



Cambridge City Council Planning

Date: Friday, 16 October 2020

Time: 10.00 am

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

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

Agenda

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

- **Part One**
Major Planning Applications
Start time: 10am
- **Part Two**
Minor/Other Planning Applications
Start time: At conclusion of Part One

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

If the meeting should last to 6.00pm, the Committee will vote as to whether or not the meeting will be adjourned.

- 2 Apologies
- 3 Declarations of Interest
- 4 Minutes - to follow

Part 1: Major Planning Applications

- 5 18/1678/FUL - Station Area Development (Pages 7 - 188)

Part 2: Minor/Other Planning Applications

6	18/0887/FUL - 75 Newmarket Road	(Pages 189 - 220)
7	19/1770/FUL - 32 St Andrews Street	(Pages 221 - 242)
8	20/02876/FUL - 78 Grantchester Meadows	(Pages 243 - 256)
9	20/01033/FUL - 12 Gilmour Road	(Pages 257 - 268)

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

Alternates: Bird and Price

Information for the public

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

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

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

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

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

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

Appendix 1 – Planning Policies and Guidance

(Updated September 2020)

1.0 Central Government Advice

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

1.2 Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG)

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

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

Planning Obligations

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

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

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

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

2.0 Development Plans

2.1 The Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Plan 2011

2.2 Cambridge Local Plan 2018

3.0 Supplementary Planning Documents

3.1 Sustainable Design and Construction 2020

3.2 Cambridge Flood and Water 2018

3.3 Affordable Housing 2008

3.4 Planning Obligations Strategy 2004

Development Frameworks and Briefs

3.5 The New Museums Site Development Framework (March 2016)

3.6 Ridgeons site Planning and Development Brief (July 2016)

3.7 Mitcham's Corner Development Framework (January 2017)

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

3.9 Land North of Cherry Hinton (February 2018)

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

4.0 Use Classes

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

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

PLANNING COMMITTEE

16th October 2020

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 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 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, 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

Applicant c/o Agent

Addendum Report

- 0.0 This application was reported to the 17 June 2020 Planning Committee with an officer recommendation of approval.
- 0.1 During the consideration of the application, Members of the Planning Committee raised numerous concerns with the proposal and voted not to accept the officer recommendation. A decision on whether to approve or refuse the application was subsequently deferred following the implementation of the Adjourned Decision Protocol (ADP).

- 0.2 During the debate, the Planning Committee agreed a motion that they were minded to refuse the application for two reasons. These were as follows:
- 0.3 *1: The proposed development would fail to prioritise the movement and safety of pedestrians and cyclists within the CB1 area introducing conflict at Station Square and Station Road and further conflict along the car park access road connecting to Devonshire Road. In addition, the footprint of B2 would reduce the flexibility of development coming forward within this quarter of CB1 to adequately respond and provide for high quality cycling (including the Chisholm Trail) and pedestrian routes that should have priority over vehicular traffic. The proposal is therefore contrary to policies 25, 56, 57, 59 and policy 80 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2018) and NPPF (Feb 2019) paragraphs 104 and 109.*
- 0.4 *2: By virtue of the scale, massing and footprint of building B2 in close proximity to Carter Bridge, the proposed building would appear visually cramped, overly prominent and detract from the character and appearance of the existing area. The proposal is therefore contrary to policies 55, 56 and 57 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2018) and NPPF (Feb 2019) paragraph 124.*
- 0.5 The Committee agreed, through the ADP process, that a further officer report should be brought back to the Planning Committee in relation to the minded to refusal reasons to inform its decision.
- 0.6 This report summarises officer advice regarding the merits of the minded to refusal reasons. It is given following further discussions with the applicants who, after the June Committee, sought to address the draft reasons for refusal through the submission of amendments and further supporting information. These amendments and further information have been subject to additional consultation with third parties and consultees over the summer period and comprise:
- a) A revised site location plan and description of development removing the proposed access from Station Road to Station Square. Members will recall that the Planning Committee expressed a clear preference to

support option B (removal of the new access from Station Road) as set out in the initial officer recommendation.

- b) Revisions to F2 and B2 footprints, including the widening of the pavements on the car park access road, the removal of a disabled parking space and changes to the surfacing treatment of a servicing layby on the car park access road adjacent to Block F2. The pavement widening includes an increase by 2.9m at the junction with Great Northern Road and 1.9m and 1m along the Northern Access Road. This is achieved by locally recessing the ground floor of F2. The loading bay demarcation is amended with the same paving treatment across the site to provide visual continuity of pedestrian priority. Members will recall that concerns were raised regarding the adequacy of pavement widths.
- c) Alterations to the multi storey car park entrance and exit arrangements so that the entrance is from the southern side of block B2 and exit on the northern side. The amendment is put forward to better integrate the flows of cycle and vehicular movements. Members will recall that concerns were raised regarding vehicular and cycle conflict at the point of the Devonshire Road / car park access road junction.
- d) The submission of a Design Document examining the reasons for refusal and the applicant's amendments / response including additional views of block B2 (the aparthotel) from Devonshire Road and an indicative link to the Chisholm Trail. The applicants set out that sufficient space is safeguarded to protect the future route of the Chisholm Trail. Brookgate have also committed not to build buildings G1 and G2 and have indicated that they are willing to agree to a suitably worded condition regarding the provision of future links for the Chisholm Trail.

Process and Approach

- 0.7 Some members may be concerned regarding the fact that amendments have been made to the planning application during the period of adjournment. However, the ADP process

does not prohibit amendments from being put forward by applicants to directly address concerns raised by the Planning Committee. In fact, such an outcome could be considered desirable to most parties as the effect of the ADP and the subsequent amendments could be either to remove the need for a refusal of planning permission and the need for any subsequent appeal or at the very least to narrow the issues and / or exhaust all reasonable opportunities for agreement before any refusal of planning permission is issued. Even if a refusal arises from the Planning Committee's further consideration of the application as amended, it is desirable that an improved amended scheme is put forward for any Inspector's consideration.

- 0.8 Paragraph 38 of the NPPF 2019 states: *'Local planning authorities should approach decisions on proposed development in a positive and creative way. They should use the full range of planning tools available, including brownfield registers and permission in principle, and work proactively with applicants to secure developments that will improve the economic, social and environmental conditions of the area. Decision-makers at every level should seek to approve applications for sustainable development where possible.'*
- 0.9 Amendments to planning applications are a commonplace tool to address concerns. Case law has established that a local planning authority has the power to determine an application for planning permission which has been amended prior to determination if the changes proposed to the application are not "substantial" and the development proposed is not so changed that it is "not in substance that which was originally applied for." It is not considered that the amendments made to the application are substantial or that they make the proposed development one which is not in substance the development for which permission was originally sought. This is because the key components of the scheme, the office block, aparthotel and multi-storey car park and access road, including their location and quantum of space sought, remain substantially the same as before.
- 0.10 As set out above, third parties and consultees have been consulted about the proposed changes. The amendments have been put forward to directly address the minded to reasons for

refusal of the Planning Committee and it would be contrary to the spirit of the NPPF and para. 38 for the Planning Committee to disregard them. Members should also be aware that the planning application has been lodged with the Council for a considerable time (since 2018) and has already been subject to multiple amendments to overcome issues. Officers are of the view that the site is a major remaining piece of the CB1 jigsaw, and it is entirely reasonable in the circumstances to allow for amendments to be considered, even at this late stage. It would therefore be unreasonable of the Planning Committee not to consider the amendments put forward by the applicants. Such an approach may attract an application for costs at any subsequent appeal if the application were to be refused.

Speaking Rights

- 0.11 The amendments are material to the minded to reasons for refusal and relate to some of the substantive third-party objections regarding the Chisholm Trail in particular. In the interests of fairness, given the circumstances of this case and because further third-party representations have been sought and received on the latest amendments (summarised above a-d), officers advise that third-party rights to address the Planning Committee are allowed.

Process

- 0.12 To ensure safe decision making, members of the Planning Committee absent from the previous discussion should not take part in the resumed debate. The purpose of the resumed debate is for Committee to determine if their original minded-to resolution is still appropriate, should be amended, or whether the original officer recommendation should be followed.
- 0.13 Further analysis is therefore required to understand the policy framework for the potential issues in relation to the minded to reasons for refusal, relevant appeals and any other guidance available to members to help inform a decision.

Consultations

Local Highways Authority

- 0.14 No Objection: The Highway Authority welcomes the removal of the proposed access to the Station Square from Station Road.
- 0.15 The redesigned exit from the car park including for the future route of the Chisholm Trail as shown on drawing P5000 02 Context Plan is a significant improvement on the original design and provides clear wayfinding messages for all users of the traffic routes.
- 0.16 On the indicative design elements, a number of minor issues (paving units) are raised. The width of the footway as it exits the site at the Devonshire Road could be widened at the expense of the cycle route. Not convinced the Chisholm Trail Route needs to be segregated and the use of a mini roundabout appears over designed. This route is likely to be strongly tidal during it periods of main flow as people access then exit the station, outside that the width appears to be sufficient to allow for easy mixing of directional use. None of the roads will be sought to be adopted. Suggests a condition in relation to management and maintenance of the streets (see appendix 1, proposed condition 12B).

Urban Design and Conservation Team

- 0.17 The Urban Design and Conservation Team have reviewed the amended drawings and supporting information submitted for application 18/1678/FUL.
- 0.18 The submitted amendments have been made to address draft reasons for refusal.

Changes to Block F2

- 0.19 The ground floor has been set back along the east elevation to achieve a wider footway of between 1.1m and 1.9m. The pinch point at the junction with Great Northern Road has been increased from 3.7m to 5.2m. The increases in width are acceptable in design terms.
- 0.20 In terms of the changes to the elevations and form to Block F2, the recessed section works well with the horizontal band

between ground and first floor and so is considered acceptable in design terms.

Changes to Block B2

- 0.21 The north-west corner of Building B2 has been chamfered to increase the footway width from 2.2m to 3.5m (at the maximum width). The design creates a concave curved recess to the corner that compliments the convex form above.
- 0.22 The horizontal metal section between ground and first floor has been extended to create a datum for the recess to extend up to. The change to the elevation is acceptable in design terms.
- 0.23 The circulation to the multi storey car park MSCP has been revised to relocate the entrance between Block B1 (Ibis/Cycle Point) and proposed Block B2. The change in circulation removes the need for vehicles to travel the length of the street to access the car park and so may go some way to relieving pressure on the northernmost section of the street where pedestrians and cyclists will be coming into the Station Area from Devonshire Road and the Carter Cycle Bridge.

Public Realm

- 0.24 The changes to the building footprints have allowed for footway widths to be increased at former 'pinch points'. The treatment of the loading bay allows it to be 'read' as part of the footway and so helps create additional capacity for pedestrians when not in use.
- 0.25 Adjustments to the proposed exit to the MSCP through the deletion of a car parking space also creates additional width by Block B2.
- 0.26 The proposed car entrance to the MSCP crosses the footway running along the east side of the access road. The footway should be detailed so as to prioritise pedestrian movements and run across the access level with the footway to the north and south.
- 0.27 The [indicative] proposed mini-roundabout for the cycle routes to the north of the development is unconvincing as a solution to

managing the different flows in the area. A 'give way' may be a better solution.

Massing Studies

- 0.28 A series of views have been submitted to illustrate the massing of the proposed scheme against that considered in the Outline. The scale and massing of the Block B2 in relation to the Carter Cycle Bridge is acceptable.
- 0.29 In the view of UD and Cons. officers, the proposed massing does not impact on the silhouette of the Carter Cycle Bridge stanchions or the ability to read them as local landmarks to any significant degree more than the consented Outline massing.

Station Square and Station Road

- 0.30 Zebra Crossings are proposed to aid pedestrian connectivity across the Station Square and Station Road. Concerned about the visual dominance of the Zebra Crossing.

Access Officer

- 0.31 Looking at the revised highway design at CB1, the officer is pleased that the footway is wider. The loss of the Blue Badge space in the parking lay-by is not a great loss because the layout of this does not provide convenient spaces for egress of disabled users and is mitigated by the blue badge spaces in the nearby car park. The space also does not serve shops, hotels etc where luggage, shopping, etc would need to be transported to/from.
- 0.32 The Access Officer queries who the car park would be run by. NCP charge for Blue Badge parking and this may encourage Blue Badge holders to park on yellow lines, which is legal but less convenient generally for the users of the area. It would be good if the loading bay gave extra time for Blue Badge holders and this information shown on the signage for the bay.

Further Third-party Representations

Camcycle

- 0.33 Objection: While some of the changes are positive steps forward, such as the principle of creating a segregated Chisholm Trail through the surface car park, there are a number of important details that must be fixed in the proposed design.
- 0.34 The application still does not address the safety problems further south at the Great Northern Road mini-roundabout, nor does it safeguard a suitable route for the Chisholm Trail through that part of the site, as required by Policy 80.
- 0.35 With the publication of Local Transport Note 1/20, the DfT's new Cycling Infrastructure Design guide, there is now a strong central government policy backing the creation of segregated cycleways that are protected from motor traffic and separate from pedestrian space.
- 0.36 With some relatively small changes to the ground floor of F2 it is possible to open up an inclusive and policy-compliant Chisholm Trail route all the way across the site, one which connects with a safe route running via the quiet Mill Park Road, and is suitable for all ages and abilities. Several further suggested amended designs and indicative alternative arrangements for the intersection and design of the Chisholm Trail route as it comes from Devonshire Road and along the car park access route are suggested by Camcycle to support their objection, including an indicative route for the Chisholm Trail cutting through part of the revised F2 footprint on the corner to allow for a connection with Great Northern Road (avoiding the existing mini-roundabout) and Mill Park Road.

South Petersfield Residents' Association (SOPRA)

- 0.37 Objection: Earlier concerns still stand. Additional observations on the amendments provided. SOPRA state that committee should refuse the application on the grounds that the applicant has not addressed the second draft reason for refusal; and that the amended footprint of F2 still blocks provision of a safe, protected cycle link in a strategically important north-south cycle route (the Chisholm Trail), and thereby obstructs the local authorities' duty to enable and promote cycling in accordance with local and national policies.

- 0.38 Footprint B2: The applicant has not addressed the second draft reason for refusal. It has justified the substantial extension of B2 beyond the outline plan towards Devonshire Rd on the basis that it will not now develop the building on the corner of Devonshire Rd (G1) given outline planning consent. The applicant has not undertaken to include a covenant in the freehold to forbid any future development of this land. Without that, the applicant's assurance is void since the freeholder (Network Rail) may bring forward an application to develop any of the remaining land north of Carter Bridge at any time.
- 0.39 Delivery Vehicles: The proposed design requires large vehicles to reverse across a busy pedestrian and cycle route without the assistance of a banks person. This is not a safe arrangement without greater segregation of pedestrians, cycles and motor vehicles. It appears that the only way for drivers to turn around safely is to reverse into and drive out of the multi-storey car park access lane. This will be a difficult manoeuvre to execute unassisted when there are large numbers of people walking and cycling along the Northern Access Rd, and cars accessing or leaving the car park.
- 0.40 Chisholm Trail: The developer has offered no solution to improve the inclusivity of this cycle route through the site. At present, there is no clear route that is safely navigable by an unaccompanied 12-year-old, yet alone 8–80 year olds, which is the design standard required in LTN 1/20. Cycling between the station car park and the Busway across Station Square requires a high level of road sense to navigate around pedestrians, other cycles and reversing cars. SOPRA suggest the footprint of F2 is pulled back further to allow for the suggested Smarter Cambridge Transport route (and that proposed by Camcycle) to be delivered.
- 0.41 Link to Devonshire Rd: The design of the cycleway and footway link between the Northern Access Road and Devonshire Rd is complicated and conflicted. It is too narrow for pedestrians and there is restricted visibility due to the Carter Bridge pillars.
- 0.42 SOPRA re-submit objections in relation to taxi-ranking and Greater Anglia's former franchise agreement to provide an additional 1,000 cycle parking spaces (now removed by the Department for Transport).

0.43 Further representations have been received from the following addresses:

- 81 Great Northern Road
- 116 Tenison Road

0.44 The representations can be summarised as follows:

- Pollution in the Great Northern Road and neighbouring streets
Great Northern Road is a narrow residential street and all the traffic should go to the station via Station Road.
- An entrance to Station Square from Station Road was the only slight positive in the entire scheme, and without that, many of the issues previously raised will be worse.
- None of the concerns mentioned in previous letters have been adequately addressed, and the needs of residents on Great Northern Road have been ignored.
- Piecemeal development.
- Increase in lorry traffic.
- Increase in pollution.
- No effective way to restrict deliveries or rubbish collection to daytime hours.
- There needs to be a way for the lorries to use Station Road.
- Greater concerns if the entrance to Station Square from Station Road is removed.
- Taxi parking should be on Station Road.
- The proposed traffic solutions inadequate, but the layout of building F2 is still likely to increase the noise and disruption to residents in building F1.
- The nearness of building F2 to F1 decreases the light and privacy available to residents and the courtyard and increases the chances of anti-social behaviour.
- This would be an ideal opportunity for the area to be considered as a whole, and for general improvements made to the entire site rather than compound mistakes.

The above responses are a summary of those received following the amendments. Full details of the responses can be inspected via the Council's website via public access.

Key Issues and Officer Advice

Minded to Reason for Refusal 1

- 0.45 *'The proposed development would fail to prioritise the movement and safety of pedestrians and cyclists within the CB1 area introducing conflict at Station Square and Station Road and further conflict along the car park access road connecting to Devonshire Road. In addition, the footprint of B2 would reduce the flexibility of development coming forward within this quarter of CB1 to adequately respond and provide for high quality cycling (including the Chisholm Trail) and pedestrian routes that should have priority over vehicular traffic. The proposal is therefore contrary to policies 25, 56, 57, 59 and policy 80 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2018) and NPPF (Feb 2019) paragraphs 104 and 109.'*
- 0.46 The amendments put forward deal directly with the issue of the access from Station Road to Station Square by removing it from the application. This was the subject of the previous and only objection from the County Council's Local Highways Engineer.
- 0.47 The amendments put forward to reduce the ground floor footprints of both blocks F2 and B2 allow for greater pavement widths. The County Council Local Highways Engineer and Urban Design Colleagues support these revisions. Officers consider the amendments a positive approach to improving pedestrian flow and permeability.
- 0.48 The change in the access arrangement to the car park is assessed by the Local Highways Engineer as a *'significant improvement on the original design and provides clear wayfinding messages for all users of the traffic routes'*.
- 0.49 In respect of this change also, the Urban Design officer states, *'the change in circulation removes the need for vehicles to travel the length of the street to access the car park and so may go some way to relieving pressure on the northernmost section of the street where pedestrians and cyclists will be coming into the Station Area from Devonshire Road and the Carter Cycle Bridge'*.
- 0.50 Officers are of the view that the change should be broadly welcomed as an attempt to reduce vehicular / cycle conflict and

thus helps address part of the reason for refusal. The change in access arrangements to the car park is supported.

- 0.51 The Access Officer has not raised an issue with the loss of the disabled parking bay on the car park access road nor is an issued raised regarding the surface treatment of the loading bay. This has been incorporated as a shared pavement space. There is sufficient disabled parking nearby in the car park of B2 or in Station Square itself.
- 0.52 A good deal of third-party concern relates to the Devonshire Road and Great Northern Road cycling and pedestrian connection points. Members are reminded that the developer has already contributed - from 50/60 Station Road and 30 Station Road - approximately £870,000 from respective S106 planning obligations combined towards the delivery of the Chisholm Trail. The applicants state that they do not seek permission for any works related to the Chisholm Trail itself, only to demonstrate that the route of the trail is not prejudiced by the development. To that extent an indicative connection to the Chisholm Trail is shown in the applicant's Design Document via a cycling mini-roundabout located underneath Carter Bridge connecting northwards through the surface grade station car park. The indicative plan indicates the removal of some car parking spaces in current use to allow the connection.
- 0.53 The indicative arrangement has drawn criticism from third parties, the Urban Design Officer and from the Local Highways Officer on numerous grounds (visibility, over-engineered design). However, the applicant's intention was not to put forward a finalised design. Camcycle have themselves put forward an alternative indicative arrangement for this part of the site to illustrate how a connection to the Chisholm Trail could work. The applicants have confirmed that they have no objection to the direction of travel with the Cam Cycle plan in respect of the Devonshire Road section of the connection.
- 0.54 In fact, none of the drawings for the Devonshire Road / Chisholm Trail connection put forward by either the applicants or the third parties have been subject to formal surveys or safety audits. Given the circumstances, officers recommend a condition is imposed upon any permission to secure the details of both a temporary connection from the car park access road

to Devonshire Road and a permanent Devonshire Road / Chisholm Trail linked connection at the appropriate point in time. This is secured via proposed condition 7 and can resolve many of the concerns raised including the timing of when the Chisholm Trail connects to the Devonshire Road link.

- 0.55 All of the indicative plans put forward indicate that there is space available to facilitate an appropriate connection to the Chisholm Trail in the northern part of the site. Subject to condition 7 being imposed, officers consider that the matter has been adequately addressed by the applicants and the provision of a link to the Chisholm Trail in the northern part of the site is not prejudiced.
- 0.56 The applicants do not propose an alternative treatment to the finish of the car park access road itself and neither do they agree to a further cut back of block F2 either along its eastern façade facing the car park access road or on the corner of Great Northern Road (GNR) to facilitate the Camcycle / SOPRA (Smarter Cambridge Transport) suggestion of providing a route for the Chisholm Trail west down the GNR, around the back of One Station Square (Sainsbury's) and connecting to Mill Park Road, thereby bypassing the GNR mini roundabout and Station Square.
- 0.57 The applicant's vision is for the public realm treatment for the car park access road to be similar to Station Square and for there to be no dedicated cycle lane, whereas third parties see this as a necessity and for a segregated cycle route to be enabled through the site and around the corner of F2 block. This would take up further floorspace from the F2 office block.
- 0.58 Policies 25 and 80 are key, together with the NPPF para 104 (c) which states in relation to planning policies that they should *'identify and protect, where there is robust evidence, sites and routes which could be critical in developing infrastructure to widen transport choice and realise opportunities for large scale development;'*
- 0.59 The reason for refusal would be stronger if the proposed route for the Chisholm Trail and its design (or its design standard) in this part of CB1 was identified either by the County Council or the Councils' delivery partners the Greater Cambridge

Partnership and / or the Combined Authority as sound reason to support a recommendation for refusal; none do. The design and exact route of the Chisholm Trail in this part of CB1 is not formalised and the route shown is merely indicative and high level.

0.60 The suggested route along GNR and behind One Station Square put forward by third parties is but one solution, is indicative, relies on the use of third party land, has not been costed, ratified by the Highway Authority or subjected to a safety audit. Because of this and because of the other improvements to the scheme that have been undertaken by the applicants, including the removal of the Station Square Access (which was the only objection raised by the Local Highways Engineer), it is not considered that there are sound planning reasons for refusing the application by reference to Minded to Reason for Refusal 1.

0.61 While the risk of an adverse costs award on appeal is not a material planning consideration and should not be taken into account by members of the Planning Committee in their decision, members will no doubt be aware of the availability of an appeal against any refusal of planning permission and the possibility that a developer may make an application for costs against the Council as part of such an appeal if the Council has engaged in unreasonable behaviour (which would include, for example, a failure to produce evidence to substantiate a reason for refusal on appeal).

Minded to Reason for Refusal 2

0.62 *'By virtue of the scale, massing and footprint of building B2 in close proximity to Carter Bridge, the proposed building would appear visually cramped, overly prominent and detract from the character and appearance of the existing area. The proposal is therefore contrary to policies 55, 56 and 57 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2018) and NPPF (Feb 2019) paragraph 124.'*

0.63 The applicants have not amended the scheme to address this minded to reason for refusal. Instead, they have provided a series of visualisations of block B2 and dimensioned drawings.

0.64 These visualisations show:

- a) An 8.1m gap between the Ibis/Cycle Point building and B2 (which would not have occurred if B1 had been delivered in totality) enabling light and space to penetrate between the buildings. This breaks up an otherwise monolithic building length frontage that would have come about from realising B1 in totality; and
- b) The 8.1m gap results in B2 moving 12.2m north towards Carter Bridge without any demonstrable harm to visual amenity.

0.65 The Design Document provides some useful comparative elevations demonstrating the differences in visual impact of one long B1 (outline) block compared to two B blocks (B1 & B2). In addition, 3D massing studies show the value of the cut-back in the detail of B2 providing relief to the façade. The applicants calculate that B1 as built *and* B2 as proposed provide for a 9% reduction in overall volume compared to what outline B1 could have delivered itself (70,465 m³, proposed: 76,091 m³ outline).

0.66 Visualisations within the Design Document along Devonshire Road show the 'A' frame of Carter Bridge as visually distinguishable against clear sky and little noticeable difference between the skylines of the outline B1 and proposed B2 from different vantage points.

0.67 The Council's Urban Design Team and Conservation Officers have further considered the visualisations and conclude that the scale and massing of block B2 in relation to the Carter Bridge to be acceptable and maintain their support of the proposal.

0.68 The applicants (Brookgate) confirm in their Design Document that buildings G1 and G2 will not be delivered if the proposed buildings B2 and F2 are constructed. As orally advised in the earlier Committee meeting, officers are of the view that limited weight can be given to this commitment as the local planning authority cannot prohibit future planning applications from being made. Any such application, should the applicants or Network Rail review their intentions for the use of the land where G1 and G2 are located, would have to be treated on its own merits given that the outline consent has lapsed.

- 0.69 Draft refusal reason 2's wording is such that the harm is confined to the relationship of the B2 building to Carter Bridge only and is therefore limited in scope. The volumetric cut out of the upper level of B2 and the gap between the Ibis Hotel / Cycle Point building are such that it is difficult to find fault with the applicant's approach to the design and footprint of the B2 building given the outline parameters.
- 0.70 Ultimately, whether the proposed design for the development is acceptable by reference to the relevant planning policies is a matter of judgment for members. Even if, however, members consider the proposed design to be unacceptable in the limited way described above so as to be in conflict with policies 55, 56 and 57 of the Local Plan, members will nonetheless have to consider whether, despite the conflict identified, the proposals accord with the Development Plan overall. Further, even if members consider that the proposals do not accord with the Development Plan overall, members will in any event have to weigh in the planning balance the benefits of the proposal as a whole - jobs, provision of visitor accommodation, provision of office floorspace, redevelopment of brownfield land of poor environmental quality and completion of the CB1 public realm and Devonshire Quarter - against the degree of visual harm which they consider may otherwise arise.

Other Matters

- 0.71 Third parties have raised concern regarding the danger of delivery lorries reversing into or out of the new car park access road without adequate visibility for pedestrians and cyclists. This is not a matter that the Highways Officer has raised and would largely arise as a problem if a driver were to accidentally turn into the car park access between the Ibis and the MSCP in forward gear. It is for delivery drivers to ensure they manoeuvre in a controlled and safe manner and appropriate signage could be put in place or delivery arrangements with the Hotel clarified if it becomes an issue. This could include the use of a banksman if so required.
- 0.72 Other objections have been raised by third parties but these are largely a reiteration of previous concerns including in relation to: taxi-ranking; Greater Anglia's former franchise agreement to provide an additional 1,000 cycle parking spaces; noise and

pollution; access from Station Square; delivery and collection times for servicing and refuse; piecemeal development; the impact of F2 on residential amenity; and intensification of the use of Great Northern Road. These matters were addressed within the original officer report attached as appendix 0 and were debated at length by members but did not contribute to the minded to refuse reasons.

Recommendation

0.73 Committee is invited to review the minded to reasons for refusal in the light of this Addendum report and **APPROVE** the application 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.

Appendices

Appendix 0: Officer Report 17 June 2020

Appendix 1: Proposed conditions (revised for 16 Oct Committee)

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

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.
---------	--

	<p>-The scheme would deliver public realm improvements and the design of the 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	A/C Time period for submission of reserved matters has lapsed Granted 9 April 2010 with 7year period for submission

	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 cycle spaces, private and public spaces etc.	of RM's.
--	--	----------

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 Plan 2018	1, 2, 5, 6, 21 (Station Areas West M14) 25 (Cambridge Railway Station, Hills Road Corridor to the City Centre Opportunity Area) 28, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 40, 42 55, 56, 57, 59, 60, 61 72, 77 (visitor accommodation) 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 – Planning Practice Guidance from 3 March 2014 onwards Circular 11/95 (Annex A)
Supplementary Planning Documents	Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Flood and Water

<p>Previous Supplementary Planning Documents</p>	<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> <p>Public Art (January 2010)</p>
<p>Material Considerations</p>	<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> <p>Station Area Development Framework (2004) includes the Station Area Conservation Appraisal.</p>
--	---

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 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:

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

- 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 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.
<i>Noise from Traffic</i>	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 apart-hotels 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 apart-hotels 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			-Proposed Height (18/1678/FUL)
	Max Building Height	Max Plant Height	Total	
F2	-9m adjacent to Ravensworth Gardens	2m	11m	9.6m (no plant)
	-15m height	2m	17m	12.8m (14.8

	adjacent to F1			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 There 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 F1 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	The proposal is not justified on this basis. Any application for G1 and G2 would have to be justified on their own merits.

	Bridge (G1, G2).	
	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	This may be desirable to some third parties, but it is not a requirement of policy

	CB1.	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 residents.	This is an existing issue for residents. It is unreasonable to expect the MSCP to cater 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	The application is not supported by County Highways on the basis of increased conflict at the new access for pedestrians and cyclists.

	manoeuvre.	
	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 expansion	This is not a requirement arising from the application and would be 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	This is an infrequent requirement and does not justify the retention of the land for this use.

	Station Place and disrupt those services.	
	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 unlicensed taxis should be explored.	Noted, this is within the gift of the TOC.
	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		
	Traffic increases will increase noise on GNR	The primary function of GNR is not changed by the

<i>Noise from Traffic</i>	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.	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	See Env. Health advice. The proposed mitigation is acceptable.

	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.	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	Discussed in report, paras.

	residents of Ravensworth Gardens.	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 should only be allowed over the weekdays 8am – 6pm and not weekdays.	As above.
	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 station square.	Not a material consideration.
	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 development would exacerbate site wide issues.	The need for strategic interventions to address wider existing issues is not a 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	Agreed. Discussed in the committee report.

	interventions would not work.	
	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 residents' associations.	Noted.
	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 £500,000 to remedy problems. This is an admission that the design as implemented is defective.	Noted. The design of Station Square and its use has been approved by the Council. The applicants are 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	Station Square is in private ownership. The new access

	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.	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:

- (3) 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
- (4) 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 (17 Oct Version)

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 D5802	Rev04
B2 Ground Floor Plan D5100	Rev14
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	Rev04
B2 West Elevation D5700	Rev07
B2 East Elevation D5701	Rev06

B2 South Elevation D5207	Rev05
B2 North Elevation D5703	Rev07
F2 Ground Floor Plan D6100	Rev13
F2 First & Second Floor Plan D6101	Rev11
F2 Third and Roof D6103	Rev13
F2 Basement Floor Plan D6105	Rev13
F2 Section AA D6500	Rev04
F2 Section BB D6501	Rev04
F2 Section CC D6502	Rev04
F2 West & East Elevation D6710	Rev09
F2 South Elevation D6711	Rev07
F2 North Elevation D6712	Rev06
Proposed Zebra Crossings and Pedestrian Routes 217382-MMD-00-XX-DR-C-1021	P2

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 location and sequence of provision of any temporary buildings and hoardings on land for construction purposes, iv) temporary connections for pedestrians, cyclists, vehicular routes and parking provisions during the construction phase, v) 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 P2.

No more than 50% of the proposed floorspace within building F2 shall be occupied until such time as the hard surface public realm provisions and all proposed new zebra crossings 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).

Pedestrian and Cycle Links and the Chisholm Trail

7. Notwithstanding the approved plans for the cycle and pedestrian links between Devonshire Road and the car park access road:

- 1) Prior to any development apart from below ground enabling works, detailed plans of temporary connections pursuant to condition 6 (iv) for pedestrians and cyclists to Devonshire Road from the car park access road shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved temporary connections shall be provided prior to any above ground development works and phased in accordance with the approved details.
- 2) No floorspace within any building shall be occupied until such time as detailed plans showing permanent connections for pedestrians and cyclists to Devonshire Road from the car park access road have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. No more than 50% of the floorspace within building F2 shall be occupied until the permanent connections are fully provided in accordance with the approved plans. The permanent connections shall take account of and facilitate any emerging detailed designs of the Chisholm Trail within the CB1 area which seek to connect into the development site either from Devonshire Road or from the Network Rail grade car park to the north. The plans shall demonstrate that a Chisholm Trail link is viable and compatible with the approved design in terms of highway safety.
- 3) No later than 5 years following the commencement of development, any proposed connection by the recognised delivery body for the Chisholm Trail into the northern part of the application site as indicated on plan MMD-217382-C-DR-10-XX-5063 contained within the Design Document shall be facilitated through the submission of appropriate amendments to the design and layout of the pedestrian and cycling links to Devonshire Road as required. Any required amendments to the approved permanent connection shall be carried out within 4 months of notification by the Local Planning Authority that they are required unless alternative timing arrangements are otherwise agreed.

Reason: To ensure the connection of the Chisholm Trail is not prejudiced by the development (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policies 21, 25, 55, 56, 59, 80).

Station Road Bus Stops

8. Prior to the provision of the Station Road 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).

Maintenance of the Car Park Access Road

12B. There shall be no occupation of any building until details of the proposed arrangements for future management and maintenance of the proposed car park access road and associated public realm, including the enforcement and management of the use of the proposed loading bay within the development, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The car park access road and associated public realm shall thereafter be maintained and managed in accordance with the approved management and maintenance details.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety, visual amenity and given the high volume of public use of the area (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policies 21, 25, 55, 56, 59, 80).

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 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 NO_x/Nm³
- Compression ignition engine: less than 400 mg NO_x/Nm³
- Gas turbine: less than 50 mg NO_x/Nm³

The details shall include a manufacturers Nitrogen Oxides (NO_x) 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.

INFORMATIVE: Maintenance of Private Roads

Maintenance of Private Roads: Guidance document. As part of the release of any condition relating to the future management and maintenance of the proposed streets within a development prior to either the signing of a Section 38 Agreement of the Highways Act 1980 or the establishment of a Private Management and Maintenance Company, the developer should provide the following level of information: A Plan showing the proposed hard standing types on the proposed development. A Document stating how the private roads, paths etc., will be maintained in the short and long term. A suggested Maintenance Document is provided below to assist in the creation of the same by the developer. Areas to be offered to the Local Highway Authority for adoption under S38 of the Highways Act 1980: 1. In the short term, i.e. prior to the signing of the Section 38 Agreement, the Contractor will maintain the roads prior to adoption ensuring a suitable level of maintenance to facilitate future adoption and a safe working site. 2. Should the Section 38 Agreement not be signed or completed, the Contractor will maintain the roads prior to site completion and handover to a level which would otherwise be deemed suitable

for adoption by the Highways Authority. 3. The site shall be inspected once a year and any failures within the potential adopted public highway shall be repaired to the requirements of the Housing Estate Road Construction Specification current at the time within 28 days of the inspection or within 7 days if the damage is deemed to represent a hazard to the users of the site. 4. Any damage reported to the owner of the road shall be inspected within 5 working days and remedial action in accordance with the above shall be undertaken.

A regular inspection regime shall be implemented in accordance with the schedule below: Maintenance Schedule for private highways Regular maintenance, should include for the Sweeping of carriageways, footways, footpaths and shared surfaces, this should be undertaken three times a year: i. End of winter (March) ii. Mid-summer (July-August) iii. After main autumn leaf fall

Cleaning of gullies should be undertaken annually after main autumn leaf fall

Lantern inspection should be undertaken twice yearly at the end and start of British Summer Time any faulty lanterns will be replaced within 10 days of the inspection

Herbicide application should be undertaken annually during May

Monitor inspection chambers and catchpits annually and clean as required

Monitor soakaway chambers annually and clean as required

5. Within six months of the site handover, a Management Company will be set up by the Developer to maintain all access roads to an adoptable standard until any adoption by the Local Highway Authority takes place or otherwise for the lifetime of the development. The Management Company will maintain the private roads in accordance with the requirements detailed above in perpetuity. Maintenance of Private Access Driveways 6. The responsibility for maintaining private access driveways, either permeable or non-porous, will be shared by local homeowners, whose homes the driveways serve. The ownership of the driveways will be shared by said homeowners or by a Management Company set up by the Developer. 7. Individual homeowners will be made aware of their responsibilities for maintenance via the sale deeds for the houses and this will be reinforced by details included in homebuyers packs produced by the Developer. It will be stated that it is a legal requirement for the necessary maintenance for highways (and other features) to be undertaken. The Management Company set up by the Developer will enforce this aspect during the lifetime of the development.

Maintenance of Private Permeable Paving 8. Areas of private permeable block paving which will be used by a single owner will be conveyed as part of the plot land sale for the relevant dwelling. 9. The maintenance responsibility private permeable paving will be by the individual homeowners who will be made aware of their responsibilities for maintenance via the sale deeds for the houses and reinforced by details included in homebuyers packs produced by the Developer. It will be stated that it is a legal requirement for the necessary maintenance for driveways (and other features) to be undertaken. The Management Company set up by the Developer will enforce this aspect during the lifetime of the development. 10. All non-porous private access driveways etc., shall be maintained in accordance with the requirements of table 1 and paragraphs 3.and 4 above. 11. The required maintenance regime for all permeable paving is set out in the schedule below: Maintenance of the private permeable driveways Permeable drives shall be swept and

vacuumed three times/year: i. At end of winter (March) ii. Mid-summer (July-August) iii. After autumn leaf fall, or as required based on site-specific of clogging or manufacturers recommendations See Note 1

Occasional Maintenance: stabilise and mow contributing and adjacent areas. This should be carried out as required

The removal of weeds should be carried out as required. Any landscaping which, through vegetation maintenance or soil slip, has been raised to within 50mm of the level of paving will need to be remediated as required

Remedial work to any depressions, rutting considered detrimental to the structural performance or a hazard to users carried out as required.

Reconstruction of surface and upper sub-structure will be carried out as required (if infiltration performance is reduced as a result of significant clogging).

Monitoring the initial inspection Inspect for evidence of poor operation and/or weed growth and if required take remedial action. Then monthly for 3 months after Installation and 3-monthly & 48hrs after any storm that is considered to be a 1:30year event.

Inspect silt accumulation rates and establish appropriate sweeping frequencies this is to be carried out annually.

Monitor inspection chambers and catchpits and clean as required this is to be carried out annually. Note 1: Pervious surfaces need to be regularly cleaned of silt and other sediments to preserve their Infiltration capability. As suggested a minimum of three surface sweepings per year is relevant although Manufacturers recommendations should always be followed.

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	18/0887/FUL	Agenda Item	
Date Received	15th June 2018	Officer	Aaron Coe
Target Date	14th September 2018		
Ward	Market		
Site	73 Newmarket Road		
Proposal	Proposed mixed Use Development, comprising part demolition of the existing building (with the retention of the front and side elevations and erection of 7 studio units and 2 x 2 bedroom units and Commercial/Restaurant/Public House (A1, A2, A3, A4, A5 and B1 in the alternative) flexible Use, with associated works.		
Applicant	Mr Aldo Marino c/o Swann Edwards Architecture		

SUMMARY	<p>The development accords with the Development Plan for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The design and scale of the proposed development would not have an adverse impact on the character of the surrounding area; - 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.
RECOMMENDATION	APPROVAL

1.0 SITE DESCRIPTION/AREA CONTEXT

1.1 The application site is located on the northern side of Newmarket Road and is occupied by a two storey building that is currently used as an Indian restaurant which fronts the back edge of the pavement.

To the rear of the building is an area of hardstanding. The rear boundary is defined by a 2.5 metre high brick wall which also extends along the western boundary and part of the eastern boundary. The western boundary wall is hidden behind a piece of public art which extends along the entire length of the boundary.

- 1.2 The site is located within an area of mixed uses such as residential apartments, offices and other commercial uses. To the west of the site is the main entrance/access into Kingsley Walk which contains blocks of apartments with car parking at ground level. On the other side of the main entrance is Brooke Court which is an apartment block. Newton Court which is an apartment block is located adjacent to the northern boundary of the site. To the east is a three storey office building which is set back from the front elevation of no.73. Opposite the site; south of Newmarket Road, are office buildings and other commercial uses with car parking within the frontage
- 1.3 The site is located within the Riverside and Stourbridge Common Conservation Area (2012) and a Controlled Parking Zone. There is a tree which is subject to a Tree Preservation Order close to the eastern boundary of the site. There are no listed buildings or other heritage assets within close proximity of the application site.

2.0 THE PROPOSAL

- 2.1 The proposed development involves the part demolition of No.73 Newmarket Road with the retention of the front and side elevations of the existing building. The proposal also involves the creation of an attached block of studio apartments at the rear of the restaurant. The apartment block would consist of 9 apartments over three storeys. The ground floor would consist of the main entrance which would be accessed from the west of the site with bin and cycle storage, and two ground floor studio apartments with private external amenity spaces. On the first floor, the proposal includes two new studios, a two bedroom unit, each with an outdoor balcony and two studio units on the first floor of within the footprint the existing building. On the second floor the proposal would include one studio and one two bedroom unit each with an outdoor balcony.
- 2.2 This planning application as originally submitted proposed the demolition of the entire existing building (No. 73 Newmarket Road) and erection of 10 units following the demolition. However, during

the course of the application a number of amendments have been made to the proposal.

2.3 The amendments to the proposed development include:

- Retention of the front and side elevations of No.73 Newmarket Road.
- Reduced height and massing and a reduction in the number of proposed residential units from 10 units to 9 units.
- The addition of a lift to the proposed development in order to comply with Cambridge Local Plan 2018 Policy 51.

2.4 There is an extant permission on the site for an extension to the existing restaurant and construction of 6 studio apartments (approved under application reference 16/0720/FUL).

2.5 The application is accompanied by the following supporting information:

1. Design and Access Statement;
2. Heritage statement
3. Topographical survey;
4. Drainage strategy
5. Plans

3.0 SITE HISTORY

Reference	Description	Outcome
05/0182/ADV	Installation of 2 externally illuminated signs of individual letters and one externally illuminated hanging sign.	PERMITTED
08/1142/FUL	Erection of timber framed shelter.	PERMITTED
10/0547/ADV	Installation of three non-illuminated fascia signs and one externally illuminated hanging sign.	PERMITTED
11/0240/FUL	Installation of acoustic baffle to boundary wall and smoking shelter.	PERMITTED
12/0933/FUL	External works including the installation and modification to doors and windows (following	PERMITTED

16/0720/FUL demolition of existing out-buildings)
 Proposed development of 6 studio flats and extension to the restaurant. **PERMITTED**

4.0 PUBLICITY

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

5.0 POLICY

5.1 Cambridge Local Plan 2018

PLAN	POLICY NUMBER
Cambridge Local Plan 2018	1 3 28 31 32 33 34 35 36 50 51 52 55 56 57 59 61 70 71 81 82

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

Central Government Guidance	National Planning Policy Framework 2019 National Planning Policy Framework – Planning Practice Guidance from 3 March 2014 onwards Circular 11/95 (Annex A) Technical housing standards – nationally described space standard – published by
-----------------------------	--

	Department of Communities and Local Government March 2015 (material consideration)
<p>Previous Supplementary Planning Documents</p> <p>(These documents, prepared to support policies in the 2006 local plan are no longer SPDs, but are still material considerations.)</p>	<p>Greater Cambridge Sustainable Design and Construction (Jan 2020)</p> <p>Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Waste Partnership (RECAP): Waste Management Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (February 2012)</p>
Material Considerations	<p><u>City Wide Guidance</u></p> <p>Arboricultural Strategy (2004)</p> <p>Cambridge and Milton Surface Water Management Plan (2011)</p> <p>Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (November 2010)</p> <p>Cambridge City Council Waste and Recycling Guide: For Developers.</p> <p>Cycle Parking Guide for New Residential Developments (2010)</p>

6.0 CONSULTATIONS

Cambridgeshire County Council (Highways Development Management)

As submitted

- 6.1 The forecourt is accessed by an existing vehicular crossing of the footway, leaving a short length that is too short to accommodate a car without it overhanging and obstructing the footway. This parking opportunity must be designed out to remove the temptation to park in the space. This issue could be resolved by reducing the width of the dropped kerb.
- 6.2 Following implementation of any Permission issued by the Planning Authority in regard to this proposal the residents of the new dwelling will not qualify for Residents' Permits (other than visitor permits) within the existing Residents' Parking Schemes operating on surrounding streets. This should be brought to the attention of the applicant, and an appropriate informative added to any Permission that the Planning Authority is minded to issue with regard to this proposal.
- 6.3 Officer comments: The scheme has been amended and the originally proposed forecourt has been removed. The following conditions are recommended: Traffic Management Plan, reinstatement of kerb, retention of access.

Environmental Health

- 6.4 Acceptable subject to conditions covering construction hours, collection during construction, piling, dust, plant noise, noise insulation, hours of opening, restriction on external windows/doors to commercial unit, use of commercial waste receptacles, odour and smoke control, protection of external spaces and lighting.

City Council Sustainable Drainage Engineer

As submitted

- 6.5 Unacceptable due to lack of a surface water drainage strategy.

- As amended
- 6.6 The proposals have indicated that a suitable surface water drainage scheme can be delivered. However further refinement of the design including infiltration tests are required to ensure that the design follows the drainage hierarchy and can be maintained for the lifetime of the development. The development is acceptable subject to a surface water drainage and maintenance plan condition.

Lead Local Flood Authority

- As submitted
- 6.7 Object due to lack of surface water drainage strategy.

Anglia Water

- 6.8 Surface water drainage condition required.

City Council Conservation team

- As submitted
- 6.9 Objects to the demolition of buildings in the Conservation Area as there is no evidence that the building is incapable of use for structural reasons. It appears capable of being used beneficially if upgraded or converted. The proposed replacement building would neither preserve nor enhance the CA as it merely replicates nearby examples of 'modern' design and fails to appreciate the contribution the existing building makes in retaining some of the character of this part of the CA. The proposal is overly bulky, bland commercial architecture which, particularly in relation to the front façade, fails to contribute to the townscape and the suggested restaurant use at GF fails completely to meet the requirements of the approved Shopfronts Design Guide. The existing consent demonstrates clearly that there is no necessity to demolish the existing building to further develop the site.

- As amended (December 2019)
- 6.10 The suggestion that a 'façade-retention' scheme would be a "pragmatic" solution seems to miss the point about the historic presence of the building in the CA and this being one of last vestiges of the traditional nature of this part of town. It is the building itself, not a replica or fragment of the building, that conveys this presence and reminds citizens and passers-by that the scale and form of this area was once very different. The idea that rebuilding significant

areas of the historic building will be 'identical' seems unlikely; to repeat the previous comments "The patina of age and the qualities of traditional construction give the existing building much of its merit in providing a last reminder of what this area used provide before the comprehensive redevelopment of the area removed most of the historic environment."

As amended (August 2020)

- 6.11 This seems to represent a fairly satisfactory position regarding external appearance. It is a given that the interior would be re-worked. I note that the first floor is shown as two separate studio flats which does not take account of the CAMRA concern that for the operation of a pub below, two bed accommodation above should be possible. I think this is a shortcoming of the scheme in relation to achieving viable use of the heritage asset as encouraged by NPPF para 192 a.
- 6.12 Should approval be recommended a condition to secure the details of external facing, window or roofing materials including for 'making good' or repairs will be required.

Landscape Architect

- 6.13 Hard and soft landscaping condition and boundary treatment conditions required.

Policy Team

- 6.14 Proposed Commercial/Restaurant/Public House (A1, A2, A3, A4, A5 & B1) flexible Use.
- The site is a safeguarded site, which has the intention of allowing the site's use to oscillate amongst 'A' and 'D1' Class Use Types when it has been proven that the site is no longer needed for public house use. While there are other public houses in the area, each public house provides a variation in local service and therefore caters to different parts of the community while providing a degree of competition for local people. This means they create a vibrant and appealing destination by providing a competitive range of local facilities. This is exemplified by The Corner House public house hosting a small, performance venue and The Wrestlers providing Thai food. The rebuilt Five Bells is expected to have a gaming theme to it. The Burleigh Arms is currently a gastro pub with a large beer

garden. These public houses help the area retain its attractive and vibrant appeal as a location to visit throughout the day and evening for people to meet and socialise in. The site's retention as a viable public house site is essential to ensure this area is able to serve and support the day-to-day needs of a growing local community. There is no manager's flat linked to the proposed public house A4 use. Public houses that include a manager's flat are more attractive to public house operators than those without. There is no such unit proposed in this scheme. Without a manager's flat it is unlikely a publican would be interested in the site. There is an example of this occurring at the Seven Stars public house on Newmarket Road which was rebuilt retaining the A4 use on the ground floor but without a manager's flat and has not re-opened since its refurbishment. The retention of the public house (A4 Use Class) on-site is welcomed however its co-location with new residential units must be satisfactorily designed. The overall design should ensure the use can operate normally without having an adverse effect on residential amenity which leads to disputes over noise pollution restricting the public house's long term viability. The layout should also include both a bar area and a cellar to ensure the public house can function properly as a public house. An adequately sized accommodation unit for the manager, and/or business owner is also needed to provide a sustainable and attractive business opportunity.

- 6.15 The proposal to allow the site's use to include a B1 use type class has not been justified nor has it been explained how this use would not prevent the return of an A4 public house use due to the difference in land values between these uses. The introduction of a B1 use is considered to be contrary to the Council's approach and without further justification should not be considered to be an appropriate alternative use.

Access Officer

- 6.16 The toilet in the commercial use needs to be wheelchair accessible.

Public Art Officer

- 6.17 No public art details submitted.

Developer Contributions Monitoring Unit

- 6.18 National Planning Practice Guidance Paragraph 031 ID: 23b-031-20160519 sets out specific circumstances where contributions for affordable housing and tariff style planning obligations (section 106 planning obligations) should not be sought from small scale and self-build development. This follows the order of the Court of Appeal dated 13 May 2016, which gives legal effect to the policy set out in the Written Ministerial Statement of 28 November 2014 and should be taken into account. The guidance states that contributions should not be sought from developments of 10-units or less, and which have a maximum combined gross floorspace of no more than 1000sqm. The proposal represents a small scale development and as such no tariff style planning obligation is considered necessary.

City Council Tree Officer

- 6.19 Acceptable subject to tree protection conditions.

Designing Out Crime Officer

- 6.20 There is no section in the Design and Access statement regarding security or crime prevention. My concerns at this time are: -
- What access control is proposed in relation to a side fence/gate
 - Access control for residents only into the building
 - Cycle store security – this should be secure with access only to residents.
 - Bin storage security – over the last few years the City has seen problems with rough sleepers gaining access to insecure bin stores, causing damage and anti-social behaviour.
 - Proposed exterior lighting

Sustainability Officer

- 6.21 Acceptable subject to conditions securing renewable energy strategy and water efficiency details.

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 which object to the application:

- 13 Newton Court, Kingsley Walk
- 46 Newton Court, Kingsley Walk
- 34 Marlowe House, Kingsley Walk
- 19 Brooke House, Kingsley Walk
- 33 Brooke House, Kingsley Walk
- Cambridge Riverside Residents Association
- CAM cycle
- CAMRA
- 7a Adams Road

7.2 The representations can be summarised as follows:

- Concerned that the proposal is overdevelopment and will be overbearing with overshadowing impacts on Newton Court properties.
- The additional mass is too much compared to the approved scheme (16/0720/FUL).
- The increase in height of the new building above the front elevation of the existing building will be unattractive.
- The density of the proposal is too high
- Concerned by the access arrangements for vehicles during the construction process
- Overlooking issues
- Lack of car parking
- The design of the building is out of character with surrounding buildings
- Negative impact of smells from the future potential ground floor restaurant use.
- Loss of trees.
- Insufficient space between the proposed cycle parking layout.
- The proposal does not provide any family housing above the pub which would make it less attractive to licensees
- Loss of an existing attractive building in the streetscape.

The owners/occupiers of the following addresses have made representations which support the application:

- 74 Newmarket Road
- 1 The Lakes, Cottenham
- 169 East Road

- 141 Flamstead Close
- 54 Greville Road
- 57 Catharine Street

7.3 The representations can be summarised as follows:

- Attractive design which fits in with the adjacent developments
- There is a need for more housing
- Better use of the land than existing
- Good sized residential units and high quality materials

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

8.0 ASSESSMENT

Principle of Development

8.1 Policy 3 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2018) seeks to ensure that the majority of new development should be focused in and around the existing urban area, making the most effective use of previously developed land, and enabling the maximum number of people to access services and facilities locally. A previous application for 6 residential units was granted permission (16/0720/FUL) and the site is considered appropriate for residential development.

8.2 The existing use of the site is an Indian restaurant (use class A3) with a garden area to the rear which is not used in connection with the restaurant. It is used as a storage area and enclosed by a 2.5 metre high brick wall. This application seeks consent for the ground floor to have a flexible use for Commercial /Restaurant/Public House (A1, A2, A3, A4, A5 & B1). In respect of the proposed uses, given that the existing use is a restaurant it would be permitted development for the restaurant to be changed into A1 or A2 use. Therefore, it is only necessary to assess the impact of the proposed potential alteration to A4 (public house), A5 (hot food takeaway) and B1 (office). The site was previously used as an A4 public house and the principle of the site returning to this use would be considered acceptable. The existing Indian restaurant has been operating since 2014 and has offered a takeaway service during its operation and therefore the A5 use would be acceptable for this site. The City Council Policy team have raised concern regarding the loss of the

pub use, this information is outdated as the existing use of the site is a restaurant as detailed under the previous consent 16/0720/FUL. CAMRA have made comments suggesting a resident unit should be provided that is suitable for a landlord and family. Given that the existing building and use does not include first floor residential accommodation which is restricted to the occupancy of the ground floor commercial use it would be considered unreasonable to impose this requirement under this application. In relation to the proposed potential introduction of a B1 use at ground floor, it is necessary to take into account the recent changes to the use classes order in England. As of 1st September 2020 use classes A1, A2, A3 and B1 will be subsumed into a new use class (Class E). Therefore, the proposed alteration from the existing A3 use to B1 use is no longer classed as development and does not require planning permission. Notwithstanding the changes to the use classes order, there are a number of office use developments surrounding the site and therefore an office use within the application site would not be considered inappropriate or out of character with the surrounding area. The proposed flexible use is therefore considered acceptable subject to other material planning considerations.

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

- 8.3 The application site consists of an existing two storey building which is used as an Indian restaurant. To the rear is a garden area which is not used in connection with the restaurant. It is used as a storage area and enclosed by a 2.5 metre high brick wall. The western boundary is screened by an existing artwork as part of the Kingsley Walk development, which is set off the boundary. The site is surrounded on three sides by 4 to 5 storey apartment blocks on the northern and western side, and a three storey office building on the eastern side. The existing two storey domestic scale building on the site is dwarfed by the surrounding built form.
- 8.4 The proposed development of the rear garden space is considered to be acceptable as it would read as part of the overall development of this part of Newmarket Road without appearing out of character. The Kingsley Walk development consists of a 5 storey block of flats accessed off a private road. The scale of the proposed development is much smaller than the existing development to the rear of the site but proportionate with the size of the site. The design of the

proposed development is acceptable and appropriate for the size of the plot.

- 8.5 The proposal involves the demolition of the rear of the building and addition of the proposed apartment block which connects to the existing building via a flat roofed link that is proposed to be used as a balcony space for a first floor unit. The overall apartment block involves a series of flat roofs. The proposed block is located directly behind the footprint of the existing building. In respect of views of the proposed development, the circulation space area is proposed to project 1.2m above the ridgeline of the existing building but due to being set back approximately 17.5m from the Newmarket Road frontage views of this element will be limited. Balconies are proposed to project out along the west elevation and these will be visible from the public realm in the same way they were under the previously approved scheme.
- 8.6 The proposed building has been designed to incorporate the main bulk within the centre of the site with the height and massing gradually reducing to the north of the site in order to respond to the adjacent flats in Newton Court. The flat roof form of the centre three storey element responds to the flat roof apartment buildings to the rear of the site. This is considered to be an acceptable response. The proposal would not appear as overdevelopment of the plot as it satisfactorily accommodates the necessary provisions such as bins and bike storage facilities.
- 8.7 In terms of external space, 7 out of the 9 units have access to private external space. The two ground floor units have garden spaces, whilst five of the upper floor units have balconies. The two units proposed to be located within the existing building which are being converted from dining spaces to residential units are not proposed to have access to private external space.
- 8.8 In relation to the impact of the development on the Conservation Area, Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires local authorities to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character and appearance of Conservation Area. Paragraph 193 of the National Planning Policy Framework states that, when considering the impact of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the assets conservation. The more important the asset, the greater the weight should be. Para 196 goes on to state that, where

a proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of an asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal. It is acknowledged that the proposal involves the demolition of part of the building. However, given that the main frontage and side elevation is being retained as existing it is considered by officers that the impact of the proposal will not result in detrimental harm to the appearance or character of the Conservation Area. Part of the revised submission involved additional bulk and height which resulted in an overbearing and adverse impact on the existing building. However, during the course of the application this additional height and bulk was removed in order to respect the character of the Conservation Area and minimise the prominence of the proposed development when viewed from Newmarket Road. The City Council Conservation team has reviewed this revision and consider the external appearance to be satisfactory.

- 8.9 Moreover, as noted within the delegated report for the previously approved scheme (16/0720/FUL) the proposal would fill in an existing gap with a form of development that offers better visual articulation and responds better with the Kingsley Walk development which would improve the appearance of the site. This aspect would make a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.
- 8.10 The form, height and layout of the proposed development is appropriate to the surrounding pattern of development and the character of the area and would not constitute overdevelopment. The proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2018) policies 55, 56, 57 and 61.

Residential Amenity

Impact on amenity of neighbouring occupiers

- 8.11 The amendments to the previously approved scheme that need reassessing in terms of impact on neighbouring properties include the following: The first floor element has been set 0.6m further to the south of the site (away from the adjacent Newton Court flats). A reduction in height of the second floor element by 1.6m with the second floor element proposed 1.5m further to the north of the site. Repositioning of the proposed balconies on the west elevation.

Overbearingness and Overshadowing

- 8.12 The main area to be assessed in terms of overbearingness is the relationship with the Newton Court apartments to the north. The height of the ground floor element has been reduced by 0.5m and the proposed development maintains a separation of 3 metres from the balcony space and 4.2 metres from the flank wall of the Newton Court properties. It is acknowledged that the revised design involves the second floor element being 1.5m closer to the Newton Court properties than the approved scheme. However, the height of the second floor has been reduced by 1.6m which minimises the impact on the Newton Court properties in terms of overbearingness or the level of overshadowing. Moreover, it is important to note that the adjacent flats have dual aspect rooms and dual aspect balconies. The flats also contain large glazed windows which currently provide views into the garden of no.73 and over the private access to the west.
- 8.13 The proposal would not cause any significant overbearing impact on the occupiers of the flats in Brooke House due to the separation distance which is in excess of 20 metres.

Overlooking

- 8.14 In terms of overlooking the proposed development involves 4 windows on the north elevation adjacent to the Newton Court flats. It is considered appropriate to impose a condition that ensures all of the windows serving the bedrooms of unit 7 to be obscure glazed for the bottom/ lower 1m of glazing on each window to protect the privacy of the Newton Court flats and their balcony spaces.
- 8.15 In terms of external projecting balconies, there would be no overlooking from these areas. The balconies located along the western boundary would not provide any direct view towards the balconies in the Newton Court flats. Furthermore, there are balconies in the Brooke House flats which face directly towards Newton Court.
- 8.16 In terms of overlooking of the flats in Brooke House, it is not considered the proposal would cause any significant loss of privacy over and above the existing. The proposed development would be approximately 20 metres from Brooke House which is an acceptable

level of separation in this urban context. The eastern elevation of Brooke House contains several external balconies which overlook each other and the balconies in Newton Court face these balconies. Therefore, the introduction of the proposed new balconies, in this context, would not cause any significant levels of overlooking or loss of privacy, particularly at the distance proposed.

Amenity for future occupiers of the site

8.17 Policy 50 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2018) sets out internal residential space standards. All the proposed units exceed the standards. In this regard, the units would provide a high-quality internal living environment for the future occupants. The gross internal floor space measurements for units in this application are shown in the table below:

Unit	Number of bedrooms	Number of bed spaces (persons)	Number of storeys	Policy Size requirement (m ²)	Proposed size of unit	Difference in size
1	1	1	1	37	39	+2
2	1	1	1	37	37	0
3	1	1	1	37	37	0
4	1	1	1	37	37	0
5	1	1	1	37	37	0
6	1	1	1	37	37	0
7	2	3	1	61	66	+5
8	2	4	1	70	74	+4
9	1	1	1	37	37	0

8.18 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. All of the proposed new residential units will have direct access to an area of private amenity space. Units 3 and 4 are within the footprint of the existing building and would not have access to private external space. However, the supporting text of policy 50 states that new homes created through conversions will only be required to provide external amenity space where practicable to do so. Given the nature of the site it would not be practicable to do so in this instance and the absence of private external amenity space for these 2 units is considered acceptable.

Accessible homes

- 8.19 The development has been assessed for compliance with Policy 51 in relation to all the new units. The agent amended the internal layout of the block of flats to ensure the proposal complies with the requirements of Part M4 (2) of the Building Regulations. A condition is recommended to secure this requirement and comply with policy 51. It should be noted that the previously approved scheme was not Policy 51 compliant, this is an additional benefit of this scheme.

Refuse Arrangements

- 8.20 The residential uses and future use of the ground floor will have separate bin store areas. The proposal is compliant with the RECAP guidance and in accordance with Cambridge Local Plan (2018) policy 57.

Highway Safety

- 8.21 Neighbours have also raised concerns about construction traffic and access arrangements during construction. A traffic management plan condition is recommended which would address the logistics of construction. As originally submitted the application involved a gated forecourt element which the Highway Officer raised concerns with. This has now been removed from the proposal and officers are satisfied that the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2018) policy 81.

Car Parking

- 8.22 Policy 82 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2018) relates to parking management. This states that car free developments will be accepted where they have easy access by walking or cycling to the city centre, there is high public transport accessibility and where the car-free status can be realistically enforced for example through on-street car parking controls. Given that the site lies within the CPZ, it is considered that the proposal meets with the criteria and would satisfy policy 82.

Cycle Parking

8.23 Cycle parking is provided through Sheffield stands for 12 cycle parking spaces. The proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2018) policy 82.

Integrated water management and flood risk

8.24 The application has been assessed by the City Council Sustainable Drainage Engineer and has been considered acceptable subject to conditions to secure a drainage strategy and maintenance plan, subject to meeting the requirement of the conditions imposed the proposal is in accordance with Cambridge Local Plan (2018) policies 31 and 32.

Arboricultural Impact

8.25 There is a tree which is subject to a tree protection order located to the south east of the application site. Comments are being sought from the City Council tree officer and an update will be provided on the amendment sheet.

Affordable Housing

8.26 The proposed development is for a scheme of 9 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

8.27 A number of the third party representations have been addressed in the above section of the report. However, other comments are addressed below:

Representation	Response
Overbearing, overshadowing and overdevelopment.	Addressed at paragraph 8.12-8.13. The amount of development

	is considered acceptable for this site.
Additional mass is too much compared to the approved scheme (16/0720/FUL).	Since the original submission the massing has been reduced to address this concern.
The increase in height above the existing building will be unattractive.	Addressed at paragraph 8.5.
Concerned by the vehicle access arrangements during construction	Addressed at paragraph 8.21
Overlooking issues	Addressed at paragraphs 8.14-8.16
Concerned by lack of car parking	Addressed at paragraph 8.22
Concerned by the design being out of character	Addressed at paragraphs 8.3-8.10
Negative impact of the potential future restaurant use	The City Council Environmental Health team have assessed the proposals and considered acceptable subject to an odour and smoke control condition to protect the amenity of residents.
Loss of trees	The loss of the trees within the site were considered acceptable under the previously approved scheme. An update will be provided to committee on the amendment sheet in relation to the TPO'd tree to the east of the site.
Insufficient space between cycle parking spaces.	This has been amended and there is now an acceptable amount of space between cycle parking spaces in accordance with Appendix L of the Cambridge Local Plan 2018.
Lack of family housing provided.	There is no policy requirement for market housing proposals to provide family units. However, this proposal now includes a 2 bedroom (3 persons) unit which would be suitable for a small family.

Loss of an existing attractive building in the streetscape	The proposed development has been revised to retain the front and side elevations of the existing building.
--	---

9.0 CONCLUSION

9.1 The proposed development would not result in an adverse impact upon neighbouring properties, it would retain the key elevations of the existing building in the Conservation Area and would also provide an acceptable level of amenity for future occupiers.

10.0 RECOMMENDATION: APPROVE

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

Reason: In accordance with the requirements of Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended by Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004).

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

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

3. No construction work or demolition work shall be carried out or plant operated other than between the following hours: 0800 hours and 1800 hours on Monday to Friday, 0800 hours and 1300 hours on Saturday and at no time on Sundays, Bank or Public Holidays.

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

4. There shall be no collections from or deliveries to the site during the demolition and construction stages outside the hours of 0800 hours and 1800 hours on Monday to Friday, 0800 hours to 1300 hours on Saturday and at no time on Sundays, Bank or Public Holidays.

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

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

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

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

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

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

7. Prior to the occupation of the development or the commencement of the use, a noise assessment detailing noise levels emanating from all plant, equipment and vents, relative to background levels, shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority.

If the assessment demonstrates that noise levels exceed the background level at the boundary of the premises, having regard to adjacent noise sensitive premises, a mitigation scheme for the insulation of the plant in order to minimise the level of noise emanating from the said plant shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and the scheme as approved shall be fully implemented before the use hereby permitted is commenced.

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

8. No development above ground level, other than demolition, shall commence until a noise insulation scheme, detailing the acoustic noise insulation performance specification of the external building envelope of the residential units (having regard to the building fabric, glazing and ventilation) to reduce the level of noise experienced in the residential units as a result of the proximity of the habitable rooms to the high ambient noise levels in the area has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall achieve internal noise levels recommended in British Standard 8233:2014 "Guidance on sound insulation and noise reduction for buildings". The scheme as approved shall be fully implemented before the development, hereby permitted, is occupied or the use commenced and shall thereafter be retained as such.

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

9. Before the development hereby permitted is commenced, a noise insulation scheme for the commercial unit, giving consideration to the impacts of airborne, structural and flanking sound, in order to minimise the level of noise emanating from the commercial unit within the residential units immediately above and within the neighbouring residential premises, (having regard to A1, A2, A3, A4, A5 & B1 Class Uses, potential internal noise generation and acoustic performance of building fabric, glazing, openings and ventilation system requirements) 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 be retained thereafter.

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

10. The ground floor commercial unit shall not be open to customers outside the hours of 08:00 and 23.00hrs daily (including weekend and Bank / Public Holidays).

Reason: To protect the amenity of adjacent residential premises and future occupants. (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policy 35)

11. Collections / deliveries to and from the commercial unit (including takeaway food) shall not be made outside the hours 0700-2300 Monday-Saturday and 0900-2300 on Sundays and Bank/Public Holidays.

Reason: To protect the amenity of adjacent residential premises and future occupants. (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policy 35)

12. No bottles or other commercial refuse / waste or recycling material shall be emptied into external receptacles, taken out or moved around the external area of the site, between 2100-0700hrs.

Reason: To protect the amenity of adjoining and adjacent residential premises (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 Policy 35).

13. Any uses involving the preparation of hot food within the ground floor of the development shall have installed and maintained an odour filtration/extraction system designed in accordance with the principles of Annex B and C of the, "Guidance on the Control of Odour and Noise from Commercial Kitchen Exhaust Systems," prepared by Netcen on behalf of Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (DEFRA) dated January 2005.

Full details of the odour filtration/extraction system shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the planning department prior to use.

Reason: To protect the amenity of adjoining and adjacent residential premises (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 Policy 35).

14. Prior to the commencement of development, full details and specifications of noise mitigation methods to protect the external amenity spaces from the high ambient noise levels shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Development shall then be carried out in accordance with the approved details and shall thereafter be maintained in perpetuity.

Reason: To protect future occupiers of the residential units from excessive noise and disturbance (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policy 35).

15. Prior to the commencement of use (or prior to the installation of any artificial lighting) an external 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 (horizontal / vertical isolux contour light levels and calculated glare levels) . Artificial lighting on and off site must meet the Obtrusive Light Limitations for Exterior Lighting Installations contained within the Institute of Lighting Professionals - Guidance Notes for the Reduction of Obtrusive Light - GN01:2011 (or as superseded).

The artificial lighting scheme as approved shall be fully implemented before the use hereby permitted is commenced and shall be retained thereafter.

Reason: To protect the amenity of adjoining and adjacent residential premises (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policy 35).

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

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

17. The redundant vehicle crossover of the footway must be returned to normal footway and kerb at no cost to the Highway Authority.

Reason: for the safe and efficient operation of the public highway (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 Policy 81).

18. The access shall be provided as shown on the approved drawings and retained free of obstruction.

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

19. No development above ground level, other than demolition, shall commence until full details of both hard and soft landscape works have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The works shall be carried out as approved. These details shall include proposed finished levels or contours; means of enclosure; car parking layouts, other vehicle and pedestrian access and circulation areas; hard surfacing materials; minor artefacts and structures (eg furniture, play equipment, refuse or other storage units, signs, lighting); retained historic landscape features and proposals for restoration, where relevant. Soft Landscape works shall include planting plans; written specifications (including cultivation and other operations associated with plant and grass establishment); schedules of plants, noting species, plant sizes and proposed numbers/densities where appropriate and an implementation programme.

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

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

20. No development above ground level, other than demolition, shall commence until there has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority a plan indicating the positions, design, materials and type of boundary treatments to be erected. The boundary treatment shall be completed in accordance with the approved details prior to the first occupation or the bringing into use of the development (or other timetable agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority) and retained as approved thereafter.

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

21. Prior to the commencement of development, other than demolition, a scheme for surface water drainage works shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The details shall include an assessment of the potential for disposing of surface water by means of a sustainable drainage system in accordance with the principles set out in the National Planning Policy Framework and the National Planning Policy Guidance, and the results of the assessment provided to the Local Planning Authority. The system should be designed such that there is no surcharging for a 1 in 30 year event and no internal property flooding for a 1 in 100 year event + an allowance for climate change. The submitted details shall include the following:

1) Information about the design storm period and intensity, the method employed to delay and control the surface water discharged from the site and the measures taken to prevent pollution of the receiving groundwater and/or surface waters;

2) A management and maintenance plan for the lifetime of the development which shall include the arrangements for adoption by any public authority or statutory undertaker and any other arrangements for adoption by any public authority or statutory undertaker and any other arrangements to secure the operation of the scheme throughout its lifetime.

The approved details shall be fully implemented on site prior to the first use/occupation and shall be retained thereafter.

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

22. No development shall take place within the site until the applicant has secured the implementation of a programme of archaeological works in accordance with a written scheme of investigation has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority.

Reason: To ensure that an appropriate archaeological investigation of the site has been implemented before the development commences (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policy 61).

23. Prior to the occupation of the development, hereby permitted, the lower 1 metre of glazing on all four windows shown on the first floor north elevation on the approved plans shall be obscure glazed to a minimum level of obscurity to conform to Pilkington Glass level 3 or equivalent and shall have restrictors to ensure that the windows cannot be opened more than 45 degrees beyond the plane of the adjacent wall. The glazing shall thereafter be retained in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: In the interests of residential amenity (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policies 55 and 57).

24. The flat roofs hereby approved shall be a Green Roof or Brown Roof unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. A Green Roof shall be designed to be partially or completely covered with plants in accordance with the Cambridge Local Plan 2018 glossary definition, a Brown Roof shall be constructed with a substrate which would be allowed to self-vegetate.

Reason: To ensure that the development integrates the principles of sustainable design and construction and contributes to water management and adaptation to climate change (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policies 28 and 31).

25. 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)

26. External facing, window or roofing materials including for "making good" or repairs to the retained elements of the frontage building shall match the existing and any change shall be agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In the interests of the appearance of the building of local interest and in accordance with Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policy 62.

27. Prior to the commencement of development, with the exception of the demolition of the existing buildings on the site, a renewable energy statement, which demonstrates that at least 10% of the development's total predicted energy requirements will be from on-site renewable energy sources, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The statement shall include the following details:

- a) The total predicted energy requirements of the development, set out in Kg/CO₂/annum.
- b) A schedule of proposed on-site renewable energy technologies, their respective carbon reduction contributions, location, design and a maintenance programme.
- c) An assessment of any air quality, noise or odour impact and;
- d) Mitigation measures required to maintain amenity and prevent nuisance in accordance with the Council's Sustainable Construction and Design Supplementary Planning Document.

The proposed renewable energy technologies shall be fully installed and operational prior to the occupation of any approved buildings and shall thereafter be maintained in accordance with a maintenance programme, which shall be submitted to and agreed in writing by the local planning authority.

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

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

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

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

29. All external windows and doors to the ground floor commercial unit shall be kept closed between 2100hrs and 0900hrs or at any time during entertainment or the playing of music except for general ingress and egress via the main entrance door or in the case of an emergency.

Reason: To protect the amenity of adjoining and adjacent residential premises (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 Policy 35).

30. 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.

31. 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.

32. No development shall take place above ground level until samples of the external materials to be used in the construction of the development have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Development shall thereafter be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure that the external appearance of the development does not detract from the character and appearance of the area. (Cambridge City Council Local Plan 2018 policy 55 and 61).

This page is intentionally left blank

Application Number	19/1770/FUL	Agenda Item	
Date Received	24th December 2019	Officer	Aaron Coe
Target Date	18th February 2020		
Ward	Market		
Site	32 St Andrews Street		
Proposal	Change of use of the former Cambridge Building Society branch (A2/B1) to an (A4) public house use with ancillary staff accommodation and associated development including the insertion of new openings and the relocation of the entrance.		
Applicant	McMullen and Sons Limited c/o agent		

0.0 Addendum

- 0.1 At 1st July 2020 Planning Committee, Members resolved to approve the application for the change of use of the former Cambridge Building Society from A2 (professional and financial services) to A4 (drinking establishments) on the ground and first floor with ancillary staff accommodation/facilities on the second floor.
- 0.2 Following the committee the applicant contacted the Planning department to advise that there had been confusion regarding the proposed layout and use of staff accommodation proposed on the second floor. The second floor as submitted included floor plans which labelled three of the rooms as 'staff rooms' which were thought by officers to be spaces that staff would use between shifts or on breaks rather than as sleeping accommodation and therefore, it was considered necessary to condition that only bedrooms 1 and 2 could be used as sleeping accommodation. However, the applicants have confirmed that these 3 staff rooms were in fact proposed to be used as permanent residential accommodation for staff members. The proposed changes required re-consultation with the City Council Environmental Health team and re-assess the proposals.

Environmental Health Comments

- 0.3 The development is acceptable subject to conditions (the same as originally recommended) and an additional condition for noise insulation/ mitigation scheme and securing details of the following:
- Construction Hours, Collection during construction restrictions, plant noise condition, opening hours, collection and delivery hours, removal of waste, odour control, noise insulation, occupancy restriction.
- 0.4 The Environmental health team confirmed the occupation of additional bedrooms on the second floor and addition of external amenity space is acceptable subject to the same conditions as previously recommended and a further condition which secures a noise assessment and mitigation scheme to protect the amenity of future occupants.
- 0.5 The imposition of these conditions are supported by officers and the proposal is considered to adequately respect the residential amenity of its neighbours and the constraints of the site and is considered to be compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2018) policies 56, 58 and 35.

Amenity for future occupiers

- 0.6 The updated drawings submitted show a self-contained unit for the managers accommodation with a living room/ kitchen/ dining space and another separate unit which shows two bedrooms for staff and one room labelled as 'staff bedroom 3 / staff lounge'. Discussions have taken place with the applicant and a condition will be attached to ensure that the room labelled as 'staff bedroom 3 / staff lounge' is not used as sleeping accommodation and is retained as a communal lounge space to serve the staff members that will occupy staff bedrooms 1 and 2. This is secured through the recommended condition 14. This condition is considered necessary and reasonable to achieve the requirements of policy 50 of the Cambridge Local plan 2018 as good residential designs should provide sufficient space for basic daily activity and needs. It is considered the provision of communal space within both the managers flat and staff unit is necessary to make the standard of accommodation acceptable for the future occupants.

0.7 Policy 50 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2018 states that homes created through change of use from non-residential uses should seek to meet space standards where practicable to do. It is acknowledged that the overall size of the two units do not meet the internal residential space standards requirements. However, given that the proposed converted accommodation will be ancillary to the A4 use of the development it is not considered necessary to apply the same amount of weight to Policy 50 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2018 in this instance. The sizes of the two bedrooms in the proposed managers flat have floor areas of 9.8m² and 12m² which both exceed the minimum space standard requirements for a single bedroom and a double bedroom. Within the unit for the staff accommodation the two bedrooms also exceed the minimum space standard requirements with the single bedroom measuring 8.9m² and the double bedroom 11.6m². Therefore, on balance given that the policy does not state that it is essential for conversions to meet space standards and the residential uses will be ancillary to the A4 use with bedroom sizes that meet the space standard requirements, overall the quality of the living environment is considered to be acceptable in respect of internal space.

Overall unit size

Unit	Number of bedrooms	Number of bed spaces (persons)	Number of storeys	Policy Size requirement (m ²)	Proposed size of unit	Difference in size
1	2	3	1	61	42	-19
2	2	3	1	61	50	-11

Bedroom sizes

Managers flat

Bedroom	Number of occupants	Proposed internal space (m ²)	Policy Size requirement (m ²)	Difference in size
1	2	12	11.5	+0.5
2	1	9.8	7.5	+2.3

Staff accommodation

Bedroom	Number of occupants	Proposed internal space (m ²)	Policy Size requirement (m ²)	Difference in size
1	2	11.6	11.5	+0.1
2	1	8.9	7.5	+3

0.8 Within the proposed managers flat the communal area consist of an open plan kitchen and lounge space and as mentioned in paragraph 0.6 a condition will be imposed to ensure the room labelled as staff bed 3/ lounge is retained as a communal space to serve the staff accommodation unit. Additionally, an area of external space is also proposed to serve the future occupants of the managers flat and staff. Overall the proposal is considered to provide a sufficient amount of communal space both internally and externally for the future occupants in accordance with policy 50 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2018.

SUMMARY	<p>The development accords with the Development Plan for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposal would not harm the character and appearance of the Conservation Area, the Listed Building or the setting of nearby Listed Buildings. • The proposal would add to the vitality of the City Centre. • The proposal is considered not to cause excessive noise and disturbance to adjoining occupiers.
RECOMMENDATION	APPROVAL

1.0 SITE DESCRIPTION/AREA CONTEXT

- 1.1 The application site (No.32 St Andrew's Street) is situated on the corner of St Andrew's Street and Downing Street. The building has been vacant since early 2018, it was previously occupied by Cambridge Building Society (A2 use on the ground floor with ancillary B1 office use on the upper floors).
- 1.2 The site is within the Cambridge Central Conservation Area, which contains a mix of commercial, residential and academic buildings. To the north of the site is the Grand Arcade which is anchored by the John Lewis department store, adjacent to the site on the eastern side of St Andrew's Street is Emmanuel College, a Grade I Listed Building and immediately to the south of the site are No's 33,34 and 35 which are Grade II Listed Buildings.
- 1.3 The site is located within the Controlled Parking Zone.

2.0 THE PROPOSAL

- 2.1 The application proposes the change of use of the former Cambridge Building Society from A2 (professional and financial services) to A4 (drinking establishments). On the upper floors ancillary staff accommodation/facilities are proposed.
- 2.2 The proposed external alterations involve the creation of a new entrance along the Downing Street frontage. A mixture of fixed and openable windows are proposed on the ground floor along both the St Andrew's Street and Downing Street frontages. On the St Andrew's Street elevation three smaller windows which are flush with the existing elevation are proposed on the first floor and three new dormer windows which match the appearance of the existing dormers are proposed to be introduced on the second floor. On the Downing Street Elevation the first floor is proposed to remain as existing but on the second floor the proposal involves the addition of three lead dormer windows along Downing Street to match the existing ones on the St Andrew's Street elevation.
- 2.3 The details of menu boxes and any proposed signage will be subject to assessment under a separate application for Advert Consent.

2.4 The application is accompanied by the following supporting information:

1. Planning Statement
2. Drawings

3.0 SITE HISTORY

Reference	Description	Outcome
10/0310/FUL	Installation of ATM	Permitted.
C/94/0255	Installation of shopfront	Permitted.
C/94/0204	Enclosure of roof space	Permitted.

4.0 PUBLICITY

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

5.0 POLICY

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

5.2 Relevant Development Plan policies

PLAN	POLICY NUMBER
Cambridge Local Plan 2018	<p>1- The presumption in favour of sustainable development</p> <p>10- The City Centre</p> <p>11- Development in the City Centre Primary Shopping Area</p> <p>34- Light Pollution Control</p> <p>35- Protection of human health and quality of life from noise and vibration</p> <p>41- Protection of business space</p> <p>55- Responding to context</p> <p>56- Creating successful places</p> <p>58- Altering and extending existing buildings</p> <p>61- Conservation and enhancement of the historic environment</p> <p>64- Shopfronts, signage and shop security measures</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 March 2014</p> <p>Circular 11/95 (Annex A)</p>
Supplementary Planning Guidance	<p>Greater Cambridge Sustainable Design and Construction (Jan 2020)</p> <p>Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Waste Partnership (RECAP): Waste Management Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document</p>

	(February 2012)
Area Guidelines	Cambridge Historic Core Conservation Area Appraisal (2006)

6.0 CONSULTATIONS

Cambridgeshire County Council (Highways Development Control)

- 6.1 The proposed development is acceptable subject to a condition which secures the details of a servicing plan for deliveries and removal of waste.

Cambridge City Council Environmental Health Team

- 6.2 The proposed development is acceptable subject to conditions.

Urban Design and Conservation team

- 6.3 *As Submitted*
- It would be beneficial to the character and appearance of the conservation area for this building to be brought back into use.
 - No objections to the change of use
 - The ground floor external alterations are supported.
 - Object to the large windows proposed on St Andrew's Street elevation. The proposed projecting windows form a focal point and distract from the adjacent Listed Building.

- 6.4 *As Amended*

- Acceptable subject to condition securing the full details of the windows.

- 6.5 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:

- Emmanuel College

7.2 The representations can be summarised as follows:

- Object to the overconcentration of A4 uses due to amenity issues
- The number of A1 uses will be below 55% along St Andrews Street frontage, conversion to an A1 use class would be more appropriate.
- The Public House (2012) study is out of date.
- Object to the design of the proposed development due to impact on Emmanuel College.

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

8.0 ASSESSMENT

Principle of Development

8.1 The site falls within the City Centre and within the Primary Shopping Area. Policies 10 and 11 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2018 are the relevant policies to apply when determining whether the proposed use is acceptable in this location.

8.2 Policy 10 states that new development should:

- a. add to the vitality and viability of the city centre;
- b. achieve a suitable mix of uses;
- c. preserve or enhance heritage assets and their setting, open spaces and the River Cam;
- d. be of the highest quality design and deliver a high-quality public realm; and
- e. promote sustainable modes of transport.

8.3 Policy 11 states that proposals for other centre uses as defined in Table 3.1 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.
- 8.4 The proposal would introduce an A4 use at both ground floor and first floor which would comply with the aims of Policy 10 and 11. The proposal would also introduce ancillary residential accommodation, staff rooms and welfare facilities for the members of staff on the second floor. Policy 11 states that residential accommodation is supported on upper floors subject to not inhibiting the function of the ground floor use. Table 3.1 states that A4 use is a suitable use on all floor levels within the Primary Shopping Area.
- 8.5 Policy 11 seeks to retain A1 uses in the city centre and encourage a mix of complementary uses. It also states that A4 uses are suitable within the Primary Shopping Area. Given that the building is presently in an A2 use the proposed change of use would not conflict with the aim of preventing the loss of A1 uses. Moreover, the introduction of an A4 use which will complement the existing mix of uses in this area and add to the attraction of this part of the city centre, helping to support the viability of the existing A1 uses in the area. The proposed development is considered to add to the vitality of the area by introducing a suitable use in a currently vacant building in the City Centre which detracts from the character of the area due to the existence of security shutters and lack of an active frontage.
- 8.6 Policy 41 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2018 seeks to protect business space. However, it is not considered appropriate to apply this policy in this instance as the primary use class of this building was A2 (professional and financial institutions) with ancillary offices above which supported the main A2 use. Therefore, the loss of the ancillary offices is not considered to a significant loss of an employment use and the criteria within Policy 41 should not be applied.
- 8.7 The proposal is therefore considered to comply with policies 10 and 11 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2018.

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

- 8.8 In respect of design, the proposed alterations to the exterior of the building do not involve significant changes to the scale or visual presence of the building. At ground floor along St Andrew's Street and Downing Street the proposals follow the rhythm of the existing arrangement but introduce more of an active frontage with views into the ground floor. A mixture of fixed glazing panels and opening window are proposed above a fixed ribbed glaze panel. A new entrance is proposed to replace an existing window along the Downing Street frontage. At first floor level as originally submitted the proposal involved the introduction of a large window along the first floor of the St Andrews frontage which projected forward of the existing elevation of the buildings. However, following objections from the City Council Conservation team and the Grade I Listed Building (Emmanuel College) during the course of the application this detail was amended and three smaller windows which are flush with the existing elevation have been introduced on this frontage. It is considered by officers, that following the amendment to significantly reduce the amount of first floor glazing along St Andrew's Street there would not be any further impacts on the adjacent Emmanuel College than the existing arrangement. On the second floor the proposal involves the addition of three lead dormer windows along Downing Street to match the existing ones on St Andrew's Street elevation.
- 8.9 The proposed alterations to the building are considered to be in keeping with the character of the immediate surrounding area and are not considered to have a significant impact on the setting of the surrounding Listed Buildings or the wider Conservation Area. The City Council Conservation team have reviewed the application and considered the proposals to be acceptable subject to a condition to secure the full details of the windows and glazing. This view is supported by officers.
- 8.10 Overall, it is considered that the applicant has given consideration to the proportions and design of the existing openings which respect the surrounding character, Listed Buildings and wider Conservation Area. The proposal is considered to be compliant with Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policies 55, 56, 58 and 61.

Residential Amenity

Impact on amenity of neighbouring occupiers

Overlooking and Loss of privacy

- 8.11 Emmanuel College is situated to the east of the application site on the opposite side of St Andrew's Street. As there are already existing first and second floor windows on the eastern elevation of No.32 St Andrews Street it is not considered that the proposed alterations will have any further impact in terms of overlooking.

Overbearingness and overshadowing

- 8.12 The proposed external design changes would not result in any overbearing or overshadowing issues.

Noise and Disturbance

- 8.13 It is acknowledged that given the nature of the use class proposed (A4), there will be an increase in noise levels compared to the existing use (A2). However, given that the surrounding character along St Andrews Street, Downing Street and Regent Street includes various similar uses it is not considered that the addition of an A4 use in this location would have a detrimental impact on neighbouring amenity in respect of noise and disturbance. Moreover, the City Council Environmental Health officer has reviewed the application proposal and considered the development to be acceptable subject to various conditions which will ensure the amenity of neighbouring residents and uses are protected. The imposition of these conditions are supported by officers.

- 8.14 The proposal adequately respects the residential amenity of its neighbours and the constraints of the site and is considered to be compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2018) policies 56, 58 and 35.

Amenity for future occupiers:

Amenity for future occupiers

- 8.15 The proposed development involves the conversion of the second floor to ancillary residential accommodation, this accommodation would be occupied by persons directly associated with the A4 use. The residential amenity of the prospective occupiers must also be considered in terms of the

quality of the living environment and provision of adequate amenity space.

8.16 Policy 50 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2018) sets out internal residential space standards. The floor space of the proposed units is presented in the table below against the requirements of policy 50.

Unit	Number of bedrooms	Number of bed spaces (persons)	Number of storeys	Policy Size requirement (m²)	Proposed size of unit	Difference in size
1	2	3	1	61	42	-19

8.17 Policy 50 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2018 states that homes created through change of use from non-residential uses should seek to meet space standards where practicable to do. It is acknowledged that the overall size of the two-bedroom unit does not meet the internal residential space standards requirements. However, given that the proposed converted accommodation will be ancillary to the A4 use of the development it is not considered necessary to apply the same amount of weight to Policy 50 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2018 in this instance. Moreover, the sizes of the two bedrooms proposed have floor areas of 9.8m² and 12m² which both exceed the minimum space standard requirements for a single bedroom and a double bedroom. Therefore, on balance given that the policy does not state that it is essential for conversions to meet space standards and the residential use will be ancillary to the A4 use with bedroom sizes that meet the space standard requirements, overall the quality of the living environment is considered to be acceptable in respect of internal space.

8.18 In respect of external space, the proposal does not involve direct access for the future occupiers to private external amenity space. However, given the nature of the site it would not be practicable to do so in this instance. Moreover, the site is located in a City Centre location which is in close proximity to various green spaces including Parkers Piece and Jesus Green. Overall, the absence of private external amenity space for this unit is considered acceptable.

Highways

8.19 The County Council Highways officer has assessed the application and considered the proposal to be acceptable subject to a condition securing the details of a servicing plan involving the details of waste collection and deliveries. The addition of this condition is considered appropriate and is supported by officers.

Car Parking and Cycle Parking

8.20 Due to site constraints the site itself does not have the ability to accommodate on-site car parking or cycle parking. However, there is a significant amount of public cycle parking that is available in and around the city centre; the nearest being along St Andrews Street, along Downing Street and the Grand Arcade cycle parking. Notwithstanding that, the proposal is for change of use and there is limited space to provide a large amount of cycle parking. Appendix L of the Cambridge Local Plan states that some flexibility is applied to applications of the standards for the historic core area of the city, where constraints may make application of the standards difficult for change of use or refurbishment. Therefore, given the nature of the proposal and its siting within the historic core of the city and its sustainable location, flexibility needs to be applied in this instance.

8.21 Policy 82 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2018) relates to parking management. This states that car free developments will be accepted where they have easy access by walking or cycling to the city centre, there is high public transport accessibility and where the car-free status can be realistically enforced for example through on-street car parking controls. It is considered that the proposal meets with the criteria and would satisfy policy 82.

8.21 Third Party Representations

Representation	Response
Overconcentration of A4 uses causing amenity issues.	Addressed at paragraphs 8.11-8.14
The number of A1 uses will be below 55% along St Andrews Street frontage, conversion to an	Addressed at paragraph 8.4

A1 use class would be more appropriate.	
The Public House study is out of date	Noted. Not relevant in the determination of this application.
Object to the design of the proposed development due to impact on Emmanuel College	Addressed at paragraph 8.8

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

Reason: In accordance with the requirements of Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended by Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004).

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

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

3. Prior to the proposed change of use coming into operation a written servicing plan with details of the arrangements for deliveries and removal of waste for the proposed A4 use shall be submitted and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The proposed scheme shall not involve any collections from and deliveries to the premises outside the hours of 07:00 to 23:00 daily. The plan shall be operated in accordance with the agreed details.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety and amenity of neighbouring properties (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 Policies 35 and 81).

4. No new windows shall be constructed in the existing building, nor existing windows altered until drawings at a scale of 1:10 of details of new or altered sills, lintels, jambs, transoms, and mullions have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

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

5. Unless an alternative scheme of working hours is submitted to and approved in writing, 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)

6. Unless an alternative scheme of collection and delivery arrangements are submitted to and approved in writing, 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)

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

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

8. The A4 use hereby permitted shall only be open to customers between the following hours
- Monday - Friday: 10:00 - 00:30
 - Saturdays: 09:00 - 00:30
 - Sundays and Bank Holidays: 09:00 - 00:30

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

9. All external doors and windows serving the A4 use as approved shall be kept closed at any time during the use of devices to amplify speech, singing or musical instruments within the premises (except for the purposes of access and egress or in the case of an emergency)

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

10. The emptying of bottles or other commercial refuse / waste into external receptacles shall only take place between the hours of and 07:00 and 23.00 daily.

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

11. No development shall commence until a noise assessment and any noise insulation / mitigation scheme as required has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The noise assessment/insulation scheme shall have regard to the external and internal noise levels recommended in British Standard 8223:2014 "Guidance on sound insulation and noise reduction for buildings" and shall include details of:
 - (i) the acoustic/noise insulation performance specification of the external building envelope of the residential units having regard to the building fabric, glazing and ventilation;
 - (ii) mitigation to reduce the level of noise experienced internally

The scheme shall be carried out as approved before the use is commenced or the development is occupied and shall be retained as such.

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

12. Prior to the installation of any equipment and systems for the purpose of extraction, filtration, abatement of odours and fumes to discharge at an appropriate outlet level and the standard of dilution / dispersion expected, a ventilation scheme shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority (LPA). The approved ventilation scheme details as approved shall be installed before the use hereby permitted is commenced and shall be retained thereafter. 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.

Any approved scheme or system installed shall be regularly maintained in accordance with the manufacturer's specifications / instructions to ensure its continued satisfactory operation to the satisfaction of the LPA.

Reason: To protect the amenity of nearby properties from malodours. (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policy 36 - Air quality, odour and dust)

13. The occupation of the 2nd floor residential accommodation hereby permitted shall be limited to persons directly associated with the A4 use as approved.

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

14. Notwithstanding the details shown on the approved plans, the rooms labelled as 'staff lounge/ staff bed 3' and 'managers kitchen/lounge' shall only be used as communal living spaces. These living spaces shall be provided prior to occupation of the building for the proposed use and retained as a staff living room spaces thereafter. These rooms shall not be used as sleeping accommodation or for any other purpose(s).

Reason: To ensure adequate internal communal space is provided for future occupants (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policy 50).

15. **INFORMATIVE:** To satisfy standard condition C62 (Noise Insulation), the rating level (in accordance with BS4142:2014) from all plant, equipment and vents etc (collectively) associated with this application should be less than or equal to the existing background level (L90) at the boundary of the premises subject to this application and having regard to noise sensitive premises.

Tonal/impulsive noise frequencies should be eliminated or at least considered in any assessment and should carry an additional correction in accordance with BS4142:2014. This is to guard against any creeping background noise in the area and prevent unreasonable noise disturbance to other premises. This requirement applies both during the day (0700 to 2300 hrs over any one hour period) and night time (2300 to 0700 hrs over any one 15 minute period).

It is recommended that the agent/applicant submits a noise prediction survey/report in accordance with the principles of BS4142: 2014 "Methods for rating and assessing industrial and commercial sound" or similar, concerning the effects on amenity rather than likelihood for complaints. Noise levels shall be predicted at the boundary having regard to neighbouring premises.

It is important to note that a full BS4142:2014 assessment is not required, only certain aspects to be incorporated into a noise assessment as described within this informative.

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

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

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

- The supply of alcohol
- Regulated entertainment e.g.

- Music (Including bands, DJ's and juke boxes)
- Dancing
- The performing of plays
- Boxing or wrestling
- The showing of films
- Late Night Refreshment (The supply of hot food or drink between 23:00-05:00)

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

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

17. **INFORMATIVE:** As the premises is intended to be run as a food business the applicant is reminded that under the Food Safety Act 1990 (as amended) the premises will need to be registered with Cambridge City Council. In order to avoid additional costs it is recommended that the applicant ensure that the kitchen, food preparation and food storage areas comply with food hygiene legislation, before construction starts. Contact the Commercial Team at Cambridge City Council on telephone number (01223) 457890 for further information.

Determined under delegated powers by:

Designation - Development Control Manager

Date:

Declaration of Interest for case officer

Does the case officer have any interest (whether financial or not) in the application or application site or any personal or business connection with the applicant(s)?

1. Yes
2. No

If yes, please confirm that full details of any interest or connection have been provided to the [Head of Planning] [Director of Environment]

Signed

Declaration of Interest for officer with delegated powers

Does the officer with delegated powers have any interest (whether financial or not) in the application or application site or any personal or business connection with the applicant(s)?

3. Yes

4. No

If yes, please confirm that full details of any interest or connection have been provided to the [Head of Planning] [Director of Environment]

Signed

Application Number	20/02876/FUL	Agenda Item	
Date Received	29th June 2020	Officer	Aaron Coe
Target Date	24th August 2020		
Ward	Newnham		
Site	78 Grantchester Meadows		
Proposal	Ground floor rear extension and loft extension, complete with dormers, creation of new dwelling and all associated works		
Applicant	Mr Paul Murray John 78 Grantchester Meadows		

SUMMARY	The development accords with the Development Plan for the following reasons:
RECOMMENDATION	<p>APPROVAL</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The proposed development would respect the character and appearance of the surrounding Conservation Area. - The proposed development would not have any significant adverse impact on the amenity of surrounding occupiers. - The proposed development would provide accessible living accommodation and a good level of indoor and outdoor amenity for future occupiers.

1.0 SITE DESCRIPTION/AREA CONTEXT

1.1 The application site is No.78 Grantchester Meadows, a two storey detached residential property located on the south side of Grantchester Meadows. The site is located within the Newnham Croft Conservation Area which consists of a mix of Victorian, Edwardian and 1960's houses. The adjacent land to the west and south of the application site lies within the Cambridge Green Belt. The site falls within Flood Zone 3.

1.2 The site is neither a listed building nor a building of local interest.

2.0 THE PROPOSAL

2.1 The application proposes to sub-divide the existing residential property to create a separate residential unit. The proposals involve the demolition of the existing garage and utility room on the western side of the property and erection of a wrap around single storey ground floor rear and side extension, a loft conversion with the addition of dormers, and alterations to the front driveway.

2.2 The ground floor extension is proposed to project 2.5m in depth and 10.7m in width. The side extension proposed to replace the garage is 2.7m in width and would involve a lean to roof with two velux windows.

2.3 The loft conversion will create living space within the second floor of the residential units and the addition of the two dormer windows will serve these bedrooms.

3.0 RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

Reference	Description	Outcome
19/1732/FUL	Ground floor rear and two-storey side extension plus loft extension with two rear dormers	Withdrawn

4.0 PUBLICITY

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

5.0 POLICY

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

5.2 Relevant Development Plan policies

PLAN		POLICY NUMBER
Cambridge Plan 2018	Local	1, 3, 4 28,32,35 50, 51, 52, 55, 56, 57, 58, 61 82

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

Central Government Guidance	National Planning Policy Framework February 2019 National Planning Policy Framework – Planning Practice Guidance March 2014 Circular 11/95 (Annex A)
Supplementary Planning Guidance	Greater Cambridge Sustainable Design and Construction (Jan 2020) Cycle Parking Guide for New Residential Developments (2010)

5.4 Area Guidelines

Central Government Guidance	Newnham Croft Conservation Area Appraisal (2013)
-----------------------------	--

6.0 CONSULTATIONS

Cambridgeshire County Council (Highways Development Control)

- 6.1 Acceptable subject to conditions securing details of contractor parking arrangement, visibility splays, driveway drainage/ materials and an informative regarding any works within the public highway.

City Council Environmental Health

- 6.2 Acceptable subject to a construction hours condition.

City Council Sustainable Drainage Engineer As Amended

- 6.3 Acceptable subject to conditions regarding finish floor levels (to be no lower than existing floor levels), flood resilient construction and a surface and foul water drainage scheme.

City Council Conservation Team

- 6.4 The proposals have been amended since the previously withdrawn scheme to reduce the size of the originally proposed extension and the size of the dormers. The proposal will preserve or enhance the character of the conservation area and comply with policies 58 and 61.

South Newnham Neighbourhood Forum

- 6.5 -Concerned by the impact on the character and appearance of the area, neighbour amenity impacts, insufficient amenity space for future occupants, impact of surface water run off from the driveway and impact of additional car parking.
- 6.6 The above responses are a summary of the comments that have been received. Full details of the consultation responses can be inspected on the application file.

REPRESENTATIONS

- 7.1 The owner occupier of the following address has objected to the application for the following reason:
- 106 Grantchester Meadows
- 7.2 The representations can be summarised as follows:
- Concerned the proposal is an overdevelopment of the plot
 - Insufficient space for off road parking within the site which is close to a dangerous and busy junction.
- 7.3 The owner occupier of the following address has made a neutral representation:
- 76 Grantchester Meadows
- 7.4 The representations can be summarised as follows:
- Two comments were received from the occupants of No.76, the first listed the following comments:

- Questioned the impact of the development on the character and appearance of the conservation area
- Questioned the size of the dormers and additional overlooking impacts if too large
- Referenced the need for appropriate landscaping within the frontage

The second comment from the occupants of No.76 stated:

- We do not object to the new proposal and greatly appreciate the changes made by our neighbour.
- We seek only clarification as to the final size of the dormers, and hope for positive landscaping at the front to offset the loss of the hedge.

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

8.0 ASSESSMENT

Principle

8.1 As the proposal is for the subdivision of an existing residential plot, policy 52 of Cambridge Local Plan (2018) is relevant in assessing the acceptability of the proposal. Policy 52 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2018) states that: Proposals for development on sites that form part of a garden or group of gardens or that subdivide an existing residential plot will only be permitted where:

- a. the form, height and layout of the proposed development is appropriate to the surrounding pattern of development and the character of the area;
- b. sufficient garden space and space around existing dwellings is retained, especially where these spaces and any trees are worthy of retention due to their contribution to the character of the area and their importance for biodiversity;
- c. the amenity and privacy of neighbouring, existing and new properties is protected;
- d. provision is made for adequate amenity space, vehicular access arrangements and parking spaces for the proposed and existing properties; and
- e. there is no detrimental effect on the potential comprehensive development of the wider area.

- 8.2 The proposed subdivision of the large detached dwelling is considered to comply with the above criteria and the reasons for this are set out in the relevant sections of this report. The principle of development is therefore considered to be acceptable subject to the material planning considerations discussed below.

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

- 8.3 The site lies within the Newnham Croft Conservation Area. The application is accompanied by a Heritage Statement which provides an overview of the significance of nearby heritage assets and the relative impact of the scheme upon them. The statutory considerations as set out in section 66(1) and section 72(1) of the Town and Country Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, are matters to which the determining authority must give great weight to when considering schemes which have the potential to impact on heritage assets.

- 8.4 Section 72 (1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 makes it a statutory duty for a local planning authority, in the exercise of its planning powers with respect to any buildings or other land within a Conservation Area, to:

'Pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of that area'

- 8.5 In respect of development proposed to be carried out within the setting of, or which may impact upon a listed building, or in a conservation area, a decision-maker must, in respect of a conservation area, give a high priority to the objective of 'preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the area', when weighing this factor in the balance with other 'material considerations' which have not been given this special statutory status.

- 8.6 The respective national policy guidance is set out in paragraphs 193-196 of the NPPF. Para. 193 of the NPPF states that when considering the impact of a proposal on the significance of a designated heritage asset, "great weight" should be given to the asset's conservation (meaning the more important the asset,

the greater the weight should be). Para. 194 makes it clear that any harm to, or loss of significance of a heritage asset should require clear and convincing justification. Para. 196 of the NPPF states that where a proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, such harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal, including its optimum viable use. Para. 200 makes it clear that local planning authorities need to look for opportunities for new development within Conservation Areas, World Heritage Sites and within the setting of heritage assets to enhance or better reveal their significance. Proposals which make a positive contribution to the asset or better reveals its significance should be treated favourably.

- 8.7 In respect of non-designated heritage assets para. 197 of the NPPF states that the effect that a proposal will have on such an asset should be taken into account in determining the application, and in considering such applications a balanced judgment is required having regards to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset.
- 8.8 The proposed alterations involve the subdivision of the large detached dwelling into two semidetached residential units. Grantchester Meadows has a varied character with a number of detached and semi-detached properties, the proposed subdivision to create a pair of semidetached properties would therefore not be at odds with the surrounding character. In terms of the proposed alterations to the appearance of the dwelling the addition of two dormers to the rear and a single storey side extension to replace the existing garage and a rear extension are considered to be minor and not have an adverse impact when viewed from the street scene.
- 8.9 In respect of the landscaping, a hard and soft landscaping condition is recommended in addition to a boundary treatment condition to ensure the proposals will create a high quality development and appropriately landscaped external space.
- 8.10 Cambridge City Council Conservation team have reviewed the proposals and consider the proposed development to preserve or enhance the character of the area. This view is supported by officers and the proposals are considered to be in accordance with Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policies 58 and 61.

Residential Amenity

Impact on amenity of neighbouring occupiers

- 8.11 In terms of overlooking and privacy there are two additional dormer windows proposed within the roof slope on the rear elevation. However, the addition of these windows are not considered to give rise to additional overlooking as there are already a number of first floor windows with views towards the garden spaces of No's 76 and 80 Grantchester Meadows. Therefore, the impact is considered to be acceptable.
- 8.12 On the western side of the property a side extension with a lean-to roof is proposed to replace the existing flat roof garage and utility. This extension is proposed to stretch approximately 10 metres along the boundary with No.80. However, given the single storey nature and positioning of the proposed extension (which will not project beyond the rear elevation of No.80) it is not considered to cause an adverse impact on the amenity of this property.

Wider area

- 8.13 The Environmental Health Team has recommended a construction hours condition in order to protect the residential amenity of occupiers of properties in the wider area during construction. This advice is accepted and the condition is recommended accordingly.
- 8.14 For the above reasons, it is considered that the proposal adequately respects the residential amenity of its neighbours and the constraints of the site in accordance with Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policies 52, 57 and 35.

Amenity for future occupiers of the site

- 8.15 The dwelling would comply with the space standards set out within Policy 50 of the Local Plan. A condition will be attached to ensure the proposals comply with the requirements of Part M4(2) of the Building Regulations, to ensure compliance with Local Plan Policy 51. The gross internal floor space measurements for the unit in this application is shown in the table below:

Unit	Number of bedrooms	Number of bed spaces (persons)	Number of storeys	Policy Size requirement (ml)	Proposed size of unit	Difference in size
1	4	7	3	121	200	+79
2	2	3	3	79	110	+31

8.16 The proposal provides an acceptable living environment and an appropriate standard of residential amenity for future occupiers in accordance with Cambridge Local Plan (2018) policies 50, 51 and 52.

External amenity space

8.17 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. The application proposes an acceptable level of external amenity for both dwellings.

Highway Safety

8.18 The Cambridgeshire County Council Highways Engineer has not raised any highway safety issues subject to conditions. The proposal is considered to be compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2018) policy 81.

Car Parking

8.19 The site and the streets in the immediate vicinity of the site fall within the controlled parking zone. The residents of the new dwelling would not qualify for Residents' Permits within the existing Residents' Parking Schemes operating on surrounding streets and an informative is recommended to this effect. The proposed dwelling would have an allocated off-street car parking space and the existing dwelling would also retain a car parking space. The proposal is considered to be compliant with policy 82 of Cambridge Local Plan (2018).

Cycle Parking and Refuse

8.20 Appendix L of the Cambridge Local Plan (2018) states that there should be a minimum of 1 cycle parking space per bedroom. A bin store is shown on the plans within the front

garden space. A condition will be attached to secure the details of a bin and cycle store which will be covered and secure.

- 8.21 The proposal is considered to be compliant with policy 82 of Cambridge Local Plan (2018).

9.0 CONCLUSION

- 9.1 In the opinion of officers, the proposed development would provide a high quality living environment for future occupants whilst being in keeping with the surrounding area and respecting the amenity of neighbouring properties.

10.0 RECOMMENDATION: APPROVE

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

Reason: In accordance with the requirements of Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended by Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004).

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

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

3. Prior to the commencement of any works on site a written statement which details how contractor parking will be controlled shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The works shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: For the safe and effective operation of the highway. (Cambridge Local Plan policy 81).

4. Prior to the bringing into use of the access, two pedestrian visibility splays of 2m x 2m shall be provided each side of the new vehicular access measured from and along the highway boundary. Such splays shall be within the red line of the site and shall thereafter be maintained free from obstruction exceeding 0.6m above the level of the adopted public highway.

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

5. The new driveway shall be constructed using a bound material and so that its falls and levels are such that no private water from the site drains across or onto the adopted public highway. Please note that the use of permeable paving does not give the Highway Authority sufficient comfort that in future years water will not drain onto or across the adopted public highway and physical measures to prevent the same must be provided.

Reason: for the safe and effective operation of the highway (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policy 81).

6. The finished ground floor levels shall be set no lower than the existing floor levels.

Reason: To reduce the risk of flooding to the proposed development and future occupants. (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policy 32).

7. No development shall commence until a scheme for flood resilient /resistant construction has been submitted to and approved in writing with the Local Planning Authority. Development shall take place in accordance with the approved details.

Reason To reduce the risk of flooding to the proposed development and future occupants (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policy 32).

8. Prior to commencement of development a scheme for the disposals of surface water and foul water shall be provided to and agreed in writing with the local planning authority. All external areas should utilise permeable surfaces. The development shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details.

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

9. 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)

10. Unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority, the extension(s) hereby permitted shall be constructed in external materials to match the existing building in type, colour and texture.

Reason: To ensure that the extension(s) is(are) in keeping with the existing building. (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policies 55 and 58)

11. Prior to the occupation the full details of the refuse arrangements and cycle parking facilities shall be submitted and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter the development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: In the interests of visual amenity and cycle parking provision. (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policies 55, 57 and 82).

12. No development above ground level, other than demolition, shall commence until full details of both hard and soft landscape works have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority and these works shall be carried out as approved. These details shall include proposed finished levels or contours; boundary treatments; hard surfacing materials; refuse and cycle storage units; proposed and existing functional services above and below ground. 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)

INFORMATIVE: Cambridge City Council recommends the use of low NOx boilers i.e. appliances that meet a dry NOx emission rating of 40mg/kWh, to minimise emissions from the development that may impact on air quality.

INFORMATIVE: The applicant should note that the proposed 'new' dwelling will not be eligible for residents parking permits.

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

This page is intentionally left blank

Application Number	20/01033/FUL	Agenda Item	
Date Received	29th January 2020	Officer	Charlotte Spencer
Target Date	20th April 2020		
Ward	Trumpington		
Site	12 Gilmour Road X		
Proposal	Ground floor extension and access gate alterations within the building curtilage and projection of first floor sitting room window onto the existing terrace		
Applicant	Mr & Mrs Roca 12, Gilmour Road		

SUMMARY	<p>The development accords with the Development Plan for the following reasons:</p> <p>The proposal does not adversely impact on the setting, character or appearance of the Brooklands Avenue Conservation Area</p> <p>The proposal respects the character and proportions of the original building and surrounding context.</p> <p>The proposal is considered to address the reason for the previously refused application being dismissed at appeal.</p>
RECOMMENDATION	APPROVAL

0.0 Addendum

0.1 At 10th September 2020 Planning Committee, Members resolved to defer this item to enable Officers to provide further clarification and information regarding the scheme and for members to undertake their own site visits. Further details will be included in the presentation on the day

1.0 SITE DESCRIPTION/AREA CONTEXT

- 1.1 The application relates to a three storey, mid-terrace dwelling house located to the South of Gilmour Road. The brick dwelling is built up to the road and it benefits from private terraces and has access to a communal garden area at the rear. The application property is attached to Nos.10 and 14 Gilmour Road to the West and East respectively.
- 1.2 The property is located within the Accordia Development which is covered by an Article 4 Direction and it lies within the Brooklands Avenue Conservation Area.
- 1.3 The row of properties in which the application site is situated, is uniform in appearance. The dwellings each have a terrace at second floor level to the side and a terrace to the rear of the dwelling at first floor level. There is also a ground floor terrace.

2.0 THE PROPOSAL

- 2.1 Planning permission is sought for a ground floor extension and access gate alterations within the building curtilage and projection of first floor sitting room window onto the existing terrace.
- 2.2 To the rear lower section, the existing decked area is to be changed into habitable space and a square skylight would be added over this area to fully enclose it. Full height sliding glazed doors would be fitted behind the existing rear gate and railings which are to be retained with the gate swing being adjusted so it would swing outwards rather than inwards.
- 2.3 At first floor level, the existing opening to the lounge is to be enlarged to form a projecting window. This would project 0.8 metres and would be 4.4 metres wide. It would have a copper clad flat roof.

3.0 SITE HISTORY

Reference	Description	Outcome
18/1813/FUL	Ground floor extension and access gate alterations within the	Refused 15.08.2019

	building curtilage; projection of first floor sitting room window onto the existing terrace and erection of garden studio within the second floor terrace.	Appeal dismissed 20.12.2019
C/02/0999	Approval of siting design and external appearance, and landscaping relating to the redevelopment of 9.45 hectares of land for residential development pursuant to condition 3 of the outline planning permission	APC dated 03.06.2003
C/00/1175	Outline Application for 9.45ha of Residential Development (Class C3) comprising not more than 382 dwellings; together with 1.92ha office development (Class B1) comprising a total maximum floorspace of 16500 sq metres (gross); alterations to the public highway, access, car parking and ancillary.	Approved 10.10.2001

- 3.1 This application is a revised scheme further to the previously refused application 18/1813/FUL. This previous application was refused at Committee, contrary to Officer recommendation, for the following reasons: The second floor garden studio would harm the cohesive architectural uniformity of the wider terrace and Accordia development as a whole; the ground floor infill element of the proposal would enclose the existing open area and harm the cohesive architectural uniformity of the wider terrace and the Accordia development as a whole. This application subsequently went to Appeal. The Planning

Inspector concluded that the second floor studio would significantly diminish the openness of the terrace and would appear as a visual intrusion disrupting the visual harmony and rhythm of the streetscape. However, it was considered that the ground and first floor alterations would not detract from the architectural uniformity of the dwellings. In response to this decision, the current application has removed the second floor garden studio.

3.2 Full copies of the previous decision notice and appeal decision are attached as an appendix to this report.

4.0 PUBLICITY

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

5.0 POLICY

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

5.2 Relevant Development Plan policies

PLAN	POLICY NUMBER
Cambridge Local Plan 2018	1 3 35 55 56 58 61

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

Central Government Guidance	National Planning Policy Framework 2019 National Planning Policy Framework – Planning Practice Guidance from 3 March 2014 onwards
-----------------------------	--

	Circular 11/95 (Annex A)
Material Considerations	<u>City Wide Guidance</u> Buildings of Local Interest (2005) Cambridgeshire Design Guide For Streets and Public Realm (2007)
	<u>Area Guidelines</u> Brooklands Avenue Conservation Area Appraisal (2013)

6.0 CONSULTATIONS

Cambridgeshire County Council (Highways Development Management)

6.1 No comment on behalf of the Highway Authority.

Urban Design and Conservation Team

6.2 The site lies within the Brooklands Avenue Conservation Area. The Accordia development is significant for its high quality design including the consistent and regular layout and style of the buildings and the spaces between them, and the contemporary architectural form and treatments of buildings.

6.3 An appeal was dismissed for a similar application which included a garden studio within the second floor terrace. The proposals do not now include the second floor studio which in the Inspectors decision was noted as being out of step with the prevailing regular pattern and layout of the development on the street, to the detriment of the character and appearance of the area and Conservation Area.

- 6.4 The ground floor extension would not be significantly visible from the surrounding area. The proposed first floor extension would also be largely hidden and unobtrusive in the street and from the communal garden space to the rear. Neither of these elements would detract from the architectural uniformity of the dwellings in the area.
- 6.5 For these reasons, the proposal is not considered contrary to Policies 58 or 61 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2018 or the NPPF.
- 6.6 The above responses are a summary of the comments that have been received. Full details of the consultation responses can be inspected on the application file.

7.0 REPRESENTATIONS

7.1 Councillor Thornburrow has called the application to committee due to the number of concerns raised with them. The concerns relate to Policies 55, 56, 58 and 61 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2018 and paragraph 196 of the NPPF 2019.

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

- 1 Aberdeen Square
- 7 Aberdeen Square
- 11 Aberdeen Avenue
- 3 Henslow Mews
- 7 Henslow Mews
- 22 Henslow Mews
- 3 Morland Terrace

7.3 The representations can be summarised as follows:

- The proposal materially degrades the character of the conservation area;
- This street is one of the jewels in the design of the Accordia neighbourhood and its outstanding design appearance derives from the cadence of fenestration alternating with small courtyards;
- The proposed scheme fills out these courtyards which would be out of keeping;

- There clearly is not room for a car if the occupiers are to have anywhere to put bins, bikes etc. This will add pressure to the road space;
- Proposal severely reduces the amenity space and alters the balance between types of space in the home;
- Ground floor infill will detract from views into, within and out of the conservation area;
- Loss of outdoor space will have a negative impact on the character of the estate;
- Will set precedents to the rest of the estate, specifically the other 37 similar properties;
- Proposed changes are visible from the shared garden (shared by 18 properties) and terraces of neighbouring houses breaking homogeneity;
- The proposed ground floor enclosure is not in style with the original design and would go against the award-winning design of the home
- The alleged previous alterations mentioned in the Design and Access Statement have not been done;
- Although the most harmful elements of the original application have been abandoned, still continue to have concerns about is immediate impact and the precedent;
- Design interferes with the open view through the building to the communal gardens;
- There will be little separation space between the extension and existing railings resulting in a poor outlook for the occupiers and wider community;
- The design puts at risk the retention of the existing railings

7.4 The owners/occupiers of the following addresses have made representations supporting or neutral to the proposal:

- 21 The Steel Building, Kingfisher Way
- 8 Gilmour Road
- 10 Gilmour Road
- 14 Gilmour Road
- 16 Gilmour Road
- 24 Meridian Close
- 11 Gilpin Place
- 4 Henslow Mews
- 23 Brook End Close
- 17 Copse Way

- 7.5 The representations can be summarised as follows:
- No homeowner should be restricted from developing and improving property to evolve to meet the changing needs of families;
 - The outward appearance would not be affected;
 - Extension will not make any harm to the Accordia Development;
 - Appropriately sensitive extension that respects the conservation Area and the character of the estate;
 - No further impediment on the views through the undercroft and courtyard areas than is already caused by parking of cars and storage;
 - Clear from Appeal Decision Notice that the elements in this application would not be detrimental to the Conservation Area;
 - Better use of space;
- 7.6 The above representations are a summary of the comments that have been received. Full details of the representations can be inspected on the application file.

8.0 ASSESSMENT

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

- 8.1 On the 21st February 2014, the Council published an Article 4 Direction on the Accordia Estate. This means that certain works to dwellinghouses which are generally permitted development would now require a planning application. These works are:
- The infill or enclosure of a recessed entrance or an open terrace area
 - Insertion of a new window opening
 - Removal of a projecting part of a dwelling house
 - The recladding of any part of a building in a material of a different type or appearance to the original
 - The provision within the curtilage of a dwellinghouse of a hard surface
 - The alteration or removal of a chimney
 - The erection or construction of a gate, fence, wall or other means of enclosure

- The painting of the exterior of any building or work

This came into force on the 23rd February 2015.

- 8.2 The Article 4 direction restricts certain types of development where the exercise of permitted development rights would harm local amenity, the historic environment or the proper planning of the area. This does not mean that the building cannot be changed in any way however proposed changes to the building as a whole would need to be carefully assessed to ensure that their architectural cohesiveness is preserved and that the proposal does not detract from the appearance of the conservation area.
- 8.3 To the rear ground floor lower section, the existing decked area is proposed to be changed into habitable space and a square skylight would be added over this area to fully enclose it.
- 8.4 Given this section is recessed from the front elevation of the dwelling by approximately 7 metres and views would still be available through the glazing to this section, and as the front section is used as a garage and a parked car would obscure the view it is considered that views would not change dramatically and views through to the rear section of the building would be maintained. It is also noted that, although this element of the proposal was previously refused, the Inspector also concluded that it would be hidden and unobtrusive in the street and from the communal garden space.
- 8.5 The top of the rooflight with seating to the first floor terrace would be set down from the parapet level and this wall would screen the skylight from view from outside the curtilage of the dwelling. Subsequently, it is considered that there would not be wider views of this element and as such it would not impact detrimentally on the character and appearance of the conservation area.
- 8.6 At first floor level, the existing opening to the sitting area in the rear elevation is to be enlarged to form a projecting window. This again would be set back from the parapet edge of the first floor terrace and views of this would be minimal and against the backdrop of the existing rear elevation. This would take up a small amount of outdoor amenity space however, it is considered that this would not impact detrimentally on the

usability or the visual openness of this terraced element. This element was considered acceptable within the previously refused scheme, and also by the Inspector when considering the appeal against the previous decision.

- 8.7 The previous application also included a 2nd floor garden studio and this was the sole reason for the scheme being dismissed at appeal. This element has now been removed within the current proposal.
- 8.8 Subsequently, it is considered that the proposed works would not have a detrimental impact on the existing property, street scene and surrounding area and would preserve the character and appearance of the conservation area. As such, the proposal is compliant with Policies 55, 56, 58 and 61 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2018).

Residential Amenity

Impact on amenity of neighbouring occupiers

- 8.9 The first floor terrace is already outdoor amenity space with the ability to afford the occupiers unrestricted views from them outside the application site. Subsequently, the addition of an extension would not alter this situation and there would therefore not be any additional overlooking issues as a result of this proposal.
- 8.10 The proposed window would project above the wall separating the first floor terrace from the adjoining terrace at No. 14 Gilmour Road. Given the minimal projection above the wall, this projection would not be detrimental to the amenities of this property.
- 8.11 The proposal would result in a loss of amenity space to the ground floor of the dwelling but given that this area is currently enclosed to a certain degree already, it is considered that the loss of this space would not impact detrimentally on the amenity space provision for this property.
- 8.12 Subsequently, it is considered that the proposal would not have a detrimental impact on the residential amenities of the neighbouring properties in terms of loss of light, loss of outlook, sense of dominance or loss of privacy or an impact on the

amenities of the occupiers of the application property. As such, it is considered that the proposal is compliant with Policy 58 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2018).

9.0 CONCLUSION

- 9.1 In conclusion, it is considered that the current proposal, in removing the previously proposed 2nd floor garden studio, addresses the reason behind the dismissal of the previous scheme at appeal, and now results in a form of development that preserves the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.

10.0 RECOMMENDATION

APPROVE subject to the following conditions:

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

Reason: In accordance with the requirements of Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended by Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004).

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

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

3. No development shall take place above ground level, other than demolition, until samples of the external materials to be used in the construction of the development have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Development shall thereafter be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure that the external appearance of the development does not detract from the character and appearance of the conservation area. (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policies 55, 58 and 61)