

Cambridge City Council Planning

Date: Wednesday, 17 June 2020

Time: 10.00 am

Venue: This a virtual meeting and therefore there is no physical location for this meeting. [Click here to view the meeting.](#)

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

Agenda

1 Order of Agenda

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

- **Part One**
Major Planning Applications
Start time: 10am
- **Part Two**
Minor/Other Planning Applications
Start time: At conclusion of Part Two
- **Part Three – not required**
General and Enforcement Items

2 Apologies

3 Declarations of Interest

4 Minutes - to follow

Part 1: Major Planning Applications

5 19/1763/FUL - Whittle Laboratory, 1JJ Thomson Avenue (Pages 7 - 84)

6 18/1678/FUL - Station Area Development (Pages 85 - 242)

Part 2: Minor/Other Planning Applications

7 19/1375/FUL - 1 Rectory Terrace, High Street, Cherry Hinton (Pages 243 - 264)

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

Alternates: Bird, Page-Croft and Price

Information for the public

[Click here to view the meeting.](#)

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

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

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

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

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

Appendix 1 – Planning Policies and Guidance

(Updated January 2020)

1.0 Central Government Advice

1.1 National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) February 2019 – sets out the Government’s economic, environmental and social planning policies for England. These policies articulate the Government’s vision of sustainable development, which should be interpreted and applied locally to meet local aspirations.

1.2 Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG)

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

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

Planning Obligations

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

Paragraph 122 Places a statutory requirement on the local authority that where planning permission is dependent upon a planning obligation the obligation must pass the following tests:

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

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

2.0 Development Plans

2.1 The Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Plan 2011

2.2 Cambridge Local Plan 2018

3.0 Supplementary Planning Documents

3.1 Sustainable Design and Construction 2020

3.2 Cambridge Flood and Water 2018

3.3 Affordable Housing 2008

3.4 Planning Obligations Strategy 2004

Development Frameworks and Briefs

3.5 The New Museums Site Development Framework (March 2016)

3.6 Ridgeons site Planning and Development Brief (July 2016)

3.7 Mitcham's Corner Development Framework (January 2017)

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

3.9 Land North of Cherry Hinton (February 2018)

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

4.0 Use Classes

Class A1: Shops

Class A2: Financial & Professional Services

Class A3: Restaurants & Cafes

Class A4: Drinking Establishments

Class A5: Hot Food Take-away

Class B1: Business

Class B2: General Industrial

Class B8: Storage or Distribution

Class C1: Hotels

Class C2: Residential Institutions

Class C3: Dwellinghouses

Class C4: Small House in Multiple Occupation

Class D1: Non-Residential Institutions

Class D2: Assembly and Leisure

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

This page is intentionally left blank

Application Number	19/1763/FUL	Agenda Item	
Date Received	20th December 2019	Officer	Yole Medeiros
Target Date	20th March 2020		
Ward	Newnham		
Site	Department of Engineering, Whittle Laboratory, 1 J J Thomson Avenue		
Proposal	Full planning permission for extension of the Whittle Laboratory, including new National Centre for Propulsion and Power (4,251 sq metres of Academic (D1) Floorspace), demolition of 1,149 sq metres of D1 floorspace, and all associated Infrastructure including landscaping, drainage, substation and car and cycle parking.		
Applicant	Chancellor, Masters and Scholars University of Cambridge c/o agent		

SUMMARY	<p>The development accords with the Development Plan for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The proposal is in accordance with Policy 19 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2018 which supports the proposed use and the densification of the site. 2. The proposed new building is of high-quality design and will successfully integrate in the context of surrounding buildings and the emerging outline masterplan strategy, forming an important 'gateway' with the new Cavendish Laboratory to the wider West Cambridge campus. 3. There will be no significant adverse visual impact from or to neighbouring residential properties, the historic environment, or the views from the
---------	---

	<p>west along Madingley Road into the City.</p> <p>4. Noise, lighting, and amenity impacts arising from the development are not significant and can be addressed by imposition of appropriate conditions.</p> <p>5. The proposal is acceptable in transport terms. A two-way cycleway will be provided on Clerk Maxwell Road, as mitigation to the impacts from development.</p>
RECOMMENDATION	APPROVAL subject to planning conditions.

A.1 BACKGROUND

West Cambridge

- A.1 The application site is a 1.32hectare (ha) area in the north-eastern portion of the West Cambridge site, a major new academic campus undertaken by the University of Cambridge. The wider campus covers 66ha situated between Madingley Road to the north and the M11 to the west. The site area is wholly within proposals site M13 of the Cambridge Local Plan adopted in 2018.
- A.2 An extant 1999 outline planning permission ('OPP' ref. C/97/0961/OP) relating to the West Cambridge campus has been partially implemented. This related to a scheme of 244,212m² floorspace, which includes pre 1999 developments. The principal roads through the site have been implemented along with numerous key buildings including the Civil Engineering building, the Centre for Physics of Medicine, the Maxwell Centre, a new academic research building for Materials Science and Metallurgy and new academic research buildings for the University's Electrical Engineering Division. In addition, the East and West Forums and lake area have been developed, which are the main areas of public realm on the campus.
- A.3 An outline planning application ('OPA' ref. 16/1134/OUT) was submitted in June 2016 by the University for a new masterplan

for the West Cambridge site. It seeks permission for up to 383,300m² of development comprising academic and commercial/research institute floorspace and other ancillary uses, which remains undetermined. Since submission of the outline in 2016, the Council has approved three new buildings at West Cambridge: the new Cavendish Laboratory (ref. 17/1799/FUL); the Shared Facilities Hub (ref. 17/1896/FUL) and the new Civil Engineering Building (ref. 16/1811/FUL). These developments came forward as separate full planning applications.

1.0 SITE DESCRIPTION/AREA CONTEXT

Whittle Laboratory

- 1.1 The existing Whittle Laboratory site is located on the eastern side of JJ Thomson Avenue and southern side of Madingley Road and currently is occupied by a research facility for turbomachinery aerodynamics built in 1971, comprising 2,840m² of D1 floorspace. The Whittle Laboratory comprises a group of single storey buildings, with the testing halls being double storey heights. The entrance to the site is from the access road which spurs off JJ Thomson Avenue from south of the site, where there is both car and cycle parking as well as utilities infrastructure and servicing entrances. Access to the laboratory comes between the testing halls into the offices to the rear of the site.
- 1.2 At the northern boundary of the site is a substantial tree belt, approximately 5m deep, of mixed species. Beyond this is Madingley Road, one of the main radial routes linking the M11 with Cambridge City centre. On the northern side of Madingley Road are the closest residential properties including those along Conduit Head Road and forming the Conduit Head Conservation Area (CA), at approximately 150m north-west of the site. At a closer distance (approximately 50m) north-east of the site is the West Cambridge CA, including the University observatories and the Institute of Astronomy.
- 1.3 Immediately east of the site is University's Park and Cycle facility which leads to Clerk Maxwell Road, with residential properties further east. Across JJ Thompson Avenue west of the site is the recently approved Cavendish Laboratory building which was granted full planning permission in August 2018 for

37,160m² of D1 floorspace, currently under construction. Opposite the southern access road is currently a car parking which once development of this area is completed will become the Engineering Square, framed by the Whittle Laboratory, the existing William Gates and the Civil Engineering building.

- 1.4 The site is not covered by any statutory or non-statutory wildlife site designation and is not in close location to any statutory designated site. It also falls outside the Cambridge City's Air Quality Management Area (AQMA). The central-western portion of the site is mostly at high to medium risk of flooding from surface water. JJ Thompson Avenue is a private road and therefore the site falls outside of the Controlled Parking Zone.

2.0 THE PROPOSAL

- 2.1 Full planning permission is sought for the demolition of existing 1,063m² of D1 floorspace, and the erection of a new extension to accommodate the National Centre for Propulsion and Power (NCP) laboratory and offices consisting of 4,251m² of D1 floorspace, with associated infrastructure. The new extension is proposed to the west of the existing buildings, between these and JJ Thomson Avenue. In total, the proposed Whittle Laboratory will have a total floorspace of 6,014m².
- 2.2 The existing high and low speed laboratories will be retained with continued operation. A new substation will be constructed to the east of the existing buildings, and new cycle parking provision will be added onto the new east elevation where the offices will be demolished.
- 2.3 The central external area which currently accommodates utilities infrastructure, cycle and car parking will no longer be accessible from the southern access off JJ Thomson Ave and will be reconfigured to be accessed from the rear, via Clerk Maxwell Road, with the relocation of the existing car and cycle parking.
- 2.4 A net number of eight car parking spaces will be provided on-site, including two accessible parking spaces in an existing area to the north of the William Gates Building. Servicing for medium sized vehicles and larger heavy goods vehicles (HGVs) will be able to access the rear of the new building from Clerk Maxwell

- Road. The proposal will include drainage works as well as new landscaping on all sides of the building.
- 2.5 The extension to the west fronting JJ Thompson Avenue will accommodate the NCPP with a three storeys void and will be the tallest element of the buildings at 35m above Ordnance Datum (AOD). The buildings step down slightly (approximately 0.5m) towards south and further down towards east, to approximately 32m AOD. For later reference, the Cavendish Laboratory will be at approximately 38m AOD once completed.
- 2.6 The final configuration of the site layout will be a 'U' shape and comprised of the existing high-speed and low speed labs, with the additional NCPP testing hall, workshops and offices with central atrium. The office and atrium area consists of two storeys with maximum depth of 9 metre per floor plate. The ground floor is made up of a central atrium and staircase and public exhibition areas, as well as a library. The tea table, considered to be the 'heart' of the existing Whittle Laboratory where visitors, staff and students congregate, will be brought to this new part of the building and will be located on the first floor, breaking out into the first-floor terrace garden.

Application documents

- 2.7 The application was accompanied by the following supporting information:
- Planning Statement
 - Design and Access Statement
 - Energy Strategy
 - Flood Risk and Drainage Strategy
 - Noise Report
 - Arboricultural Impact Assessment
 - Woodland Maintenance and Management Plan
 - Ecological Assessment
 - Statement of Community Engagement
 - Lighting Report
 - Site Investigation Report
 - Servicing and Operational Management Plan
 - Transport Assessment

Amended Plans and Additional Information

- 2.8 The following supplements the original submission:
- Existing and proposed development overland flow routes

- Assessment of road noise propagation
- Anglian Water Pre-Planning Assessment Report
- CGI extracts
- DEFRA/Natural England Biodiversity Metric 2.0 spreadsheet
- GCP Madingley Rd proposal option 1 overlay
- GCP Madingley Rd proposal option 2 overlay
- Revised Woodland Management and Maintenance Plan
- Revised Illustrated Terrace GA
- Revised Trees to be removed and retained
- Revised Site levels GA
- Revised Planting to NW Woodland
- Revised Site wide Topsoil and Seeding Plan
- Revised Site Wide Planting Plan
- Revised Landscape GA - Public Realm
- Revised Illustrated Landscape Plan
- Revised NW Woodland Elevation
- Revised Site Section 01
- Revised Site Section 03

3.0 SITE HISTORY

Reference	Description	Outcome
C/97/0961/OP (OPP)	Outline application for the development of 66.45ha of land for University academic departments (73,000sq.m), research institutes (24,000sq.m), commercial research (41,000sq.m) and associated [infrastructure].	Approved with conditions on 06 Oct 1999
16/1134/OUT (OPA)	Outline planning permission with all matters reserved for up to 383,300m ² of development comprising up to 370,000m ² of academic floorspace (Class D1 space), commercial/research institute floorspace (Class B1b and sui generis research uses), of which not more than 170,000m ² will be commercial floorspace (Class B1b); up to 2,500m ² nursery floorspace (Class D1); up to 1000m ² of retail/food and drink floorspace (Classes A1-A5); up to 4,100m ² and not less than 3,000m ² for assembly and leisure floorspace (Class D2); up to 5,700m ² of sui generis uses, including Energy Centre and Data Centre; associated infrastructure including roads (including	Awaiting decision

	adaptations to highway junctions on Madingley Road), pedestrian, cycle and vehicle routes, parking, drainage, open spaces, landscaping and earthworks; and demolition of existing buildings and breaking up of hardstanding.	
--	--	--

3.1 Further to the specific application site history as above, the table below shows relevant planning history for the immediate context and West Cambridge campus, which will be referenced along this report:

Reference	Description	Outcome
17/1896/FUL	Mixed use building 4907 sq m in total, comprising 3411 sq m of D1 academic floor space on the first and second floors; 1421 sq m of A3 (Café and restaurant) space on the ground floor; 75 sq m of A1 (retail) on the ground floor; all associated infrastructure, including drainage, service yard area, utilities, landscape and cycle parking; modifications to JJ Thomson Avenue to provide disabled car parking and a substation building. [<u>Shared Facilities Hub</u>]	Granted Permission on 4 Jan 2019
17/1799/FUL	Development of 37,160 sqm for D1 academic floor space to accommodate the relocation of the <u>Cavendish Laboratory</u> , namely; all associated infrastructure including drainage, utilities, landscape and cycle parking; strategic open space to the south and west of the new Cavendish; modifications to JJ Thomson Avenue to provide disabled parking and changes to road surface materials; alterations to the existing access to Madingley Road to the north west to enable servicing; and demolition of Merton Hall Farmhouse and removal of existing Vet School access road from JJ Thomson Avenue.	Granted Permission on 17 Aug 2018
16/1811/FUL	Full planning permission for 4,376sqm of D1 (Academic) floorspace, along with external landscape, cycle parking, temporary parking area and associated infrastructure including	Granted Permission on 01 Mar 2017

	new service road connecting to existing entrance from Clerk Maxwell Road. [<u>Civil Engineering building</u>]	
C/99/0042	Erection of three storey building to form Computer Sciences Faculty with associated parking and landscaping. [William Gates Building]	Approved with conditions on 17 Jan 2000

4.0 PUBLICITY

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

5.0 POLICY

5.1 Relevant Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policies

PLAN	POLICY NUMBER
Cambridge Local Plan (October 2018)	Section 2 – Policies 1, 2, 4, 5, 8 Section 3 – Policy 19 Section 4 – Policies 28, 29, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38 Section 5 – Policies 42, 43 Section 7 – Policies 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 64, 65, 69, 70, 71 Section 9 – Policies 80, 81, 82, 85

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

Central Government Guidance	National Planning Policy Framework February 2019 National Planning Policy Framework – Planning Practice Guidance from 3 March
-----------------------------	--

	<p>2014 onwards</p> <p>Circular 11/95 (Annex A)</p> <p>Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Regulations 2010 (as amended)</p>
Development Plans	The Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Plan (2011)
Supplementary Planning Documents	<p>Sustainable Design and Construction SPD (2020)</p> <p>Cambridgeshire Flood and Water SPD (2018)</p> <p>RECAP Waste Management Design Guide (2012)</p>
Material Considerations	<p>Cambridgeshire County Transport Assessment Guidelines (2019)</p> <p>Cambridge City Air Quality Action Plan (2018-2023)</p> <p>Cambridge City Citywide Tree Strategy 2016-2026 (October 2015)</p> <p>Cambridge City West Cambridge Conservation Area Appraisal (2011)</p> <p>Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (November 2010)</p> <p>Planning Obligations Strategy SPD (2010)</p> <p>Public Art SPD (2010)</p> <p>Cambridge City Contaminated Land - Developers Guide (2009)</p> <p>Cambridge City Conduit Head Road Conservation Area Appraisal (2009)</p> <p>Cambridge Suburbs and Approaches:</p>

	<p>Madingley Road (2009)</p> <p>Cambridgeshire Quality Charter for Growth (2008)</p>
--	--

6.0 CONSULTATIONS

Developer Contributions Monitoring Unit

- 6.1 No objection. Do not propose contributions are sought through the application as the Council's Planning Obligation Strategy SPD 2010 does not seek S106 financial contributions from developments such as the proposed.

Highways England

- 6.2 No objection given the remote location of the site from the strategic road network (SRN), therefore unlikely to be of any severe impact.

Cambridgeshire County Council (Highways Authority – Highways Development Management)

- 6.3 No objection. As JJ Thompson Avenue is a private road the only modifications to the existing adopted public highway could occur at the junction of JJ Thompson Avenue and Madingley Road. The nature, scale and complexity of any such modifications will be determined by the outcomes of the Transport Assessment.

Cambridgeshire County Council (Highways Authority – Transport Assessment)

Comments on application as submitted

- 6.4 No objection subject to mitigations to transport impact from development, including the provision of a mandatory two-way cycleway along Clerk Maxwell Road, agreed and secured prior to approval and with design and layout to be discussed with the Highways Development Management team. A Travel Plan is to be secured through by condition and approved by the LPA prior to occupation.

- 6.5 All other aspects of the Transport Assessment submitted with the application are agreed, including its description, study area, traffic data, trip generation, distribution and assignment, assessment scenarios and traffic growth, and junction modelling.

Comments on application as amended

- 6.6 Required a condition to any permission requiring that prior to the occupation the developers agreed with the LPA the layout, design and programme of delivery of mandatory cycle lanes on Clerk Maxwell Road and that the design be fully implemented by the developer prior to fifty percent (50%) the proposed buildings being occupied for their intended use.
- 6.7 On further correspondence with the applicants and the LPA, the Highways Authority (Transport Assessment and Development Management teams) have expressed their preference to have the cycleway along Clerk Maxwell Road implemented by the applicants via S278 agreement (Highways Act 1980) and secured by condition, should permission be granted. Due to the complexity of the process and the difficulties of booking road space, condition should require that within 12 months of the commencement of development the scheme is approved by the LPA and implemented prior to occupation, with flexibility for an alternative timeframe to be agreed in writing with the LPA.

Cambridge International Airport

- 6.8 No objection. Any intended crane usage should be referred to the Airport for assessment.

Natural England

- 6.9 No comments as the proposal is unlikely to result in significant impacts on statutory designated nature conservation sites or landscapes.

Environment Agency

- 6.10 No objection in principle, highlighting the site is not located within a groundwater source protection zone (SPZ). Recommend conditions and informative regarding contaminated

land, sustainable urban drainage, pollution control, foul water drainage and wildlife conservation.

Cambridge City Council Sustainable Drainage Engineer

Comments on application as submitted

- 6.11 Pre-construction and post-construction modelling of this surface water flooding needs to be submitted to ensure it is fully taken into consideration in the design proposals.

Comments on application as amended

- 6.12 No objection. Following submission of the required information and further clarification, is satisfied that these clarify as required and are acceptable. Recommends additional information and the existing and proposed flow land routes plans to be appended to the FRA and Drainage strategy report.

Local Lead Flood Authority (LLFA)

Comments on application as submitted

- 6.13 Objects the application and requests additional information, as the surface water flood risk should be addressed further. Informative regarding green roofs and pollution control are recommended.
- 6.14 One of the new buildings is in an area of high flood risk, and if its location in lower flood risk areas is not feasible, the finished floor level should be set an appropriate level above the maximum anticipated flood depth.
- 6.15 The central section of the site is at a high to medium risk of surface water flooding (300-900mm during a Medium Risk scenario), and this needs to be further addressed. The proposed form of discharge of surface water would require a principle agreement prior to discharge at an agreed rate into an existing Anglian Water surface water network.

Comments on application as amended

- 6.16 No objection, following review of the amended documents and further clarifications through correspondence exchange, the

LLFA concluded that it would be unreasonable to ask for floor levels to be raised any further, on the basis that the modelled surface water flooding against the buildings would only be during events exceeding a 1 in 100 year event plus 40% climate change.

- 6.17 The LLFA is satisfied that exceedance flows from the proposed attenuation basin will be contained to the north of the proposed building, with flows only being directed south-eastwards and towards buildings when storage in these areas is also exceeded.
- 6.18 Recommended conditions relating with surface water drainage scheme to be approved by the LPA prior to commencement of ground works and details of the surface water drainage system (including all SuDS features) to be approved by the LPA prior to the first occupation of the building.

Anglian Water

- 6.19 No objections subject to a condition that no hard-standing areas are to be constructed until the works have been carried out in accordance with the approved surface water strategy. Recommend informatives including regarding the need for notification of intention to connect to the public sewer under S106 of the Water Industry Act Approval, noting consent will be required by Anglian Water, under the Water Industry Act 1991.

Cambridge City Council Sustainability Officer

- 6.20 No objection. Supports the proposals in sustainable construction terms, highlighting they incorporate sustainable design and construction features in response to planning policy and the Sustainability Assessment Matrix that has been prepared for the West Cambridge site overall.
- 6.21 Further note the energy strategy, includes the use of air source heat pumps to provide heating and cooling and provision of a photovoltaic panel array of 210m², which would cover around 25% of the roof area. This strategy would lead to a 37% reduction in carbon emissions compared to Part L 2013 and achieves 5 credits under Ene01 of BREEAM, which is supported.

6.22 Requests conditions for BREEAM and energy strategy.

Cambridge City Council Arboricultural Officer

Comments on application as submitted

6.23 Objects the proposal and require amendments to the Woodland Management Plan, and confirmation of services to be installed in the Root Protection Area (RPA) within the submitted Arboricultural impact Assessment.

6.24 Disagrees that an Arboricultural Method Statement (AMS) is not required on this site, given the limited space for construction and storage within the site, therefore agreement is necessary in relation to site access, site facilities, site storage and the installation of services within the RPA. Notes it may be necessary to adjust the location of protection barriers and install ground protection to ensure reasonable construction space without damage to retained trees.

6.25 Further notes in relation to the replacement of the T1 to T14 trees are located too close to the southern boundary and appropriate relocation of those trees are necessary to ensure their long-term retention/survival.

6.26 Conditions are requested for an AMS and a Tree Protection Plan (TPP) to be approved by the LPA; for a site meeting to discuss details of the approved AMS; and for the implementation of the AMS and TPP.

Comments on application as amended

6.27 No objections as concerns raised previously have been satisfied with the submission of the amended application. This is subject to the imposition of the suggested conditions.

Cambridge City Council Landscape Officer

Comments on application as submitted

6.28 No objection. Suggestions/comments were made regarding terrace planters, handrails and cycle hoops, flowering hedge, planting densities, planting specification and the need for a

landscape management plan to be submitted. All matters to be addressed by condition.

- 6.29 Requests conditions regarding terrace planter automatic irrigation, soft landscaping specifications, rain garden detail, implementation of hard and soft landscaping, green (biodiverse) roof detail, planting replacement, landscape maintenance and management plan, and terrace planting irrigation system.

Comments on application as amended

- 6.30 No further comments noting comments previously made are still relevant and should be covered within the landscape conditions.

Cambridge City Council Biodiversity Officer

Comments on application as submitted

- 6.31 Requests further information with base line and proposed habitats to be entered into the Defra biodiversity impact metric (V2) to establish whether a measurable net gain will be achieved by the proposal. Recommends a condition for bird and bat box specifications to identify and secure further species-specific enhancement. Support landscape condition for detailed specification for green roofs and programmed works and monitoring to secure the proposed woodland enhancements.

Comments on application as amended

- 6.32 No objection. Following submission of the biodiversity impact calculations as requested, officers are content with the metric assessment, with the assurances on management to be secured by the landscape condition, with specific reference made to the meadow management.
- 6.33 Acknowledges that the site is relatively small and constrained is content that onsite gain was achieved with the proposal, noting that further ecological interventions proposed and those to be captured within the previously requested condition, will provide additional ecological enhancements not yet measurable within the Defra metric.

Cambridge City Council Urban Design Officer

- 6.34 No objection. The proposed scheme is supported in Urban Design terms and will create a distinctive new building that responds to both its setting and the constraints of the site. Overall, the scheme is compliant with the emerging West Cambridge framework. Recommend conditions regarding external materials and details of the rooftop plant and solar panels.

Cambridge City Council Public Art Officer

- 6.35 No objection. Requires each application that comes forward [within the West Cambridge campus] to set out the status of the PAS implementation and include which phase of the strategy it relates and a timeline for implementation.
- 6.36 In further correspondence with the applicants, it was noted that the above requirement is reflected in the public art proposal within the Planning Statement submitted in support of the application. Based on this, officers are satisfied that the proposals form part of the wider site PAS, which is supported. Officer notes the triggers and funding of the PAS requires monitoring.

Cambridge City Council Access Officer

- 6.37 No objection. Refers to comments from the Disability Panel [meeting of 24 September 2019]. Further recommends/emphasizes handrails on external steps; external garden routes between planters having 1.5m at corners for wheelchairs to turn, with potential 1.8m widths for chairs to pass each other; external tables with benches with gaps for wheelchair users to sit at table with no obstruction to their footrests; double doors to be powered or be asymmetrical with one leaf being at least 850mm and having an opening force of less than 20N; meeting rooms need hearing loops; good signage and colour contrast of décor for visually impaired people; glazing needing manifestations, internal blinds and consideration of reflected glare from floor surfaces.
- 6.38 Further recommends that where more than one seat is to be installed in a reception area or externally, a variety of seat heights should be provided, with at least one each with a seat

height of 380 mm, 480 mm and 580 mm from ground level. Where only one seat is installed, the seat height should be between 450 mm and 480 mm, and the seat should have both back support and arm rests. Some seating without arms and space within the seating is also recommended so that a wheelchair user can sit alongside and facing the same direction as others who are waiting.

Historic England

- 6.39 No comments. Officers should seek the views of the Council's conservation and archaeological advisers, as relevant. It is not necessary to consult HE on the application again unless there are material changes to the proposal.

Cambridgeshire County Council (Archaeology)

- 6.40 No objections, highlighting the site is in an area of high archaeological potential. Noted archaeological excavations were undertaken with the development of the William Gates building to the immediate south and east of the application area, which identified an extensive Roman period settlement with associated field systems, trackways and cemeteries (HER ECB1015).
- 6.41 Recommend that the site should be subject to a programme of archaeological investigation to be secured through a pre-commencement condition, and an informative explaining the sequencing of the investigation works.

Cambridge City Council Conservation Officer

Comments on application as submitted

- 6.42 No objection. The proposal is unlikely to have any significant effect upon Conservation Areas, but additional information should be provided to demonstrate the impact on the character of Madingley Road as an important approach route into the City. Computer generated images (CGIs) should be provided to show how the proposal frames the entry into the West Cambridge site with the adjacent Cavendish Laboratory building, and to show the proposal's relationship with the north side of Madingley Road.

Comments on application as amended

- 6.43 Following submission of the CGIs, officers confirm the proposed extension would read satisfactorily together with the building already permitted on the opposite corner of JJ Thompson Avenue in framing the entrance to this University site.
- 6.44 Further notes that although the proposed extension would be austere, formal and institutional in form, the additional images do not alter officers view that the proposal would have no harmful impact on the Conduit Head Road or West Cambridge conservation areas or on their settings.

Cambridgeshire Constabulary (Designing Out Crime Officer)

- 6.45 No objection. Noted that the proposals have been subject of pre-application discussions with the Crime Prevention Design team and have been advised that the measures on the Security Needs Assessment are to be addressed through BREEAM accreditation under HEA06.

Cadent Gas

- 6.46 No objection. Given the existence of apparatus in the vicinity of the proposal which may be affected, requested the LPA to inform Plan Protection on the likely decision on this application.

Health and Safety Executive

- 6.47 Do not have an interest in the development, as it does not intersect a pipeline or hazard zone.

Cambridge City Council Environmental Health

Comments on application as submitted

- 6.48 No objection. The development is acceptable, subject to standard conditions relating to construction hours, collection during construction, construction/demolition noise/vibration & piling, dust condition and Material Management Plan. Bespoke conditions are recommended for noise and vibration insulation / mitigation, servicing and operational management plan

compliance, servicing collection and delivery times, artificial lighting, electric vehicle charging points.

Comments on application as amended

- 6.49 Further information has been provided following representations regarding potential noise and lighting impacts from development to neighbouring properties, and officers are of the view that any potential building noise reflections will not have any adverse noise impact on neighbouring residential premises. The proposed Whittle extension is approximately 22 to 25m from the Madingley Road carriage way and 10m from JJ Thomson Avenue, and reflected traffic noise is not envisaged and at worst negligible in the immediate vicinity of the proposals.
- 6.50 Noted the proposed development will be considered a class E3 – Suburban site (medium district brightness – small town centres or suburban location) due to its proximity to other educational developments in the West Cambridge site, and that an E2 zone is considered for a rural location (low district brightness). Further notes that the Obtrusive Lighting Report provided with the application demonstrates compliance with Sky Glow (Upward Light Ratio) limits - predicted as 0% compared with recommended limits of 2.5% (E2 Zone) to 5 % (E3 Zone) - (Upward Light Ratio - refers to the maximum allowed percentage of luminaire flux (lumens) in the installation that goes directly into the sky).
- 6.51 Noted recommended working hours are standard practice for planning application sites across Cambridge City. The hours permitted are considered reasonable and unacceptable adverse impact on quality of life / amenity is not envisaged if development adheres to the permitted hours. Concluded reiterating the information submitted in response to various consultee consultation comments raise no new or additional environmental health related material considerations or concerns, and that the proposed development is acceptable subject to the imposition of the conditions and informative already outlined.

Cambridgeshire Fire and Rescue Service

6.52 No comments in terms of emergency water supplies as there is an existing provision in place which should be adequate to serve the development.

Cambridge City Council Disability Consultative Panel (Meeting of 24th September 2019)

6.53 No objection. In summary the Panel made the following comments and recommendations:

- Accessible drop-off area near entrance - this area would also need to be a pick-up point with a covered seating area to provide protection in inclement weather;
- Secondary pass door (to be confirmed) - the Panel would welcome a fully automated, outward opening door accessible to wheelchair users;
- 'Spanish steps' [exhibition space] - noted will be non-retractable with seating for 120 people and strongly recommends a handrail is for the lengthy staircase, with the Nicosia Museum in Cyprus being cited as an example of a good quality stairlift installed in a similar environment;
- South-facing terrace at the top of the staircase - noted to appear to be a very pleasant space;
- Extent of the public permeability of the building (to be confirmed) - any accessible features should be provided to ensure the building is as inclusive as possible to a variety of users;
- Lift - details of the lift have yet to be confirmed with a reminder for designers to look to Building Regulations (Part M) to give instruction on best lift selection and the requirements for compliance, as well as the British Standards guidance BS8300: 2018;
- Reception, interior surfaces and signage - the Panel stresses the need for colour contrasts for the benefit of the visually impaired, with recommendation for advice to be taken from acoustic experts regarding the installation of a hearing induction loop system;
- Shower room - the design presented as a diagram reflects a very poor example and should not be included as part of the submitted scheme.

Cambridgeshire Quality Panel (Meeting of 18th September 2019)

- 6.54 No objection. In summary, the Panel has welcomed the great ambition of the project and recognised that a lot of work has been carried out but highlighted that the architecture and landscape around the turbine hall needs further consideration. In summary, the main recommendations of the Panel were:
- Explore other materials for the turbine hall and the design of the landscape adjacent;
 - The landscape needs to be more integrated with the building and enhance the ground floor experience;
 - The service courtyard needs further consideration;
 - Promote the idea of celebrating what you do and displaying engines or related objects within the landscape;
 - Provide energy estimates in kWhr/m² for easier comparison; and
 - Consider the WELL Building Standards.
- 6.55 The above are a summary of the comments that have been received. Full details of the consultation responses and report and minutes from the consultative panels can be inspected on the application file.

7.0 REPRESENTATIONS

- 7.1 Five representations were received from neighbouring residents. These included one letter objecting to the proposal, on the basis of the negative impact on the Madingley Road character, the potential for the solid façade to amplify traffic noise and impact on adjoining residents; interference of the proposal with the improvements to Madingley Road; dust; and car parking stress.
- 7.2 The further representations including a letter in support of the application, have the comments summarised as follows:
- Requests for the removal of the street parking along Clerk Maxwell Road and implementation of two-way cycleway;
 - Requests for reduced working hours;
 - Concerns over light pollution and potential impact on neighbouring properties and the Institute of Astronomy;
 - Concerns over noise pollution from the proposal and increased pollution as a result of amplification of traffic noise;

- Potential impact on Madingley Road improvement proposals.
- Concerns over parking stress;
- Concerns over scale and massing being overbearing;
- Support to the signage north-west of the site, potentially to be made part of the public art proposal;
- Support to energy strategy and suggestions to biodiversity net gains measures.

7.3 The above is a summary of the representations that have been received and the relevant planning matters will be considered in the assessment. Full details of the representations can be inspected on the application file.

8.0 ASSESSMENT

8.1 From the consultation responses and representations received, along with officers' inspection of the site and the surroundings, the main issues relating with the current application are:

- Principle of development
- Built Environment
- Natural Environment
- Climate change and resources management
- Infrastructure
- Human Health and Residential Amenity
- Planning Obligations

Principle of Development

Site Allocation

8.2 Policy 19 states that development for University needs will be permitted on the West Cambridge Area of Major Change (AoMC), where the site is located, and where the principal land uses include D1 use class for educational use, associated sui generis research establishments and academic research institutes. Within the AoMC the wider West Cambridge Campus is allocated as Site Proposal M13 on the Cambridge Local Plan (2018), Appendix B, to accommodate higher education, research, sports and shared facilities.

8.3 The Whittle Laboratory was built in 1971 through the Cambridge University Engineering Department at the time, and officially opened as the 'Science Research Council Turbomachinery Laboratory' in 1973. The current application is proposed by the

Whittle Laboratory which is still linked to the Department of Engineering within the University of Cambridge. The proposals relate with the historic research use of the Laboratory and aim to enable through the proposed extension to home the National Centre for Propulsion and Power (NCP), where the development of technology for ultra-low emission aircraft and low carbon power generation will take place.

- 8.4 The initiative is led by the Cambridge University through the Whittle Laboratory and funded by external organizations, including the Government, private organizations and the University itself. Whilst there will be private interest involved through funding in the development of the research which will take place at the NCP, and the use of the building is for the research and development of a potential new product (ultra-low emission aircraft), the premises are directly linked with the University of Cambridge educational role and are, for this reason, considered of an educational D1 use rather than a 'business' B1 use class.
- 8.5 In this context, the demolition of 1,149m² D1 floorspace followed by the extension of the existing Whittle Laboratory with 4,251m² D1 floorspace, (an therefore net addition of 3,102m² including the new NCP), are considered compliant with Policy 19 and the site allocation as set out by the Cambridge Local Plan 2018.

Outline Planning Permission (OPP)

- 8.6 The extant 1999 permission at West Cambridge allowed for development of 176,120m² floorspace in addition to development prior to this consent, therefore resulting in a total potential of 244,212 m² floorspace for the 1999 masterplan.
- 8.7 To date, 201,710 m² have been delivered or received planning consent to be implemented at the West Cambridge campus, including the Civil Engineering building approved in March 2017 (ref. 16/1811/FUL) and the Cavendish building approved in August 2018 (ref. 17/1799/FUL). As set out in the Planning Statement submitted with the application, the academic components of the 1999 masterplan have been delivered to the levels anticipated in the previous approval, as have the residential elements.

- 8.8 However, the delivery of commercial research and shared facilities on the site is well below the levels envisaged in the 1999 planning permission and 2004 review. This prompted the University and City Council to agree through the adopted Cambridge Local Plan that it is appropriate to prepare a new site-wide masterplan through a new outline planning application, currently the OPA ref. 16/1134/OUT, explained below.
- 8.9 The initial phase of West Cambridge development enabled the relocation of the Cavendish Laboratory to the site west of JJ Thomson Avenue (currently under construction), and of the Department of Engineering from its site on Trumpington St (and fronting the Fen Causeway) to provide a new Engineering 'campus' on the eastern part of the West Cambridge Site. Following completion of the Civil Engineering building was in September 2019 and has been occupied, the Whittle Laboratory, is the next element of this Inset Masterplan or the Engineering Campus fronting JJ Thomson Avenue. Therefore, this current application is considered to align with the phasing of the wider campus.

Outline Planning Application (OPA)

- 8.10 In the event proposals include densification of the development on site with a significant increase of floorspace over that already approved, Policy 19 sets out that a revised masterplan supporting an outline planning application (OPA) is to be submitted and agreed, to allow an integrated and comprehensive approach to the provision and distribution of the uses and supporting facilities and amenities.
- 8.11 The application proposals include a net increase of 3,102m² floorspace to the current laboratory, after which the Whittle Laboratory would have a total of 6,014m² floorspace. This is more than twice the existing 2,840m², which is considered a significant densification of the site.
- 8.12 The current outline application for the wider West Cambridge (OPA ref.: 16/1134/OUT) includes a total of 370,000m² of D1 floorspace, which is additional to the permitted floorspace with the OPP in 1999. The Planning Statement submitted with the application explains that the additional floorspace proposed with the extension of the Whittle Laboratory is not an addition to the floorspace submitted through the OPA. As the OPA remains

undetermined at the time of writing this report, consideration will need to be given to the planning history of the area and determined floorspace, as part of the assessment of that application.

- 8.13 Furthermore, Policy 19 (3c) requirements for an integrated and comprehensive approach to the provision and distribution of the uses is given by the current OPA, and the current application to Whittle Laboratory does not conflict with the outline proposals as assessed to date.

Cambridge Economy

- 8.14 Beyond the site allocation and Policy 19 of the Local Plan, Policy 43 deals with University developments and is supportive of the continued development of the West Cambridge site, where the Whittle Laboratory site is situated. Policy 43 sets out that sites within West Cambridge will provide opportunity for enhanced faculty and research facilities.
- 8.15 The proposed facility will accommodate additional 32 members of the staff and benefit additional 36 students through the proposed net addition of 3,102 m² D1 use, aiming for the extension and modernisation of the existing laboratory. This is in line with Policy 43 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2018.

Conclusion

- 8.16 In light of the above evaluation, the principle of the net increase of 3,102 m² of D1 use is considered acceptable and in accordance with the site allocation and Policies 19 and 43 of the Cambridge Local Plan.
- 8.17 Further requirements of Policy 19 (items 3d to 3i) relating to the protection of views from the Green Belt and into the City, sustainable travel, green infrastructure, phasing and building heights will be discussed in the following sections and when relevant will refer to the OPA and OPP. Other aspects of the planning assessment will have reference to other policies within the adopted Cambridge Local Plan, as well as further current policies and guidance.

Built Environment

- 8.18 The development plot boundary is defined by an established woodland edge and an area of vegetation to the north which separates the site from Madingley Road and representing a key feature in the northern extremity of the West Cambridge site. Some of the trees on the north-west corner of the site will be removed to accommodate the extension and the National Centre for Power and Propulsion (NCP) test hall, however the existing tree belt with Madingley Road will be maintained as a landscaped buffer of 10m width, or twice as the current tree belt. This is further discussed in the Natural Environment section.
- 8.19 The masterplan as proposed within the OPA (ref. 16/1134/OUT) includes a new integrated Engineering 'campus' on this eastern part of the West Cambridge site, where the Whittle Laboratory is located. This includes the emerging surrounding context, from which the buildings' external expression takes its cues from. In officers views the proposals would sit comfortably with the Williams Gates building to the south and the new Cavendish Laboratory to the to the west in this context.
- 8.20 Locating the NCP to the north west corner of the site was intended to create a showpiece space for the Whittle Laboratory and wider Department of Engineering worthy of its gateway position at one of the most prominent entry points to West Cambridge. The remaining offices and shared facilities have been arranged to provide an engaging and activated frontage along the west and southern edges of the site, as aimed by the new masterplan for West Cambridge.

Building Heights

- 8.21 Policy 19 of the Local Plan when setting out requirements for this West Cambridge site sets out that 'the approach to appropriate development heights will be determined through the OPP, giving consideration to the sensitivity of the landscape within the Green Belt to the south and west'. In terms of the extant 1999 masterplan (ref.: C/97/0961/OP), Table 5 of the Design Guidelines set out that academic buildings should have an approximate range of height of up to 14.8m (AOD), with specific parameters established to each of the masterplan plots. Whittle Laboratory falls into plot F of the master plan, however

no specific height or massing guidelines is provided on this section of the document.

- 8.22 Officers are of the view that whilst the proposed Whittle Laboratory extension at 32m AOD would be significantly higher than the broad maximum height of 14.8m AOD, the guiding principle of the OPP 1999 masterplan of protection of the surrounding Green Belt landscape and character is kept in the current proposal. In addition, more recent permissions within the West Cambridge campus establish a different character to this new Engineering 'campus' on this eastern part of the West Cambridge, where the Whittle Laboratory is located. This is particularly in relation to the residential and other institutional character of the areas north of the tree belt and Madingley Road, to the north of the Whittle site.
- 8.23 The acoustic and height requirements of the NCPP test hall drive the proposed scale and massing. Whilst very limited weight is given to the OPA as undetermined, the supporting information demonstrates the proposal is coordinated with this wider strategy coming forward. The development site overlaps three maximum height zones within the West Cambridge - 32.00 AOD zone towards the north, 35.00 AOD in the middle and 38.00 AOD to the south of the site - identified on the West Cambridge height parameter plan. The proposal has been designed to meet the requirements of the Whittle labs brief whilst remaining within specified parameters. As noted by the Council's Urban Design officer, the submitted East & West Elevation (Drawing EM01262-GAL-WH-XX-DR-A-42020 Rev 3) clarifies that the overall maximum height of the NCPP Test Hall is 32m AOD, which equates to the maximum height identified in the emerging West Cambridge outline masterplan (OPA).
- 8.24 In terms of the potential impact from the proposed heights to the Green Belt west and south of the wider West Cambridge campus, the proposed extension is likely to be visually connected with the emerging buildings in the campus, in particular the William Gates building and the future Cavendish Laboratory currently under construction. From a closer location the proposed Whittle is very likely to 'frame' the future square envisaged in the OPA, along with the William Gates and Civil Engineering buildings.

8.25 This is demonstrated with the computer-generated images (CGIs) submitted as part of the application demonstrate the impact of the proposals on the Green Belt. The existing landscape along JJ Thompson Avenue and particularly the more recent buildings south of the West Cambridge campus and the emerging Cavendish Laboratory west of the Whittle site will assist in filtering the views from those directions. This is demonstrated by the cross-section on page 42 and photomontage on page 43 of the Design and Access Statement (DAS) and confirmed by officer on site visit. Officers therefore conclude that proposals would not be detrimental to the openness neither would have a negative visual impact to the Green Belt south and west of the application site.

Impact on Historic Environment

8.26 The most sensitive location in terms of the resulting visual impact to the historic environment is the junction between JJ Thompson Avenue and Madingley Road, where the tallest NCPP test hall will be located. As previously described, the site is in close distance (approximately 150m and 50m respectively) from the boundaries of the Conduit Head Road and West Cambridge Conservation Areas (CAs).

8.27 Nevertheless, the existing tree belt which bounds this part of the northern side of the wider campus shows a high level of vegetation, which coupled with the relatively flat topography creates a secluded, inward looking sense of enclosure and provides a significant level of screening to the detached properties within the CAs. Officers conclude that filtered views of the Laboratory extension at the junction of Conduit Head Road would not result in significant harm to its setting.

8.28 In addition to the proximity to CAs, the JJ Thomson Avenue and Madingley Road junction lies on an important route into the city. As noted by the Council's Conservation Officer, this section of Madingley Road is described in the Cambridge Suburbs and Approaches character assessment as a distinct rupture between two different character areas along the road. The site is located in what is considered a separation between the prevailing domestic character east of the wider campus and the more open area, with distinctive buildings such as the Schlumberger Research Centre and further infrastructure related with the University use, west of Whittle site.

- 8.29 The Cambridge Suburbs and Approaches also states that buildings along JJ Thomson Avenue, such as William Gates building south of the Whittle Laboratory, have already contributed to the emerging character on the south side of Madingley Road into the city. Conservation officers conclude that the proposals for the Whittle Laboratory extension are unlikely to have any significant effect upon the character of the nearby CAs, however it is the effect upon this important route into the city and its relationship with existing buildings as it forms the 'gateway' into the university's wider campus.
- 8.30 The character description to Madingley Road also sets out that the trees and the scale of the new buildings along the eastern side of JJ Thompson Avenue establish an institutional and formal character of this part of the West Cambridge campus. The document also points out that a different scale and character is established along the northern side of Madingley Road, where the observatory buildings are set back in trees and of a more modest scale.
- 8.31 The visual impact of the building has been considered and the DAS submitted with the application include verified views. From these it is possible to see from verified view 02 (page 45 of the DAS) that the NCPP laboratory will have a significant presence on the junction between Madingley Road and JJ Thompson Avenue. Nevertheless, the illustrative visualization on the same page confirms that the scale will be appropriate to meet the aims that this junction will form one of the primary gateways to the West Cambridge campus, with the Cavendish III and Whittle Laboratory framing this primary entrance to the wider area.
- 8.32 The section provided within page 42 of the DAS demonstrates that the proposed extension sits well in the context of the proposed gateway for the wider West Cambridge site, with the Whittle Laboratory being approximately one storey lower than the Cavendish building to the west. This demonstrates that the building will not be unduly dominant or intrusive and will be just if the scale to celebrate this gateway to the West Cambridge campus, as expected within the wider OPA masterplan strategy and supported by the Cambridgeshire Quality Panel.
- 8.33 Officers are of the view are the proposed building will not result in significant visual harm from closer vantage points along Madingley Road to the east and west of the site as the tree belt

will remain the dominant feature along Madingley Road. As illustrated by both the verified views 01 and 02 (pages 44 and 45 of the DAS, respectively), the proposed acoustic screen north of the NCPP Test Hall is obscured by the woodland belt and will not be intrusive from Madingley Road.

Street Frontages

- 8.34 The NCPP testing hall accommodates testing equipment which requires strong acoustic treatment, which justifies the absence of any openings on the northern façade fronting the tree belt and landscaped buffer. Nevertheless, the proposed design of the NCPP includes a large portal window on the ground floor which provide views into the testing hall and the scientific production taking place in the building, giving opportunity for promoting science on show and engaging with the street.
- 8.35 The relocation of the existing office space to the southwest of the site would also enable some key active features to the ground floor to engage the street. As well as the main entrance facing south into the future public square, the ground floor accommodates collaboration spaces for the NCPP and the library and workshop along the western façade fronting JJ Thompson Avenue. Around the primary entrance on the south elevation the frontage is activated with a first-floor accessible terrace and colonnade at ground floor. The proposed creation of active frontages is acceptable in urban design terms and in accordance with the emerging OPA Design Guidelines.
- 8.36 From the NCPP test hall the building steps down slightly (0.5m) for the workshops and office space and to the south, and the similar height along the west elevation creates a continuity to the street scene, sitting well with the larger scale Cavendish building on the other side of JJ Thomson Avenue. The eastern side of the site contains some of the retained components from the existing Whittle Laboratory along with the back of house facilities. The definition of the yard with proposed gates and continuation of the building line with the proposed cycle park enclosure creates a well resolved boundary to the east side of the building.

Landscape and Public Realm

- 8.37 The Planning Statement submitted in support of the application notes that the approach to the landscape proposal to the west relates to JJ Thomson Ave and the ground floor uses of the building. The landscape design in this part of the site allows for the implementation of the enhanced cycleway along the eastern side of JJ Thomson Ave approved through the Cavendish Laboratory application (ref. 17/1799/FUL).
- 8.38 The landscape is paired back adjacent to the NCPP to allow the building to meet the ground and allow people to walk up to and dwell in front of the feature window. As the building moves back away from the road the landscape provides some defensible space in front of the workshop, library and NCPP project space not dominating the street scene. As noted by the Council's Urban Design officer, the service courtyard has been revised to create a well-defined and secured space to hold the west side of the open space and to provide a more logically placed cycle park. Within the courtyard shade tolerant planting has been introduced.
- 8.39 To the east of the building the proposals aimed to enhance the area of land where the office building is demolished, forming a new square with species rich meadow to the north and a lawn area with new tree planting to the southern side. The landscape approach has been further developed to achieve a better integration of the building with the retained tree belt on Madingley Road and to the more open nature of this part of the site. Between this area and the main entrance to the building a new garden walk is planned for, along the trees to be replaced at the southern boundary. This allows for a future visual integration with the Engineering square to the south, between Whittle and the William Gates building, once this is developed in a later phase of the OPA.

Public Art

- 8.40 The University has developed a public art strategy (PAS, dated 12 September 2017) which identifies different themes and priorities for public art across the West Cambridge campus site. This will be developed by the University within the remit of the OPA (ref. 16/1134/OUT) with the intention that the PAS would

provide the strategic framework for reserved matters applications in the future.

- 8.41 In correspondence dated 12 February 2020, the applicants have stated that the Whittle proposal follows the strategy set out in the OPA PAS. Further, the applicants advise on the same correspondence that the initial piece of art 'The Green' is fully funded and that the process for is well under way for securing the art in relation to that strand. For this reason, the current application proposes that the Whittle development provides the first contribution to the next commission following the PAS, relating to Water and the Ecological Corridor.
- 8.42 As per the OPA PAS, the contributions would follow a floorspace approach on calculating each of the sites/developments coming forward within the OPA / West Cambridge campus area. In the case of Whittle, the amount would be equivalent to £17,825, or equivalent to the net floorspace of 3,103m² being proposed with this application, which would not be enough for triggering the next full commission of £75,000.
- 8.43 For this reason, the applicants propose that the contribution relating to the current application is not spent until the total amount for the full commission is in place with future development in the wider West Cambridge and following the PAS. The further detail of the specific commission can only come forward following selection of an artist, through a process following the planning decision(s) which would trigger a full commission. This is the approach adopted in more recent permissions in the campus, notably for the Civil Engineering building (ref. 16/1811/FUL), the Shared Facility Hub (ref. 17/1896/FUL) and the Cavendish Laboratory (ref. 17/1799/FUL).
- 8.44 Given the above and the fact that the submitted PAS has been at this stage considered in accordance with the Council's Public Art SPD, officers are satisfied that a scheme for public art, either on site or in the immediate locality, can be satisfactorily agreed through the imposition of a planning condition.

Building Design

- 8.45 The overall composition of the NCPP test hall at the junctions of Madingley Road and JJ Thomson Avenue was raised at the review by the Cambridgeshire Quality Panel, who are supportive of the architectural response. This celebrates the NCPP function as a key driver in the proposed architectural response with a heavier weight approach taken through use of fibrocement panels, and continuous parapet line which runs through to the workshop and office section of the building to link them visually.
- 8.46 The Council's Urban Design officer is supportive of the proposals, stating that the proposed aluminium rain screen panels, Equitone fibre cement board, brickwork to match the existing building and blockwork are all considered to be acceptable in design terms and will combine to create a distinctive building that sits well with the emerging palette of materials found on the West Cambridge site. In officers' views, all the proposed elevations have a rhythm created by either the chosen panelised system on the NCPP test hall or the modular aluminium panel and window system employed on the other parts of the building. The cladding is being designed to be easily prefabricated and provide a high-performance façade, and the scale of the opening within the otherwise solid elevation creates an assertive form at a key entrance to the West Cambridge site. Signage zones are also identified on the elevations, which have been further developed along with the location of the portal window and the materials to the NCPP test hall, following recommendations by the Quality Panel. The Council's Urban Design officer recommends conditions requiring the submission of details of materials and rooftop plant and solar panels. These are supported and an additional condition requiring the submission of the signage details is recommended.
- 8.47 The proposed internal layout is a product of the Whittle Laboratory functional requirements of research and development. Laboratories and workshops undertaking heavier industrial operations will be grouped towards the northern end of the site to separate them from the more sensitive undertaking lighter, and more vibration sensitive operations located towards the south of site. The northern end of the building uses the natural site and existing building levels to allow for ease of

single level connections between the existing labs, heavy workshops and the NCPP lab.

8.48 The importance of creating a human scale and collaborative environment, with particular attention to the 'tea table' where currently students, engineers and industry traditionally meet has been a key drive of the internal design of the Whittle extension. The 'tea table' is a large space located at the first floor, adjacent to the breakout area and the void over the 'Spanish steps' or the exhibition area designed in the form of a rectangular amphitheatre. This "communal heart" seems well located and conveniently accessible to everyone from the lift core which runs from the ground floor to the second-floor level of the building. The void over the amphitheatre is a common aspect linking all level of this part of the Whittle Laboratory where the cellular offices and open plan areas would be above the library, exhibition and seminar rooms at the ground floor, clearly where the more publicly accessible areas of the building would be.

8.49 Consideration has been given for the extension to Whittle Lab to be an accessible building, with the ground floor showing wider corridors (generally of a minimum of 1.5m to 1.8m). Accessible toilets will be provided in all three main levels, as well as level access at all main entry points, and lifts enabling independent vertical movement. The DAS states that some of the features raised by the Council's Access officer and the Disability Panel will be provided, such as hearing loops, designated wheelchair spaces in the amphitheatre and a handrail along the 'Spanish steps' staircase. Details can be secured by way of condition.

Conclusion

8.50 Overall, the proposed extension to the Whittle Laboratory will create a distinctive new building that responds to both its setting and the constraints of the site and is in compliance with the requirements of policies 19, 55, 56 and 57 the Cambridge Local Plan, subject to the conditions referred to above.

Natural Environment

8.51 A Preliminary Ecological Appraisal (PEA) was submitted with the application to determine the likely ecological constraints of the application proposals for both demolition and extension part of the proposal, and to establish the potential scope of

further/more detailed ecological surveys which may be needed to support any future planning application.

- 8.52 As part of the protected species survey, a preliminary bat roost inspection of laboratory buildings and trees of enough maturity was completed. A follow-up bat roost emergence survey was also completed in September 2019 for a mature white willow pollard on the western side of the site for its potential value to roosting bats. Whilst evidence of bats was found in the buildings, no bats were seen to emerge from the mature white willow during the surveys.
- 8.53 In terms of habitats, the site comprises of semi-natural habitat included amenity grassland lawns to the west of the lab buildings, an area of broadleaved plantation woodland and adjoining semi-natural broadleaved woodland which bounded the north of the site, and a smaller area of semi-improved neutral grassland in the centre of the site. This latter provides potentially suitable habitat for reptiles although, due to the small size of the habitat and its isolation from any other suitable habitat areas, their presence is highly unlikely. In addition, previous surveys on the wider campus site have only recorded the occasional presence of individual grass snake, the latest from 2007.
- 8.54 A small number of common garden and hedgerow bird species were recorded during the survey, and the study concludes the site has the potential to support a small number of common hedgerow-nesting species, but it is too small and lacking in habitat diversity to support a large or particularly significant assemblage of species. Insufficient evidence for badgers was found in the site and it is expected they pass through the northern boundary infrequently.
- 8.55 The PEA concludes that most habitats on site are of low relative ecological value, with individual mature trees and semi-improved grassland of relatively increased ecological value. On-site buildings have negligible potential for roosting bats, and the one white willow towards the west of the site which has been assessed would not support a bat roost. The northern boundary woodland was previously confirmed as being used by commuting bats by surveys informing previous development of the site. Furthermore, whilst the site is likely to be of value to a small range of common hedgerow nesting bird species, these

would not be of any ornithological significance. The Council's Biodiversity officer is content with the survey effort made in support of the application.

Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG)

- 8.56 The Council's Biodiversity officer supports the proposed woodland enhancements, meadow creation and species mix which would appear to deliver no net loss, and potentially a net gain in biodiversity. This has been confirmed by the inclusion of the base line habitats and proposed habitats for enhancement and creation into the Defra biodiversity impact metric (Version 2). Officers are satisfied that a measurable net gain of 5.73% in habitat units will be achieved by the proposal.
- 8.57 The biodiversity assessment is based on assessment assumptions including that most of the grassland will be managed as meadow as opposed to amenity grassland lawn, which would result in a 'good' value as per the classification in the metric. Applicants have clarified that some lawn area will be retained and managed as such and meadow areas will not be open space where general access is encouraged, with terms of split set out in section 7.3 of the DAS. It has also been clarified that the brown roof will be in the University's ownership/management, which justify the value applied to this feature within the metric.
- 8.58 Furthermore, applicants have proposed that details will be specified through a Landscape Maintenance and Management Plan. In accordance with the advice offered by the Council's Landscape and Biodiversity officers, this can be secured by planning condition. Relevant conditions have also been recommended to include detailed specification for green roofs and programmed works and monitoring to secure the proposed woodland enhancements, should permission be granted to the Whittle Laboratory extension.

Green Infrastructure

- 8.59 Policy 19 of the Local Plan in setting out the requirements for the development of the West Cambridge campus to come forward, requires proposals to provide appropriate green

infrastructure which is well integrated with the existing and new development, as well as with the surrounding area.

8.60 As set out in the submitted Planning Statement, the landscape proposal to the north of the site has had to respond to the constraints of the development and the need to retain and enhance the woodland belt. A detailed survey shows that the site can accommodate the building without harming the trees that are identified to as mandatory in the outline application parameter plans, and that works in the vicinity required for drainage can also be accommodated.

8.61 A Woodland Maintenance and Management Plan has been developed to ensure that the woodland belt is managed strategically to thrive over time and enhance the vegetation on the edge of the development. The landscape proposals including those relating with the retention of the woodland belt are supported by the Council's Landscape and Arboricultural officers. The Woodland Maintenance and Management Plan will be one of the approved documents with this application, and the further landscape maintenance proposals will be secured by condition, should permission be granted.

Trees

8.62 Policy 71 of the Cambridge Local Plan sets out that development proposals should preserve, protect, and enhance existing trees and hedges that have amenity value as perceived from the public realm. Furthermore, Policy 71 states that development should not be permitted when involving felling to trees of amenity or other value. This is unless the proposal outweighs the current and future amenity value of the trees, and, where felling is proved necessary, appropriate replacement planting is provided.

8.63 The Arboricultural Impact Assessment (AIA) provided in support of the application was based on the inspection of a total of 118 individual trees and 19 groups, ranging from young planted trees of less than ten years of age through to a Willow and Elms of up to 80 years of age. The assessment states that most of the trees have been planted as part of a landscaping scheme, with later additions, mainly to the north and south of the site. Most of the trees are of less than 20 years of age and those on

the northern boundary are generally drawn up, crowded and with high or heavily asymmetric crowns.

8.64 Whilst retaining the majority of trees along the northern boundary of the site and the tree belt along Madingley Road, the proposal to extend the Whittle Laboratory would result in the removal of approximately 64 trees (32 individuals and 4 groups), mostly to accommodate the building extension itself, with some trees removed along the access road south of the site, as shown on Drawing EM01262-TMN-ZZ-00-DR-L-000002 P6. As noted in the AIA, the majority of the trees to be removed are relatively small, young trees planted in the last 20 years, of these most are Ash and with Ash Dieback, and high probability of being dead within the next 10 years. As such, the assessment concludes that their loss will not be significant in planning terms. The proposed tree losses to the north of the site are accepted by the Council's Arboricultural officer.

8.65 For the trees along the access road (identified as T1 to T14 in the drawing), their removal was agreed on the basis that replacement planting would be with large trees (at maturity) and sustainable. The Council's Arboriculture Officers does not object to the development, subject to the recommended conditions for the approval of an Arboricultural Method Statement (AMS) and a Tree Protection Plan (TPP) be imposed should permission be granted to the current application. Relevant conditions have been recommended.

Conclusion

8.66 The Council's Ecology Officer is content that the site has limited ecological value, and that the proposals do not impact on the site wide ecology designations. Habitats that have been identified through the wider OPA West Cambridge masterplan application will not be adversely affected by the proposed development.

8.67 The tree belt as a key feature to the West Cambridge northern boundary and to the character of Madingley Road will be maintained and enhanced. The Council's Arboriculture Officers does not object to the development and consider the removal and replanting of trees as proposed to be acceptable. Officers are of the view that the proposed conditions would enable an enhanced amenity value of the remaining and replanted trees.

- 8.68 For the above reasons, the proposals are considered compliant with policies 69, 70 and 71 of the Cambridge Local Plan, subject to the planning conditions as described above.

Climate Change and Resources Management

Energy Strategy

- 8.69 Policy 29 of the Local Plan is supportive of developments involving the provision of renewable and/or low carbon energy generation. The proposal for the Whittle Laboratory includes the use of air source heat pumps to provide heating and cooling and provision of a photovoltaic panel array of 210m², which would cover around 25% of the roof area.
- 8.70 This strategy would lead to a 37% reduction in carbon emissions compared to Part L 2013 and achieves five credits under Ene01 of BREEAM, which is supported by the Council's Sustainability Officer. A condition to secure implementation of this strategy is recommended.

Carbon reduction and sustainable design

- 8.71 Cambridge Local Plan supports the achievement of national carbon reduction targets, with expectations set out in Policy 28 for all new development to meet the minimum standards including for sustainable construction, carbon reduction and water efficiency. Furthermore, Policy 19 when determining the aspects relating with the site allocation within Cambridge Local Plan, sets out that the Council will be supportive of a site-wide approach to renewable or low carbon generation.
- 8.72 In terms of carbon reduction, new non-residential developments are expected to meet an of excellent BREEAM level as a minimum, with on-site carbon reduction in line with the minimum requirements associated with this level and full credits for water efficiency to be achieved for category Wat 01 of BREEAM. The submitted information include a BREEAM Stage 3 Planning Report which sets out the proposals will achieve BREEAM 'excellent', with a score of 77.9%. In addition, the proposals would target between 3 and 4 credits for water efficiency under BREEAM, noting that 3 credits represent a 40% reduction in water use are currently targeted, with the potential for a further credit. A condition is recommended to secure certification.

8.73 Policy 28 further states that all development should take the available opportunities to integrate the principles of sustainable design and construction into design of proposals. The proposals incorporate design and construction features which are supported by the Council's Sustainability officer, among which:

- Use of green roofs;
- Design for 75% of all habitable spaces to benefit from natural ventilation, with automated night purge designed in;
- Role of biophilic design in helping to improve the health and wellbeing of those using the building;
- Role of the external façade system in providing solar shading to minimise unwanted direct solar gain on the western and southern elevation;
- The use of an energy cost metric to identify sustainable solutions for the development;
- Overheating modelling using TM52, considering future climate scenarios.

8.74 In addition to the 37% reduction in carbon emissions set out in the energy strategy for the Whittle Laboratory, most part the scheme meets the targets set out in the bespoke Sustainability Assessment Matrix (SAM) that has been developed as part of the outline application (OPA) for the wider West Cambridge site. Whilst this application has yet to be determined, this comparison is supported by officers, to ensure the site-wide approach requested by Policy 19.

Water management and flood risk

8.75 Policy 32 of the Cambridge Local Plan advises that for previously developed sites opportunities should be taken to reduce the existing flood risk by the positioning of any development so that it does not increase flood risk elsewhere by either displacement of flood water or interruption of flood flow routes. The Environment Agency (EA) flood maps illustrate that the centre of the site is generally at high and medium risk from surface water, with medium to low and very low areas towards the west, south and eastern boundaries of the site.

8.76 As noted by the Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA), the overall surface water scheme for this site includes an extensive network of Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS). Applicants advise this will comprise green roof, vegetated swales/ planters,

permeable paving detention basins and below ground geocellular storage, providing the required degree of surface water attenuation storage. The LLFA had initially required that the surface water to be addressed further, with a requirement for finished floor levels to be raised higher.

- 8.77 The Council's Drainage Engineer noted in initial comments to the application that the Anglian Water surface water sewer is an historic culverted watercourse and the 'pond' is a remnant of the open watercourse. There is an overland flood route that follows the old route of the watercourse and is interrupted by the current design of the building. This flow route from Madingley Road will still exist after the new extension and needs to be addressed in the design of the external works so that no internal flooding occurs.
- 8.78 In further correspondence the applicants have advised that to deal with the existing flood water in the centre of the site, a new overland flood route retains/directs surface water to the north of the new/existing buildings, as shown on drawing EM01262-SAW-XX-XX-DR-C-0303. Furthermore, the central part of the site comprises porous paving as part of the SuDS and can store surface water up to the 1:100-year return period and would only generate overland flow from events exceeding this return period.
- 8.79 Following clarifications from the applicants and further correspondence with the Flood Authority, the LLFA are satisfied that the modelled surface water flooding against the buildings would only be during events exceeding a 1 in 100-year event plus 40% climate change. Further, the LLFA is satisfied that exceedance flows from the proposed attenuation basin will be contained to the north of the proposed building, with flows only being directed south-eastwards and towards buildings when storage in these areas is also exceeded.
- 8.80 Pre-construction and post-construction modelling of the surface water flooding needs have been submitted as above and the Council's Sustainable Drainage Engineer is satisfied that those have been considered in the design proposals and are acceptable. Officers are content that a suitable surface water and foul water drainage provision for the proposed development can be achieved.

8.81 In response to consultation, Anglian Water has stated the surface water strategy/flood risk assessment submitted with the planning application acceptable on what concerns the organization. This is on the basis that a condition be imposed for works to be carried out in accordance with the surface water strategy and submission of details of the surface water discharge, which is supported. Relevant conditions have been recommended.

Waste

8.82 The proposals include waste storage and recycling points provided within the building design, and applicants advise the University's own Facility Management will be responsible for the day to day management and collection of waste and collection services. Bin lorries will access the site from JJ Thompson and the access road south of the proposed buildings. The refuse collection will be from the east end of the access road, where bins will be temporarily held on the collection day, after being manually transferred through a paved area from the enclosed refuse store within the courtyard. This is consistent with the use distribution across the site, with deliveries and servicing taking place on the eastern parts of the building.

8.83 Refuse requirements are being considered in the context of servicing arrangements for the wider West Cambridge site and the waste strategy employed at the development will be developed in order to meet the requirements placed upon the development by BREEAM and the West Cambridge Sustainability Assessment Matrix (SAM 2017). Given this context and the support by Sustainability officers, the proposals are considered to meet the requirements of Policy 28 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2018.

Conclusion

8.84 Considering the above, the proposals are supported in terms of achieving sustainable construction and adequate resources and flood risk management, including through the exploration of alternative methods of surface water disposal. Therefore, the application is in line with the aims of policies 19, 28, 29, 31 and 32 of the Cambridge Local Plan, as well as with the Greater Cambridge Sustainable Design and Construction SPD 2020.

Infrastructure

8.85 Policy 19 of the adopted Cambridge Local Plan sets out that in the case of a proposal for development to come forward above the quantum permitted with the OPP, the precise quantum of new floorspace will be subject to testing and demonstration through the development of a revised OPA for the site. This would include a comprehensive transport strategy for the site, incorporating a sustainable transport plan to minimise reliance on private cars, and the enhancement of sustainable travel to support development. Policy 19 also requires in cases of densification of the site that the transport strategy includes assessing the level, form and type of car parking on the site.

Transport Assessment

8.86 The Transport Assessment (TA) prepared for the West Cambridge masterplan review within the OPA assessed the transport impacts associated with the increase in total floor area from 248,272m² to 500,280m² at the wider West Cambridge site. Accordingly, the proposal has identified a mitigation strategy to support these proposals, including the West Cambridge Travel Plan (TP).

8.87 The TA submitted with the current application assesses the standalone impact of the Whittle Laboratory redevelopment, in advance of the determination of the West Cambridge outline application. The assessment considers the Whittle Laboratory would form one of the first completions within the new masterplan, should the OPA be approved, and this approach aligns with Policy 19 requirements.

8.88 The TA submitted with the current Whittle application concludes that the proposal will not have any significant adverse impact on the highway and public transport network but there will be several additional cycle movements linked to the proposal. A review of the travel survey data indicates that those staff that are within a bus catchment generally already choose to cycle and no bus users were recorded within the travel survey. The assessment indicates an increase in 32 members of staff and 36 students, usually with 80% attendance on a typical day and forecasted proportion of 55% of staff members driving to the development. The future baseline for the TA has considered the

several committed developments associated with the densification of the West Cambridge campus.

- 8.89 In terms of motor-vehicular movements, the assessment concludes that there would be an increase of five two-way trips in the AM peak and seven two-way trips in the PM peak, which the Highways Authority has considered a robust approach and acceptable outcome. In response dated 16 January 2020, the Highways Authority has advised that JJ Thompson Avenue as a private road would only be subject to modifications to the existing adopted public highway at the junction of the avenue and Madingley Road, with further correspondence confirming the relatively small additional vehicular flows would not have a significant impact on this or other local junctions. Given this context, mitigations relating with motor-vehicular impact would not be necessary to make the Whittle Laboratory extension acceptable in planning terms.
- 8.90 Nevertheless, following review of the impacts from the application the Highways Authority recommended mitigations be sought for the cycle movements occurring with development. This would be in the form of a mandatory two-way cycle way along Clerk Maxwell Road, with condition for submission of details to be agreed and secured prior to approval be given to the current application. The implementation of the two-way cycle path will have a timeframe secured by condition; however, the works will be undertaken by the developer as obligation under a S278 agreement between the Cambridgeshire County and the applicants.
- 8.91 Further to the above, a condition requiring a Travel Plan to be agreed prior to occupation is recommended by the Highways Authority as part of the mitigation package. This is supported and the package of mitigation requested by the Highways Authority will mitigate the transport impact of the development based on its impact over and above the current situation. Appropriate mitigation for cycling is provided, in accordance with Local Plan Policy 81.

Madingley Road Interventions

- 8.92 The Madingley Road Cycling and Walking Project is a Greater Cambridge Partnership (GCP) initiative resulting from a 2019 consultation with local residents, workers and regular users of

Madingley Road, as well as key stakeholders, on potential improvements to make walking and cycling along the route more attractive. Two options (1 and 2) along with a Madingley Road Landscape Appraisal were subject to public consultation, and the contributions are currently under review. A report of the consultation will be considered by the GCP Joint Assembly and Executive Board later in 2020 (<https://consultcambs.uk.engagementhq.com/madingleyrd2020>, assessed 6 May 2020).

- 8.93 Following officers' request, applicants have provided drawings (EM01262-TMN-XX-XX-SK-L-40043 Rev A and 40044 Rev A) in support of the application, which demonstrate the Whittle Laboratory extension would not interfere with either Option 1 or 2 of the Madingley Road improvements, as proposed by GCP. In response to consultation the cover letter for the amended information notes the proposed building sits approximately 20 metres clear of the proposed routes and does not therefore prejudice the ability for either scheme to come forward. Officers note from the submitted drawings that the red boundary adjoins the limit of the GCP proposals in either improvements options and therefore are content that the current application would not interfere with the Madingley Road Cycling and Walking Project.
- 8.94 Applicants note in the same correspondence dated 6 March 2020 that the planting location of the replacement trees in the north-western corner of the application site has been revised (EM01262-TMN-ZZ-00-DR-L-000004_P5) to avoid conflict with one of the proposed trees and some low level street planting. Applicants note that in both GCP options existing scrub vegetation overhanging the footpath is to be removed, which is consistent with the GCP landscape appraisal (pages 15 and 16) issued as part of the consultation and is shown on the overlay plans (EM01262-TMN-XX-XX-SK-L-40043 Rev A and 40044 Rev A). The tree planting proposal has been accepted by the Council's Arboricultural officer and the amendments are supported.
- 8.95 Bus services operate on Madingley Road, with the nearest bus stop at approximately 100m to the west of the north-western most corner of the application site. As such and as demonstrated by the overlay drawings (EM01262-TMN-XX-XX-SK-L-40043 Rev A and 40044 Rev A) provided with the

amendments to the application, the proposals would not interfere with existing bus stops along this route.

8.96 Third party comments have raised the issue of securing transport mitigation through the S106 planning obligation process, towards improvements to Madingley Road. However, the application would result in no more than seven two-way trips in the peak hours and the transport assessment concludes that the proposal will not have any significant adverse impact on motor-vehicular movements, which is accepted by the Highways Authority. As previously discussed, mitigations as a result from development increasing cycling movements will be delivered in the form of the implementation of a two-way cycleway along Clerk Maxwell Road. This will be secured by condition, with works to be carried out by the applicants under a Highways Act S278 agreement, as confirmed by the Cambridgeshire County Council, acting as Highways Authority.

8.97 In terms of the wider improvements to transport and mobility in the area, it is noted that contributions to the Greater Cambridge Partnership (GCP) A428 Cambridge to Cambourne project is under negotiation for the outline planning application (OPA). It is the view of officers that contributions to this project would be inappropriate, given the extant 1999 outline permission (OPP) and the negligible impact in terms of additional staff and students occupying the Whittle Laboratory, if this permission is granted.

Parking management

8.98 To inform the technical work within the TA, the applicants have undertaken a site-wide car parking occupancy survey and a car and cycle parking occupancy survey in the vicinity of the site, in May 2019. The cycle parking occupancy survey was repeated later in June 2019 to verify the occupancy of a few cycle parking areas around the Whittle Laboratory. The methodology used for the surveys has been accepted by the Highways Authority.

8.99 Based on the surveys, the TA concludes that the demand associated with the Whittle Laboratory extension can be accommodated within the existing car parks in the area and additional cycle parking would be required. The TA submitted with the application sets out the total car parking capacity across the wider West Cambridge campus in May 2019 was of

1,797 spaces, with occupancy survey identifying 1,272 (71%) spaces as being the highest car parking occupancy that occurred during a single hour and demonstrating that spare car parking capacity across the wider campus. Table 3.7 of the TA shows that whilst both car and cycle parking are over capacity at 108% and 103% respectively in the immediate vicinity of the Whittle site, there is residual car parking in the area.

8.100 Further to this assessment, Table 6.15 of the TA demonstrates that within the West Cambridge masterplan, parking areas 15, 18, 20, 23, 41, 49, 50, 51, 59, 60, 61 and 73 have ample spare capacity and can accommodate the majority of the parking requirements for Whittle. This is mainly due to the recently completed Civil Engineering building (ref. 16/1811/FUL) requirements for less 94 spaces than shown in the table, resulting in a cumulative residual capacity in the busiest hour of 76 spaces, in the vicinity of the site. Considering this worst-case scenario, the proposal is for accommodating the car parking spaces required by the Whittle extension through the upgrade of parking area 60.

8.101 Amongst the 23 existing car parking spaces within the Whittle site, only eight spaces are proposed to be retained, therefore with a significant net reduction in car parking spaces. The Highways Authority notes this is below Cambridge's indicative parking standards of 1 car parking space for every 4 staff members, or a total of 19 car parking spaces if assessing the Whittle extension on its own merits. Nevertheless, given the residual car parking capacity across West Cambridge campus and in the immediate vicinity of the application site, the proposed net number of car parking spaces is acceptable. This assessment considers the approach given by Policy 19 of the Local Plan and the need to consider the assessment of the wider campus in proposals resulting on the densification of the site(s), as in the case of this current Whittle Laboratory application. It is noted that the Local Plan parking standards in Policy 82 refer to the maximum, and not the minimum, provision for car parking.

8.102 The net provision of eight car parking spaces include two disabled spaces, which equates to 20% of the total net provision and 5% of the current mode share (55%) of the predicted 74 staff members of the Whittle extension using car as a mean of travelling. This provision is supported and accords with the

requirements of the Cambridge Local Plan. Further to the parking spaces, provisions have been made for a drop-off area near the main entrance of the building.

8.103 The proposal for reducing car parking spaces within the Whittle site aligns with the aims of the Local Plan to reduce private car dependency, and to support the enhancement of sustainable travel to support development. In this sense and having concluded for the overcapacity of the existing cycle parking spaces, the proposal is for a removal of 40 existing cycle spaces, with new on-site provision of 128 cycle parking spaces. This is well above the minimum of 78 spaces required for students and staff, as per the current Cambridge Local Plan standards, and is supported.

8.104 In the view of officers, adequate car parking is retained to meet the needs of future building occupiers in the short to medium term. The approach to car parking provision for the Whittle Laboratory extension accords with the emerging outline strategy of reducing car trips and travel demand management within the wider West Cambridge campus and in its own merits. Approval of this application will not prejudice the Council's position in relation to the ongoing work associated with the OPA (ref. 16/1134/OUT) Transport Assessment.

Airport Safeguarding

8.105 The site is within an area of protected airspace for Cambridge Airport which is required to be kept free of obstruction from tall structures. Following requirements in Policy 37 of the Cambridge Local Plan, consultation was undertaken with the operator of the airport and Ministry of Defence (MOD).

8.106 Cambridge International Airport has examined the application from the airport safeguarding perspective and concluded the proposal does not conflict with the safeguarding criteria and raises no objection to the application. In accordance with the advice offered, a condition requiring details of crane usage is recommended.

Human Health and Residential Amenity

8.107 There is a significant distance of approximately 160m to 170m separating the proposed development from the nearest

residential property at 14 Conduit Head Road to the northwest and 53 Madingley Road to the east. Given the distances involved, the tree belt and Madingley Road, there will be no direct visual impacts, enclosure or over shadowing resulting from the development.

8.108 Pollution from the demolition and construction phases has the potential to affect the amenity of surrounding properties if not mitigated / controlled. In the interests of amenity, standard construction/demolition conditions are recommended, relating to the associated delivery and collection hours, noise / vibration / piling and dust.

Noise and Vibration

8.109 Policy 35 of the Cambridge Local Plan requires developments to demonstrate that no adverse impact from noise and/or vibration will occur to human health and amenity, including from cumulative effects and construction phase. When inevitable, noise impacts should be reduced preferably by high quality acoustic design.

8.110 The new Whittle Laboratory will house the National Centre for Propulsion and Power (NCP). Potential sources of operational noise include (but are not limited to) the following:

- Noise breakout from new NCP laboratory facility building extension
- Process-related noise from the NCP laboratory testing equipment
- Fixed ventilation and other plant / equipment noise emissions including HVAC plant serving the offices – external plant enclosures
- Vehicle movements including servicing deliveries and collections

8.111 Having reviewed the Noise Impact Assessment (NIA) submitted with the application, Environmental Health officers note the predicted noise rating levels and impact assessment indicate that the noise emissions are likely to be acceptable. Furthermore, officers are of the view that the operational noise levels have negligible or no effect on the acoustic character of the area, and no impact on quality of life of residents.

8.112 Nevertheless, design options consider acoustic matters as previously discussed in this report. Environmental Health officers note that as final design is ongoing and not completed, certain assumptions on the NIA (e.g. building façade performance and possible inclusion of pressure release panels to the NCPP Laboratory) will need to be confirmed at detailed design stage. Despite this, officers are confident that acceptable operation noise levels can be achieved either at day or night-time hours by a combination of careful acoustic design and the implementation of a noise and vibration insulation or mitigation scheme. Accordingly, a condition referring to operation noise mitigation scheme is recommended.

8.113 In terms of noise from vehicle movements, officers note the current noise environment around the site is generally dominated by traffic noise from Madingley Road (to the immediate north). Further, Environmental Health officers note that the proposed Whittle extension is approximately 22 to 25m from the Madingley Road carriage way and 10m from JJ Thomson Avenue, and reflected traffic noise is not envisaged in the immediate vicinity of the proposals.

8.114 The servicing arrangements being concentrated to the east of the site contribute to noise being reduced to that area. Environmental Health officers conclude that any changes in general vehicle movements to the development site and any associated vehicular servicing operational noise levels are negligible and that no unacceptable adverse noise impacts are envisaged with the proposed development. Conditions are recommended restricting servicing deliveries and collections to certain day time hours, as a standard practice in Cambridge, and compliance with the Servicing and Operational Management Plan submitted with the application.

Contaminated Land

8.115 A Site Investigation Report comprising a desk study and ground investigation was submitted with the application, seeking to establish the history of the site and including the assessment of ground contamination. The desk study indicates the agricultural use of the site and alterations in the water environment in the area until 1946, when development had occurred to the north and east of the site, principally consisting of housing to the north-east and east, and University of Cambridge buildings to

the north. Later maps and aerial images show the existing Whittle Laboratory and the expansion of educational uses within the West Cambridge campus, with further the expansion/consolidation of farming further to the west and residential further to the north-east and east, a situation which remains similar to date.

8.116 Although records of historical potentially contaminative uses listed for the site include the Whittle Laboratory, no evidence was encountered within the exploratory holes during the investigation, including visual evidence of asbestos containing material (ACM). Further, the report concludes as result of further laboratory analysis that the made ground did not contain elevated concentrations of contaminants exceeding the soil screening criteria for residential end uses, or for a commercial/industrial end use.

8.117 Environmental Health officers are of the view that the Site Investigation Report comprises of a very thorough desk study and an appropriately designed site investigation. Officers are content that the investigation is robust and confirms the findings of the preliminary conceptual model, in that the application site is suitable for use without the need for any further assessment and/or remediation. Nonetheless, conditions relating to unexpected contamination and materials management plan are recommended.

Light Pollution

8.118 The Obtrusive Lighting Report provided with the application concludes that, based on the current modelled design, the exterior lighting installation as proposed is likely to comply with the environmental zone 'E3' category of the Institution of Lighting Professionals (ILP) Guidance Notes for the Reduction of Obtrusive Light: GN01 (2011) at nearby receptors.

8.119 Environmental Health officers note that as part of the new Whittle Laboratory development, new external lighting will be required to illuminate the traffic areas outside the building; the courtyard; and the new access road to the east of the development. Furthermore, officers are of the view that the report is comprehensive and the proposals for artificial lighting scheme design meet requirements within Policy 34 of the Cambridge Local Plan, as an unacceptable artificial lighting

impacts on human amenity or quality of life is not envisaged with the proposals. This is on the basis that the proposed lighting strategy is fully implemented and maintained thereafter, which is recommended to be secured by condition.

8.120 During consultation, concerns were raised by neighbours in relation to the light impacts on the continued operation of the Institute of Astrology, at north of Madingley Road. Environmental Health officers note that whilst assessing the proposals, consideration is given to light impacts on human health / quality of life / amenity, as required by planning policies. Nonetheless, officers note that the Obtrusive Lighting Report submitted in support of the application does assess sky glow as a form of light pollution in accordance with ILP guidance for obtrusive lighting. There is compliance with sky glow (Upward Light Ratio) limits, which is predicted as 0% compared with recommended limits between 2.5% (E2 Zone) to 5 % (E3 Zone). The report concludes that that sky glow has been minimised to reflected light from the landscape only, by not including any fittings that light directly upwards.

8.121 Moreover, Environmental Health officers clarify that determining lighting 'environmental zone' classification is a professional judgement. In support of the proposal the Obtrusive Lighting Report states that the site of the new development will be considered a class E3, applicable for a suburban site, with medium district brightness such as in small town centres or a suburban location, due to its proximity to other educational developments in the wider West Cambridge campus. An E2 zone is would apply to a rural location, with low district brightness. The classification of the Whittle Laboratory extension as E3 (suburban) is considered acceptable and reasonable for this site-specific location, in officer's views.

8.122 Whilst noting that the use of motion sensors in external lighting may be considered good practice and energy efficient, the submitted Obtrusive Lighting Report concludes that based on the current modelled design the exterior lighting installation when on is likely to comply with the 'E3' category. Officers note that whilst the assessment does not include light spill from existing external lighting, the contribution is expected to be small, which is considered acceptable. As such officers reiterate that artificial lighting impacts on quality of life / amenity are

unlikely to arise or would have either none or an insignificant level of impact.

Air quality, Odour and Dust

8.123 Cambridge Local Plan Policy 36 requires applicants to demonstrate the proposed development will not lead to significant adverse effects on health, the environment or amenity from polluting or malodorous emissions, or dust or smoke emissions to air. Furthermore, the applications for sensitive-end use must demonstrate these adverse effects will not occur within the proposed development.

8.124 Environmental Health officers note the Transport Assessment submitted with the application to predict an increase of 12 peak hour vehicle movements and deliveries. Nevertheless, the proposed development will lead to a decrease in car parking spaces (albeit to be placed elsewhere within the West Cambridge campus) and an increased cycle provision from 40 to 128 cycle parking spaces to accommodate both staff and students. Furthermore, the proposals include heating and hot water provision from electric sources only with no combustion emissions to air.

8.125 The Cambridge City Council - Air Quality Action Plan 2018 - 2023 (AQAP 2019) measures 36a and 36b state that where there is an intensification of a site and/or new or replacement car park electric vehicle (EV) charge points are required. Based on this and supported by the increase in vehicular movement and further information above, Environmental Health officers have no objections on air quality grounds subject to an Electrical Vehicle (EV) charging point condition being imposed should permission be granted.

Conclusion

8.126 Environmental Health officers note that in the context of the medium and longer term the same high level of protection of the existing amenity of residential properties can be secured by the imposition of the same or similar conditions on the wider Cambridge West OPA (ref. 16/1134/OUT). In its own merits the proposals are considered compliant with Cambridge's Local Plan. the recommendations by the Environmental Health team

are supported and the relevant conditions are recommended if permission is granted.

9.0 CONCLUSION

Planning Balance

- 9.1 The NPPF in paragraph 11 sets out a presumption in favour of sustainable development, with proposals that accord with the Development Plan to be approved without delay. The proposed development will provide a high-quality building for research and development functions and is in accordance with the and is in accordance with the existing strategy for West Cambridge set out in Policy 19 of the Local Plan and site allocation M13.
- 9.2 The development scheme would have dis-benefits of construction related impacts and the removal of a significant number of trees existing on the site. These dis-benefits have been evaluated as part of this report and overall, it is considered that they do not outweigh the benefits that the scheme would bring, which are set out below and which can be mitigated by planning condition.
- 9.3 Significant economic benefits locally will result from the proposed development, through the employment of 74 members of the Whittle Laboratory staff and academic research benefiting students. The outcome of this enhanced academic facility will enable innovative technology for power and propulsion engines, which when successful will have remarkable effects in society and for the environment.
- 9.4 Environmentally, the proposed maintenance and management of the existing tree belt will improve not only the local green infrastructure, but also the character of Madingley Road and one of the approaches to the City from the west. In parallel, the West Cambridge campus will be marked in this route, framed by the gateway created by the emerging Cavendish laboratory and Whittle, in this important junction with JJ Thompson Avenue. Despite the loss of some of the existing trees, the amenity value of those remaining and to be replanted, is expected to improve, with the implementation of a Woodland Management and Maintenance Plan and a Landscape Maintenance and Management Plan.

- 9.5 Socially, the improvements the improvements for the local cycling network with the implementation of a two-way cycleway along Clerk Maxwell Road will benefit not only the occupiers of the proposed development, but users in the wider campus and in the vicinity of the site. This will have a direct impact on the active travel and well-being of people living and working in Cambridge City.

10.0 RECOMMENDATION

APPROVE subject to the following conditions:

1. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved drawings and technical documents:

EM01262-SAW-XX-XX-DR-C-0302_P01
EM01262-SAW-XX-XX-DR-C-0303_P01
EM01262-TMN-WH-01-DR-L-000001_P2
EM01262-TMN-WH-01-DR-L-000002_P3
EM01262-TMN-ZZ-00-DR-L-000000_P1
EM01262-TMN-ZZ-00-DR-L-000002_P6
EM01262-TMN-ZZ-00-DR-L-000003_P5
EM01262-TMN-ZZ-00-DR-L-000004_P5
EM01262-TMN-ZZ-00-DR-L-000005_P5
EM01262-TMN-ZZ-00-DR-L-000006_P5
EM01262-TMN-ZZ-00-DR-L-000007_P5
EM01262-TMN-ZZ-00-DR-L-000008_P5
EM01262-TMN-ZZ-ZZ-DR-L-100001_P5
EM01262-TMN-ZZ-ZZ-DR-L-100004_P2
EM01262-TMN-ZZ-ZZ-DR-L-100007_P2
EM01262-TMN-ZZ-ZZ-DR-L-100010_P5
EM01262-TMN-ZZ-ZZ-DR-L-100011_P4
EM01262-TMN-ZZ-ZZ-DR-L-100012_P4
EM01262-TMN-ZZ-ZZ-DR-L-100013_P2
EM01262-TMN-ZZ-ZZ-DR-L-100014_P2
EM01262 - GAL - WH - 01 - DR - A - 40030_Rev3
EM01262 - GAL - WH - 02 - DR - A - 40040_Rev3
EM01262 - GAL - WH - B1 - DR - A - 40010_Rev3
EM01262 - GAL - WH - GF - DR - A - 40020_Rev3
EM01262 - GAL - WH - GF - DR - A - 40021_Rev3
EM01262 - GAL - WH - RF - DR - A - 40050_Rev4
EM01262 - GAL - WH - RF - DR - A - 40051_Rev3
EM01262 - GAL - WH - XX - DR - A - 40000_Rev5
EM01262 - GAL - WH - XX - DR - A - 40001_Rev3

EM01262 - GAL - WH - XX - DR - A - 40002_Rev3
EM01262 - GAL - WH - XX - DR - A - 40003_Rev4
EM01262 - GAL - WH - XX - DR - A - 40004_Rev3
EM01262 - GAL - WH - XX - DR - A - 42010_Rev3
EM01262 - GAL - WH - XX - DR - A - 42020_Rev3
Woodland Management and Maintenance Plan Ref 19-1151 V3

Reason: To facilitate any future application to the Local Planning Authority under Section 73 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

2. Prior to the commencement of site clearance, a pre-commencement site meeting shall be held and attended by the site manager, the arboricultural consultant and Local Planning Authority Tree Officer to discuss details of the approved Arboricultural Method Statement.

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.

3. No development shall commence until the applicant, or their agents or successors in title, has implemented a programme of archaeological work which has been secured in accordance with a written scheme of investigation (WSI) which has been submitted to and approved by the local planning authority in writing. For land that is included within the WSI, no 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

Reason: To secure satisfactory mitigation measures and to conserve the interest of the historic environment evidence in compliance with paragraph 199 of the NPPF and Policy 61 of the Cambridge Local Plan.

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

In a logical sequence the AMS and TPP will consider all phases of construction in relation to the potential impact on trees and detail tree works, the specification and position of protection barriers and ground protection and all measures to be taken for the protection of any trees from damage during the course of any activity related to the development, including supervision, demolition, foundation design, storage of materials, ground works, installation of services, erection of scaffolding and landscaping.

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

5. No development shall commence (including any pre-construction, demolition, enabling works or piling), until a written report, regarding the demolition / construction noise and vibration impact associated with this development, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The report shall be in accordance with the provisions of BS 5228:2009 Code of Practice for noise and vibration control on construction and open sites and include full details of any piling and mitigation measures to be taken to protect local residents from noise and or vibration. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details only.

Due to the proximity of this site to existing residential premises and other noise sensitive premises, impact pile driving is not recommended.

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

6. No development shall commence until a programme of measures to minimise the spread of airborne dust from the site during the demolition / construction period has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be implemented in accordance with the approved scheme.

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

7. Prior to commencement of development on site, or within 6 months of commencement, a BRE issued Design Stage Certificate demonstrating that the development has achieved a BREEAM rating of 'excellent' shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In the interests of reducing carbon dioxide emissions and promoting principles of sustainable construction and efficient use of buildings, as set out by Cambridge Local Plan 2018 Policy 28 and Supplementary Planning Document 'Greater Cambridge Sustainable Design and Construction', January 2020.

8. Prior to importation or reuse of material for the development (or phase of) a Materials Management Plan (MMP) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The MMP shall:
 - a) Include details of the volumes and types of material proposed to be imported or reused on site
 - b) Include details of the proposed source(s) of the imported or reused material
 - c) Include details of the chemical testing for ALL material to be undertaken before placement onto the site
 - d) Include the results of the chemical testing which must show the material is suitable for use on the development

e) Include confirmation of the chain of evidence to be kept during the materials movement, including material importation, reuse placement and removal from and to the development.

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

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

9. Prior to the erection of any cranes on site details of any intended crane usage shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure the safe movement of aircraft and the operation of Cambridge Airport (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policy 37).

10. No above ground works shall commence until a surface water drainage scheme for the site, based on sustainable drainage principles, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The scheme shall subsequently be implemented in full accordance with the approved details prior to first occupation.

The scheme shall be based upon the principles within the agreed Flood Risk and Drainage Strategy Report prepared by Smith and Wallwork Engineers (ref: EM01262-SAW-ZZ-ZZ-RP-S0009) dated 2 April 2020 and shall also include:

- a) Detailed drawings of the entire proposed surface water drainage system, including levels, gradients, dimensions and pipe reference numbers;
- b) Full details of the proposed attenuation and flow control measures;
- c) Details of overland flood flow routes in the event of system exceedance, with demonstration that such flows can be appropriately managed on site without increasing flood risk to occupants;
- d) Full details of the maintenance/adoption of the surface water drainage system;

e) Measures taken to prevent pollution of the receiving surface water. The drainage scheme must adhere to the hierarchy of drainage options as outlined in the NPPF PPG.

Reason: To ensure that the proposed development can be adequately drained and to ensure that there is no increased flood risk on or off site resulting from the proposed development (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 Policies 31 and 32)

11. Prior to the installation of any internal and external operational machinery, plant and equipment (to include any mechanical and electrical building services, electricity transformers, emergency generators, ventilation systems and air source heat pumps) a detailed noise and vibration insulation scheme and implementation of other noise mitigation/control measures as appropriate in order to mitigate / control and reduce to a minimum the level of noise / vibration emissions from the said building / machinery / plant / equipment and to protect the amenity of neighbouring properties, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

The said noise and vibration insulation / mitigation scheme shall include but not exhaustively, consideration of the following:

- a) sound reduction indices (R) of the airborne sound insulation properties / performance (in octave and 1/3 octave frequencies as appropriate) for each external building façade construction element - walls / panels / screens, roofs, windows and doors including any acoustic door sets. The sound reduction index performance for each element shall be certified by official "third party" laboratories according to relevant international and or national standards.
- b) details and calculations of the airborne sound insulation performance of the external composite building façades having regard to representative internal noise levels and use
- c) detailed architectural construction and engineering specifications and drawings (with sections) for each composite element of the external building façade
- d) operational noise data for any plant and equipment and the airborne sound reduction performance of any acoustic / sound silencers, screens or enclosures
- e) ventilation provision
- f) administrative/management noise mitigation controls, as appropriate

The noise and vibration insulation / mitigation scheme shall be in accordance with and shall demonstrate compliance with the principles, operational noise / vibration levels / limits, outline noise insulation / mitigation measures and recommendations detailed in the submitted 'Cambridge University Whittle II Laboratory: Noise Impact Assessment (Report ref. EM01262-MXF-WH-XX-RP-Y-150000, 29th November 2019 - Max Fordham LLP Acoustics Team)'.

The development shall be constructed / completed and operated in strict accordance with the building / machinery / plant / equipment noise and vibration insulation / mitigation scheme as approved. The approved scheme shall be maintained and retained thereafter.

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

12. No development shall commence, with the exception of below ground works and the erection of the 'relocated switch gear room' showing in drawing EM01262-GAL-WH-XX-DR-A-40003_Rev4, 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 and bat boxes on the new buildings and retained trees. 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.

13. Prior to the commencement of the development hereby approved, with the exception of below ground works and the erection of the 'relocated switch gear room' showing in drawing EM01262-GAL-WH-XX-DR-A-40003_Rev4, full details including samples of all the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of buildings, which includes external features such as non-masonry walling systems; bricks; windows, cills, headers and surrounds; doors and entrances; external metal work, balustrades, rain water goods, edge junction and coping details; colours and surface finishes, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. This may consist of a materials schedule, large-scale drawings and/or samples. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Sample panels (minimum of 1.5x1.5m) of the facing materials to be used shall be erected to establish the detailing of materials shall be agreed in writing with the local planning authority.

The quality of finish and materials incorporated in any approved sample panels, which shall not be demolished prior to completion of development, shall be maintained throughout the development

Reason: To ensure that the appearance of the external surfaces is appropriate and that the quality and colour of the detailing of the facing materials maintained throughout the development. (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 Policies 55 and 57).

14. Within 12 months of the commencement of development a scheme for the provision of two-way cycleway along Clerk Maxwell Road shall be submitted to and approved by the local planning authority. The approved scheme shall then be implemented in accordance with the approved plans prior to occupation of the approved development or within an alternative timeframe agreed in writing by the Planning Authority.

Reason: In order that adequate mitigation is provided for the transport impact of the development in accordance with Cambridge Local Plan 2018 Policy 81.

15. Prior to 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. For the 8 parking spaces as detailed on site in the submissions, the scheme shall include:
 - a) Three slow electric vehicle charge points with a minimum power rating output of 7kW
 - b) One rapid electric vehicle charge point enabling 80% charge in one hour or under
 - c) 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 cabling to parking spaces for the remaining 4 car parking spaces to facilitate and enable the future installation and activation of additional active electric vehicle charge points as required
 - d) The electric vehicle charge points shall be designed and installed in accordance with BS EN 61851 or as superseded.

The electric vehicle charge point scheme as approved shall be fully installed / implemented 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) paragraph 105, 110, 170 and 181, Policy 36 - Air Quality, Odour and Dust of the Cambridge Local Plan (2018) and Cambridge City Council's adopted Air Quality Action Plan (2018).

16. Details of the biodiverse (green) roof(s) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to the installation of the green roof(s). Details of the green roof(s) shall include means of access for maintenance, plans and sections showing the make-up of the sub-base to be used and include the following:
 - a) Roofs can/will be biodiverse based with extensive substrate varying in depth from between 80-150mm,

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

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

17. Prior to the commencement of installation of any roof mounted equipment, full details of all roof top plant and solar panels and/or photovoltaic cells, including type, dimensions, materials, location, fixing, etc. shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure that the external appearance of the buildings is maintained throughout the development (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policies 55 and 57).

18. Prior to construction of the rain gardens, details of the structures shall be submitted and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The details shall include dimensioned plans and cross sections through the rain gardens, drainage details, soils, mulch, and 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).

19. Details of the irrigation system for the roof terrace and trough planting should be submitted prior to completion. Details should include water delivery system to planting, water source, automatic control system, times and amounts of water to planting beds, system maintenance details (to be included within the Management Plan).

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).

20. Prior to first use, details of signage and materials in relation to signage to be located in the areas defined as signage zones on the approved elevations (drawing numbers EM01262-GAL-WH-XX-DR-A-42010 Rev3 and EM01262-GAL-WH-XX-DR-A-42020 Rev3) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved material sample and signage details.

Reason: To ensure that the appearance of the external surfaces is appropriate (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policies 55 and 57).

21. Details for the long-term maintenance arrangements for the surface water drainage system (including all SuDS features) to be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to the first occupation of any building.

The submitted details should identify runoff sub-catchments, SuDS components, control structures, flow routes and outfalls. In addition, the plan must clarify the access that is required to each surface water management component for maintenance purposes. The maintenance plan shall be carried out in full thereafter.

Reason To ensure the satisfactory maintenance of drainage systems that are not publically adopted, in accordance with the requirements of paragraphs 163 and 165 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

22. Prior to first occupation or the bringing into use of the development, hereby permitted, the soft landscape specification shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Soft landscape specification shall include green/biodiverse roofs, planting in planters on terrace, ground preparation including decompaction, soil handing and spreading, cultivation and other operations associated with good practice plant and grass establishment 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).

23. 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 (minimum 25 years), management responsibilities and maintenance schedules for all landscape areas shall be submitted to and approved by the local planning authority in writing. The Plan must provide specification for meadow establishment and ongoing management cutting regimes and collection of arisings. The Landscape Maintenance and Management 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).

24. Prior to occupation of the building hereby approved, full details of a scheme of public art shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved scheme for public art shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details not later than 6 months after the first occupation of the building.

Reason: In the interest of creating successful, high quality, attractive environments. (Cambridge Local Plan 2018; policy 56).

25. No occupation of the building shall commence until a Travel Plan has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The Travel Plan shall specify the methods to be used to discourage the use of the private motor vehicle and the arrangements to encourage use of alternative sustainable travel arrangements such as public transport, car sharing, cycling and walking. The Travel Plan shall be implemented as approved upon the occupation of the development and monitored in accordance with details to be agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

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

26. Prior to first occupation of the development hereby permitted, fire hydrants shall be installed and fully operational in accordance with a scheme for the provision of fire hydrants that has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure the provision of adequate water supply infrastructure to protect the safe living and working environment for all users and visitors in accordance with Cambridge Local Plan policies 56, 57 and 85.

27. Prior to the occupation, or within 6 months of occupation, a certificate following a post-construction review, shall be issued by an approved BREEAM Assessor to the Local Planning Authority, indicating that the approved BREEAM rating has been met. In the event that such a rating is replaced by a comparable national measure of sustainability for building design, the equivalent level of measure shall be applicable to the proposed development.

Reason: In the interests of reducing carbon dioxide emissions and promoting principles of sustainable construction and efficient use of buildings, in accordance with Cambridge Local Plan 2018 Policy 28 and Supplementary Planning Document 'Greater Cambridge Sustainable Design and Construction', January 2020.

28. 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 / scheme has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Thereafter the development shall not be implemented otherwise than in accordance with the approved remediation scheme.

Reason: To ensure that any unexpected contamination is rendered harmless in the interests of environmental and public safety in accordance with Cambridge Local Plan, 2018 - Policy 33: Contaminated land.

29. Save for collections from and deliveries to the approved use, the 'rating level' (as defined in BS 4142: 2014 - Methods for rating and assessing industrial and commercial sound - or any successor document) of all sources of sound / noise emissions, from and attributable to operation of the site and approved use when collectively measured at the property boundary of any premises / property (for avoidance of doubt this is the actual property boundary inclusive of external amenity areas such as property / garden boundaries or similar) shall not exceed the Operational Sound / Noise Rating Levels on any day, in the tables and explanation notes as set out in section 2.4 and 2.5 in the submitted 'Cambridge University Whittle II Laboratory: Noise Impact Assessment (Report ref. EM01262-MXF-WH-XX-RP-Y-150000, 29th November 2019 - Max Fordham LLP Acoustics Team)'

Following written notification from the Local Planning Authority (LPA) that it is their view that the above Operational Sound / Noise Rating Levels are being exceeded the applicant shall undertake a noise impact assessment (methodology and approach shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the LPA in advance) to assess compliance with the said levels. The noise impact / compliance scheme assessment shall be commenced within 21 days of the notification, unless a longer time is approved in writing by the LPA. The applicant shall provide to the LPA a copy of the impact / compliance scheme assessment within a time period to be agreed.

Noise rating levels shall be measured directly or derived from a combination of measurement and calculation using propagation corrections. All noise measurements and rating levels shall be carried out in accordance with the requirements of BS 4142: 2014 and BS 7445- Parts 1 to 3: Description and measurement of environmental noise, or as superseded. (just moved)

If the said assessment confirms non-compliance with the operational noise rating levels the applicant shall submit in writing to the LPA a noise mitigation scheme employing the best practical means to ensure compliance with the said operational noise rating levels. Following the written approval by the LPA of the scheme and a timescale for its implementation the scheme shall be activated forthwith and thereafter retained.

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

30. No construction or demolition work shall be carried out and no plant or power operated machinery / equipment 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, unless otherwise previously agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority and in accordance with agreed emergency procedures for deviation.

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

31. All servicing collections / dispatches from or deliveries to the development site hereby approved during the operational phase shall only be permitted / undertaken between the following hours:

- 0800 hrs and 1800 hrs Monday to Friday
- 0900 hrs and 1300hrs on Saturdays
- No collections or deliveries on Sundays and any Bank / Public Holiday

Reason: To protect / safeguard the health and quality of life (amenity) of existing premises from noise in accordance with paragraphs 170 e) and 180 a) of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), 2019 and Policy 35: Protection of human health and quality of life from noise and vibration of the Cambridge Local Plan, 2018.

32. The development hereby approved shall be operated in accordance with the submitted 'Servicing and Operational Management Plan: For the Department of Engineering On the West Cambridge Site, Madingley Road, Cambridge - Submitted as part of the Whittle Extension Planning Application Issue 2.1- December 2019- University of Cambridge'.

Reason: To protect / safeguard the health and quality of life (amenity) of existing premises from noise in accordance with paragraphs 170 e) and 180 a) of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), 2019 and Policy 35: Protection of human health and quality of life from noise and vibration of the Cambridge Local Plan, 2018.

33. The external artificial lighting strategy / scheme for the development hereby approved shall be constructed, completed and implemented and maintained / retained thereafter, fully in accordance with the submitted 'Whittle Laboratory Project, OBTRUSIVE LIGHTING REPORT, December 2019 (Max Fordham LLP - EM01262-MXF-IN-XXRP-E-310000, Issue - P02 13/12/2019)'

Reason: To limit the impact of light pollution from artificial light on local amenity, intrinsically dark landscapes and nature conservation in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) paragraph 180 c) and Policy 34: Light pollution control of the Cambridge Local Plan, 2018.

34. The energy strategy for the approved buildings shall be implemented in accordance with the ground source heat pump driven cluster approach set out in the Whittle Laboratory Energy Statement, Max Fordham (EM01262-MXF-ZZ-XX-RP-N-430000 P01 December 2019). The development shall be implemented in accordance with the approved Strategy and shall thereafter be retained and remain fully operational in accordance with a maintenance programme, which shall be submitted to and agreed in writing by the local planning authority.

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

Reason: In the interests of reducing carbon dioxide emissions, promoting principles of sustainable construction and efficient use of buildings, in accordance with Cambridge Local Plan 2018 Policy 28 and Supplementary Planning Document 'Greater Cambridge Sustainable Design and Construction', January 2020.

35. No hard-standing areas shall be constructed until the works have been carried out in accordance with the surface water strategy so approved unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To prevent environmental and amenity problems arising from flooding (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 Policies 31 and 32).

36. All hard and soft landscape works shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details, and to a reasonable standard in accordance with the relevant recommendation of the appropriate British Standard or other recognised code of good practice. The works shall be carried out prior to the occupation of any part of the development or in accordance with the programme agreed by the local planning authority in writing. The maintenance shall be carried out in accordance with the approved schedule.

Reason: To ensure provision, establishment, and maintenance of a reasonable standard of landscaping in accordance with the approved design. (Cambridge Local Plan 2018; Policies 55, 57 and 59)

37. 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.

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

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

39. Any trees or plants provided as part of any landscape scheme which, within a period 5 years of planting date, die, are removed or become seriously damaged or diseased, shall be replaced in the next planting season with other of similar size and species as those originally planted, unless the Local Planning Authority gives written consent to any variation.

Reason: In the interest of the amenity of future residents and other likely users of the green corridor and open spaces (Cambridge Local Plan 2018; Policies 55, 57 and 59).

INFORMATIVE: Archaeological Works

Partial discharge of the Archaeological Works 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.

INFORMATIVE: Considerate Contractor Scheme

New development can sometimes cause inconvenience, disturbance and disruption to local residents, businesses and passers-by. As a result the City Council runs a Considerate Contractor Scheme aimed at promoting high standards of care during construction. The City Council encourages the developer of the site, through its building contractor, to join the scheme

and agree to comply with the model Code of Good Practice, in the interests of good neighbourliness. Information about the scheme can be obtained from The Considerate Contractor Project Officer in the Planning Department (Tel: 01223 457121).

INFORMATIVE: Demolition/Construction noise/vibration report

The noise and vibration report should include:

a) An assessment of the significance of the noise impact due to the demolition/construction works and suitable methods for this are to be found in BS 5228:2009 Part 1 Annex E - Significance of noise effects. It is recommended that the ABC method detailed in E.3.2 be used unless works are likely to continue longer than a month then the 2-5 dB (A) change method should be used.

b) An assessment of the significance of the vibration impact due to the demolition/construction works and suitable methods for this are to be found in BS 5228:2009 Part 2 Annex B - Significance of vibration effects.

If piling is to be undertaken, then full details of the proposed method to be used is required and this should be included in the noise and vibration reports detailed above.

Following the production of the above reports a monitoring protocol should be proposed for agreement with the Local Planning Authority. It will be expected that as a minimum spot checks to be undertaken on a regular basis at site boundaries nearest noise sensitive premises and longer-term monitoring to be undertaken when:

- Agreed target levels are likely to exceeded
- Upon the receipt of substantiated complaints
- At the request of the Local Planning Authority / Environmental Health following any justified complaints.

Guidance on noise monitoring is given in BS 5228:2009 Part 1 Section 8.4 - Noise Control Targets and in Annex G - noise monitoring.

A procedure for seeking approval from the Local Planning Authority (LPA) in circumstances when demolition/construction works need to be carried out at time outside the permitted hours. This should incorporate a minimum notice period of 10 working days to the Local Planning Authority and 5 working days to neighbours to allow the Local Planning Authority to consider the application as necessary. For emergencies the Local Planning Authority should be notified but where this is not

possible the Council's Out of Hours Noise service should be notified on 0300 303 8389.

Contact details for monitoring personnel, site manager including out of hours emergency telephone number should be provided.

INFORMATIVE: Construction Dust

Any condition requiring a construction related dust mitigation / management plan or details should reference and have regard to various national and industry best practical technical guidance such as:

- Guidance on the assessment of dust from demolition and construction, version 1.1 (IAQM, 2016)
- Guidance on Monitoring in the Vicinity of Demolition and Construction Sites, version 1.1 (IAQM, 2018)
- London Good Practice Guide: Noise & Vibration Control for Demolition and Construction - The London Authorities Noise Action Forum, July 2016
- The Control of Dust and Emissions during Construction and Demolition -supplementary planning guidance, (Greater London Authority, July 2014).

INFORMATIVE: Definition of 'Superstructure'

A condition attached to this permission has the trigger / time restriction 'Prior to any above ground superstructure works commencing'. The council considers the definition of 'superstructure' as having its normal or dictionary meaning, which is: 'the part of a building above its foundations'.

INFORMATIVE: Public Sewer Connection

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.

INFORMATIVE: 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.

INFORMATIVE: 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.

INFORMATIVE: Adoption of Sewers

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.

INFORMATIVE: Green Roofs

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

INFORMATIVE: Removal and Disposal of Waste

The Environment Agency, Brampton Environment District, Bromholme Lane, Brampton, Huntingdon, Cambs, PE28 4NE, Tel no: 01480414581 for advice regarding, the removal and disposal of waste and adherence with Agency pollution prevention guidelines. The waste produced on the site during demolition / construction will be subject to the general Duty Of Care under the Environmental Protection Act 1990 and is likely to be subject to control under the Waste Management Licensing Regulations 2011 and the Hazardous Waste Regulations 2005.

INFORMATIVE: Dry Watercourses

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

INFORMATIVE: Oil Storage Tanks

Notwithstanding the provision of the Town and Country Planning General Permitted Development Order 1995 (or any order revoking or re-enacting that Order), any oil storage tank shall be sited on an impervious base and surrounded by oil tight bunded walls with a capacity of 110% of the storage tank, to enclose all filling, drawing and overflow pipes. The installation must comply with Control of Pollution Regulations 2001, and Control of Pollution (Oil Storage) Regulations 2001. Site operators should ensure that there is no possibility of contaminated water entering and polluting surface or underground waters.

INFORMATIVE: Parking Areas

Surface water from roads and impermeable vehicle parking areas shall be discharged via trapped gullies. Prior to being discharged into any watercourse, surface water sewer or soakaway system, all surface water drainage from lorry parks and/or impermeable parking areas for fifty car park spaces or more and hardstandings should be passed through an oil interceptor designed compatible with the site being drained. Roof water shall not pass through the interceptor. Site operators should ensure that there is no possibility of contaminated water entering and polluting surface or underground waters.

INFORMATIVE: Surface Water Drainage and Infiltration Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS)

All surface water from roofs shall be piped direct to an approved surface water system using sealed downpipes. Open gullies should not be used.

Only clean, uncontaminated surface water should be discharged to any soakaway, watercourse or surface water sewer.

The water environment is potentially vulnerable and there is an increased potential for pollution from inappropriately located and/or designed infiltration (SuDS). We consider any infiltration (SuDS) greater than 2.0 m below ground level to be a deep system and are generally not acceptable. All infiltration SuDS require a minimum of 1.2 m clearance between the base of infiltration SuDS and peak seasonal groundwater levels. All need to meet the criteria in our Groundwater Protection:

Principles and Practice (GP3) position statements G1 to G13 which can be found here:

<https://www.gov.uk/government/collections/groundwater-protection>.

In addition, they must not be constructed in ground affected by contamination and if the use of deep bore soakaways is proposed, we would wish to be re-consulted. The proposals will need to comply with our Groundwater protection position statements G1 and G9 to G13.

INFORMATIVE: De Watering

There have been changes to the licensing process for de-watering purposes. A provision of the Water Act 2003 was that abstraction of water for de-watering purposes would require an abstraction licence. This provision is now being implemented and we are inviting applications from existing abstractors from January 2018. There will be a transitional period where abstractors will have up to two years to apply for a licence of a previously exempt activity. When the 2-year application period has closed the Environment Agency can take up to a further 3 years to determine any application.

More information on this and how to apply for a de-watering licence can be found on our website using the below link:

<https://www.gov.uk/guidance/apply-for-a-new-abstractionlicence-for-a-currently-exempt-abstraction>.

Application Number	18/1678/FUL	Agenda Item	
Date Received	23rd November 2018	Officer	Toby Williams
Target Date	22nd February 2019		
Ward	Petersfield		
Site	Station Area Redevelopment Blocks B2 And F2 Devonshire Road		
Proposal	<p>The proposed erection of two new buildings comprising 5,351sqm (GEA) of Class B1(a)/ Class B1(b) floorspace including ancillary accommodation/ facilities with associated plant, 162 cycle parking spaces, and 8 off-gauge cycle spaces for Block F2 and an Aparthotel (Class C1) comprising 125suites, terrace, ancillary accommodation and facilities with multi-storey car park for Network Rail (total GEA 12,153sqm) comprising 206 car parking spaces and 34 cycle parking spaces for Block B2 with associated plant, hard and soft landscaping, new alignment of access from Station Road into Station Square and permanent access from Devonshire Road to the Cambridge Station Car Park, utilising the existing pedestrian and cycle access, restricted to emergency access to the railway only.</p>		
Applicant	c/o Agent		

SUMMARY	<p>The proposal accords with the Development Plan for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -The principle of the proposed office, aparthotel and car park uses are acceptable. -The scale, footprint and proximity of the F2 office building to its boundaries and its impact on residential amenity is acceptable. -The scheme would deliver public realm improvements and the design of the
---------	---

	<p>buildings is high quality.</p> <p>-The proposed new access into Station Square does not arise as a requirement of the development of buildings B2 and F2. The officer recommendation in respect of this aspect of the proposal is neutral. The proposal is recommended for approval with or without the proposed new access.</p>
RECOMMENDATION	APPROVAL

1.0 SITE DESCRIPTION/AREA CONTEXT

- 1.1 The site comprises an irregular shaped parcel of land, which is mainly the existing surface level station car park and its access road. This is located to the north of the main station and immediately north and west of the six storey IBIS hotel and Cycle Point building and includes a section of land which extends to connect to the bend in Devonshire Road where pedestrians and cyclists are currently able to cut through to the station underneath Carter Bridge. The application site also incorporates a separate area of land that lies in-between Station Road and Station Square on its SW corner in front of Café Nero and is the proposed location of the new access.
- 1.2 The northern boundary of the site is defined by Devonshire Road and station car parking to the north of Carter Bridge. The eastern boundary of the site is defined by the railway line. The southern boundary of the main site is defined by the mini roundabout at the eastern end of Great Northern Road. The western boundary is defined by the gardens and properties of Ravensworth Gardens, a 2.5 storey red brick pitched terrace whose gardens face east towards the site and which are terminated by a close boarded fence onto the station car parking area. Immediately to the south of Ravensworth Gardens properties is an 'L' shaped 4 storey residential block known as F1 which fronts onto Great Northern Road. This block forms part of the CB1 development and includes apartments which have rooms which face onto a private rear courtyard space defined by a brick wall which abuts the station car parking area.

- 1.3 The site is 0.7 hectares (ha) in size. The main part of the site lies outside any defined conservation area, but immediately to the north is the Mill Road Conservation Area, the boundary of which is defined by Devonshire Road. To the south is the New Town and Glisson Road Conservation Area which extends to include the grade II listed Station and Station Square in front.
- 1.4 The application site forms part of a wider site allocation for CB1 which is referred to as site M14 in the adopted LP appendix B proposals schedule. This allocation indicates capacity for mixed uses including residential, retail, office / R&D use classes and other amenities. The relevant LP policy is 21 (Station Areas West and Clifton Road Area of Major Change). The site falls within the controlled parking zone and is within the Air Quality Management Area (AQMA).

2.0 THE PROPOSAL

- 2.1 The description of proposed development is set out on the front page of this report. Two separate buildings are proposed which are known as B2 (an aparthotel and multi-storey car park) and F2 (offices) together with alterations to the public realm, including upgrading a stretch of the station car park access road which runs between the buildings. Full planning permission is sought. Multiple amendments have been made to the proposal since it was originally lodged, including amendments that have been submitted and reconsulted upon in January and February 2020.
- 2.2 The application is accompanied by the following documents:
- Acoustics Report
 - Air Quality Assessment
 - Application Drawings and Forms
 - Archaeological Statement
 - BREEAM Assessment Report
 - Contamination Report
 - Daylight, Sunlight and Overshadowing Assessment and Review
 - Design and Access Statement
 - Ecology Report
 - EIA Compliance Covering Letter
 - Energy Strategy
 - Estate Management Strategy

- Heritage Statement
- Hotel Needs Assessment
- Landscape Plans, Management Plan and Report
- Operational Waste Management Report
- Planning Statement
- Surface and Foul Water Drainage Strategy (including rainwater and grey water feasibility studies)
- Sustainability Statement
- S106 Transport Mitigation Table
- Transport Assessment (including construction phase plans, zebra crossing plans, Road Safety Audit for new Station Road / Square Access, fire tender access plans and various TA technical notes)
- Travel Plan

2.3 The originally submitted plans and accompanying reports have been amended, updated or subject to addendums in Dec 18, April 19, June 19, Sept 19, Jan 20 and Feb 20 to respond to officer requests, consultee responses and third-party representations. The latest amendments in Jan 20 and Feb 20 have been subject to a further 14-day neighbour consultation and they include:

Block F2

- Introduction of a mansard roof in the mid-section facing Ravensworth Gardens to reduce the impact of the building on these residential properties;
- Removal of the fourth floor on the southern section of the building adjacent to F1 to lessen impact on these apartments; and
- Provision of a basement area, marginally increasing the overall floorspace for this building from 4,555sqm to 5,351sqm and increasing cycle parking provision accordingly;

Other Changes

- Minor revisions to the site and location plans;
- Revisions to the description of development, including the proposed removal of construction access from Devonshire Road;

- Further Surface Water and Foul Water Drainage Strategy Note to ensure compliance with LP policy 32 and further technical drainage information in Feb 20;
- Further Transport Assessment Addendum Note presenting revised traffic assessment scenarios with and without the proposed Station Square access proposal;
- Air Quality Assessment Update. This report provides an updated air quality assessment referencing the latest advice and data available. The assessment presents potential impacts on air pollution for an estimated opening year 2022. The potential air quality impacts are assessed both with and without the new access;
- Noise Assessment Technical Memo;
- Updated Hotel Needs Assessment for the aparthotel (Jan 20); and
- Sunlight and Daylight Report Review (Jan 20) and further technical note update (Feb 20).
- Commitment to the provision of 25% of spaces within the multi-storey car park to be provided as trickle charge EV charging spaces in line with Environmental Health Advice; and
- Alternative option for a contribution for the management of Station Square of £500,000 in the event that the proposed new Station Road Access is not supported.

Overview of Proposal

B

- 2.4 Block B2 lies to the north of the existing Ibis Hotel / Cycle Point building and to the east of the station car park access road. Permission is sought for a 6 storey building above ground plus basement. It includes a split-level multi-storey car park (MSCP) for 206 cars with a 125-suite aparthotel above totaling 12,153sqm (GEA). The number of car parking spaces provided within B2 is equal to the number of car parking spaces being taken up by the combined footprints of B2 and F2. There is no net increase in car parking from existing as result of the MSCP. The car park occupies basement, ground and first floor levels. The second to fifth floors contain the aparthotel bedrooms.
- 2.5 The building is approximately 19m to the top of the uppermost occupied storey and 21.2m to the top of its plant enclosure. It would appear equivalent in height to the Ibis / Cycle Point

building. The footprint is rectangular with a curved NW corner and canted SE corner. It has a cut-out 'C' section at its upper levels to form a west facing courtyard for the aparthotel.

- 2.6 Guests to the aparthotel would access it by foot from the pavement of an upgraded station car park access road through a main lobby which is contained within a triple height glazed atrium space. The car park is thus hidden from view from the access road being located behind the atrium. The atrium rises upwards from street level to connect to a breakfast / lounge area and a west facing raised courtyard space for guests.
- 2.7 Vehicular access to the car park is on the north elevation of the building whilst the vehicular exit is to the south adjacent to the Ibis hotel within an 8.1m gap between the buildings. Main pedestrian access to the car park is on the south-western corner of the building i.e. at a point closest for pedestrians walking to or from the station.
- 2.8 The building would be mainly constructed from a buff brick interspersed with textured lighter brickwork panels, 3 storey glazing on the main frontage and a recessed roof formed of grey aluminium cladding with standing seams. A strong pre-cast white concrete band would wrap horizontally around the lower half of the building beneath which the car parking frontage on the northern, eastern and southern facades would be defined by bronze coloured perforated aluminium panels. A rectangular area of brickwork on the north western curved corner of the building is indicated to be retained for an art intervention. The building would incorporate a green roof.

F2

- 2.9 Block F2 lies to the west of the station car park access road and opposite the Ibis Hotel / Cycle Point building and B2. Permission is sought for the erection of a long rectangular office building (5,351sqm GEA) which would be adjacent to the existing apartment block F1 and the rear gardens of Ravensworth Garden properties. It would be a part three / four storey building above ground plus basement below. The fourth storey would only be contained in its southern section and be equivalent in height and extent contiguous with the curtilage of the apartment block (F1) fronting Great Northern Road to the west.

- 2.10 The majority (2/3rds) of the F2 block is 3 storeys, stepping down to this height where adjacent to Ravensworth Garden properties. Its three storey height would be 9.6m, its four storey height would be 12.8m, aligning itself with the boundary of F1. The building would incorporate a green roof. The western edge of the 2nd storey would be set 15.9m away from the rear facade of Ravensworth Garden properties to the west as shown via cross-section B-B.
- 2.11 The rear of the building and its upper roof form is cut away from the common boundary by 4.4m metres providing a recess to Ravensworth Garden properties facing it. The latest amended plans of January 20 incorporate a mansard roof for the second floor. The top of the mansard is equivalent in height to the ridge of Ravensworth Gardens.
- 2.12 At ground floor level, the main access to F2 is shown to be from the south into an office space - anticipated to be for co-working - and is shown to incorporate a café / reception area. A separate office and access for the Train Operating Company (TOC) is shown in the northern section of the building close to Carter Bridge. The ground floor rear contains a refuse area adjacent to the side of the existing F1 block and secure cycle parking for 162 cycles which would be covered by a cantilevered roof. On top of the cantilevered roof would sit an integrated landscape planter bed facing Ravensworth Gardens. The cycle parking and bin storage would be securely accessed from Great Northern Road. Users would be able to access the rear of the building directly from the cycle parking area.
- 2.13 The eastern and southern public realm facing facades onto the station car park access road and Station Square would be articulated by a staggered corner façade and two vertically recessed sections onto the access road, breaking the form of the building down into three visually distinguishable blocks. The first (southern) and tallest of these sections addressing Station Square would have vertical floor-to-ceiling high windows and would be constructed from a series of narrow buff brick columns terminating in a darker engineering brick base extending across most of the façade of all three sections of the building. A recessed and screened plant area would sit on top of the roof and would be set back from the building edge. The second (middle) section of the building is proposed to be constructed

from a red brick and larger (wider) windows. The third (northern) section of the building, would be constructed from a buff brick and treated similarly to the southern section, with a recessed screened area for plant on top of the roof. The building would be framed by horizontal white concrete banding across its lower middle and across its brow forming a parapet for the roof.

- 2.14 The northern façade of the building would be curved, reflecting the proposed curved design of the aparthotel opposite, providing a gentle visual gateway from Devonshire Road for pedestrians and cyclists.
- 2.15 For windows directly facing Ravensworth Gardens, the Design and Access Statement and Computer-Generated Images (CGI's) show a series of fixed louvred windows only allowing views upwards over the ridge height of these properties in order to avoid overlooking. Other more obliquely positioned windows are proposed to be obscure glazed. The treatment of all windows facing westwards in block F2 is proposed to be secured by condition 48.

Public Realm

- 2.16 The red line for the planning application extends to include the existing access road to the station car park and the pathway / cycleway which connects to Devonshire Road. The treatment of the public realm proposes similar materials to those used within Station Square, with a combination of block paving, low kerbs, tree planters and vehicular bays located off the access. The cycle / pedestrian cut through from Devonshire Road would be resurfaced and demarcated by a series of bollards where it meets the station car park access road. A raised table is proposed at this point to slow down vehicular speeds.

Station Road / Station Square Access

- 2.17 The proposal seeks permission for a new access from Station Road into Station Square. The applicants seek for the new access to be used by taxis only and these would only be taxis that are licensed Hackney Carriages (HC's) who are allowed to use the designated Station Square taxi rank by Abellio Anglia Greater (AGA). Private hire vehicles would continue to use the public drop-off / pick-up area.

- 2.18 The proposal would remove the requirement for licensed HC taxis to utilise Great Northern Road to access the designated taxi rank. The proposed new access (as made clear by County Transport and Environmental Health colleagues) does not arise directly from the proposed office and aparthotel / MSCP buildings (F2 and B2) and their associated transport impacts. The access is proposed by the applicant as part of this application in order to seek to address wider concerns regarding the intensity of use of Great Northern Road (particularly at peak times) and the associated amenity issues this has caused for residents who live in this road.
- 2.19 The County Highways Engineer / Transport colleagues and the applicants are agreed that the installation of the new access into Station Square is not required to make the development acceptable. Neither is the new access required because of air quality concerns as confirmed by the Council's Environmental Health team. The County Highways Engineer has stated that he would withdraw his objection to the scheme if the new access is removed from the proposal. As such, the proposed access could be removed from the application without impacting on the overall acceptability of F2 and B2.
- 2.20 However, the Station Road access has been retained as part of the proposal to allow Members of the Planning Committee to reach a view on the material planning considerations for and against its inclusion. If the proposed access is not supported by Members, the applicants propose an alternative scenario, removing the new access from the description of development and a separate financial contribution of £500,000. The process for how such a financial contribution would work in practice is set out as part of the recommendation (Chapter 10) and is summarised below.

Option A (with new access)

- 2.21 Applicable where Committee wishes to secure delivery of the new access from Station Road as part of the development proposal.

APPROVE subject to:

- (1) a s106 Agreement
- (2) the planning conditions contained in Appendix 1

Option B (without new access)

2.22 Applicable where Committee does not wish to secure delivery of the new access from Station Road as part of the development proposal and in all other respects the Committee is minded to approve the application.

APPROVE subject to:

- (1) a s106 Agreement
- (2) all references to the proposed new access from Station Road being removed from the development proposal description; and
- (3) the planning conditions contained in Appendix 1 revised to take account of the removal of the access.

2.23 The alternative recommendation (Option B – without the access) is not dependent on the financial contribution of £500,000 being secured before the issuing of planning permission because the offered contribution does not meet the CIL regulations; it is not necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms, it is not directly related to the development and it is not fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development. The application of the CIL regulations and the offered contribution is discussed in more detail in paragraph 8.126 within this report. If the alternative recommendation (Option B) is accepted, this will simply grant planning permission without the new Station Road access. The financial contribution of £500,000 would be the subject of separate discussions between the applicant and relevant stakeholders and relies on the continuing goodwill of the developer to engage.

2.24 With regard to the alternative contribution of £500,000, in their letter of 6 Dec 2019, the applicants suggest that the alternative enhanced management of the Station Square could include:

- Expansion of the existing Automatic Number Plate Recognition (ANPR) to improve management of access into the Station Square;

- Better management of the ranking of taxis in the Station Square and enforce 'clear zones' at the rear of the taxi rank to stop 'over-ranking';
- Improved enforcement of ban on HGV's and delivery traffic access to the Station Square (except overnight deliveries);
- Using Traffic Marshalls at peak periods to manage traffic circulation issues, including over-ranking of taxis, extended stays in 'drop off' bays, misuse of 'accessible bays', blocking of circulation routes etc;
- Introduction of a low emissions zone for the Station Square area. This could include: Charging for all drop-offs and pick-ups by taxis and private hire vehicles (other than those complying with the City Council's Licensing definition of zero emissions vehicles); Charging for all drop-offs by private car; and Electric charging points in Station Square (induction loops or cable connections);
- Improvements in wayfinding signage and route marking for pedestrians, cyclist, taxis and private cars through the Station Square;
- Review of alternative routes for cyclists travelling north / south through the Station Square area;
- Opportunities for additional soft landscaping and seating; and
- Measures to manage and control visitor / short stay cycle parking.

2.25 It is not necessary to precisely define the acceptability or deliverability of the possible alternative solutions prior to the issuing of planning permission because the £500,000 contribution is not required to make the development acceptable in planning terms as it would not pass the CIL 122 (limitation on the use of planning obligations) regulations. The possible solutions and their merits would have to be assessed separately by the Planning Committee as part of a separate officer report with any associated planning application following a stakeholder engagement process. Continuing engagement is within the gift of the developer as a willing partner. A summary analysis of the merits of some of the options is provided in the officer conclusion.

3.0 SITE HISTORY

- 3.1 There is no detailed planning application history relevant to the two plots associated with the former outline application for CB1 applicable to F2 and B2.

Reference	Description	Outcome
13/1034/REM	137 residential units, Blocks C1, C2, D1 and F1 (adjoining)	A/C
13/0860/REM	Development of Station Square	A/C
12/1622/FUL	Block B1, Hotel and Multi-Storey Car Park (2,850 cycle parking spaces) (opposite the site of F2)	A/C
12/1608/FUL	Office Building plus retail / café & restaurant (Blocks A1 / A2) One The Square (to the immediate south of plots F1 and F2)	A/C
08/0266/OUT	331 residential units, 1,250 student units; 53,294 sq m of Class B1a (Office); 5,255 sq m of Classes A1 /A3/A4 and/or A5 (retail); a 7,645 sq.m polyclinic; 86 sq.m of D1 (art workshop) floorspace; 46 sq m D1 (community room); 1,753 sq m of D1 and/or D2 (gym, nursery, student/community facilities) floorspace; use of block G2 (854 sq.m) as either residential student or doctors surgery, and a 6,479 sq.m hotel; along with a new transport interchange and station square, new multi storey cycle and car park including accommodation for c. 2,812	A/C Time period for submission of reserved matters has lapsed Granted 9 April 2010 with 7year period for submission of RM's.

	cycle spaces, private and public spaces etc.	
--	--	--

- 3.2 The application site for blocks B2 and F2 is within the outline application area associated with permission 08/0266/OUT. The time period for the submission of reserved matters in respect of the governing outline planning has lapsed. This means that there is not an automatic fall-back position in respect of either in-principle planning matters (land use etc) or planning parameters (heights, footprint etc) granted as part of the outline permission. This notwithstanding, the outline permission is still a relevant point of reference in terms of, for example, footprint and height and other site wide infrastructure which has been put in place across the wider CB1 area to anticipate the development of plots B2 and F2 coming forward.
- 3.3 Where material circumstances have not altered since the grant of the outline permission, it is a reasonable expectation of the applicants to expect a consistent approach from the Council in assessing the proposal. The outline permission is therefore a strong material consideration for members. The new Local Plan 2018, which has introduced a new suite of development management policies relevant to this application, is the starting point for the assessment of the application and 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).

Great Northern Road Balconies

- 3.4 A recent appeal has been allowed in relation to application 16/2012/S73 which was refused by the Council on 15 March 2018. The application sought planning permission for minor material amendments to outline planning permission reference 08/0266/OUT (the CB1 masterplan outline application) without complying with a condition (no. 33) attached to planning permission ref: 13/1041/S73, dated 13 January 2014.
- 3.5 Condition 33 related to noise attenuation for external residential areas associated with residential properties and namely in this case with those facing onto Great Northern Road granted

reserved matters approval for 137 residential units under application 13/1034/REM on 10 January 2014 and now built and occupied. The details of the appeal decision are attached for reference at appendix 2 to this report.

3.6 Paragraphs 18 – 21 of the Inspector's report states:

'18. During my site visit I was able to sit on one of the upper floor balconies for a short period of time. Noise from the traffic in the street below was noticeable, particularly as the vehicles bumped over the speed tables. However, I do not accept the view that the balconies are unusable for relaxation. They provide a reasonable level of amenity for a central urban location near a busy railway station where a certain level of noise is to be expected. This is precisely one of those areas where the BS indicates that compromise is required.

19. Despite noise being above the stipulated levels, those units with balconies provide a better standard of living than those without. The development gives its occupiers the choice as to whether or not to use their external amenity space, but it also provides convenient access to public open space adjacent to the blocks as an alternative. Those areas provide seating for relaxation purposes and based on my experiences they are quieter than the street frontage. PPG2 advice is that noise impacts may be partially offset if residents have access to a relatively quiet, protected, external publicly accessible amenity space that is nearby.

20. The PPG also states that the impacts may be partly offset by giving residents access to a relatively quiet facade (containing windows to habitable rooms) as part of their dwelling; or a relatively quiet external amenity space for their sole use. A significant number of units within the scheme have windows, and in some cases balconies and terraces, to the rear. Notably, the Council raises no concerns regarding the living conditions within the flats and I noted during my visit that double glazing is effective in suppressing external noise.

21. The Council concedes that it has adopted a more flexible condition wording in more recent cases involving balconies. In my view, the disputed condition is too onerous, and it is neither necessary nor reasonable to secure acceptable living conditions for occupiers of the flats. There are no practical measures that

could be implemented within the scope of the condition, and not requiring planning permission in their own right, that would result in a noticeable reduction in noise levels on the balconies. Therefore, having given careful consideration to all material considerations, including representations from residents and elected members, I conclude that the disputed condition should be removed. Although the Council tabled an alternative condition wording for discussion purposes, this is insufficiently precise or enforceable, and does not pass the test of necessity'

3.7 It is also pertinent in relation to some of the third-party representations made in relation to this application for members to be aware of paragraph 22 of the appeal decision:

'22. At the hearing it was suggested that traffic should be removed from Great Northern Road and/or the public highway altered to delete the raised speed tables. However, the outline permission established the parameters for the Station Area Redevelopment scheme which included use of Great Northern Road as the primary means of access to the station. There is no evidence to suggest that the road has been constructed otherwise than in accordance with the approved details and therefore to require the developer to make alterations retrospectively as part of a noise attenuation scheme would be unreasonable'

4.0 PUBLICITY

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

5.0 POLICY

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

5.2 Relevant Development Plan policies

PLAN	POLICY NUMBER
Cambridge Local	1, 2, 5, 6,

Plan 2018	<p>21 (Station Areas West M14)</p> <p>25 (Cambridge Railway Station, Hills Road Corridor to the City Centre Opportunity Area)</p> <p>28, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36,</p> <p>40, 42</p> <p>55, 56, 57, 59, 60, 61</p> <p>72, 77 (visitor accommodation)</p> <p>80, 81, 82, 85</p>
-----------	--

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

Central Government Guidance	<p>National Planning Policy Framework 2019</p> <p>National Planning Policy Framework – Planning Practice Guidance from 3 March 2014 onwards</p> <p>Circular 11/95 (Annex A)</p>
Supplementary Planning Documents	<p>Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Flood and Water</p>
Previous Supplementary Planning Documents	<p>Sustainable Design and Construction (2020)</p> <p>Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Waste Partnership (RECAP): Waste Management Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (February 2012)</p> <p>Planning Obligation Strategy (March 2010)</p>

	Public Art (January 2010)
Material Considerations	<p><u>City Wide Guidance</u></p> <p>Air Quality in Cambridge – Developers Guide (2008)</p> <p>Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (November 2010)</p> <p>Cambridge City Council Draft Air Quality Action Plan 2018-2023</p> <p>Cambridge Walking and Cycling Strategy (2002)</p> <p>Cambridgeshire County Council Transport Assessment Guidelines (2017)</p> <p>Cambridgeshire Design Guide for Streets and Public Realm (2007)</p> <p>Protection and Funding of Routes for the Future Expansion of the City Cycle Network (2004)</p>
	<p><u>Area Guidelines</u></p> <p>Cambridge City Council (2002)–Southern Corridor Area Transport Plan:</p> <p>Mill Road Area Conservation Area Appraisal (2011)</p> <p>New Town and Glisson Road Conservation Area Appraisal (2012)</p>

	Station Area Development Framework (2004) includes the Station Area Conservation Appraisal.
--	---

6.0 CONSULTATIONS

Access Officer

- 6.1 No Objection: Asks for clarification regarding the location of the accessible rooms. Provides detailed advice regarding the internal layout of the hotel in relation to common areas and bedrooms. Advises that the applicants need to meet Part M Building Regulations and relevant British Standards.

Note, the applicants have subsequently identified the location of the accessible rooms on a plan for the Access Officer.

Anglian Water

Original Comments

- 6.2 Anglian Water are obligated to accept the foul flows from the development with the benefit of planning consent and would therefore take the necessary steps to ensure that there is sufficient treatment capacity should the Planning Authority grant planning permission.

The preferred method of surface water disposal would be to a sustainable drainage system (SuDS) with connection to a sewer seen as the last option. The surface water strategy / flood risk assessment is unacceptable. The proposed surface discharge rate of 44.8l/s is too high for B2.

Recommends conditions in relation to:

- foul water
- surface water

(Officer note: Since Anglian Water's original comments were made, a revised drainage strategy has been received which has significantly reduced the surface water discharge rates. No further comment from Anglian Water has been received).

Cambridgeshire Constabulary (Architectural Liaison Officer)

- 6.3 No Objection: Asks the applicant to make contact to arrange a meeting to discuss security measures to help reduce the vulnerability to crime including building security, external environment and layout of block B2 (see last suggested informative).

Cambridgeshire County Council (Highways Development Management)

- 6.4 Objection: To the inclusion of the proposed new access onto Station Square.

User Hierarchy

The LHA officer raises issues concerning the free flow and movement of pedestrians and cyclists. Leaving aside potential accident risks, the predicted PM peak in 2022 is some 204 motor vehicles using the proposed new access or approximately one every seventeen seconds. This will undoubtedly impact negatively and severely in terms of non-motorised traffic using Station Road. This is an unacceptable inversion of the user hierarchy in an attempt to solve an issue created by too many motor vehicles being allowed to access the Station Square, an area of private ground over which a third party has full control.

It is understood that the installation of the proposed access onto Station Road is not required to make the development acceptable in transport terms and as such the proposed access could be removed from the application without impacting on the proposed development's overall acceptability.

The problems created within the Square could be resolved by better management of the space by the operator/owner (in relation to double banked taxis, misuse of drop-off / pick-up areas).

It would be useful to explore how improvements in managing the Square can be achieved within its existing context. The LHA officer would welcome some form of requirement within the

S106 to ensure that such an investigation took place and that any recommendations of the same were implemented.

It is appreciated that the residents of Great Northern Road have concerns regarding the level of pollution that they are experiencing. It is understood that Cambridge City Council will be requiring that all taxis be zero emission vehicles by 2023. In relationship to managing the Square, it could perhaps be one of the criteria that all taxis that are permitted to use the Square be a zero-emission vehicle, ahead of the City Councils deadline. This could go some way to alleviate some of the concerns of the residents of Great Northern Road.

Highway Safety

The Road Safety Audit recognises an increased risk of collisions with pedestrians. Pedestrians may not wait to cross the proposed access as this would unnecessarily interrupt/impede their journey and this may not always happen creating additional risks for the most vulnerable highway users.

The further information in relation to swept paths and bollard positions reinforces concern that the proposed works would introduce an unacceptable hazard within the adopted public highway that does not exist at present and would, therefore, be a significant safety risk.

If the proposed access and any mention of the same is removed from the application, then the objection will have been overcome.

Other

The proposed zebra crossing locations shown on drawing number XX-DR-C-1021P1 are acceptable to the Highway Authority.

Bollard widths on the cut through from Devonshire Road should be placed no greater than 1.5m apart.

In the event that permission is given, recommends conditions in relation to:

- Construction Traffic Management Plan

- Delivery times for vehicles > 3.5 tonnes
- Cycle access provision from Devonshire Road

Informative: Residents parking permits

Cambridgeshire County Council (Transport)

Original Comments

6.5 No Objection: The Transport Assessment is acceptable.

Surveys of traffic flows are agreed. The collision analysis in the area surrounding the station is agreed. Office parking ratios within the CB1 development vary from one space per 146sqm to 280sqm. The existing two hotels in the area are car free. It is proposed that both blocks B2 and F2 will be car free. This is acceptable, given the highly accessible location. Rail replacement buses will in the future use the bus interchange area instead of the station car park.

Block F2 cycle parking is acceptable. Block B2 will have 34 cycle bays. This is acceptable.

Forecast Trip Generation and Distribution

The trip rate generation of the hotel will predominantly be from pedestrians in the AM and PM peaks. This will generate 98 trips in the AM peak and 63 in the PM peak, based on TRICS and is agreed.

The office trip generation is 85 trips in the AM peak of which 77 are inbound and 67 trips in the PM peak, of which 58 are outbound. This trip rate is agreed.

When compared to the CB1 masterplan the trips to B2 and F2 are 6 lower in the AM peak and 56 lower in the PM peak.

Station Road / Station Square Proposals

It is proposed to re-route taxis to and from Station Square via Station Road. All other vehicles would continue to use Great Northern Road as at present. With the expected growth of the station area the amount of vehicles using Great Northern Road

in the current routing of vehicles would be expected to increase by up to 100 and 170 in the AM and PM peaks.

Redistributing taxis to Station Road results in a reduction of flow of 49 eastbound and 64 westbound taxi movements on Great Northern Road in the AM peak, and 157 eastbound and 146 westbound in the PM peak. These vehicle trips would be redistributed to the eastern section of Station Road.

This arrangement has been modelled using microsimulation including pedestrian movements. This shows that a good level of service is retained for pedestrians and vehicles using the area.

Bus Stops

There is a significant amount of interchange between bus and rail users at the railway station. The existing station interchange has bus stops that are located up to 210m away from the station entrance, and no turn around facility for buses at the station. Information as to what bus stop to use for each bus service is also very limited and poor. This is not convenient for regular commuters, but also visitors to the City, and delays buses turning at the station.

A single bus stop should be located to the south of the station access in each direction with bus stop locations as shown. Each bus passing the station should stop at these bus stops, and then wait for longer at the interchange, if buses need to stand for any length of time.

Access to the southern footway on Station Road and the City Centre bound bus stop should be via a pedestrian crossing located outside the station entrance. This should be clearly marked and could be a zebra type facility.

Comments of 26 Feb 20

No Objection: Sufficient detail has been presented to make a sound assessment.

Mitigation: Should the development go ahead the developer should be conditioned to:

- S106 payment of £35,000 towards a Brompton Bike Cycle Hub;
- Travel Plan (see proposed conditions 45 and 73);
- Provision of improved bus stops and interchange;
- Provision of pedestrian crossing outside station entrance;

Proposal Description:	Accepted
Study Area:	Accepted
Traffic Data:	Accepted
Trip Generation:	TRICS trip rates
accepted	
Distribution / Assignment:	Agreed
Assessment Scenarios and Traffic Growth:	Agreed
Junction Modelling:	Modelling is
agreed	
Mitigation:	To be agreed.

These comments are further to a Transport Assessment provided by Mott MacDonald Transport Consultants as part of an application for mixed use development of 5,351 sqm of B1 in block F2 with 136 cycle parking and 7 off gauge spaces.

The TA shows that the increase in trips on Great Northern Road resulting from the proposal is 1% of all trips of Great Northern Road. As a result of this negligible impact, the proposed access to Station Square from Station Road is not required to make the application acceptable in transport terms.

S106

Overall mitigation has been determined within CB1 in line with the outline planning consent. Should approval be given the applicants should make a payment of £35,000 towards the cost of a Brompton Bike Docking Station.

Conditions recommended in relation to:

- Travel Plan for each building (see conditions 45 and 73)
- Additional bus stop provision close to the station entrance (see condition 8)
- Provision of pedestrian crossing facility over Station Road close at the entrance (see condition 6)

- Cycle parking installation prior to upon occupation (condition 74).

Design and Conservation Panel (Meetings of 11 April 2018 and 13 Dec 2017)

- 6.6 The conclusions of the 2018 Panel meeting(s) were as follows:

‘The effort made to respond to the Panel’s comments from December, specifically in relation to east elevation of B2 and the vehicular movements in relation to the car park are appreciated. The Panel would however stress the need to maintain strong aspirations for the design expression of these two important contributory blocks as for many, they will be viewed as the ‘front door’ to the CB1 development.’

The minutes of the last 2018 D&C meeting is attached to this report at Appendix 3.

Development Control Forum (16 January 2019)

- 6.7 The minutes of the DC Forum meeting from January 2019 are attached at appendix 4 to this report.

The applicants responded to issues arising out of the DC Forum in a covering letter of 12 April 2019 and with revised plans. The revisions and the applicant’s response are addressed as part of the officer assessment.

Disability Consultative Panel (Meetings of 26 February 19)

- 6.8 Concerned about the location of the accessible rooms and layout of the aparthotel. Provides detailed advice regarding the location of the accessible rooms, which should ideally be located close to lift cores in the hotel. Detailed advice is provided in relation to issues of fire management, hoist equipment, hearing help, room layout, hotel drop off and fire doors. The design of F2 (office building) was found to be acceptable.

Environment Agency

6.9 No Objection: Planning permission should be granted to the proposed development as submitted if the following planning conditions are included as set out below:

- Contaminated land analysis and remediation
- Unidentified contamination
- Surface water scheme
- Piling

Environmental Health

Original Comments

6.10 No Objection: A variety of conditions are recommended to protect existing residents and users of the development (for the construction and operational phases). The proposed development is located within the Air Quality Management Area (AQMA).

No provision for EV charge points has been made in the TA or elsewhere, which is disappointing given the increasing demand from residents of and visitors to Cambridge for these facilities.

Combustion Emissions

The Energy Strategy and Sustainability Statement confirm that energy provision for the supply of heating and hot water will be via a mix of air source heat pumps, CHP (hotel only) and gas condensing boilers.

Air Quality Assessment

The Air Quality Assessment assesses the impact of the development for two scenarios which model the access of taxis both along and away from Great Northern Road. For both scenarios there is a small increase at one or more receptors which is contrary to Local Plan Policy 36. Mitigation is therefore required.

We recognise that the MSCP is replacing an existing ground level car park however all new developments should install electric vehicle (EV) charge points in accordance with the

principles of the NPPF, Local Plan Policy 82 and the requirement of Local Plan Policies 36(f) and the Air Quality Action Plan (2018).

Operational EV charge points should be installed in a minimum of 25% of the car parking spaces. Infrastructure for the remaining 75% of the car parking spaces should be installed to enable increased provision as demand rises. This can be secured by an appropriate planning condition.

Based on the information provided we have no objections on air quality grounds for the proposed development; although conditions to secure the use of low NOx boilers, limit emission levels from CHP and ensure that EV charge points are installed should be secured.

Amendment Comments of 14 Feb 20

A further submission has been received and Environmental Health re-consulted:

Station road / Station Square Access

Further details have been provided of the proposed Station Road / Station Square access which is proposed to allow taxi movements only to access the Station Square via Station Road. Reducing traffic levels on Great Northern Road would be beneficial to existing residents and is discussed further within the air quality comments.

However, it is understood Cambridgeshire County Highways have objected to the proposed Station Road / Station Square access, predominantly due to pedestrian safety.

Air Quality

The development site represents an intensification of use within the air quality management area (AQMA). The application is for an Aparthotel, multi-story car park (MSCP) and office accommodation. The MSCP is the rationalisation of the existing station car park and will not lead to an increase in car park spaces therefore the vehicle movements associated with the MSCP will remain unchanged. The aparthotel and office accommodation are designed as being 'car free'. Vehicle

access to the site is via Great Northern Road. Measured levels of nitrogen dioxide are currently below national air quality objective levels but continue to be monitored.

The following documents have been reviewed as part of this response which should be read in conjunction with earlier air quality comments.

- Letter from Bidwells to planning officer dated 6th December 2019 and titled 'Submission of Further Information and Change of Description of Development'.
- Transport Assessment Addendum (Ref:377606) produced by Mott Macdonald and dated 10th January 2019.
- Operational Air Quality Assessment Rev C produced by Mott MacDonald and dated 8th January 2020.

Transport Assessment Addendum

In parallel to the proposed development the applicant has submitted proposals for an alternative access option onto Station Square for taxis; to partially alleviate the congestion, noise and air quality issues on Great Northern Road. The Transport Assessment Addendum deals solely with these proposals. The report predicts an '*annual rail passenger growth of 5.7% per annum*' which can be assumed will lead to a similar increase in traffic growth.

The Addendum report predicts that should the access to Station Square remain unchanged with access via Great Northern Road maintained as it is the proposed development will result in increases in AM and PM peak two ways flows of 2% and 1% respectively.

Should the proposed Station Square taxi access proposal be implemented redistributing taxis from Great Northern Road onto Station Road a reduction in AM and PM peak two ways flows of 17% and 33% respectively is predicted.

Given that the development site is located within the AQMA with its primary access along Great Northern Road where monitored levels of nitrogen dioxide are higher than was predicted in the original CB1 Master Plan, we welcome any proposal that shifts vehicle emissions away from sensitive residential receptors;

redistributing to Station Road where monitored levels are lower, there is a wider streetscape to encourage better dispersion and fewer sensitive residential receptors.

Further to this we ask that consideration is given to where Taxis will wait when the taxi rank is full. It is our understanding that this is currently at the existing car park site. Once construction begins on site without consideration of this issue there is the potential for additional vehicles to be shifted onto surrounding streets which could impact on local air quality.

Air Quality Assessment

The Operational Air Quality Assessment considers air quality both with and without the proposed development at agreed receptor locations; considering both proposed access scenarios off Station Square. The methodology is considered acceptable.

Modelling predicts an increase of 0.1 $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ of nitrogen dioxide (28.8 $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ and 27.3 $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ respectively) and less than 0.1 $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ of PM_{10} (18.92 $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ and 18.67 $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$) at both receptor points (1 & 2) on Great Northern Road should all access to Station Square be maintained along Great Northern Road.

Should the option to redistribute some taxi movements onto Station Road; modelling predicts a maximum decrease of 2.9 $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ of nitrogen dioxide (annual mean concentration 25.8 $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$) and 0.6 $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ of PM_{10} (annual mean concentration of 18.3 $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$) at receptor point 1 on Great Northern Road. In parallel there is an increase of 0.7 $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ nitrogen dioxide (16.8 $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$) and 0.2 $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ of PM_{10} (16.8 $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$) at receptor point 5 which is adjacent to Station Square.

The report concludes that under both scenarios the proposed development will not lead to a breach in objective levels within the AQMA. We agree with this conclusion. However, the report will introduce increased vehicle movements within the AQMA therefore mitigation is required.

MSCP Electric Vehicle (EV) charge points

The Letter from Bidwells dated 6th December 2019 confirms that the provision of 25% active slow EV charge points will be provided in the MSCP. These should have a minimum power

rating output of 3kW in line with guidance and best practice. The remaining car parking spaces will have passive provision in the form of 'ducts and service risers'. We agree that most car park users are commuters who will park their cars for longer period of times; therefore on this occasion the provision of 25% slow active EV charge points is considered acceptable.

Conclusion

We welcome the commitment from the applicant to deliver the 25% active slow EV charge points in the MSCP. Subject to the conditions above we have no objections on air quality grounds.

Conditions are recommended in relation to:

- Construction hours
- Collection hours during construction
- Construction/demolition noise/vibration & piling
- Dust
- Emergency or backup generator
- Contaminated land
- Acoustic compliance
- Plant noise insulation
- Delivery hours
- Waste compactor
- Artificial Lighting
- Kitchen extraction discharge
- Odour filtration / extraction
- Combustion Appliances – Low Emissions (CHP and Low NOx)
- EV Charge Points – Multi Storey Car Park

Informatives in relation to:

- Plant Noise
- Dust
- Emergency / back-up generator

Head of Policy

Latest Comments 18 Feb 20

6.11 No Objection: A revised National Planning Policy Framework was published February 2019. National policy in the NPPF

includes the presumption in favour of sustainable development at the heart of the planning system. This sets a clear expectation on planning authorities to plan positively to promote development and create sustainable communities. Paragraph 80 outlines how planning decisions should help create the conditions in which businesses can invest, expand and adapt by placing significant weight on the need to support economic growth and productivity, taking into account both local business needs and wider opportunities for development.

The adopted Cambridge Local Plan 2018

The Council adopted the Cambridge Local Plan in October 2018.

Policy 2: 'Spatial strategy for the location of employment development' outlines the Council's aim to ensure there is sufficient land available to support the forecast of 22,100 new jobs in Cambridge by 2031, including some 8,800 in B-use class (offices and industry). To support this aim, a range of locations, types and sizes of employment land has been allocated in the Local Plan.

The application site is located within site allocation 'Station Area West (1) – Site M14', listed in Appendix B, which forms part of the Station Area West area in Policy 21: Station Areas West and Clifton Road Area of Major Change. Policy 21 supports the area's continued and complete regeneration listing a range of acceptable uses which include B1(a) and B1(b) employment and hotel uses.

Policy 77: 'Development and expansion of visitor accommodation' explains the locations where new visitor accommodation in Cambridge will be supported as part of mixed-use schemes. These include land around Cambridge Station. The policy also reflects the increasing number of potential proposals for alternative types of visitor accommodation and how they should be treated, i.e. apart-hotels and serviced accommodation.

Hotel Needs Assessment

The applicant has submitted a report supporting the need for the proposed use. This is based upon an assessment of the performance of the Cambridge hotel market including how the

various consented proposals in recent years compare to the proposed aparthotel; a new midscale serviced aparthotel concept that does not currently exist in Cambridge. The report notes the site's proximity to the main railway station which should encourage guests to arrive by public transport who can then benefit from the extensive bus network that serves the station.

Hotel Need in Cambridge

The Cambridge Hotel Futures Study (2012) estimated the demand for visitor accommodation was split 35%-65% between leisure tourists and University & business visitors. The study identified a new generation of serviced accommodation that combines an element of self-catering with some hotel-style service is causing a blurring of the boundaries between uses in planning terms. These types of premises are generally intended to service extended stay corporate and university markets. They may, however, let units for shorter stays to business and leisure markets.

Since the Hotel Future Study was published, the number of visitors to Cambridge between 2010 & 2018 has doubled from 4 million visitors to 8.1 million visitors¹. The economic value of Cambridge's visitor economy is worth approximately £835 million accounting for 22% of employment in Cambridge². As noted in the applicant's Hotel Needs Assessment, the performance of Cambridge's hotel market has remained robust despite the recent arrival of new hotels.

While there is no specific published data relating to the performance of serviced apartments in Cambridge, there is national data available. UK (including London) reported occupancy levels achieved more than 76% compared to hotels at just over 73%. From this, it can be concluded that the use of aparthotels is a popular option with guests.

Accor is a national and internationally recognised brand with a dedicated reservation network; Adagio is Accor's aparthotel concept. At present, there are three sub-brands in operation: Adagio Premium (upscale) Adagio (midscale) and the economy

¹ Only 12% of these visitors are currently exploring beyond Cambridge; Around 30% of these visitors are visiting friends and family locally.

² Economic Impact of Tourism - Cambridge Report 2017

Adagio Access. The proposed Adagio is a midscale aparthotel brand, as such, in terms of hotel quality rating standard it would be fair to assume it is the equivalent of a 3-star.

Summary

Policy 2 and policy 21 allocation Station Area West (1) – Site M14 support the need for new Class B1(a) and B1(b) floorspace use in this location.

The location for hotel/visitor accommodation use is also supported in policy 21(h) and policy 77(c), respectively. The quality of the proposed Aparthotel is the equivalent of a 3-star hotel which is one of the identified hotel-rating needs for Cambridge outlined in 2012 Study and the supporting text of Policy 77. The Aparthotel (Class C1) proposal is therefore considered acceptable from a policy perspective, assuming the maximum length of stay (typically 90 days) is conditioned.

Recommends the following condition:

- Maximum length of stay 90 days (see proposed condition 14).

Head of Streets and Open Spaces (Landscape Team)

6.12 *Original Comments*

Amendments Required: The landscape proposals are generally supported, but amendments are sought relating to the Devonshire Road boundary.

Amendment Comments

No Objection: The proposals for the Devonshire Road boundary are acceptable subject to conditions finalising the planting design. The area allocated for planting is acceptable.

Conditions are recommended in relation to:

- Hard and soft landscaping
- Landscape maintenance and management plan:
- Green Roof

- Roof planting irrigation system
- Tree Pits

Head of Streets and Open Spaces (Sustainable Drainage Officer)

6.13 *Original Comments*

Objection: The proposals do not reduce flow to pre-development rates. i.e. greenfield discharge rates and should do more in terms of water quality and infiltration. The proposal is not in accordance with policies 31 and 32 of the LP and would result in an increase in flood risk.

Amendment Comments

No Objection: The planning officer and drainage officer met with the applicants and the drainage strategy was revised in Jan 20 and further supporting technical information submitted in Feb 20. This shows flow rates improved for block B2.

The City Council drainage officer states that the proposals have demonstrated that the improved surface water drainage scheme for this particular urban and constrained area can be delivered. However, for further clarity a detailed plan should be secured by condition with the following information:

- The flow controls and flow rates should be clearly marked on the drainage network drawing of the network to demonstrate that the flows leaving Building B2 and Building F2 sites meet the 5 l/s run-off rate.
- The drainage network drawing shall include all of the SuDS proposed.
- Detailed drawing of the entire proposed surface water drainage system, including pipe reference numbers matching the Hydraulic model (Micro Drainage) pipe/chamber references
- The treatment train for each different area should be indicated on a plan.

Local Lead Flood Authority

Comments of 24 Feb 20

Holding Objection: Refers to policies 31 and 32 of the Local Plan. Seeks further information / clarification regarding: green roofs; re-use of water; SuDs; hard surface infiltration / water quality; discharge rates; connection points.

Amendment Comments of 10 March 20

No Objection: Met with the applicants and case officer on 2 March 2020 and has reviewed further supporting drainage information / drainage documents.

The applicant has demonstrated that surface water from the proposed development can be managed using green roofs, tree pits, and an area of permeable paving, restricting surface water discharge to 5l/s from each proposed building. The LLFA is supportive of the use of green / brown roofs, tree pits and permeable paving as these features manage surface water runoff at the source.

Request a surface water drainage scheme condition based on SuDs principles. Suggests informatives regarding permeable paving and green roofs.

Senior Sustainability Officer (Design and Construction)

- 6.14 No Objection: These comments focus on the applicant's approach to sustainable design and construction in light of policies contained within the Cambridge Local Plan (2018), making reference to information contained within the Design and Access Statement, Sustainability Statement and Energy Strategy.

The Sustainability Statement outlines the approach that has been taken to integrating the principles of sustainable design and construction into the overall design of the scheme, including:

- Achievement of BREEAM 'excellent' for both buildings, with the hotel having a predicted score of 74.6% and the office 76.0%. This provides a reasonable buffer of credits against the minimum score required for BREEAM excellent;

- Proposals for green roofs on both the B2 and F2 buildings, which meets the requirement for all flat roofs to be green or brown roofs contained in policy 31 of the LP. The plans have been amended to show their precise location.
- Submission of a thermal comfort report which assesses the risk of overheating for both the hotel and the office space. Solar control glazing is proposed to help limit internal solar gains.
- Proposals for a hierarchical approach to reducing energy demand and associated carbon emissions, with the Energy Strategy highlighting that the scheme delivers a 31.5% reduction in carbon emissions over the Part L 2013 baseline. In terms of renewable and low carbon energy, the strategy involves the use of gas fired CHP and air source heat pumps for the hotel and air source heat pumps for the office building. Further information has clarified that there is no conflict between the use of the two systems for the hotel. Emissions standards will need to be secured for the gas CHP.
- With regards to water efficiency, policy 28 of the LP requires that all non-residential schemes achieve maximum credits under Wat 01 of BREEAM. The proposed scheme achieves 3 out of a possible 5 credits under Wat 01, which equates to a 40% reduction in water use. The findings of the Rainwater and Greywater feasibility studies is noted and the proposal represents a significant improvement on baseline water use.

Recommends conditions in relation to:

- BREEAM Certification (Design Stage and Post Construction)
- Renewable and Low Carbon Implementation

Urban Design and Conservation Team

6.15 No Objection: This has been the subject of extensive pre-application discussions with the applicants & agents.

Block B2

The block is to be used as a car park and an aparthotel and the form and C-plan layout has been arrived at following lengthy discussions about the relationship with existing buildings.

The visual impact of the block when viewed from the CA should be mitigated partly by the screening effect of the bicycle bridge, partly by the curved NE corner and the set-back of the top floor. This building forms the 'gateway' into the CB1 development when approached from the North and provides the design transition between the modest scale of the residential areas of the CA and the more commercial scale of the new area around the railway station.

The elevations have been treated in a similar way to many of those in the rest of the development and reflect the job that they have to do in relation to the adjacent uses. The East elevation fronting the railway has the car parking elements at the lower level, screened in a similar way to that of the bicycle park. The rooms are arranged above that with the top floor is set back from the parapet. The South elevation backs onto the back of the bicycle park / hotel and forms a service space between the buildings. The corner at the front here is important as it has to 'read' as the pedestrian entrance to the car park.

The North elevation is relatively close to the Carter Bridge and provides the entrance to vehicles entering the car park. The detailed design and signage will be important to the success of this element. The West elevation, the main street frontage has to function as the main entrance to the 'Aparthotel' as well as having the two entrances to the car park on the corners. The double-height atrium, provided that it is well-detailed and in suitable materials, should allow users to see clearly how to approach & enter the building. The 'feature staircase' will also be important in giving the views into the atrium from the street some visual focal point. The important thing here is that the materials are well-chosen so that the building feels part of the overall development and has some shared characteristics but also has some distinction from others so that its wider function [the car park] is easily identified.

Block F2

Throughout the pre-app. period the use of this block changed several times. It is now submitted as offices. The design remains similar to those presented for other uses and generally follows the pattern of trying not to appear as one, very long, monolithic building. The corner block [facing into the Station Square] is very important in townscape terms but it should not dominate the streets leading from the mini roundabout. The recessed entrance seems to work reasonably well – subject to detail – but the floor-to-ceiling glazing is raised as a concern. How the flank of this building links to the adjacent blocks of housing on Great Northern Street will need to be properly detailed via a condition.

The ‘family resemblance’ proposed for the brick facades with artificial stone banding is acceptable as a concept but will need to be done well. The curved end at the ‘gateway’ into the development from the CA works in relation to the end of Block B2 opposite and helps to funnel pedestrians, cyclists and vehicles into the new street being created. The hard landscaping here will be crucial to the success of providing safe passage for all. The palette of materials here – provided that it is selected correctly – also should work well with the building opposite and with the corner block at the other end but, again, floor-to-ceiling glass is unacceptable; the screening shown looks inadequate for the job.

This building is intended for the train drivers and it would be a good thing to recognise this somehow in this part of the building and to emphasise the railway heritage somewhere. The central block of this frontage is of similar design but of a different brick – this will be acceptable as long as the types are chosen well. This also goes for the engineering brick plinth. The rear elevation design facing Ravensworth Gardens housing is now very straightforward compared to previous iterations which may give it rather less visual impact in terms of materials and articulation but might, alternatively, appear somewhat bland. Others will comment upon its appropriateness in terms of neighbourliness.

Recommended Conditions

Block B2

Recommends conditions in relation to:

- material samples
- glass types
- sample panels
- design of the atrium
- design of entrances
- car park security
- lighting
- rooftop plant
- ramp retaining walls
- top floor cladding
- service yard
- green roofs and gardens

Block F2

Recommends conditions in relation to:

- link construction
- special masonry
- main entrance
- windows & frames
- signage

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

7.0 REPRESENTATIONS

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

- CamCycle, 140 Cowley Road
- Gonville Hotel
- Great Northern Road Residents Association
- Meldreth, Shepreth and Foxton Rail User Group
- Rail Future, Cambridge
- Smarter Transport UK
- South Petersfield Residents' Association
- Ilex House, Barrington
- Rose Cottage, Bury St Edmunds
- The Hilton, 20 Downing Street

1 Edieham Cottages (Royston)
1 St Eligius Place
1 Lamor Drive
4 Pearce Close
5 Ramsden Square
6 Hertford Street
7 Caxton End (St Neots)
8 Holland Street
9 Devonshire Road
12 Saxon Road
13 The Beech Building, Rudduck Way
14 Harry Scott Court
14 Bead Road
15 Latham Road
15 Shelly Garden
17 Romsey Road
17 Lilywhite Drive
19 Ainsworth Place
19 Petersfield Mansions
20 Downing Street
21 Bowers Croft
21 North Lodge Park, Milton
22 Devonshire Road
22 Camside
25 Devonshire Road
26 Crathern Way
27 St Barnabas Road
27 Devonshire Road
30 Great Northern Road
31 Devonshire Road
31 Hinton Road, Fulbourn
33c Great Eastern Street
34 Great Northern Road
34 Emery Street
36 Ditton Walk
41 Raeburn House, Lapwing Avenue
41 Garden Walk
42 Owlstone Road
43 Ravensworth Gardens
43 Devonshire Road
45 Ravensworth Gardens
46 Devonshire Road
51 Scholars Walk
51 Ravensworth Gardens

52 Macaulay Avenue, Great Shelford
 52 St Thomas' Square
 54 Devonshire Road
 57 Tenison Road
 62 Devonshire Road
 62 Great Northern Road
 70 Devonshire Mews
 72 Devonshire Mews
 72 Hemingford Road
 72 Ravensworth Gardens
 74 Ravensworth Gardens
 74 Holbrook Road
 74 Foster Road
 79 DeFreville Avenue
 80b York Street
 81 Winfold Road (Waterbeach)
 81 Great Northern Road
 83 Great Northern Road
 85 Great Northern Road
 89 Great Northern Road
 91 Great Northern Road
 95 North End, Meldreth
 108 Great Northern Road
 113 Great Northern Road
 116 Tenison Road
 117 Great Northern Road
 140 Cowley Road
 176 Foster Road

A number of representations have been received from unknown addresses.

7.2 The representations can be summarised as follows:

Topic	Issue
Road and Highways	Impact of additional traffic and associated impacts on Great Northern Road, Tenison Road and Devonshire Road.
	Vehicular traffic will continue to be allowed to dominate Great Northern Road which is a residential street.
	Vehicular traffic will continue to cause conflict on Great Northern Road between pedestrians and cyclists.

	Narrowing of road to station car park unsafe.
	Great Northern Road should be closed to vehicular traffic except for residential use.
	The Tenison Road / Station Road junction should be signal controlled with safe crossings for pedestrians.
	Loss of zebra crossing at the corner of Station Road is not acceptable.
	The raised table crossing of Station Road south east of the Tenison Road junction is not acceptable.
	Plans for people to cross Station Road are insufficient
Transport Assessment	Transport Assessment figures are not reliable, there are discrepancies in traffic count data with Resident Association counts.
	24-hour traffic count data is incorrect (average hourly flows over 24 hours exceed measured peak hour flows).
	Growth in traffic (taxis, private hire, pick-up / drop-off) to and from the station at 5.7% per year will mean the 29% reduction in evening peak traffic will be eliminated in just five years.
	Traffic counts undertaken too long ago.
	The TA underplays traffic impact associated with servicing / deliveries to the proposed business uses.
New Access	The entire access arrangements to the Station Area should be re-examined.
	Moving only Hackney carriages onto the new access will not resolve issues on Great Northern Road.
	The new access would cut across a pedestrian through route used by large numbers of people (30,000 – 40,000 people enter / exit the station every day) and cause conflict and be unsafe.
	Pedestrian users should be put above the interests of car and taxi users. Pedestrians are disadvantaged. Hierarchy of use is

	broken.
	The new access would partially solve a problem on Great Northern Road but introduce a new problem elsewhere.
	Over-ranking will not occur.
	The access would not allow for mandatory cycle lanes to be provided down either side of Station Road.
	It will not be possible to separate cars and taxis using the new access.
	New access is supported, it will improve existing issues on Great North Road.
	The new access should allow for all traffic utilising the Station Square and allow for one-way routing up Great Northern Road and out onto Station Road.
Height, Massing, Siting	Blocks B2 and F2 are too tall and massive and would detract from the smaller scale houses on Devonshire Road.
	B2 is taller than the IBIS and the outline parameter.
	F2 is taller than envisaged in the outline parameter.
	B2 is closer to Carter bridge and Devonshire Mews than the outline parameter.
	Plant is too high.
	The development cannot be justified on the basis that there is no proposal coming forward on the northern side of Carter Bridge (G1, G2).
	Overdevelopment.
Masterplan, Design and Landscaping	Lacks character and craft for a gateway position.
	The vision for Station Square is broken by the proposal to include a new access point.
	Devonshire Road area should be re-landscaped.
	Lack of green space across CB1.
	A permanent emergency access from Devonshire Road will facilitate the permanent

	removal of TPO'd trees.
	Design of CB1 is becoming a 'concrete jungle'.
	The development does not improve the appearance of Station Square.
	Station Square is dominated by cars.
	The whole layout of Station Square should be reviewed.
	Station Square should be planned for the provision of a metro interchange.
	Lack of wayfinding in Station Square.
	All decisions should be postponed on CB1 until a new masterplan with car parking and an entrance on the eastern side of the railway line pursued as an option.
Car Park	The multi-storey car park encourages motor traffic into a congested area and is not sustainable contrary to policy 80 of the LP.
	Preserving car parking numbers does not align with encouraging modal shift away from driving and parking in the City.
	Parking capacity has already been reduced through the outline consent; why not reduce capacity further.
	Removing the car park would improve the appearance of B2.
	The Cambridge Leisure car park should be amalgamated with CB1.
	All car parking around the station should be removed and replaced on the Clifton Road side of the railway.
	The need for the car park appears only to be for the short term, this is not planning for the future.
	Parking provision only needs to be sufficient for deliveries and for disabled parking.
	Will lead to more anti-social behaviour.
	The car park should provide short-term car parking as provision in the area for existing residents is poor.
Pedestrian	There should be a zebra crossing on Great

	Northern Road.
	The footway around the multi-storey car park would be too narrow.
	The design of the shared space on the access road to the station car park would result in user conflict and be unsafe (particularly when the Chisholm Trail opens).
	Pedestrians need better protection from cyclists.
Cycle	Adjustments to Devonshire Road cycle route link and zebra crossing on Station Road are welcome.
	Bulk of cycling comments from DCF not addressed.
	Kerb-upstands on the cycle link will create accidents. They should be flush.
	Franchise obligation for Abellio / Greater Anglia for an extra 1,000 cycle parking spaces should be implemented in place of the carpark. There are currently no plans for where these would go. No plans have been forthcoming which show how the car park could be converted for cycles. Any additional cycle parking should be provided by way of an extension to the existing cycle park, as separate entrances would not be appropriate. The Station Area should be future proofed for increased and better cycle parking provision (2,850 + 1,000 will not be sufficient). Better cycle parking would include space for electric charging points, better provision for 'off gauge' cycles and better security.
	A solution should be provided to enable better cycle access across Station Square. The new access onto it does not resolve this issue.
	Cyclists travelling south – north would have to cross (turn right) into the new access. This would be a dangerous manoeuvre.
	A Bidirectional cycle lane should be pursued as per Smarter Cambridge sketch but this would interfere with the footprint of F2.

	Station area provision for cyclists, including access to Cycle Point is poor. Proper joined up cycle paths need to be provided for the Station Area, particularly given the proposed plans for the Chisholm Trail.
	Great Northern Road is unusable by cycle. The mini-roundabout at the top of Great North Road will become more unsafe.
Rail	The station requires a strategic masterplan ahead of any further expansion to better accommodate pedestrian and non-motorised users.
	Support an additional eastern entrance to the Station to mitigate overcrowding. There has been growth in the use of station by 25% between 2013 and 2018 and this will likely continue.
	New accesses to the station near platforms 3 and 6 should be provided.
Buses	Rail service replacement buses would be shifted to local bus stops in Station Place and disrupt those services.
	Bus services to the station should be improved.
	Bus stops around the station should be closer to the entrance than taxis.
Taxis	The taxi rank and pick-up drop-off area should be moved to where Murdoch House currently sits and the area re-landscaped.
	The existing taxi rank cover should be extended.
	Alternative solutions for dealing with unlicensed taxis should be explored.
	Taxis currently idle in the station car park.
	Taxis currently abuse the use of the drop-off / pick-up bays.
	There is no provision to stop taxis continuing to use Great Northern Road.
Amenity	Traffic increases will increase noise on Great

<i>Noise from Traffic</i>	Northern Road and will mainly be from 7.5 tonne diesel lorries. Deliveries are not currently managed and are often early in the morning and not enforced.
	Noise associated with the bin and bike store for F2 adjacent to residential boundary would cause harm.
	Great Northern Road properties are already exposed to noise levels that are in violation of planning conditions and European recommended levels
	This is an opportunity to revisit traffic routing and reduce further the use of Great Northern Road by vehicles.
	Noise from waste collection vehicles collecting from Great Northern Road.
<i>Noise from Hotel Users</i>	Users of the hotel will have no vested interest in the amenity of the existing area or its community. There will be increases in late night noise associated with the hotel use.
<i>Air Pollution</i>	Traffic increases from delivery vehicles (most polluting vehicles) will increase air pollution on Great Northern Road beyond already exceeded legal limits.
	Air pollution would be shifted to Station Road where queuing taxis would emit pollution affecting pedestrians and cyclists.
	Canyon effect of design amplifying noise and air pollution.
	Air pollution levels would return after 5 years on Great Northern Road due to background growth in traffic levels.
	Adding more car parking will not address pollution levels
	The car park should have EV charge points to allow it to comply with the Council's Air Quality Action Plan.
<i>Overshadowing</i>	Height of the corner element of F2 is above the outline parameter.
	Overshadowing and loss of daylight of rooms and the courtyard of F1.
	Overshadowing and loss of daylight of Ravensworth Gardens (gardens and

	properties).
<i>Privacy</i>	Privacy impact on residents of F1.
	Privacy impact on residents of Ravensworth Gardens.
<i>Enclosure</i>	Will loom over and dominate Devonshire Road properties.
<i>Quality of Life</i>	The development would reduce the quality of life of residents of Great Northern Road and users of the area.
Construction	Construction access from Devonshire Road is unacceptable and would be unsafe.
	Further construction vehicles visiting the area will generate highway safety issues.
	Construction work should only be allowed over the weekdays 8am – 6pm and not weekdays.
	Construction phasing plans should be revised.
Hotel	No need for a further aparthotel use.
	The city is oversupplied with hotels.
	The hotel needs assessment is out of date and does not contain up-to-date information.
	Homestay (AirBnB) is not referred to in the hotel needs assessment
	Hotel investment in Cambridge is declining.
Other	Submitted plans need updating.
	The applicant is not giving an undertaking not to develop G1 and G2.
	Lost revenue from a multi-storey car park could be replaced with revenue from additional shops and services.
	Greed and profit have overruled the goal of a pleasant, efficient station square.
	The aparthotel should be replaced with social housing
	Consultation poor
	Emergency vehicle access will be made more difficult down Great North Road.
	Aldwyck Housing Group not consulted
	Missed opportunity

	Station Road to Station Square should be opened up to traffic prior to construction of B2 and F2.
	Devonshire Road parking route should be opened up prior to construction.
	Construction traffic must be limited to 9am – 5pm and not weekdays or bank holidays.
	All private hire vehicles (Hackney Carriages, Ubers and drop-off / pick-up) should be moved to Station Road.
	Deliveries to Station Square should be moved to Station Road.
	Residents needs have been ignored over the needs of businesses.
	Damage caused to sewers and road infrastructure.
	Existing issues in CB1 are not out of scope for discussion. The development would exacerbate site wide issues.
	Existing deliveries often take place too early (between 5am – 7am) despite complaints.
	Estate management by Brookgate is poor.
	Character of the area would change the balance of residential vs business/short-term let.
	Residents' parking should be introduced to Great Northern Road.
Amendments	Amendments to F2 are welcome but have not overcome issues of overlooking, overshadowing and overbearing on Ravensworth Gardens properties.
	F2 is not residential and should be considered entirely on its own merits and compliance with national and local policies.
	NPPF para 123 does not allow for flexibility for office development.
	The alternative commuted sum for a range of interventions for the Station Square is not a detailed proposal. The interventions have not been modelled or costed and the offer is irregular. A number of the proposed interventions would not work.

	None of the proposed interventions will be able to restrict the rate at which CCLT-licensed taxis return to the station.
	Amendments have not addressed the lack of a clear, safe, signed north-south cycle route between Devonshire Rd and the Busway to Addenbrooke's and to Cycle point. Segregated safe cycle access through the Station Area needs to be provided. The improvements should be costed.
	The proposal will create more conflicts between cars, cycles and pedestrians on Great Northern Rd, at the junction in front of the Ibis hotel and through the pick-up/drop-off area.
	DoT have agreed to derogate Greater Anglia's franchise for a further 1,000 cycle parking at the station. Peak demand will exceed current provision within a few years. It is irresponsible of Greater Anglia and Brookgate to prioritise commercial redevelopment of station land over enhanced and expanded provision for sustainable transport in light of growing passenger nos. at the Station.
	Welcome removal of Devonshire Road construction access.
	Amendments to F2 have not overcome concern regarding impact on Great Northern Road (GNR) properties in terms of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Natural daylight and sunlight entering bedrooms and study rooms and flowing through to other rooms will be significantly reduced and flats less warm with less overall amenity. -Enclosure and dominating outlook. -Enclosure and loss of daylight / sunlight to the external courtyard. -The proposal would worsen good aspects of amenity enjoyed by GNR residents which accord with national guidance. -The proposal is contrary to the BRE guidance (3 properties would fail the BRE

	guidelines). -Overlooking
	Amendments proposed have not been borne out of discussions with the residents or residents' associations.
	Increase in office floorspace unjustified. 20% increase in floorspace
	Amendments have not addressed traffic, pollution or noise and disturbance concerns. Deliveries times needs to be controlled and they are not currently enforced. The land uses will attract large vehicle deliveries. There are existing respiratory issues experienced by residents of GNR. Predicted air quality levels at outline are already being exceeded breaching legal limits. The proposal would exacerbate these.
	The Council is only concerned about profit.
	The basement for F2 will involve a greater degree of disturbance, with large nos. of construction traffic required for excavation.
	Unsure if the pedestrian crossing is still proposed across to Sainsbury's. Need a pedestrian crossing on the East side of the street.
	Supporting technical daylight and sunlight assessment not provided.
	F2 should be residential not offices as per the original outline consent to help foster a sense of community. The uses, the MSCP, will encourage anti-social behaviour.
	Traffic modelling is only to 2022
	Impact should improve not worsen the existing traffic issues
	Construction traffic should be limited to between 9am and 4pm.
	Delivery traffic should be limited to between 9am and 6pm
	Waste collections should be limited to those for deliveries and servicing
	The developer should demonstrate how the proposal will meet net zero carbon emissions

	over the lifetime of the development given the declared Climate Emergency.
	Amendments have not addressed the short-term parking needs of residents in the area.
	No need for the uses.
	The car parking spaces need to remain in order to preserve the openness of the area.
	The applicant's offer to review cycle routes through Station Square and to provide £500,000 to remedy problems. This is an admission that the design as implemented is defective.
	The offer of £500,000.00 is not sufficient to tackle existing issues.
	The MSCP will continue to attract cars into CB1
	The new access for CC licenced Hackney carriages will not control Ubers or SCDC licenced taxis from using GNR and neither does the taxi licencing policy introduced by Cambridge affect Ubers or SCDC licenced taxis or those from elsewhere. These vehicles would continue to pollute. Taxis could also be allowed to continue to use GNR.
	The existing environmental quality is poor, the proposal will only worsen this.
	The number of electric charge points should be increased and they should be arranged in hubs.

7.3 Cllr Robertson has made representations in relation to the application. These are summarised as follows:

- The outline consent for B2 and F2 was for both buildings to provide residential accommodation. Uses not acceptable.
- Need for hotel, given two existing Hotels in CB1.
- F2 would adversely affect the adjacent block of flats F2 causing loss of light.
- Ravensworth Gardens would be overshadowed and suffer loss of direct sunlight.

- The proposal for B2 to extend further north and with a taller building than approved at outline stage would lead to visual dominance and overbearing of houses on Devonshire Road.
- Plans for G1 and G2 should be withdrawn.
- Scheme should make better use of rainwater recycling for B2 (Hotel) as per policy 28.
- Risk of flooding contrary to local plan policies.
- PV panels should be provided on the southeast facing walls of B2.
- A minimum of 25% of parking spaces be provided with charging points and 100% be provided with infrastructure as part of the construction.
- The pedestrian crossings at the station end of Gt Northern Road, across the busway, and on Station Road near Tenison road, are welcomed.
- Bike lanes should be provided on Gt Northern Road which currently has a highway which is too narrow to allow for safe cycling.
- The development of the Chisholm Trail running north from the station through the car park will lead to ever increasing cycle movements along the road between blocks B2 and F2. It appears that there are no cycle lanes proposed on this road which would be a serious mistake.
- The franchise under which Govia run the station is a requirement for an additional 1000 bike parking spaces to be provided. These should be provided as close as possible to the station and the area to be built on by blocks B2 and F2 is the only remaining space available.
- The impact of redirecting all traffic to the station (apart from buses) via Gt Northern Road has been to create high levels of noise and air pollution. A requirement of any planning permission should be that the new access from Station Road to the Square be provided and that all hackney taxis and hire cars be allowed to use it.
- A requirement of any planning permission should be that servicing of B2 and F2 is restricted to appropriate hours and 8am to 8pm is suggested. This must include banning the

movement of these service vehicles on Gt Northern Road out of these hours.

- The alternative £500,000 should be detailed and the other options for mitigation and their feasibility set out.

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

8.0 ASSESSMENT

8.1 From the consultation responses and representations received the main issues are as follows:

1. Principle of Development
2. New Access and Alternatives
3. Context of Site, Design, External Spaces and Heritage
4. Carbon Reduction and Sustainable Design
5. Integrated Water Management and Flood Risk
6. Residential Amenity
7. Environmental Impacts
8. Contaminated Land
9. Inclusive Access
10. Ecology
11. Cycle Parking
12. Third party representations
13. Planning Obligations (s106 Agreement)
14. Conclusion

Principle of Development

Background

8.2 The outline planning permission for CB1 was approved in April 2010 under ref: 08/0266/OUT for the following development:

The comprehensive redevelopment of the Station Road area, comprising up to 331 residential units (inclusive of 40% affordable homes), 1,250 student units; 53,294 sqm of Class B1a (Office) floorspace; 5,255 sqm of Classes A1/A3/A4 and/or A5 (retail) floorspace; a 7,645 sqm polyclinic; 86 sqm of D1 (art workshop) floorspace; 46 sqm D1 (community room); 1,753

sqm of D1 and/or D2 (gym, nursery, student/community facilities) floorspace; use of block G2 (854 sqm) as either residential student or doctors surgery, and a 6,479 sqm hotel; along with a new transport interchange and station square, including 28 taxi bays and 9 bus stops (2 of which are double stops providing 11 bays in total), a new multi storey cycle and car park including accommodation for c. 2,812 cycle spaces, 52 motorcycle spaces and 632 car parking spaces; highway works including improvements to the existing Hills Road / Brooklands Avenue junction and the Hills Road/Station Road junction and other highway improvements, along with an improved pedestrian/cyclist connection with the Carter Bridge; and works to create new and improved private and public spaces

- 8.3 The outline permission was subject to a series of parameter plans setting maximum building heights, development areas and uses for plots across the station area.
- 8.4 For the land upon which the aparthotel and multi-storey car park is located, this was identified as Block B1 on the approved parameter plans. Block B1 was to be a single building accommodating retail at the ground floor fronting the square, offices and car and cycle parking. Block B1 has subsequently been divided and is being delivered in two phases, with the first phase already built. This comprises a 231 room IBIS hotel, food and beverage uses addressing the square and a multi-storey cycle park accommodating 2,850 bicycles. This block has been in full operational use since late summer 2016. Block B2 forms the majority of the second half of the B1 parameter plan plot which is the subject of this application.
- 8.5 Block F2 was envisaged for residential use. It is currently undeveloped and utilised for surface grade car parking.

Key Policies, Guidance and Approach to Decision Making

- 8.6 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).
- 8.7 Policies 1 and 2 of the 2018 LP set out the Council's aspirations for sustainable development and the spatial strategy for the

location of employment development. The supporting text to policy 2, at para. 2.41 specifically refers to the Station Area in playing a key role in delivering the spatial strategy, stating:

'The local plan will support the continued growth of the nationally significant Cambridge Cluster. The plan seeks to deliver new employment land at six key locations in Cambridge. These are: the area around Cambridge Station, West Cambridge, Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrooke's), North West Cambridge (covered by the North West Cambridge Area Action Plan), Fulbourn Road and Cambridge Northern Fringe East. There are also likely to be a number of opportunities to redevelop and improve offices throughout Cambridge over the lifetime of the plan.'

- 8.8 The redevelopment of the station area through the outline consent and subsequent approvals / permissions has helped contribute towards the previous 2006 LP's vision to regenerate the station area as a mixed-use neighbourhood around an enhanced transport interchange (see policy 1 supporting para. 2.36). The delivered strategic transport infrastructure improvements which include Station Square, CyclePoint and additional new access points / integration with the guided busway set the context within which the proposed development of blocks B2 and F2 come forward. The redevelopment of these blocks is entirely consistent with strategic employment and transport policies 2 and 5 embedded into the LP. This is a highly sustainable urban location where the completion of the regeneration of the CB1 Devonshire Quarter is strongly supported by adopted policy.

- 8.9 LP policy 21 is directly applicable to the proposal, which identifies that the application site lies within proposal site M14 Station Area West (1). The text to the policy states:

'Development at the Station Areas West and Clifton Road Area of Major Change, as defined on the Policies Map and shown on Figure 3.7, will support the continued and complete regeneration of vibrant, mixed-use areas of the city, centred around and accessible to a high quality and improved transport interchange. The principal land uses will include:

- a. a major regenerated multi-modal transport interchange focused on the existing Cambridge Railway Station, which services Cambridge and its subregion;
- b. residential use with an indicative capacity of 331 dwellings and 1,250 student units;
- c. B1(a) and B1(b) employment;
- d. a mix of uses in classes A1, A2, A3, A4 and A5;
- e. improved cycling and walking routes and facilities;
- f. open spaces, both hard surfaced and green;
- g. community uses; and
- h. hotel uses.'

8.10 The policy does not seek to cap the B1(a) or B1(b) employment floorspace uses and neither does it seek to cap hotel provision. Both are principal land uses proposed as part of the application and are consistent with policy 21. The supporting text to policy 21 at para. 3.85 goes on to state:

'Development should be carried out in accordance with the masterplan and parameter plans established by the outline permission. However, it is recognised that some flexibility will be needed to respond to changes in planning policy and to ensure that the overall development continues to be capable of supporting the delivery of the transport infrastructure and improvements to the public realm.'

8.11 The supporting text is relevant because of the shift from those uses envisaged at outline for the application site to those now being proposed and the flexibility that is afforded. It is also relevant in relation to the approved parameter plans and the appropriateness of these in setting a baseline for development proposals; the text to the policy suggesting that the parameters established at the masterplan stage will continue to have relevance for development proposals. The inference is that it is reasonable for e.g. to assess the visual and amenity impacts of blocks B2 and F2, particularly in relation to residential amenity, against what was approved at outline stage.

Aparthotel

8.12 LP policy 77 (Development and expansion of visitor accommodation) states that proposals for high quality visitor accommodation will be supported as part of mixed-use schemes at:

- a. Old Press/Mill Lane;
 - b. key sites around Parker's Piece;
 - c. land around Cambridge station and the proposed new station serving North East Cambridge; and
 - d. any large windfall sites that come forward in the city centre during the plan period.
- 8.13 The application site meets criterion c). There is therefore a strong policy presumption to support the aparthotel proposal.
- 8.14 The supporting text to the policy at para 8.46 states that there is a projected requirement for *'around 1,500 new bedrooms over the next 20 years'*, and this is predicated on a study undertaken in 2012 entitled 'Cambridge Hotel Futures'.
- 8.15 The figure of 1,500 new hotel bedrooms is not a cap on overall provision. For it to be a cap it would have to be expressed as such within the text of the policy.
- 8.16 The NPPF sets out that policies for assessed need should be as a minimum, and this is consistent with the way in which policy 77 is worded.
- 8.17 The applicant has submitted a document prepared by Bridget Baker Consulting Ltd in September 2017 detailing the trends in the local hotel market and providing a statement of need for the proposed Adagio aparthotel.
- 8.18 This sets out that the 125-bed aparthotel is for the company Accor and is branded an Adagio mid-scale aparthotel. There are currently two hotels in the CB1 development – the Accor branded Ibis (231 beds) and the 155 room Clayton (formerly the Tamburlaine) - on CB1. The Adagio will take the number of hotels up to three in the immediate CB1 cluster.
- 8.19 It would comprise 90 studio apartments and 35 one-bedroom apartments, the latter would be able to sleep up to four people and the studios up to two people. The applicants state that the Cambridge hotel market is relatively well supplied in terms of budget, three-star and four-star provision, but currently there are very limited options for those guests seeking an extended stay (Aparthotel, Serviced Apartment) product.
- 8.20 Adagio aparthotels provide the following services:

Rooms come with an equipped kitchen;

- Free wi-fi & web corner;
- 24 hour reception;
- Breakfast/Grab & Go;
- Self-service laundry;
- Luggage room;
- Mini Market;
- Fitness Room; and
- Daily housekeeping at extra cost.

8.21 The pricing structure for the aparthotel encourages longer stays, with average stays of 4.5 nights.

8.22 The planning application was received by the Council in November 2018. As such, officers asked for an updated hotel needs assessment. This was submitted in January 2020 and takes into account recent approved applications. The updated report provides a current overview of existing and proposed hotel supply in Cambridge, which is replicated in tables 2.1 and 2.2 below.

Table 2.1 Structure of Cambridge Hotel Market (2019)				
Category	No. Hotels	No. Rooms	Mix (%)	Av. Size
Ungraded	3	41	1.2	14
Hostel	1	32	0.9	32
Budget / Limited-Service	11	1,276	37.6	116
Three-Star	8	492	14.5	62
Four-Star	13	1,360	40.1	105
Serviced Apartments	5	192	5.7	38
Total	41	3,393	100.0	83
Source: Bridget Baker Consulting Research				

Table 2.2 Potential New Hotel Openings in the City Centre area

Hotel Name	Location	No. rooms	Category	Planning Status
The Lion Yard	Behind Grand Arcade Shopping centre, opp. High St.	125	Tbc	Granted
Curio by Hilton	Mitcham's Corner, at the bottom of Milton Road	160	Upscale aparthotel	Granted
Premier Inn	Grafton Centre, Fitzroy Street, CB1 1PS	153	Budget	Granted sub. to S106
Wilde, StayCity Aparthotel	On Park St. Car Park, opp. Varsity Hotel	227	Upscale aparthotel	Granted
Easyhotel	Newmarket Rd., on the jct with Godestone Rd	90	Budget	Granted sub. To S106
The Hobson, Rogue City Hotels	Hobson House, St Andrews St.	57	Upscale Boutique	Granted
Total		812		
Source: Bridget Baker Consulting Research				

8.23 The update report on hotel need states that even with recent increases to the upscale hotel bedroom supply in the city centre there has been no impact on performance levels (vacancy rates or room rates). This shows that there is significant unmet accommodation demand.

The update report also assesses the nature of the existing and future proposed hotels in Cambridge and concludes that the Adagio aparthotel product is not directly competitive. In particular, the 227 aparthotel at Park Street (Staycity Wilde) is described as a premium brand, whereas an Adagio is a midscale aparthotel brand and the update report from the

applicant's hotel consultants concludes that these two aparthotels are competing in different markets.

- 8.24 The applicants have also considered other hotels in the pipeline outside the city centre, such as at Cambridge North (217 beds), Eddington (330 beds), and at the Science Park (153 beds) but conclude due to the strength of demand in the city and high occupancy levels and average room rates achieved, Cambridge continues to be a significant interest to hotel companies.
- 8.25 In officers' view, the evidence suggests that the proposed midscale aparthotel is needed and that it would fill a gap in the aparthotel market for Cambridge. Its location is ideally suited to visitors (business and tourist) arriving by train. Extended stays in the aparthotel will encourage more expenditure in the Cambridge economy, particularly in the evenings. There is no reason to disagree with the findings of the report and the recent addendum submitted by the applicant.
- 8.26 Policy 77 does not cap the provision of new visitor accommodation. The principle of the aparthotel use, being located in a highly sustainable location with excellent public transport links and within walking distance of thriving businesses, shops, services and attractions in the city centre, is acceptable. Conditions 13 and 14 seek to limit the maximum number of nights stay for any individual visitor (90 days in any 12 month period, with records kept) given the facilities provided within the aparthotel product in line with advice from colleagues in Policy.

Multi-Storey Car Park

- 8.27 The application site relates to the area of the CB1 Masterplan which was identified as part of Block B1 on the approved parameter plans. Block B1 was to comprise a multi-storey car park (MSCP) and a retail and office building addressing the new Station Square.
- 8.28 Third-party representations have questioned, in what is a highly sustainable location, the principle of replacing surface level parking with a MSCP. The existing road network at peak times within CB1 – particularly Great Northern Road and its feeder roads - struggles to cope with the volume of traffic attempting to access the Station. The levels of vehicular traffic are a cause for

concern for third parties in relation to air quality, noise and disturbance and conflict with pedestrians and cyclists. The applicant proposes mitigation including the provision of EV charging points (25%) within the car park, a new access between Station Road from Station Square (not directly required as a result of B2 and F2 being proposed) and controls over delivery and servicing times. Even with these measures, it is understandable that third parties wish for the opportunity to be taken to reduce car parking levels overall.

- 8.29 However, in terms of principle, the proposal would not introduce any more car parking than at present, representing a re-provision of 206 car parking spaces within a split-level MSCP. The impact of the scheme in this respect is neutral. Policy 21 does not provide any specific guidance regarding car parking levels and there would be no in principle conflict with policy 82 'Parking management'. In fact, the distinct lack of car parking specifically for either the aparthotel or the office block is in the spirit of policies 80 and 82 which support car-free and car capped development where there is good, easily walkable and cyclable access to the city centre and where there is high public transport accessibility. Given the outline application envisaged a 632 multi-storey car park, the proposal for 206 spaces appears reasonable and could not be resisted under the current LP.
- 8.30 Whilst not material planning policy, the applicants have also indicated – as part of part of their amendments to the scheme in April 2019 in response to a Development Control Forum in Jan of that year - that the income from the station car parking and the ability to grow this income is an important commercial factor for the Train Operating Company (TOC) being able to meet its franchise commitments. The franchise process also penalises TOC's financially if it is unable to meet its franchise service commitments and the provision of parking is part of that commitment. The applicant's confirm that car parking at the Station as an important part of the offer to passengers to trains and that there is no realistic prospect that the Rail Industry would commit to the closure or even reduction of the car parking at Cambridge Station during the life of the current franchise which runs to 2025. These are matters which are outside of the control of the local planning authority. However, this notwithstanding, the applicants have confirmed that the physical structure of the MSCP is capable of being converted

into a cycle park albeit in no way does this potential conversion form part of the planning application before members.

Office and Research and Development (R&D) Uses for Building F2

- 8.31 The provision of an office / R&D block for block F2 aligns with the range of uses envisaged for the Station Area West under policy 21. Third party representations suggest that the block should be used for housing in order to help meet housing need and help build a community within CB1. However, the amount of office space across the Station Area West is not capped by policy 21 and the supporting text to the policy at para. 3.85 allows for flexibility. The applicants suggest that an office use is better suited to the location of block F2. Officers agree, privacy constraints posed by Ravensworth Gardens and F1 properties would mean that officers would not want to introduce residential windows overlooking the gardens and rooms of these properties. This would mean that any rooms from a residential block facing onto the access road would be likely to have to rely on this aspect as the main outlook where future occupants' privacy would be compromised. The view of officers is that a residential use here does pose considerably greater challenges in terms of land use planning and typology layout. An office use is a better fit in this location, providing a greater animation of the access road during the day and being equally compliant with policy 21.
- 8.32 Third party representations suggest that a residential use should attract greater support from the Council because it would help the Council continue to meet its housing needs. However, the office / R&D uses would also be compatible with the Council's employment strategy in this location and help strengthen the existing cluster of companies working within the CB1 masterplan area. Given that the Council has a five-year housing land supply, there is no additional weight that could be attributed to one use over another. Whilst the development of a larger residential community in this part of the CB1 development is desirable for existing residents in Great Northern Road, this could not contribute towards a reason to resist the proposed office / R&D use.
- 8.33 The applicants recognise that the proposed commercial use for F2 is not compatible with the CB1 Masterplan residential

allocation. However, in this respect it is noted that Ceres and the Mill, Vesta and I1 / K1 blocks (now under construction and which were originally commercial blocks earmarked for around 9,500sqm of space) together provide an additional 64 residential units above that allowed for by the outline. The overall amount of residential accommodation has therefore slightly increased over the original CB1 consent, with I1/K1 more than compensating for the loss of residential accommodation originally consented at outline for Block F2. See the below table for breakdown.

Outline Consent	Approvals
Up to 331 residential units	11/0633/REM Ceres and the Mill: 169 residential units
	13/1034/REM Vesta: 137 residential units
	15/1759/FUL I1 and K1: 89 residential units
	Total approved 395 dwellings (+64 above outline)

8.34 With the above factors in mind, there are no grounds to resist the B1a / B1b uses proposed for block F2.

Other Land Use Matters

8.35 Third-party representations state that the land subject to block B2 should be subject to increased cycle parking provision. A franchise obligation by the Department of Transport for Abellio / Greater Anglia for an extra 1,000 cycle parking spaces is quoted. Third parties suggest the extra cycle parking should be implemented in place of the MSCP in the absence of any other plans as to where these should go.

8.36 The franchise agreement is not planning policy. The existing cycle parking provision exceeds that envisaged as part of the outline (2,812 outline, 2,850 granted under 12/1622/FUL). From a recent inspection of Cycle Point, the upper level is underused and has capacity for increased usage. South Petersfield RA suggests in any event that the franchise agreement has been derogated by the Department for Transport. Be that as it may, there is no adopted planning policy hook that can be utilised to resist the MSCP on the grounds that it should be provide additional cycle parking. Third parties also suggest that the car park should be designed to be converted for cycle parking. There is no policy basis to require a demonstration of this albeit

the applicants have suggested that this would be possible and have issued an indicative plan to officers showing this.

- 8.37 Other matters raised by third parties include the lack of existing off-gauge cycle parking facilities and poor security arrangements within Cycle Point. These are existing issues not arising from the planning application before members. There are alternative means by which the Council can explore with Greater Anglia improvements to this facility and these are ongoing.

Conclusion

- 8.38 The mix of uses proposed is compatible with the range of uses permitted within the wider CB1, M14 West allocation area. The proposal would make the efficient re-use of previously developed urban land, concentrating development in an accessible location close the railway station and transport interchange consistent with the NPPF para. 102(b). The range of uses is entirely acceptable and accords with policies 1, 2, 5, 21, 77, 80 and 82 of the LP. The proposal would not be contrary to Station Area Development Framework (2004) which supports mixed use, high quality development with the provision of an increase in existing office (B1a) and which acknowledges that hotel uses (Class C1) within this area would be a complementary land use.

New Access and Alternatives

- 8.39 The proposal includes a new access from Station Road into Station Square. The access would be located in the south western corner of the square and would contain a raised table and central island feature with separate in and out lanes.
- 8.40 The impacts of the new access were assessed in section 9 of the Transport Assessment dated August 2018 and the capacity of the access modelled for taxis. The applicant's modelling demonstrates that the access configuration would likely retain a good flow of pedestrians in and out of the station, whilst remaining within capacity for taxis, meaning that there is unlikely to be a queue of taxis on Station Road.
- 8.41 The applicants have undertaken a Road Safety Audit for the new access and this has led to a designer's response and subsequent amendments to the plans to address issues such

as signage, monitoring and management of the access, positioning of bollards and the positioning of drainage gullies. The new access has also been subject to vehicle tracking.

8.42 The impact with and without the new access has also been assessed by the applicant's transport consultants. Their assessment has assumed a completion date of the scheme of 2022 and has assumed base-line traffic growth and growth of rail passenger numbers of 5.7% per annum. It assesses AM and PM peak period impacts in both scenarios.

8.43 The applicant's January 2020 TA addendum summarises:

'Without the Station Road taxi access in place, the distribution of taxis on the highway network would remain as existing, with taxis travelling via Great Northern Road to reach the Station drop-off/ pick-up. Block B2/F2 development is expected to result in a marginal increase in flows on Great Northern Road of 2% (10 two-way flows) and 1% (7 two-way flows) during the AM and PM Peaks respectively. The increases in traffic flows associated with the B2/F2 development are considered to be minimal and are comparable to daily variations in traffic flows within Cambridge.

With the proposed Station Road taxi access in place, taxis would redistribute via Station Road in order to access Station Square. This would lead to a 17% reduction in two-way flows on the Great Northern Road in the AM peak, and a 33% reduction in the PM peak¹. The introduction of the Station Road taxi access would result in an increase in traffic flows primarily on Station Road east of the junction with Tenison Road. This section of Station Road is currently only used by vehicles for access to the existing and proposed CB1 blocks and by buses using the bus interchange, and it should be recognised that these are redistributed trips rather than new trips on the network.'

(Note 1: The applicants have clarified that this anticipated reduction relates to licenced Hackney Carriages authorised to use the designated taxi rank in Station Square by Abellio Greater Anglia).

8.44 The outcome of the TA and its associated addendum has been assessed and accepted by the County Council Transport Team.

The safety of the proposed access has also been assessed by the County Council Highways Engineer. The advice is that the application be refused in its present format on the grounds of highway safety. The Highways Engineer states that at present, with no access, the flow of pedestrians is unhindered and reducing this, through the provision on the access, is an unacceptable impact on the most vulnerable highway user i.e. the pedestrian. The proposed new access is stated by the Highways Engineer as an unacceptable inversion of the Nationally agreed user hierarchy. The advice from the Highways Engineer is that the impacts of B2 and F2 on Great Northern Road do not necessitate the creation of the new access but is an attempt to resolve an existing problem.

8.45 Third party representations raise similar issues to the Highways Engineer, with many representations stating that with background vehicular growth, the benefits of the new access would be quickly cancelled out. There is no reason to disagree with such an assessment, there may be some short-term benefits to residents of Great Northern Road but assuming growth in CB1 rail passengers continues, the benefits of freeing up road-space is likely to only be short-lived. These wider trends and impacts are of course outside of the control of the applicant with the solutions for mitigation resting more squarely with the GCP, Combined Authority, County and City Councils.

8.46 The difficulty for members in reaching a decision on the access is that the need for it does not arise from the development of blocks B2 and F2. The application is car parking neutral and any additional vehicular movements generated by the aparthotel and office block are minimal and could not support a reason to refuse the proposal. The NPPF suggests at para. 109 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’.

8.47 Access to blocks B2 and F2 was always envisaged as part of the outline application to be from Great Northern Road and a Planning Inspector would be likely to take a critical view - as per the appeal decision (Appendix 2) - if the Council sought to

resist access from Great Northern Road entirely given that it is consistent with the outline consent.

- 8.48 The proposed access should be considered within this context and the officer view is that the environmental benefits - albeit potentially only short lived – could be considered sufficient to support the new access if Members so choose. This is a finely balanced issue. The control over the timing of delivery, final design, signage, ANPR monitoring and enforcement and on-going impact through a monitor and manage approach are set out as part of proposed conditions 6 (Phasing Plan) and 7 (Station Road Access).
- 8.49 The monitor and manage approach could include surveys before and after construction of the new access at key junctions / streets in and around the CB1 area which would be summarised within a technical report. The findings of the report could be reviewed by key stakeholders including the City Council and County Council and the management of the access altered to address issues / respond to opportunities. The monitor and manage approach could be secured so that such surveys are carried out yearly for a time limited period into the future.
- 8.50 Through a monitor and manage approach and in accepting an inversion of the user hierarchy, the Council would have the ability to consider the extent of control over the use and management of the access. The suggested approach is flexible. Officers recommendation on this aspect of the proposal is neutral because:
- there would clearly be benefits in reducing the % share of licenced HC taxis using Great Northern Road on residents of Great Northern Road in terms of noise and pollution;
 - there is the ability to monitor, manage and review use of the new access;
 - the removal of a % share of taxis using Great Northern Road would help reduce queuing on GNR and backing-up from the Square and conflict at the mini-roundabout which currently occurs.

- 8.51 It is left open for members to determine the most appropriate course of action balancing the potential benefits / disbenefits of the access against its non-provision.
- 8.52 In line with County Transport advice, a condition is also in respect of a feasibility study for the provision of additional bus stops on Station Road to help improve the travel distance for bus passengers (see condition 8). Travel plan conditions for each building (see 45 and 73) are also proposed. Subject to these conditions, the proposal accords with policy 81.

No New Access Alternatives

- 8.53 In the event that members wish to approve the proposal for B2 and F2 but consider the new access cannot be supported, the applicants suggest that a contribution of £500,000 is made towards the alternative enhanced management of the Station Square. A range of possible measures is proposed, and these are assessed below and in the concluding paragraphs of this report. The applicants have confirmed that in such a scenario the new access would be formally removed from the description of development.
- 8.54 A number of these solutions have been subject to criticism from third parties, such as the introduction of drop-off parking charges resulting in drop-offs occurring elsewhere on surrounding streets, that alternative solutions such as routes for cyclists have not been costed or that particular measures are beyond the control of the applicant.
- 8.55 Officers agree with many of the third-party concerns. Some of the possible alternative solutions would require separate planning permission and these would have to be justified just like any other planning application. Such a process is dependent on the applicant's ongoing willingness to engage in finding solutions for Station Square, they do not arise directly through this application but through impacts generated from the outline permission and associated permissions which the Council has endorsed.

Context of Site, Design, External Spaces and Heritage

- 8.56 The proposed blocks B2 and F2 have the support of the Council's Urban Design and Conservation Team and have been subject to extensive discussion and revision prior to and during the application.
- 8.57 The design composition of both blocks relates to the wider CB1 family, and this is reflected in the elevational composition of the units and use of materials for e.g. artificial stone banding. In particular, the visual impact of the aparthotel block when viewed from the conservation area to the north would be set behind the Carter bridge and be lessened by its curved NE corner and set-back top floor. Together with the curved end to F2 opposite, as a pair, the buildings would provide a gateway into the CB1 development, with an improved appearance to the public realm from Devonshire Road. The applicants have amended the design of the public realm and landscaping interface with Devonshire Road (in their April 2019 submission following a DCF in Jan 19) to address landscaping and third-party concerns whilst also removing the proposed construction access from this point (see proposed condition 9).
- 8.58 Both buildings would have active frontages onto the access road, with vehicular access and egress into the MSCP positioned on the northern and southern sides of block B2. This arrangement has freed up the western elevation onto the access road to incorporate the glazed and activated atrium space. For F2, the façade is broken up with the use of different brick types and fenestration detailing. Both buildings deliver high quality designs.
- 8.59 B2 would be approximately 19m to the top of the uppermost occupied storey and 21m to the top of its plant enclosure. It would appear equivalent in height to the Ibis / Cycle Point building, which itself is marginally higher than the outline parameter. The approved CB1 Masterplan allowed for a total height including plant for B1 of 20m. B2 is marginally closer to Carter bridge than allowed for through the outline consent because of the break in buildings between B1 and B2. The marginally extended footprint is of little / no consequence in terms of visual impact from Devonshire Road and is more than compensated for by the large upper level 'U' recess in its form and its separation from B1.

8.60 For F2 the majority (2/3rds) of this block is 3-storeys in height, stepping down to this height where adjacent to Ravensworth Garden properties. Its three-storey height would be 9.6m, its four-storey occupied height would be 12.8m aligning itself with the boundary and height of F1. The plant for F2 would bring the total height above ground level to 14.7m. Note this part of F2 has been amended since the application was registered to remove an upper floor on the corner facing Station Square. The approved CB1 Masterplan allowed for total heights including plant of 11m (adjacent to Ravensworth) and 17m (adjacent to F1).

8.61 As is shown in the table below, the proposed heights are consistent with those set at the outline stage. For F2, the heights are generally lower and, combined with a more recessive footprint, provide a betterment over the outline in terms of the outlook from and impact on Ravensworth Gardens and F1 properties (discussed later in the report). For B2, the maximum parameter plan height is breached by just over 1m, however, the areas of plant are substantially recessed from the front and sides of the building. The height of the building would align with B1 (Cycle Point) and would be significantly mitigated by the large 'U' shaped cut-out in its middle. The plant would not be readily visible from nearby.

Table 1

Building	Approved Outline Parameter	Max Plant Height	Total	-Proposed Height (18/1678/FUL)
F2	-9m adjacent to Ravensworth Gardens -15m height adjacent to F1	2m 2m	11m 17m	9.6m (no plant) 12.8m (14.8 with plant)
B1 (B2)	-18m unbroken	2m	20m	18.9m (21.2 with plant)

8.62 The palette of materials for the new street compliments those used elsewhere in Station Square (conservation kerbs and paving setts, benches, tree planting, granite setts for ramps / crossings points, permeable paving) and will help visually

connect the spaces. This is an entirely reasonable approach to take, rather than propose a segregated cycleway suggested by third parties. Mindful of the advice of the Design and Conservation Panel and that of colleagues in Urban Design and Conservation, officers recommended design conditions include for the design of the glazed atrium, perforated panels and planting for the raised garden of B2 (see proposed conditions 15 and 46).

Heritage

- 8.63 The application includes a Heritage Statement which sets out that the proposed Devonshire Quarter will form the northernmost section of the CB1 Masterplan area and will positively contribute to the character and the setting of the nearby Mill Road and New Town and Glisson Road Conservation Areas.
- 8.64 No heritage concerns have been raised by colleagues in relation to nearby heritage assets, including the setting of Mill Road Conservation Area to the north (defined by Devonshire Road), New Town and Glisson Road Conservation Area or the setting of the listed station building. Officers agree that the impact of the scheme would be positive. In particular, the existing public realm in the area of B2 and F2 is poor. A vast swathe of car parking is to be relocated within a purpose designed building, a new street created and animated by adjacent uses. The public realm will be landscaped and finished to tie into the existing Station Square design and appearance. The proposed scale of the buildings is appropriate and they both invite pedestrians and cyclists into the site through their curved facades facing towards and softening the appearance from Devonshire Road. Part of the curved wall facing Devonshire Road is proposed to accommodate public art. Condition 16 seeks to secure a public art strategy for this building in accordance with LP policy 56 and the Public Art SPD 2010.
- 8.65 The application is accompanied by an Archaeological Assessment. This concludes that given the paucity of remains that have thus far been recovered throughout CB1's fieldwork-evaluation stages, the archaeological potential of both buildings B2 and F2 is low. The area occupied by B2 and F2 was extensively utilised for railway sidings and associated structures

during the 19th and early 20th centuries. No further archaeological investigation is warranted.

8.66 Overall, the proposals will help provide a sense of completion to this part of the CB1 development and would improve the setting of adjacent conservation areas and heritage assets.

8.67 The proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2018) policies 55, 56, 57, 59, 60 and 61.

Carbon Reduction and Sustainable Design

8.68 Policy 28 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2018) requires:

- Submission of a Sustainability Statement
- A requirement for new non-residential development to meet the BREEAM 'excellent' standard as a minimum; and
- A requirement for maximum credits related to the Wat 01 (water consumption) to be achieved.

8.69 The Sustainability Statement submitted by the applicant outlines the approach that has been taken to integrating the principles of sustainable design and construction including:

- Achievement of BREEAM 'excellent' for both buildings, with the hotel having a predicted score of 74.6% and the office 76.0%. This provides a reasonable buffer of credits against the minimum score required for BREEAM excellent;
- Proposals for green roofs on both the B2 and F2 buildings, which meets the requirement for all flat roofs to be green or brown roofs contained in policy 31 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2018).
- Submission of a thermal comfort report which assesses the risk of overheating for both the hotel and the office space. Solar control glazing is proposed to help limit internal solar gains.
- Proposals for a hierarchical approach to reducing energy demand and associated carbon emissions, with the Energy Strategy highlighting that the scheme delivers a 31.5%

reduction in carbon emissions over the Part L 2013 baseline. In terms of renewable and low carbon energy, the strategy involves the use of gas fired CHP and air source heat pumps for the hotel and air source heat pumps for the office building. Emissions standards are to be secured for the gas CHP to ensure that it does not impact on air quality (see condition 24).

- 3 out of a possible 5 credits under Wat 01, which equates to a 40% reduction in water use.

8.70 The Council's Sustainability Officer originally queried whether any of the spaces within the proposed MSCP would have electric vehicle charging infrastructure. The applicant's additional commitments in Jan 20 confirm the provision of 25% of spaces within the MSCP to be provided as EV charging spaces. The EV spaces to be secured would be 3kW 'trickle charge', which is considered to be an appropriate solution for a station car park. The remaining spaces are to be future proofed through the provision of ducts and service risers to allow the future installation of EV charging points to other spaces. This provision is secured through proposed condition 23 in line with EH advice.

8.71 The Council's Sustainability officer also requested further clarification as to whether it would be feasible and viable for maximum water efficiency credits to be achieved. The applicants subsequently submitted a Rainwater and Greywater feasibility study which concluded that further credits were not viable. For B2, rainwater harvesting and greywater systems were considered and rejected because of low yields associated with the proposed green roofs and higher building height requirements. For F2, similar issues arise with a lower yield for greywater recycling (1% of annual demand) making this unviable. The Sustainability officer agrees with the findings of these reports and supports the proposal.

8.72 The approach to sustainability is supported by the Council Sustainability Officer. The applicants have suitably addressed the issue of sustainability and renewable energy and, subject to conditions (see conditions 42-44 and 70-72, the proposal accords with Cambridge Local Plan (2018) policy 28 and the Greater Cambridge Sustainable Design and Construction SPD Jan 2020.

Integrated Water Management and Flood Risk

- 8.73 The are no surface watercourses on site and the site is located in Flood Zone 1 (low probability of flooding). The site is currently hard surfaced and 100% impermeable. Existing water discharge is uncontrolled and untreated. The supporting Drainage Strategy confirms that, due to previous land uses and contamination, it is not feasible to drain surface water to the ground via infiltration. This is accepted by both the City Council's Sustainable Drainage Officer and the Local Lead Flood Authority.
- 8.74 Surface water from building F2 is proposed to drain to the Devonshire Quarter surface water drainage network and storage cells in the associated open spaces of CB1. Surface water from building B2 is proposed to drain to the Anglian Water public drainage network running through Station Square to Station Road.
- 8.75 A SUDS drainage strategy has been developed by the applicants and revised to accord with officer advice in January and February of this year. The proposal allows for significant betterment over the existing surface water drainage regime and flow rates. Both blocks F2 and B2 incorporate green roofs, taking up 30% and 20% of roof space respectively. The green roofs will help attenuate the rate of run off and peak flows, intercepting the first 5mm of rainwater, whilst also providing ecological and thermal benefits to the buildings. The scheme also includes permeable paving, impermeable paving draining to tree pits, geo-cellular attenuation tanks (located underneath B2), vortex flow control devices (controlling flow rates), a petrol interceptor (helping treat the quality of the water) and below ground drainage infrastructure. Peak run-off rates are proposed to be reduced from 221 l/s (litres per second) from the existing site to 5 l/s for F2, 5 l/s for B2 and 15 l/s for the remaining car park to the north. These combine to reduce overall flows from 221 l/s to 25 l/s, almost a tenfold decrease in flow rates. This is a significant betterment given the existing brownfield site.
- 8.76 The drainage strategy is supported by both the City Council's Sustainable Drainage Officer and the Local Lead Flood Authority subject to conditions (see proposed conditions 19 and 50) securing its final design and details of the green roofs.

- 8.77 The applicants have suitably addressed the issues of water management and flood risk, and the proposal is in accordance with Cambridge Local Plan (2018) policies 28, 31 and 32.

Residential Amenity

Sunlight, Daylight, Overshadowing

- 8.78 The applicant's consultants Mott MacDonald submitted a revised sunlight, daylight and overshadowing report as part of their February 2020 submission following amendments to the design of building F2, which involved revisions to the roof structure of F2 to provide a mansard roof to the upper western side of the building and amendments which have removed the upper storey of F2 facing onto Station Square.
- 8.79 The report assesses the relative impact of the scheme - on the terrace of five Ravensworth Gardens houses (nos. 39-43 south to north) + those perpendicular to F2 (44-45 east to west) and all F1 apartments which adjoin the site. The report compares the parameters of a building allowed under the CB1 masterplan for the F2 block against the impact of the detailed scheme now proposed.
- 8.80 Occupiers of these properties have raised objections in terms of loss of daylight and sunlight into apartments and overshadowing of external gardens and courts.
- 8.81 As set out in table 1 (para. 8.62) above, for the outline permission, block F2 on the approved parameter plans showed a height of 15m for a building contiguous with the boundary of F1, stepping down to 9m towards Carter Bridge adjacent to Ravensworth Garden properties. An additional 2m in height was also provided for plant enclosure, to be set back from the edge of the building. The approved parameter plans show the footprint and building edge for block F2 running parallel and close to the boundary of the gardens and private court of the adjacent residential properties, effectively enclosing the courtyard of F1 and enclosing the gardens and outlook from Ravensworth Gardens looking eastwards. The physical constraints which led to the parameters being set for the outline permission have not changed. The key material change is that F1 has been built and is occupied and other parts of CB1 have developed out. The occupation of F1 has meant that residents

have become used to their existing amenity albeit many would have been aware, prior to occupation, that block F2 was allocated for development.

8.82 As set out in table 1 (para. 8.62), the proposed heights of F2 are lower than those that were allowed for under the outline permission. The proposed heights of 12.8m and 9.6m align with the existing heights of F1 and Ravensworth Gardens properties respectively. Furthermore, rather than the rear facade aligning directly with and adjacent to the backs of Ravensworth Gardens, the rear façade of F2 is cut back and away from the edge of these gardens by approximately 4.4m and is further mitigated with the inclusion of a mansard roof at its uppermost level and at a lower level with a planted cantilevered ground floor roof. The inclusion of the mansard formed part of the January 20 amendments.

8.83 Officers have visited properties within F1 and Ravensworth Gardens. The rear gardens to Ravensworth properties are approximately 11.5m long. These are accessed via patio doors from living room and dining room spaces. Bedrooms are located on the upper floors. The outlook from these properties is east facing and relatively open, mainly over the station car park but also with the Cycle Point / IBIS hotel building partially in view.

8.84 The apartments within F1 face onto a rectangular private courtyard space and are typically arranged with floor to ceiling glazed bedrooms and study rooms facing onto the courtyard. Within F1, main living room spaces and their associated balconies face outwards towards Great Northern Road to the south or open space to the west and the living room spaces are largely unaffected by the proposal. The rear outlook is east and north facing for the occupiers of these properties towards the Cycle Point / IBIS hotel building or over the station car park towards Carter Bridge.

8.85 The daylight and sunlight assessment submitted by the applicants has been carried out in accordance with the BRE guidance. In terms of the overall impact, the study concludes:

'The impact assessment has indicated that the overall impact on daylight and sunlight availability of the proposed F2 development of the CB1 masterplan on the F1 building (Building C) and the adjacent potentially affected residential properties on

Ravensworth Gardens (Buildings A and B) is not likely to be noticeable as compared to the impact of the massing of building F2 as it appeared on the Outline Planning Application (2008).

In fact, it is deemed that the results obtained indicate that the currently proposed massing of Building F2 overall performs better with regards to the impact on the diffuse daylighting (total amount of skylight and daylighting distribution) and sunlight availability of the existing assessed residential receptors as compared to either the previous massing proposals or the outline planning application massing.'

- 8.86 In terms of the impact on sunlight to gardens and courtyards, the results of the daylight and sunlight assessment indicate that none of the studied gardens and open spaces are expected to suffer any loss of sunlight as compared to the 'outline planning scenario'. The study concludes that:

'In fact, results obtained indicate that the proposed massing of Block F2 will improve sunlight availability for the gardens of the Ravensworth Gardens studied residential properties as well as the block F1 ground floor courtyard, as compared to the massing of Building F2 as it appeared on the Outline Planning Application in 2008. This is due to the fact that from the 1st floor up the proposed massing of F2 is slightly recessed on the façade opposite the studied gardens as compared to the F2 massing as it appeared on the Outline Planning Application, allowing for greater access of sunlight to the adjacent directly opposite gardens when the sun is at a higher position.' (para 3.3).

- 8.87 The results of the study notwithstanding, the courtyard of F1 will receive a low percentage of direct sunlight for 2 hours on 21 March (1.1%). This is mainly because it would be enclosed on three of its sides and would be north facing (as envisaged by the outline application). In fact, none of the courtyard spaces or gardens of F2 or Ravensworth Garden properties which face east would receive above 50% of direct sunlight for 2 hours on the 21 March, either in the outline or the proposed scenario (see table 2). The proposed scheme and its outline counterpart both fail this part of the BRE guidelines.

Table 2

Property	Percentage of garden / courtyard receiving at least 2 hours of sunlight			
	Outline 21 March	Proposed 21 March	Outline 21 June	Proposed 21 June
F1 courtyard	0.9%	1.1%	65.0%	65.7%
Garden of no. 39	10.0%	13.1%	82.5%	88.1%
Garden of no. 40	13.5%	19.3%	80.0%	86.5%
Garden of no. 41	27.9%	31.6%	80.8%	87.0%
Garden of no. 42	28.1%	33.7%	80.7%	86.9%
Garden of no. 43	38.5%	43.4%	81.9%	87.9%

- 8.88 The results improve (as shown in table 2 above) as one might expect in the height of summer when associated gardens would be most in use with the 50% value exceeded in both the outline and proposed scenarios on 21 June.
- 8.89 As stated above, the daylight and sunlight study does not provide an assessment against existing levels of daylight and sunlight because it is measured against the outline permission which provides the baseline for the assessment. Whilst no longer extant, the outline permission for CB1 and its associated parameters remains a strong material consideration and in officers' view it is reasonable to assess the impact of F2 against what was allowed for under the outline (see policy 21, supporting text para.3.85 '*Development should be carried out in accordance with the masterplan and parameters established by the outline permission*'). To do otherwise would be inconsistent of the Council in its approach to the assessment of the development in what is a sustainable location and where the physical constraints have not altered.
- 8.90 The concerns of existing residents in F1 are noted. Residents have become accustomed to their existing outlook and daylight / sunlight levels. This is, in part, due to the phasing of the scheme which has resulted in apartment block F1 being built prior to building F2. This has resulted in a greater perceived

impact on residential amenity than what would have occurred if both F1 and F2 had been built out and occupied together. This notwithstanding, many of the existing residents of F1 should have been aware of the plans for CB1 and for an additional building to be constructed (F2). It is unrealistic to think that F2 would not come forward for development, particularly in such a sustainable urban location where the land has been earmarked for development under an historic outline permission and allocated for development under the current (2018) and previous (2016) Local Plans.

Enclosure

- 8.91 Officers have visited both properties within Ravensworth Gardens and F1. It is apparent that the outlook from windows in these properties and from their associated gardens and courtyard spaces would be significantly more enclosed than at present. For all properties, officers are of the view that the extent of enclosure is not as significant as it would have been had the outline parameters been followed. The amendments to F2 to cut back its upper floors, angle the roof and landscape a cantilevered (lower) roof have helped mitigate the visual impact of the building. The height of F2 aligns with the height of building F1 and steps down to align with the ridge height of the Ravensworth Gardens properties.
- 8.92 It is not unreasonable to conclude that a 3-storey building should be accommodated on the F2 plot given the outline parameters and because the site is allocated for development in the local plan. This is an urban location where building densities are expected to be high to make the most efficient use of brownfield land. Most adjacent residents will have been aware of the approved outline proposals and that the land is earmarked for development. As such, the extent of enclosure to the affected properties, whilst significant, is acceptable given the history and context of the site.

Privacy

- 8.93 The proposal includes office windows facing towards Ravensworth Gardens and F1. The submitted plans indicate that 19 of the windows would be treated with an internal fixed louvre to ensure that views out are directed upwards and do not infringe on residential privacy. Officers are of the view that it is

necessary that marginally more windows in the western elevation either side of the indicated cluster on the plans should be treated in order to reduce oblique overlooking. Condition 48 is recommended accordingly.

Environmental Impacts

Air Quality

- 8.94 The development site represents an intensification of use within the air quality management area (AQMA) on a site which is allocated for development. The application is accompanied by an Air Quality Assessment which was updated in January 20 and which is the subject of the latest advice from Environmental Health.
- 8.95 As set out as part of the proposal, the application will not lead to an increase in car parking spaces on the site and average measured levels of nitrogen dioxide within the CB1 area are currently below national air quality objective levels. The Council's Environmental Health team indicate that additional vehicle servicing movements associated with the hotel and office uses do not alter their recommendations regarding air quality.
- 8.96 Environmental Health recognise that the alternative access option onto Station Square for taxis is to partially alleviate congestion, noise and air quality issues on Great Northern Road and that should the access to Station Square remain unchanged with access via Great Northern Road maintained as it is, the proposed development will result in increases in AM and PM peak two ways flows of 2% and 1% respectively. Conversely, should the proposed Station Square taxi access proposal be implemented, redistributing taxis from Great Northern Road onto Station Road, a reduction in AM and PM peak two ways flows of 17% and 33% respectively are predicted.
- 8.97 Shifting vehicle emissions away from sensitive residential receptors, such as Great Northern Road and redistributing these to Station Road - where monitored levels are lower – is supported by colleagues in Environmental Health. Station Road has a wider street to encourage better [pollution] dispersion and has fewer sensitive residential receptors.

- 8.98 The Air Quality Assessment concludes that under both scenarios (with and without the new access onto Station Road) the proposed development will not lead to a breach in objective levels within the AQMA. Environmental Health colleagues agree with this conclusion subject to mitigation in form of EV charge points within MSCP. A condition is also recommended in respect of the proposed combined heat and power (CHP) system for the hotel, to ensure that any gas fired appliances are low Nitrogen Oxide emission technology.
- 8.99 The applicants confirm the provision of 25% active slow EV charge points within the MSCP. These would have a minimum power rating output of 3kW in line with guidance and best practice. The remaining car parking spaces would have passive provision in the form of ducts and service risers. As most car park users would park their cars for longer periods of time in this car park, the provision of 25% slow active EV charge points is considered acceptable. This is secured by way of proposed condition 23. On this basis no objection on air quality grounds is raised by the Council's Environmental Health team.
- 8.100 Whilst officers are conscious of the third-party concerns regarding the perceived limited benefit of the new access because of future continued growth (5.7% p/a) in passenger numbers using the station, vehicular background growth is beyond the control of the applicants. The provision of the new access from Station Road does not arise as a direct consequence of this proposal, yet it would be of benefit to residents of Great Northern Road, even if only felt in the short term. It is for the Councils and their delivery partners to devise and implement strategic sustainable transport solutions for travel to and from the Station, not the applicants. Whilst the concerns of the residents of Great Northern Road are understood, as highlighted by the Inspector in the recent appeal regarding noise attenuation to their balconies, the outline permission *'established the parameters for the Station Area Redevelopment scheme which included use of Great Northern Road as the primary means of access to the station'*. It would therefore be unreasonable to resist the application on the basis that access to the proposed hotel and new office space is from Great Northern Road.

8.101 Subject to the conditions recommended by Environmental Health, the proposal accords with Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policy 36; no adverse effect on air quality in the air quality management area would arise.

Taxi Waiting

8.102 Environmental Health and third parties have queried where Taxis would wait when the taxi rank is full. Currently, if the station taxi rank is full, some taxis wait in the existing surface car park which is the site of the B2 building for the hotel. As a result of the proposal, there is therefore the potential for waiting taxis to be shifted onto surrounding streets. This could impact on local air quality. Whilst this issue has been raised with the applicant, no mitigation plans for this are put forward. The applicants state:

'there has been an informal arrangement in place for some time which has utilised the surface car park owned by National Rail adjacent to the station. It has always been part of the CB1 proposals since the original 2010 Outline Planning Permission to build on the majority of that surface car park which is precisely what we are doing now. The arrangement you refer to exists as we had an undeveloped phase of CB1 which temporarily allowed for this informal arrangement – it was never intended nor was it ever conditioned that this would be a permanent arrangement.'

8.103 An informative (see penultimate informative) is recommended for the applicants to work with the Councils and taxi companies to see if a solution can be found.

Environmental Construction and Operational Impacts

8.104 The application is accompanied by an Acoustic Planning Report (Noise and Vibration Assessment) which has been assessed by Environmental Health. This sets noise levels for fixed plant and/or machinery.

8.105 Conditions 3, 4 and 5 are proposed to ensure construction and delivery hours, Separate conditions for each block are also proposed in respect of piling, plant noise levels, dust and control of the emergency back-up generators, the approval of a noise insulation scheme for plant and plant design and location

for odour filtration. Condition 5, as suggested by the Highways Authority, specifically seeks to limit the times of construction and muck away lorries of 3.5 tonnes or greater to between 9.30am and 3.30am unless in specified circumstances.

- 8.106 Conditions are also recommended in respect of delivery hours for servicing and collections, a noise insulation scheme for a proposed waste compactor and an artificial lighting scheme.
- 8.107 The application originally included construction access from Devonshire Road. The applicants amended the application in April 2019 following a DCF to remove this from the scheme. Construction access is now proposed via Great Northern Road. Proposed condition 6 seeks to secure a phasing plan detailing the sequence of delivery of the key buildings, the location of temporary buildings / compounds for construction purposes and provisions for pedestrians and cyclists during construction. It is likely that building B2 is to be constructed first, followed by F2 and then the public realm completed and finished. Condition 6 seeks to secure the completion of the final approved public realm provisions no later than 50% occupation of F2.
- 8.108 The application is accompanied by an Operational Waste Management Strategy. Storage space for bins has been calculated according to anticipated demand for the uses and space set aside within the footprint of both buildings. For building B2, space is to be set aside adjacent to the access gap between the Cyclepoint / Ibis Hotel. Refuse vehicles would reverse into the access gap to collect the waste and this has been modelled and tracked. For F2, this building has a side access from a refuse storage area located in the SW corner of the building. Bins would be wheeled onto Great Northern Road and around to the front of the building to a delivery bay where refuse would be collected.
- 8.109 Third parties have asked for conditions to control the timing of collection of refuse from the F2 unit and have asked for the refuse area to be relocated so that refuse is moved internally through the building. Commercial waste collections for CB1 are currently provided by Cambridge City Council, Veolia and AmeyCespa amongst others. In the view of officers, requiring refuse to come through an office space or requiring specific amendments to the plans for this sole purpose is unreasonable. However, refuse collection times could be controlled to be

within day-time hours. Condition 56 for building F2 is proposed accordingly.

8.110 The proposal adequately respects the residential amenity of its neighbours and the constraints of the site and is considered that it is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2018) policies 34, 35, 36, 55, 56 and 57.

Contaminated Land

8.111 The application is accompanied by a contaminated land Desk Study. Due to previous uses, the site is highly likely to be affected by both on-site contamination and off-site contamination, with a lengthy and complicated history of former industrial usage. The potential risk to controlled waters is described as high, which is why a surface water infiltration scheme is not achievable.

8.112 Further site investigation is to be undertaken. Further detailed information specific to the application site is required and this is to be secured with the imposition of contaminated land conditions recommended by Environmental Health colleagues.

8.113 Subject to these conditions, the application is in accordance with Cambridge Local Plan policy 33.

Inclusive Access

8.114 The Disability Consultative Panel initially raised concerns about the location of the accessible rooms and layout of the aparthotel. The Councils' Access Officer raised similar issues and provided advice on the internal design of the aparthotel including, signage for the visually impaired, wayfinding, hearing loops at counters, reception desk and door design, fire evacuation lifts and accessible room layout and design. No issues were raised regarding the design of the office building F2.

8.115 The applicants subsequently clarified the location of the accessible rooms as part of amendments in April 2019 (following a Development Control Forum in Jan 2019) and confirmed that Part M of the Building Regulations and British Standards would be met. Five percent of the total number of rooms would be accessible rooms (125 Keys, 6 of which

accessible) and the raised courtyard space would be provided with level access. Many of the other matters raised by the consultees are associated with the internal and detailed design of the buildings which are not for the local planning authority to approve. An informative is attached the permission reflecting the advice that has been received. In terms of the car parking within the MSCP, 14 of the 206 car parking spaces are disabled parking and these are located close to the station side entrance and served by a lift.

8.116 The proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2018) policies 56 and 57.

Ecology

8.117 The application is accompanied by an Ecology Report. This identifies the site as being of low ecological value, consisting of hard standing. There are no existing ecological constraints.

8.118 The Ecology Report states that the inclusion of native species planting on blocks F2 and B2 will result in a positive impact on the ecological value, and therefore biodiversity, on site and that the proposal responds to the wider Ecology Conservation Management Plan for the CB1 development by contributing to the habitat linkage, providing feeding, roosting and nesting space for urban bird and bat species and maintains ecological connectivity across the wider CB1 site for species such as bats. Proposed conditions 17 and 47 seek to implement a scheme for the provision of bird and bat boxes in accordance with the recommendations.

8.119 Subject to these conditions, the proposal accords with (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policy 69).

Cycle Parking

8.120 For B2, guest cycle parking for 26 cycles is located within a secure area within the ground floor of the B1 CyclePoint building adjacent to the access road. For staff, secure cycle parking for 8 cycles is provided within the southern side of the building between the B1 and B2 buildings. All of the spaces are to be provided by means of Sheffield hoops. The adopted standard for hotels requires 2 spaces for every 5 members of

staff and 2 spaces for every 10 bedrooms. The cycle parking provision for B2 accords with the adopted standards.

8.121 For F2, cycle parking for 162 cycle spaces - comprising 154 spaces plus 8 (5%) off gauge, is proposed. Access would be through a secure access from Great Northern Road. Access to the building is provided through the rear of the building giving direct access to the staff showers and secondary entry to the offices.

8.122 The adopted standard for offices requires 1 space per 30 sqm of gross internal floor area (GIA). The revised floor area of F2 is 4,845sqm GIA requiring 161.5 spaces and thus the level of provision accords with the standard. Condition 74 is recommended to ensure that a detailed cycle parking layout is submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority prior to construction of this building.

8.123 Subject to this condition, the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2018) policy 82.

Third Party Representations

8.124 The main third-party representations have been dealt with in the body of this assessment. A summary response table is set out below.

Topic	Issue	Officer Response
Road and Highways	Impact of additional traffic and associated impacts on Great Northern Road (GNR), Tenison Road and Devonshire Road.	County Transport and Environmental Health consider the impacts acceptable.
	Vehicular traffic will continue to be allowed to dominate GNR which is a residential street.	The function of GNR accords with the outline permission. See appeal findings. The permission would not alter this.
	Vehicular traffic will continue to cause conflict on GNR between pedestrians and cyclists.	This is an existing issue. A zebra crossing is proposed on GNR.

	Narrowing of road to station car park unsafe.	Not raised as a highway safety issue.
	GNR should be closed to vehicular traffic except for residential use.	This would be contrary to the outline permission and is an unreasonable adjustment.
	The Tenison Road / Station Road junction should be signal controlled with safe crossings for pedestrians.	Not requested as direct mitigation by the County. The issue is existing.
	Loss of zebra crossing at the corner of Station Road is not acceptable.	This forms part of an approval plan for implementation.
	The raised table crossing of Station Road south east of the Tenison Road junction is not acceptable.	This is not part of the permission.
	Plans for people to cross Station Road are insufficient.	A zebra crossing forms part of an approval plan for implementation.
Transport Assessment	Transport Assessment figures are not reliable, there are discrepancies in traffic count data.	The applicants responded to these concerns in a technical response to residents on 28/02/2019. No further TA issues have been raised.
	24-hour traffic count data is incorrect.	As above
	Growth in traffic at 5.7% per year will mean the 29% reduction in evening peak traffic will be eliminated in five years.	Noted and covered in assessment. Background traffic growth will happen with or without the development.
	Traffic counts undertaken too long ago.	The TA is accepted by the County.

	The TA underplays traffic impact associated with servicing / deliveries to the proposed business uses.	County Transport has not objected to predicted servicing impacts. The timing is to be controlled via condition.
	The access would not allow for mandatory cycle lanes to be provided down either side of Station Road.	Noted. These do not form part of or arise as a result of the sought proposal.
	The development cannot be justified on the basis that there is no proposal coming forward on the northern side of Carter Bridge (G1, G2).	The proposal is not justified on this basis. Any application for G1 and G2 would have to be justified on their own merits.
	Overdevelopment.	The development broadly complies with the outline parameters and is appropriate for such a central site.
	Lack of green space across CB1.	Existing issue not caused or exacerbated by the proposal.
	Emergency access from Devonshire Road will facilitate the removal of TPO'd trees.	The revised landscaping plans are accepted by landscape officers.
	All decisions should be postponed on CB1 until a new masterplan with car parking and an entrance on the eastern side of the railway line is pursued	Unreasonable requirement. Not related in scale and kind to the proposal.
Car Park (MSCP)	The MSCP encourages motor traffic into a congested area and is contrary to LP policy 80.	Agree. The issue is covered in the assessment. No additional car parking spaces are proposed.

	Preserving car parking nos. does not align with encouraging modal shift away from driving and parking in the City.	Agree.
	Parking capacity has been reduced through the outline; why not reduce capacity further?	The proposal preserves the status quo. No policy requirement for this.
	Removing the surface car park would improve the appearance of B2.	Agree.
	Cambridge Leisure car park should be amalgamated with CB1.	This may be desirable to some third parties, but it is not a requirement of policy or of the application.
	All car parking in CB1 should be removed and replaced on the Clifton Road side of the railway.	Unreasonable requirement. Not supported by policy.
	The need for the car park appears only to be for the short term, this is not planning for the future.	The applicants have confirmed the MSCP is suitable for cycle parking use. If short term demand for the MSCP falls away this may be a future option for the TOC.
	Parking provision only needs to be sufficient for deliveries and for disabled parking.	Adopted policies do not require this. No parking is proposed for the office or aparthotel. Existing parking levels are maintained.
	Will lead to more anti-social behaviour.	Disagree. The access road will be better animated and overlooked. A management plan for the car park is proposed via condition 15 (f).
	The MSCP should provide short-term car parking for existing	This is an existing issue for residents. It is unreasonable to expect the MSCP to cater

	residents.	for this.
Pedestrian	There should be a zebra crossing on Great Northern Road.	This is proposed.
	The footway around the multi-storey car park would be too narrow.	No objection from the Highways Officer. The width is sufficient.
	The access road shared space would result in user conflict and be unsafe (particularly when the Chisholm Trail opens).	No objection from the Highways Officer. Segregated pedestrian paths are proposed. A segregated cycle route would be contrary to the wider public realm design in the Station Area.
	Pedestrians need better protection from cyclists.	As above, segregated cycle routes across CB1 is an existing issue and cannot be resolved through this application.
Cycle	Adjustments to Devonshire Road cycle route link and zebra crossing on Station Road are welcome.	Noted.
	Bulk of cycling comments from DCF not addressed.	Noted.
	Kerb-upstands on the cycle link will create accidents. They should be flush.	No objection from the Highways Officer on highway safety has been provided.
	Franchise obligation for Abellio / Greater Anglia for an extra 1,000 cycle parking spaces should be implemented in place of the carpark.	See officer report. This is not planning policy. Officers are currently working with the TOC to improve the management and security of CyclePoint.

	A solution should be provided to enable better cycle access across Station Square. The new access onto it does not resolve this issue.	See officer report. This is an existing issue. Such a solution does not arise directly from the proposal and is not related in scale and kind. The alternative contribution suggested by the applicants could go towards a solution if it was deliverable but there are no plans before the Council.
	Cyclists travelling south – north would have to cross (turn right) into the new access. This would be a dangerous manoeuvre.	The application is not supported by County Highways on the basis of increased conflict at the new access for pedestrians and cyclists.
	A bidirectional cycle lane should be pursued as per Smarter Cambridge sketch but this would interfere with the footprint of F2.	This is not a requirement arising from the application and is unreasonable in light of the land allocation.
	Station area provision for cyclists, including access to Cycle Point is poor. Proper joined up cycle paths need to be provided for the Station Area, particularly given the proposed plans for the Chisholm Trail.	Agreed, this is an existing problem that requires a strategic solution which does not arise directly from the application for B2 and F2.
	GNR is unusable by cycle. The mini-roundabout at the top of GNR will become more unsafe.	A zebra crossing is proposed at the top of GNR. The new access would shift licenced Hackney traffic away from GNR.
Rail	The station requires a strategic masterplan ahead of any further	This is not a requirement arising from the application and would be

	expansion	disproportionate in scale and kind.
	Support an additional eastern entrance to the Station to mitigate overcrowding.	As above.
	New accesses to the station near platforms 3 and 6 should be provided.	This is not a requirement arising from the application and would be disproportionate in scale and kind.
Buses		
	Rail service replacement buses would be shifted to local bus stops in Station Place and disrupt those services.	This is an infrequent requirement and does not justify the retention of the land for this use.
	Bus services to the station should be improved.	This is not a requirement arising from the application and would be disproportionate in scale and kind.
	Bus stops around the station should be closer to the entrance than taxis.	See County Council suggested S106 provision for this.
Taxis		
	The taxi rank and pick-up drop-off area should be moved to where Murdoch House currently sits and the area re-landscaped.	This land is proposed as an extension to Station Square. Use for taxis would erode the quality of the space. This is not a direct requirement arising from the application, is an existing issue and the works would be disproportionate in scale and kind.
	The existing taxi rank cover should be extended.	Noted, existing issue.
	Alternative solutions for dealing with	Noted, this is within the gift of the TOC.

	unlicensed taxis should be explored.	
	Taxis currently idle in the station car park.	Noted, this is a private arrangement that is not within the control of the LPA.
	Taxis currently abuse the use of the drop-off / pick-up bays.	Agreed. This is an existing issue that is within the control of the TOC.
	There is no provision to stop taxis continuing to use GNR.	This could form part of a wider monitor and manage approach agreed with the TOC and is covered by proposed condition 7(c).
Amenity		
Noise from Traffic	Traffic increases will increase noise on GNR and will mainly be from 7.5 tonne diesel lorries. Deliveries are not currently managed and are often early in the morning and not enforced.	The primary function of GNR is not changed by the proposal. Delivery times would be controlled by condition. Such provisions are enforceable.
	Noise associated with the bin and bike store for F2 adjacent to residential boundary would cause harm.	To be controlled via condition. The location is acceptable. Discussed in report.
	GNR properties are already exposed to noise levels that are in violation of planning conditions and European recommended levels	See appeal decision outcome and comments of Environmental Health officers. A refusal on this basis could not be justified.
	This is an opportunity to revisit traffic routing and reduce further the use of GNR by vehicles.	The nature of GNR and its function would continue as approved. The proposed new access does not arise as a direct consequence of the development of B2 and F2.

<i>Noise from Hotel Users</i>	Users of the hotel will have no vested interest in the amenity of the existing area or its community. There will be increases in late night noise associated with the hotel use.	This is a mixed-use scheme in a central area of the city. There will be more comings and goings from users of the buildings and some of these associated with the hotel would be later. The access road will be activated by users of F2 and B2 and better overlooked with an improved public realm. Significant harm would not arise.
<i>Air Pollution</i>	Traffic increases from delivery vehicles (most polluting vehicles) will increase air pollution on Great Northern Road beyond already exceeded legal limits.	See Env. Health advice. The proposed mitigation is acceptable.
	Air pollution would be shifted to Station Road where queuing taxis would emit pollution affecting pedestrians and cyclists.	See Env. Health advice. The proposed mitigation is acceptable. Station Road is wider and more capable of dispersing pollutants.
	Canyon effect of design amplifying noise and air pollution.	The footprints and heights of the buildings are consistent with those granted outline pp. No objection is raised by EH on the canyoning effect.
	Air pollution levels would return after 5 years on GNR due to background growth in traffic levels.	This is beyond the control of the applicants and would occur with or without the development.
	Adding more car parking will not address pollution levels	Disagree, the MSCP includes 25% EV charging provision. There is no net increase in parking spaces proposed.
	The car park should have EV charge points.	As above.

<i>Overshadowing</i>	Height of the corner element of F2 is above the outline parameter.	This has been reduced as part of amendments.
	Overshadowing and loss of daylight of rooms and the courtyard of F1.	Discussed in report, paras. 8.79 – 8.94
	Overshadowing and loss of daylight of Ravensworth Gardens (gardens and properties).	Discussed in report, paras. 8.79 – 8.94
<i>Privacy</i>	Privacy impact on residents of F1.	Discussed in report, paras. 8.79 – 8.94
	Privacy impact on residents of Ravensworth Gardens.	Discussed in report, paras. 8.79 – 8.94
<i>Enclosure</i>	Will loom over and dominate Devonshire Road properties.	Discussed in report, paras. 8.79 – 8.94
<i>Quality of Life</i>	The development would reduce the quality of life of residents of GNR and users of the area.	Agreed in terms of existing residents. However, all residents of GNR would or should have been aware of the plans for CB1 in purchasing or renting here. The development of F2, its scale and proximity to existing residents should not be unexpected and has been well established for over a decade.
Construction	Construction access from Devonshire Road is unacceptable and would be unsafe.	Removed from plans and description of development as part of amendments.
	Further construction vehicles visiting the area will generate highway safety issues.	The application would be subject to restrictions of large vehicle size movements outside of peak hours.
	Construction work	As above.

	should only be allowed over the weekdays 8am – 6pm and not weekdays.	
	Construction phasing plans should be revised.	Subject to condition
Hotel	No need for a further aparthotel use.	Disagree, the applicants have provided an updated Hotel Needs Assessment. Discussed in report.
	The city is oversupplied with hotels.	As above.
	The hotel needs assessment is out of date.	This has been updated in Jan 20.
	Homestay (AirBnB) is not referred to in the hotel needs assessment	There is no evidence this market would be impacted. The purpose of the planning system is not to hinder competition.
	Hotel investment in Cambridge is declining.	The updated Hotel Needs Assessments demonstrates a continuing market for the aparthotel.
Other	Submitted plans need updating.	This has been undertaken.
	The applicant is not giving an undertaking not to develop G1 and G2.	G1 and G2 are not proposed as part of this scheme. Any proposed for these blocks would have to be justified on their own merits.
	Lost revenue from a MSCP could be replaced with revenue from additional shops and services.	Noted, but this is not what is applied for and members must determine what is before them.
	Greed and profit has overruled the goal of a pleasant, efficient	Not a material consideration.

	station square.	
	The aparthotel should be replaced with social housing	Members must determine what is proposed. The principle of the proposed uses are acceptable.
	Consultation poor	Noted.
	Emergency vehicle access will be made more difficult down GNR.	No objection is raised by Highways on this basis. Increased flows on GNR would be minimal.
	Aldwyck Housing Group not consulted	All owners / occupiers in F2 have been sent letters. Some occupiers have informed Aldwyck directly as per their consultation letter.
	Missed opportunity	Noted.
	Station Road to Station Square should be opened up to traffic prior to construction of B2 and F2.	Works are to be controlled via a phasing plan.
	Devonshire Road cycle and pedestrian route should be opened up prior to construction.	Works for the new access are to be controlled via a phasing plan. The final completed route would need to be finished following construction of B2 and F2 in order that it is not damaged. Temporary route realignment will be necessary. See condition 6 regarding timing of completion.
	Deliveries to Station Square should move to Station Road.	Existing issue not arising from the application.
	Residents needs have been ignored.	Noted.
	Damage caused to sewers and road infrastructure.	Civil matter.
	Existing issues in CB1 are not out of scope for discussion. The	The need for strategic interventions to address wider existing issues is not a

	development would exacerbate site wide issues.	planning requirement arising out of F2 and B2.
	Existing deliveries often take place too early (between 5am – 7am) despite complaints.	Existing issues not arising from the application.
	Estate management by Brookgate is poor.	Noted.
	Character of the area would change the balance of residential vs business/short-term let.	Dealt with in the report under principal land uses. Not accepted.
	Residents' parking should be introduced to GNR.	Existing issue not arising from the application.
Amendments (additional to those above)	Amendments to F2 are welcome but have not overcome issues of overlooking, overshadowing and overbearing on Ravensworth Gardens properties and F1 apartments. .	Noted. Residential impacts are dealt with in the report, paras. 8.79 – 8.94.
	NPPF para 123 does not allow for flexibility for office development.	Para. 123 is not directly applicable. The impact of the building arises from its height & proximity to neighbours and this should be fairly judged against the outline parameters. Residential / office uses of the same scale would have the same physical impact. If F2 was proposed as residential, para.123 would be applicable but it is not and there is no evidence to suggest that F2 was permitted for residential use

		under the outline on the basis of para.123 or similar policy requirement.
	The alternative commuted sum for a range of interventions for the Station Square is not a detailed proposal. The interventions have not been modelled or costed and the offer is irregular. A number of the proposed interventions would not work.	Agreed. Discussed in the committee report.
	DoT have agreed to derogate Greater Anglia's franchise for a further 1,000 cycle parking at the station. Peak demand will exceed current provision within a few years. It is irresponsible of Greater Anglia and Brookgate to prioritise commercial redevelopment of station land over enhanced and expanded provision for sustainable transport in light of growing passenger nos. at the Station.	Noted. The franchise agreement is not planning policy. There is no planning policy requirement for an expanded Cycle Point.
	Welcome removal of Devonshire Road construction access.	Noted.
	Amendments proposed have not been borne out of discussions with the residents or	Noted.

	residents' associations.	
	Increase in office floorspace unjustified. 20% increase in floorspace	No permanent harm in an uplift in office floorspace has been identified through the provision of a basement.
	Amendments have not addressed traffic, pollution or noise and disturbance concerns. There are existing respiratory issues experienced by residents of GNR.	No objection is raised by Environmental Health. The proposed modelling and mitigation is accepted.
	The Council is only concerned about profit.	Not material and untrue.
	The basement for F2 will involve a greater degree of disturbance, with large nos. of construction traffic required for excavation.	Agreed. Impacts would be temporary and construction management conditions are proposed see conditions 18 and 49. Also see condition 5 re. control over larger construction vehicles >3.5 tonnes
	Supporting technical daylight and sunlight assessment not provided.	Addressed through further submission in Feb 20.
	The developer should demonstrate how the proposal will meet net zero carbon emissions over the lifetime of the development given the declared Climate Emergency.	This is not planning policy.
	The car parking spaces need to remain in order to preserve the openness of the area.	The land is allocated for development, it is not reasonable to suggest this.
	The applicant's offer to review cycle routes through Station Square and to provide	Noted. The design of Station Square and its use has been approved by the Council. The applicants are

	£500,000 to remedy problems. This is an admission that the design as implemented is defective.	unilaterally seeking to help address existing issues through the application for a new access or the proposed alternative contribution.
	The offer of £500,000 is not sufficient to tackle existing issues.	This is likely to be the case. It is not the applicant's sole responsibility or a requirement of B2 and F2. Discussed in concluding paragraphs.
	The new access for CC licenced Hackney carriages will not control Ubers or SCDC licenced taxis from using GNR and neither does the taxi licencing policy introduced by Cambridge affect Ubers or SCDC licenced taxis or those from elsewhere. These vehicles would continue to pollute. Taxis could also be allowed to continue to use GNR.	Station Square is in private ownership. The new access to it can form part of a monitor and manage approach which is reviewed with key stakeholders.
	The number of electric charge points should be increased and they should be arranged in hubs.	The quantum provided has been sought by Environmental Health and subsequently provided by the applicants as part of their Jan 2020 amendments.

Planning Obligations (s106 Agreement)

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

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

(b) directly related to the development; and

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

8.126 The County Council Transport Team has asked that a contribution of £35,000 is secured towards the provision of storage facilities for Brompton bicycles. The level of contribution arises proportionately in relation to what was secured from the CB1 development as a whole - £2.3m - towards transport infrastructure provisions, including for the guided busway, the southern transport corridor and the Chisholm Trail, and the anticipated transport contribution from parcels F2, B2 and G2, amounting to £35,000. Whilst this is a full planning application, the level of contribution sought is proportionate and is agreed by the applicants. The provision for Brompton bicycles could cater for secure and bespoke storage demand arising from the use of the offices and aparthotel.

8.127 As discussed earlier in the report, the proposed new access does not directly arise as a requirement of constructing F2 and B2 buildings for their proposed uses and neither is the alternative contribution of £500,000 necessary in order to grant planning permission. The contribution is not directly related to the development or fairly or reasonably related in scale and kind. If the proposed new access is removed from the description of development because of highway safety concerns, there would be no planning reason to withhold the granting of planning permission if the new access is the only issue for Members. The alternative contribution would be within the developer's gift to offer through a S106 linked to other improvements in Station Square. If any of these other improvements required planning permission, they would have to be separately applied for and determined on their own merits.

8.128 It is officers' view that the planning obligation for £35,000 is proportionate and is necessary, directly related to the development and fair and reasonable in scale and kind and therefore passes the tests set by the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010.

9.0 CONCLUSION

- 9.1 Given the recommendation, it may be helpful for members to think of this proposal as two separate applications, one for the B2 and F2 buildings and another for the new access. As set out within the report, the development of blocks B2 and F2 does not necessitate the creation of a new access from Station Road. The access is proposed unilaterally by the applicants and its benefits, or by consequence the potential benefits of an alternative financial contribution as offered, should not have any material bearing on the acceptability of the part of the application which seeks approval for the B2 and F2 buildings.
- 9.2 Whilst the access is not supported in highway safety terms, it would provide an opportunity to improve the residential amenity of those residents of Great Northern Road, both in terms of noise and disturbance but also air quality. These benefits may be short lived given the wider context of increased passenger numbers using the station and policy changes to implement an electric taxi fleet by 2023, but the proposed condition relating to the new access allows for flexibility in how it is to be used, monitored, enforced and reviewed with stakeholder engagement.
- 9.3 The proposed new access does not purport to represent a panacea for all perceived issues associated with the CB1 development. It is unreasonable to suggest there is a wider planning obligation incumbent on the developer and arising out of this development to resolve wider strategic issues perceived by third parties or indeed change Great Northern Road for tertiary residential use only; the function of this road was set by the outline permission and approved by the Council. Growth in passenger numbers using the station or in background traffic growth is not within the applicant's control. Neither are the applicants able to make strategic interventions themselves, these are promoted and led by the Combined Authority and the Greater Cambridge Partnership together with the Councils. It is inevitable that changes in taxi licencing policy to influence low or ultra-low emissions in a move towards an electric fleet will occur. There is also the prospect of the introduction of a clean air zone. Currently the Council is promoting the installation of rapid charge points for vehicles across the City and working with the GCP to reduce bus emissions / provision of electric buses. Wider strategic provisions, such as the completion of the

Chisholm Trail, to which Brookgate have contributed £500,000, are in the process of being developed.

- 9.4 It is conceivable that a range of measures, as set out under paragraph 2.23 of this report, could by way of an alternative to the Station Road access, contribute towards the developer offer of £500,000. Yet many of the suggested alternative solutions are less tangible than the physical provision of the new access. Officers agree with third parties that the use of the contribution towards the introduction of a low emissions zone for the Station Square area or charging for drop-offs and pick-ups (by specified vehicle type) may only shift existing issues into surrounding streets. Furthermore, the introduction of a low emissions zone is not within the control of the applicants.
- 9.5 A review of strategic cycling routes north – south and an implementation of this is likely to significantly exceed £500,000. It would require detailed stakeholder engagement and a costing exercise for different options to be undertaken together with relevant planning permissions gained. It would not be reasonable to withhold planning permission for F2 and B2 on such a basis.
- 9.6 Marshalling of traffic within Station Square would require the TOC consent and on-going revenue funding which a fixed contribution would not secure for the long term. Other suggested improvements in Station Square, such as in wayfinding signage and landscaping to better direct pedestrians to the southern side of Station Road, avoiding the new access, could be examined more closely. Such plans would have to be subject to a wider consultation exercise, have key stakeholder agreement and require separate planning permission. Again, any such works do not arise directly from the proposal for B2 and F2 and it would be unreasonable to withhold planning permission until this was agreed. The wayfinding and landscaping works would have to be pursued separately by the Councils with Brookgate as a willing partner.
- 9.7 Alternative solutions to the access, their rationale and delivery would need a separate planning report – likely in association with a separate planning application. It is for Members, particularly in considering the merits of the new access, to determine the best course of action and planning weight to be attributed to the scenarios as set out.

- 9.8 Turning to the B2 and F2 buildings, their individual designs and associated public realm improvements has involved extensive negotiations with officers. The applicants have made numerous amendments to the buildings to better meet the concerns of officers and third parties. The amendments have included improvements to the landscaping provisions in and around Devonshire Road, the removal of the temporary construction access from Devonshire Road, the reduction in the height of building F2 on its southern corner and a redesign of its rear façade to improve the impact of the building on the residential amenity of those living in Ravensworth Gardens and on the adjacent F1 building. No formal consultees object to these buildings, either in terms of their design or their sustainability credentials.
- 9.9 Notwithstanding the evolution of the plans for B2 and F2, third party concerns remain regarding their construction and operational impacts. For F2, the issues arise from the close proximity of the building to its residential boundaries, yet the scheme before members represents an improvement in terms of scale and footprint for surrounding residents over the parameters agreed under the Outline Planning Permission. These parameters are a strong material consideration notwithstanding that the Outline Planning Permission has lapsed.
- 9.10 Taking all of these factors into account and given that the land for F2 and B2 is allocated for development, is supported by policy 21 of the Local Plan and the parameters for buildings on these blocks are well established, it is officers' view that the proposed buildings and associated public realm improvements should be supported. They will facilitate the completion of the Devonshire Quarter and help unify the CB1 development.

10.0 RECOMMENDATION

- 10.1 Committee is invited to approve the application either with or without the new access road featuring as part of the development proposal. Accordingly, your officer's can recommend approval to grant planning permission by reference to only one of the following two options.

OPTION A (inclusion of new access from Station Road)

10.2 Applicable where Committee wishes to secure delivery of the new access from Station Road as part of the development proposal.

APPROVE subject to:

- (1) the prior completion of a s106 Agreement under the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 to secure a planning obligation in the form of a financial contribution of £35,000 for cycle parking within the CB1 precinct; and
- (2) the planning conditions contained in Appendix 1 of this report including the delegated authority to officers (i) independently to settle any minor non-significant amendments to those conditions and/or (ii) in the case of any significant amendment or the introduction of additional conditions to do so in consultation with the Chair and Vice Chair of Committee.

OPTION B (removal of new access from Station Road)

10.3 Applicable where Committee does not wish to secure delivery of the new access from Station Road as part of the development proposal and in all other respects the Committee is minded to approve the application.

APPROVE subject to:

- (1) the prior completion of a s106 Agreement under the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 to secure a planning obligation in the form of a financial contribution of £35,000 for cycle parking within the CB1 precinct; and
- (2) all references to the proposed new access from Station Road being removed from the development proposal description; and
- (3) the planning conditions contained in Appendix 1 of this report save for the deletion and/or amendment of those conditions which relate to the new access from Station Road; delegated authority to officers (i) independently to settle any minor non-significant amendments to those conditions and/or (ii) in the case of any significant

amendment or the introduction of additional conditions to do so in consultation with the Chair and Vice Chair of Committee; and

Officer Note Option B

If option B is chosen by members, officers would continue to negotiate with relevant parties and to settle the terms and conditions determining how the proposed alternative £500,000 financial contribution would be secured by an appropriate planning obligation providing for improvements to Station Square and its management arrangements. This process is to be carried out independently of the issuing of planning permission under option B.

Appendices

Appendix 1: Proposed conditions

Appendix 2: Appeal decision Great Northern Road

Appendix 3: D&C Panel Minutes 11 April 18

Appendix 4: Development Control Forum Minutes 16 January 2019

This page is intentionally left blank

Appendix 1, Proposed Conditions 19/1678/FUL

Conditions Applicable to the Site

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).

Plans

2. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans:

Drawing	Revision
Site Location Plan 6302 D5802	Rev 02
B2 Ground Floor Plan D5100	Rev12
B2 First Floor Plan D5101	Rev12
B2 Second Floor Plan D5102	Rev12
B2 Third Floor Plan D5103	Rev12
B2 Fourth Floor Plan D5104	Rev12
B2 Fifth Floor Plan D5105	Rev12
B2 Roof Plan D5106	Rev12
B2 Basement Plan D5199	Rev12
B2 Section D5500	Rev03
B2 West Elevation D5700	Rev06
B2 East Elevation D5701	Rev06
B2 South Elevation D5207	Rev05
B2 North Elevation D5703	Rev06
F2 Ground Floor Plan D6100	Rev12
F2 First & Second Floor Plan D6101	Rev11
F2 Third and Roof D6103	Rev13
F2 Basement Floor Plan D6105	Rev12
F2 Section AA D6500	Rev03
F2 Section BB D6501	Rev03
F2 Section CC D6502	Rev03
F2 West & East Elevation D6710	Rev08
F2 South Elevation D6711	Rev06
F2 North Elevation D6712	Rev05
New Access to Station Square, MMD-217382-C-DR-14-XX-1012	RevP4
Proposed Zebra Crossings and Pedestrian Routes, 217382-MMD-00-XX-DR-C-1021	RevP1

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 199

Construction / Delivery Hours

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 unless agreed otherwise in writing by the local planning authority.

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

Construction Vehicles < 3.5 Tonnes

4. There shall be no collections from or deliveries to the site during the demolition and construction stages by vehicles with a gross weight of less than 3.5 tonnes 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)

Construction Vehicles > 3.5 Tonnes

5. No deliveries or egress for construction purposes from or to the site, including associated vehicular movements for the delivery of materials or removal of any construction waste during the construction period, by vehicles with a gross weight in excess of 3.5 tonnes, shall be carried out outside of the hours of 09.30hrs to 15.30hrs on Monday to Friday, 09.30 hours to 1300 hours on Saturdays and at no time on Sundays, Bank or Public Holidays unless a specific construction requirement on identified days and times such as for full day concrete pours or crane erection, is first submitted to and otherwise agreed in writing by the local planning authority.

Reason: To protect the amenity of the adjoining properties and in the interests of highway safety (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policies 35, 81).

Phasing Plan

6. No development shall commence until a phasing plan for the site, including the expected sequence of delivery of development, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The phasing plan shall include the sequence of development of i) buildings B2 and F2, ii) the public realm provisions north and west of the CyclePoint / Ibis building, iii) the new access from Station Road including the implementation of associated traffic management measures including ANPR cameras, iv) the location and sequence of provision of any temporary buildings and hoardings on land for construction purposes, v) temporary provisions for pedestrians, cyclists, vehicular routes and parking provisions during the construction phase, vi) the provision of new zebra crossings across Station Road from Station Square and across Great Northern Road adjacent to building F2 as shown on plan 217382-MMD-00-XX-DR-C-1021 Rev P1.

No more than 50% of the proposed floorspace within building F2 shall be occupied until such time as the hard surface public realm provisions, all proposed new zebra crossings referred to in vi) above and the new access from Station Road have been fully completed. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved phasing plan.

Reason: To ensure the co-ordinated delivery of the various components of the scheme in the interests of users of the associated public realm and highway safety (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policies 55, 56 and 81).

Station Road Access

7. The new access from Station Road into Station Square shall not be implemented until the following matters have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority:

- a) a detailed engineering scheme / plan, including cross-sections (existing/proposed), levels changes and associated street furniture (bollards etc);
- b) management and licencing arrangements for controlled vehicular access;
- c) enforcement provisions for controlled vehicular access to the Station Square from Station Road and Great Northern Road for all vehicular types, including the location of ANPR cameras as necessary;
- d) publicity arrangements;
- e) signage proposals;
- f) monitoring and reporting provisions; and
- g) a review mechanism, including creation of a stakeholder group.

The development shall be carried out, managed and enforced in accordance with the approved details and as amended through any review.

Reason: In order to ensure the new access is appropriately delivered, managed, monitored, enforced and reviewed (Cambridge Local Plan 2019, policy 81)

Station Road Bus Stops

8. Prior to the provision of the new access from Station Road and the nearby zebra crossing, a feasibility scheme shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority for the provision of any additional bus stops within Station Road. The scheme shall include liaison with the Train Operating Company (TOC), bus operating companies, the County Council and District Councils. The scheme shall include a delivery timetable if the local planning authority determines that it is feasible for the additional bus stops to be delivered. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To promote improved provisions relating to the transport interchange (Cambridge Local Plan 2018, policy 81).

Devonshire Road

9. Vehicular access from Devonshire Road shall only be allowed for fire tender vehicles and vehicles which are incapable of moving underneath Carter bridge due to their physical size

and which require access to land north of Carter Bridge. No construction vehicles for the proposed development shall access the site from Devonshire Road.

Reason: In the interests of the safety of pedestrians and cyclists and in the interests of residential amenity (Cambridge Local Plan 2018, policies 35 and 81).

Hard and soft landscaping

10. Notwithstanding the approved planning drawings, no development above ground level of either building B2 or F2 shall commence until full details of both hard and soft landscape works have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority and these works shall be carried out as approved. These details shall include proposed finished levels or contours; means of enclosure; car parking layouts, other vehicle and pedestrian access and circulation areas; hard surfacing materials; minor artefacts and structures (e.g. furniture, play equipment, refuse or other storage units, signs, lighting); proposed and existing functional services above and below ground (e.g. drainage, power, communications cables, pipelines indicating lines, manholes, supports); 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).

Landscape Maintenance and Management Plan

11. Prior to the first occupation of either building B2 or F2, 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)

Tree Pits

12. No development of the access road shall take place until full details of all tree pits, including those in planters, hard paving and soft landscaped areas, including their irrigation, 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).

Block B2

Aparthotel Use

13. The maximum cumulative stay in the aparthotel by any individual occupier shall be 90 days in any twelve month period.

Reason: To ensure that the aparthotel rooms are not used as permanent residential accommodation or student accommodation, which would give rise to substantially different impacts and because the scheme may otherwise require the need for affordable housing, or a formal agreement to occupy with an educational institution (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policies 45, 46, 50, 51, 77 and 78).

14. The proposed aparthotel shall keep records of the lengths of stay of all guests and shall retain them for 24 months. The said records shall be made available to the local planning authority on request, within seven days.

Reason: To ensure that use of the proposed building only as visitor accommodation can be satisfactorily monitored. (Cambridge Local Plan 2018, policy 77).

Design and Management

15. No development of building B2 shall take place above ground level or no occupation shall take place (as indicated) until samples / plans of the following external materials / detailed elements to be used in the construction of the development have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority:

No development above Ground Level

- a) Sample panels of all brickwork and stonework (bonding, coursing and colour and type of jointing) retained on site throughout the development.
- b) Samples of glass type(s) to be used in curtain walling/windows/doors or other glazed features
- c) Samples of all non-masonry walling systems, perforated panels, cladding panels or other external screens including structural members, infill panels, edge, junction and coping details, colours, surface finishes/textures and relationships to glazing and roofing
- d) Design of the structural support system of the glazed atrium
- e) Design of the appearance of vehicular entrances, associated signage and traffic control measures
- f) Design and planting plan of the green roof system and external roof garden area, including its irrigation

Prior to Occupation

- f) Details of security installation and management arrangements for the car park
- h) Design of any rooftop plant screening systems to be installed

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

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

Public Art Strategy

16. No development above ground level of building B2 shall commence (or in accordance with an alternative timetable agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority), until a Public Art Delivery Plan (PADP) has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The PADP shall include the following: a) Details of the public art and artist commission; b) Details of how the public art will be delivered, including a timetable for delivery; c) Details of the location of the proposed public art on the application site; d) The proposed consultation to be undertaken; e) Details of how the public art will be maintained; f) How the public art would be decommissioned if not permanent; g) How repairs would be carried out; h) How the public art would be replaced in the event that it is destroyed. The approved PADP shall be fully implemented in accordance with the approved details and timetabling. Once in place, the public art shall not be moved or removed otherwise than in accordance with the approved maintenance arrangements.

Reason: To accord with the provisions of Cambridge City Council Public Art SPD (2010) and policies 55 and 56 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2018.

Bird and Bat Boxes

17. No works above slab level for building B2 shall commence until a plan has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority detailing the proposed specification, number and locations of internal and / or external bird and bat boxes on the new building. The installation shall be carried out and subsequently maintained in accordance with the approved plans prior to the occupation of building B2.

Reason: To provide ecological enhancements for protected species in accordance with the Ecology Report (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policy 69).

Traffic Management Plan

18. No demolition or construction works for building B2 shall commence on site until a traffic management plan has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority and the development shall not be implemented otherwise than in accordance with the approved details. The principle areas of concern that should be addressed are:

- i. Construction access routes
- ii. Movements and control of muck away lorries
- iii. Contractor parking; provide details and quantum of the proposed car parking and methods of preventing on-street car parking.
- iv. Movements and control of all deliveries (all loading and unloading facilities)
- v. Control of dust, mud and debris, in relationship to the operation of the adopted public highway.

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

Surface Water

19. No development of building B2 shall commence until a surface water drainage scheme for the site, based on sustainable drainage principles and which shows that the flows leaving building B2 meets the 5 l/s run-off rate, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The scheme shall subsequently be implemented in accordance with the approved details before development is completed. The scheme shall include: a) Detailed drawings of the entire proposed surface water drainage system, including all SuDS, with levels, gradients, dimensions and pipe reference numbers; b) Full details of the proposed attenuation and flow control measures and discharge rates – these should be marked clearly on the drainage network drawing; c) Measures taken to prevent pollution of the receiving surface water, namely a plan detailing the water quality treatment train for each area of the site.

Reason To ensure that the proposed development can be adequately drained and to ensure that there is no increased flood risk on or off site resulting from the proposed development (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policies 31 and 32).

Foul Water

20. No development of building B2 shall commence until a foul water scheme for the building has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The foul water drainage works shall be carried out in complete accordance with the approved scheme.

Reason: To prevent the increased risk of pollution to the water environment and to prevent an increased risk of flooding to existing property (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 4/16, 8/18).

Green Roof

21. Prior to the occupation of building B2, a scheme for the design and maintenance of the green roof shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority and these works shall be carried out as approved. The details shall include details of build-ups, make up of substrates, planting plans for biodiverse roofs, methodologies for translocation strategy, irrigation and drainage details. The green roof once installed shall be maintained in perpetuity in accordance with the approved details.

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

Waste

22. Operational waste storage, management and collection for building B2 shall be carried out in accordance with the Operational Waste Management Strategy (June 2018).

Reason: To ensure the appropriate management of waste in accordance with the submitted details (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policies 35, 36 and 57)

EV Bespoke – MSCP Electric Vehicle Charge Points

23. Prior to the installation of any electrical services within building B2, an electric vehicle charge point scheme demonstrating a minimum of 25% provision of dedicated active slow electric vehicle charge points with a minimum power rating output of 3kW to car parking spaces, designed and installed in accordance with BS EN 61851 (or as superseded) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

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 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 shall be provided.

The active electric vehicle charge point scheme and passive provision as approved shall be fully installed prior to first use of the car park and maintained and retained thereafter.

Reason: In the interests of encouraging more sustainable modes and forms of transport and to reduce the impact of development on local air quality, in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF, 2019) paragraphs 105, 110, 170 and 181, Policy 36 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2018) Cambridge City Council's adopted Air Quality Action Plan (2018).

Combustion Appliances – Low Emissions (CHP and Low NOx)

24. Prior to the installation of any gas fired combustion appliances within building B2, technical details and information demonstrating the use of low Nitrogen Oxide (NOx) combustion boilers, i.e., individual gas fired boilers that meet a dry NOx emission rating of $\leq 40\text{mg/kWh}$, to minimise emissions from the development that may impact on air quality, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

If the proposals include any gas fired Combined Heat and Power (CHP) System, technical details and information demonstrating that system meets the following emissions standards for various engines types shall be submitted for approval in writing by the Local Planning Authority:

- Spark ignition engine: less than or equal to 150 mg NOx/Nm^3
- Compression ignition engine: less than 400 mg NOx/Nm^3
- Gas turbine: less than 50 mg NOx/Nm^3

The details shall include a manufacturers Nitrogen Oxides (NOx) emission test certificate or other evidence to demonstrate that every boiler installed meets the emissions standards above.

The scheme details as approved shall be fully installed and operational before first occupation and shall be retained thereafter.

Reason: To protect local air quality and human health by ensuring that the production of air pollutants such as nitrogen dioxide and particulate matter are kept to a minimum during the

lifetime of the development, to contribute toward National Air Quality Objectives in accordance with the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF, 2019) paragraphs 170 and 181, policy 36 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2018 and Cambridge City Councils adopted Air Quality Action Plan (2018).

Acoustic Compliance

25. The noise insulation scheme and mitigation requirements for building B2 as stated within the *Hilson Moran "Acoustic Planning Report – noise and vibration assessment" dated 3rd September 2018 (issue 05, ref: 18830-RP-AC-001)* shall be fully implemented, maintained and not altered.

Reason: In order to safeguard residential amenity (Cambridge Local Plan 2018, policies 35 and 36)

Plant noise insulation

26. Prior to the installation of plant on building B2, a scheme for the insulation of the plant in order to minimise the level of noise emanating from the said plant shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority and the scheme as approved shall be fully implemented before the use hereby permitted is commenced.

The combined rating level of sound emitted from all fixed plant and/or machinery associated with the development at the use hereby approved shall not exceed the rating level limits specified within the *Hilson Moran "Acoustic Planning Report – noise and vibration assessment" dated 3rd September 2018 (issue 05, ref: 18830-RP-AC-001)*.

Reason: In order to safeguard residential amenity (Cambridge Local Plan 2018, policies 35 and 36)

Delivery hours

27. All servicing, delivery and collections to building B2 shall only be undertaken between the hours of 07:00 to 23:00 Monday to Saturday only, excluding Sundays, Bank and other public holidays.

Reason: In order to safeguard residential amenity (Cambridge Local Plan 2018, policies 35 and 36)

Waste compactor

28. Prior to the installation of the waste compactor adjacent to building B2, a scheme for the insulation of the compactor in order to minimise the level of noise emanating from the said compactor shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Full details are required on the type of waste to be compacted and hours of use. The scheme as approved shall be fully implemented before the use hereby permitted is commenced.

Reason: In order to safeguard residential amenity (Cambridge Local Plan 2018, policies 35 and 36)

Artificial Lighting

29. Prior to the installation of any artificial lighting on building B2, an artificial lighting scheme shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The scheme shall include details of any artificial lighting of the site and an artificial lighting impact

assessment with predicted lighting levels at proposed and existing residential properties shall be undertaken. Artificial lighting on and off site must meet the Obtrusive Light Limitations for Exterior Lighting Installations contained within the Institute of Lighting Professionals Guidance Notes for the Reduction of Obtrusive Light - GN01:20 (or as superseded). The approved lighting scheme shall be installed, maintained and operated in accordance with the approved details / measures.

Reason: In order to safeguard visual amenity (Cambridge Local Plan 2018, policy 34).

Kitchen extraction discharge

30. No development above slab level of building B2 shall take place details of the location of associated duct work, for the purpose of extraction and/or filtration of fumes and or odours shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The approved ductwork shall be installed before the use hereby permitted is commenced.

Reason: In order to safeguard visual amenity (Cambridge Local Plan 2018, policy 34).

Odour filtration / extraction

31. Prior to the installation of plant on building B2, details of equipment for the purpose of extraction and filtration of odours shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The approved extraction/filtration scheme shall be installed before the use hereby permitted is commenced and shall thereafter be retained as such. The scheme shall have regard to design recommendations within EMAQ's "Control of Odour and Noise from Commercial Kitchen Exhaust Systems (update to the 2004 report prepared by NETCEN for DEFRA)" dated September 2018.

Reason: In order to safeguard visual amenity (Cambridge Local Plan 2018, policy 34).

Construction, Noise, Vibration and Piling

32. No development of building B2 shall commence (including any pre-construction, demolition, enabling works or piling), until a written report, regarding the demolition / construction noise and vibration impact associated with this development, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The report shall be in accordance with the provisions of BS 5228:2009 Code of Practice for noise and vibration control on construction and open sites and include full details of any piling and mitigation measures to be taken to protect local residents from noise and or vibration. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details only. Due to the proximity of this site to existing residential premises and other noise sensitive premises, impact pile driving is not recommended.

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

Dust

33. No development of building B2 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).

Emergency Generator

34. Before building B2 is occupied, a scheme for the insulation of the emergency generator in order to minimise the level of noise emanating from the said generator shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme as approved shall be fully implemented before the use hereby permitted is commenced and shall thereafter be retained as such. The scheme shall include the following:

(i) Generator – Use

The generator shall only be used in the event of mains power failure or in accordance with (ii) below. It shall not be used as an alternative supply in the event of disconnection from the mains supply following for example non-payment.

(ii) Generator - Hours of Running for Maintenance

Running of the generator as part of routine maintenance and repair shall only take place for the length of time specified by the manufacturer between the hours of 8am - 6pm Monday to Friday, 9am - 1pm Saturday and no time Sunday or Public Holidays.

To protect the amenity of nearby properties (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 4/13)

Contamination

Submission of Preliminary Contamination Assessment

35. Prior to the commencement of the development of building B2 (or phase of) or investigations required to assess the contamination of the site, the following information shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority:

(a) Desk study to include:

- Detailed history of the site uses and surrounding area (including any use of radioactive materials)
- General environmental setting.
- Site investigation strategy based on the information identified in the desk study.

(b) A report setting set out what works/clearance of the site (if any) is required in order to effectively carry out site investigations.

Reason: To adequately categorise the site prior to the design of an appropriate investigation strategy in the interests of environmental and public safety in accordance with Cambridge Local Plan 2018 Policy 33.

Submission of Site Investigation Report and Remediation Strategy

36. Prior to the commencement of the development of building B2 (or phase of) with the exception of works agreed under condition 35 and in accordance with the approved investigation strategy agreed under clause (b) of condition 35, the following shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority:

(a) A site investigation report detailing all works that have been undertaken to determine the nature and extent of any contamination, including the results of the soil, gas and/or water analysis and subsequent risk assessment to any receptors;

(b) A proposed remediation strategy detailing the works required in order to render harmless the identified contamination given the proposed end use of the site and surrounding

environment including any controlled waters. The strategy shall include a schedule of the proposed remedial works setting out a timetable for all remedial measures that will be implemented.

Reason: To ensure that any contamination of the site is identified, and appropriate remediation measures agreed in the interest of environmental and public safety in accordance with Cambridge Local Plan 2018 Policy 33.

Implementation of Remediation.

37. Prior to the first occupation of building B2 (or each phase of the development where phased) the remediation strategy approved under clause (b) to condition 36 shall be fully implemented on site following the agreed schedule of works.

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

Completion Report

38. Prior to the first occupation of building B2 (or phase of) hereby approved the following shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

(a) A completion report demonstrating that the approved remediation scheme as required by condition 36 and implemented under condition 37 has been undertaken and that the land has been remediated to a standard appropriate for the end use.

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

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

Reason: To demonstrate that the site is suitable for approved use in the interests of environmental and public safety in accordance with Cambridge Local Plan 2018 Policy 33.

Material Management Plan

39. Prior to importation or reuse of material for the development of building B2 (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.

Unexpected Contamination

40. If unexpected contamination is encountered whilst undertaking the development of building B2 which has not previously been identified, works shall immediately cease on site until the Local Planning Authority has been notified and the additional contamination has been fully assessed and remediation approved following steps (a) and (b) of condition 36 above. The approved remediation shall then be fully implemented under condition 37.

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

Piling

41. Piling or any other foundation designs for building B2 using penetrative methods shall not be undertaken other than with the express written consent of the Local Planning Authority, which may be given for those parts of the site where it has been demonstrated through submission of details and methodology that there is no resultant unacceptable risk to groundwater. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: Piling or any other foundation designs using penetrative methods can result in risks to controlled waters. It should be demonstrated that any proposed piling will not result in contamination of groundwater (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policy 33).

BREEAM, Design Stage Certification

42. Within 6 months of commencement of development of building B2, a BRE issued Design Stage Certificate shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority demonstrating that BREEAM 'excellent' as a minimum will be met, with a minimum of 3 credits for Wat01. Where the interim certificate shows a shortfall in credits for BREEAM 'excellent', a statement shall be submitted identifying how the shortfall will be addressed. In the event that such a rating is replaced by a comparable national measure of sustainability for building design, the equivalent level of measure shall be applicable to the proposed development.

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

BREEAM, Post Construction Certification

43. Prior to the occupation of the building B2, or within 6 months of occupation, a BRE issued post Construction Certificate shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, indicating that the approved BREEAM rating has been met. In the event that such a rating is replaced by a comparable national measure of sustainability for building design, the equivalent level of measure shall be applicable to the proposed development.

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

Renewable and Low Carbon Energy Implementation

44. The proposed on-site renewable and low carbon technologies for building B2 as set out in the Hilson and Moran Sustainability Statement 2018, shall be fully installed and operational prior to the occupation of building B2 and shall thereafter be maintained in accordance with a maintenance programme, which shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority prior to the occupation of the development.

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.

Further information shall also be submitted and agreed in writing by the local planning authority in relation to the technical specification of the proposed gas fired Combined Heat and Power System (CHP), including emissions standards. Any gas fired CHP should meet an emissions standard of:

Spark ignition engine: less than 150 mgNO_x/Nm³
Compression ignition engine: less than 400 mgNO_x/Nm³
Gas turbine: less than 50 mgNO_x/Nm³

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

Travel Plan

45. No occupation of the building B2 shall commence until a Travel Plan has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The Travel Plan shall specify the methods to be used to discourage the use of the private motor vehicle and the arrangements to encourage use of alternative sustainable travel arrangements such as public transport, car sharing, cycling and walking. The Travel Plan shall be implemented as approved upon the occupation of the development and monitored in accordance with details to be agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

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

Block F2

Design

46. No development of building F2 shall take place above ground level or no occupation shall take place (as indicated) until samples / plans of the following external materials / detailed elements to be used in the construction of the development have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority:

No development above Ground Level

- a) Sample panels of brickwork and stonework (bonding, coursing and colour and type of jointing) retained on site throughout the development.
- b) Samples of glass type(s) to be used

- c) Samples of all non-masonry walling systems, cladding panels or other external screens including structural members, infill panels, edge, junction and coping details, colours, surface finishes/textures and relationships to glazing and roofing
- f) Design and planting plan of the green roof system and its irrigation

Prior to Occupation

- g) Design of any rooftop plant screening systems to be installed
- h) Design and detail of the surface finishes and appearance of the link constructions between buildings
- i) Design of the entrance areas

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

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

Bird and Bat Boxes

47. No works above slab level for building F2 shall commence until a plan has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority detailing the proposed specification, number and locations of internal and / or external bird and bat boxes on the new building. The installation shall be carried out and subsequently maintained in accordance with the approved plans prior to the occupation of building F2.

Reason: To provide ecological enhancements for protected species in accordance with the Ecology Report (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policy 69).

Privacy

48. No development above slab level of building F2 shall occur until a privacy scheme for the treatment of west facing windows on the first floor level and above, to safeguard the privacy of adjacent occupiers of F1 and Ravensworth Gardens, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Unless otherwise agreed in writing by the local planning authority, the treatment of the windows shall include the installation of a fixed louvre on the external face of the building, angled and spaced as such that it is not possible to view adjacent gardens and habitable rooms. Prior to the occupation of the office space, the development shall be constructed fully in accordance with the approved privacy scheme and a site inspection carried out by the local planning authority to confirm compliance with the approved details. Any reasonable adjustments to the privacy scheme shall be made as necessary if requested in writing by the Local Planning Authority to ensure residential privacy is adequately protected. The approved privacy scheme shall be retained for the lifetime of the development.

Reason: In order to safeguard the privacy of adjacent residential properties (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policies 55, 56 and 57).

Traffic Management Plan

49. No demolition or construction works for building F2 shall commence on site until a traffic management plan has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority and the development shall not be implemented otherwise than in accordance with the approved details. The principle areas of concern that should be addressed are:

- i. Construction access routes
- ii. Movements and control of muck away lorries
- iii. Contractor parking; provide details and quantum of the proposed car parking and methods of preventing on-street car parking.
- iv. Movements and control of all deliveries (all loading and unloading facilities)
- v. Control of dust, mud and debris, in relationship to the operation of the adopted public highway.

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

Surface Water

50. No development of building F2 shall commence until a surface water drainage scheme for the site, based on sustainable drainage principles and which shows that the flows leaving building F2 meets the 5 l/s run-off rate, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The scheme shall subsequently be implemented in accordance with the approved details before development is completed. The scheme shall include: a) Detailed drawings of the entire proposed surface water drainage system, including all SuDS, with levels, gradients, dimensions and pipe reference numbers; b) Full details of the proposed attenuation and flow control measures and discharge rates – these should be marked clearly on the drainage network drawing; c) Measures taken to prevent pollution of the receiving surface water, namely a plan detailing the water quality treatment train for each area of the site.

Reason To ensure that the proposed development can be adequately drained and to ensure that there is no increased flood risk on or off site resulting from the proposed development (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policies 31 and 32).

Foul Water

51. No development of building F2 shall commence until a foul water scheme for the building has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The foul water drainage works shall be carried out in complete accordance with the approved scheme.

Reason: To prevent the increased risk of pollution to the water environment and to prevent an increased risk of flooding to existing property (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 4/16, 8/18).

Green Roof

52. Prior to the occupation of building F2, a scheme for the design and maintenance of the green roof and the west facing cantilevered trough planting shall be 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 and the troughs, methodologies for translocation strategy,

irrigation and drainage details. The green roof and troughs once installed shall be maintained in perpetuity in accordance with the approved details.

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

Waste

53. Operational waste storage, management and collection for building F2 shall be carried out in accordance with the Operational Waste Management Strategy (June 2018). Waste shall not be collected between the hours of 11pm and 7am on any given day.

Reason: To ensure the appropriate management of waste in accordance with the submitted details (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policies 35, 36 and 57)

Acoustic Compliance

54. The noise insulation scheme and mitigation requirements for building F2 as stated within the *Hilson Moran "Acoustic Planning Report – noise and vibration assessment" dated 3rd September 2018 (issue 05, ref: 18830-RP-AC-001)* shall be fully implemented, maintained and not altered.

Reason: In order to safeguard residential amenity (Cambridge Local Plan 2018, policies 35 and 36)

Plant Noise Insulation

55. Prior to the installation of plant on building F2, a scheme for the insulation of the plant in order to minimise the level of noise emanating from the said plant shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority and the scheme as approved shall be fully implemented before the use hereby permitted is commenced. The combined rating level of sound emitted from all fixed plant and/or machinery associated with the development at the use hereby approved shall not exceed the rating level limits specified within the *Hilson Moran "Acoustic Planning Report – noise and vibration assessment" dated 3rd September 2018 (issue 05, ref: 18830-RP-AC-001)*.

Reason: In order to safeguard residential amenity (Cambridge Local Plan 2018, policies 35 and 36).

Delivery Hours

56. All servicing, delivery and collections for building F2 (including for refuse) shall only be undertaken between the hours of 07:00 to 23:00 Monday to Saturday only, excluding Sundays, Bank and other public holidays.

Reason: In order to safeguard residential amenity (Cambridge Local Plan 2018, policies 35 and 36)

Artificial Lighting

57. Prior to the installation of any artificial lighting on building F2, an artificial lighting scheme shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The scheme shall include details of any artificial lighting of the site and an artificial lighting impact assessment with predicted lighting levels at proposed and existing residential properties shall be undertaken. Artificial lighting on and off site must meet the Obtrusive Light Limitations for Exterior Lighting Installations contained within the Institute of Lighting Professionals Guidance Notes for the Reduction of Obtrusive Light - GN01:20 (or as superseded). The approved lighting scheme shall be installed, maintained and operated in accordance with the approved details / measures.

Reason: In order to safeguard visual amenity (Cambridge Local Plan 2018, policy 34).

Kitchen Extraction Discharge

58. No development above slab level of building F2 shall take place until details of the location of associated duct work, for the purpose of extraction and/or filtration of fumes and or odours shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The approved ductwork shall be installed before the use hereby permitted is commenced.

Reason: In order to safeguard visual amenity (Cambridge Local Plan 2018, policy 34).

Odour Filtration / Extraction

59. Prior to the installation of plant on building F2, details of equipment for the purpose of extraction and filtration of odours shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The approved extraction/filtration scheme shall be installed before the use hereby permitted is commenced and shall thereafter be retained as such. The scheme shall have regard to design recommendations within EMAQ's "Control of Odour and Noise from Commercial Kitchen Exhaust Systems (update to the 2004 report prepared by NETCEN for DEFRA)" dated September 2018.

Reason: In order to safeguard visual amenity (Cambridge Local Plan 2018, policy 34).

Construction, Noise, Vibration and Piling

60. No development of building F2 shall commence (including any pre-construction, demolition, enabling works or piling), until a written report, regarding the demolition / construction noise and vibration impact associated with this development, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The report shall be in accordance with the provisions of BS 5228:2009 Code of Practice for noise and vibration control on construction and open sites and include full details of any piling and mitigation measures to be taken to protect local residents from noise and or vibration. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details only. Due to the proximity of this site to existing residential premises and other noise sensitive premises, impact pile driving is not recommended.

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

Dust

61. No development of building F2 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).

Emergency Generator

62. Before building F2 is occupied, a scheme for the insulation of the emergency generator in order to minimise the level of noise emanating from the said generator shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme as approved shall be fully implemented before the use hereby permitted is commenced and shall thereafter be retained as such. The scheme shall include the following:

(i) Generator - Use

The generator shall only be used in the event of mains power failure or in accordance with (ii) below. It shall not be used as an alternative supply in the event of disconnection from the mains supply following for example non-payment.

(ii) Generator - Hours of Running for Maintenance

Running of the generator as part of routine maintenance and repair shall only take place for the length of time specified by the manufacturer between the hours of 8am - 6pm Monday to Friday, 9am -1pm Saturday and no time Sunday or Public Holidays.

To protect the amenity of nearby properties (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 4/13)

Contaminated Land

Submission of Preliminary Contamination Assessment

63. Prior to the commencement of the development of building F2 (or phase of) or investigations required to assess the contamination of the site, the following information shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority:

(a) Desk study to include:

- Detailed history of the site uses and surrounding area (including any use of radioactive materials)
- General environmental setting.
- Site investigation strategy based on the information identified in the desk study.

(b) A report setting set out what works/clearance of the site (if any) is required in order to effectively carry out site investigations.

Reason: To adequately categorise the site prior to the design of an appropriate investigation strategy in the interests of environmental and public safety in accordance with Cambridge Local Plan 2018 Policy 33.

Submission of Site Investigation Report and Remediation Strategy

64. Prior to the commencement of the development of building F2 (or phase of) with the exception of works agreed under condition 63 and in accordance with the approved investigation strategy agreed under clause (b) of condition 63, the following shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority:

(a) A site investigation report detailing all works that have been undertaken to determine the nature and extent of any contamination, including the results of the soil, gas and/or water analysis and subsequent risk assessment to any receptors;

(b) A proposed remediation strategy detailing the works required in order to render harmless the identified contamination given the proposed end use of the site and surrounding environment including any controlled waters. The strategy shall include a schedule of the proposed remedial works setting out a timetable for all remedial measures that will be implemented.

Reason: To ensure that any contamination of the site is identified, and appropriate remediation measures agreed in the interest of environmental and public safety in accordance with Cambridge Local Plan 2018 Policy 33.

Implementation of Remediation.

65. Prior to the first occupation of building F2 (or each phase of the development where phased) the remediation strategy approved under clause (b) to condition 64 shall be fully implemented on site following the agreed schedule of works.

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

Completion Report

66. Prior to the first occupation of building F2 (or phase of) hereby approved the following shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

(a) A completion report demonstrating that the approved remediation scheme as required by condition 64 and implemented under condition 65 has been undertaken and that the land has been remediated to a standard appropriate for the end use.

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

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

Reason: To demonstrate that the site is suitable for approved use in the interests of environmental and public safety in accordance with Cambridge Local Plan 2018 Policy 33.

Material Management Plan

67. Prior to importation or reuse of material for the development of building F2 (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.

Unexpected Contamination

68. If unexpected contamination is encountered whilst undertaking the development of building F2 which has not previously been identified, works shall immediately cease on site until the Local Planning Authority has been notified and the additional contamination has been fully assessed and remediation approved following steps (a) and (b) of condition 64 above. The approved remediation shall then be fully implemented under condition 65.

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

Piling

69. Piling or any other foundation designs for building F2 using penetrative methods shall not be undertaken other than with the express written consent of the Local Planning Authority, which may be given for those parts of the site where it has been demonstrated through submission of details and methodology that there is no resultant unacceptable risk to groundwater. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: Piling or any other foundation designs using penetrative methods can result in risks to controlled waters. It should be demonstrated that any proposed piling will not result in contamination of groundwater (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policy 33).

BREEAM, Design Stage Certification

70. Within 6 months of commencement of development of building F2, a BRE issued Design Stage Certificate shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority demonstrating that BREEAM 'excellent' as a minimum will be met, with a minimum of 3 credits for Wat01. Where the interim certificate shows a shortfall in credits for BREEAM 'excellent', a statement shall be submitted identifying how the shortfall will be addressed. In the event that such a rating is replaced by a comparable national measure of sustainability for building design, the equivalent level of measure shall be applicable to the proposed development.

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

BREEAM, Post Construction Certification

71. Prior to the occupation of the building F2, or within 6 months of occupation, a BRE issued post Construction Certificate shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by the Local

Planning Authority, indicating that the approved BREEAM rating has been met. In the event that such a rating is replaced by a comparable national measure of sustainability for building design, the equivalent level of measure shall be applicable to the proposed development.

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

Renewable and Low Carbon Energy Implementation

72. The proposed on-site renewable and low carbon technologies for building F2 as set out in the Hilson and Moran Sustainability Statement 2018, shall be fully installed and operational prior to the occupation of building B2 and shall thereafter be maintained in accordance with a maintenance programme, which shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority prior to the occupation of the development.

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.

Further information shall also be submitted and agreed in writing by the local planning authority in relation to the technical specification of the proposed gas fired Combined Heat and Power System (CHP), including emissions standards. Any gas fired CHP should meet an emissions standard of:

Spark ignition engine: less than 150 mgNO_x/Nm³
Compression ignition engine: less than 400 mgNO_x/Nm³
Gas turbine: less than 50 mgNO_x/Nm³

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

Travel Plan

73. No occupation of the building F2 shall commence until a Travel Plan has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The Travel Plan shall specify the methods to be used to discourage the use of the private motor vehicle and the arrangements to encourage use of alternative sustainable travel arrangements such as public transport, car sharing, cycling and walking. The Travel Plan shall be implemented as approved upon the occupation of the development and monitored in accordance with details to be agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

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

Cycle Parking

74. Prior to the development of building F2 above slab level, a detailed design of the cycle parking area shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The building shall not be occupied until the cycle parking provision has been laid out and fully completed as approved. The entrance to the cycle parking area shall be securely operated and covered by security camera.

Reason: To ensure compliance with adopted cycle parking standards (Cambridge Local Plan 2018, policy 82)

INFORMATIVES B2 and F2

INFORMATIVE: EV Car Parking

It is recommended that adequate signage is included in the car park to encourage non-electric car drivers to, where possible, not occupy spaces with electric charge points.

INFORMATIVE: Sound Insulation

To satisfy the plant sound insulation condition, the rating level (in accordance with BS4142:2014) from all plant, equipment and vents etc (collectively) associated with this application should be less than or equal to the existing background level (L90) at the boundary of the premises subject to this application and having regard to noise sensitive premises.

Tonal/impulsive sound frequencies should be eliminated or at least considered in any assessment and should carry an additional correction in accordance with BS4142:2014. This is to prevent unreasonable disturbance to other premises. This requirement applies both during the day (0700 to 2300 hrs over any one hour period) and night time (2300 to 0700 hrs over any one 15 minute period).

It is recommended that the agent/applicant submits an acoustic prediction survey/report in accordance with the principles of BS4142:2014 "Methods for rating and assessing industrial and commercial sound" or similar, concerning the effects on amenity rather than likelihood for complaints. Noise levels shall be predicted at the boundary having regard to neighbouring premises.

It is important to note that a full BS4142:2014 assessment is not required, only certain aspects to be incorporated into an acoustic assessment as described within this informative. Such a survey / report should include: a large scale plan of the site in relation to neighbouring premises; sound sources and measurement / prediction points marked on plan; a list of sound sources; details of proposed sound sources / type of plant such as: number, location, sound power levels, sound frequency spectrums, sound directionality of plant, sound levels from duct intake or discharge points; details of sound mitigation measures (attenuation details of any intended enclosures, silencers or barriers); description of full sound calculation procedures; sound levels at a representative sample of noise sensitive locations and hours of operation.

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

INFORMATIVE: Dust

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

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

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

-Guidance on the assessment of dust from demolition and construction

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

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

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

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

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

INFORMATIVE: Back Up Generator

To satisfy the backup generator condition the noise level from the generator associated with this application should not raise the existing background level (L90) by more than 5 dB(A) at the boundary of the premises subject to this application and having regard to noise sensitive premises.

Note: Only in exceptional circumstances where the applicant has shown that the above cannot be achieved and the need is for real emergencies (e.g. hospital operating theatre or emergency services) the following standard may be used

To satisfy the emergency generator condition the noise level from the emergency generator associated with this application should not raise the existing background level (L90) by more than 10 dB(A) at the boundary of the premises subject to this application and having regard to noise sensitive premises.

INFORMATIVE: Public Utility

Apparatus may be affected by this proposal. Contact the appropriate utility service to reach agreement on any necessary alterations, the cost of which must be borne by the applicant.

42 INFORMATIVE: It is recommended that adequate signage is included in the car park to encourage non-electric car drivers to, where possible, not occupy spaces with electric charge points.

INFORMATIVE: Accessibility

The applicants are advised that the design of the buildings B2 and F2 should ensure Part M of the Building Regulations compliance and consider the following: tactile signage; the use of colour contrast to help visually impaired people and those with learning difficulties wayfind; the provision of hearing loops at counters and receptions; the provision of a dropped height counter; door design so that each door must have one leaf of a minimum of 900mm and an opening weight of less than 20Newtons; the provision of fire evacuation lifts; accessible room design ensuring good turning circles, access to all features such as kitchens, bathrooms, balconies, etc, adjustable height shelving, work surfaces, desk, kitchen utilities, etc, doorway links to adjacent rooms for carers, etc; en-suite bathrooms with doorways from principle bedrooms to bathrooms; provision of ceiling hoists serving bed, toilet and shower; provision of support rails, accessible ironmongery, switches and emergency alarms; provision of cycle store charging points for mobility scooters; outwardly opening public toilet doors and a wheelchair accessible and Changing Places standard toilet.

INFORMATIVE: Green Roof Irrigation

The details submitted for the irrigation of the green roofs of the buildings shall include the water delivery system to planting beds, water source, automatic control system, times and amounts of water to planting beds, system maintenance details (to be included within the Management Plan).

INFORMATIVE: Residents Parking Permits

Future residents of the aparthotel will not qualify for any Residents' Permits, including visitors permits, within the existing Residents' Parking Schemes operating on surrounding streets.

INFORMATIVE: Taxi Feeder

The applicants are encouraged to engage with the Council and the Train Operating Company to seek to provide alternative arrangements for the taxi feeder rank that will be removed as a result of building B2.

INFORMATIVE: Designing Out Crime

The applicants are advised to contact the Policy Architectural Liaison Officer regarding designing out crime prior to the detailed designs of the buildings being undertaken.

This page is intentionally left blank



Appeal Decision

Hearing held on 11 September 2019

Site visit made on 11 September 2019

by Robert Parker BSc (Hons) Dip TP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 15 October 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/Q0505/W/18/3210468

Station Area Redevelopment Land off Tenison Road Blocks C1/C2, D1 and F1 of the CB1 Station Area Masterplan, Cambridge, Cambridgeshire

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission under section 73 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 for the development of land carried out without complying with conditions subject to which a previous planning permission was granted.
 - The appeal is made by Hill Partnerships Ltd against the decision of Cambridge City Council.
 - The application Ref 16/2012/S73, dated 16 November 2016, was refused by notice dated 15 March 2018.
 - The application sought planning permission for minor material amendments to outline planning permission reference 08/0266/OUT (the CB1 masterplan outline application) comprising an alteration to conditions 4 and 5 to enable an increase in the height of Block C1/C2, a basement car park under Block D1 and minor adjustments to Blocks C1/C2, D1 and F1 without complying with a condition attached to planning permission Ref 13/1041/S73, dated 13 January 2014.
 - The condition in dispute is No 33 which states that: Before any residential or other noise sensitive development (as defined by PPG 24) is commenced a noise attenuation scheme and/or phased attenuation measures shall be submitted to and approved by the local planning authority in order to demonstrate that no primary external leisure/amenity area associated with the proposed dwellings (rear gardens, balconies) will be affected by a daytime (0700-2300) outdoor noise level in excess of 50 dB LAeq, 16 hours or a night time (2300-0700) outdoor noise level in excess of 50 dB LAeq, 8 hours. Any phased measures that form part of the noise attenuation scheme shall be completed prior to the occupation of any proposed residential or other noise sensitive development that requires protection by the requirements of this condition.
 - The reason given for the condition is: To protect amenity of the occupants of residential and other noise sensitive development (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 4/13).
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for minor material amendments to outline planning permission reference 08/0266/OUT (the CB1 masterplan outline application) comprising an alteration to conditions 4 and 5 to enable an increase in the height of Block C1/C2, a basement car park under Block D1 and minor adjustments to Blocks C1/C2, D1 and F1 at Station Area Redevelopment Land off Tenison Road Blocks C1/C2, D1 and F1 of the CB1 Station Area Masterplan, Cambridge, Cambridgeshire in accordance with the application Ref 16/2012/S73 made on the 16 November 2016 without complying with condition No 33 set out in planning permission Ref 13/1041/S73 granted on 13 January 2014 by Cambridge City Council, but otherwise subject to the same conditions, insofar as they are still relevant.

Background and Procedural Matters

2. The appeal site forms part of the wider Station Area Redevelopment proposals which were granted outline planning permission on 9 April 2010 under Council reference 08/0266/OUT. Application reference 13/1041/S73 sought to amend this permission and in approving this the Council re-imposed condition No 33.
3. Most of the Masterplan area has now been developed under a number of separate reserved matters approvals. The site which is the subject of this appeal was built-out under reserved matters approval 13/1034/REM, approved on 10 January 2014. This related to, amongst other things, 137 residential units (including 58 affordable units) within Blocks C1/C2, D1 and F1 along with the Northern Access Road [subsequently named Great Northern Road] and two areas of open space.
4. The appellant has disposed of its interest in the buildings and the flats are now occupied as a mix of private owner-occupied, shared ownership and affordable rented tenures. The Council does not dispute that the scheme has been constructed in full accordance with the plans approved at reserved matters.
5. Despite protracted discussions, condition No 33 has not been discharged. This is a breach of planning control, albeit one which does not go to the heart of the planning permission. I have dealt with the appeal under section 73A of the Act, on the basis that permission is being sought retrospectively for the development of the land without complying with the disputed condition.

Main Issue

6. The main issue is whether condition No 33 is necessary and reasonable to secure acceptable living conditions for the occupiers of the flats.

Reasons

7. Blocks C1/C2, D1 and F1 of the Station Area Redevelopment flank Great Northern Road. This provides the sole means of access to Cambridge Railway Station for taxis and private vehicles seeking to pick-up and drop-off rail passengers. The road also leads to a public car park and provides service access to various commercial uses in and around Station Square. Traffic levels fluctuate according to train arrivals and departures, but there is no dispute that it is a busy thoroughfare. My observations confirmed this.
8. The floor plans provided at the hearing demonstrate how the residential blocks provide a mix of internal layouts. Some of the flats, mainly within Block C1/C2, benefit from more than one balcony. Others have a single balcony or private terrace, whereas a small minority (8 units) have no external amenity space at all. At the time the scheme was permitted, the Council had no policies requiring such provision. In approving the reserved matters, the authority must have considered the future living conditions to be acceptable throughout the scheme. It therefore follows that it was not a prerequisite for units to have a balcony.
9. It is nevertheless argued that balconies should provide an acceptable living environment where they exist; hence the disputed condition requires the submission of a noise attenuation scheme to ensure that specified noise levels are not exceeded. The condition is of necessity generic, because the Council had no means of knowing at the outline stage where any external leisure/amenity areas would be positioned in relation to sources of noise.

10. The plans submitted at reserved matters showed numerous balconies on the main facades of all three blocks fronting Great Northern Road, and on the side elevations overlooking public open space in between Blocks D1 and F1. The appellant contends that the balconies were included for architectural reasons to provide articulation. Whatever the reason, balconies with 1.1 m high glass balustrades were accepted by the Council, with detailed construction drawings being agreed as part of the discharge of conditions on the reserved matters.
11. It is common ground that the approved design is unable to comply with the noise levels stipulated within condition No 33. This was made clear in the noise assessment which accompanied the reserved matters application. Actual measurements taken after the opening of Great Northern Road show that noise levels in the daytime, when balconies are most likely to be in use, are in the region of 62 dB LAeq, 16 hours. This figure is agreed between the parties.
12. British Standard BS8233:2014¹ (BS) states that for traditional external areas that are used for amenity space, such as gardens and patios, it is desirable that the external noise level does not exceed 50dB LAeq, T, with an upper guideline value of 55 dB LAeq, T which would be acceptable in noisier environments. The BS makes an exception for smaller balconies but states that the general guidance on noise in amenity space is still appropriate for larger balconies, roof gardens and terraces, which might be intended to be used for relaxation. Given that most of the balconies facing Great Northern Road are large enough to fit a table and chairs, I can see no reason why the guidance should not be relevant.
13. The BS recognises that the guideline values are not achievable in all circumstances where development might be desirable. In higher noise areas, such as city centres or urban areas adjoining the strategic transport network, a compromise between elevated noise levels and other factors, such as the convenience of living in these locations or making efficient use of land resources to ensure development needs can be met, might be warranted. The guidance advises that, in such a situation, development should be designed to achieve the lowest practicable levels in these external amenity spaces. It is the Council's case that this criterion has not been met.
14. The appellant has considered several options for modifying the balconies. The first is to increase the height of the balustrade to 1.5 m, in conjunction with the installation of acoustic absorption to the underside of the soffit. Acoustic modelling, the results of which are uncontested by the Council, indicates that this would achieve an improvement of 2.6 dB. Although this may be perceptible to the human ear under laboratory conditions, it does not represent an appreciable reduction in noise levels in the real world.
15. The second option is the raising of the balustrade to 1.8 m, again with absorptive material under the soffit. This is predicted to achieve a reduction of 3.4 dB which may be perceptible. However, glazing to this height would represent a material change to the external appearance of the buildings. Likewise, and to a much greater extent, the conversion of the open balconies to fully enclosed winter gardens. These options would be the most effective in reducing noise, but they would also require a grant of planning permission – a point accepted by the Council. Consequently, they are beyond the scope of what could reasonably be expected as part of a noise attenuation scheme.

¹ Guidance on sound insulation and noise reduction for buildings

16. The Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) makes clear that conditions which modify a development in such a way as to make it substantially different from that set out in the application should not be used. In this case, the plans have been approved with 1.1 m high glass balustrades. To agree a fundamentally different balcony design retrospectively through the mechanism of a noise attenuation scheme would deprive those who should have been consulted on the changed development of the opportunity of such consultation.
17. There was debate during the hearing as to whether the mechanical ventilation systems provided within the flats are effective, with some residents arguing that patio doors need to be left open to prevent overheating. The enclosure of the balconies is unlikely to assist in cooling the main living accommodation where patio doors are routinely left open. I am also mindful that some residents may prefer to retain an external leisure space, rather than an internal, or substantially internal, one.
18. During my site visit I was able to sit on one of the upper floor balconies for a short period of time. Noise from the traffic in the street below was noticeable, particularly as the vehicles bumped over the speed tables. However, I do not accept the view that the balconies are unusable for relaxation. They provide a reasonable level of amenity for a central urban location near a busy railway station where a certain level of noise is to be expected. This is precisely one of those areas where the BS indicates that compromise is required.
19. Despite noise being above the stipulated levels, those units with balconies provide a better standard of living than those without. The development gives its occupiers the choice as to whether or not to use their external amenity space, but it also provides convenient access to public open space adjacent to the blocks as an alternative. Those areas provide seating for relaxation purposes and based on my experiences they are quieter than the street frontage. PPG² advice is that noise impacts may be partially offset if residents have access to a relatively quiet, protected, external publically accessible amenity space that is nearby.
20. The PPG also states that the impacts may be partly offset by giving residents access to a relatively quiet facade (containing windows to habitable rooms) as part of their dwelling; or a relatively quiet external amenity space for their sole use. A significant number of units within the scheme have windows, and in some cases balconies and terraces, to the rear. Notably, the Council raises no concerns regarding the living conditions within the flats and I noted during my visit that double glazing is effective in suppressing external noise.
21. The Council concedes that it has adopted a more flexible condition wording in more recent cases involving balconies. In my view, the disputed condition is too onerous, and it is neither necessary nor reasonable to secure acceptable living conditions for occupiers of the flats. There are no practical measures that could be implemented within the scope of the condition, and not requiring planning permission in their own right, that would result in a noticeable reduction in noise levels on the balconies. Therefore, having given careful consideration to all material considerations, including representations from residents and elected members, I conclude that the disputed condition should be removed. Although the Council tabled an alternative condition wording for discussion purposes, this is insufficiently precise or enforceable, and does not pass the test of necessity.

² Reference ID: 30-011-20190722

Other Matters

22. At the hearing it was suggested that traffic should be removed from Great Northern Road and/or the public highway altered to delete the raised speed tables. However, the outline permission established the parameters for the Station Area Redevelopment scheme which included use of Great Northern Road as the primary means of access to the station. There is no evidence to suggest that the road has been constructed otherwise than in accordance with the approved details and therefore to require the developer to make alterations retrospectively as part of a noise attenuation scheme would be unreasonable.
23. Residents allege that they were mis-sold their properties on the basis that they were not made aware of the likely noise impacts of traffic on Great Northern Road. However, information regarding the future road layout was available as part of the outline application which is in the public domain. The request for compensation is a private matter which should be addressed between the relevant parties concerned; it carries very limited weight as a material planning consideration in the determination of this appeal.
24. Concerns have been raised regarding noise from delivery vehicles, particularly early in the morning. This is a broader issue which goes beyond the quality of environment on the balconies, seemingly affecting residents within their flats. The Council did not provide details but indicated that it was seeking to resolve the issue separately.
25. Notwithstanding my findings above, there would be nothing to prevent an individual flat occupier from making a planning application to alter their balcony, should they so wish. Any such application would need to be considered on its merits following a period of public consultation. Given my conclusions on the adequacy of the existing balconies, residents should not be compelled to pursue any particular solution.

Conclusion

26. For the reasons given above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Robert Parker

INSPECTOR

APPEARANCES

FOR THE APPELLANT:

Colin Campbell BSc (Hons) Dip TP MRTPI	Head of Planning, Hill Partnerships Ltd
Peter McKeown BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI	Associate Partner, Carter Jonas
Chris McNeillie MIOA CEng	Director, Cass Allen Associates Ltd
Matthew Wilson	Technical Manager, Hill Partnerships Ltd

FOR THE LOCAL PLANNING AUTHORITY:

Lewis Tomlinson	Senior Planning Officer
Ben Walther	Principal Environmental Health Officer

INTERESTED PARTIES:

Deborah Bowen	Local resident
Cllr Kelley Green	Ward member
Tom de Grunwald	Local resident
Fernando Perez	Local resident
Cllr Richard Robertson	Ward member
David Stoughton	Local resident

Documents submitted at the hearing

1. Condition wording for discussion
2. URS Noise Assessment, June 2013
3. Cass Allen Addendum – Balcony Noise Calculations
4. Internal floor plans

**Cambridge City Council
Design & Conservation Panel**

Notes of the meeting Wednesday 11th April 2018

Attendees:

Di Haigh	RIBA (Chair)
David Grech	Retired architect, formerly English Heritage
Zoe Skelding	RIBA
Tony Nix	RICS
Ian Steen	Retired architect, co-opted member
Robert Myers	Landscape Institute (item 2 only)
Jon Harris	Architectural historian, draughtsman, co-opted member
Stacey Weiser	Cambridge PPF

Officers:

Sarah Dyer	Cambridge City Council (item 1)
Jonathan Brookes	Cambridge City Council (item 1)
Charlotte Burton	Cambridge City Council (item 1)
Mairead O'Sullivan	Cambridge City Council (item 2)
Nigel Blazeby	Cambridge City Council (item 2)
Susan Smith	Cambridge City Council (item 2)

Observers:

Cllr Martin Smart	Cambridge City Council
Sven Topel	Brookgate (item 1)
Laura Fisher	Bidwells (item 1)
Vimal Fatania	Formation Architects (item 1)
Daniel Cooper	TFT Consultants (item 2)
Andrew Ferrznolo	TFT Consultants (item 2)

Apologies – Russell Davies

1. Presentation - Revised (pre-application) proposals for CB1 - Blocks B2 & F2 ('Devonshire Quarter')

This follows the last presentation in December 2017 (verdict AMBER – unanimous). Since that meeting the building use for F2 has now changed from a hostel to a Business Centre (operated by Brookgate) and still incorporating the Train Operator offices. The presentation also included the design team's response to comments made in respect of B2 such as the entrance to the multi-storey car park, the treatment of the top floor set back and the articulation of the eastern (railway) elevation.

Presentation by Michael Richter of Formation Architects with Robert Myers of RM Associates and Will Salter of Mott Macdonald.

The Panel's comments were as follows:

- **Block B2**

- **East (railway line) elevation.**

- The Panel felt the revised articulation had, in general, produced a more successful result, although some concern was expressed as to whether the projecting 'corduroy' brickwork would show signs of weathering in the long term.

- **Glazed atrium (aparthotel entrance – west elevation)**

The Panel was reminded that the 'glass box' has its own architectural logic and that this was the justification for not aligning it with the brickwork. The Panel would nevertheless appreciate further detail as to how this element would fit into the brick building. The proposed 200mm shadow gap was not regarded as a sufficient gesture to be effective. Options to project or recess the atrium could be explored as well as using lighting to emphasise the sculptural nature of this space. The designers are reminded that the construction details of the glazing system would need to be of the highest standard.

- **The SW corner studies.**

As a general principle, the Panel would not wish to see the aesthetic compromised the further you are from Station Square. Although eliminated from the current study options, the Panel were supportive of the introduction of blue tiles to the west (front) elevation as this could add some relief by making windows appear more generous. Some animation to the perforated metal panels would also be welcomed for this reason.

- **The view SE along Northern Access Road (the curved corner).**

For many, this would be the primary entrance to the site, with views particularly relevant to the residents of Devonshire Road. For this reason, the Panel would emphasise the need to treat this façade not as the end of the development but as an opportunity for celebration; perhaps with the addition of unique elements to the blank brick elevation. As there is no issue of privacy in relation to the windows, there is an opportunity to be less conformist on this corner and more playful in shape and detail.

- **The view north along Northern Access Road.**

The Panel would like to see a greater sense of harmony between the elevations above and the planting at ground level. It is hoped that the internal courtyard within B2 is delivered to the highest possible standard. As the landscaping within this scheme has been greatly reduced however, this has become less of a concern to the Panel.

- **The Northern Access Road layout**

Although the narrowness of the street as a minimum, not optimum solution is a concern, the Panel applaud the intention to maintain the shared surface. The introduction of a dedicated cycle route would be inappropriate. Ideally, more tree planting would be preferable, although this would contribute to the competition for space.

It is recommended that the cycle route closer to Devonshire Road is widened at both ends to create a more generous space where cyclists and pedestrians are likely to pause for traffic. The designers are also advised to look again at the proposed use of 25mm upstand kerbs, as this is sufficient to topple cyclists.

- **The car park.**

The Panel feel that the revised car park entrance is a significant improvement. The justification for the 'missing tree' at the corner of the car park exit is understood to be for reasons of visibility when looking right. The Panel would welcome a re-examination of traffic movements at this point.

- **Block F2**

- **Cycle park.**

The Panel were comfortable with the departure from the vertical planting of the previous scheme providing the roof garden planting is designed to a high standard and can be easily maintained so as to be a success. The entrance should be as wide as possible to avoid conflict.

○ **The Business Centre.**

In the Panel's view, there is an opportunity here to be more expressive - to create a building that could inspire and attract users. The Panel would suggest that the design team might look at the Bradfield Centre on the Science Park www.bradfieldcentre.com as an example of what has been achieved with this emerging typology in Cambridge.

Conclusion.

The effort made to respond to the Panel's comments from December; specifically in relation to east elevation of B2 and the vehicular movements in relation to the car park are appreciated.

The Panel would however stress the need to maintain strong aspirations for the design expression of these two important contributory blocks as for many, they will be viewed as the 'front door' to the CB1 development.

VERDICT – AMBER (6), GREEN (1)

2. Presentation – Lion Yard, Cambridge.

(Notes provided in a separate document)

3. Notes of the last meeting – Wednesday 14th March 2018.

Notes agreed.

4. Date of next meeting – Wednesday 9th May 2018

Reminder

CABE 'traffic light' definitions:

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

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

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

This page is intentionally left blank

DEVELOPMENT CONTROL FORUM16 January 2019
10.00 am - 12.57 pm**Present****Planning Committee Members:** Councillors Blencowe, Baigent, Green, Hipkin, Thornburrow and Tunnacliffe**Officers:**Principal Planner Nigel Blazeby
Principal Planner: Patricia Coyle
Committee Manager: Sarah Steed**Others in attendance:**3 representatives for the Applicant
2 representatives for the CamCycle
3 representatives for the South Petersfield Resident's Association
2 representatives for the Great Northern Road Residents Association**FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE COUNCIL****18/16/DCF Declarations of Interest****Opening Remarks by Chair**

The Chair outlined the role and purpose of the Development Control Forum. He stated no decisions would be taken at the meeting.

Apologies

Councillor Smart provided apologies.

Declarations of Interest

No declarations were made.

18/17/DCF Application and Petition Details (18/1678/FUL / Station Area Redevelopment Blocks B2 And F2 Devonshire Road Cambridge Cambridgeshire

Application No: 18/1678/FUL

Site Address: Station Area Redevelopment Blocks B2 And F2 Devonshire Road Cambridge Cambridgeshire

Description: The proposed erection of two new buildings comprising 4,555sqm (GEA) of Class B1(a)/ Class B1(b) floorspace including ancillary accommodation/ facilities with associated plant, 136 cycle parking spaces, and 7 off-gauge cycle spaces for Block F2 and an Aparthotel (Class C1) comprising 125 suites, terrace, ancillary accommodation and facilities with multi-storey car park for Network Rail (total GEA 12,153sqm) comprising 206 car parking spaces and 34 cycle parking spaces for Block B2 with associated plant, hard and soft landscaping, new alignment of access from Station Road into Station Square and permanent access from Devonshire Road to the Cambridge Station Car Park restricted to emergency access to the railway and temporary access to parking during construction

Applicant: C/O Agent
Agent: Mr Anthony Child, Bidwells LLP
Address: Trumpington Road Cambridge CB2 9LD
Petition (1): CamCycle
Petition (2): South Petersfield Resident's Association
Petition (3): Great Northern Road Residents Association
Case Officer: Patricia Coyle

Text of Petition 1:

We the undersigned petition the council to convene a Development Control Forum in relation to planning application 18/1678/FUL Station Area Redevelopment Blocks B2 And F2, Devonshire Road, Cambridge, Cambridgeshire. We believe that this application does not take sufficient steps to prioritise sustainable transport as required by Local Plan Policy 80, nor improve road safety issues, either during or after construction. Furthermore, the development of this site as a multi-storey car park would contradict prior commitments to provide additional cycle parking for the station and would not fix problems of congestion and pollution along Great Northern Road. We do not object to the principle of development on this site, instead we offer recommendations to resolve our objections.

Cambridge Local Plan Policy 80 states that:

"Development will be supported where it demonstrates that prioritisation of access is by walking, cycling and public transport, and is accessible for all. This will be achieved by:

b. supporting public transport, walking and cycling to, from and within a development by:

1. giving priority to these modes where there is conflict with cars;
3. prioritising networks of public transport, pedestrian and cycle movement so these are the best and safest means of moving around Cambridge. Areas where public transport, pedestrian and cycle movement is difficult or dangerous will be improved and, where possible, have further capacity for these sustainable modes provided;
5. safeguarding existing and proposed routes for walking, cycling, and public transport, including the Chisholm Trail, from development that would prejudice their continued use and/or development."

This application does not meet the Local Plan requirements because it:

- fails to deliver a coherent, direct cycle route from Devonshire Road to the southern Busway cycle route, a central segment of the "Chisholm Trail", via the Cycle Point and station entrance,
- fails to prioritise sustainable transport because the design for the internal roadways gives better, more direct and higher priority access to motor vehicles for the station car park than for the cycle link from Devonshire Road end, and because there is no coherent Chisholm Trail cycle route across the Station Square,
- fails to fix the outstanding problems with highway safety in the Station Square and Great Northern Road,
- undermines efforts to reduce air pollution and congestion at this central location because the proposed multi-storey car park will attract car drivers from miles around the area and because the proposals still put 10,000 daily motor vehicle movements on Great Northern Road in front of people's homes.

We believe that it is wrong to construct a multi-storey car park at this location, and this application would be a missed opportunity to reduce congestion and pollution at this site. The station will be without this parking capacity for the period of the construction anyway, which simply demonstrates that it is unnecessary. The residents' parking schemes now in place on the east side of the railway, in conjunction with the long-established schemes on the west side, mean there are no issues with parking displacement. This application should be seen as an opportunity to reduce peak hour motor traffic and air pollution, in line with the council's goals to improve air quality and reduce congestion.

Instead of a multi-storey car park, the B2 structure should be re-designed to be an extension of the Cycle Point. The Train Operating Company Greater Anglia has a requirement in their Franchise Agreement to deliver an additional 1,000 cycle parking spaces at Cambridge by 2021; this development should be used to satisfy that commitment.

Instead of prioritising motor traffic along the Chisholm Trail, the design of the roadways should prioritise walking and cycling movements, and there should be a convenient, clear and safe cycling route north/south through the entire station complex, including between blocks B2/F2 and linking with the Cycle Point

Text of Petition 2

We the undersigned wish to petition for a Development Control Forum to allow residents representatives to discuss with the applicant, planning officers and Councillors how the above application could be improved.

We have particular concerns regarding

1. The proposed temporary car park access on Devonshire Road as the street already takes a heavy flow of traffic. We wish to explore if the existing access could be retained by phasing the development.
2. The loss of the protected tree belt between Devonshire Road and the existing surface car park. Further what provision is the developer making to provide long term landscaping to shield the new development from existing residential houses in Devonshire Road.
3. That the proposed buildings exceed the parameters in the 2010 outline permission both in size and height and this produces an overbearing development for the area. We wish to explore ways this could be mitigated.
4. The development will occupy land best suited for a future extension of the cycle park. Expansion will undoubtedly be needed, given forecast growth in footfall through the station. Cycles are already fly-parked on Devonshire Rd because of (perceived) poor accessibility at the Cycle point, and this problem will worsen when it fills up.

Text of Petition 3

This is a petition asking Cambridge City Council to hold a Development Control Forum in relation to the following Planning Application:

Application No. 18/1678/FUL

Site Address: Blocks F2 and B2 at CB1. Current station car park at the end of Great Northern Road

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

We believe the planning application does not meet the following planning policy clauses:

- Policy 35: This development, its construction and the traffic produced and services required during its use will lead to significant adverse effects and impact on health and quality of life from noise.
- Policy 36: This development, its construction and the traffic produced and services required during its use will lead to significant adverse effects on health, the environment or amenity from pollutions and malodourous emissions to air.
- Policy 36: This development, its construction and the traffic produced and services required during its use will have an adverse effect on air quality in the Air Quality Management Area (AQMA).
- Policy 56: This development will create a street that do not respond to its primary level of use (residential) by allowing vehicular traffic to dominate.

We strongly believe there are changes that could be made to overcome our concern such as but not limited to:

- Re-route the traffic to the station square to Station Road.
- Restrict the number of parking spaces on the multi-storey car park.
- Allow deliveries to the new buildings from Devonshire Road.
- Limit the height of Block F2 to match the adjacent Block F.

Case by Applicant

- 1) 9 pre-application meetings had taken place with officers and 4 meetings with the Design and Conservation Panel.
- 2) A public consultation had also taken place and the scheme had been amended following this consultation.
- 3) The outline planning permission for the site was issued in 2010. Buildings F2 and B2 were part of a masterplan which has evolved since 2010.
- 4) The existing building was due to be demolished soon.
- 5) The F2 scheme was originally consented for residential use but the new use was more enabling.

- 6) The scheme improved current cycle and pedestrian links.
- 7) The proposal was to build on the current surface car park.
- 8) There was nil impact on traffic as the overall net number of parking spaces remained the same.
- 9) There had been discussions about reducing the number of car parking spaces but Network Rail was not currently in a position to do so.
- 10) The proposals improved the north / south links to Devonshire Road.
- 11) £500,000 would be given to the Chisholm Trail through a s106 contribution.
- 12) Rail replacement buses had been moved to the bus interchange rather than using the surface car park.
- 13) Looked at the junction link with Devonshire Road in terms of traffic calming and it was proposed that there should be a table top system as it was a key cycle corridor.
- 14) A new vehicular access would be created onto Station Road.
- 15) The key change to the operation of Station Square was the new taxi zone. A new in / out system had been modelled for transport impacts looking at the interaction of pedestrians crossings and movement of buses. This had been modelled for the base year and 5 and 7 years based on the growth of passengers that would use the station. In all scenarios this worked for pedestrians.
- 16) This was a car free development in terms of the office and hotel development. There would be an increase in the number of drop offs and pick-ups for the hotel and office use.
- 17) An error was found within the Traffic Assessment numbers in the 24hr table, a detailed technical note would be provided to Planning Offices to clarify this.
- 18) The Air Quality Assessment showed a slightly beneficial impact because of the redistribution of taxis.
- 19) There was the potential for the multi-storey car park to be converted to a multi-storey cycle park in the future which could provide 2918 cycle parking spaces.
- 20) The B2 development was proposed to be developed first.
- 21) Referred to a temporary access off Devonshire Road to access the Station Road car park. It was noted that the access could be maintained off Great Northern Road but that access off Devonshire Road would be required for the later part of construction.

- 22) In response to concerns raised about landscaping and the removal of trees which currently screened the existing car park, 4 additional trees had been proposed to be planted with some additional hedging which was 1.2m in height.
- 23) The original building B was a single long continuous building which had 2 car park entrances off the northern access road, it was 18m high which equated to 6 residential floors.
- 24) Building F2 was originally consented as a residential building; a residential use would impact on neighbours by overlooking. Believed the proposed uses were much more neighbourly than those consented. The proposed building was higher than the outline consent by 0.95m to accommodate the proposed new use. The building was broadly going to be used between 9am-6pm and would not be used in the evenings or at the weekends.
- 25) Building B2 was proposed to be 6 storeys as per the original consent, the B2 building was 200mm taller than the Ibis hotel.
- 26) Both buildings would provide an active frontage.
- 27) The applicants had worked hard with officers as the buildings were in the Conservation Area. The building stepped down closer to Carter Bridge and was curved to provide a soft transition.

Case by First Petitioners

- 1) The current situation at the station was a car park of taxis which was intolerable for residents and people accessing the station.
- 2) The planning process was meant to be thinking about the future and he questioned if the station square should look as it was proposed and said it was not sufficient to swap around traffic.
- 3) Asked members of the public to send in comments via social media about the station square:
 - a) It was a 'traffic soaked sewer' with no safe route through and was horrible for pedestrians.
 - b) Very little thought given to how cyclists should safely cross the square.
 - c) No sensible route to get from Station Square to Devonshire Road.
 - d) Asked why a car park was required at the station.
 - e) Bus stops were very far away.
 - f) Would be helpful to have a clear delineated bike path.
 - g) Getting to the bike park was truly terrible, watch out for taxis.
- 4) On the southern arm of the mini roundabout, the applicant stated that there would be approximately 7.549 vehicle movements, this would not

meet sustrans guidance this would mean the area may not be able to become part of the cycle network.

- 5) Questioned why a car park was needed; sustainable transport mode shift was the answer. A multi-storey car park would prevent cycle park extension.
- 6) Could not rely on future conversion of the car park to a cycle park as it was not part of the application.
- 7) Referred to a blind spot at Devonshire Road.
- 8) The design would create the 'cyclist came out of nowhere complaint' and 'sorry I didn't see you'.
- 9) This would create car priority for people driving to the station.
- 10) Devonshire Road was congested already the temporary access would add to this.
- 11) Referred to policy 56 and 80 which prioritised public transport.
- 12) Commented that they wanted to work with the applicants. Public transport was strong in this location and the application needed to build on this and make it stronger.

Case by Second Petitioners

- 1) Commented that they had lived in Cambridge for 30 years and nothing had prepared the Petitioner for the traffic in Devonshire Road. There was a blind corner in the middle of the road. Speeding was the norm. Cycling up the street was hair raising.
- 2) People used Devonshire Road as a short cut so that they did not have to cycle on East Road.
- 3) At the top of the road was Mill Road crossing which was simply too narrow for cars to turn safely.
- 4) The volume of traffic, speeding and the narrowness of the road added to noise and air pollution levels.
- 5) Cars mounted the pavement and left pedestrians nowhere to go.
- 6) Temporary access for the development for 2 years was not safe or acceptable as on a blind corner.
- 7) In relation to landscaping, the proposal put forward by the applicant at the forum to provide extra trees and hedging was a positive contribution, although it was noted that some of these fell outside of the 'red edge' planning application area.
- 8) Expressed concern that the temporary access could be sought to be made permanent and asked that the work access was completely removed. Commented that there was currently no access to the site now via Devonshire Road so queried why this was required.

- 9) Noted that the building heights proposed were significantly increased to those included in the outline planning application. Building B2 was 3m higher and building F2 was 2.9m higher.
- 10) Commented that Devonshire Road was in the Conservation Area and that some houses on the road were over 125 years old. The development was overbearing and created overlooking concerns.
- 11) A 'brick and concrete canyon' was being proposed, if the scale was reduced that would be good and the design could be further improved by additional landscaping.

Case by Third Petitioners

- 1) Commented that not many changes had been made regarding Great Northern Road. There were 470 flats and residents had formed a Residents Association.
- 2) The Great Northern Road was usually packed with taxis.
- 3) Referred to policy 56, Great Northern Road was a residential street which was different to Station Road. Asked that traffic was moved to Station Road.
- 4) Traffic was the cause of problems for air and noise pollution.
- 5) All deliveries were proposed to go through Great Northern Road and asked that deliveries to offices be restricted to office hours.
- 6) The north side of Great Northern Road had 4 storey buildings and commented that the proposed development would be 2 storeys higher than existing buildings.
- 7) Delivery lorries caused congestion on Great Northern Road.
- 8) If a car park was provided then cars would park in it.
- 9) Asked for the height of block F2 to be limited around block F1 so that it did not increase the canyon effect, this would be more neighbourly.
- 10) Commented that Brookgate had given assurances that existing issues for residents would be resolved in this planning application but they weren't.
- 11) The applicant said that there would be negligible impact on noise levels but he disagreed and commented that noise levels would only get worse.
- 12) Residents were ready to engage but did not feel that they were being listened to and believed that a better area could be created.

Case Officer's Comments:

- 1) Consultation responses had been updated on the website.
- 2) Environmental Health had some concerns regarding noise and air quality but proposed conditions to address their concerns.

- 3) County Council Highways had only provided a consultation response the day before the forum meeting and this needed to be reviewed further. There was due to be a £35,000 contribution towards Brompton bike docking stations, which would be reviewed after a certain period of time.
- 4) The Great Northern Road was currently in private ownership and was not part of the public highway.
- 5) There was scope for discussion about bus / rail interaction improvements.

Case by Ward Councillors

Councillor Robertson spoke as a Ward Councillor on behalf of local residents. He made the following points:

Buildings

- 1) The outline consent from 2010 was for the two blocks to be used for residential purposes and this should be adhered to in view of the need for housing in Cambridge
- 2) The proposal for the multi storey car park to be converted to a cycle park would work better if there was a link to the existing cycle park (above ground) so that when the first cycle park was full, people could walk across to the new one without having to go back down to the ground. He asked if this had been considered.
- 3) Block B2 (beside the railway) was proposed to be higher than the 2010 consent. This should be reduced in height by a storey and towards the north stepped down to avoid dominating and taking sky light from the houses in Devonshire Road.
- 4) Block F2 was proposed to be further from Ravensworth Gardens than as consented in 2010. This was a good move but the new proposal was for the building to make the road between B2 and F2 narrower. This would create an even worse canyon effect for that road. Great Northern Road already suffered from this. The F2 building line should be moved back to the line envisaged at outline stage.
- 5) Blocks G1 and G2 were accepted in 2010 and the applicant said they had no plans at this stage to build them. They would further dominate and over look the Devonshire Road houses and applicant should be required to confirm that plans to develop these blocks will be permanently given up.

People Movement (ie pedestrians, cyclists and those in vehicles).

- 6) The development of blocks of offices and flats had exceeded that envisaged at the original outline consent. There were no pedestrian crossings anywhere in the CB1 area (though there was approval for one on Great Northern Road). If the change to allow hackney taxis to enter and leave the square from Station Road was agreed then a pedestrian crossing would be required to enable pedestrians to cross Station Road (somewhere between Tenison Road and the station) because although there was currently little traffic on this section of road this would no longer be the case.
- 7) Asked if a distinction was made between hackney taxis and hire cars when the traffic count was conducted. He suspected there was not because in counting vehicles all those marked as taxi/hire cars were difficult to identify separately. This was important because the current proposal was that only the hackney taxis contracted with Abellio Greater Anglia would be allowed to use the new entrance exit to Station Road from the square. All hackney taxis and hire cars should be allowed to use this new facility because otherwise there will not be enough vehicles moved off Great Northern Road.

Devonshire Road

- 8) It was not clear whether it is proposed that construction traffic would use Devonshire Road to access the site. If so then it should all be required to only use the road from Tenison Road to the new temporary access, and not access via Mill Road and the long, narrow stretch of Devonshire Road from Mill Road
- 9) If temporary access to the station car park was allowed then a junction would be created on the sharp bend in Devonshire Road which was already a safety hazard for cyclists in particular. Traffic lights should be provided on this temporary junction to manage this issue more safely.
- 10) The proposal to create a permanent emergency access to the station from Devonshire Road should not be accepted. There was no provision at present and it would risk it being brought into use other than for emergency use in future. It would also mean far less landscaping was possible at this point.

Members' Questions and Comments:

The Applicant's Agent answered as follows in response to Members' questions

- 1) Traffic concerns would be directed to and considered by the County Council Highways Department who may propose conditions. It would be difficult to control traffic movements.
- 2) A full air quality and noise 24 hour assessment for Great Northern Road was has been submitted as part of the application.
- 3) Would check the extent of the impact on the air quality in Devonshire Road and what would happen during construction.
- 4) In relation to a hierarchy for road users, no preference should be given to one user over others.
- 5) Cambridge station was the busiest train station in East Anglia. Legally Network Rail required a car park.
- 6) Network Rail had agreements in place as part of their franchise to maintain certain car parking levels. Ministerial approval would be required to change parking levels. Agreed to provide a briefing note outlining Network Rail's responsibilities regarding car parking.
- 7) When taxis queued in the station car park they did not usually park in car parking spaces but queued in the aisles.
- 8) A plan had been agreed with Greater Anglia for rail replacement buses to use the bus interchange rather than the station car park. Current practice was to try and use Cambridge North station as a hub for rail replacement services and this would be the first option going forward.
- 9) They would look into alternative emergency access. Construction traffic would not use Devonshire Road, it would use Great Northern Road.
- 10) Would take away the issues raised about building heights.

Summing up by the Applicant's Agent

- 1) Had listened to the petitioners concerns about station square but had to be mindful of the constraints of the operator of the train station to operate a functional train station.
- 2) This was a car free scheme; minimum deliveries.
- 3) The increase in traffic from 2020 was with or without this development going forward.
- 4) The new access off Station Road would be a benefit.
- 5) Would be providing £500,000 towards the Chisholm Trail.
- 6) Would look at temporary access and how could optimise landscaping.

- 7) Commented on the mass and scale of the buildings and the bulk of building F2, the relationship to Great Northern Road and the relationship to the outline planning permission.
- 8) Would look at the practicality of permanently removing blocks G1 and G2.
- 9) There was a net gain of residential development as blocks I1 and I2 were converted to residential use.
- 10) Landscaping required further discussion.
- 11) Mass and scale further discussion to be had.
- 12) Review status of the original planning permission / Masterplan.

Summing up by the First Petitioners

- 1) Referred to a commitment to provide 1000 cycle parking spaces by 2020.
- 2) The design of Devonshire road link, the road hierarchy would put pedestrians first, just questioned why vehicles had been given priority.
- 3) Referred to a blind spot area which needed to be re-evaluated.
- 4) Referred to the taxi rank being moved.
- 5) Commented that Station Road needed a zebra crossing.
- 6) The question of congestion, noise and pollution by excessive vehicle movements needed to be addressed.
- 7) Had seen unsafe incidents and referred to the public's comments he showed during his presentation.
- 8) The square was simply parking for taxis.
- 9) Referred to taxis queuing on Station Road, he thought the intention of this scheme was to avoid this.
- 10) The public square did not have the public amenity value that the name intended.
- 11) Commented that there needed to be a segregated cycle route through the station and this could be done outside Sainsburys.

Summing up by the Second Petitioners

- 1) Was not happy with the new access into Devonshire Road.
- 2) Welcome the assurance that the access would not be used for construction traffic.
- 3) Expressed concerns about Devonshire road becoming an informal drop off and pick up area for the station.
- 4) Pleased with the changes made to landscaping.
- 5) Still queried why the emergency access was required.

Summing up by the Third Petitioners

- 1) Took on board the willingness to engage.
- 2) Understood that in planning terms this planning application could only deal with issues arising out of this planning application.
- 3) Questioned the 'red line' application site as the Applicant had confirmed that they could undertake landscaping outside of this area.
- 4) Made comments in relation to building F1 from F2.
- 5) The traffic impact was not negligible; he needed to understand which figures were correct in the transport assessment and what kind of taxis were being referred to.
- 6) Any more vehicles on the road would increase air and noise pollution.
- 7) Commented about the servicing of the bin stores and commented whether bin access and location could be reconsidered.
- 8) Asked why the railway could not be used for construction purposes.
- 9) Thanked the applicants for working with the petitioners and said he looked forward to working with them in the future.

Final Comments of the Chair

The Chair observed the following:

- Notes of the Development Control Forum would be made available to relevant parties.
- Welcomed the willingness of the parties to work together and agreed to facilitate a further public engagement meeting.
- Application to be considered at a future Planning Committee.

The meeting ended at 12.57 pm

CHAIR

Application Number	19/1375/FUL	Agenda Item	
Date Received	4th October 2019	Officer	Lewis Tomlinson
Target Date	29th November 2019		
Ward	Cherry Hinton		
Site Proposal	1 Rectory Terrace, High Street Cherry Hinton Rebuild existing convenience store (including part demolition, external works, and refurbishment) - Use Class A1 (Shop), and the provision of 8no. one bed residential apartments above to create a two storey development, reconfiguration of the existing car park, cycle parking provision, landscaping and associated infrastructure works.		
Applicant	c/o Agent		

SUMMARY	<p>The development accords with the Development Plan for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The proposed development is of a high quality design - The proposed development would not have any significant adverse impact on the residential amenity of the neighbouring occupiers; - The proposed development would provide a high quality living environment for the future occupiers; - The proposed development provides an acceptable level of car parking and would not result in parking pressures on nearby streets.
RECOMMENDATION	APPROVAL

1.0 SITE DESCRIPTION/AREA CONTEXT

1.1 The site is located to the west of the High Street in Cherry Hinton. It consists of 1 convenience store, a terrace of small retail units and a car park to the rear of the site. The site is surrounded by a mix of commercial, civic and residential uses. The site sits within a District Centre and is not located within a Controlled Parking Zone.

2.0 THE PROPOSAL

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

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

3.0 SITE HISTORY

3.1 None relevant

4.0 PUBLICITY

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

5.0 POLICY

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

5.2 Relevant Development Plan policies

PLAN		POLICY NUMBER
Cambridge Plan 2018	Local	1, 3, 28, 29, 31, 32, 34, 35, 36, 41, 45, 50, 51, 55, 56, 57, 59, 61, 70, 71, 80, 81, 82, 85

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

Central Government Guidance	National Planning Policy Framework 2019 National Planning Policy Framework Circular 11/95 (Annex A)
Supplementary Planning Guidance	Sustainable Design and Construction (Jan 2020) Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Waste Partnership (RECAP): Waste Management Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (February 2012) Planning Obligation Strategy (March 2010)
Material Considerations	<u>City Wide Guidance</u> Cycle Parking Guide for New Residential Developments (2010)

6.0 CONSULTATIONS

Cambridgeshire County Council (Highways Development Management)

- 6.1 The Technical Note dated 23rd March 2020, provides sufficient data to demonstrate that the unloading bay should be able to meet the demands of the proposed development without undue impact on the operation of the adopted public highway. No objection subject to a traffic management plan condition and construction delivery condition.

Environmental Health Officer

- 6.2 Following the submission of additional information, no objection subject to the conditions regarding: construction hours, collections during construction, construction demolition noise vibration piling, dust, acoustic assessment compliance for residential units and internal plant room, A1 use opening hours, A1 use operational collection/delivery hours, odour control, external lighting, unexpected contamination, electric vehicle charging points.

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

7.0 REPRESENTATIONS

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

- 26 Orchard Estate
- 4 Chalfont Close
- 6 Chalfont Close
- No's 41, 43,45, 47, 49 to 51, 43, 55 High Street (Same land owners)

7.2 The representations can be summarised as follows:

- Temporary closure of the retail shop (Tesco) would have a significant harmful effect on the village as it would reduce the amount of footfall for the Rectory Terrace area. A condition should be imposed ensuring the shop stays open during construction.
- Reduction in car parking
- No's 2, 4 and 6 Chalfont Close have a legal right for vehicular access from the carpark to the rear of their properties.
- Difference in ground level between the car park and the properties of No's 6 & 8 Chalfont Close will result in overlooking.
- The proposed decrease in car parking spaces and the formal layout of the car park which increase parking in nearby streets
- Already planned reduction of local public carpark facilities on Colville Road (19/1034/FUL) which will further increase parking burden in the local area.
- Difficult to manage overnight parking in the car park
- Inappropriate siting of refuse for shops
- Shop deliveries could cause congestion due to insufficient space

- Access to the car park is too narrow for large vehicles such as refuse vehicles
- Noise and dust impact upon nearby shops
- The development would only produce 8 residential units
- The proposal would fenestration that would overlook the rear land of No's 41, 43,45, 47, 49 to 51, 53, 55 High Street as well as rely on daylight/sunlight from the current open space. This will have an impact on the potential future use of the site.

7.3 The owners/occupiers of the following addresses have made neutral comments:

- 92 Mill End Road

7.4 The representations can be summarised as follows:

- The on-road bay, which is adjacent to pedestrian crossing, will be used for deliveries. It is too narrow for the parking of HGV's and could create conflict with other road users such as cyclists as well as pedestrians.
- The retail space will be reduced
- The car parking spaces will be reduced.

7.5 110 High Street has written in stating their support for the application as it will modernise Cherry Hinton High Street.

7.6 Ward Councillor's Mark Ashton and Robert Dryden have also written in stating their support for the application.

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

8.0 ASSESSMENT

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

1. Principle of development
2. Context of site, design, external spaces,
3. Residential amenity
4. Refuse arrangements
5. Highway safety
6. Car and cycle parking
7. Integrated water management and flood risk
8. Trees
9. Affordable housing
10. Third party representations

Principle of Development

8.2 The site falls within a District Centre as defined by Policy 72 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2018 and set out on the policies map. Policy 72 states that proposals for other centre uses (including residential use) as defined in Table 8.1 will be permitted provided:

a) they complement the retail function and maintain or add to the vitality, viability and diversity of the centre;

b) provision is made for an active frontage, such as a window display, which is in keeping with the character of the shopping area; and

c) they would not give rise to a detrimental effect, individually or cumulatively, on the character or amenity of the area through smell, litter, noise or traffic problems.

8.3 The proposal would retain the existing convenience retail store at ground floor which would comply with the aims of Policy 72. The proposal would introduce 8 residential units at first floor. Policy 72 and table 8.1 state that residential uses are acceptable at above ground floor level. The proposal therefore complies with Policy 72 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2018.

8.4 The site contains an existing building, it is classed as previously developed (brownfield) land. Policy 3 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2018) states that the majority of new development should

be focused in and around the existing urban area, making the most effective use of previously developed land, and enabling the maximum number of people to access services and facilities locally. Taking all of the above not consideration, the principle is therefore considered to be acceptable subject to the material planning considerations discussed below.

Context of site, design, external spaces

- 8.5 The existing building which Tesco currently occupies is a flat roof building. The majority of the building is single storey with a two storey element set back from the High Street. There is an adjoining single storey terrace of retail units which is to be retained. The site and the convenience store building itself is in a prominent location along the High Street and District Centre.
- 8.6 The proposal would rebuild the existing convenience store through part demolition, external works and refurbishment adding a second storey onto the building. The proposed design would be of a contemporary style with a pitched roof fronting the High Street, and a flat roof element to the rear. The design would use materials such as a multi grey brickwork and zinc roofing. The design of the front of the building would be similar in height and scale to neighbouring properties. The proposal would retain key features such as the large shop windows at the ground floor. The flat roof element to the rear is designed to be of a similar scale to the residential properties in Desmon Avenue and would appear subservient to the gable element at the front. The existing car park to the rear is informal and tired, and also acts as a service yard. The proposal would reconfigure the car park to formalize the layout with additional landscaping. Conditions regarding landscaping and materials is recommended to ensure the development is of a high quality.
- 8.7 The form, height and layout of the proposed development is appropriate to the surrounding pattern of development and the character of the area. The proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2018) policies 55, 56, 57 & 59.

Residential Amenity

Impact on amenity of neighbouring occupiers

8.8 The site is sited adjacent to residential properties. To the immediate north of the building is Desmond Avenue and to the immediate north of the rear car park is Chalfont Close.

No.33 Desmond Avenue

8.9 The nearest property to the building is No.33 Desmond Avenue. The existing building slopes away from the common boundary with No.33, being single storey nearest to the common boundary, gradually increasing in height to two storeys. No.33 has a garage on the ground floor adjacent to the common boundary. The nearest proposed two storey element, flat 8, would be in line with the two storey front elevation of No.33. Flat 1 sits forward of the front elevation of No.33 and does step up in height in comparison to the existing situation. However, it is recessed off the common boundary by 2.8m and the winter garden element of flat 1 only slightly protrudes into the 45 degree sight line when measured from the first floor bedroom window on the front elevation. Given the setback, the limited height of the additional storey and the flat roof form, it is not considered to have a significant overbearing impact upon any of the windows on the front elevation of No.33. The Daylight and Sunlight Assessment outlines that the vertical sky component is at 94% of its former value (meeting the 80% criterion for daylight); and the sunlight hours meet the British Standards. The building would also be set in line with the two storey rear elevation and therefore would not have a detrimental impact upon the garden area of No.33 and the daylight/sunlight study shows that the garden will not be significantly overshadowed. The plans show a privacy screen on the side elevation of the winter garden for flat 8 to avoid overlooking of the garden, a condition is recommended to secure this. For these reasons, officers consider the impact upon No.33 to be acceptable.

General

8.10 It is to be noted that the proposal will move the deliveries for the convenience store from the rear of the site to the front of the site. This will help reduce the noise and disturbance upon the properties to the rear. Neighbours have raised concerns about the difference in ground level between the car park and the properties of No's 6 & 8 Chalfont Close which will result in overlooking. This is an existing situation with neighbouring properties gardens backing onto the car park. The application is accompanied by a Daylight/Sunlight Assessment which shows that neighbouring properties will retain 80% of sunlight for windows and gardens. The potential impact on the residential amenity of the surrounding occupiers has been assessed in terms of overlooking, overbearing/sense of enclosure and overshadowing and is considered to be acceptable.

Wider area

8.11 Neighbours have raised concerns regarding the impact of noise, dust and vibrations during the construction phase. The Environmental Health Team has recommended various construction related conditions in order to protect the residential amenity of occupiers of properties in the wider area during construction. The conditions are recommended accordingly. The impact of additional demand for car parking spaces on residential amenity are assessed in the 'car parking' section below. The proposal adequately respects the residential amenity of its neighbours and the constraints of the site and is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2018) policies 35, 55 and 56.

Amenity for future occupiers of the site

8.12 Policy 50 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2018) sets out internal residential space standards. All the proposed units exceed or meet the standards. In this regard, the units would provide a high-quality internal living environment for the future occupants. The application is accompanied by a Daylight/Sunlight Assessment which shows the units will benefit from good levels of natural light internally. The gross internal floor space measurements for units in this application are shown in the table below:

Unit	Number of	Number of bed	Number of	Policy Size requirement	Proposed size of	Difference in size
------	-----------	---------------	-----------	-------------------------	------------------	--------------------

	bedrooms	spaces (persons)	storeys	(m ²)	unit	
1	1	1	1	37	40	+3
2	1	1	1	37	39	+2
3	1	1	1	37	38	+1
4	1	2	1	50	50	0
5	1	1	1	37	42	+5
6	1	1	1	37	42	+5
7	1	1	1	37	39	+2
8	1	2	1	50	50	0

8.13 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. Within the supporting text of Policy 50 of Cambridge Local Plan (2018) it also states that new homes created through residential conversions should seek to meet or exceed the standards as far as it is practicable to do so. The scheme includes external amenity space for all units in the form of winter gardens or terraces. Due to potential noise from the neighbouring Chinese restaurant and the High Street, winter gardens have been chosen instead of balconies. Winter gardens have been accepted on other developments throughout the city in similar situations. The proposal will also provide a shared external courtyard amenity area for all the occupants of the flats to enjoy. Officers acknowledge that the proposed external amenity areas for each unit are small. However, as these are 1 bed units (not family units), and the scheme includes a shared amenity area as well as Cherry Hinton recreation ground being located within walking distance, it is considered to be acceptable in this instance. The proposal is therefore, in compliance with policy 50 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2018.

Potential noise impacts

8.14 The applicant has submitted an Acoustic Assessment (Ref:RP01-18383 Rev 3) produced by Cass Allen and dated April 2020. The assessment identifies potential noise sources including traffic noise from Cherry Hinton High Street and various commercial noise sources most notably from the adjacent Cherry House Takeaway on the western boundary which could impact on the amenity of future occupants of the proposed development. The Environmental Health Team has reviewed the submitted information and raises no objection

subject to a number of conditions ensuring compliance with the noise assessment.

Accessible homes

- 8.15 Policy 51 requires new buildings to comply with the requirements of Part M4 (2) of the Building Regulations generally does not apply to dwellings resulting from a conversion or a change of use. However, the scheme has been designed to comply with the requirements such as step free access by providing a lift. A condition is recommended to secure this.

Refuse Arrangements

- 8.16 A refuse store is located to the rear of the site which is separated from the retail refuse stores. It is considered to be in an appropriate place. The proposal is compliant in this respect with Cambridge Local Plan (2018) policy 57.

Highway Safety

- 8.17 Neighbours have raised concerns about the use of the layby at the front of the site for deliveries for the convenience store. Currently these deliveries are carried out to the rear of the site within the car park. Following the submission of additional information, the Highway Authority has confirmed that the unloading bay should be able to meet the demands of the proposed development without undue impact on the operation of the adopted public highway. Neighbours have raised concerns about the access to the car park, but the access points remains unchanged from the existing situation and therefore is considered to be acceptable. Whilst officers acknowledge residents' concerns, the advice from the Highway Authority is accepted. A traffic management plan condition is recommended which would address the logistics of construction. The proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2018) policy 81.

Car and Cycle Parking

Car Parking

- 8.18 The site is outside the Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ). The existing car park to the rear of the site is meant to accommodate 32 car parking spaces but due to the informal nature of the car park, it can provide additional parking. Appendix L of the Local Plan states that 1 space for every 50 sq m Gross Floor Area up to 1,400 sq m and 1 per 18 sq m thereafter, including disabled car parking. The total floor space for all the retail units on the site results in the level of provision should be 26 car parking spaces. The proposal will provide these 26 car parking spaces for the retail units. The car parking for the retail units would also include 2 disabled car parking spaces and electric vehicles charging points within the 26. The proposal would also include a further 6 car parking spaces for the residential units including a disabled car parking space. This level of provision is considered to be acceptable.
- 8.19 Whilst this would be a decrease from the existing situation, it would comply with the level of car parking required by policy. Neighbours have raised concern that the proposed decrease in car parking spaces and the formal layout of the car park will increase parking in nearby streets. This is coupled with the already planned reduction of local public carpark facilities on Colville Road (19/1034/FUL) which will further increase parking burden in the local area. Officers consider the proposed level of provision to be acceptable for a number of reasons. This is a private car park for the use of customers and staff for the retail units. As outlined below in the cycle parking section, the scheme would improve the cycle parking provision for the site. Nearby properties benefit from driveways and therefore have off street car parking. For these reasons, the proposed level of car parking is considered to be acceptable and officers consider the proposal would not increase parking pressures on nearby streets to an unacceptable degree and would not therefore be detrimental to the amenity of nearby residents.

Cycle Parking

- 8.20 There are 18 existing cycle parking spaces at the front of the terrace of retail units. The proposal would introduce a further 8 cycle parking spaces into this space at the front of the site. There is currently a poor level of cycle parking for the retail staff. The proposal would introduce 20 new cycle spaces to the

rear of the site for the retail units, these would be spread out evenly in groups of 4 along the rear of retail units for the retail staff. The proposal includes cycle parking for the residential units within a store to the rear of the existing convenience store building. The proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2018) policy 82.

Integrated water management and flood risk

- 8.21 The application is accompanied by a Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Strategy. This confirms that the site is within Flood Zone 1 and is at low risk of flooding from both river and surface water (high rainfall) events. The submission sets out how the proposal will not exacerbate the risk of flooding to surrounding properties. As there is an existing building, the proposal will use the existing on site surface water sewer and foul water sewer connections.

Trees

Trees

- 8.22 The application is accompanied by a Tree report. There are a number of trees on the site and surrounding the site. The proposal would result in 4 trees being removed to allow reconfiguration of the car park. These trees are T1 (Bird Cherry), T2 (Bird Cherry), T3 (Bird Cherry) and T5 (Ash). The application will provide 2 large tree replacements and 4 smaller tree replacements. Officers consider this loss to be acceptable subject to the new planting which be secured through a landscaping condition. A tree protection condition is also recommended. The proposal is in accordance with policy 71 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2018 subject to the conditions outlined above.

Affordable Housing

- 8.23 The proposed development is for a scheme of 8 units. Policy 45 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2018) states that affordable housing provision should be calculated on the basis that the thresholds are to be considered against the net increase in the number of units on the site. As the proposed net increase of units on the site would be below the threshold of 10 units, there is no policy basis to require affordable housing provision as part

of this application. The proposal is compliant with policy 45 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2018).

Third Party Representations

8.24 The majority of third-party representations have been addressed in the preceding paragraphs. The remaining ones are addressed in the table below

Representation	Response
Temporary closure of the retail shop (Tesco) would have a significant harmful effect on the village as it would reduce the amount of footfall for the Rectory Terrace area. A condition should be imposed ensuring the shop stays open during construction.	As this proposal is for a retail unit (use class A1) not a community building use and for the refurbishment of the property, it is not reasonable to require the property to stay open during the construction period.
No's 2, 4 and 6 Chalfont Close have a legal right for vehicular access from the carpark to the rear of their properties.	This is a civil matter between the landowners.
The retail space will be reduced.	There will be no reduction in retail space.
The proposal includes fenestration that would overlook the rear land of No's 41, 43,45, 47, 49 to 51, 43, 55 High Street as well as rely on daylight/sunlight from the current open space. This will have an impact on the potential future use of the site.	Amenity considerations are addressed in the relevant section above. The adjacent site No's 41, 43,45, 47, 49 to 51, 43, 55 High Street does not have any relevant planning permissions nor is it an allocated site. Therefore the application has been assessed against the existing situation and not a potential future situation.
Difference in ground level between the car park and the properties of No's 6 & 8 Chalfont Close will result in overlooking.	Amenity considerations are addressed in the relevant section above. This is an existing situation with neighbouring properties gardens backing onto the car park.

9.0 CONCLUSION

- 9.1 The proposal is a high-quality design which would not result in an adverse impact upon neighbouring properties and would also provide an acceptable level of amenity for future occupiers. It would also improve nearby resident's amenity by relocating servicing of the convenience store to the public highway. The proposal will provide improved cycle parking provision and a refurbished car park with an acceptable level of car parking that would not result in significant additional parking pressures on surrounding streets.

10.0 RECOMMENDATION

APPROVE subject to the following conditions:

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

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

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

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

3. No construction work or demolition work shall be carried out or plant operated other than between the following hours: 0800 hours and 1800 hours on Monday to Friday, 0800 hours and 1300 hours on Saturday and at no time on Sundays, Bank or Public Holidays.

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

4. There shall be no collections from or deliveries to the site during the demolition and construction stages outside the hours of 0800 hours and 1800 hours on Monday to Friday, 0800 hours to 1300 hours on Saturday and at no time on Sundays, Bank or Public Holidays.

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

5. No development shall commence (including any pre-construction, demolition, enabling works or piling), until a written report, regarding the demolition / construction noise and vibration impact associated with this development, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The report shall be in accordance with the provisions of BS 5228:2009 Code of Practice for noise and vibration control on construction and open sites and include full details of any piling and mitigation measures to be taken to protect local residents from noise and or vibration. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details only.

Due to the proximity of this site to existing residential premises and other noise sensitive premises, impact pile driving is not recommended.

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

6. No development shall commence until a programme of measures to minimise the spread of airborne dust from the site during the demolition / construction period has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be implemented in accordance with the approved scheme.

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

7. Acoustic assessment compliance condition - Residential Units

To protect future occupants against external noise impacts, the residential flats 1 to 8 shall be constructed and retained thereafter fully in accordance with the noise insulation scheme and mitigation measures including ventilation requirements as detailed in the submitted 'Acoustic Assessment, 'RECTORY TERRACE, CHERRY HINTON, CAMEL PROJECTS (CHERRY HINTON) LTD (Ref:RP01-18383 Rev 3)' produced by Cass Allen and dated 30th April 2020.

Reason: To protect the amenity of residential premises (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 Policy 35)

8. Acoustic Assessment compliance condition - Internal Plant Room

The mechanical services plant, auxiliary equipment / machinery associated with the Class A1 Use as approved shall be installed / implemented and operated fully in accordance with the operational noise levels, plant / equipment and noise insulation scheme and mitigation measures as detailed / specified in the submitted Acoustic Assessment (Ref:RP01-18383 Rev 3) produced by Cass Allen and dated 30th April 2020 and the Plant Noise Impact Assessment (Ref:88035 Rev01 Revised 14th April 2020) produced by Noise Solutions Ltd.

In addition the following mitigation measures shall also be installed to prevent unacceptable vibration impacts on the residential units located above the plant room:

- Installation of anti-vibration mounts and the use of inertia bases where required.
- Flexible connections between plant/equipment and ductwork/pipework.
- Anti-vibration mounts/hangers for all ductwork/pipework.
- Roller shutter isolation and dampening

The plant / equipment operational noise levels and noise insulation scheme and mitigation measures shall be fully maintained and retained thereafter. No additional machinery, plant equipment shall be installed in addition to the that approved.

Reason: To protect the amenity of adjoining and adjacent residential premises (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 Policy 35)

9. Hours of Opening of the Class A1 Use

The Class A1 Use hereby permitted shall not be open to customers outside the hours of 07:00 to 23.00 Monday to Sunday including Bank Holidays

Reason: To protect the amenity of adjoining and adjacent residential premises (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 Policy 35)

10. Operational Collection and Delivery Hours - Class A1 Use

Collections from and deliveries to the Class A1 Use shall not be made outside the hours of 07.00-17.00 Monday-Saturday and 09.00-17.00 on Sundays and Bank/Public Holidays.

Reason: To protect the amenity of adjoining and adjacent residential premises (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 Policy 35)

11. Odour Control: Cooking of Food on Site

Prior to the 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 adjoining and adjacent residential premises (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 Policy 36)

12. External Lighting

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 scheme/ assessment shall include the following:

- (i) the method of lighting (including details of the type of lights, orientation/angle of the luminaries, the headgear cowling, the spacing and height of lighting columns)

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

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

The scheme shall be implemented / carried out as approved and shall be retained as such.

Reason: To minimise the effects of light pollution on the surrounding area (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policy 34)

13. Unexpected Contamination

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 in writing by, the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter the development shall not be implemented otherwise than in accordance with the approved remediation scheme.

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

14. EV Bespoke - Electric Vehicle Charge Points

Prior to 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. Slow active electric vehicle charge points with a minimum power rating output of 7kW in 50% of parking spaces allocated for residential dwellings (3 car parking spaces).

2. 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 cabling to parking spaces for 50% of car parking spaces allocated for residential dwellings (3 car parking spaces)

3. One active rapid electric vehicle charge point in the public car park for exclusive use by electric vehicles.

4. The electric vehicle charge points shall be designed and installed in accordance with BS EN 61851 or as superceded 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) paragraph 105, 110, 170 and 181, Policy 36 - Air Quality, Odour and Dust of the Cambridge Local Plan (2018) and with Cambridge City Council's adopted Air Quality Action Plan (2018).

15. 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)

16. Prior to the commencement of works on the car park, full details of both hard and soft landscape works shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The works shall be carried out as approved. These details shall include proposed finished levels or contours; means of enclosure; car parking layouts, other vehicle and pedestrian access and circulation areas; hard surfacing materials; minor artefacts and structures (eg furniture, play equipment, refuse or other storage units, signs, lighting); retained historic landscape features and proposals for restoration, where relevant. Soft Landscape works shall include planting plans; written specifications (including cultivation and other operations associated with plant and grass establishment); schedules of plants, noting species, plant sizes and proposed numbers/densities where appropriate and an implementation programme.

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

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

17. Prior to the occupation of unit 8, a 1.8m solid privacy screen shall be installed on the west facing elevation of unit 8's first floor winter garden. The development shall thereafter be retained and maintained.

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

18. The approved tree protection methodology shown within the submitted Arboricultural Impact Assessment Ligna Consultancy dated 2nd October 2019 and submitted Arboricultural Method Statement Ligna Consultancy dates 2nd October 2019 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.

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

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