture, play equipment, refuse or other storage units, signs, lighting); proposed and existing functional services above and below ground (e.g. drainage, power, communications cables, pipelines indicating lines, manholes, supports); retained historic landscape features and proposals for restoration, where relevant.

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. The landscaping scheme shall also reference the required soft landscaping mitigation for wind including location, size and species of planting.

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).

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

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

- 14 No development above ground level, other than demolition, shall commence until full details of green roofs and roof gardens have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority and these works shall be carried out as approved. The details shall include details of build-ups, make up of substrates, planting plans for biodiverse roofs, methodologies for translocation strategies (if applicable) and drainage and irrigation details where applicable.

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

- 15 Prior to the commencement of development, 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).

- 16 Prior to first occupation of Building B a Travel Plan has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The Travel Plan shall specify the methods to be used to discourage the use of the private motor vehicle and the arrangements to encourage use of alternative sustainable travel arrangements such as public transport, car sharing, cycling and walking. The Travel Plan shall be implemented as approved upon the occupation of the development and monitored in accordance with details to be agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In the interests of encouraging sustainable travel to and from the site (Cambridge Local Plan 2018, policies 80 and 81).

- 17 Prior to first occupation of Building C a Travel Plan has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The Travel Plan shall specify the methods to be used

to discourage the use of the private motor vehicle and the arrangements to encourage use of alternative sustainable travel arrangements such as public transport, car sharing, cycling and walking. The Travel Plan shall be implemented as approved upon the occupation of the development and monitored in accordance with details to be agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In the interests of encouraging sustainable travel to and from the site (Cambridge Local Plan 2018, policies 80 and 81).

- 18 Demolition and/or construction vehicles with a gross weight in excess of 3.5 tonnes shall enter or leave the site only between the hours of 09.30hrs -15.30hrs, seven days a week.

Reason:

- 19 Prior to first occupation of any part of the development hereby approved, a scheme and programme of highway works as set out in drawing MMD-411987-C-DR-01-XX-1041 entitled Hills Road Highways Scheme General Arrangement shall be completed and fully operational, with the exception of the bellmouth access to the basement car park to the west of Building C. The realignment of this access shall be completed and be fully operational prior to the first occupation Building C.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety and to mitigate the impact of the development (Cambridge Local Plan 2018, Policy 81).

- 20 No operational plant, machinery or equipment both internal (including any plant rooms with louvres) and external including proposed electricity substations shall be installed associated with Building B until a noise assessment and any noise insulation / mitigation scheme as required to mitigate and reduce to a minimum potential adverse impacts, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The scheme shall be carried out as approved and retained as such.

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

- 21 No operational plant, machinery or equipment both internal (including any plant rooms with louvres) and external including proposed electricity substations shall be installed associated with Building C until a noise assessment and any noise insulation / mitigation scheme as required to mitigate and reduce to a minimum potential adverse impacts, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The scheme shall be carried out as approved and retained as such.

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

- 22 No development, including demolition, shall commence until a site wide Demolition and Construction Environmental Management Plan (DCEMP) has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The DCEMP shall include the consideration of the following aspects of demolition and construction:
- a) Demolition, construction and phasing programme.
  - b) Contractors' access arrangements for vehicles, plant and personnel including the location of construction traffic routes to, from and within the site, details of their signing, monitoring and enforcement measures.
  - c ) Construction/Demolition works shall only be carried out between 0800 hours to 1800 hours Monday to Friday, and 0800 hours to 1300 hours on Saturday and at no time on Sundays, Bank or Public Holidays, unless in accordance with agreed emergency procedures for deviation which shall be detailed.
  - d) Delivery times and collections/dispatches for construction/demolition purposes shall be carried out between 0800 to 1800 hours Monday to Friday, 0800 to 1300 hours on Saturdays and at no time on Sundays, bank or public holidays, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority
  - e) Soil Management Strategy having particular regard to potential contaminated land and the reuse and recycling of soil on site, the importation and storage of soil and materials including audit trails.
  - f) Noise impact assessment methodology, mitigation measures, noise monitoring and recording statements in accordance with the provisions of BS 5228-1:2009+A1:2014 Code of Practice for noise and vibration control on construction and open sites.

- g) Vibration impact assessment methodology, mitigation measures, monitoring and recording statements in accordance with the provisions of BS 5228-2:2009+A1:2014 Code of Practice for noise and vibration control on construction and open sites. Details of any piling construction methods / options, as appropriate.
- h) Dust mitigation, management / monitoring and wheel washing measures in accordance with the provisions of Control of dust and emissions during construction and demolition in accordance with the Greater Cambridge Sustainable Design and Construction SPD (2020).
- i) Use of concrete crushers
- j) Prohibition of the burning of waste on site during demolition/construction.
- k) Site artificial lighting including hours of operation, position and impact on neighbouring properties.
- l) Drainage control measures including the use of settling tanks, oil interceptors and bunds.
- m) Screening and hoarding details.
- n) Access and protection arrangements around the site for pedestrians, cyclists and other road users.
- o) Procedures for interference with public highways, including permanent and temporary realignment, diversions and road closures.
- p) External safety and information signing and notices.
- q) Implementation of a Stakeholder Engagement / Residents Communication Plan, Complaints procedures, including complaints response procedures.
- r) Details of any proposed temporary structures, works, plant or machinery required in relation to construction of the building of more than 30m AOD in height to be submitted and agreed
- s) Impacts on biodiversity including vegetation clearance on nesting birds, demolition works on potential roosting bats and artificial night time lighting on crepuscular and nocturnal fauna
- s) Membership of the Considerate Contractors Scheme.

Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved DCEMP

Reason: To protect the amenity of the adjoining properties. (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policies 35 and 37)

23 Material Management Plan:

Prior to importation or reuse of material associated with the necessary groundworks and soft landscaping for the development (or phase of) a Materials Management Plan (MMP) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The MMP shall:

- a) Include details of the volumes and types of material proposed to be imported or reused on site
- b) Include details of the proposed source(s) of the imported or reused material
- c) Include details of the chemical testing for ALL material to be undertaken before placement onto the site.
- d) Include the results of the chemical testing which must show the material is suitable for use on the development
- e) Include confirmation of the chain of evidence to be kept during the materials movement, including material importation, reuse placement and removal from and to the development.

All works will be undertaken in accordance with the approved document.

Reason: To ensure that no unsuitable material is brought onto the site in the interest of environmental and public safety in accordance with Cambridge Local Plan 2018 Policy 33.

- 24 Building B hereby approved shall not be occupied until a Completion Report demonstrating full compliance with the approved Material Management Plan, and any remediation works required by the Local Planning Authority as a result of the discovery of unexpected contamination, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure that the reuse or importation of material on site has been appropriately managed on site in the interest of environmental and public safety in accordance with Cambridge Local Plan 2018 Policy 33.

- 25 Building C hereby approved shall not be occupied until a Completion Report demonstrating full compliance with the approved Material Management Plan, and any remediation works required by the Local Planning Authority as a result of the discovery of unexpected contamination, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure that the reuse or importation of material on site has been appropriately managed on site in the interest of environmental and public safety in accordance with Cambridge Local Plan 2018 Policy 33.

- 26 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).

- 27 With the exception of the public house, all service collections / dispatches from and deliveries to the approved development including refuse / recycling collections shall only be permitted between the hours of 07:00 to 23:00 Monday to Friday, 08:00 to 13:00 on Saturday. Service collections / dispatches from and deliveries are not permitted at any time on Sundays or public holidays.

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

- 28 No external lighting shall be provided or installed until an artificial lighting impact assessment and mitigation scheme as required has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The assessment shall include the following:



(i) the method of lighting (including luminaire type / profiles, mounting location / height, aiming angles / orientation, angle of glare, operational controls, horizontal / vertical isolux contour light levels and calculated glare levels to both on and off site receptors)

(ii) the extent/levels of illumination over the site and on adjacent land and predicted lighting levels at the nearest light sensitive receptors

All artificial lighting must meet the Obtrusive Light Limitations for Exterior Lighting Installations contained within the 'Institute of Lighting Professionals - Guidance Notices for the Reduction of Obtrusive Light - GN01/20 (or as superseded)'.

(iii) demonstrate that proposed lighting scheme adheres to Advice Note 2 'Lighting Near Aerodromes' (available at [www.aoa.org.uk/policy-campaigns/operations-safety/](http://www.aoa.org.uk/policy-campaigns/operations-safety/)) where necessary. Your attention is drawn to the CAP 393: Air Navigation Order, Section 1, Part 28, Lights and Lighting, available at ([www.caa.co.uk](http://www.caa.co.uk)) which states that;

(1) A person must not exhibit in the United Kingdom any light which:

(a) by reason of its glare is liable to endanger aircraft taking off from or landing at an aerodrome; or

(b) by reason of its liability to be mistaken for an aeronautical ground light is liable to endanger aircraft.

The Order also grants the Civil Aviation Authority power to serve notice to extinguish or screen any such light which may endanger aircraft. Further information can be found Advice Note 2 'Lighting Near Aerodromes'.

The scheme shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details and shall be retained as such.

Reason: To protect the amenity of nearby properties and respond appropriately to nearby sensitive receptors including Cambridge Airport (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policies 36, 37, 69 and 70).

- 29 No development above ground level of any of the proposed Food and Beverage uses, including the Flying Pig Public House shall commence until a scheme detailing plant, equipment or machinery for the purposes of extraction, filtration and abatement of odours and to discharge at an appropriate outlet height / level, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Unless otherwise agreed with the

Local Planning Authority, the approved scheme shall be installed before the use is commenced and shall be retained as such. All odour filtration/extraction/abatement systems shall always be designed and operated in accordance the "Control of Odour and Noise from Commercial Kitchen Exhaust Systems (update to the 2004 report prepared by NETCEN for DEFRA) dated 05-09-2018" or as superseded.

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

- 30 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)

- 31 No development above ground level of Building B hereby permitted shall commence until details of the location of associated duct work, for the purpose of extraction, filtration and/or abatement of fumes and or odours shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Unless otherwise agreed with the Local Planning Authority, the approved ductwork shall be installed before the use hereby permitted is commenced and retained as such.

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

- 32 No development above ground level of Building C hereby permitted shall commence until details of the location of associated duct work, for the purpose of extraction, filtration and/or abatement of fumes and or odours shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Unless otherwise agreed with the Local Planning Authority, the approved ductwork shall be installed before the use hereby permitted is commenced and retained as such.

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

33 Prior to first occupation and the installation of any electrical services, an electric vehicle charge point scheme demonstrating the provision of allocated car parking spaces with dedicated electric vehicle charging, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall include:

1. Fifty-Two slow electric vehicle charge points with a minimum power rating output of 7kW
2. Six fast electric vehicle charge points with a minimum power rating of 24kW
3. Additional passive electric vehicle charge provision of the necessary infrastructure including capacity in the connection to the local electricity distribution network and electricity distribution board, as well as the provision of infrastructure to enable future cabling to parking spaces for all remaining car parking spaces to facilitate and enable the future installation and activation of additional active electric vehicle charge points as required

The electric vehicle charge point scheme as approved shall be fully installed prior to the first occupation and maintained and retained thereafter.

Reason: In the interests of encouraging more sustainable modes and forms of transport and to reduce the impact of development on local air quality, in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF, 2019) paragraphs, 110, 170 and 181, Cambridge City Council's adopted Air Quality Action Plan (2018) (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policy 82).

34 Within 12 months of commencement of the construction of each building, a BRE issued Design Stage Certificate shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority demonstrating that BREEAM 'outstanding' will be met, with maximum credits for Wat 01 (water consumption). Where the Design Stage certificate shows a shortfall in credits for BREEAM 'outstanding', 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).

- 35 Prior to the use or occupation of each building hereby approved, or within 12 months of use or occupation of each building, 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 or 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).

- 36 Prior to the first occupation of any of the development a Lighting and Ecological Management Plan (LEMP) shall be submitted to and agreed in writing by the local planning authority. This shall include as a minimum;

- Detail on how the proposed ecological features, such as planting and bird/bat boxes will be established and managed for the long-term to enhance the ecological value at the site;
- Type and location of bat and bird boxes; and
- Detail on the artificial lighting scheme for Building B and Building C based on the Bat Conservation Trust guidance on artificial lighting (BCT, 2018).

The approved LEMP shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details

Reason: To improve biodiversity on site and to mitigate any potential impacts upon biodiversity within the adjacent Botanic Gardens (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policy 69).

- 37 Prior to commencement of the development and in accordance with BS5837 2012, a phased tree protection methodology in the form of an Arboricultural Method Statement (AMS) and Tree Protection Plan (TPP) shall be submitted to the local planning authority for its written approval, before any tree works are carried and before equipment, machinery or materials are

brought onto the site for the purpose of development (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 Prior to the installation of any rooftop photovoltaic panels on Building B, a photovoltaic glint and glare study shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The installation of the photovoltaic panels shall take place in accordance with details agreed.

Reason: To ensure the development does not endanger the safe movement of aircraft or the operation of Cambridge Airport through confusion with aeronautical ground lights or glare in accordance with policy 37 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2018.

- 41 Prior to the installation of any rooftop photovoltaic panels on Building C, a photovoltaic glint and glare study shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The installation of the photovoltaic panels shall take place in accordance with details agreed.

Reason: To ensure the development does not endanger the safe movement of aircraft or the operation of Cambridge Airport through confusion with aeronautical ground lights or glare in accordance with policy 37 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2018.

- 42 Prior to first occupation, a Bird Hazard Management Plan shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The submitted plan shall include details of:

- 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/policy-campaigns/operations-safety/](http://www.aoa.org.uk/policy-campaigns/operations-safety/))
- Lidded bins should be provided throughout the site
- Physical arrangements for the collection (including litter bins) and storage of putrescible waste, arrangements for and frequency of the removal of putrescible waste
- A good housekeeping plan should be in place in order to ensure spilt or dropped food is cleaned up promptly
- Signs deterring people from feeding the birds

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

The Bird Hazard Management Plan must ensure that flat/shallow pitched roofs be constructed to allow access to all areas by foot using permanent fixed access stairs ladders or similar. The owner/occupier must not allow gulls, to nest, roost or loaf on the building. Checks must be made weekly or sooner if bird activity dictates, during the breeding season. Outside of the breeding season gull activity must be monitored and the roof checked regularly to ensure that gulls do not utilise the roof. Any gulls found nesting, roosting or loafing must be dispersed by the owner/occupier when detected or when requested by Cambridge Airport (CIA) Airside Operations staff. In some instances it may be necessary to contact CIA Airside Operations staff before bird dispersal takes place. The owner/occupier must remove any nests or eggs found on the roof.

The breeding season for gulls typically runs from March to June. The owner/occupier must obtain the appropriate licences where applicable from Natural England before the removal of nests and eggs

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 in accordance with policy 37 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2018.

- 43 Obstacle lights shall be placed on any crane above a maximum jib height of 10m AOD to be used in the development at 104-112 Hills Road The obstacle lighting scheme shall be implemented for the duration of the construction period. These obstacle lights must be steady state red lights with a minimum intensity of 200 Candela Periods of illumination of obstacle lights, obstacle light locations and obstacle light photometric performance must all be in accordance with the requirements of 'CAP168 Licensing of Aerodromes' (available at [www.caa.co.uk](http://www.caa.co.uk)).

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 in accordance with policy 37 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2018.

- 44 Prior to first occupation a Car and Cycle Parking Management Plan shall be submitted to and approved in writing by, the Local Planning authority.

The Plan shall include, but not be limited to:

- Details of how the car and cycle parking spaces will be allocated
- Details of how access to the car and cycle parking area will be controlled, including after hours
- Details, including the location and appearance of proposed security measures such as gates/shutters across the cycle and vehicle entrance/exit

The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details prior to first occupation and retained thereafter.

Reason: To ensure the development does not have an unacceptable impact on highways safety (Cambridge Local Plan 2018, policies 36, 81 and 82).

- 45 Prior to the commencement of the development, a Phasing Plan shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority. The Plan should include, but not be limited to, the following:

1) Phasing of the demolition of existing buildings including elements of the Flying Pig Public House

2) Phasing of the construction of the basement, proposed office buildings and basement and extensions to the Flying Pig Public House

3) The phasing plan shall include timescales for both demolition and construction phases

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



Reason: To ensure demolition and construction works are phased appropriately in the interests of residential amenity and to provide the best opportunity to reopen the community use (public house) as expeditiously as possible. (Cambridge Local Plan 2018, policies 35 and 76).

- 46 Prior to first occupation of Building B, all restoration works to the Flying Pig public house including the basement, pub garden and internal fit out shall be substantially completed.

Reason: To ensure the viability of the public house in accordance with policy 76 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2018.

- 47 No development shall commence until a programme of archaeological work in accordance with a written scheme of investigation (WSI) has been submitted to and approved by the local planning authority in writing. For land that is included within the WSI, no demolition/development shall take place other than under the provisions of the agreed WSI, which shall include:

- a. The statement of significance and research objectives;
- b. The programme and methodology of site investigation and recording and the nomination of a competent person(s) or organisation to undertake the agreed works;
- c. The timetable for the field investigation as part of the development programme;
- d. The programme and timetable for the analysis, publication & dissemination, and deposition of resulting material

Partial discharge of the condition can be applied for once the fieldwork at Part c) has been completed to enable the commencement of development.

Part d) of the condition shall not be discharged until all elements have been fulfilled in accordance with the programme set out in the WSI.

Reason: To ensure appropriate consideration of Cambridge's historic environment in accordance with the NPPF and policy 61 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2018.

- 48 Prior to first occupation of Building B, a waste management plan shall be submitted to and agreed in writing by the local planning authority. The waste management plan shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details and retained thereafter.

Reason - To ensure appropriate storage and collection of waste in the interests of visual amenity (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policies 56 and 57)

- 49 Prior to first occupation of Building C, a waste management plan shall be submitted to and agreed in writing by the local planning authority. The waste management plan shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details and retained thereafter.

Reason - To ensure appropriate storage and collection of waste in the interests of visual amenity (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policies 56 and 57)

- 50 Prior to first occupation of each of Building B, details of the two-tier bicycle racks shall be submitted to and agreed in writing by the local planning authority. The two-tier bicycle racks shall be installed in accordance with the approved details and retained in perpetuity.

Reason: To ensure convenient and accessible cycle parking is provided in accordance with policy 82 of the Cambridge Local Plan

- 51 Prior to first occupation of each of Building C, details of the two-tier bicycle racks shall be submitted to and agreed in writing by the local planning authority. The two-tier bicycle racks shall be installed in accordance with the approved details and retained in perpetuity.

Reason: To ensure convenient and accessible cycle parking is provided in accordance with policy 82 of the Cambridge Local Plan

- 52 Prior to construction of the pub garden wall, details of its appearance, method of construction and proposed materials shall be submitted to and agreed in writing by the local planning authority. Where practicable, the materials shall include brick and flint salvaged from the existing right rear boundary wall of the pub

garden. The wall shall be constructed in accordance with the approved details and retained in perpetuity.

Reason: In the interests of visual amenity, acoustic performance and local historic character in accordance with policies 35, 55 and 62 of the Cambridge Local Plan.

- 53 The areas of internal floorspace identified as “F&B” and coloured purple at ground floor level within Building B and Building C on approved plan no. (00)\_P100 Rev P03 shall be used for purposes falling with class A1, A2 or A3 only and for no other purpose.

Reason: To ensure an appropriate mix of uses at ground floor level and to provide active uses to the buildings frontages in accordance with policies 40 and 56 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2018.

- 54 All servicing, delivery and collections for Building B and Building C shall be undertaken between the hours of 07:00 to 23:00 Monday to Saturday only, excluding Sundays, Bank and other public holidays.

Reason: In the interest of residential amenity (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 Policy 35)

- 55 The Flying Pig public house shall only be used for purposes falling within Schedule 2 Part A Class E(b) of the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes)(Amendment)(England) Regulations 2020.

Reason: To retain the existing use of the premises for the sale of food and drink mostly undertaken on the premises in accordance with policy 76 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2018.

### **Informatives**

- 1 Connection to a public sewer

Notification of intention to connect to the public sewer under S106 of the Water Industry Act Approval and consent will be required by Anglian Water, under the Water Industry Act 1991. Contact Development Services Team 0345 606 6087.

## 2 Protection of existing assets

A public sewer is shown on record plans within the land identified for the proposed development. It appears that development proposals will affect existing public sewers. It is recommended that the applicant contacts Anglian Water Development Services Team for further advice on this matter. Building over existing public sewers will not be permitted (without agreement) from Anglian Water.

## 3 Building near to a public sewer

No building will be permitted within the statutory easement width of 3 metres from the pipeline without agreement from Anglian Water. Please contact Development Services Team on 0345 606 6087.

## 4 Sewer adoption

The developer should note that the site drainage details submitted have not been approved for the purposes of adoption. If the developer wishes to have the sewers included in a sewer adoption agreement with Anglian Water (under Sections 104 of the Water Industry Act 1991), they should contact our Development Services Team on 0345 606 6087 at the earliest opportunity. Sewers intended for adoption should be designed and constructed in accordance with Sewers for Adoption guide for developers, as supplemented by Anglian Water's requirements.

## 5 Sustainable Design and Construction SPD Informative

To satisfy and discharge Environmental Health conditions relating to artificial lighting, contaminated land, noise / sound, air quality and odours / fumes, any assessment and mitigation shall be in accordance with the scope, methodologies and requirements of relevant sections of the Greater Cambridge Sustainable Design and Construction SPD, (Adopted January 2020) <https://www.cambridge.gov.uk/greater-cambridge-sustainable-design-and-construction-spd> and in particular section 3.6 - Pollution and the following associated appendices:

- 6: Requirements for Specific Lighting Schemes

- 7: The Development of Potentially Contaminated Sites in Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire: A Developers Guide
- 8: Further technical guidance related to noise pollution

## 6 Odour/fume informative

To satisfy the odour/fume filtration/extraction condition, details shall be provided in accordance with Appendix 2 and 3 of EMAQ's "Control of Odour and Noise from Commercial Kitchen Exhaust Systems (update to the 2004 report prepared by NETCEN for DEFRA) dated September 2018".

## 7 Food safety informative

As the premises / approved uses are intended to be run as or includes a food business, the applicant is reminded that under the Food Safety Act 1990 (as amended) the premises / use will need to register with Cambridge City Council, as required by law. In order to avoid additional costs, it is recommended that the applicant ensure that the kitchen, food preparation and foods storage areas comply with food hygiene legislation, before construction starts. Contact the Commercial Team of Environmental Health at Cambridge City Council on telephone number (01223) 457890 or email [Commercial@cambridge.gov.uk](mailto:Commercial@cambridge.gov.uk) for further information.

## 8 Licensing informative

A premises licence under the Licensing Act 2003 may be required or varied for this development in addition to any planning permission. A premises licence may be required to authorise:

The supply of alcohol

Regulated entertainment e.g.

- Music (Including bands, DJ's and juke boxes)

- Dancing

- The performing of plays

- Boxing or wrestling

- The showing of films

Late Night Refreshment (The supply of hot food or drink between 23:00-05:00)

A separate licence may be required for activities involving gambling including poker and gaming machines.

The applicant is advised to contact The Licensing Team of Environmental Health at Cambridge City Council on telephone number (01223) 457899 or email [licensing@cambridge.gov.uk](mailto:licensing@cambridge.gov.uk) for further information.

## 9 Local Highway Consent

The granting of a planning permission does not constitute a permission or licence to a developer to carry out any works within, or disturbance of, or interference with, the Public Highway, and that a separate permission must be sought from the Highway Authority for such works.

**DEVELOPMENT CONTROL FORUM**

11 November 2020  
10.00 am - 12.11 pm

**Present**

**Planning Committee Members:** Councillors Baigent, Green, Page-Croft, Porrer, Robertson, Smart, Thornburrow and Tunnacliffe

**Officers:**

Assistant Director (Delivery): Sharon Brown  
Interim Management Support: Phil McIntosh  
Committee Manager: Claire Tunnicliffe  
Meeting Producer: Liam Martin

**For Applicant:**

Bidwells: Jonathan Bainbridge  
Pace Investments: Johnny Vincent  
AHMM Architects: Simon Allford

**For Petitioners:**

A Cambridge resident.

<b>FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE COUNCIL</b>
---

**20/29/DCF Declarations of Interest**

Name	Item	Reason
Baigent		Member of Cambridge Cycling Campaign and a member of Extinction Rebellion
Thornburrow		Ward Councillor for Trumpington, attended earlier consultations and spoken to the applicant's team, but had not done so in relation to the latest planning application. Had also been a patron of the venue in the past but remained unfettered.
Page-Croft		Family members were regular patrons of the venue and had played paid gigs.

		However, remains unfettered with regard to this application Had been sent a book related to the history of The Flying Pig by an individual involved with the business.
Smart		Had been sent a book related to the history of The Flying Pig by an individual involved with the business.
Porrer		Had been sent a book related to the history of The Flying Pig by an individual involved with the business.
Green		Had been sent a book related to the history of The Flying Pig by an individual involved with the business.

## **20/30/DCF Application and Petition Details (20/03429/FUL / 104 - 112 Hills Rd Cambridge)**

### **Description:**

1. The demolition of Betjeman House, Broadcasting House, Ortona House, Francis House, and the rear multi-storey carpark to Francis House, together with existing refuse and cycle stores; to allow for construction of two new commercial buildings of five and seven storeys respectively, providing flexible B1(a), B1(b), A1, A2, A3 uses on the ground floor and Class B1(a) and B1(b) on the upper floors.
2. The construction of basement with mezzanine level to provide for building services, cycle parking and car parking for the proposed commercial buildings, cycle and car parking spaces for Botanic House and services for Flying Pig Public House.
3. The refurbishment of the Flying Pig Public House at 106 Hills Road, including demolition of part single/part two storey outrigger and single storey store, alterations to elevations, construction of extension to enable level access and layout pub garden.
4. Creation of new public realm and landscaping, incorporating segregated vehicular and cycle access ii from Hills Road, a new access to service areas and substations, and taxi drop off for both the development proposed and existing Botanic House.

Applicant: Pace Investments (Johnny Vincent)

Agent: Jonathan Bainbridge, Bidwells Address: 25 Old Burlington Street  
London W1S 3AN

Lead Petitioner: Cambridge City resident



Case Officer: Phil McIntosh

**The grounds for asking for a Forum on this application were as follows:**

Text of Petition: This is a petition to request Cambridge City Council hold a Development Control Forum in respect of planning application 20/03429/FUL Site address: 104 – 112 Hills Rd Cambridge on the grounds that: [according to 'Probity in Planning for Councillors and Officers', published by the Local Government Association and The Planning Advisory Service, it ought to be advertised as a 'Departure' application, because:]

The application is not in accordance with the following Local Plan (LP) Policies:

Local Plan Policy 14 - Areas of Major Change, states; 'development shall only be permitted: where the development is based on clearly articulated and justified objectives and approach through the provision of a site-wide masterplan'. and: '3.28 Substantial development will not be permitted in advance of the preparation and approval of a site-wide masterplan, strategies and/or other overarching documents as required by the scale and nature of development'. Masterplanning has not been carried out in accordance with the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012);

Policy 21 states: 'Station Area West 2 will be subject to masterplanning and detailed transport assessment before any new planning applications come forward.' Masterplanning has not been carried out in accordance with the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012);

Policy 55 - Responding to context; The proposal ignores the prevailing character of the area in terms of both scale, mass and architectural detail;

Policy 58 - Altering and extending existing buildings; The proposed alterations to the Flying Pig do not respect the character of the existing building, and will seriously undermine the viability of the pub as a business;

Policy 61 - Conservation and enhancement of Cambridge's historic environment; The Flying Pig is completely dominated by this overbearing proposal and its significance lost by the poor juxtaposition of the new buildings; The University Botanic Garden is overlooked and overshadowed, negatively impacting the skyline as viewed from within the Garden, and the sense of privacy and intimacy currently enjoyed from within the garden.

Policy 62 - Local Heritage Assets; The history of this site not adequately understood: There is considerable new information regarding the history of both the Public House and the wider site, and it's relevance to the development of the city physically, politically, historically and economically, that has yet to be disseminated.

Policy 76 - Protection of Public Houses; The economic benefits have not, and cannot be predicted in the current Covid climate, as acknowledged by the authors of the 'Economic Benefits Statement' submitted in support of this application. No justification for the development has therefore been provided; It has not been demonstrated that the viability of the pub will not be adversely affected; The associated development does not preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the Conservation Area in which it sits; The proposals will result in the garden area (both existing and proposed) being overshadowed during trading hours and thus deprived of sunlight, to the detriment of the flora and patrons. Sunlight is an important factor in its attractiveness to customers, particularly during the most lucrative summer months.

and furthermore, we are also concerned:

That application 20/03429/FUL and supporting documents contain a number of potentially inaccurate statements and premises, on which comments by statutory consultees, and nonstatutory consultees have been made;

That a number of alternative schemes have been illustrated in the 'Design and Access Statement' (Both sets!), but not shown to the local iv community at any public consultation for comment or discussion prior to submission and validation of the application;

That the cumulative impacts of some of the other developments that will occur in the vicinity, for example as the CB1 development progresses, have not been adequately assessed or quantified in the EIA process;

That insufficient information has been provided regarding the construction methods proposed to form a view of either the long term danger to the structure of the Flying Pig Public House caused by the proximity of proposed excavation, piling and subsequent building works, or of the danger of sudden collapse during construction works, and that if that were to occur, substantial harm would be done to the character and appearance of the New Town and Glisson Rd Conservation Area, which the Local Authority has a duty to

preserve or enhance under the Planning (Listed buildings and Conservation Areas) Act;

That insufficient evidence has been provided ‘...on how the basement [of the new offices] will be protected from groundwater flooding. Further information on the waterproofing strategy is required at this stage to allow us to assess the groundwater flood risk to the proposed development in more detail. The applicant must also demonstrate that the basement will not increase groundwater flood risk in adjacent areas as a result of groundwater displacement.’ The Flying Pig beer cellar will be extremely vulnerable to such floodwater displacement, unless tanked. That either means lining the interior of the existing cellar... to what thickness? Will barrel access be impeded? Or, will external tanking be required, meaning excavating around the cellar exterior, at huge risk to the integrity of the existing (remaining) structure.

That the specified opening hours of the Flying Pig (1500 – 2300hrs Mon – fri, 0700 – 2300hrs Sat-Sun) are hours adopted in response to the Coronavirus crisis, not the hours kept pre-Covid, and which will have a serious impact on the viability of the business when this crisis passes. No opening hours are specified for either offices or other F & B’s;

That the condition proposed to be attached to any permission by Environmental Health, that amplified music and vocal performance in external areas be prohibited between the hours of 1900 – 2300 daily, will have a huge impact on the viability of the pub, as it has proven to v be a popular and essential adaptation to the current crisis.

There’s no such specification of the same for other F & B’s, and also that the proposal that the first floor windows be upgraded to provide better acoustic transmission properties, to protect future occupants from traffic noise will alter the character of the facade, and thus the character and appearance of the Conservation Area;

That the justifications for denying the Cambridge community its otherwise rightful, meaningful and accountable say in the work up of proposals for the site (masterplanning) require verification (one of them is demonstrably untrue and misleading); That the description of the proposal (06/0552/FUL, ‘the extant permission’, which is relied upon as a justification for not masterplanning the site, and which lends credibility to this application, despite it being a completely different scheme) misleadingly states: ‘including retention of ‘Flying Pig’ Public House’. Which means the publicity notices advertising that application were

‘recklessly misleading in a material particular’(in our opinion), which is an offence under Section 65 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990; The above list of planning concerns is by no means exhaustive.

This is not an outright in-principle objection.

Your encouragement ‘to say in the petition what changes might be made to the development to overcome’ our concerns, is noted, as are the statements on the Petitions and Development Control Forum Petition page <https://www.cambridge.gov.uk/petitions-anddevelopment-control-forum> that: ‘You will be expected to explain what changes you are seeking at the development control forum itself.’ and that: ‘The aim of the forum is to allow early discussion of the planning issues raised by petitioners and to explore the scope for building consensus and resolving concerns. It is an informal meeting and the forum does not determine the application.’

Specific examples of changes which might be made to overcome our concerns include, but are not limited to (and these are the views of us all):

1. That the bulk of the buildings should be kept below the tree line when viewed from within the Botanic Garden, which suggests a maximum height of three commercial storeys at the southern end of the site, rising to perhaps four/five storeys at the northern end. The proposed heights should therefore be reduced by at least one / two storeys along its western edge.
2. That the heights to the Hills Rd frontage should be restricted to four storeys so that the buildings fit the context. Apart from Botanic House, the prevailing height for office buildings along the west side of Hills Rd is no more than four storeys. Botanic House is an exception because it marks an important junction between Hills Rd and Station Rd. If built as proposed Botanic House would lose its landmark status.
3. That a condition be attached to any proposed grant of permission to the effect that: Any accidental damage that might befall the Flying Pig during construction works that is not envisaged or permitted by any planning permission be re-instated in facsimile [as in the case of The Carlton Tavern, Kilburn] before any further work on site proceeds, or to a schedule agreed by the council before re-commencement of development on the site, and in any case before commission of any new buildings.
4. That Flying Pig trading hours be set at the discretion of the tenants, within the terms of its license and national licensing regulations. The same to apply to the other food and beverage units.

5. That any proposed restrictions on usage of external areas be applied equally to all food and beverage units on the site.
6. That development should aim to be car-free, except for essential disabled parking and access for service (including tenants and musicians) vehicles.
7. That the office building behind the Flying Pig be pulled back such that the existing (Flying Pig) buildings need not be developed in any way, and such that the pub can continue to trade. The developer has said this can be done. The community has been asking for this loudly and clearly for 15 years. There are schemes in the Design and Access Statement illustrating such a scenario. The publicly accessible ground floor of the proposed new buildings will incorporate disabled access toilets. The statement of economic benefits is, according to its authors, out of date, so no justification for any work to the Flying Pig has been offered in this application.

**Case by the Applicant / Agent:**

Johnny Vincent (Managing Director of Pace investments) said the following points:

- i. The scheme had been principally driven by an aspiration over sustainability, wellbeing, public realm, the campaign to save The Flying Pig and to preserve and protect the tranquillity of the Botanic Garden.
- ii. The scheme provided a campus for people and would allow innovation, education, provide a space for future learning and leadership.

Simon Allford (AHMM Architects) made the following points:

- i. The Flying Pig was the centrepiece of the development with the Botanic Garden and two new buildings creating the masterplan for the site.
- ii. The current site consisted of surface carpark, minimal planting and two 'dilapidated' buildings and a car park.
- iii. The driving mantra of the project was "A building fit for the future, long term, loose fit, low energy."
- iv. It had been established the site had been a place of work within the City for over 100 years.
- v. Botanic House, developed by the client, had informed the developer's thinking in consultation with statutory and non-statutory bodies, several of whom had provided positive feedback.
- vi. The Flying Pig would be a focus of Hills Road with a new garden extended along Hills Road, surrounded by but separate from extensive public realm. Buildings B & C would carefully define the potential of the site; used for work purposes and would be in the 'slipstream' of Botanic House.

- vii. Looking south down Hills Road the importance of Botanic House would clearly be seen and used as marker in the centre of the development.
- viii. The blank rear wall of Botanic House would be offset by buildings C & D with the church spire remaining as the focus. Roof gardens would be available for leisure activity such as the use of exercise tracks. The roof would also have green and seasonal planting.
- ix. The aim of the site was to provide a new public realm including opening the views of the Botanic Gardens which would bring in the public to the site.
- x. Inside the buildings the target was to provide adaptable volume, long life, low energy and low carbon with personality and character, and natural ventilation hybrid system.
- xi. Plans listed as Outstanding/Platinum under BREEAM2018, WELL and WiredScore ratings, with Water Consumption and Energy Use both significantly less than average office buildings.
- xii. The development included less car parking, increased cycle parking, public realm, and green space than the existing levels or the levels stated in a previously consented application. It would be the first offices in Cambridge to meet such high standards.
- xiii. The following feedback had been received:
  - Historic England: "The current scheme in its revised form would significantly enhance the setting of the pub... we support the applicant's aim for the scheme to be BREEAM Outstanding".
  - Cambridge Past, Present & Future: "A significant improvement on the 2007 permission and likely to be the best scheme proposed for this site."
  - Cambridge Disability Panel: "...among the most impressive proposals brought before the Panel in recent years... to be applauded, as are the much needed improvements proposed for the Flying Pig PH and to its surrounding public realm."
  - Camcycle: "Trying to more than meet LP requirements with regard to cycle parking and access design and layout"
- xiv. The percentage of onsite parking suitable for electric vehicles would increase each year until fully compliant.
- xv. The development included buildings which were two floors less high than the previous scheme which had consent.
- xvi. Through a number of 'verified' views, it was possible to show the increase in visible sky and the decrease in visible buildings both in winter and summer months, with trees more able to completely shield the new planned development.

- xvii. Agreeable with any appropriate conditions to protect against accidental damage caused to the Flying Pig during construction; ensuring it would be able to trade in a similar manner to other venues on the same site.
- xviii. Proposed revisions included matching the existing trading area, garden area, an increased size of landlord accommodation and improved storage and kitchen areas.

**Case by the Petitioner:**

- i. The plans displayed by the applicant showed a seven-storey building plus setback, but the street view drawings shown during a previous presentation showed a six-storey building. Sought clarification which was correct.
- ii. Aside from the extant planning permission, a previous application 05/0487 had been refused in 2005. The façade along Hills Road for that refused application were identical to the extant permission, with the only difference being the addition of the phrase 'including retention of the Flying Pig Public House', despite the fact plans submitted did not include the Flying Pig.
- iii. Concerned of the legitimacy of the extant permission, and that it had been properly consulted upon.
- iv. LP policy 21 required the site should have been master-planned before any application came forward. Had requested clarification from Officers multiple times during the last year but had not received a response. There were no records the public had been consulted for this to take place.
- v. There was no masterplan on the Council's website. Reasons for this had included the progress of the station area meaning it was not necessary, despite the fact this site was not part of the CB1 development, and that the land is in single ownership.
- vi. The redacted application form stated that 'one of the owners was resident at shire hall' and asked which parts of the site were owned by Cambridgeshire County Council.
- vii. The extant permission was also noted as a reason why a masterplan was not required. However, believed this could not proceed without Conservation Area Consent, which would be a separate planning application, and to which the 2018 LP would apply.
- viii. Alleged councillors did not have to choose between this permission or the extant permission, that if this application were not granted permission, the developer would instead carry out construction as granted in the extant permission is incorrect.
- ix. Questioned if the existing permission was valid why construction had not taken place already.

- x. Believed there would be approximately 1700 new employees working on site and had not seen confirmation how public transport providers would manage capacity to accommodate this increase, or how road networks would manage a rise in cycle traffic.
- xi. Air quality issues were likely to affect the periphery of the city more than the application site, away from the location of air quality monitoring systems.
- xii. Current Park & Ride sites were already often at capacity and this would lead to employees attempting to park in other areas.
- xiii. Was aware that other Park & Ride sites had been proposed but concerned these would not be of suitable capacity for offices at this site, or others currently planned in the city.
- xiv. The impact of COVID on the demand for office space could not yet be assessed, with workers finding that working from home is a better option
- xv. A significant proportion of the area set aside for landlord accommodation in the Flying Pig included attic space under the eaves, which did not believe was justifiable as habitable space.
- xvi. Considered that residents of Cambridge did not want the public house touched, and that the applicant had not put any case forward which demonstrated a need for the pub to be touched

**Case Officer's Comments:**

The Officer's assessment of the application was currently under review and therefore provided a broad summary of the representations made regarding the proposals and of the key consultee responses.

- i. There had been approximately two hundred representations received from the public with the majority in objection.
- ii. An online petition had been set up in 2012 entitled to 'Refuse Conservation Area consent to demolish the Flying Pig Public House' which had around 14,500 signatures. Although it was not clear how many signatures are related to the current application.
- iii. Over 2,800 comments had been made on this petition, nine of which had been made since the current application had been submitted.
- iv. The key themes of objection around the application were as follows:
  - i. Extent of alterations to the Flying Pig would impact on its viability as well as alterations to its charter as a local community facility which supported the arts and music.
  - ii. Additional office space was not required in the city.
  - iii. Omission of housing (extant planning permission) was not in accordance with development plan; there was a demand for good quality affordable housing in the city.



- iv. The scale of the development and the impact on the character and appearance of the area including heritage assets such as the conservation area, Botanical Garden, and war memorial.
- v. Impact on the amenity on the public house, residents opposite and the botanical gardens in terms of over shadowing.
- vi. Additional traffic congestion in the surrounding area and the impact on safe moving of pedestrians and cyclists.
- vii. Impact on wind marshal climate in a location as there was already a wind tunnel effect caused by Botanic House.
- viii. Two local ward councillors had objected to the application:
  - Councillor McGerty objected on the grounds the proposal conflicts with LP policy 76 relating to the protection of public houses.
  - Councillor Robertson objected to the office space proposed and there were no plans for housing as originally sought.
- ix. Those in support of the application stated the following:
  - The proposal would remove obsolete office buildings.
  - The application provided a catalyst for innovation.
  - A level of investment should be welcomed post COVID 19 economic recovery.
  - Setting the standard for exemplar sustainable development.
- x. Consultees stated the following:
  - Historic England: Aware that the two blocks would be clearly visible all year round in views within the eastern section of the Botanic Garden.
  - The scheme would undoubtedly have an impact on the street scene along Hills Road, particularly southwards towards the Alms houses at the junction of Hills Road and Brooklands Avenue, in comparison of the two storey terrace buildings opposite.
  - Welcomed the retention of the Fly Pig and noted the current scheme in its revised form would significantly enhance the setting of the pub in comparison to the initial proposals.
  - Considered the proposals a moderate level of harm to the significance of the Botanic Garden and the Glisson Road conservation area; the harm would be less than substantial.
  - Had no objection on heritage grounds to the application.
  - Conservation Officer: Apart from the Flying Pig public house the buildings were of no historic interest; those building being demolished did not contribute positively to the conservation area. The Conservation Appraisal Area Town

Scape Analysis Map indicated these buildings as buildings which detract.

- There was an opportunity for the area to be enhanced particularly the conservation area street scape. This would not have occurred with the previous proposals due to the building's height and other design aspects, with the main impact on the Botanic Garden, the appearance of the conservation area and the integrity of the Flying Pig.
- The current proposals had significantly reduced the degree of harm to the character and appearance of the conservation area and Botanic Garden if the scheme was implemented to less than substantial harm.
- Would recommend conditions regarding materials and structural integrity of the Flying Pig.
- Urban Design Officer: Comments during the pre-application design process had resulted in substantial reduction in scale and massing, integration of the Flying Pig, changes to materials and detailed design of the buildings.
- In urban design terms the scheme had been well considered and was an improvement of the extant consented scheme.
- Landscape Officer: With regards to the landscape and townscape visual impact assessment the proposed development had been through an extensive pre application process which resulted in multiple design adjustments because of feedback received.
- The landscape team have had extensive discussion regarding the content and viewpoint selections of the LVIA (Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment); considered the quality of the LVIA to be high and the conclusions fair and correct.
- Whilst the scheme cannot be hidden by vegetation the verified views show the buildings will be screened in part by trees and vegetation in the summer months.
- Materials do not create stark differences but was warm in tone.
- Considered the buildings had struck the right balance between harm and positive contribution to the street and the city which is acceptable.
- Satisfied with the distribution of garden spaces, both public and private in and around the buildings. However, there were points which required resolution and regarding the

planting pits of street trees, the impact on the basement and drainage.

- Shadow studies provided during pre-application should be updated and submitted to represent the current proposal.
- Tree Officer: There were no trees of value on the site at present.
- There was a limited number of trees proposed for the scale of the site.
- Concerns raised regarding root volume; given the lack of break out route systems.
- The agricultural impact assessment showed branches and roots that have grown into the site to be removed to make way for construction.

### **Case by Ward Councillor:**

Councillor Robertson spoke as a Ward Councillor and made the following points:

- i. Virtual meet with the developers a few weeks before this meeting to express concern the consent for housing on site had been ignored.
- ii. Important to recognise that some of the site had been added to the original consent.
- iii. Acknowledged it was a site that required development.
- iv. The approved 2007 application did not include Francis House or the building in front of it, but the remainder of the site and the car park included, although a smaller site this application included 156 housing units.
- v. In 2008, a variation was allowed, so the first phase could be constructed (Botanic House), but the rest of site had been left.
- vi. The LP identified the site for employment, residential and retail.
- vii. Believed that housing was an important part of the consent (although expired) on the site.
- viii. Would like to see the Francis House area of the site to have housing on as this part of the city was already heavily developed with offices; there was too many offices proposed to be built on site and the dominance of offices was overwhelming.
- ix. The impact of the COVID virus on home working should be recognised; it was possible that there would be empty offices waiting to be filled.
- x. Agreed with the petitioner that there should be some retention to the Flying Pig.
- xi. Had hoped the developers would recognise the commitment to providing housing was valued and should be an important part of the development.

- xii. The proposal was for 1700 people to work on the site and questioned where these people would live and they travel to the site; the transport assessment had yet to be completed and no travel plan had been created.
- xiii. Requested the Planning Officer investigated the need for housing and the need for offices; would like to see the outcome of the research and the travel assessment before consideration by the planning committee.
- xiv. The Tree Officer's concern should be considered.
- xv. The developers had highlighted the importance of sustainability but questioned if this were a net zero site so this needed to be improved; if there was housing on site this would be a requirement.

### **Members' Questions and Comments:**

In response to Members questions and comments the Planning Officer said the following:

- i. The proposal did not include affordable housing; the extant permission had included 156 residential units of which 62 were to be affordable housing units.
- ii. The scheme was now for office-based development, office campus and retention of the Flying Pig as presented; the proposal would be assessed on this plan. However, the applicant had to justify the lack of provision of residential in the scheme.
- iii. With regards to the extant planning permission, phase 1 was Botanic House and phase 2 the 156 residential units, including the Flying Pig as part of this phase. The consent was extant and could be implemented at any time.
- iv. The site was not part of the conservation area when permission was granted; this came after in 2012.
- v. The proposal retained the front element of the bar and sitting area of the Flying Pig, removed the rear section of the building, extending further back to provide additional services, including accessible toilet and services in the basement.
- vi. The Conservation Officer was satisfied with the proposal regarding the Flying Pig; notwithstanding that there would be some level of harm to the building but would be less than substantial harm measured against the National Planning Policy Framework for Heritage Assets.

The Assistant Director said the following:

- i. As part of the work on the new LP there would be a “lesson learnt review” on the station area development and the surrounding area.
- ii. Reminded the Forum that the 2018 LP had taken a long time to be adopted; therefore, some of the policies had been carried forward several years without analysis.

In response to Members’ questions the agent said the following

- i. A draft framework travel plan had been submitted as part of the application which would be discharged through conditions once occupiers were known.
- ii. Had engaged with both the County Council (highways authority) and the City Council to clarify the intent to manage future travel plan(s).
- iii. A travel plan training budget would be available for future tenants with a central co-ordinator (if there were multiple occupants) to manage the travel plan(s) across the site.
- iv. The highways authority in principle had agreed with the transport assessment; mitigation included improvements to the cycle network along Hills Road, relocation of bus stops and the creation of a new toucan crossing. Discussions were still taking place regarding wider improvements.
- v. With regards to the LVIA, had worked closely with the Urban Design and Landscape Officer to agree where the most sensitive views would be in respect of the scheme. Then began the process of surveying and using GPS coordinates to obtain a verified view.
- vi. Had undertaken extensive engagement with Cambridge University and the Botanic Garden who agreed the conclusions of the LVIA were robust and a much more appropriate scheme was being brought forward.
- vii. At the point extant permission was granted the applicant did not own the entire site. Further land had since been obtained allowing a master plan to be brought forward for the full site.
- viii. The Botanic Gardens had stated the impact of a residential scheme would have a greater effect to their site than the scheme proposed.
- ix. Potential conflict on the residential amenity and that of the Flying Pig (well known for its support of the Cambridge music scene).
- x. Recognised the impact that COVID-19 had on the workplace with homeworking. It had also shown how important human interaction was with a loss of productivity and creativity. It was important for individuals to return to the workplace when safe to do so.

- xi. The height of the tallest building was ground plus six-storey and was setback on the tallest element.
- xii. Could not answer how many individuals who worked at Botanic House cycled to work; would clarify post meeting.
- xiii. The building in its current form would not suit residential living; designed as a 21<sup>st</sup> century office for a multi-let beehive of activity.
- xiv. The design was high up on the urban greening factor. There was greening of the ground floor with extensive planting with potential of greening of the first-floor canopy. Could review whether a biophilic planters' edge in the space between buildings A&B was possible as a minor amendment. The greening and planting of the roof top would be a benefit to the insect community.
- xv. Working to encourage sustainable access, taking advantage of being close to the station, with 1300 cycle spaces within the basement for occupants, significantly reducing the level of car parking each year.
- xvi. Working to mitigate the impact on the junction of Station Road and Hills Road by improving the access down Hills Road; moving the junction into the site which was currently south of Botanic House. Providing a new Toucan Crossing opposite the southern building away from the junction.

### **Summing up by the Agent**

- i. Noted within the planning statement the primary purpose of the planning system was to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development, which it was hoped had been demonstrated throughout the application.
- ii. There were many aspects to sustainability and the National Planning Policy Framework directed planners to consider the social, economic, and environmental objectives. The development would be the first in Cambridge to exceed the policy and achieve BREEAM Outstanding.
- iii. To achieve BREEAM Outstanding the application must score 85% or above against the BRE criteria; the application scored 92% of all possible credits and would be operationally zero carbon. This was a direct response to the city councils' declaration of climate emergency and put the application in the top 1% of all buildings in the United Kingdom.
- iv. The current LP outlined the development and vision for 22,100 jobs and 12 hectares of new employment land.
- v. Since the extant planning permission was granted fourteen years ago and ten years since the delivery of Botanic House, the remaining land had been obtained. This had allowed the application to respond to policy

- requirement to provide a masterplan for the site which protects and builds upon the existing employment.
- vi. LP Policy 2 sets out the spatial strategy for the location of the employment development, supporting the economy with a wide range of employment opportunities and the focus on growth within urban areas, areas of major change, opportunity areas and areas in the city centre.
  - vii. The site has been in employment use for the last century and was recognised as one of the most sustainable locations across the city. The site was in an opportunity area and designated within two areas of major change.
  - viii. There was not a better location to contribute to the 22,100 jobs stated in the LP.
  - ix. There was less than 3-month supply of office space within central area of Cambridge.
  - x. Recognised a need for homes for workers to live in. LP Policy 3 o sets out the spatial strategy of the location of new homes, with 14,000 new homes to be delivered over the Plan period.
  - xi. The shared planning service (Cambridge City Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council) published housing trajectory on 1 April 2020 which stated the two planning authorities could demonstrate that they could meet their individual housing requirements between 2011 and 2031.
  - xii. Important to focus on the benefits the application could bring with all the external consultees agreeing this commercial scheme was a better scheme for this site.
  - xiii. After engaging with the local community understood the Flying Pig was an asset which should be preserved and have responded to this. The building and community of the Flying Pig will be maintained which will become accessible and inclusive to all which will remain for the next 100 years.
  - xiv. The application proposed a highly sustainable development which responded to the vision of the council for economic growth and prosperity. A scheme which had been master planned to deliver a workplace site and would safeguard key community assets, improve the public realm on a key route into the city.

### **Summing up by the Petitioner**

- i. There was no masterplan for this site as required by LP Policy 21 with no reference to such a plan in any of the supporting documents to this application.
- ii. If a masterplan existed much of the topics for discussion raised at the meeting would have been addressed in the master plan process. Such a

- process would normally be conducted by the relevant planning authority and not the applicant.
- iii. There should be on the council's website a record of the consultation responses; usually the council would arrange workshops to discuss several issues. Discussions could have taken place much earlier.
  - iv. Questioned if the extant permission was proceedable and believed that conservation area consent was required for demolishing the Flying Pig.
  - v. LP Policy 76 required justification in terms of development. The proposal would not sustain the Flying Pig economically once the development was complete, the capacity would not be as it was now in terms of accommodating customers.
  - vi. Security to the site had not been considered with a small hedge running along the garden area which would not stop access.
  - vii. Ignored the public concerns of the viability of the Flying Pig.
  - viii. There had been no indication of what would happen while the Flying Pig was shut, if it were to be shut.
  - ix. Stated that the Director of Stone Realestate had said in 2019 of the Flying Pig " if we design a scheme that wraps around it which could be done the pub would have to shut during the development, if it closes for 2-3 years we think it won't survive."
  - x. LP policy 76 stated it must be demonstrated that the viability of the public house will not be affected. If the Flying Pig were shut for a prolonged period it would be affected. The application should be refused on this ground alone.
  - xi. Suggested the proposed buildings could be pulled back behind the Flying Pig.
  - xii. There had been no indication there would be sufficient provision of different modes of transport to accommodate the additional 1700 people arriving on site.
  - xiii. There would also be an increase in people arriving in the city, not just to this site. By 2031 there would be an additional 14000 people working at the biomedical campus at the Addenbrookes site; plus, the additional number of individuals working in the new offices built along Station Road.
  - xiv. Would ask the application to be refused unless the public house was left untouched.

### **Summing up by the Ward Councillor.**

- i. There were some questions which had remained unanswered and needed to be addressed.
- ii. Reiterated the concern at the lack of housing on site, mainly affordable housing.



- iii. If the offices were to be built and then found there was no requirements, they could be converted to housing but there would be no affordable housing provided as a result. Build what was known to be needed.
- iv. Residents moving next to or close to a public house usually were aware of what they were moving to.
- v. The applicants concern of creating jobs in the area needed to be widened to recognise that housing was as important.
- vi. Challenged the statement of three-month supply in the city.
- vii. Although the buildings were not as high as first proposed they were still higher than Botanic House and were too dominant to the area.
- viii. This was a better scheme than the one before; but the one before had been of an appalling standard.

### **Final Comments of the Chair**

- i. Summarised the main issues discussed.
- ii. Suggested a meeting between the case officer, the applicant and petitioner to discuss some of the issues raised.
- iii. Would encourage the applicant to keep in touch with the petitioner throughout the process particularly if there were any amendments to the scheme.
- iv. Suggested the Planning Officer hold discussions with community representatives on issue that had been raised.
- v. Minutes of the Development Control Forum would be made available to the relevant parties and published on the city council website.
- vi. A copy of the minutes would be attached to the Planning Officer's report when the application would be considered at a future Planning Committee.

The meeting ended at 12.11 pm

**CHAIR**

This page is intentionally left blank

## Representations

### Objectors

Robinson Way	59 Whitwell Way	54 Park Leys Harlington Dunstable	Mail Boxes Etc. 23 King Street Cambridge
57C Alpha Tce	20 Harvest Road	14 Sedley Taylor Road Cambridge	13 Suez Road Cambridge
109 Mawson Road	20 Harvest Road	31 Golding Road Cambridge	28 Radegund Road Cambridge
5 Bentink Street	5 Rexbury Court	21 Bowers Croft Cambridge	27 Scotsdowne Road Cambridge
138 Shelford Road	21 Glisson Road	95 Burnside Cambridge	5 Hauxton Road, Cambridge,
5 Hauxton Road	79 Tenison Road	16 Pages Way Huntingdon	1 Newell Walk Cambridge
10 St Barnabas Court	29 Bateman Street	Homestead Cottage Main Road, East Boldre Brockenhurst	165 Foster Road Cambridge
18 Rutherford Road	81 Highsett	61 Highsett Hills Road Cambridge	100 Grantham Road London
269 Hills Road	95 Long Road	25 Tenison Avenue Cambridge	1 Dumpling Farm Cottages Barton Road Grantchester
79 Richmond Rd	31 Golding Road Cambridge CB1 3RN	2 Highsett Hills Road Cambridge	15 Latham Road Cambridge
68 Flitwick Road Maulden Bedford	23A Marmora Road Cambridge	10 River Terrace Washbank Road Eynesbury, St Neots	11 Aberdeen Avenue Cambridge
30 Warren Close Cambridge	20 Millington Road Cambridge	21 Norwich Street Cambridge	15 Lyndewode Road Cambridge
35 Chalkwells Way Trumpington Cambridge	13 Cookes Field Waterbeach	6 hetley close, Brampton Huntingdon	2 Bateman Street Cambridge
121 Derwent Close Cambridge	2 Vinter Terrace Cambridge	169 Gladiator Road Cambourne Cambridge	Bron Epynt Llangammarch Wells

5 Fitzwilliam Road Cambridge	5 Copel Close Highfields Caldecote Cambridge	80 Hobson Avenue Trumpington Cambridge	14 Newmarket Road Cambridge
14 Lichfield Road Cambridge	142 Sleaford Street Cambridge	Hilltrees Newmarket	134 Hawkins Road Cambridge
144 Warren Close Cambridge	400C Milton Road Cambridge	20 Hopkins Close Cambridge	North Wing, Bottisham Hall Cambridge
80B York Street Cambridge	76 Providence Way Waterbeach	16 Willis Road Cambridge	15 Shelly Garden Cambridge
24 Parsonage Street Cambridge	16 Pages Way Brampton	12 Lilac Court Cambridge	50 Tiverton Way Cambridge
7 High Street Earith Huntington	27 Silverwood Close Cambridge	54 Winstanley Court Cromwell Road Cambridge	3 Henslow Mews Cambridge
7 Aylesford Way Stapleford Cambridge	119 York Street Cambridge	107 Hemingford Road Cambridge	78 Sturton Street Cambridge
3 Fitzwilliam Road Cambridge	65 Hartington Grove Cambridge	76 High St Wilburton Ely	7 Boxworth End Swavesey Cambridge
3 Clarendon Road Cambridge	22 Brooklands Avenue Cambridge	79 High Street Foxton Cambridge	165 High Street Chesterton Cambridge
3 Shaftesbury Road Cambridge	3 Claremont Cambridge Cambridgeshire	59 Longworth Avenue Cambridge	6 Hetley close Brampton Huntingdon
36 Glisson Road Cambridge	9 Marque House 143 Hills Road Cambridge	79 High Street Foxton Cambridge	2 Piper Road Trumpington Cambridge
3 St Johns Close Waterbeach	3 St Johns Close Waterbeach	7 Evans Way Sawston Cambridge	Chethams School of Music Long Millgate Manchester
10 Coopers Close stetchworth Newmarket	1 College Farm Court Barton Cambridge	11 Haviland Way Cambridge	3 Blenheim Way Hardwick Cambridge

5 Marlborough Court Pinehurst Cambridge	3 Coronation Street Cambridge	39 Blinco Grove Cambridge	4 Whittle Avenue Trumpington Cambridge
22 Norwich Street Cambridge	7 Meadow Court Ditton Fields Cambridge	2A High Street Harston Cambridge	9 Mill Court West Drayton
10 Thirleby Close Cambridge	Flat 3 1 Lower Rock Gardens Brighton	10 River Terrace Washbank Road St. Neots	8 Lynfield Court Cambridge
9 Tenby Close Cambridge	124 High Street Meldreth Royston	15 New School Road Histon Cambridge	212 Histon Road Cambridge
365 Glenalmond Avenue Cambridge	22 Evergreens Cambridge	5 Kinnaird Way Cambridge	76 Providence Way Waterbeach Cambridge
24 Duxford Road Whittlesford Cambridge	79 Tenison Road Cambridge	7 Albert Street Cambridge	118 High Street Edlesborough
45 Bar Lane Stapleford Cambridge	Flat 19 The Clay Farm Centre Hobson Square Hobson Avenue Trumpington Cambridge	66A Blinco Grove Cambridge	3 Lambourn Close Cambridge
4 Malvern Road Cambridge	85 Cavendish Road Cambridge	12 High Street Pampisford Cambridge	46 Discovery Way Cambridge
12 Bateman Street Cambridge	5 Victoria Road Cambridge	46A Home Close Histon Cambridge	164 York Street Cambridge
21 Norwich Street Cambridge	84 Church Road Quarndon Derby	21 Beachampstead Road Great Staughton St Neots	18 Pasture Grove Cambridge
27 Robert Jennings Close Cambridge	25 Alpha Terrace Cambridge	33 Malta Road Cambridge	47 Great Eastern Street Cambridge
47 Kings Grove Barton Cambridge	318 duffield road Derby	11 Missleton Court Cambridge	3 Catharine Street Cambridge
10A Alstead Road Histon Cambridge	1 Orwell Terrace Barrington Cambridge	22 Chapman Court Sackville Close Cambridge	38 Station Road Haddenham Ely

29 Windmill Walk Sutton Ely	1 - 3 Hills Road Cambridge	Selwyn college Cambridge	80 Sedgwick Street Cambridge
44 Childebert Road Balham London	8A Ditton Fields Cambridge	2 York Street Cambridge	21 Bateman Street Cambridge
26 Victoria Park Cambridge	74 High Street Horningssea Cambridge	6 The Belvedere Homerton Street Cambridge	19A Belgrave Road Cambridge
32 Alms Hill Bourn Cambridge	24 Duddle Drive Longstanton Cambridge	119 York Street Cambridge	The Annexe 23 Hope Street Cambridge
22A Ward Road Cambridge	33 Argyle Street Cambridge	77 Mill End Road Cambridge	102 Hemingford Road Cambridge
57 Mill Road Cambridge	Music Venue Trust The Ministry 79 Borough Road London SE1 1DN	30 Lyndewode Road Cambridge	

## Supporters

Little Orchard Bedchester Shaftesbury  
University Arms Hotel Regent Street Cambridge  
Downsview Manor Road, Wroxall Ventnor  
The Old Manse 29 St Peters Street Duxford

## Neutral

Cambridge University

## Cambridge City Council Design & Conservation Panel

Notes of the meeting Wednesday 11<sup>th</sup> March 2020

### Attendees:

Di Haigh	RIBA (Chair, item 1)
David Grech	formerly Historic England, co-opted member (Chair, item 2)
Russell Davies	RTPI
Tony Nix	RICS
Ian Steen	Retired architect, co-opted member
Jo Morrison	Landscape Institute
Michael Goodhart	Cambridge PPF

### Officers:

Phil McIntosh	Greater Cambridge Planning
Joanne Preston	Greater Cambridge Planning
Aaron Coe	Greater Cambridge Planning

### Presenters - item 1:

Tom Gardner	Allford Hall Monaghan Morris
Robert Myers	RM Associates
Jonathan Bainbridge	Bidwells
Chris Surfleet	Bidwells
Johnny Vincent	Pace Investments Ltd
Simon Stone	Stone Real Estate

### Presenters – item 2:

John McHale	Wrenbridge Land Ltd
Chris Collins	Wrenbridge Land Ltd
Paul Newton	Barton Willmore
Emma McCready	Barton Willmore
Oliver Unwin	Allies & Morrison
Peter Howle	Allies & Morrison
Paul Eaton	Allies & Morrison
Max Kettenacker	Allies & Morrison
Alex Pridige	Mott Macdonald

### Apologies:

Zoe Skelding	RIBA
--------------	------

### Observers:

Katie Thornburrow	City Councillor
Michael Sargeant	City Councillor

### 1. Presentation – 104-112 Hills Road Cambridge.

The pre-application proposal for a mixed-use development comprising office use, food and beverage as well as new public realm at ground floor.

The Panel's comments were as follows:

- **Context - relative to the NPPF and the Cambridge Local Plan**

The development is designated as an opportunity area for mixed development in the Cambridge Local Plan. In the NPPF, para. 193 states that there should be no impact on the significance of listed heritage assets. The adjacent Botanic Gardens are Listed Grade II\*. Thus the impact of buildings of this scale on the visual environment of the Botanic Gardens is a material consideration.

- **Clarity of information at Review**

The scheme drawings lacked straightforward sections that clearly describe the heights of the buildings or the width and height of the passages between the building blocks. There was also little information on the size of the proposed development relative to adjacent buildings, such as the terraces on the other side of Hills Road.

It took the Panel some time to establish in the review that Botanic House has 6 stories of office accommodation of 3.75m height + ground floor + plant space on the roof. The proposed Block B is 7 stories of accommodation each 4m f/f height + ground floor + Plant room on roof = 9 stories in total. The proposed Block C has 5 stories of accommodation each 4m f/f height + ground floor + plant room on roof = 7 stories in total. Both of the new blocks would be taller than Botanic House. In addition the extensive basement car parking with 250 spaces was not shown.

- **Scale and massing**

The combined site area now under single ownership is considerable. That factor, combined with the existing scale of Botanic House, understandably has tempted maximisation of the built floor space and height. However, despite the emphasis in the presentation on the landscape area as a proportion of site area, the footplates are too large. There is insufficient space set aside to for a coherent and successful landscaping component to this proposal. The scheme is divided into two distinct blocks, but the resulting buildings are monolithic, their scale far greater than the immediate context except for Botanic House, the imposing form of which is slightly softened by its lens shape. The Panel advised that significant revisions should be made to reduce the scale of the blocks and increase the public realm between them, thus opening up views through the development.

- **Urban context**

The Panel were interested in the 'nodes of density' identified at points along Hill's Road. They agreed that Botanic House currently serves as a pivot point on the street for those heading to the station. However, the current scheme does not acknowledge the impact these proposals would have at this 'node' and the knock-on requirement to reshape it to accommodate the number of people accessing it from the station. Adding the footfall of 3,000 extra employees with 1,500 bicycle parking racks would substantially increase pedestrian and cycle traffic. The extensive basement car parking is all entered from a single point on Hills Road. The consequent impact on the crucial Hills Road / Station Road junction would be considerable.

The Panel believes that a scheme of this scale, in such a prominent location, needs convincing modelling of its impact on the wider urban context, as well as on the immediate surrounding city. The current plans fall far short of what is required to establish this.

- **Impact on the historic environment**

The proposal has significant implications for the historic environment, both in the immediate vicinity of the site and also in longer views of the city. The greatest impact will be to the adjoining Botanic Garden, which is a Registered Park and Garden listed at Grade II\*, and also on the Conservation Area.



As NPPF 193 states regarding heritage assets, “great weight should be given to the asset’s conservation... This is irrespective of whether any potential harm amounts to substantial harm, total loss or less than substantial harm to its significance.” The Panel feels that the consideration currently given to this is far from adequate.

Whilst the buildings would not be visible from much of the west section of the Botanic Garden, there would be significant overlooking for buildings of this height for the east section, including the Winter Garden. The views presented, which included only full, verdant summertime tree canopies, give no indication of the scheme’s impact on these views in winter. At all seasons, the Panel felt that a scheme of this height will have significant impact on the Garden’s feeling of *rus in urbe*, which is key to visitor enjoyment and integral to the Garden’s significance.

With respect to the conservation area, Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires the Planning Authority, in exercising their planning functions, to give special regard to ‘the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of that area’. Very little attention seemed to have been given to identify the key contributors to the conservation area’s character, or the impact of the height of the scheme on the existing terraces on the other side of Hills Road. The scale of the new buildings will be much greater than the current scale of Francis House at four stories and threatens to overwhelm the adjacent streetscape.

- **The Flying Pig**

The Panel welcomes the proposals to keep the existing Flying Pig pub, both in terms of the retention of the existing building and saving this community use. However, the design fails to convincingly integrate the building with the new-build elements, so that it appears out of scale and entirely coincidental to the tall new office blocks that would surround it.

Some revision to the treatment of blocks B and C, to reduce both their scale and massing, would mean that the pub would not stand out quite so starkly. Further changes to the scheme layout, perhaps by realigning the space between blocks to focus more on the pub, could also help with this.

Furthermore, the building’s historic character needs to be reflected in the definition of the adjacent outdoor spaces and treatment of the street frontage. It appears uncomfortably out of place surrounded by low level office planters. The definition of the whole frontage to that side of Hills Road should be rethought so that it forms an integral part of the continuing urban context, including the boundary railings to the Botanic Garden and the streetscape of the Almshouses

- **Landscape proposals**

For all its promised interactive public realm, the scheme seems to lack realistic consideration of how it will actually be experienced. The intention is to activate the ground floor frontages, and to interweave planting between internal and external spaces. There are, however, areas where this is lacking, most notably in the narrow corridor between blocks B and C, where all frontages are for utilities, bin stores and substations, and natural light will be lacking.

The CGI images give a misleading impression of what will actually be achieved. At the moment, as proposed, the combination of shading around the buildings and limited soil depth in the planting pits, will limit the growth potential and result in less than verdant trees of limited size. The planting will be completely reliant on artificial irrigation and vulnerable to any failures in this system.

The Panel questioned how pleasant the office environment would be to work in. Due to the size of the floorplates, the green spaces would not usually be visible to the average worker from their work station. The views from offices not facing the Botanic Garden, especially those facing across the tight linear gaps between the blocks, will be limited. Office views

onto terraced gardens change the atmosphere of the space and can create a much more pleasant working environment. These are concentrated at roof level.

- **Sustainability**

The Panel supported the aspirations to achieve a high standard of sustainability, including carbon capture, but queried some of the specific proposals for achieving this. The Panel suggested that, for office blocks primarily in need of cooling, a system that captures excess heat for reuse would be useful. They suggested the use of ground source heat pumps, which would remove the need for the roof-mounted air source heat pumps, and which failed to match up to their aspirational title as “towers of wind and light”.

- **Architectural design**

The opportunity to create such a prominent scheme at a key entrance point to Cambridge city centre should provoke an aspiration to produce the highest quality of architectural design. The Panel felt that the scheme falls far short of the level of design integrity that could be achieved. There seemed to be little guiding rationale to the scheme.

The form of the buildings focus on maximising the floor space on the site, rather than defining appropriate built form. The elevations present overbearing walls of undulating glass with a simplistic solar shading system. From a distance, the plant chimneys stand tall on the skyline. The internal partitions at ground floor level block views though to the Botanic Garden, both from inside and out.

- **Conclusion:**

This is a site of critical importance for Cambridge. The current proposals fall well short of the coherent and aspirational design that should be expected here. The scale of the scheme as currently proposed, both in terms of height and massing, is overbearing and this impacts on both the Botanic Garden and Hills Road. It creates a highly constrained public realm. This proposal needs a fundamental rethink of both the brief and the design before being considered for approval.

## **VERDICT – RED (unanimous)**

### **2. Presentation – Abbeygate House, East Road, Cambridge.**

Abbeygate House fronts onto East Road and is bounded to the rear by Crispin Place and Burleigh Place. The existing building is occupied by the British Heart Foundation (Use Class A1) with first and second floors in office use occupied by Anglia Ruskin University (ARU).

The site is identified as part of a wider redevelopment opportunity area in both the adopted Cambridge Local Plan (2018) and the Grafton Area Masterplan SPD (2018) for a mix of uses including retail and office floorspace. The brief is to deliver a high-quality design led scheme that is consistent with the planning policy aspirations and that reflects the changing context of the immediate local area

Di Haigh declared a conflict of interest as a former director at Allies and Morrison. She therefore stepped aside from chairing the review of this project, but, having retired in 2016, it was agreed that she need not withdraw from the discussion. She abstained from voting on the proposal. Jo Morrison also declared a conflict of interest due to Mott Macdonald's involvement with the project. As the only landscape specialist available to advise the panel all agreed that she should stay for the discussion, but she again abstained from voting.

The proposals are still work in progress and the comments of the panel reflect the current state of development. The Panel's comments were as follows:

- **Scale, form and massing; responding to context**

The Panel broadly accepted the premise that building is divided into two parts, a 'harder' frontage that defines the edge of East Road, with a more sculptured element to the rear. In addition, the design acts as a transition between the traditional buildings on East Road to the south of the site and the new hotel that has recently been approved to the north, on the far side of a stretch of public realm that is to be upgraded to form an enhanced access to the Grafton Centre.

However, the Panel had some concerns over the way the new building turned the corner between East Road and Crispin Place. The principal entrance to the new offices is on this corner and would benefit from being given greater emphasis. Raising the level of the soffit to the arcade on this corner could deliver this. The rhythm of this arcade also appeared somewhat unresolved; generally on East Road the arcade corresponds to two bays of office windows, but the bay is then stretched at the corner, where it corresponds to three bays of office windows.

The storey height at the plant level (Level 5) was also felt to be too overpowering, and this is given added prominence on the corner of East Road and Crispin Place where the plant room steps forward to the building line. Further work was required to justify the height needed for the plant at Level 5. Furthermore, the current set-back to the plant room on the Crispin Place elevation appears somewhat ambiguous. If the intention of the set-back at the west end of this elevation is to give added emphasis to the corner with East Road, then that would be better achieved through the plant room being set back after two bays, i.e. in line with the arcade to the office entrance at ground floor level. However, the elevation might appear equally resolved if the plant room extended the full length of Crispin Place without a setback.

On East Road, where the building steps down in response to the scale of the existing traditional buildings, the appearance of the building also changes from a framed structure to a more solid, masonry structure with 'punched' openings. The rhythm of these 'punched' windows is somewhat uncomfortable, in that they are not centred on the shopfront arcade below, and a revised rhythm might deliver a more resolved appearance to the building.

It was a matter of regret that the building could not completely close the gap to No 168 East Road, due to a requirement to keep a clear access way to an existing sub-station. A pair of gates are proposed and these will need to be given careful consideration so that they have sufficient presence in the streetscape. It may be appropriate to consider these gates as an opportunity to work with an artist.

- **The 'sculptured element' to the rear**

A cross passage divides the building into two parts, and to the west of this passage is the more sculptured element. This is to be enclosed behind a screen of regularly spaced, vertical elements. At the time of the review the detailed design and material selection for this screen had not been determined. While the Panel supported the design intention, significant more work is needed to bring this to a successful resolution. The Panel questioned whether the regular spacing might be too imposing, and there was scope for a degree of flexibility in the spacing so as to provide a sense of movement across the elevation. The role of this screen in providing solar shading to the offices also requires more thought, and access to the bin store, material selection, colour and protection of the screen from vandalism at ground level all need to be addressed. In addition, keeping an active frontage at ground level will be important to successfully integrating the building into the locality.

The roof of this element incorporates a garden opening off the fourth floor of offices, but it is a matter of deep regret that the offices have no view out onto this roof garden. The central office core (lift, stair and toilets) obscures most of the garden, but even where there is a potential for views out, the wall is currently solid. The opportunity for both this garden and the third floor roof terrace to enhance the adjacent office environment needs to be explored and developed.

- **Sustainability – Responding to climate change**

The Panel was advised that the building is being designed to achieve a BREEAM excellent rating and this was agreed to be an appropriate starting point. The use of reflective light-shelves to the windows will help natural light to penetrate deeper into the core of the building, but these will need to be carefully detailed so as to avoid them becoming homes to pigeons. The Panel had further concerns that the requirement for solar shading had not been fully thought through in designing the elevations.

However the overall servicing of the building requires further consideration, including whether a more sustainable heating/cooling system might be incorporated. For a lot of the year the building will only require cooling, and the surplus energy might be captured and used for domestic heating hot water.

While the existing building is of no architectural or historic significance, it does incorporate a high level of embodied energy and consideration might be given to reusing the existing frame as part of the new structure, were that to be possible.

- **Landscape**

It is understood that, under a separate proposal, East Road is to be remodelled and the carriageway reduced to one lane in each direction, thereby allowing the pavements to be widened and cycle lanes added. The Panel was keen to understand how this remodelling might also allow for the introduction of new landscaping to help 'green' this stretch of East Road, even if existing underground services might prevent the introduction of significant street trees in front of this development.

The retention of existing trees to Crispin Place was broadly welcomed.

- **Other issues**

Future proofing – the building will represent a significant investment in embodied energy and, in the event that the demand for office accommodation declines over the life of the building, it will be important that the building can be readily adapted for different uses (eg residential).

Shop front and signage – there is a need to develop a long term policy for ensuring replacement shop frontages and signage is controlled and not allowed to conflict with the architectural intent that underlies the redevelopment proposals.

Visibility in long views across the city - while the site is not within a conservation area, it nevertheless has the potential to impact on the setting of important heritage assets that lie within the city centre, and the proposals will need to comply with the Council's Tall Buildings policy. This will include the preparation of verified views from agreed locations to fully understand its impact.

- **Conclusion:**

**The Panel accepted that the presentation was for a project that was still work in progress and, overall, the feeling was that the design was going in the right direction. However significant further development is required and the panel would welcome the opportunity to review the design again, before it is submitted for planning permission.**

**VERDICT – AMBER (5), abstentions (2)**

### **3. Notes of the last meeting – Wednesday 15<sup>th</sup> January 2020**

Notes agreed.

### **4. Any Other Business**

## 5. Date of next meeting – Wednesday 8<sup>th</sup> April 2020

### Reminder

#### CABE 'traffic light' definitions:

**GREEN:** a good scheme, or one that is acceptable subject to minor improvements

**AMBER:** in need of *significant* improvements to make it acceptable, but not a matter of starting from scratch

**RED:** the scheme is fundamentally flawed and a fresh start is needed.

This page is intentionally left blank

**Cambridge City Council  
Design & Conservation Panel**

**Notes of the meeting Wednesday 10<sup>th</sup> June 2020  
(via MS Team)**

**Participants**

Di Haigh	RIBA (Chair)
David Grech	formerly Historic England, co-opted member
Tony Nix	RICS
Zoe Skelding	RIBA
Jo Morrison	Landscape Institute
Michael Goodhart	Cambridge PPF
Chris Davis	IHBC

**Officers:**

Christian Brady	Greater Cambridge Planning
Phil McIntosh	Greater Cambridge Planning
Joanne Preston	Greater Cambridge Planning
Bana Elzein	Greater Cambridge Planning

**Presenters:**

Simon Allford	Allford Hall Monaghan Morris Architects
Tom Gardner	Allford Hall Monaghan Morris Architects
Robert Myers	RM Associates
Jonathan Bainbridge	Bidwells
Chris Surfleet	Bidwells (Historic environment)
Stephen Ball	Couch Perry Wilkins (sustainability)
Mark Taylor	Mott MacDonald (transport/highways)
Johnny Vincent	Pace Investments Ltd
Simon Stone	Stone Real Estate

**Observers:**

Cllr Katie Thornburrow	Cambridge City Council
Bonnie Kwok	Greater Cambridge Planning
Tom Davies	Greater Cambridge Planning
Katie Roberts	Greater Cambridge Planning
Mike Derbyshire	Bidwells

**Apologies** - Ian Steen, Russell Davies and Cllr Martin Smart

**1. Presentation - The Flying Pig PH, 104-112 Hills Road Cambridge.**

The pre-application proposal is for a mixed-use development comprising office use, food and beverage as well as new public realm at ground floor.

This is a revised proposal following the presentation in March 2020 (verdict RED - unanimous).

As at the March meeting, Jo Morrison identified a potential conflict of interest due to Mott MacDonald providing transport and highway advice to the design team. Therefore while she continued to provide specialist landscape advice to the Panel, she abstained from voting.

The Panel's comments were as follows:

- **Scale and massing**

The drop in the bulk and massing is appreciated, with Building B now reduced from 9 floors total above ground height to 7, and Building C reduced from 7 stories total to 5. In addition the floor to floor height has been reduced.

The area of floor plates for each block are still significant, as the comparison shown with other comparable AHMM designed professional and tech office floor plates demonstrates. Slight adjustments to the perimeter had been made to create more sitting spaces around both blocks.

The Panel welcomed the inclusion of verified views for the winter months as well as summer. They explored the impact of the new buildings both in distant views as well as from closer angles. The thorough scope of the information issued for this review was appreciated.

- **Impact on historic environment**

The Panel expressed concern over how visible these buildings would still be from the Grade II\* Botanic Gardens, particularly in winter. This is not only in terms of the skyline but the impact of the extent of highly glazed elevations overlooking the Gardens. The Panel expressed little confidence in the proposition that during winter, blinds would be drawn throughout and that this would alleviate any light pollution. In the view taken from Cory Lodge, the large new buildings loomed above. The visibility of the new development would result in a degree of harm to the environment of the Botanic Gardens, although this is felt to be much reduced by the lower blocks proposed in the revised scheme.

The part of the designated Conservation Area along Hills Road is composed primarily of 2-3 storey terraced houses and has a linear, largely Victorian feel. These large buildings will permanently change the character of the Conservation Area. The increase in scale of the new development will also tend to confuse and detract from the simple form of Botanic House.

Whether this level of harm to both the Listed Botanic Gardens and the character and appearance of the Conservation Area can be offset by other benefits, could be the subject of further debate.

- **The Flying Pig PH**

The Flying Pig PH still appears to be a fish out of water. This revised proposal provides greater generosity for the pub at ground level but does not yet create a setting that makes sense of this left-over fragment of the historic street. The Panel remains concerned about the dominating enclosure caused by these large office buildings in views looking both north, up Hills Road, and south, from the junction with Station Road. They did not support the suggestion that a three-fold stepping up of the proposed scale of the buildings from the PH would achieve a coherent context for it.

The Panel were unsure as to the nature of the proposed 'D' shaped extension to the rear of the pub. Would it try to replicate the existing building or bring or would there be a contemporary approach to its treatment? The adjacent outdoor seating areas seem to be defined by planters relating to the new development, rather than by the walls and yards that



might help to embed the building in the street. Overall, it was felt that The Flying Pig needs to be much more carefully embedded in the design if it is not to appear as an absurd left-over fragment. This feeling of an isolated remnant of a historic streetscape is compounded by the two vehicle drop-offs being located either side of the Flying Pig and its garden, along with the new pedestrian through route created between the west side of the public house and Building B.

- **Definition of the street**

The reconfiguration of the west edge of Hills Road will be considerable. In many ways this will be a great improvement to the very blank elevations of the present office buildings. The Panel feels that the new street frontage needs to be considered as a whole from Brooklands Avenue to Station Road. The experience of walking along the highly articulated frontage proposed needs to be very clear as to where the public realm begins and ends, where there will be vehicles crossing and where there might be glimpses through to the Botanic Garden. There needs to be therefore, a specific design exercise to establish a coherent new street edge, given the complexities of the proposed development.

- **Urban context**

The Panel feels that the traffic impact of the scheme still needs to be proven. They note that the proposed cycle parking access is now located alongside the vehicular access point at Building C. With the predicted high volume of bicycle traffic as well as the number of pedestrians walking along Hills Road and using the crossing, the Panel expressed some concern whether conflict between cars, pedestrians and cyclists was likely at this point.

The Panel also note that the designers are working with the County Highways team to widen cycleways and footways. This will be welcomed, as particularly with the volume of pedestrian and cycle movement coming from the Station Road crossing, this rather hostile environment will need to be managed. The new crossing is likely to have a considerable impact on vehicular traffic along Hills Road at a particularly busy point before the turn off for access to the station.

The entrances to both buildings need to be spacious and well defined. In particular, the forecourt to Building C seems tight for any scale of pedestrian gathering. Within this context, the Panel questioned whether the taxi drop-off points adjacent to each entrance were effectively planned.

- **Landscape proposals.**

To have an office development with views out onto the Botanic Gardens should feel like an extraordinary opportunity, yet it was felt the proposals failed to reflect this. Much of the landscaping is on a podium and in planters. This suggests that any substantial planting will be reliant on watering; undermining the scheme's sustainable credentials. Large trees would not flourish in planters, though the perspectives give a verdant impression, indicating large trees. While drought tolerant trees may be another option, it is felt that they would contribute little to the street scene.

The frontage and public forecourt area to the north of Building B is likely to remain heavily shaded even in high summer, which might reduce its appeal as a space for socialising. There is a similar concern regarding the degree of sunlight that will penetrate to ground level in the public realm between Buildings B and C.

Roof gardens may well become increasingly important amenity and working environments in an era of social distancing. The roof terraces as proposed are likely to create very hot,

exposed and windy places. The designers are strongly encouraged to explore shading options to create spaces that can be used as embedded elements of the working environment.

- **Environment and sustainability**

The sustainability ambitions for the scheme have never been in question and are welcomed. However, the Panel would stress that although these are important drivers, they will not in themselves deliver a good scheme against all factors such as urban form, access, parking, workspace quality etc. The window shading, specification of the glazing etc. will be part of the package that determines the performance of the building. Any scheme that promises great environmental performance must be supported by good judgment in terms of form, orientation and the embodied carbon of the building fabric.

The Panel was reassured by the specific commitment both from the developers and the Planning officers that the environmental promises in terms of water consumption, BREEAM excellence and WEL platinum would be embedded requirements of any planning permission.

- **Architectural design.**

While the Panel applauds the significant steps forward since the previous discussion in March, it was felt that further design resolution is required to achieve a scheme worthy of this prominent site on one of the principal approaches into Cambridge.

The Panel felt that the form of the buildings, whilst accepting their curved plan, still feels quite sprawling and could be more clearly ordered. The curved sections of the undulating elevations might be more consistently defined and further consideration given to the definition of the contrasting flat and angled sections of the facades.

The two buildings need to relate to each other architecturally, so that despite their differing brick detailing, they have a shared language. This consideration could then extend to relating the new offices to Botanic House, so that the three buildings might form a considered whole. One might even ask if the elevational treatment to Hills Road needs necessarily to be the same as that to the Botanic Gardens, or whether these significantly different contexts demand a differing architectural response.

There has been little explicit discussion of the aspirations for achieving high quality internal office environments in the scheme.

**Conclusion.**

**The Panel appreciates the design team's careful response to the previous review in March. By reducing the proposed height of both buildings by two stories, the scheme appears less dominant which is a significant step forward. Its appearance from the Botanic Gardens remains a concern, as would be the case for any scheme of this scale.**

**The bar for success with this new development has been set high. The opportunity to create a new development in such a prominent location in close proximity to CB1 and on one of the major approach roads into the city is rare. The Panel would urge the design team to go further in resolving the remaining design challenges to reach a proposal of the highest architectural quality.**

**For the Flying Pig, the Panel feel more could be done to enhance its setting. Strengthening its presence on the street would be preferable to it becoming just a**

fragment left over from the previous street frontage. A clearer identity for the pub would also improve its engagement with the community that did so much to secure its retention.

**VERDICT - RED (2), AMBER (4) with 1 abstention.**

**2. Date of next meeting - Wednesday 8<sup>th</sup> July 2020**

**Reminder**

**CABE 'traffic light' definitions:**

**GREEN:** a good scheme, or one that is acceptable subject to minor improvements

**AMBER:** in need of ***significant*** improvements to make it acceptable, but not a matter of starting from scratch

**RED:** the scheme is fundamentally flawed and a fresh start is needed.

This page is intentionally left blank

## **Response to Design and Conservation Panel Comments June 2020.**

### *Appearance from the Botanic Garden*

Comment: Acknowledge there are some significant visual effects. See further assessment below regarding Townscape Impacts. Recognition from Conservation officer and Historic England that the proposal is of significantly lesser degree of harm than extant planning permission.

### *Setting of the Flying Pig amongst large office buildings*

Comment: The provision of a higher boundary wall to the pub garden provides a greater visual presence in the streetscape. In the context of the overall townscape, the removal of low-quality detracting buildings and replacement with buildings of greater architectural quality is a considerable improvement. It is also a significant improvement from the extant planning permission which retains the Flying Pig's presence and identity as a standalone building set within an improved public realm.

### *Treatment of the extension to the Flying Pig*

Comment: This is proposed as matching brickwork, details of which will be sought by condition. No objection raised by urban design or conservation officers.

### *Pub garden should help define the pub in streetscene through use of walls so as not to appear left over*

Comment: This is considered to have been addressed through the provision of a higher boundary wall along the frontage of the pub garden which will lift its presence.

### *Needs to be clear where public realm begins and ends*

Comment: A raised table across the ramp entrance to the basement is now proposed to favour/define pedestrian movement along Hills Road. The public space between Buildings B and C is designed for people and will use materials which are appropriate to a pedestrian environment, not vehicles.

*Traffic impact needs to be proven*

Comment: County Highways officers are satisfied with the findings of the Transport Assessment which will reduce peak time vehicle movements and that there are no significant environmental effects in transport terms.

*Concern regarding conflict with pedestrian, cyclists and vehicles outside Building C*

Comment: Toucan crossing outside Building C provided as part of highway mitigation package. County Highways officers have raised no objections in relation to this matter.

*Concern whether taxi drop off points are well planned in the context of space for pedestrians*

Comment: The County highways officers acknowledge the benefit of vehicle set down areas near both building entrances. The buildings benefit from appropriate setbacks to the street to allow pedestrian movement in and out of the buildings together with significant internal lobby space which will allow people to congregate.

*Concern regarding impact of crossing on Hills Road junction*

Comment: County Highways officers are satisfied there is no material impact on the junction as a result of the proposed Toucan crossing.

*Office with views onto Botanic Garden is a significant opportunity but proposals fails to reflect this*

Comment: The ground floor of both buildings is designed as a space where the public are welcome and will have active frontages through uses such as food and beverage. The ground floors are light and transparent using full length glazing to maximise views of the gardens. The exterior spaces around the building at ground level (public and private) also provide opportunities for views of the Botanic Gardens. All elevations benefit from glazing. Upper floors also provide outdoor space with views across the gardens. The proposal improves upon the extant planning permission which created a continuous built form along the back edge of pavement.

*Large trees will not flourish in planters*

Comment: This has been addressed through amendments to provide larger planters and is now considered acceptable by officers.

*Drought tolerant trees may be an option but contribute little to the streetscene*

Comment: Details of soft landscaping scheme will be sought by condition to ensure appropriate planting is achieved.

*Landscaping is on podiums and in planters and therefore reliant on watering undermining sustainability credentials*

Comment: The development includes SuDS which incorporate a blue roof and storage tanks to allow for rainwater harvesting. This can be used to irrigate landscaped areas thus conserving the use of water.

*Frontage likely to remain heavily shaded in summer and degree of sunlight penetration to public realm between Buildings B and C*

Comment: Shadow studies have been provided to demonstrate the effects of shadowing. The orientation of the site is such that shadowing of the site frontage is inevitable in the afternoons, although this may provide some welcome shade in the summer.

*Roof terraces likely to be very hot and windy (should consider shading elements)*

Comment: This detail could be secured through a landscaping condition however, is likely to be explored further during the detailed design process. In terms of wind, appropriate mitigation has been identified in the ES and there are no significant environmental effects.

*Accept the curved form but still feel sprawling and could be more clearly ordered*

Comment: Refer to Urban Design Officer comments

*The two buildings need to relate to each other architecturally so despite the different brick detailing, have a shared language*

Comment: Refer to Urban Design officer comments

*Little discussion on aspiration on achieving high quality internal office environments*

Comment: The buildings propose to be WELL platinum enabled. WELL is the leading tool for advancing health and wellbeing in buildings globally. Furthermore, the overall design of the building is aimed at securing excellent thermal comfort for occupants.



**Greater Cambridge Shared Planning Service  
Disability Consultative Panel**

**Notes of the meeting Tuesday 27<sup>th</sup> October 2020  
(via MS Teams)**

**Participants:**

<b>Mark Taylor</b>	<b>Greater Cambridge Planning (Chair)</b>
<b>Sue Simms</b>	<b>Resident/City Council Housing (retired)</b>
<b>Rosalind Bird</b>	<b>MS Society/Architect (retired)</b>
<b>Jane Renfrew</b>	<b>Resident</b>
<b>John Taylor</b>	<b>Resident</b>

**Apologies: Jean White, Elizabeth French, Gary Reed and Jeremy Miller.**

**Presenters:**

<b>Tom Gardner</b>	<b>AHMM Architects</b>
<b>Johnny Vincent</b>	<b>Pace Investments (site owners)</b>
<b>Jonathan Bainbridge</b>	<b>Bidwells</b>
<b>Simon Stone</b>	<b>Pace Investments (site owners)</b>

**Officers:**

<b>Phil McIntosh</b>	<b>Greater Cambridge Planning</b>
----------------------	-----------------------------------

**Presentation - 104-112 Hills Road (20/03429/FUL)**

**The demolition of Betjeman House, Broadcasting House, Ortona House, Francis House, and the rear multi-storey carpark to Francis House, together with existing refuse and cycle stores; to allow for construction of two new commercial buildings of five and seven storeys respectively, providing flexible B1(a), B1(b), A1, A2, A3 uses on the ground floor and Class B1(a) and B1(b) on the upper floors.**

**The construction of basement with mezzanine level to provide for building services, cycle parking and car parking for the proposed commercial buildings, cycle and car parking spaces for Botanic House and services for Flying Pig Public House.**

**The scheme also includes the refurbishment of the Flying Pig PH as well as new public realm and landscaping.**

**Mark Taylor has already been in discussions with the design team and highlighted requirements in relation to accessible parking bays, manifestations on glazing for the benefit of the partially sighted and solar shading.**

**The Panel understand there is also the possibility of a Changing Places WC on site.**

**The Panel's comments were as follows:**

**The inclusion of accessible WCs throughout the development is applauded, as are the fire fighting lifts and high quality external spaces with views into the Botanic Gardens.**

**The Hills Road/Station Road junction is very busy and although there is the intention to widen the pavement, this is still a hostile environment for the ambulant disabled fearful of conflict with cyclists.**

**During the presentation, the Panel were informed there is a proposal by the Highways Authority to relocate the bus stop to help address this, in the context of increased traffic movements and sustainable travel. This is welcomed.**

**Routes from the accessible parking bays to the office spaces. The Panel expressed concern as to the distances involved.**

**Outdoor working spaces. The Panel agree that the pandemic has redefined working styles and that access to outdoor spaces will become more important. The multiple (level) accesses onto the roof terraces are therefore welcomed. The need for a surface treatment suitable for wheelchair users at the terrace level is emphasised.**

**Seating (pocket gardens). The Panel would always recommend a variety of seating styles for the benefit of the ambulant disabled.**

**Café and reception spaces. The designers are reminded of the need to consider acoustics for any environment with high ceilings and a high volume of activity and noise, as such spaces are challenging for the hearing impaired.**

**Interior detailing. Colour contrasts and manifestations will be needed for both the public and office spaces.**

**The detailing of the office spaces will be based on tenant need, and with this in mind, the Panel would stress the importance for the designers not to lose sight of their aspiration for this development to be in many ways an exemplar.**

### **Conclusion.**

**This is among the most impressive proposals brought before the Panel in recent years. The opportunity for such an accessible landmark development is to be applauded, as are the much needed improvements proposed for the Flying Pig PH and to its surrounding public realm.**

**Date of next meeting - Tuesday November 24<sup>th</sup>. It is likely another meeting will need to be scheduled in early December (date TBC)**

This page is intentionally left blank

## **Description of significance of designated and non-designated heritage assets.**

### **Designated Assets**

#### **New Town and Glisson Road Conservation Area**

It comprises residential streets either side of Hills Road as it enters the City from the railway bridge. It also includes the railway station and the buildings around it. The character then is a mix of fine houses in spacious grounds, modest terraces and larger villa style houses with open space beyond with a backcloth of mature trees.

Buildings are mainly of the 19th or early 20th centuries, of gault brick with slate roofs. In New Town, they are usually two storey, but elsewhere they are higher, some are three storey with basements. Modern buildings tend to be higher and few are in traditional brick. The Department of Chemistry building reaches six storeys. The recent redevelopment around the station has taken an altogether different form. The 104 -112 Hills Road site is a part of the Newtown & Glisson Rd Conservation Area that now transitions between the scales and characters of the new development on Station Road and those of Hills Road, the Garden, and Newtown beyond.

#### **Botanic Garden (Grade II\* Registered Park and Garden)**

The Botanic Garden was created for the University of Cambridge in 1831 by Professor John Stevens Henslow (Charles Darwin's mentor) and was opened to the public in 1846. The Garden is entered from the western side through the Trumpington Gates in Bateman Street and is a 16 ha generally flat site that was laid out on meadow land from 1846 onwards to an 1835 design of Andrew Murray, the first Curator, in a formal and landscape style, which was further extended eastwards from the 1950s onwards.

The main axial walk, which is lined with a rare collection of pines and cedars, leads east to a fountain of stone and steel, completed in 1969 to a design by David Mellor of Sheffield. The Garden now holds a plant collection of over 8,000 plant species from all over the world to facilitate teaching and research.

It has doubled in size since becoming a single unit in the 1950s, but can be described by dividing the site into the Victorian gardens to the west and the modern 20th century gardens to the east.

#### Cory Lodge, Botanic Garden (Grade II)

Between 1924-1925 Cory's Lodge, a white neo-Georgian two-storey house with projecting wings to the north and south was built in the gardens, to a design by the architect M H Baillie Scott, as the residence of the Director of the Garden.

#### Church of Our Lady and the English Martyrs(Grade II\*)

Built from designs of Messrs. Dunn, Hansom and Dunn in modern Decorated style on cruciform plan with polygonal apse, central lantern and North-West tower with spire. A stone church considerably enriched with carving, and a good example of late C19 Gothic architecture. Inside a stone tierceron vault. Wooden figure of St Andrew crucified presented by and to the design of Augustus Welby Northmore Pugin 1843. The statuary by Boulton of Cheltenham.

#### Highsett and front retaining wall (Grade II)

Block of 31 flats, six maisonettes and garages front retaining wall. 1958-60 by Eric Lyons for Span Developments Ltd; Z Pick engineer; Leslie Bilsby, builder. Brick cross-wall construction with concrete floors, mostly tile hung. Flat roof over broad cornice. The group set in a courtyard plan mirroring that of the traditional Cambridge colleges, but with openings in the east, west and north-west corner elevations where the upper floors are supported on pilotis. The views through to the rear garden, though now with semi open screens and gates, are an important part of the composition. Three storeys.

#### Milestone outside 100 Hills Road (Grade II)

Erected in 1731 by Dr William Warren. Stone block inscribed with "1 mile from Great St Mary's Church Cambridge". This is the first of a series of milestones that were erected to mark the distances between Cambridge and Haverhill. Dr Warren was a Fellow of Trinity Hall, who was also responsible for erecting a series of 16 milestones on the old road to London.

## Royal Albert Homes (Grade II)

Mid/Late C19. By Peck and Stephens of Maidstone. In 3 blocks. Nos 9-20 (consec). Facing Hills Road. Foundation stone dated 1861. In the Gothic style. Grey gault brick with red and blue brick dressings and string course. 2 storeys. Pointed headed windows, 6-light below, 2-light above. Panelled central tower with the clock missing. Many gabled slate roof with different sized gables. Nos 1-8. Facing Brooklands Avenue. Dated JS 1877, and 1879 in different gables. As main block but lacking the tower. The gables are arranged in different sizes, LSSLLSSSL with the larger ones set forward. Nos 21-25 (consec). Block at rear. Probably slightly later. 5 gables only, much plainer decoration.

## War Memorial (Grade II)

World War I memorial. 1922. Bronze figure by R. Tait McKenzie. Stone faced brick plinth. Rectangular. Based with inscriptions supporting sarcophagus with rounded ends to north and south. Sarcophagus carved with high-relief plaque to the east side, coats of arms to remaining 3 sides. Sarcophagus supports full-sized bronze figure of British soldier in military dress striding forward, rifle slung, gazing to right.

## Non-designated Assets

### Flying Pig Public House (Building Important to Character)

The Flying Pig Public House (two storey, rendered front with ground floor bay windows and eight over eight pane windows above). Constructed in gault brick and dating to c1840.

### Nos 55-59 (odd) Hills Road (with 1-7 Station Road) (Locally Listed)

Large corner building of 3 storeys and 28 bays originally housing 3 shops on Hills Road, 3 on Station Road and with the Great Northern Hotel between on the corner. Gault brick with stone detailing and a slate roof. The first floor has large 2/2 sash windows with arched stone heads. The second floor has similar but smaller windows with flat stone heads. Above is a decorative cornice with dentils and pendentive brackets between the windows. The windows at 1st and 2nd floor are bricked up in bay 12 (from the left), as is the 2nd floor window in bay 15. With the exception of the first shop (55 Hills

Road), which had five bays, the other shops were of three bays. The hotel seemingly occupied bays 12 to 19. Some original shopfronts with pilasters with stepped console brackets survive to 59 Hills Road, 7 Station Road and in part to Nos. 55, 57 and 5. Large ridge stacks survive at each end and between bays 5 & 6, 8 & 9, 11 & 12, 19 & 20 and 22 & 23..

#### Nos 63-99 Eastbourne Terrace, Hills Road (Locally Listed)

Built sometime between 1863 and 1888. Terrace of 19 houses, the plans alternately handed. Each 2 bay, 2-storey plus basement and dormer. Panelled door with arched head and plain fanlight. Bay window to ground floor with slate roof. Windows 2/2 sashes with flat brick arches to 1st floor. Shared stacks. Dormer window in same bay as bay window. Originally all had small front gardens behind low walls. Various incremental alterations have taken place.

#### Nos 101-123 College Terrace, Hills Road (Locally Listed)

Terrace of 12 houses, virtually identical to the above, but only 2 storeys plus basement.

#### 125 Hills Road (Locally Listed)

Built between 1863-1888, probably as railway coal yard offices and manager's house. 2 storeys, 3 bays in gault brick with overhanging hipped slate roof. Central panelled door with red brick flat arched head. To each side are bay windows to ground floor with slate roofs. 3, 6/6 sashes to first floor with similar heads to ground floor. End stacks. Rebuilt front garden wall in disrepair. Part of an iron gate and railing survives to S. Ground floor boarded up (May 2004). At the other side of the gateway is a small gate lodge.

#### Nos 9-15 Station Road (Locally Listed)

Group of houses built c1874 possibly by Richard Reynolds Rowe. Arundel Villas are two pairs of semis which had their own shared access. Salisbury Villas were six detached properties with another shared access whilst in-between was the largest house, St Andrew's, which had its own double access to Station Road. All the properties are similar in style, of 2-3 storeys with semi basements, of gault brick with red brick and stone dressings and slate roofs.



Whilst all the buildings are different, they share common features and mostly Gothic detailing; Most have prominent gables and end chimney stacks (except no. 13) and plate glass sash windows. The original separate (but shared) accesses have now been consolidated into one combined access road / car park, though the lime trees adjacent to the road. 'No-fines' concrete boundary wall to Station Road and Tenison Road (qv).

This page is intentionally left blank

## PLANNING COMMITTEE

24<sup>th</sup> March 2021

<b>Application Number</b>	20/04514/FUL	<b>Agenda Item</b>	
<b>Date Received</b>	18/11/2020	<b>Officer</b>	Dean Scrivener
<b>Target Date</b>	2/4/2021 (EOT Agreed)		
<b>Ward</b>	Petersfield		
<b>Site</b>	St Matthews Centre, Sturton Street		
<b>Proposal</b>	Erection of a building comprising student accommodation (C2) (113 rooms in 14no flats), including an ancillary reception building, part change of use of existing building from non-residential institution (D1) to cafe (A3), including outdoor terrace with associated development		
<b>Applicant</b>	Mr Sebastian Hayes		

SUMMARY	<p>The development does not accord with the Development Plan and is recommended for refusal for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The principle of student accommodation on this site is not supported due to the lack of an identified need being demonstrated, as well as a lack of satisfactory security measures preventing anti-social behaviour of students, given its location</li> <li>- The design, scale, height and massing of the proposed development would have a significant adverse impact on the character of the local area and is not in accordance with the Eastern Gate SPD</li> <li>- The overall scale of the building would significantly impose and dominate St Matthews Piece and result in harm to the Mill Road Conservation Area</li> </ul>
---------	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Due to the excessive scale of the proposed building, protected trees would be removed and severely impacted, resulting in harm upon these trees which significantly contribute to the amenity of the local area.</li> <li>- Given the overall scale of the building, the proposal is considered to dominate St Matthews Piece and result in a loss of its recreational and environmental values</li> <li>- The proposal does not contribute any provision of open space and there is a lack of justification to demonstrate that an acceptable amount and design of open space can be delivered as part of the proposal</li> <li>- A significant proportion of the proposed cycle parking is not easily accessible and is inappropriately located, making it impractical for students to use and which would result in abandoned and inappropriate cycle parking</li> </ul>
RECOMMENDATION	REFUSAL

## 1.0 SITE DESCRIPTION/AREA CONTEXT

- 1.1 The application site is located at the St Matthews (former Howard Mallet) Centre. It comprises an existing rectangular building of one and two storeys, dark grey / black in appearance with large areas of glazing, which is occupied by the Cambridge School of Visual and Performing Arts (CSVPA). There is on-site car and cycle parking.

- 1.2 The site is located within the Eastern Gate Opportunity Area and Mill Road Conservation Area. It is directly adjacent to an area of Public Open Space (including play area) to the south and includes an area of Private Open Space to the east adjoining York Street. A number of mature London Plane trees are located around the perimeter of St Matthews Piece and the application site which have statutory protection through the Conservation Area designation and by virtue of Tree Preservation Orders (TPOs).
- 1.3 The surrounding area is characterised by residential development which is 2, 2.5 and 3 storeys in height. To the west of the site turning the corner of New Street and Sturton Street is Anglia Ruskin University's Faculty of Health, Social Care & Education, a contemporary styled solid brick institutional building designed by Richard Murphy Architects.

## **2.0 THE PROPOSAL**

- 2.1 The application submitted proposes the erection of a building comprising student accommodation, including an ancillary reception / bin storage building, part change of use of existing building from a non-residential institution (D1) to cafe (A3), including an outdoor terrace, with associated landscaping, open space, car and cycle parking and infrastructure.
- 2.2 The proposal seeks to redevelop the site to provide 113 student rooms separated into 14 cluster flats, 12 of which would be located within three storeys (4 clusters on each main floor) of a long rectangular building with a fourth recessed storey on the roof top accommodating a pair of cluster flats. The accommodation is for the Cambridge School of Visual and Performing Arts (CSVPA). CSVPA occupies the St Matthew's Centre and teaches approximately 150 of its 430 students on the site.
- 2.3 The existing building is to be retained with the new proposed building being built as a 'floating' structure, part over the existing building and part jutting out over the car park towards New Street and private open space to the east. It would be supported on a series of timber stilts, some of which would rest

on the existing building with others extending to ground level. It would be clad in corrugated steel and dressed with terracotta baguettes positioned semi-randomly across the facade between and partly overlapping windows to the student rooms. The eastern side of the building would include two main lift cores finished in terracotta tiles extending full height and two powder coated aluminium 'zig-zag' balustrades providing stepped access from the external ground level to the first floor of the building. The two roof top clusters would be finished in standing seam zinc cladding in a modulated form. Access would be from the private open space to the east. A new café would be provided within the existing ground floor space with access into the surrounding parkland and a new south facing outdoor seating terrace located to the rear of the building.

- 2.4 Vehicular access to the site would be via the existing car park entrance on New Street, which gives access to car and cycle parking, including wheelchair accessible parking spaces. Two TPO'd trees along the frontage are proposed to be removed as a result of the building projecting significantly forwards towards New Street. Additional cycle parking is proposed at ground level and on the roof of the building.
- 2.5 A new footpath is proposed close to the eastern side of the building within the private protected open space. The footpath would provide a link from New Street, past the proposed new reception / refuse building to the lift / stair cores.
- 2.6 Given the large number of objections received by consultees and third-party representations, officers consider it appropriate to present the scheme to the Planning Committee. Furthermore, a request from local councillors for the application to be presented to Planning Committee has been received from Councillor Richard Robertson and Councillor Mike Davey, objecting to the proposal on the following grounds:

- The application fails to protect existing public assets, including open spaces and leisure facilities

- Fails to enhance to the character of the area by developing buildings of a scale and massing that do not respond to context and reflect the predominantly residential nature of the area
- Fails to respond positively to its context and draw inspiration from the key characteristics of its surroundings to help create distinctive and high quality places
- Would not have a positive impact on the setting in terms of location on the site, height, scale and form, materials and detailing, ground floor activity, wider townscape and landscape impacts and available views;
- Fails to design external spaces, landscape, public realm, and boundary treatments as an integral part of the new development proposal and coordinated with adjacent sites and phases. Nor does it demonstrate that the design relates to the character and intended function of the spaces and surrounding buildings;
- It would be significantly taller than the surrounding built form and not fit within the existing landscape and townscape causing harm to the significance of surrounding heritage assets
- It would not ensure that the character or appearance of Cambridge, as a city of spires and towers emerging above the established tree line, remains dominant from relevant view points
- It would have an adverse impact on the Cambridge skyline
- have an adverse impact on neighbouring buildings and open spaces in terms of the overlooking and overshadowing, and would lead to inadequate sunlight and daylight within and around the proposal
- It would cause harm to the character of open space of environmental and recreational importance and loss of some of that open space
- It would involve the felling of two large trees and significant surgery to others on the site, trees which are of great amenity and other value, without demonstrable

public benefits accruing from the proposal which clearly outweigh the current and future amenity value of the trees.

2.7 The application was presented to the Design and Conservation Panel on 9<sup>th</sup> December 2020. The Panel's comments are attached to this report under Appendix 1 for reference. The Panel voted against the proposal, with 4 members voting for RED and two members voting AMBER.

2.8 The application is accompanied by the following supporting information:

1. Design and Access Statement
2. Arboricultural Impact Assessment/Tree Survey
3. Planning Statement
4. Existing and proposed plans
5. Townscape Visual Impact Assessment (TVIA)
6. Drainage Strategy
7. Pre- Planning Assessment
8. Ecological Appraisal
9. Statement of Community Involvement
10. Structural Survey
11. SUDS Drainage Strategy Report
12. Sustainability Statement
13. Transport Statement
14. Travel Plan
15. Utility/Ventilation Statement
16. Air Quality Assessment
17. Bat Survey Report
18. BREEAM Ecology Credit Report
19. Daylight and Sunlight Impact Assessment
20. Desk Study Report
21. Heritage Statement
22. Landscape Strategy
23. Noise Impact Assessment
24. Accommodation Needs Assessment
25. CASL Student Behaviour Policy 2020

2.9 Additional information was submitted on 1<sup>st</sup> March 2021 in relation to CSVPA's accommodation needs to justify the proposal against policy 46 and outlining more detail of CSVPA's



student behavioural policy. Given this additional information is limited in scope and was requested by officers, further public consultation has not been carried out and officers do not consider it unfairly prejudices any interested party.

- 3.0 The applicants have sought to make further changes to the plans and supporting documents to partially address technical issues arising from consultee responses, however, officers have advised that such changes do not deal with the substantive issues and given the level of re-consultation required, this would cause the Council unnecessary expense and create delay.

### 3.0 RELEVANT SITE HISTORY

Reference	Description	Outcome
12/5357/PREAPP	Proposed student accommodation building (unit numbers are to be determined).	Not Supported
14/1252/FUL	Change of use from the permitted use as a studio/cafe bar/multimedia education centre and community facility (sui generis) granted under planning permission 97/1020 to a Class D1 dance school/studio including limited alterations to the external envelope of the building.	Approved
14/5452/PREAPP	Proposed student accommodation (58 units) to sit alongside proposed dance school/studio including ground floor cafe.	Not Supported
15/5354/PREAPP	Proposed student accommodation (48No studio units) plus residential development (4No flats) to sit alongside proposed dance	Partly Supported

school / studio including ground floor cafe and to include car and cycle parking, refuse provision and hard and soft landscaping.

17/1312/CL2PD	Application for a Certificate of Lawfulness under section 192 for the proposed use of the building for general educational use falling within Use Class D1 (Non Residential Institutions) as defined by the Town and County Planning (Use Classes) Order 1987 (as amended).	Certificate Granted
19/5139/PREAPP	Proposed development for an extension to the existing building on the site comprising student accommodation (C2) (116 rooms in 14no. flats) over with four connected roof top pods, with associated car and cycle parking provision. The dance school facilities on site will not be removed and will continue to function as part of the wider extended building.	Not Supported

- 3.1 Pre application 15/5354/PREAPP, was undertaken in 2015 by a previous officer who is no longer working at the Council. The pre application response was mostly positive and supported the scheme which proposed a raised building comprising two storeys in height with roof top pods. The applicant draws attention to this pre application response within their Design and Access Statement. Despite this positive response six years ago, the adoption of a new Local Plan has meant that the Council are required to assess the current proposal against these new and up to date policies, which are outlined within this report.

## 4.0 PUBLICITY

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

## 5.0 POLICY

### 5.1 Cambridge Local Plan 2018

PLAN		POLICY NUMBER
Cambridge Local Plan 2018		1, 3, 14, 23
		28, 29, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36
		46, 51
		55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 67, 68 (Appendix I), 70, 71,
		80, 81, 82

### 5.2 Relevant Central Government Guidance, Supplementary Planning Documents and Material Considerations

Central Government Guidance	National Planning Policy Framework 2019 National Planning Policy Framework – Planning Practice Guidance from 3 March 2014 onwards Circular 11/95 (Annex A)
Supplementary Planning Documents	Greater Cambridge Sustainable Design and Construction (Jan 2020) Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Waste Partnership (RECAP): Waste Management Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (February 2012)

	Eastern Gate Supplementary Planning Document (SPD)
Material Considerations	<p><u>City Wide Guidance</u></p> <p>Arboricultural Strategy (2004)</p> <p>Cambridge and Milton Surface Water Management Plan (2011)</p> <p>Open Space and Recreation Strategy 2011 (Which recognises as a weakness in Petersfield at page 55, <i>'Limited amount of Protected Open Space, of which approximately two-thirds is publicly accessible. Although there is a range of publicly accessible open spaces close to the ward including Parker's Piece and Coldham's Common, the amount of informal open space in the ward is low given the local population density and natural and semi-natural green space is restricted to Mill Road Cemetery (CEM 06). There is no publicly accessible formal outdoor sports provision within Petersfield'</i></p> <p><i>And which recognises as an opportunity:</i></p> <p><i>'Improvements to St. Matthew's Piece dependent on the future of the Howard Mallett Centre. Site 5.09 Travis Perkins is allocated in the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 for housing. If these sites were to come forward for their allocated use, the quality and quantity of open space made available on site should be high in line with the Council's standards in order to avoid further</i></p>

	<p><i>negative impact on any deficiencies in publicly accessible open space in Petersfield.)</i></p> <p>Mill Road Conservation Area Appraisal 2011</p> <p>Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (November 2010)</p> <p>Cambridge City Council Waste and Recycling Guide: For Developers.</p> <p>Cycle Parking Guide for New Residential Developments (2010)</p> <p>Planning Obligations Strategy 2010</p>
--	--

## 6.0 CONSULTATIONS

### Urban Design Officer

#### 6.1 Objects to the proposal on the following grounds:

- The scheme proposes a significant uplift in scale over the heights identified in the Eastern Gate SPD and fails to demonstrate that an increased height will fit coherently into the surrounding context.
- The combined scale, volume and box like massing of the proposed scheme will form an intrusive, overly dominant and bulky addition to the prevailing domestic scaled context, as well as outcompeting the Crown Court, looming over the established tree line, and diminishing the sense of green openness.

- Several functional design issues have been raised such as the quality of living accommodation and adequate cycle parking which are poorly resolved.

Taking the above into account, the proposed scheme does not comply with Policies 55, 56, 57 & 82 (CLP 2018) and is therefore not supported in Urban Design terms.

### **Conservation Officer**

#### **6.2 Objects to the proposal on the following grounds:**

- The proposal is for a building with scale and extent that would block views and light through the trees thus changing the character of the space here as seen from Sturton Street, New Street and York Street, in a way that the existing single storey building does not.
- It would also reduce the openness of the space by adding the additional building (and with openness an awkward relationship with the St Matthews Centre building).
- From New Street, the openness below the canopy of the trees would also be affected by the proposed brick undercroft block at ground level. This and any other ground level service enclosures (a plant room?) would detract from claims that the design of the building mitigates any impact on the openness of the space.
- Bare trees together with any removal of existing trees together with being lit-up would emphasise the incongruous presence of the building.
- The building would stand within the conservation area but the design does not acknowledge this in terms of form or materials - for instance, in the use of the proposed corrugated cladding, green zinc, and steel balustrades in a conservation area where gault brick and slate predominate.

St Matthews Piece is significant within the Conservation area and it is considered that the proposal would fail to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Conservation Area, contrary to policy 61 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2018.

Within the broad category “less than substantial harm”, the level of the harm is considered to be significant, Paragraph 196 of the NPPF would apply here.

### **Tree Officer**

6.3 Objects to the proposal on the following grounds:

- The removal of two trees along New Street and the anticipated damage upon more trees will severely hinder their growth.
- The new building will significant decrease light levels making the trees appear more oppressive.
- For the most part the new building is located outside the RPA of retained trees, however given the footprint and height of the building, space required for construction and infrastructure will be substantial and is expected to conflict with retained trees necessitating additional tree works.
- The size and height of the building will significantly alter the light levels within the site reducing direct sunlight to trees for longer periods. Trees will have to adapt to reduced light levels and changes in temperature, influenced by the new building.

For the above reasons, the layout is not supported and is contrary to policy 71 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2018.

### **Landscape Officer**

6.4 Objects to the proposal on the following grounds:

- These trees form a special and locally distinct element in the street and their removal would alter the continuity of the treed frontage of the square which becomes quite evident in

Technical Visualisation viewpoint 1 and 2 where the building looms over a small utility building at ground level and the removal of the trees opens the view to a somewhat cluttered panorama of buildings, columns, parking, stairwells and elevator cores.

- Staircases into the Public Open Space (POS) which descend from the first floor of the building. The bulk of the overhead building also looms against the edge of the POS, impacting the character of the space. Whilst there is scope in the policy to give schools and other learning institutions leeway in developing on POS land, it is considered that the staircases are not 'required' to descend in this manner. Therefore, this intrusion and impact into the POS is unacceptable.
- Existing cycle parking has been shown to be retained around the perimeter of the dance school between the car park and the building, angled to the wall as well as some sheds to the rear of the building. These spaces are poorly overlooked and inconvenient in some respects. A scheme which has considered cycle parking differently and as a part of the proposal rather than an afterthought would be have been more welcome.
- More importantly, the cycle parking stands on the roof are wholly unacceptable. The scheme is being developed for 16-18 year old students and access to the roof is through two elevator cores with small waiting areas and a single leaf door with a turn for access. The students will ultimately find it more convenient to keep their bikes in their rooms after doing this manoeuvre or lock them to the fencing around the site.
- The landscape design depends heavily on grasses, perennials and meadow-like gardens. Whilst this is an attractive feature during the summer months, they tend to look poorly and rough in the wet winter months. The Strategy does not go into a great deal of detail but proposes nothing particularly controversial and



avoids making any wholesale changes to existing hard and soft landscape spaces, seeking to retain most of the parking areas and paths already present on site. As a setting for such a uniquely styled building, this seems rather mild and could have gone farther to create a setting for it.

In summary, the Landscape Officer does not support the application due to non-compliance with Local Plan Policies 55, 56, 57, 59, 61, 67, 71, and 82 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2018.

### **Sustainability Officer**

6.5 No objections subject to conditions/informatives regarding the following:

- BRE issued Design Stage Certificate being submitted to the LPA
- BRE issued post Construction Certificate being submitted to the LPA
- A water efficiency specification, based on the Water Efficiency Calculator Methodology or the Fitting Approach set out in Part G of the Building Regulations 2010 (2015 edition) has been submitted to LPA

### **Crime Prevention Officer**

6.6 Supports the proposal subject to conditions regarding the following:

- CCTV coverage locations
- External lighting
- Security management

### **Ecology Officer**

6.7 Supports the proposal subject to conditions regarding the following:

- Specifications of ecological enhancement features

- Compliance conditions to secure recommendations within the submitted Ecological Appraisal.

## **Environmental Health**

6.8 Unable to provide comments due to the lack of information regarding the following:

- Full details of the circumstances within which the acoustic assessment was carried out (e.g. no mention is made as to whether or not the dance studios were in use at the time of the assessment nor have details been provided of the noise from existing rooftop plant serving the cafe and the dance studios – significance of potential impacts of all of these noise sources will be required.)
- Details on the significance of impacts in terms of noise with regards to the relocation of the existing rooftop plant
- Provision of calculations carried out to obtain the 16-hr and 8-hr LAeqs reported in the assessment
- Full details of the acoustic assessment referenced in Section 4.9 of the Cass Allen assessment (referred to simply as a “2017 survey”) and justification for use of the “short term” attended measurements over previous “long-term” unattended survey results.
- Details and consideration of all new plant associated with the application
- Confirmation of the type of cooking anticipated within the café and provision of details of extract system design, height and location
- Details of proposed hours of use of the café including consideration of hours of use of the external terrace seating area.
- Submission of Air Quality Assessment as referenced in the Planning Statement

## **Local Highway Authority**

6.9 No objections subject to the following concerns being addressed and conditions:

- A clear plan showing exactly what works the applicant wishes to undertake within the adopted public highway

- The cycle parking spaces would need to be covered and placing proposed car parking in front of them significantly reduces their accessibility
- A Traffic Management Plan condition
- Time restriction on allowing construction vehicles with a gross weight in excess of 3.5 tonnes entering and exiting the site
- Visibility splays condition
- Construction and materials of the proposed access

### **Cambridgeshire County Council Transport Team**

#### **6.10 Objection due to the following:**

- Accident records for the last 60 months should be provided
- The Transport Statement objectives are broadly agreed however mitigation methods of how the proposal would not result in any significant impact upon the safe and effective operation of the surrounding road network need to be addressed

### **Drainage Officer**

#### **6.11 Unable to comment on the application due to some of the information missing in respect of the submitted Drainage Report.**

### **Local Lead Flood Authority (LLFA)**

#### **6.12 Object to the proposal due to the following reasons:**

- The proposed development is looking to discharge surface water to the foul sewer network (as it currently does). However, from the Anglian Water asset plans, it is evident that there are surface water sewers in the vicinity of the site. In line with the drainage hierarchy, surface water should be disposed to a surface water sewer ahead of a foul. Therefore, a connection should be proposed to the surface water sewer network and dialogue opened with Anglian Water to agree a connection.

- Hydraulic Calculations should be submitted with the application to demonstrate the performance of the proposed system during the 100%, 3.35 and 1% Annual Exceedance Probability (AEP) storm events, including a suitable allowance for climate change. The calculations should demonstrate the design of the surface water system will not surcharge during the 100% AEP storm and no water is outside the system during the 3.3% AEP storm. If there is any flooding expected during the 1% AEP storm, this should be managed on site without flooding any property internally, or increasing the flood risk to any external land or property.
- Chapter 9 of the submitted SuDS Drainage Strategy Report details the management and maintenance responsibilities of the site. It is detailed in this section that Thames Water are the water authority responsible for the maintenance of the Public Sewer. However, Anglian Water are the sewerage undertakers for this area. The report should be factually correct and therefore this should be amended to ensure the correct water authority is noted for the maintenance of the sewer assets.
- Informatives regarding green roof construction green roofs and pollution control

### **Environment Agency (EA)**

6.13 No comments as the application falls under the Flood Risk Standard Advice (FRSA).

### **S106 Officer**

6.14 No objections subject to the following:

- Given the scale of the proposed development on this site, and in line with the funding formula set out in Cambridge City Council's Planning Obligations Strategy 2010, a specific S106 contribution of J30,397.00 (plus indexation) is requested towards the provision and / or improvement to the indoor sports facilities at the Abbey Sports Centre and Gym.

- Given the scale of the proposed development on this site, and in line with the funding formula set out in Cambridge City Council's Planning Obligations Strategy 2010, it is proposed that the council requests J26,894.00 (plus indexation) is requested towards the provision and / or improvement to outdoor sports facilities at Coldham's Common.
- Based on the funding formula set out in the council's Planning Obligations Strategy 2010, it is proposed that the council requests J27,346.00 (plus indexation) for the provision of and / or improvement of access to the Informal Open Space at St Matthews Piece, Sturton Street, Cambridge.

Where additional on-site Informal Open Space is provided, this will be taken into consideration when the final off-site commuted sum is calculated.

- In line with the Planning Obligations Strategy 2010, Cambridge City Council does not seek S106 children's play contributions from planning applications relating to student accommodation.

### **Cadent Gas**

6.15 No objections. It is noted that Plan Protection should be notified of any reason for refusal of the application.

### **6.16 Cambridge Past, Present and Future**

Objects to the proposal on the following grounds:

- The proposed scale, height, form and use would impact upon the local character of the local area and Conservation Area
- The proposal is not in accordance with policies 23, 55, 57, 59, 60, 61, 67 and 71 of the Local Plan

No public benefits of the scheme would overcome the harm caused by the proposal in this instance

## 7.0 REPRESENTATIONS

- 7.1 There have been many objections received to this application, as outlined below:

Number of Neutral Representations: 1

Number of Objections: 323

Number in Support: 0

The table below summarises these representations by grouping the main topic of the representation received and the response given by the Council by referencing the relevant section of the report:

Representation	Response
Building is much taller than buildings on surrounding streets and does not accord with the Eastern Gate Development Framework SPD	Addressed under paragraphs 8.20-8.29.
The design and scale of the building is not appropriate in this location and would dominate the surrounding area/buildings	Addressed under paragraphs 8.20-8.29.
The building is out of keeping with the local area, Conservation Area and the surrounding public realm and there is no justification within the Heritage Statement for this. Therefore, the proposal breaches policies 14, 23, 46, 55, 56, 57, 58, 60 and 61	Addressed under paragraphs 8.30-8.39. Policy 60 is referred to in paragraph 8.56
Overshadowing/overbearing impacts	Addressed under paragraphs 8.57 and 8.58
Impact upon trees and therefore the proposal is contrary to policy 71 of the local plan	Addressed under paragraphs 8.40-8.44
Loss of open green space for residents to enjoy and relax and what is being proposed to overcome this loss?	Addressed under paragraphs 8.45-8.55
The need for this amount of student accommodation on this	Addressed under paragraphs 8.4-8.12 and 9.5

site is unjustified – especially in respect of the pandemic and Brexit	
Impact upon local wildlife	Addressed under paragraph 8.92
Increased parking competition on surrounding streets	Addressed under paragraphs 8.77
Increased noise levels/disturbance	Addressed under paragraphs 8.60-8.69
Street safety for pedestrians	Addressed under paragraphs 8.72-8.76
The control of this large number of students in respect of antisocial behaviour is a concern, especially as St Matthews Piece is used by families with young children	Addressed under paragraphs 8.17 and 8.19
There is little evidence for new student accommodation in the east part of Cambridge and therefore this proposal should not be supported	Addressed under paragraph 9.6
The proposed caf� would benefit both students and local residents however, there is a concern that the caf� use could be changed to a student bar which would result in increased noise levels	Addressed under paragraph 9.7
The development is not in accordance with BREEAM standards	Addressed under paragraphs 8.93 – 8.98
The proposed cycle parking is totally unsuitable	Addressed under paragraphs 8.78-8.83
Fire safety is a concern for a building of this height	Addressed under paragraph 9.8
There is a discrepancy in regard to the plotting of the western boundary of the eastern strip of Protected Open Space	Addressed under paragraph 8.51

## 8.0 ASSESSMENT

### Principle of Development

- 8.1 Policy 3 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2018) seeks to ensure that the majority of new development should be focused in and around the existing urban area, making the most effective use of previously developed land, and enabling the maximum number of people to access services and facilities locally. Given that the site is located within a sustainable location, is in walking and cycling distance of Cambridge City Centre, close to other CSVPA / CATS educational facilities and is in essence seeking to provide a combined place of education (existing CSVPA dance studios) and habitation for CSVPA students, the location of the application site for student accommodation is suitable.
- 8.2 Policy 14 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2018) identifies areas of major change and opportunity areas to for development, subject to a number of core principles. Although this policy is primarily aimed at more major infrastructure, its principles are nonetheless still engaged and should be aspired to. Many of the considerations under this policy refer to other policies within the local plan and these considerations will be discussed under the relevant sections in this report.
- 8.3 The site is situated within the Eastern Gate Opportunity Area, as set out under Policy 23 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2018). Including other criteria, the policy seeks for development proposals within the Eastern Gate to be of a scale and massing that respond to context and reflect the predominantly residential nature of the area with reference to appropriate building heights suggested in accompanying figure 3.9. The Eastern Gate Area Development Framework SPD is referenced within the policy and forms a material consideration having informed the wording and criteria set out in Policy 23. The overall scale of the proposal would not be in accordance with either policies 14 or 23 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2018) or the Eastern Gate SPD provisions. Clear harm arises from the proposed scale and this harm is set out in subsequent paragraphs to this report.

### *The Need for Student Accommodation*

- 8.4 The application proposes to redevelop the site to provide 113 student rooms. The accommodation would be for CSVPA



students. The School occupies the St Matthew's Centre and teaches approximately 150 of its 430 students on the site. Policy 46 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2018) supports new student accommodation provided it meets the identified needs of an existing educational institution within the city of Cambridge in providing housing for students attending a full-time course of one academic year or more. There are several criteria outlined within this policy for which proposals must accord.

- 8.5 The Planning Statement submitted outlines that the accommodation is for 16-18 year old students attending CSVPA on full time courses. CSVPA have confirmed their support for the proposal and are in the process of agreeing a formal arrangement with the applicant. This is illustrated within the letter attached to the Planning Statement under Appendix 1 and could form part of a S106 agreement/ planning condition requirement as necessary.
- 8.6 Criterion a) of Policy 46 requires applications for student accommodation to provide sufficient information to demonstrate there is a proven need for student accommodation to serve the institution. Although the Planning Statement identifies the need for student accommodation to be provided across Cambridge in an attempt to release more housing, there is little evidence provided within the application which demonstrates a specific need for new student accommodation to serve CSVPA on this site.
- 8.7 The release of general market housing is a possible outcome from a purpose built student housing proposal. However, the application does not identify the specific impact of CSVPA's continued growth on general market housing in the absence of the new accommodation or seek to quantify any benefit through the release of market housing through provision of the new accommodation. It is thus difficult to attach any significant benefit arising from the proposal in this regard.
- 8.8 It is acknowledged that the institution wishes to grow and attract more full time students and promote careers within the music and performing arts industry, however, the application fails to fully demonstrate / analyse that need for example through a business plan, evidence of increasing student applications to CSVPA, or by analysing availability of pre-existing student accommodation which could be occupied by CSVPA students

within the City which could cater for the anticipated uplift in need (see paragraph 6.14 of Policy 46).

8.9 Further information as part of an Accommodation Needs Assessment was submitted in February 2021. In a standard year, the applicants state that there are 150 Higher Education students and 300 Further Education students at the School. CSVPA has aspirations to increase student numbers to 600 over the next 5-10-year period (an increase of 150 students) and they state that there is no scope for additional student accommodation to be created at CSVPA's existing premises. The School's strong preference is for all its students to be located within purpose-built accommodation run and managed by the School and close to the teaching facilities. The Needs Assessment sets out that *'Whilst the School would prefer for all its students to be on site, the scale of the proposed growth does not entirely allow for that to happen. The aspiration therefore is to seek to house all those between the ages of 16-18 years onsite, while older students are at other accommodation in the City.'*

8.10 CSVPA state that they currently provide a total of 407 rooms for under 18s and over 18s as per the table below and that all of the accommodation below is fully utilised and does not have the opportunity to expand.

NAME	LOCATION	NO ROOMS
<b>Under 18s</b>		
Varsity House	New Street	298
<b>Over 18s</b>		
Masters House	Histon Road	80
Batim House	East Road	29

8.11 Notwithstanding the above, there is no information on the number of 16-18 year old students applying to CSVPA to give

officers confidence that additional accommodation of this scale is required on this site. The further Needs Assessment mainly reiterates the same information contained within the Planning Statement and does not provide a satisfactory evidence base. Supply for the provision of Purpose Built Student Accommodation (PBSA) as set out in the Local Plan has been significant. Whilst it is desirable for CSVPA to own and directly manage its own property for its own students, this is not a requirement of the policy and the Council would not want pre-existing PBSA to stand empty and be under-utilised, particularly as space standards for such accommodation are generally well below the adopted Non-Technical Housing Standards 2015 and would be unsuitable for alternative C3 use without major modification.

- 8.12 Therefore, the application fails to demonstrate a need for the proposed student accommodation to serve CSVPA in light of existing purpose built student accommodation within the City of Cambridge and is not in accordance with Policy 46 (a) of the Cambridge Local Plan (2018).

#### *Other Policy 46 Matters*

- 8.13 There is no existing residential development on the site and the site is not allocated for residential development. Therefore, the proposal would not result in the loss of any affordable and/or market housing and is in accordance with Policy 46 (b) of the Cambridge Local Plan (2018).
- 8.14 The proposed accommodation would be located directly above the St Matthews Centre which is used by CSVPA for teaching and is therefore a sustainable location for combining teaching and living accommodation. The site is also in close proximity to other higher educational institutions within the city and being centrally located is not out of cycle or walking range of CATS on Round Church Street. It is therefore in a sustainable and accessible location and it is appropriately located for access to and from the institution, in accordance with Policy 46 (c) and (d) of the Cambridge Local Plan (2018).
- 8.15 The proposal would not provide any dedicated parking for students. The only exception to this is the provision of a designated disabled parking space. This parking strategy is considered appropriate as there are excellent opportunities for

non-car travel at the site, with good access to public transport, walking and cycling routes. The applicants state that there would be a strict prohibition against the keeping of cars in the city by students and this would be a condition within the student's contracts. Given the age profile of students (between the ages of 16-18 years old), as well as the accommodation being directly above the teaching facility, both would further reduce the likelihood of car ownership. These matters could be controlled through S106 provisions or planning condition if necessary. Therefore, the proposal is in accordance with Policy 46 (e) of the Cambridge Local Plan (2018).

- 8.16 The proposal seeks to provide 113 student rooms separated into 14 cluster flats. There are no minimum room size standards for student accommodation. Each room would benefit from an en-suite and have desk space to study, as well as have access to a shared communal space. Although the rooms would not benefit from any private balcony space, officers consider the internal spaces are reasonable in size to provide sufficient amenity for future students (typically only residing for a temporary period) and therefore consider the proposal is in accordance with Policy 46 (f) of the Cambridge Local Plan (2018).

#### *Amenity and Anti-Social Behaviour*

- 8.17 Given the large number of students between 16-18 years old for which the proposal would cater for, antisocial behaviour and disruption to nearby residents and users of the adjacent St Matthew's Piece are a concern and are reflected in third party representations. The applicant has briefly outlined that security measures will be put in place to prevent any antisocial behaviour under section 7.6 of the Design and Access Statement. This only summarises the security methods which are intended to be implemented and does not sufficiently explain how these methods are to be successfully implemented in preventing any antisocial behaviour or prevent any unauthorised access on this site. The Crime Prevention Officer has been consulted on the application and has recommended approval, subject to conditions to secure details regarding CCTV coverage, lighting, and robust security rated doors. If officers were minded to support the proposal, these details would be recommended.

8.18 Notwithstanding the above, given the large number of students anticipated to congregate on the site and within the local area, the applicant has been invited to submit further information on how the behaviour of students will be controlled to prevent any antisocial behaviour and subsequent disturbance upon residents. The applicant has submitted the Student Behaviour Policy (dated June 2020), which outlines the disciplinary process for controlling student behaviour. These measures include rewards for good behaviour and subsequent consequences for inappropriate behaviour. These measures are standard practice which are implemented across all student accommodation sites managed by CATS Cambridge and does not present mitigation measures to control student behaviour on this particular site. St Matthews Piece is a well-used area by all age groups and is a sensitive site. Given the intensification and overall scale of the proposal together with the lack of meaningful external landscaped space for students within the site itself, officers are not satisfied that sufficient mitigation measures to control or limit anti-social behaviour have been provided and therefore the proposal is not in accordance with Policy 46 (g) of the Cambridge Local Plan (2018).

8.19 Overall, due to the lack of sufficient information demonstrating the need for student accommodation and the implementation of satisfactory measures to prevent antisocial behaviour of students on the site, the proposal fails to accord with Policy 46 (a) and (g) of the Cambridge Local Plan (2018) and is not supported in principle.

### **Context of Site, Design and Visual Impact**

8.20 The application site is located at the St Matthews Centre, directly adjacent to St Matthews Piece. The site comprises a single storey building (with mezzanine levels) occupied by CSVPA. There is on site car parking and cycle parking which is situated to the front and partly to the rear, with access onto New Street. The prevailing character of the area is predominantly two storey terraced residential dwellings surrounding the site.

8.21 The proposed building would comprise three main storeys in height with the addition of roof top pods as a limited fourth floor and would be supported by timber stilts so that the building would partly sit above and extend outwards from the existing St Matthews Centre building. This approach adopts the 'Knock

Nothing Down' concept which was originally formulated by Prof. Will Alsop which aspires to retain existing buildings on sites to combine old and new development. The proposed building would measure approximately 20m in height from ground level, 21m in width and 55m in depth.

- 8.22 The Eastern Gate Development Framework SPD identifies that the application site could allow for an overall building height of up to 2+1 storeys. The +1 refers to a third floor of accommodation in the roofscape or a setback upper floor. This translates to a recommended shoulder height of approximately 7m and overall building height of approximately 10m. The proposed building would have a shoulder height of approximately 16.5m and an overall building height of approximately 20m. Assuming a minimum floor to floor height of 4m at ground level and 3m at upper levels, as noted in paragraph 3.4.4-6, pg.42 of the SPD, the proposed building has an equivalent height of a 5+1 storey building. This is significantly above the maximum height recommended within the SPD.
- 8.23 The applicant has submitted a Townscape & Visual Impact Assessment (TVIA), which concludes that any adverse townscape effects are justified by the potential for the building to become a 'distinctive landmark'. Notwithstanding this, the site does not occupy a prominent location, is not located on a significant route, nor is the proposed use itself an important civic function to warrant an elevated townscape status. By virtue of its location and use, the proposal does not require a significantly scaled 'landmark' building, and therefore officers consider there is no basis for the significant increase in height over what is shown in the Eastern Gate Development Framework SPD in this instance.
- 8.24 The technical visualisations contained within Appendix 6 of the TVIA demonstrate that the proposed uplift in scale will create a building that does not fit coherently within the surrounding townscape. By virtue of its excessive scale, height, bulk and massing, the proposed building is not considered to be in keeping with the prevailing character of the local area which is predominantly two storey terraced dwellings. The continuous 'box like' form of the building would engulf the neighbouring development and would be incongruous and visually intrusive along the frontage of New Street, which is clearly demonstrated

within Appendix 6 of the TVIA. Whilst the proposal aims to engage with the New Street frontage by bringing the proposed building forward on the site, there are significant concerns that the excessive scale of the building would ultimately result in an unsympathetic form of development which would be excessively prominent within the street scene.

- 8.25 Furthermore, Appendix 5 (viewpoint 4) demonstrates the visual impact of the building upon York Street, to the east of the site. The proposal would clearly erode the existing openness of the site and would dominate street scene views within the immediate area. Again, the excessive scale is clearly demonstrated which is inappropriate within this location.
- 8.26 Moreover, the facades of the building would be constructed of steel cladding to which terracotta baguette battens would be fixed to, in an irregular arrangement to resemble a 'nest like' form of development in amongst the existing trees. The staircases situated on the eastern facade would comprise a green powder coated aluminum which allow access to the zinc pignmento green rooftop pods. In addition, a new reception building is proposed to the front of the site, adjacent to the access via New Street, which will comprise a Cambridge buff brick material.
- 8.27 The irregular arrangement of terracotta baguette battens does not mitigate the visual harm of the building as identified above. The battens would constitute the appearance of an overly engineered design and would not appear as a 'nest like' form of development. This design approach would exacerbate the concerns raised in regard to its overall scale and would cumulatively contribute to creating a harmful form of development within this location.
- 8.28 The use of the building requires a level of security and surveillance such as a staffed 'porters lodge' or equivalent at the building entrance. The location and layout of the proposed reception building does not provide this use at present as it is separate from the building entrances and visitors will not pass through it upon entrance. A pavilion that sits within the site between the lift or stair cores would better serve this purpose and reduce the clutter to the front of the site. Furthermore, the appearance of this space needs to be part of a 'family of buildings' or a well-conceived building itself. The choice of the

buff brick material and facade detailing is nondescript, and the resulting structure appears out of place. These concerns have also been raised by the Design and Conservation Panel (see Appendix 1).

- 8.29 Overall, by virtue of its excessive scale, height, mass, bulk, depth and unsympathetic design, the proposal would result in a visually intrusive, overly dominant and incongruous form of development which would be out of keeping with the prevailing character of the local area and as such, is not in accordance with policies 23, 55, 56, 57 or 58 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2018), as well as the guidance set out within the Eastern Gate SPD.

### **Impact upon the Conservation Area**

- 8.30 Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Area) Act 1990 states that special attention shall be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of a Conservation Area. The application site is located within the northern tip of the designated Mill Road Conservation Area. The Conservation Area is a well-preserved Victorian suburb of Cambridge comprising a grid pattern of streets, stretching off at right angles from Mill Road. The main characteristic of the Conservation Area is the dominance of two storey terraced housing which create long lines of buildings lying directly at the back of the pavement.
- 8.31 St Matthews Piece and the site on which the proposed building would stand is an important focus at this point of the Conservation Area. By virtue of its openness, it provides a long-established gap and transition at this edge of the Conservation Area between different characters and periods of development. Effectively, the boundary here is tree-lined (the buildings on New Street and the east side of York Street being outside the Conservation Area boundary) along the edge of the open space. The St Matthews Centre building is single storey in appearance and lies well below the tree canopy, allowing the trees to dominate the space and in terms of people's experience of the space and the surrounding streets, allows views and light through and beneath them to contribute to the character of the space.



- 8.32 The trees which are located around the perimeter of the application site and St Matthews Piece have statutory protection through the designation of the Conservation Area. These trees have been in this position for many years and significantly contribute to the visual amenity of the Conservation Area. The visual intrusiveness of the proposed building would be intensified during the winter months when these trees are no longer in leaf. Bare trees along with the removal of two trees along New Street would make the building more prominent within this setting and would significantly alter the open character of the Conservation Area in this instance.
- 8.33 By virtue of its excessive scale, height, bulk and massing, the proposed building would visually intrude upon the openness of St Matthews Piece, block views and light through the trees and spaces and thus change the character of the open space and relationship of built form to this as seen from Sturton Street, New Street and York Street, in a way that the existing single storey building does not. The building would loom over the existing single storey building and would intrude into views into and out of St Matthews Piece, which is an important feature of the Conservation Area. In addition, the proposed reception building would further intrude upon the openness below the tree canopy and would overall significantly disrupt the open character of this part of the Conservation Area. These concerns are reflected in the comments raised by the Design and Conservation Panel. A number of trees would also be lost and put at further risk as a result of the proposal (see below paragraphs).
- 8.34 The Conservation Area is predominantly characterised by built form comprising gault brick and slate roofs. The proposed materials of terracotta, steel cladding, green zinc and green aluminium are dissimilar to these materials and would cumulatively intrude upon the character and visual appeal of the Conservation Area in this instance.
- 8.35 With reference to the NPPF and the impact on the significance of a heritage asset, paragraph 201 advises that not all elements of a Conservation Area will necessarily contribute to its significance. Loss of a building (or other element) which makes a positive contribution to the significance of the Conservation Area should be treated either as substantial harm under paragraph 195 or less than substantial harm under paragraph

196, as appropriate, taking into account the relative significance of the asset affected and its contribution to the significance of the Conservation Area as a whole.

- 8.36 St Matthew's Piece is of considerable significance to the Mill Road Conservation Area as a whole. The proposal would not result in complete loss of the space but its partial occupation by the proposed building would have a significant impact on the perception of the openness and character of the space from streets alongside. The Heritage Statement submitted with the application identifies the importance of the Conservation Area, however, it overlooks the contribution of St Matthews Piece to the character of the Conservation Area. Representations have been received which claim the Heritage Statement undermines the benefits and importance of St Matthews Piece and overlooks the significance of this asset. Officers conclude that the applicants have failed to justify a building of this scale and design in this location and therefore cannot support the proposal.
- 8.37 Within the broad category "less than substantial harm", the level of the harm is considered to be at the higher end of the less than substantial scale. Paragraph 196 of the NPPF states that 'where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use.' In weighing this balance, and as paragraph 193 of the NPPF states, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation (and the more important the asset, the greater the weight should be). This is irrespective of whether any potential harm amounts to substantial harm, total loss or less than substantial harm.
- 8.38 Given that St Matthews Piece is an important asset and its significance within Mill Road Conservation Area is very high, officers consider that in balancing the harm against the public benefits of the scheme, significant weight should be given to the protection of St Matthews Piece. Despite this, the applicant's Heritage Statement identifies the level of harm to be minor/moderate upon the Conservation Area and as such, no public benefits have been put forward by the applicant to outweigh the level of harm identified by officers.

8.39 Overall, by virtue of the excessive height, scale, bulk, mass and unsympathetic materials and design including the loss of trees, the proposed development would result in harm to the character and appearance of the Mill Road Conservation Area which is not outweighed by public benefit arising from the scheme. Therefore, the proposal is contrary to Policy 61 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2018), NPPF 2019 paragraphs 193 and 196 and the provisions of Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.

### **Trees**

8.40 There are a number of trees which surround the site and St Matthews Piece, all of which have statutory protection through the Conservation Area and designated Tree Preservation Orders (TPOs). These trees are a dominant feature within this location and significantly contribute to the amenity of the local area.

8.41 The proposal would result in the removal of two of these trees along the front of the site, either side of the existing access, adjacent to New Street. This is to accommodate the front elevation of the proposed building, which would align with New Street. The loss of these trees along the New Street frontage will lessen the verdant impact trees make to the character and appearance of the area and the value of the visual buffer separating the site. Given the large scale of the proposal, it is anticipated that the adjacent trees either side of the two trees to be removed would also need to be removed as the trees' capacity to grow would be significantly hindered. These trees are considered to be a significant asset to the character of the local area and therefore the removal of these trees, as well as the anticipated harm upon the growth of neighbouring trees is not acceptable in this instance.

8.42 The majority of the proposed building would be located outside the Root Protection Areas (RPAs) of the retained trees, however given the excessive footprint and height of the building, space required for construction and infrastructure will be substantial and is expected to conflict with retained trees necessitating additional tree works. No information has been provided on how the building would be constructed whilst mitigating any impact upon the trees and this is a concern.

- 8.43 Changes in habitat can have a serious impact on the long-term health of trees, especially when these changes are rapid, and trees do not have an opportunity to adapt. The overall scale and height of the building will significantly alter the light levels within the site, reducing direct sunlight to the trees for longer periods, relying on trees having to adapt to reduced light levels and changes in temperature, which would ultimately result in significant harm upon their growth.
- 8.44 Overall, the scale and height of the proposed building is deemed to be excessive and would not respect the existing trees which significantly contribute to the visual amenity of the site and local area. The removal of two trees along the New Street frontage, as well as the anticipated harm brought upon the surrounding trees would result in significant harm upon these trees and therefore the proposal is not in accordance with policy 71 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2018).

### **Protected Open Space**

- 8.45 The site is set adjacent to and within an area of Protected Open Space (POS), which lies directly to the south and extends along and within the eastern boundary of the application site. The POS strip which runs along the eastern boundary is privately owned and is currently occupied with car parking spaces, footpaths and is partially grassed. The open space to the south is relatively open and is well used by residents for recreational use which includes a play area for families of young children.
- 8.46 St Matthews Piece is one of very few areas of open space within the Petersfield ward and therefore plays a pivotal role in providing green space for residents to enjoy. The Open Space and Recreation Strategy dated October 2011 confirms that Petersfield Ward comprises a limited amount of POS compared to the relatively high population of the area. Furthermore, it is considered that St Matthews Piece is classified as having both environmental and recreational value, as assessed under Appendix I of the Cambridge Local Plan (2018). Therefore, this area of POS is considered to provide a high level of amenity value for residents and retaining its existing amenity for users, including its sense of openness, is therefore of importance.

- 8.47 The proposal gives rise to two main impacts on the POS. Impact to the eastern private area of POS and impact to the southern public POS.
- 8.48 The proposed staircases on the eastern elevation would dramatically descend into the POS, eroding the sense of openness of the remaining land. Although policy 67 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2018) allows institutions to develop within POS land, it is considered that the staircases are not 'required' to descend in this manner and there appears to be no justification for their location. The staircases would erode the sense of openness and inappropriately intrude upon this part of the private POS in an unacceptable manner and would further reduce the ability of this space to provide any form of meaningful informal open space for future students to enjoy.
- 8.49 The application does propose a new footpath linking New Street to the area of POS to the rear of the site, albeit this appears to stop at the café terrace at the rear of the building. This would be used by both students and residents and is intended to increase access through the site. Despite this, given the overall scale and intensification of the proposed use, officers consider this feature does not outweigh the harm that would be caused to the character of the open space and the subsequent impact upon its environmental and recreational value.
- 8.50 The second main impact on the POS is to the south and officers are of the view that due to the scale and proximity of the proposal, it would undoubtedly dominate and detract from users' experience of the public element of the park. The proposed terraced café would provide minimal compensation for existing users, whose enjoyment of the nearest parts of the park to the site – particularly the play area - are already partially impinged upon by the existing building itself. The impact of the proposed built form and its proximity would be a clear and significant erosion of the environmental character and quality of St Matthews Piece. Given the significance of the POS locally, this forms a reason for refusal together with the easterly impact as noted above.

#### *Other Open Space Matters*

- 8.51 There is a concern raised amongst the representations received regarding the extent of the western boundary of the strip of

designated private POS . It questions the accuracy of the western boundary of this strip of POS, as depicted in the applicant's Design and Access Statement, Part 1, page 17. This discrepancy has been ongoing for a number of years and the representation is seeking clarification from the applicant as to how the western boundary was formalised. Officers have raised this query with the agent however no response was received.

### *The Overall Harm*

- 8.52 The overall scale, height and position of the building and associated access structures would dominate and enclose the public Protected Open Space of St Matthews Piece, significantly reducing its sense of openness and harming its environmental quality. It would also inappropriately intrude upon the private Protected Open Space to the east of the building, enclosing and reducing its ability to provide any form of meaningful informal open space provision for future students to enjoy. The proposal would ultimately detract from the character of the Protected Open Space and its environmental and recreational values and be contrary to policy 67 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2018).

### **Landscaping**

- 8.53 The Landscape Officer advises that the proposed landscaping depends heavily on grasses, perennials and meadow-like gardens and would be an attractive feature during the summer months, but look poorly and rough in the wet winter months. The Landscaping Strategy does not go into a great level of detail but proposes nothing particularly controversial and avoids making any wholesale changes to existing hard and soft landscape spaces, seeking to retain most of the parking areas and paths already present on site.
- 8.54 The advice is disappointing, and officers note that Policy 68 and accompanying Appendix I of the Cambridge Local Plan (2018) state that all residential development should contribute to the provision of open space and recreation sites/facilities on site. The type and size of open space provided will be dependent on the existing open space provided within the area. As previously discussed under paragraph 8.46, the Open Space and Recreation Strategy dated October 2011 confirms that Petersfield Ward comprises a limited amount of POS and that

St Matthews Piece is readily used by residents and is an important feature to be retained. It is noted that the S106 Officer has requested the applicant to provide open space through a S106 agreement however, policy 68 clearly states that the provision of on-site open space should be delivered without relying on funding through a S106 agreement. Given the large number of students who will be congregating within St Matthews Piece and the immediate area, officers consider the proposal does not provide sufficient justification for the lack of open space provided to outweigh the loss in this instance and is therefore not acceptable. Conditions could be imposed to secure further landscaping details but in the first instance, there is a lack of justification to demonstrate that an acceptable amount and design of open space can be delivered as part of the proposal to reflect future student needs.

- 8.55 Overall, the proposal does not contribute any provision of open space and there is a lack of justification to demonstrate that an acceptable amount and design of open space can be delivered as part of the proposal to reflect the intensification of the proposed use and associated student needs. The proposal is therefore contrary to policy 68 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2018).

### **Wider Visual Impact and Height**

- 8.56 A Visual Impact Assessment has been submitted by the applicant. It models views of the site from various vantage points across Cambridge in order to understand whether there is a wider visual impact on the setting of the City. The Landscape Officer concludes that although the applicants have not undertaken an assessment from Castle Mound, the proposal is broadly in accordance with policy 60 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2018) and is not considered to result in any intrusion upon the skyline of Cambridge to warrant a refusal on these grounds. Comments have been raised amongst third party representations declaring the proposal would be in breach of policy 60 however, given the building would not comprise a height to be seen in any significant viewpoints across Cambridge, officers consider the proposal would not result in significant visual intrusion upon the skyline of Cambridge in this instance and is therefore not a reason for refusal.

## **Residential Amenity**

### Neighbouring Properties

- 8.57 The site is surrounded by rows of terraced properties, of which most directly face onto St Matthews Piece. Notwithstanding the overall scale and height of the building, the proposal would be positioned at a reasonable distance away from these neighbouring properties to not result in any significantly harmful overbearing impacts.
- 8.58 The applicant has submitted a Daylight and Sunlight Assessment which has assessed the overshadowing impact upon the surrounding properties. There is no existing specific National Planning Policy guidance relating to daylight and sunlight impacts from proposed development, however, the BRE Site Layout Planning for Daylight and Sunlight: A Guide to Good Practice is the national standard tool for which developers use to assess daylight sunlight impacts of proposed development. The assessment has undertaken standard methods for assessing any potential loss of daylight and sunlight to windows of the surrounding properties, by calculating the Vertical Sky Component (VSC) for daylight and Annual Probable Sunlight Hours and Winter Probable Sunlight Hours for sunlight. The VSC and Annual Probable Sunlight Hours and Winter Probable Sunlight Hours calculations show that the daylight and sunlight levels reaching these properties are BRE PASS level which is acceptable. Therefore, no significant loss of light or overshadowing impacts are considered to occur in this instance.

### Amenity of Future Occupiers

- 8.59 In order to assess the daylight levels within the proposed building, Average Daylight Factor (ADF) values have been calculated for each of the different types of rooms within the building, including kitchens, bedrooms and communal rooms. These values have been assessed against the standard ADF Target Value for each of these rooms. Comments have been raised in respect of insufficient light levels within the communal rooms and bedrooms. In accordance with the BRE guidance, each of these rooms has been calculated to have a sufficient ADF value which would exceed the ADF Target Value for each



of the different types of room. Therefore, officers consider that each room will receive sufficient light levels and is acceptable.

#### Noise/Wider Area Impacts

- 8.60 The Environmental Health Officer has been consulted on the application and has raised several concerns with the proposal in respect of insufficient information being provided. Given the intensification of the proposed use, the applicant has failed to fully demonstrate the impacts of such a use within an area which comprises several existing noise sensitive receptors (NSR).
- 8.61 The applicant has submitted a Noise Impact Assessment which confirms that all bedrooms will have openable windows. The assessment fails to consider any potential plant noise impacts (both existing and proposed) and noise impacts from use of the dance studios on future students. It is acknowledged that the accommodation will not be adjoined to the studios as it will be supported on stilts, and therefore potential flanking and structure borne noise is eliminated. However, the dance studio is a potential source of noise which needs to be given consideration to fully assess the noise impacts upon the future students. Furthermore, the consideration of the existing roof top plant which as per the Demolition Plan (Ref:D100), is to be relocated onto the lower part of the existing roof which will move it closer to existing NSRs on Sturton Street but also locate it immediately below first floor openable windows of the building which could result in additional noise and disturbance upon future students. These details are essential to fully assess the noise impacts of the proposal upon the amenity of future students.
- 8.62 The assessment refers to a previous survey undertaken in 2017 and it is unclear as to why short-term monitoring results are being considered as opposed to long term monitoring results, which have already been undertaken within the locality. In addition, no details have been provided on how the 8-hr and 16-hr LAeqs have been obtained from the short-term monitoring

results and how they compare with the long term monitoring LAeqs. This approach needs to be explained to establish the validity of the short-term results presented under this application.

- 8.63 In officers' consideration these are technical matters which could be resolved through an exchange of correspondence and / or secured through condition. They do not amount to reasons for refusal. The applicants are in control of both elements of the teaching and living accommodation and is not in their interests to mismanage this.

#### Change of use from D1 Use to A3 Use (Cafe)

- 8.64 The proposal includes a change of use of part of the existing building from D1 to A3 use, incorporating a cafe and an outdoor terraced area. No information including proposed hours of opening or the scale and type of cooking to be provided on site has been submitted. The proposed development has the potential to impact upon the amenity of both onsite and offsite residential receptors through odour and operational noise, in particular any plant noise associated with the operation of the cafe and hours of use with consideration on the use of the external terrace.
- 8.65 The Ventilation Statement produced refers only to the student accommodation element of the application. No information is provided on the scale and types of cooking that will take place on site in association with the cafe use. Adequate ventilation/extraction systems must be provided in food and drink premises to remove steam, cooking odours and grease-laden air. In cases where cooking practices are minimal, natural ventilation may be sufficient. However, where cooking odours may potentially cause a nuisance to neighbours, an extract duct with a fan and filter is required to ventilate cooking fumes and remove those odours. Details are required on the range of food to be provided and method of cooking intended along with details of the proposed ventilation/extraction system

installed to meet all required standards. In the absence of this information, a full assessment of the proposed cafe use upon the amenities of future students and existing residents cannot be undertaken.

- 8.66 It is also noted that operational hours of the proposed cafe and the external terraced area have not been submitted, as well collection/deliveries to and from the cafe. Although these details have not been submitted, officers consider these details could be secured through conditions should the application be approved.

### Lighting

- 8.67 Section 10 of the Landscape Strategy contains a lighting strategy to include a mix of up-lighted building columns, bollarded lighting and wall mounted lights. Given the close proximity of the residential properties surrounding St Matthews Piece, the external lighting adopted would need to be carefully chosen in order to mitigate any potential disturbance upon these neighbouring properties. Specifically, it is expected that the provision of an external / artificial lighting assessment is carried out in accordance with the Obtrusive Light Limitations for Exterior Lighting Installations (contained within the Institute of Lighting Professionals Guidance Notes for the Reduction of Obtrusive Light - GN01/20 (or as superseded) for light intrusion into windows (demonstrating vertical lux levels at the nearest sensitive facades), luminaire Intensity and building luminance. These details have not been submitted with the application however should the application be approved these details could be secured by condition.

### Plant Noise

- 8.68 It is acknowledged that the existing plant is to relocate on the existing roof which could result in noise disturbance upon neighbouring properties, as well as the future students. Noise levels from plant associated equipment requires an assessment to be undertaken in order to determine the level of noise

generated would not exceed that of existing background noise levels. No assessment has been submitted with the application regarding the potential noise impacts of relocating the existing rooftop plant nor has any detail been provided on the external mechanical plant associated with the proposed development.

- 8.69 These details could be secured by a condition should the application be approved however, given the quantity of the existing plant to be relocated, it is considered that the significance of noise impacts for this aspect prior to being able to determine whether it is an appropriate proposal to do so is required.

#### Accessible homes

- 8.70 The development has been assessed for compliance with Policy 51 in relation to all the new units. The Design and Access Statement states the development will comply with the requirements of Part M4 (2) of the Building Regulations and provides wheelchair user rooms. A condition shall be imposed upon any consent granted to secure this requirement and comply with policy 51.

#### **Refuse Arrangements**

- 8.71 The refuse area will be positioned directly behind the proposed reception building to the front of the site. The proposal is compliant with the RECAP guidance and is in accordance with policy 57 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2018).

#### **Highway Safety**

- 8.72 The Local Highway Authority has been consulted on the application and has raised no objections subject to conditions regarding a Traffic Management Plan, visibility splays and construction and materials adopted for the access. Should the application be approved, these conditions are reasonable and necessary to impose.
- 8.73 The Highway Authority have raised a concern regarding the lack of details in respect of the proposed modifications to the pedestrian and vehicular access points as there are no clear

indications marked on drawing number A0427 (GA) 100 Rev A, which is the plan referenced. This could be secured by a condition should the application be approved.

- 8.74 The Transport Team from the Cambridgeshire County Council have also been consulted on the application and they have raised an objection due to the lack of accident records for the last 60 months, as well as satisfactory mitigation measures. The applicant has submitted a Transport Assessment and Travel Plan which conclude that the site is highly accessible via sustainable modes of transport and that the proposal intends to promote sustainable modes of transport. The Transport Team are in general agreement with both documents however require further information on the accident records for the last 60 months and any associated trends or clusters. This should cover East Road between its junction with Norfolk Street and Newmarket Road roundabout, and Newmarket Road between East Road roundabout and its junction with Coldhams Lane. The Transport Statement will need to pay particular attention to any collisions involving vulnerable road users. It would also be beneficial to tabulate the accidents to clearly define the number and severity of accidents occurring at each location.
- 8.75 The Transport Statement mentions that given the existing travel patterns of CSVPA students living in Varsity House it would be expected that most trips to and from the student accommodation would be made on foot or by cycle. The survey data shows that over 79% of students currently walk or cycle to the existing CSVPA site. The survey data indicates that 11% of the students drive to the site currently. It also outlines that the proposal would generate a number of trips of 24 two-way total person trips during the AM peak hour and 31 two-way movements during the PM peak.
- 8.76 Overall, the proposal is not considered to result in any significant impact upon the safe and effective operation of the surrounding road network and is in accordance with policy 81 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2018).

## **Car Parking**

- 8.77 The applicant has undertaken a car park occupancy survey for the existing dance studio which concluded that the highest accumulation of cars parked was 11 vehicles. An additional 7 car parking spaces are proposed, of which 5 will be for disabled users. Given that the proposal does not seek to increase the vehicle movements when compared to the existing vehicle movements, the existing parking spaces would be sufficient to accommodate the car parking demand of the Dance Studio. This allocation of car parking is in accordance with the standards as set out under Appendix L of the Cambridge Local Plan (2018) and would not result in any parking overnight stress, in accordance with policy 82 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2018).

## **Cycle Parking**

- 8.78 There is currently cycle parking for a total of 132 cycles on the site. The applicant has undertaken a cycle park occupancy survey for the existing dance studio which concluded that the highest number of cycles parked was 13. Given the proposal intends to provide additional cycle parking to serve the student accommodation, the existing cycle parking spaces would be sufficient to accommodate the dance studio.
- 8.79 The application proposes an additional 102 cycle parking spaces for the student accommodation which would equate to 2 spaces per every 3 bed space which is in accordance with the standards under Appendix L of the Cambridge Local Plan (2018).
- 8.80 There are concerns raised regarding the accessibility of the proposed cycle parking. The Local Highway Authority have commented that the proposed car parking layout would prevent easy access to the proposed cycle parking to east of the building. This is due to the cycle parking being located directly adjacent to the proposed car parking areas, making it difficult for cyclists to easily access the cycle parking area. There is also a concern raised in respect of the lack of overhead cover the proposed cycle parking would have, although this detail could be secured via a condition should the application be approved.

- 8.81 Policy 82 in conjunction with the Council's Cycle Parking Guide 2010, encourages cycle parking to be secure, easily accessible and be of high quality. The accessibility of the cycle parking proposed to the east of the building appears to be restricted due to the proposed car parking immediately adjacent. The new footpath link running parallel to the eastern area of cycle parking is indicated as being solely for pedestrians as opposed to a multifunctional access route. There does not appear to be any other direct route for cyclists to access the cycle parking in this area however, the width of the proposed footpath would allow for both pedestrians and cyclists to use and is therefore acceptable.
- 8.82 Moreover, the cycle parking stands on the roof is an inappropriate location to provide easily accessible cycle parking. The Landscape Officer has raised a concern in this regard as the scheme is being developed for 16-18 year old students and access to the roof through two narrow elevator cores with small waiting areas and a single leaf door with a turn for access far from not ideal. The students will ultimately find it more convenient to keep their bikes in their rooms after doing this manoeuvre or lock them to the fencing around the site, as opposed to making use of the cycle parking on the roof. Therefore, officers consider this proposed cycle parking area lacks easy access and is entirely impractical.
- 8.83 Overall, the proposed location of the cycle parking on the roof is poor, inappropriate and is impracticable to access and would result in inadequate cycle parking within the site for students to access. The scheme therefore fails to promote high quality cycle parking and is contrary to the guidance under the Council's Cycle Parking Guidance 2010 and policy 82 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2018).

### **Drainage and Flood Risk**

- 8.84 The application has been assessed by the City Council Sustainable Drainage Engineer and no comments have been provided due to the lack of drainage information contained within the appendices of the Drainage Report submitted. Therefore, the Drainage Officer cannot accurately determine as to whether sufficient drainage mitigation methods are proposed.

- 8.85 Notwithstanding the above, Anglian Water have been consulted on the application and have raised no objections subject to informatives to ensure the applicant is aware of their responsibilities regarding surface water disposal which will need to be agreed with Anglia Water prior to the commencement of development. This informative shall be imposed, should the application be approved.
- 8.86 Moreover, the Local Lead Flood Authority (LLFA) have been consulted on the application and have objected to the application. The proposed development is looking to discharge surface water to the foul sewer network (as it currently does), however, from the Anglian Water asset plans, it is evident that there are surface water sewers in the vicinity of the site. In line with the drainage hierarchy, surface water should be disposed to a surface water sewer ahead of a foul water sewer. Therefore, a connection should be proposed to the surface water sewer network and dialogue opened with Anglian Water to agree a connection. This will be covered by the suggested informative recommended by Anglian Water, should the application be approved.
- 8.87 The applicant has not submitted any hydraulic calculations demonstrating the performance of the proposed system during the 100%, 3.35 and 1% Annual Exceedance Probability (AEP) storm events, including a suitable allowance for climate change. Without these calculations, it is difficult to fully assess whether the proposal would satisfactorily manage any potential flooding of any internal property as well as any external ones within the locality. Given the site is located within Flood Zone 1 (low flood risk), officers are confident that the proposal would not result in any significant flood risk and is therefore acceptable in this instance.
- 8.88 The LLFA have raised a discrepancy in the submitted Drainage Report, in respect of which water authority is responsible for the maintenance of the public sewer. Thames Water are mentioned as being the water authority however Anglian Water have confirmed in their comments that they are the water authority and therefore officers consider this is to be a mistake made by the applicant and is not a reason for refusal in this instance.



- 8.89 The LLFA have also recommended informatives regarding green roofs and pollution control which would be attached to any consent granted, should the application be approved.
- 8.90 Lastly, the Environment Agency (EA) have been consulted on the application and no objections or comments have been raised as the site lies within Flood Zone 1 (low risk) and falls under the Flood Risk Standard Advice (FRSA).
- 8.91 Overall, whilst there are issues associated with the proposed drainage aspects of the scheme, the proposal could be made to be acceptable in terms of drainage mitigation and flood risk with the use of appropriate conditions in accordance with policies 28 and 32 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2018).

### **Ecology**

- 8.92 Comments have been raised in respect of the potential impact upon local wildlife because of the overall scale of the proposed building. The Ecology Officer has been consulted on the application and has raised no objections, subject to conditions regarding compliance with the submitted BREEAM Ecology Credit Report and Bat Survey (Greengage, 2020), as well as biodiversity enhancement methods prior to occupation. Officers consider that these conditions would mitigate any significant impact upon local species and therefore the proposal is considered to be in accordance with policy 70 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2018).

### **Sustainable Design/Construction**

- 8.93 The Sustainability Officer has been consulted on the application and no objections are raised. The applicant has submitted a Design and Access Statement, Sustainability Statement and BREEAM Pre Assessment to address sustainable design and construction.
- 8.94 The scheme is targeting BREEAM accreditation using the Multi-Residential New Construction 2018 scheme. The submitted BREEAM Pre Assessment shows a current score of 76.5%, which provides a small buffer over the minimum score required for achievement of BREEAM excellent. This meets the requirements of policy 28 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2018) and is therefore acceptable.

- 8.95 With regards to energy, the proposal adopts the energy hierarchy to reduce energy demand. The scheme is taking an all-electric approach to heating and hot water, with reference to the use of electric panel heaters and hot water via air source heat pumps. This approach helps to achieve 5 BREEAM credits for energy, which is just one credit away from the minimum requirement for a BREEAM outstanding approach to energy. In terms of improvement over Building Regulations, using the new SAP 10 carbon intensity figures suggests a 51% reduction in emissions compared to baseline Building Regulations requirements, which is acceptable. Unfortunately, the location of the proposed air source heat pumps has not been designated and therefore their potential noise levels cannot be accounted for. This additional information correlates with the information requested by the Environmental Health Officer and therefore this information could be submitted together.
- 8.96 In regard to water efficiency, the proposal is predicting a water use of 103.87 litres/person/day for units with baths, and 96.8 litres/person/day for units without baths. Given the residential nature of the proposal, the scheme should target 110 litres/person/day. The specification is still be finalised and therefore a condition in respect of water efficiency specification shall be imposed should the application be approved.
- 8.97 With regards to the issue of overheating, it is noted that detailed overheating analysis is still to be undertaken, but a high level assessment using the BREEAM requirements has been undertaken. This suggests several measures to mitigate the risk of overheating, including deep window reveals and low g value glazing on the west and south elevations. The proposed green roof will also help to reduce internal cooling loads of the building, and the trees surrounding the site will also help to provide shading.
- 8.98 Overall, the proposal is acceptable in terms of promoting sustainable design and construction, subject to conditions regarding BREEAM Design Stage Certification, BREEAM Post Construction Certification and water efficiency specification, which shall be imposed should the application be approved. Therefore, the proposal is in accordance with policy 28 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2018).

## **9.0 OTHER MATTERS**

- 9.1 A Phase I 'Desk Study Report' (Ref:GE18872-DSRv2-JUN20 Vs2.0) produced by Geo-Environmental and dated 2<sup>nd</sup> June 2020 was submitted with the application. A site walkover was also completed. The report included a conceptual site model (CSM) which identified Made Ground on site and potential contamination from off-site industrial uses as potential sources of contamination, which is acceptable. The information in respect of contamination is deemed acceptable and conditions regarding the detection of any unexpected contamination during construction and material management, shall be imposed should the application be approved.
- 9.2 The Environmental Health Officer had acknowledged the lack of an Air Quality Assessment submitted with the application. The proposed development represents an intensification of use within the Air quality Management Area (AQMA). An Air Quality Assessment was submitted by the applicant after the formal submission however no comments have been made on this.
- 9.3 The S106 Officer has been consulted on the application and has recommended that the Council should request funding towards (list items) in accordance with the Council's Planning Obligations Strategy 2010. Should the application be approved, a S106 agreement between the Council and applicant would need to be negotiated and secured.
- 9.4 The application proposes the installation of four active Electric Vehicle Charging Points within the new car parking area. However, given the intensification of the proposed use, the Environmental Health Officer has requested additional EVPC's which can be secured by condition, should the application be approved.
- 9.5 There are concerns raised in respect of the requirement for student accommodation given the current pandemic and Brexit implications. The need for student accommodation has been assessed against policy 46 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2018) which has been set out within this report.
- 9.6 There is a comment raised that there is a lack of student accommodation within the east part of Cambridge which suggests that the area is not suitable for such development. The

application proposes new student accommodation to serve CSVPA. Officers have assessed the proposal against all relevant national and local planning policy, which takes into account the impact of the proposal upon the local area, concluding to refuse the application for the reasons as set out in this report.

- 9.7 There is a concern raised that should the cafe change use into a bar serving alcohol, this would increase noise levels upon local residents and discourage public use. The application proposes a cafe use. Should the application be approved, and the cafe use change to a student bar in the future, a separate planning application would need to be submitted for officers to assess the anticipated noise levels upon residents as a result of this change.
- 9.8 A concern has been raised in respect of fire safety. The applicant has submitted a fire safety strategy within the Design and Access Statement. Building Control Officers have been informally consulted on the proposal and have confirmed these fire safety procedures are satisfactory. Should the application be approved, conditions regarding the installation of fire hydrants should be imposed to ensure satisfactory measures are put in place.

## **10.0 CONCLUSION**

- 10.1 In conclusion, the application fails to accord with a number of policies within the Cambridge Local Plan (2018) and associated guidance documents, in respect of principle, design, visual impact, Conservation Area impact, loss of trees, impact upon the public open space and poor cycle parking arrangements, as set out within this report.
- 10.2 In view of the application being recommended for refusal, the applicant is entitled to appeal any refusal. Officers acknowledge that there are other concerns raised in respect of highway safety, drainage and environmental health, however, these issues are not considered to be significant to include within the main reasons for refusal as outlined below. Should the applicant wish to address these outstanding issues at the appeal stage, officers would have no objections to this information being presented to the inspector to assess as part of their decision.

## **11.0 RECOMMENDATION - REFUSE on the following grounds:**

1. Due to the lack of sufficient information demonstrating a proven need for student accommodation on the site and the lack of satisfactory measures to prevent antisocial behaviour of students on and off the site, the proposal fails to accord with Policy 46 (a) and (g) of the Cambridge Local Plan (2018) and is not supported in principle.
2. Overall, by virtue of its excessive scale, height, mass, bulk, depth and unsympathetic design, the proposal would result in a visually intrusive, overly dominant and incongruous form of development which would be out of keeping with the prevailing character of the local area and as such, is not in accordance with policies 23, 55, 56, 57 or 58 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2018), as well as the guidance set out within the Eastern Gate SPD.
3. Overall, by virtue of the excessive height, scale, bulk, mass and unsympathetic materials and design including the loss of trees, the proposed development would result in harm to the character and appearance of the Mill Road Conservation Area which is not outweighed by public benefit arising from the scheme. Therefore, the proposal is contrary to Policy 61 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2018), NPPF 2019 paragraphs 193 and 196 and the provisions of Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.
4. Overall, the scale and height of the proposed building is deemed to be excessive and would not respect the existing trees which significantly contribute to the visual amenity of the site and local area. The removal of two trees along the New Street frontage, as well as the anticipated harm brought upon the surrounding trees would result in significant harm upon these trees and therefore the proposal is not in accordance with policy 71 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2018).

5. The overall scale and height of the building would dominate St Matthews Piece which is designated as an area of Protected Open Space and would significantly intrude upon the sense of openness. This would ultimately detract from the character of St Matthews Piece and its associated environmental and recreational values and therefore the proposal would be contrary to policy 67 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2018).
6. The proposal fails to demonstrate that an acceptable amount and design of open space for students living and studying on the site can be delivered as part of the proposal to reflect the intensification of the proposed use and associated student needs. The proposal is therefore contrary to policy 68 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2018).
7. The proposed location of the cycle parking on the roof of the building is poor, inappropriate and is impracticable to access and would result in inadequate cycle parking within the site for students to access. The scheme therefore fails to promote high quality cycle parking and is contrary to the guidance under the Council's Cycle Parking Guidance 2010 and policy 82 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2018).

## Appendix 1 – Design and Conservation Panel Comments

1. Due to the lack of sufficient information demonstrating a proven need for student accommodation on the site and the lack of satisfactory measures to prevent antisocial behaviour of students on and off the site, the proposal fails to accord with Policy 46 (a) and (g) of the Cambridge Local Plan (2018) and is not supported in principle.
2. Overall, by virtue of its excessive scale, height, mass, bulk, depth and unsympathetic design, the proposal would result in a visually intrusive, overly dominant and incongruous form of development which would be out of keeping with the prevailing character of the local area and as such, is not in accordance with policies 23, 55, 56, 57 or 58 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2018), as well as the guidance set out within the Eastern Gate SPD.
3. Overall, by virtue of the excessive height, scale, bulk, mass and unsympathetic materials and design including the loss of trees, the proposed development would result in harm to the character and appearance of the Mill Road Conservation Area which is not outweighed by public benefit arising from the scheme. Therefore, the proposal is contrary to Policy 61 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2018), NPPF 2019 paragraphs 193 and 196 and the provisions of Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.
4. Overall, the scale and height of the proposed building is deemed to be excessive and would not respect the existing trees which significantly contribute to the visual amenity of the site and local area. The removal of two trees along the New Street frontage, as well as the anticipated harm brought upon the surrounding trees would result in significant harm upon these trees and therefore the proposal is not in accordance with policy 71 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2018).
5. The overall scale and height of the building would dominate St Matthews Piece which is designated as an area of Protected Open Space and would significantly intrude upon the sense of openness. This would ultimately detract from the character of St Matthews Piece and its associated environmental and recreational values and therefore the proposal would be contrary to policy 67 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2018).

6. The proposal fails to demonstrate that an acceptable amount and design of open space for students living and studying on the site can be delivered as part of the proposal to reflect the intensification of the proposed use and associated student needs. The proposal is therefore contrary to policy 68 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2018).
7. The proposed location of the cycle parking on the roof of the building is poor, inappropriate and is impracticable to access and would result in inadequate cycle parking within the site for students to access. The scheme therefore fails to promote high quality cycle parking and is contrary to the guidance under the Council's Cycle Parking Guidance 2010 and policy 82 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2018).



## PLANNING COMMITTEE

24th March 2021

<b>Application Number</b>	20/01609/FUL	<b>Agenda Item</b>	11
<b>Date Received</b>	10th March 2020	<b>Officer</b>	Saffron Loasby
<b>Target Date</b>	5th May 2020		
<b>Ward</b>	Trumpington		
<b>Site</b>	25B Bishops Road Cambridge CB2 9NQ		
<b>Proposal</b>	Erection of two dwellings comprising of 1No. 2-bed and 1No. 5-bed dwelling following the demolition of the existing bungalow		
<b>Applicant</b>	Ms Natalie Harrington		

SUMMARY	<p>The development accords with the Development Plan for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The design and scale of the proposed development would not have an adverse impact on the character of the surrounding area;</li> <li>- The proposed development would not have any significant adverse impact on the residential amenity of the neighbouring occupiers;</li> <li>- The proposed development would provide a high-quality living environment for the future occupiers.</li> </ul>
RECOMMENDATION	APPROVAL

### 1.0 SITE DESCRIPTION/AREA CONTEXT

- 1.1 The application site is located at 25B Bishops Road which comprises a detached bungalow, approximately 6m to the ridge, set within a relatively spacious plot. The rear boundary is

defined by established tree screening which does not have any statutory protection and the site itself has a well-maintained garden space to the rear. There is parking provision for two cars to the front, although upon the site visit there were at least 3 cars on the front amenity space.

- 1.2 There is a mix of predominantly two storey dwellings along the main stretch of Bishops Road. However, the application site is located to the (south) of the linear form that dominates Bishops Road and is in a small cluster of two storey and single storey dwellings accessed via an unadopted, private road. This access measures approximately 70m from the adopted highway to the rear of No.18 Exeter Close and another 10m to the application site. It provides access to 4/5 residential addresses including the application site. Other properties that appear as part of this cluster include 18 and 20 Exeter Close, which are accessed via Exeter Close to the north east of the application site. Whilst these properties do not use the access, they do form part of the surrounding character of the area and wider streetscene. A pedestrian/cycle route runs past the rear (southeast) boundary of the application site.
- 1.3 The site is surrounded by residential properties. Beyond the site to the southwest are relatively new dwellings comprising a more contemporary design and set over three floors.

## **2.0 THE PROPOSAL**

- 2.1 The proposed development under this planning application involves the demolition of the existing bungalow and replacing it with two detached two storey dwellings. Plot 1 comprises a 2 bed dwelling and Plot 2 a 4 bed dwelling. Each property would benefit from its own private amenity area. Two car parking spaces are proposed to the front of the site for Plot 2. Plot 1 has no parking provision. Cycle parking and bin storage is located within each plot. A pedestrian gate is in the proposed rear boundary to allow for rear access onto the adjoining cycle/pedestrian route.
- 2.2 The properties will comprise facing brick (to be agreed) under a natural slate roof with composite aluminium openings. Both will have permeable gravel hard standings and green roofs on the rear single storey flat roof elements.

2.3 The scheme has been altered twice since the original submission. The first amendment detailed the various openings to be secured as obscure glazed and fixed. This was carried out to overcome the initial concerns regarding overlooking. The second amendment looked to alter the height of the larger dwelling on Plot 2. The ridge was reduced to match that of Plot 1 and offered a 1.1m reduction in height. Additionally, the side extension to plot 2 was also altered. This was to create a more obvious step down from the two-storey element of the main bulk of the house and to create a larger space between Plot 2 and the neighbouring bungalow at 25c Bishops Road, thus helping to reduce any overbearing impact. The front of plot 2 was also amended to allow for a larger turning area between the two units. This removed the potential for an additional car space in the future for plot 2 and allows a better area for manoeuvrability at this end of the narrow access.

2.4 The application is accompanied by the following supporting information:

1. Design and Access Statement (inclusive of a Daylight Assessment)
2. Arboricultural Impact Assessment
3. Topographical Survey
4. Existing and proposed plans
5. Street Elevations

### **3.0 RELEVANT SITE HISTORY**

<b>Reference</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Outcome</b>
C/73/1040	The erection of single storey extension to existing bungalow to form self-contained flat	WITHDRAWN

### **4.0 PUBLICITY**

4.1	Advertisement:	No
	Adjoining Owners:	Yes
	Site Notice Displayed:	No

## 5.0 POLICY

### 5.1 Cambridge Local Plan 2018

PLAN		POLICY NUMBER
Cambridge Plan 2018	Local	1 3 28 31 32 33 34 35 36 50 51 52 55 56 57 59 70 71 81 82

### 5.2 Relevant Central Government Guidance, Supplementary Planning Documents and Material Considerations

Central Government Guidance	National Planning Policy Framework 2019  National Planning Policy Framework – Planning Practice Guidance from 3 March 2014 onwards  Circular 11/95 (Annex A)  Technical housing standards – nationally described space standard – published by Department of Communities and Local Government March 2015
Supplementary Planning Documents	Greater Cambridge Sustainable Design and Construction (Jan 2020)  Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Waste Partnership (RECAP): Waste Management Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (February 2012)

Material Considerations	<u>City Wide Guidance</u>  Arboricultural Strategy (2004)  Cambridge and Milton Surface Water Management Plan (2011)  Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (November 2010)  Cambridge City Council <a href="#">Waste and Recycling Guide: For Developers.</a>  Cycle Parking Guide for New Residential Developments (2010)
-------------------------	--

## 6.0 CONSULTATIONS

### **Cambridgeshire County Council (Highways Development Management)**

- 6.1 The applicant intends that the new proposed dwelling will have no off street car parking. The streets in the vicinity provide uncontrolled parking, and so, as there is no effective means to prevent residents from owning a car and seeking to keep it on the local streets this demand is likely to appear on-street in competition with existing residential uses. The development may therefore impose additional parking demands upon the on-street parking on the surrounding streets and, whilst this is unlikely to result in any significant adverse impact upon highway safety, there is potentially an impact upon residential amenity which the Planning Authority may wish to consider when assessing this application.

## **Environmental Health**

6.2 Acceptable subject to conditions/informatives regarding the following:

- Construction hours
- Collection during construction
- Construction/demolition noise/vibration & piling
- Dust condition
- Electric vehicle charging point

## **Access Officer**

6.3 Refuse as Cambridge is losing this accessible housing stock or new housing is built to Code M2(3).

## **City Council Sustainable Drainage Engineer**

6.4 Acceptable subject to conditions/informatives regarding the following:

- No development shall commence until a surface water drainage strategy has been submitted and approved
- Details for the long-term maintenance arrangements for the surface water drainage system to be submitted and approved

## **Landscape Architect**

6.5 Landscape has concerns over the number of tree losses without a tree strategy which outlines how replacement and/or new tree planting will be addressed within the proposals. The Local Plan and the Cambridge Tree Strategy policies give weight to the retention of trees, particularly mature ones that contribute to the overall canopy cover which is aiming to achieve a 2% target increase by 2030.

6.6 What can be appreciated is that most of the trees on site are coniferous or otherwise evergreen species which often cause more harm than good due to their size and negative impact on soil nutrients and water retention in soils though are not without

their merit. As a result, we are more amenable to the removals, but require a tree strategy to be submitted which includes some large growing species and which provide some of the screening the existing tree cover provides, particularly in relation to the neighbouring bungalow property. We note the presence of tree stamps within the architect's drawings but these are often just 'decorative' to the drawings until reviewed into a plan by a secondary designer or process.

- 6.7 The footway down the side of the smaller unit is constrained by the presence of the cycle and bin stores. The width of the footway is approx. 600mm to 840mm down the side of the bike store and bin store respectively. To allow for ease and inclusive access, the footway should measure 900mm minimum for passage as well as the dragging of a bin to the kerbside without having to use the grass to the side which would suffer overrunning issues. This is an easily addressed issue and can be considered under condition.

## **7.0 REPRESENTATIONS**

- 7.1 The owners/occupiers of the following addresses have made representations which object to the application:

- 18 Exeter Close
- 20 Exeter Close
- Glebe Farmhouse, Exeter Close
- 25 Bishops Road
- 25A Bishops Road
- 25C Bishops Road
- 27 Bishops Road
- 29 Bishops Road
- 31 Bishops Road
- 33 Bishops Road
- 35 Bishops Road

## 7.2 The representations can be summarised as follows:

- Overdevelopment of the site
- Out of keeping with the local area
- Insufficient car parking and impact upon all surrounding roads
- Overlooking between openings and the occupiers of No 20 Exeter Close
- Poor access from Bishops Road
- No access for vehicles from Exeter Close
- Increase in pollution
- Dust during demolition
- What will happen to the existing tenants
- Lack of clarity on how site will be divided
- Loss of sunlight to No 20 Exeter Close
- Density too high
- Compass errors in the submission documents
- Lack of tree screening (details on plans are inaccurate)
- Increased potential to damage to neighbouring foundations during construction
- Potential damage to sewer
- Conflict of pedestrians and cyclists if Exeter Close is to be used during the construction period
- Lack of correct notification
- Safety of the proposed pedestrian access points to the rear
- Reassurance that parking during construction is not via Exeter Close due to poor parking provision as existing
- Loss of biodiversity
- Adverse impact on unmade, unadopted track and condition to repair should it be needed
- Too high
- Lack of a landscaping plan
- Devaluing properties
- Limit size of vehicles during construction
- Land ownership would not allow for the proposed access
- Access for emergency vehicles compromised



- 7.3 The planning agent for this application responded to some of the concerns raised in a letter dated 11<sup>th</sup> June 2020 (on public access dated 24<sup>th</sup> June).
- 7.4 Revisions have been made to the scheme twice. The first annotating obscure windows and fixed glazing to overcome overlooking and a reduction in the size of Plot 1 to address scale on neighbouring occupiers and character of the area. Notwithstanding the revisions 9 of the residents who previously raised objections resubmitted letters of objection for predominantly the same reasons (although the reduction in the height and scale was welcomed).
- 7.5 The above representations are a summary of the comments that have been received. Full details of the representations can be inspected on the application file.

## **8.0 ASSESSMENT**

### **Principle of Development**

- 8.1 Policy 3 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2018) seeks to ensure that the majority of new development should be focused in and around the existing urban area, making the most effective use of previously developed land, and enabling the maximum number of people to access services and facilities locally. Given the location of the site is within a sustainable location and is in walking and cycling distance of the major road network (Hauxton and Shelford Road), the application site is considered suitable to accommodate residential development.
- 8.2 As the proposal is for the subdivision of an existing residential plot, policy 52 of Cambridge Local Plan (2018) is relevant in assessing the acceptability of the proposal.
- 8.3 Policy 52 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2018) states that 'Proposals for development on sites that form part of a garden or group of gardens or that subdivide an existing residential plot will only be permitted where:
- a. the form, height and layout of the proposed development is appropriate to the surrounding pattern of development and

- the character of the area;
  - b. sufficient garden space and space around existing dwellings is retained, especially where these spaces and any trees are worthy of retention due to their contribution to the character of the area and their importance for biodiversity;
  - c. the amenity and privacy of neighbouring, existing and new properties is protected;
  - d. provision is made for adequate amenity space, vehicular access arrangements and parking spaces for the proposed and existing properties; and
  - e. there is no detrimental effect on the potential comprehensive development of the wider area.'
- 8.4 The proposal is considered to comply with the above five criteria and the reasons for this are set out in the relevant sections of this report.

### **Context of site, design and external spaces**

- 8.5 Bishops Lane comprises predominantly two storey dwellings set within linear plots. There appears to be a blend of brick and render materials adopted at neighbouring properties. Car parking is set to the front of dwellings or on the adjoining street.
- 8.6 The application site is part of a cluster of backland development located to the rear of Bishops Road. This small group of residential properties are an anomaly to the linear form and comprise a mixture of single and two storey properties with a wide palette of materials and alternative designs and scales. It is fair to say that some of the dwellings in this group of properties do not reflect the surrounding character in form, design or scale compared to the properties in Bishops Road, Exeter Close or the recently built Overhill Close.
- 8.7 The proposal intends to demolish the existing bungalow and replace this with two, two-storey dwellings with vehicular access via Bishops Road and pedestrian/cycle access to the rear. Given there are predominantly only two storey dwellings in the immediate vicinity, it is considered that two storey dwellings would be in keeping with the scale of neighbouring development in this location and would be acceptable. The proposed materials are more modern than some of the existing materials within the street scene however, these are not considered to be

significantly out of keeping with the appearance of the local area to warrant a refusal in this instance. A condition shall be imposed upon any consent granted to ensure the materials proposed are adopted.

- 8.8 There are concerns raised in respect of overdevelopment of the site. The site is reasonably generous in size and is capable of accommodating 2 dwellings. The footprint of the existing bungalow spreads across the site quite close to the neighbouring properties, albeit 2m lower in height, sited at an angle on the plot and with varying roof styles. The two new dwellings are proposed to sit no closer to that of the existing and are sited to overcome any overbearing impact on neighbouring occupiers. The site location plan shows how neither of the dwellings sit forward of the existing building line, and includes dimensions showing the 45° angles from openings.
- 8.9 In terms of external space, both units will have access to private external space in excess of 100sq.m each.
- 8.10 The proposed dwellings will sit gable end facing Bishops Road with a maximum ridge height of 8.1m. The roof is hipped away from both neighbouring properties and the larger of the two has been reduced in height by 1.1m and altered to have a 1.5 storey side addition that allows for a more fluid transition between the very low neighbouring bungalow at 25C and the new dwelling at Plot 2. This bungalow is predominantly flat roof and therefore significantly lower than most dwellings in the locality. The original submission saw a residential development over three floors and proposed a significantly larger dwelling in terms of scale.
- 8.11 Overall, following the amendments, the form, height and scale of the proposed development is considered to be a significant improvement on the originally submitted proposal. The reduction in the side projection of plot 2 has reduced the impact on the neighbouring dwelling at 25C and the removal of accommodation in the roof means the two storey approach is more in keeping with the immediately surrounding properties. Whilst the density of the proposal is higher than those properties in the cluster of dwellings, the scheme is not out of keeping with the wider surrounding context of development.

The proposal is therefore compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2018) policies 52, 55, 56 and 57.

## **Residential Amenity**

### Overbearing Impact

- 8.12 The proposal being considered has reduced the height of plot 2 at the ridge by 1.1m, and also altered the side projection closest to the neighbouring bungalow. This assists in reducing any significant overbearing impact upon the adjacent neighbouring garden. The change from single bungalow to two, two storey dwellings will have a material change in visual impact in this location and they are significantly different in design, scale and form from the existing dwelling. However, this change does not warrant a recommendation of refusal. The orientation and layout of the dwellings has been sited to reduce adverse neighbour impact. The distance between the two closest points of plot 2 and 25c is 6.2m. The closest 2 storey elevation of plot 2 is 9.3m from 25C. From the layout plan it is noted that both dwellings sit behind the front elevation and located to the northeast of 25C. This layout assists in reducing the potential overbearing impact on the occupiers of 25C.
- 8.13 In relation to the impact plot 1 has on No 20 Exeter Close this too has been orientated to overcome any potential overbearing. Whilst located to the southwest of No 20 the main bulk of plot 1 is located centrally to the ridge of No.20, meaning the impact of the new dwelling is balanced from front to back. The dwelling is sited marginally forward of No.20's building line but not so much as to impact the 45 degree line from the closest ground floor window of No 20. The only other opening in the opposing elevation is a small opening likely to be used for a landing or similar. Cumulatively the way in which the proposals sit on the site and the reduced scale of plot 2 reduce any significant overbearing impact and is acceptable.
- 8.14 Overall, the current application is not considered to have a significant overbearing impact, and is in accordance with policies 52, 55 and 57 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2018.

### Overlooking Impact

- 8.15 Concern has been raised regarding overlooking, from the occupiers of No 20 Exeter Close who are closest to Plot 1 and from the occupiers of 25C, the neighbouring bungalow to Plot 2.
- 8.16 In relation to plot 2 it is the southwest elevation that is closest to 25C. This is annotated incorrectly as the east elevation on the amended drawing P02 Rev B. The openings in this elevation comprise a ground floor WC and a high-level study window. The boundary treatment along this shared boundary will comprise 1.8m close boarded fence therefore overlooking will be limited. At first floor there are no openings that look directly over the neighbouring land. The roof light over the stairs is proposed as having a sill height of 1.8m above floor level, and a condition is recommended to secure this
- 8.17 In regard to the overlooking impact on No 20 the closest elevation is the northeast elevation of plot 1 (this is annotated as 'Left Elevation' on drawing P03-Rev A). The ground floor openings on this elevation comprise a secondary window to the dining room and the main entrance door. At first floor a secondary window to bedroom 2 is proposed. This faces over the rear garden of No. 20 but is annotated as being obscure glazed and restricted. This could be appropriately conditioned as fixed shut and permanently fitted with obscure glazing.
- 8.18 The new openings to the rear would not overlook either No 20 Exeter Close or 25C Bishops Road unacceptably. Roof lights are proposed within the roof however these are purely for allowing light through and can be conditioned to have a high sill height. All other windows proposed will be at ground floor level and views from these windows will be obscured by the proposed 1.8m close boarded fences along each of the boundaries.
- 8.19 Overall, the current application is considered to have addressed the concerns regarding overlooking impact, and is in accordance with policies 52, 55 and 57 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2018.

### Overshadowing Impact

- 8.20 The application includes a shadow analysis which is embedded in the Design and Access Statement. Concerns have been raised by residents regarding the potential overshadowing of the neighbouring buildings. Specifically, given the orientation of the new dwellings No 20 Exeter Close appears to have the highest threat of loss of sunlight.
- 8.21 Plot 1 is located to the southwest of No 20 Exeter Close. The garden space to No 20 is located to the north of plot 1. As a result there is some overshadowing to the side and rear of this dwelling as shown in the assessment.
- 8.22 During the summer solstice (June) there is no loss of light. During the winter solstice (December) there is potentially a short loss of light to the small first floor bathroom/landing window on the southwest elevation. During the Equinoxes (March/September) there is a potential loss of sunlight from 9am to 1pm to the small south west facing bathroom/landing window and part of the rear garden. The garden is quite large however it is understood that this part of the garden is paved and used as a seating area.
- 8.23 Whilst it has been demonstrated that there is some loss of light to a window and an area of garden space for No.20 the new dwelling on plot 1 does not cause significant levels of overshadowing. The garden space is not totally overshadowed as a result of the new dwelling and is only for a small period of the year. The small window is to that of a bathroom or landing area and not to a habitable room. As a result, whilst it is considered to result in change to the neighbouring dwellings it is not considered to result in an unacceptable level of harm to warrant a recommendation of refusal in this instance.

### Wider Area

- 8.24 The Environmental Health Officer has been consulted on the application and has recommended approval, subject to conditions regarding construction hours, collection during construction, piling/noise vibration and dust. In order to protect the amenities of neighbouring properties, these conditions are

considered to be necessary and reasonable and shall be imposed upon any consent granted.

#### Amenity for future occupiers of the site

- 8.25 Policy 50 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2018) sets out internal residential space standards. All the proposed units exceed or are in accordance with the minimum standards. In this regard, the units would provide a high-quality internal living environment for the future occupants. The gross internal floor space measurements for units in this application are shown in the table below:

Unit	Number of bedrooms	Number of bed spaces (persons)	Number of storeys	Policy Size requirement (ml)	Proposed size of unit	Difference in size
1	2	4	2	79	118m2	39
2	4	6	2	106	177m2	71

- 8.26 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. Both Plots 1 and 2 will have access to private garden areas at ground floor level.

#### Accessible homes

- 8.27 The development has been assessed for compliance with Policy 51 in relation to all the new units. The Design and Access Statement states the development will comply with the requirements of Part M4 (2) of the Building Regulations. A condition shall be imposed upon any consent granted to secure this requirement and comply with policy 51.

#### **Refuse Arrangements**

- 8.28 The residential uses will have separate purpose-made bin stores to accommodate 3 coloured 240 litre wheeled bin containers for each dwelling (allocated for green waste, dry recyclables and residual waste). These will be taken by residents to the kerbside of Bishops Road, which is an existing arrangement for both 25B and 25C Bishops Road. Due to the existing placement of the site, the travel distance for the bins to the kerb will exceed the recommended 30m tow distance.

Although this is more than recommended, it should be noted that this is an existing arrangement to both 25B and 25C Bishops Road. The application is acceptable subject to the bins being left on the kerb-side for collection. The proposal is compliant with the RECAP guidance and is in accordance with Cambridge Local Plan (2018) policy 57.

### **Highway Safety**

- 8.29 There are concerns raised regarding the lack of parking for plot 1 and the intensification of the access road as a result of the development proposal. The Local Highway Authority has been consulted on the application and has raised no objections to the proposal. Whilst not specifically required by the LHA it is considered appropriate, given the location of the site, the current accessibility and neighbouring occupants that a construction and traffic management plan should be required by condition prior to development commencing. These conditions are considered both necessary and reasonable should consent be granted. Therefore, the proposal is considered to retain the safe and effective operation of the adopted highway and is in accordance with paragraphs 108 and 109 of the NPPF and policy 81 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2018.

### **Car Parking**

- 8.30 The majority of representations received have raised concerns regarding the lack of car parking proposed to serve the proposed development. Two car parking spaces are proposed to the front of the site which are to serve plot 2. No car parking is proposed for plot 1, the 2-bed dwelling. The Local Highway Authority has mentioned within its comments that this may result in on street car parking stress upon surrounding streets. The neighbouring properties within the cluster of backland properties of Bishops Road all benefit from some form of off street car parking areas which will reduce any potential on street car parking stress. There is unrestricted parking available in the area, which has not been identified as suffering from vehicle parking stress.
- 8.31 The proposed dwelling at plot 1 is aimed at individuals or couples potentially working within Cambridge, and not relying on the car as their main mode of transport.



- 8.32 Given the location of the site is within walking and cycling distance of Hauxton Road and Shelford Road which provides shops and services, the development is considered to promote sustainable modes of transport and reduce car dependency. There is a Park and Ride in close proximity and the closest bus stop is located 160m away which provides regular bus services to and from the city centre. Overall, the site is within a sustainable location and therefore the lack of car parking provided is not considered to warrant a reason for refusal in this instance.
- 8.33 The proposed level of car parking would comply with the maximum standards set out in Appendix L of the Cambridge Local Plan 2018. For the reasons set out above, officers consider the proposed level of car parking is acceptable and would not result in significant increase in overnight parking stress. The proposal would therefore meet the aims of Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policy 82.

### **Cycle Parking**

- 8.34 Cycle parking is provided through secure cycle storage on each plot, proposing 1 space per bed space, which is in accordance with the cycle parking standards under Appendix L of the Cambridge Local Plan. Overall, the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2018) policy 82.

### **Integrated water management and flood risk**

- 8.35 The application has been assessed by the City Council's Sustainable Drainage Engineer and has been considered acceptable subject to conditions to secure a surface water drainage strategy and maintenance plan. These conditions shall be imposed upon any consent granted to ensure the development adopts sustainable drainage methods in accordance with policies 31 and 32 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2018.

### **Trees/Landscaping**

- 8.36 There are several mature conifer trees along the rear boundary which are to be removed to accommodate the new dwellings. The conifer trees generally do not contribute any significant visual amenity to the area and therefore their loss is not

significantly harmful in this instance. The applicant is proposing to plant trees and introduce soft landscaping within and around the site to compensate for the loss of the trees.

- 8.37 The Landscape Officer has been consulted on the application and has raised no objections, subject to conditions regarding hard and soft landscaping details and green roof details. These conditions are considered necessary and reasonable to ensure the development is satisfactorily assimilated within the site.

### **Other Matters**

- 8.38 To ensure compliance with policy 28 (sustainability) a condition is proposed in relation to carbon reduction measures and in relation to water efficiency standards. To ensure compliance with biodiversity requirements arising from policies 59 and 69, a condition is proposed seeking details of bird and bat box provision. Additionally, a condition is included to ensure gaps in fencing for hedgehogs as part of the hard and soft landscaping condition. As the single storey rear elements are to be flat and green roofed, a condition is included seeking the submission and approval of the detail of the green roof make-up. As neither of the dwellings, would be appropriate to extend in any fashion because of the site constraints, a condition to remove permitted development rights under class A and B are included. Additionally, permitted development for the insertion of any further windows or openings of any kind will be removed from the northeast and southwest elevations and roof slopes to prevent adverse overlooking.

## **9.0 CONCLUSION**

- 9.1 In conclusion, the proposed development would be in keeping with the scale and form of development within the local area and adequately respects the amenities of neighbouring properties.

**10.0 RECOMMENDATION: APPROVE subject to the following conditions and informatives:**

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

Reason: In accordance with the requirements of Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended by Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004).

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

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

3. No construction work or demolition work shall be carried out or plant operated other than between the following hours: 0800 hours and 1800 hours on Monday to Friday, 0800 hours and 1300 hours on Saturday and at no time on Sundays, Bank or Public Holidays.

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

4. There shall be no collections from or deliveries to the site during the demolition and construction stages outside the hours of 0800 hours and 1800 hours on Monday to Friday, 0800 hours to 1300 hours on Saturday and at no time on Sundays, Bank or Public Holidays.

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

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

Due to the proximity of this site to existing residential premises and other noise sensitive premises, impact pile driving is not recommended.

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

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

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

8. Prior to first occupation for the use hereby permitted, carbon reduction measures shall be 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 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 a maintenance programme; and D) Details of any mitigation measures required to maintain amenity and prevent nuisance. No review of this requirement on the basis of grid capacity issues can take place unless written evidence from the District Network Operator confirming the detail of grid capacity and its implications has been submitted to, and accepted in writing by, the local planning authority. Any subsequent amendment to the level of renewable/low carbon technologies provided on the site shall be in accordance with a revised scheme submitted to and approved in writing by, the local planning authority.

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

9. 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)

10. 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).

11. 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 including provision for gaps in fencing for hedgehogs; 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.

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).

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

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

13. No development above slab level shall commence until a plan has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Authority detailing the proposed specification, number and locations of internal and / or external bird boxes on the new buildings and any other measures to demonstrate that there will be a net biodiversity gain on the site of at least 10%. The installation shall be carried out and subsequently maintained in accordance with the approved plans.

Reason: To provide ecological enhancements for protected species on the site (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policies 59 and 69, NPPF 2019 para.170).

14. No development above ground level, other than demolition, shall commence until full details of these green or brown roofs have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority and these works shall be carried out as approved and the green or brown roof(s) maintained in perpetuity in accordance with the approved details. The details shall include details of build-ups, make up of substrates, planting plans for biodiverse roofs, methodologies for translocation strategy and drainage details where applicable. The green roofs shall be installed in accordance with the approved details and shall be maintained thereafter for the lifetime of the development. The development shall be retained as such thereafter.

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

15. 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).

16. The development hereby approved, shall be carried out in accordance with the materials as detailed on the approved plans/documents.



Reason: To ensure the development is satisfactorily assimilated within the local area (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policy 55).

17. 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 dwellinghouse(s) shall not be allowed without the granting of specific planning permission.

Reason: To protect the amenity of occupiers of adjoining properties (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policies 52, 55, and 57).

18. The openings on the first floor northeast and southwest elevations of both plots 1 and 2 of the development hereby permitted shall be non-opening and permanently fixed and fitted with obscure glazing to a minimum level of obscurity to conform to Pilkington Glass level 3 or equivalent. The glazing shall thereafter be retained in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: In the interests of residential amenity (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policies 55, 57/58).

19. No further doors, windows or openings of any kind, shall be inserted in to the northeast and southwest elevations or roof slopes of the development hereby permitted without the express formal consent of the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In the interests of residential amenity (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policies 55, 57/58).

20. Prior to the installation of any electrical services, information to demonstrate that at least one dedicated 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, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

The active electric vehicle charge point as approved shall be fully installed prior to first occupation and maintained and retained thereafter.

Reason: In the interests of encouraging more sustainable forms of travel/transport and to reduce the impact of development on local air quality, in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), Policies 36 and 82 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2018 and in accordance with Cambridge City Councils adopted Air Quality Action Plan (2018)