

Application Number	12/0502/FUL	Agenda Item	
Date Received	20th April 2012	Officer	Mrs Sarah Dyer
Target Date	20th July 2012		
Ward	Trumpington		
Site	32 - 38 Station Road Cambridge Cambridgeshire CB1 2JH		
Proposal	The demolition of 32-38 Station Road and the construction of two new office buildings comprising 7806 sq.m. office floorspace (class B1) for 50 Station Road and 8621 sq.m. office floorspace (class B1) and 271 sq.m. of retail/cafe and restaurant floorspace (class A1/A3) for 60 Station Road as a phased development, including ancillary accommodation/facilities with an additional single level basement to both buildings and up to 61 car parking spaces, with associated plant; along with the re-alignment of the northern section of the southern access road; 432 external cycle parking spaces; and hard and soft landscape (including additional public realm and landscaping over the cycle storage area and basement entrance).		
Applicant	Brookgate CB1 Limited C/o Agent		

SUMMARY	<p>The development accords with the Development Plan for the following reasons:</p> <p>The proposed building is of a scale, massing and design which are appropriate to its setting within an Area of Major Change and of a significantly high quality which justifies the removal of Buildings of Local Interest.</p> <p>The Outline consent for the Station Area development is a very significant material</p>
----------------	---

	<p>consideration and the development accords with that consent in all regards with the exception of site area.</p> <p>The application includes mitigation measures to ensure that all of the impacts of the development are dealt with both independently and as part of the wider Masterplan.</p>
RECOMMENDATION	APPROVAL

1.0 SITE DESCRIPTION/AREA CONTEXT

- 1.1 The application site forms part of a larger area, which is the subject of the CB1 Station Area Redevelopment proposals for which outline planning permission was granted in April 2010. The site lies on the south side of Station Road and to the east of the access serving the Warren Close development. The western half of the site is occupied by 32-38 Station Road, which accommodates Woodlands Doctors Surgery and Brookgate's Offices (the applicants). The eastern half of the site was previously occupied by offices serving the Rank Hovis site that have been demolished as part of the CB1 development. This part of the site is currently in use as a contractor's compound.
- 1.2 To the south of the site is the Warren Close housing development and land, which is under development for flats with commercial space at ground level. A six storey block of flats at Warren Close sits behind the western half of the site and following the completion of development a public square and a seven storey block of flats will sit behind the eastern half. To the west the site is bounded by the access road serving Warren Close beyond which are office buildings. To the east is Murdoch House a three-storey office block with undercroft that fronts the Station. To the north the site is bounded by Station Road beyond which is former Red House site that has planning permission for a hotel and the current station cycle park.
- 1.3 The site is within the Station Area Redevelopment Framework Boundary and within the Central Conservation Area No.1. 32-38 Station Road are buildings of Local Interest as are the Mill and

Silo that sit to the southeast. The Station is a listed building. The site falls within the controlled parking zone.

2.0 THE PROPOSAL

- 2.1 Full planning permission is sought for an office development comprising two linked office blocks that will be known as 50 and 60 Station Road. 50 Station Road is to occupy the western part of the site and 60 the eastern part. The application differs from previous applications that have been brought forward within the CB1 Station Area site because it is not an application for reserved matters. In this case a reserved matters application could not be submitted because the layout of the block does not conform to the approved Parameter Plans. The application also includes a realignment of the Southern Access Road (SAR). Separate applications for a Non Material Amendment to the Outline permission for the realignment of the SAR and Conservation Area Consent for the demolition of 32-38 Station Road have also been made. Reports to address these applications appear elsewhere on the Agenda.
- 2.2 Although the application is not constrained by the Outline permission, the approved Parameter Plans that represent the approved Masterplan are a significant material consideration in the assessment of the application. I will make reference to the Masterplan throughout my Assessment as the applicants have done in the supporting material for the application.
- 2.3 In total the two office buildings will deliver 16427 sq m of office floorspace; 7806 sq m in 50 Station Road and 8621 sq m in 60 Station Road. In addition to this floorspace 271 sq m of retail space is provided in the south east corner of 60 Station Road where it fronts the public square and in a 'pod' that between the two blocks on the Station Road frontage. Car and cycle parking is provided within the blocks with further cycle parking within the landscaped areas around the buildings. The SAR is realigned further to the east. Further details of the proposals are set out in my Assessment
- 2.4 The application is accompanied by the following supporting information:
1. Design and Access Statement by Grimshaw
 2. Heritage Statement by Beacon Planning

3. Planning Statement by Savills
4. Acoustic Report by Hilson Moran
5. Air Quality Report by Hilson Moran
6. Archaeological Statement by Cambridge Archaeological Unit
7. BREEAM Pre-assessment report by Hilson Moran
8. Car Park Ventilation Strategy by Hilson Moran
9. Daylight Report by Mott Macdonald
10. Draft s106 Agreement by Mills and Reeve
11. Ecology Report by RPS
12. Energy and Sustainability Statement by Hilson Moran
13. Estate Management Strategy by Bidwells
14. Surface/foul water strategy by Mott Macdonald
15. Ground Contamination report by Mott Macdonald
16. Landscape Proposals by Robert Myers
17. Landscape Management Plan by Robert Myers
18. Transport Assessment (inc. Travel Plan) by Mott Macdonald
19. Waste Management Strategy by Mott Macdonald

2.5 The application has been amended in the following ways:

- Response to comments by Nature Conservation Officer and revised Ecology Report to include changes to landscaping
- Response to comments by Sustainable Drainage Officer
- Response to comments by Cycling and Walking Officer and associated revisions to Ground Floor/Basement Plan and updated Travel Plan to incorporate Cycle Parking Management Plan
- Response to County Highways officer comments.
- Sustainability Checklist
- Response to comments by Senior Sustainability Officer (Design and Construction)
- Further revisions to the Travel Plan in response to comments made by County Transport Officer
- Revised plans and Addendum to Design and Access Statement in response to comments by Urban Design and Conservation Team.
- Amended plans and Addendum to Design and Access Statement to include basement/low level cycle parking spaces to ensure compliance with cycle parking standards

and in response to comments from Walking and Cycling Officer

- Revised landscape plans to include trailing plants over the car park access ramp and cycle park, additional planting to terraces, and two brown roofs at roof top level.

3.0 SITE HISTORY

Reference	Description	Outcome
05/1166	Conservation Area Consent for demolition buildings on the Rank Hovis site	A/C
06/0266/OUT	CB1 Station Area Redevelopment	A/C
09/0031	Conservation Area Consent for demolition buildings on the Rank Hovis site	A/C
11/1303/FUL	Demolition of 32 – 38 Station Road and erection of two office buildings	Withdrawn
11/1351/CAC	Conservation Area Consent for demolition of 32-38 Station Road	Withdrawn
12/0496/CAC	Conservation Area Consent for demolition of 32-38 Station Road	Pending determination
	Non Material Amendment for Realignment of SAR	Pending determination

4.0 PUBLICITY

4.1	Advertisement:	Yes
	Adjoining Owners:	Yes
	Site Notice Displayed:	Yes
	Public Meeting/Exhibition	No
	DC Forum (Meeting of 4 July 2012)	Yes

4.2 The grounds for the Forum were that the Petitioners wished to express their concerns about the increase in office space, the insufficient car parking on site, the environmental impact on the neighbourhood and the demolition of 32-38 Station Road, which are fine Victorian buildings listed as buildings of local interest. They also wished to discuss a reduction in the scale of the development and to ensure that the development makes a full financial contribution (including deferred payments) to the Cambridge Guided Bus. A copy of the DCF minutes will be attached to the Amendment Sheet.

5.0 POLICY

5.1 See Appendix 1 for full details of Central Government Guidance, East of England Plan 2008 policies, Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003 policies, Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies, Supplementary Planning Documents and Material Considerations.

5.2 Relevant Development Plan policies

PLAN	POLICY NUMBER
East of England Plan 2008	SS1 SS3 E3 T1 T2 T4 T9 T13 T14 T15 ENV6 ENV7 WM6 CSR1 CSR2
Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003	P6/1, P9/8, P9/9
Cambridge Local Plan 2006	3/1 3/4 3/6 3/7 3/11 3/12 3/13 4/4 4/11 4/12 4/13 4/14 4/15 5/11 7/2

	8/2 8/4 8/6 8/9 8/10 8/16 8/18 9/1 9/9 10/1
--	---

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

Central Government Guidance	National Planning Policy Framework March 2012 Circular 11/95 Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010
Supplementary Planning Documents	Sustainable Design and Construction Waste Management Design Guide Planning Obligation Strategy Public Art
Material Considerations	<u>Central Government:</u> Letter from Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government (27 May 2010) Written Ministerial Statement: Planning for Growth (23 March 2011)
	<u>Citywide:</u> Biodiversity Checklist Cambridge City Nature Conservation Strategy Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Strategic Flood Risk Assessment Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (2005) Cambridge and Milton Surface Water

	<p>Management Plan</p> <p>Cambridgeshire Quality Charter for Growth Cambridge City Council - Guidance for the application of Policy 3/13 (Tall Buildings and the Skyline) of the Cambridge Local Plan (2006) (2012)</p> <p>Cambridge Walking and Cycling Strategy</p> <p>Cambridgeshire Design Guide For Streets and Public Realm</p> <p>Air Quality in Cambridge – Developers Guide</p> <p>Cambridge Shopfront Design Guide</p>
	<p><u>Area Guidelines:</u></p> <p>Southern Corridor Area Transport Plan</p> <p>Buildings of Local Interest</p> <p>Station Area Development Framework/Station Area Conservation Appraisal</p>

6.0 CONSULTATIONS

Cambridgeshire County Council (Engineering)

Application as submitted

- 6.1 The development will be a significant contributor to the need for improvement to the layout of the signal-controlled junction of Station Road with Hills Road that provides full pedestrian facilities at that junction.

The realignment of the SAR and junction layout are both acceptable.

Further details are required of the size and dimensions of car parking spaces and aisle widths and larger scale plans to show

manoeuvring space. Dimensioned layouts are needed of cycle parking spaces.

Parking surveys of the residential area to the east of the railway are required in common with the Outline approval.

Conditions/informatives are recommended to address the need for a traffic management plan and works to the public highway.

Response to additional information

6.2 I refer to the Technical Note produced by Mott Macdonald dated 7th June 2012.

The document states that the car parking spaces will be 4.8 metres by 2.4 metres in size, rather than the 5 metres by 2.5 metres recommended by the Highway Authority.

Recent statistics for car sales indicate that almost one third of cars sold would be anticipated to overhang the car parking spaces to a greater or lesser degree, with one tenth overhanging by 0.5 metres as cars are unlikely to park with their bodywork, even bumpers, touching walls or crash barriers.

Whilst I am aware of the design documents referred to in the report, practical experience shows that as car sizes increase, documents based upon producing cost efficient structures are not necessarily placing enough weight on practicality of operation.

Whilst the guidance given in “Car Parking: What Works Where” is inclusive of on-street parking, it does apply equally well to the wider requirements of people.

Consideration should also be given to the advice contained in the Institute of Highways Engineers latest guidance on car parking which refers specifically to the issue of accommodating larger vehicles.

The manoeuvring diagrams provided indicate that large cars could access the parking bays, although with some degree of constraint.

Cambridgeshire County Council (New Communities)

Application as submitted

6.3 Car Parking

61 car parking spaces are provided against a requirement for 164 spaces under adopted parking standards. Given the accessibility of the site this is an acceptable level of car parking.

On-street parking surveys are needed consider overspill parking into the surrounding area. The baseline survey needs to be carried out prior to the commencement of development to avoid construction traffic affects.

Financial Contributions

The contributions towards Cambridge Guided Bus (CGB) and the Southern Corridor Area Transport Plan (SCAPT) that are suggested by the applicants are acceptable.

Workplace Travel Plan

The WTP that has been submitted needs to be enhanced to address cycle training, real time passenger information and the baseline for modal shift away from car use.

Response to additional information

- 6.4 I have asked for a comment on the revised Travel to Work Plan and will provide an update on the Amendment Sheet or orally at the meeting.

Head of Environmental Services

6.5 Environmental Protection

Construction Method Statement

This work especially the demolition presents the risk of harm to the amenity from a number of pollutants including noise, vibration and dust. Considerable work was done in the early stages of the CB1 development to control such pollution and a Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) was

required by condition 31 of the outline planning permission reference 08/0266/OUT. This has been written and agreed, each phase is also required to produce a Construction Method Statement.

Phases of the development that have followed this approach have proceeded without justified complaints. In the interests of protecting the amenity and consistency a condition requiring a Construction Method Statement that is in accordance with the existing agreed CEMP is recommended.

Further conditions covering noise, vibration, pilling and dust are not required as this are already covered in the CEMP.

Road Traffic Noise

It has already been identified; including for the Microsoft Building opposite at 21 Station Road that Station Road is and will remain noisy. Sufficient glazing will mitigate the noise and achieve the internal noise levels quoted. However, these internal levels will not be achieved with natural ventilation (open windows) so mechanical ventilation will be required.

The detailed structure of the building has not been finalised and the exact specification of the glazing is not yet known. However, this can be agreed as a condition.

Experience has shown that the specification of the glazing and the ventilation systems is not finalised until shortly before occupation. I therefore suggest the same condition as condition 34 of the outline planning condition reference 08/0266/OUT quoted in section 6.1 but amended to be, "Prior to occupation," as opposed to, "Prior to commencement."

Plant Noise

The site is close to the existing Warren Close flats as well as the residential blocks of the CB1 development including the 'L' blocks of the Blue phase. Plant noise therefore needs to be controlled to protect the amenity of these residents.

The application submission quotes the existing plant noise condition of the outline planning permission, condition 37 of 08/0266/OUT. The details of the plant and therefore its noise

are not finalised and the same condition is requested for this application, but amended to be, "Prior to occupation," as opposed to, "Prior to commencement."

Odour

Depending on the use of the retail café / restaurant area odour may harm the amenity neighbouring homes and offices. Condition 38 of the outline planning permission reference 08/0266/OUT deals with odour and the same condition is requested for this application.

Opening Times

The use of the retail / café / restaurant and particularly night time deliveries risks serious harm to the amenity of the neighbouring residents of Warren Close and the residential blocks of CB1 such as in the Blue phase. A condition to restrict opening hours to 07:00-23:00 is recommended.

Car Park Ventilation

A car park ventilation strategy is included with the application. The ventilation of the underground car parks on other phases of CB1 has previously been considered as part of the planning process. However, it has now been confirmed that this is covered by the Building Regulations.

6.6 Scientific Team

Air Quality

The Air Quality Assessment identifies 119 car parking spaces associated with the current use; 61 car parking spaces are proposed with this application, which is less than the maximum permitted in the CB1 Masterplan. Thus the requirements of Condition 57 are satisfied (albeit that they do not apply to this new application) and there are no objections to the application on air quality grounds

Contaminated Land

The development is for the demolition of the existing buildings and the erection of two office blocks (known as Numbers 50

and 60 Station Road). The site, part of CB1 Development, was investigated during the Foster Mills redevelopment and the submission of the outline application in 2006.

A comprehensive desktop study was undertaken and noted multiple past industrial uses on and off the site including scrap yards, laboratories, fuel tanks and flourmills. The intrusive investigations recorded elevated concentrations of ground gases (up to 12.4% v/v of carbon dioxide –minimal flow rate was noted) and made ground impacted by aromatic hydrocarbon contamination.

Contamination issues were adequately assessed for the eastern half of the site (known as 60 Station Road) during the Foster Mills development. No further investigation is required in this area.

Limited investigation so far has been undertaken around the western part of the site (currently occupied by Numbers 32-38 Station Road). Further investigation is required in this area following site clearance and this can be secured by condition.

6.7 Waste Strategy

The drawings are only indicative however the details appear sufficient, but will depend on the exact use of the building, which will not be known until just prior to occupation. A prior to occupation condition is therefore required to ensure that the provisions and arrangements for waste and recycling are adequate.

6.8 Licensing and Food and Occupational Safety

Informatives are requested.

Urban Design and Conservation Team

Application as submitted

6.9 Background

As shown in the consented CB1 Outline masterplan, Block I2 was intended to be the most visually prominent of the buildings in CB1 and much time and effort was spent at the pre-

application stage to work out an appropriate massing strategy across CB1 and an appropriate maximum overall height for buildings in the area. The strategy pulled the height away from the Grade II Listed Station in order to preserve its setting and to create additional skyline interest to compliment the Mill and Silo.

In order to achieve an appropriately articulated skyline, only 75% of the parameter 'volume' could be built out (DAS July 2008 page 13 and pages 14-17). Such a condition was also intended to reduce the massing of the building.

6.10 Southern Access Road – NMA

When we previously commented on the NMA for the Southern Access Road in July 2011, we concluded that whilst the loss of the axis to the west of the L Buildings was not detrimental to the overall masterplan, the resolution of the 50&60 Station Road would be even more important due to the increased prominence of No.60 terminating the view through the park. With the revised application for 50&60 submitted, we again raise no objection to the proposed NMA and have the benefit of seeing how the proposals, discussed in detail below, will respond to this revision to the masterplan.

6.11 Previous scheme

Our concerns with the previously and now withdrawn scheme for 50&60 Station Road were as follows:

1. Massing – combined equally weighted forms/identical pair of buildings
2. Response to the Southern Access Road NMA
3. Poorly detailed materials and incoherence between elevations
4. How the top of the building 'struck a line against the sky'
5. Retail provision and other ground floor activity

6.12 Current Proposals

The applicant has submitted a comprehensive Design & Access Statement that clearly describes the design of the proposals and the way in which it responds to the masterplan.

CB1 Outline Masterplan and I2

The Southern Access Road NMA allows for the creation of a revised footprint for what was 'I2' in the CB1 Outline Masterplan. Whilst the proposals for 50&60 Station Road are submitted as a full application, the parameter plans are still important in determining the acceptability of proposals particularly in terms of scale and massing.

Scale and massing

The overall approach to the scale and massing of the building is supported. The change of emphasis from two equally weighted buildings to that of increasing the prominence of 60 Station Road with a clear separation between the buildings reduces the perceived massing of the development when viewed along Station Road and continues the established rhythm of buildings on the south side.

Plant/upper floors

We have serious reservations about the resolution of the top of the building. The submitted elevations do not depict the full impact of the grey zinc cladding and the box like qualities of the top floor rather undermine the effort that has been put into the stonework and the setback upper floors on both 50&60 Station Road. The impact of the plant floor is well illustrated in the submitted perspectives contained within the D&A Statement, which demonstrate how this element conflicts with the framing of the upper floors.

We would question whether the 'box' needs to be so large and whether a lower and more compact form may be less visually intrusive. If the box was set back from the edge and reduced in height by 1m it would be less apparent from the street.

The Outline limited plant and lift overruns to 2m in height. Whilst this isn't an RM application, it would seem sensible to limit the height of the plant enclosure to accord with this parameter. This would have the benefit of reducing the massing of the upper floor.

Further details are needed of the window cleaning mechanism and solar array.

Elevations

Overall we support the approach being taken to the elevations for each of the buildings. The result of the approach has been to create two buildings that have a strong family resemblance whilst allowing No.60 to perform a wider townscape role. The entrance to each of the buildings and the location of the café between them provides a well considered an active frontage to Station Road.

Materials

The buildings use a simple and high quality palette of materials and modular reconstituted stone beams with subtle variation in orientation to achieve variety and interest. Overall we support the proposed materials that will help the scheme fit in with the family of buildings now emerging along Station Road.

Conditions are suggested to address matters of detail such as:

Weathering of facades given the phased nature of the development and the juxtaposition of natural and reconstituted stone.

Visibility of structural elements behind the glazing.

Wear and tear issues to solid walls, columns and shopfronts. The detailing of how the stonework meets the ground needs to be thought through with the use of a harder stone to deal with potential strike damage and staining caused by rainfall.

The treatment of the flank walls, the access control system and drainage details can all have an impact on the appearance of the car park access.

Signage zones need to be clearly understood.

6.13 Assessment against the draft Cambridge Skyline Guidance

The assessment is thorough and appropriate and the conclusions are supported.

6.14 Conservation Area Consent

Conservation Area Consent is required but it is recognised that the Masterplan anticipated the demolition of 32-38 Station Road. There are also public benefits to be accrued in terms of delivery of the overall strategy to massing and height on Station Road, creation of the Southern Access Road and delivery of proposed land uses.

6.15 Conclusion

Overall we support the application. However further consideration of the plant floor is needed to reduce its impact when viewed along Station Road and from across the park.

Conditions are recommended to address details of stonework, non-masonry walling systems, glass types, low pitched roofs, joinery, roof glazing, renewable energy sources, roof plant screening, coping and landscaping.

Response to additional information

6.16 The revised plans show a revised approach to the upper floor, which has reduced the impact of this element from the northern and southern elevation in particular. The amended D&A Statement contains a series of useful comparison illustrations of the submitted and amended elevations as well as a series of street level perspectives. These demonstrate how the revised design approach to the upper floors has reduced their massing and in turn the impact from street level.

6.17 The introduction of a natural stone panel in the reception area referred to in the D&A Statement addendum is supported. However the material needs to be referred to on the amended north elevation drawing. The amendments are supported in Urban Design and Conservation terms but for clarity the use of the stone in the reception needs to be added to the submitted elevation drawing.

Senior Sustainability Officer (Design and Construction)

6.18 *Application as submitted*

Policy Context

The masterplan for the site contains the ambition for all development to exceed Part L of the Building Regulations by 10%, and for office developments to utilise PV and Ground Source Heat Pumps to achieve a 15% abatement of carbon emissions from renewable energy systems. While there are many elements of the proposals that are very encouraging and in keeping with the ambitions of the CB1 Masterplan, there are other areas of the proposals that are a little disappointing, particularly in relation to the role of renewable and low carbon energy generation.

Sustainable Development

In terms of meeting the requirements of Policy 3/1 of the Local Plan, it would appear that the applicant has not submitted the Council's Sustainability Checklist and Sustainability Statement. The Design and Access Statement does contain information regarding the sustainability credentials of the scheme. The buildings will be designed to meet a BREEAM 'excellent' rating, which is fully supported, as are the proposals to utilise green roofs and the emphasis on passive design. However, inclusion of this information does not replace the requirements of policy 3/1. As such, the applicant should be asked to submit a Sustainability Statement and Sustainability Checklist prior to the determination of this application.

Reduction of Carbon Emissions and Renewable Energy

The CB1 Masterplan sets out a target for development to exceed Building Regulations Part L by 10%. The Energy Strategy submitted as part of this application sets out proposals which are estimated to achieve a 31.8% reduction in CO2 emissions overall compared to Part L 2010. This level of carbon reduction is to be achieved via a hierarchical approach (Be Lean, Be Clean, Be Green), which is fully supported, as is the extent to which the proposals exceed the ambitions of the CB1 Masterplan.

It is, however, a little disappointing that renewable or low carbon energy generation plays very little role to the achievement of these levels of carbon reduction, with the use of solar thermal panels only achieving a 2.1% reduction in regulated emissions. As mentioned above, the overall levels of carbon reduction being achieved are fully supported, and I would not wish to see renewable energy generation implemented at the expense of other measures to reduce emissions following the hierarchical approach. However, at present the proposals not only fail to meet the renewable energy ambitions set out in the CB1 Masterplan, but they also fail to meet the requirements of Policy 8/16 of the Local Plan.

It is noted that passive design forms a fundamental element of the design approach and, in line with the Council's Sustainable Design and Construction SPD; this can count towards the 10% renewable energy requirement. I would therefore request that clarification be sought as to the level of carbon reduction to be achieved through the use of passive design measures, as this may help to get the proposals closer to the 10% figure.

The report considers a range of renewable energy technologies. I welcome the consideration of connection to the district-heating scheme being provided as part of the student accommodation element of the CB1 proposals. While it is noted that the proposals will have limited heat demand, I welcome the reference to future proofing the scheme so that they could, perhaps, connect to a heat network in the future, which could assist in the achievement of lower carbon cooling solutions for the building, and possibly also low carbon electricity.

Given that the primary energy requirement of the building will be electricity; this does lead me to query whether the use of solar thermal panels is the most suitable technology choice for this scheme. While it is noted that the development will incorporate service risers and spare ways in order that PV panels can be incorporated into the building in the future, this will do nothing to minimise the electricity requirements of the building now. I would also query the statement that PV has high capital costs and long payback periods since the introduction of the Feed in Tariff, the cost of PV systems has reduced dramatically, with a subsequent reduction in payback periods. While PV alone would unlikely to meet the full 10% requirement, it is considered

that this would be a far more appropriate technology for the proposed development.

6.19 Conclusion

To conclude, the proposals approach to meeting BREEAM 'excellent' and the overall levels of carbon reduction being achieved are fully supported. However, at present I do not feel that there is sufficient justification for the failure of the proposals to meet the requirements of Policy 8/16 of the Local Plan in terms of renewable energy provision. As detailed in my comments above, clarification should be sought as to the extent to which the passive design elements of the scheme assist in meeting the requirements of Policy 8/16, as when set against the overall levels of carbon reduction being achieved, this may provide justification for not reaching full compliance. I would also encourage the applicant to reconsider the proposed renewable energy technology being installed, as it is felt that a PV system would be far more suited to a development of this nature, and may help to achieve higher levels of carbon reduction than the proposed solar thermal array.

Response to additional information

6.20 Approach to meeting policy 8/16

Policy 8/16 of the 2006 Cambridge Local Plan requires all development above a threshold of 1,000 square metres to provide at least 10% of the developments total predicted energy requirements on-site from renewable energy sources. Concern was raised that renewable technologies only contributed a 2.1% reduction in the carbon emissions of the development, significantly short of the minimum policy requirements. It was, however, noted that a major driving force behind the design of the proposals was a passive approach to building design, and the Sustainable Design and Construction SPD does allow for passive design to be included in the 10% requirement. It has been agreed that these passive design measures should be incorporated into the 10% carbon requirement. This has now been calculated and indicates that the passive design measures will lead to an additional 6.2% reduction in carbon emissions. When combined with the contribution from the solar thermal panels, this leads to an 8.3% reduction in carbon emissions from the use of renewable energy and passive design.

While this level of carbon reduction is still below the Council's minimum policy requirement, the contribution against the overall level of carbon reduction being achieved through a combination of energy efficiency, passive design and renewable energy has been considered. The CB1 masterplan sets out to design buildings that reduce carbon emissions by 23.5% compared to a Part L compliant scheme. The proposals for 32-38 Station Road will lead to a 32% reduction in carbon emissions compared to a Part L 2010 compliant scheme, which should help future proof the building against future uplifts in Building Regulations carbon reduction requirements in 2013 and, possibly, 2016. Such an approach is supported, and it is felt that in this context the level of passive design measures and renewable energy being achieved is acceptable.

The applicant is however encouraged to reconsider installing photovoltaic panels now to help further reduce carbon emissions.

6.21 Sustainability Statement

The applicant has also now submitted a completed Sustainability Checklist in light of the requirements of Policy 3/1 of the 2006 Cambridge Local Plan. This sets out the overall approach to sustainable development, making reference to the location of additional information within the documents submitted as part of the planning application. While the majority of the approach is supported, further work is encouraged in relation to the drainage strategy for the site.

6.22 Conclusion

Application supported in relation to its approach to reducing carbon emissions and overall approach to sustainable design and construction.

Access Officer

- 6.23 The main door should be automated. Side doors alongside revolving doors would best electrically opening or asymmetrical of which one is at least 900mm. Reception and cafe bars need dropped height counters and hearing loop.

Head of Streets and Open Spaces (Tree Team)

6.24 No comments received.

Head of Streets and Open Spaces (Landscape Team)

6.25 *Application as submitted*

Public Realm

The proposed landscape treatment around the perimeter of the two blocks is supported and in general accordance with the Landscape and Public Realm strategy.

The cycle parking along the northern and eastern boundaries must be reduced to a few visitor racks. Provision of cycle parking should be located towards the southern part of the site to avoid compromising the public realm of Station Road or the Southern Access Road.

Visual Amenity Space

The green roof over the retail pavilion between 50 and 60 Station Road is welcomed and when viewed from Station Road will create an interesting and contrasting green edge to the built form. We would however suggest that this should extend the full length of the space between the two buildings to meet the usable amenity space towards the southern elevation. This would substantially improve the visual amenity for the neighbouring offices, eliminating views of the unsightly car park ramp and the cycle parking.

Useable Amenity Space

The quantity of the useable amenity space provision for the two large office buildings is considered minimal given the size of these two blocks. While the first floor amenity space and the linear roof terraces are welcomed, it is considered that these will be 'exclusive' to their floor level. We would suggest that the roofs of both buildings could incorporate intensive green roofs to provide some additional meaningful amenity space.

Balconies on the southern elevation of Number 60 could also provide some amenity space for each floor as well as activate the elevations overlooking the 'Ante chamber' square.

Green roofs

The Cambridge City Council strategic flood risk assessment requires a minimum 20% reduction in surface water discharge from a previously developed site. Given that the majority of this site is impermeable, we would suggest that these roofs should be intensive green/brown roofs to help achieve this, as well as accord with the draft National SuDS Standards that state that the first 5mm of rainfall should not leave the site.

Green/brown roofs offer multiple benefits in terms of surface water management, amenity, biodiversity, water quality improvements, carbon reduction, noise attenuation, urban heat island effect reduction and can more cost effective than conventional roofs.

6.26 Conclusion

The proposed development has the potential to make a very positive contribution to the Station Area with the capitalisation of the opportunities identified above. Subject to the incorporation of the suggested amendments, the proposed development of 50 & 60 Station Road can be supported on landscape, visual and amenity grounds.

Response to additional information

- 6.27 Most of the earlier concerns in relation to visual and useable amenity space, and green/brown roofs have been addressed. However concerns remain regarding the quality of the public realm being compromised by cycle parking. The reduction in cycle stands along Station Road is welcomed, however the solid barrier along the Southern Access Road is not considered satisfactory. The middle section adjacent to the road should be removed (between the two central trees) to enable pedestrians to cross the road more freely.

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

Application as submitted

6.28 Cycle Parking

A third of the cycle parking provided for staff is on street with no shelter and no indication of how they will be kept free for staff. Demand for cycle parking at the station is very high and it is not clear how members of the public will be prevented from using the on-street parking, particularly along the front of Station Road.

The access way to the Sheffield stands near the car park is too narrow to allow people with to pass each other and there is the danger that people waiting to get in at peak hours will congregate around the entrance, spilling out into the car park entrance/exit way and delivery area. Access to the entrance also requires crossing the entrance/exit to the car park. Further thought needs to be given as to how to highlight the presence of cyclists crossing here.

6.29 Travel Plan

The Travel Plan is rather un-ambitious with regard to cycle-related elements. The plan should include:

- free or subsidized cycle training for staff
- pool bikes (including folding bikes) and equipment for staff to use (with an indication on where these will be kept and how managed)
- cycle mileage for staff cycling on their own bikes for work related journeys.
- City cycle maps available for staff

Response to additional information

6.30 To be reported on the Amendment Sheet or orally at the Meeting

Head of Streets and Open Spaces (Sustainable Drainage Officer)

6.31 *Application as submitted*

Overall

The surface water drainage design proposed does not reflect current best practice. Although the scheme is part of a wider strategy there is no management of the water within this application boundary to reduce run-off and improve water quality. There are also some technical issues that are of concern and need to be addressed to ensure the scheme is feasible.

Current design best practice

All roofs should have green/brown roofs, which will help in preventing the first 5mm of rainfall from leaving the site. Architectural and plant issues can easily be overcome with a careful and considered design. Green/brown roofs could also provide additional benefits such as an increase in biodiversity, reduction in the carbon used by the completed building, a contribution to reducing the urban heat island effect and a contribution to a reduction in noise levels in dense urban areas.

Technical issues

There are some areas of concern regarding the use of oil interceptors, surface water drainage and there is no reference to the maintenance of the oil interceptors or pump stations in the maintenance plan.

6.32 *Response to additional information*

The drainage strategy should be prepared with reference to the existing Masterplan conditions but this is a full planning application therefore reference should be restricted to the site wide strategy and allowable discharge rate only. SUDS must be addressed and the performance of green/brown roofs demonstrated. Conditions are recommended

Head of Streets and Open Spaces (Nature Conservation Officer)

Application as submitted

- 6.33 Ecological enhancements appropriate for the development should be requested. These could include bio diverse/green roofs, native tree and shrub planting, swift nest boxes, bat tubes etc which would compliment those proposed with the CB1: 50 and 60 Station Rd Ecology report.

Response to additional information

- 6.34 The additional information/clarification is acceptable.

English Heritage

6.35 Summary

The principle of demolition of 32-38 Station Road was given tacit support when the CB1 Masterplan was agreed. However consent should only be granted once a scheme for high quality replacement buildings has been secured. The current proposals require changes to the Masterplan, which have much to recommend them, and the revised design has gone a long way to address the previous concerns raised by English Heritage.

6.36 Conservation Area Consent application

The NPPF includes a provision of a presumption in favour of the conservation of heritage assets. In this instance 32-38 Station Road are not designated heritage assets but the Conservation Area within which they are located is and therefore the presumption in favour of conservation is relevant. The removal of these buildings will enable the implementation of a holistic redevelopment that will deliver an overall enhancement of the Conservation Area whereas to retain them would be at odds with the new context.

6.37 Construction of New Office Building

The office building has the potential to deliver an improvement on the Masterplan. In particular it allows the creation of a new area of public realm as an 'ante chamber' to the Station Square. However the full potential of this space cannot be realised until the future of the Silo building is resolved.

The revised massing strategy and the vertical emphasis that is delivered by the expressed stair to 60 Station Road is broadly welcomed.

The revised design, which now incorporates a series of 'giant order' of mullions and transoms, finished in reconstituted stone references the Cambridge context. The details will need to be strongly controlled to avoid problems with staining.

The lack of a double height recess on 50 Station Road (south elevation) makes this building appear 'stunted'. The plans could be revised to address this.

There is no detail of signage locations.

6.38 Recommendations:

- Review South elevation of 50 Station Road
- Approve with conditions

The Victorian Society

6.39 (Note – the Victorian Society were not formally consulted on the application because 32-38 Station Road are not listed buildings)

The Society objects to the demolition of 32-38 Station Road. They are a striking late Victorian terrace and may have been designed by Richard Reynolds-Rowe. The rarity of the buildings adds to their value in the streetscape.

The poor state of the frontage and the access ramp can be easily rectified. Other sites could provide new officer space, which would negate the need to demolish these buildings.

The Council has an obligation to ensure that development either preserves or enhances the Conservation Area.

Natural England

- 6.40 Welcomes development, which incorporates sustainable design and construction and shows both adaptation to and reduction in the contribution to climate change.

Detailed comments:

Support the Ecological Assessment particularly the need for involvement of a licensed bat ecologist and action to deal with nesting birds.

Monitoring should be carried out to ensure that the proposed development has been successful in providing habitat for both birds and bats.

Environment Agency

- 6.41 Conditions recommended to address groundwater and contaminated land issues, surface water disposal, piling and groundwater, surface water drainage and pollution control. Informatives are requested regarding surface and foul water drainage, pollution control and other legislation.

Anglian Water

- 6.42 Comments are made about protection of AW assets, wastewater treatment, foul sewerage, surface water disposal and trade effluent. The surface water strategy/flood risk assessment is acceptable. Conditions are recommended in relation to foul sewerage and surface water disposal.

Ministry of Defence (Air Safeguarding)

- 6.43 No objections.

Cambridgeshire Constabulary (Architectural Liaison Officer)

- 6.44 All entrances beyond main reception and other entry doors (especially those from the basement) should be on card

swipe/key fob. CCTV should be in place covering the basement and circulation areas of the building and in particular cycle parking area.

In terms of crime risk the underground car park and cycle parking for the scheme are issues. More information is needed about how the basement car park is to be secured 'out of normal' operating hours.

There is a problem with cycle crime and cycle parking around the railway station and any open cycle parking in the area will need to be strictly managed and abandoned cycles culled. A notice to the effect that abandoned cycles will be removed should be clearly visible. There are a number of Sheffield Hoops located around the perimeter of the building. During normal offices hours these will be subject to good surveillance but out of hours there will be less opportunity for surveillance.

The secured cycle parking should not be accessible from the top of the car park ramp.

(Note – the applicants have confirmed direct to the ALO that access is secured by swipe card/key fob and CCTV is to be provided. The ALO is satisfied with this explanation).

Cambridgeshire County Council (Archaeology)

- 6.45 In terms of heritage assets with archaeological importance, it is unlikely that further works in this area would add significant new information. An archaeological works condition is not required.

Wilton Terrace is considered to be locally significant and County Archaeology would advise against the demolition of this terrace. Should the Council be minded to grant the application, it is recommended that the buildings be recorded in accordance with English Heritage guidance. The recording should be commissioned and undertaken at the expense of the developer and secured through the inclusion of a condition of planning permission.

Design and Conservation Panel (Meeting of 14 March 2012)

6.46 The conclusions of the Panel meeting were as follows:

In strategic terms, the Panel considers that the new approach is a great improvement. The change in massing, the handling of the frontage at ground level along Station Road and the greater animation of the frontage to the 'anti-chamber' square to the south are welcomed. The 'kit of parts' proposed for the elevations looks promising but further refinement of the design is still needed, as is further examination of the treatment of stair cores at ground level.

VERDICT –

1. The strategy of the massing, the relationship of the stair core with Station Road, the overall strategy for the elevations and the handling of the public realm, **GREEN (5), AMBER (1)**

2. The 'kit of parts' for the elevations, the handling of the elevations at ground level, the design of the 'fins' and other components and the planting of the terraced area, **GREEN (3), AMBER (2)**

The relevant section of the minutes of the panel meeting(s) is attached to this report as Appendix A.

6.47 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:

Daedalus House, 30 Station Road (Operations Manager,
University of Cambridge Investments Office)
3 Ascham Road
22 Brooklands Avenue
17 Christchurch Street
5 Clarendon Road
17 Clarendon Road (x3)
28 Emery Street

33 Glisson Road
61 Highsett, Hills Road
4 Lyndewode Road
33 Lyndewode Road (x2)
62 Mawson Road
70-72 Norwich Street
15 Shelly Garden
10 St Barnabas Court (x3)
4 St Barnabas Road
27 Silverwood Close
9 Tenison Avenue (x3)
13 Tenison Avenue
25 Tenison Avenue
27 Tenison Avenue
2 Vintner Terrace
8 Thomas Christian Way, Bottisham
5 Cambridge Road Girton
20 Hinton Way, Great Shelford

The representations can be summarised as follows:

7.2 *Comments in support*

The building is of visual quality and interest. The Station Road elevation combines variety, articulation and discipline. The cutting back of the ground floor footprint on the southern corner enlivens the public area and is an element that could be repeated elsewhere on the development.

Concerns and objections

7.3 Loss of Existing Buildings

The existing buildings with their architectural heritage and elegant facades should not be demolished.

The existing buildings are more worthy of listing than the Station buildings.

Wilton Terrace is well above average in terms of design and quality for its period and has been designed to relate to the Station.

Demolition of the existing buildings amounts to vandalism against the wishes of residents.

The existing buildings are some of the better features on Station Road. Already the urban landscape of Station Road has deteriorated through poor design, miserable architecture and zero traffic planning.

Loss of welcoming vista along Station Road.

The only aspect of Station Road, which is good, is the Victorian villas.

A terrace of good, sound, attractive buildings is to be demolished and replaced by an ugly building which does not provide an improvement over the previous scheme.

The terrace does not need to be demolished and could be incorporated into the new development.

More imagination and flexibility should be deployed before it is too late.

7.4 The New Buildings

The buildings are still too large in all dimensions particularly height.

The buildings are too large and dominant and will have an adverse impact e.g. Microsoft. The Design and Access statement overlooks the impact of changing the plot boundary.

The buildings will render Station Road a high-rise corridor/wind tunnel far removed from any human scale.

The buildings will have a negative impact on the listed Station and Mill and Station Road. The new Botanic House building is an example of this and permission should not be given for any more overbearing buildings.

The new buildings are not appropriate in Cambridge and should not be supported.

We should not give visitors arriving by train a first impression of a city that is an unrelieved tunnel of brick and glass modernism

The new buildings constitute over development, cause overshadowing and over-crowding.

Other new buildings impinge on the skyline and do not fit in with the character of the surrounding area.

The Microsoft building already takes light from Tenison Road.

The new buildings are more appropriate for Croydon, Basingstoke, Slough, Dubai, Reading, Watford, Woking

Development amounts to a dreadful legacy for the residents of Cambridge.

The majority of residents agree with strong sentiments against the development.

7.5 Other Issues relating to Trees, Amenity and Parking

Several beautiful trees will need to be removed.

The new buildings will have an adverse effect on nearby residents.

The new buildings will have an adverse effect on the outlook from adjacent offices (Daedalus House)

The Woodlands Surgery is 'being mucked about' and both staff and patients are frustrated.

The level of car parking is inadequate.

Has the level of car parking/cycle parking for all staff been properly planned?

The buildings will generate more traffic.

Street cycle racks are not a good idea.

Commercial development is forcing out residential development and residents are not seeing any benefits. The only gains are

for builders, commercial firms and 'the Council and its many departments'.

7.6 Procedural Issues

The previous application was rejected and so should this application.

The application should be refused as a departure from the Outline consent. If the proposals are pursued this should be as part of a new Outline application.

If the current application is agreed then further full applications could be made each on the basis that it is a variation from the Outline consent or future applications could be made as Reserved Matters. Either way the cumulative impact would exceed the overall parameters of the Masterplan.

Either the decision on the application should be deferred until a variation to the Masterplan which adheres to the aggregate parameters is agreed or the City Council should agree with the applicants that no further full applications can be made until a new Masterplan is agreed.

New Environmental Impact Assessment and Traffic Impact Assessments are needed.

The development is argued to be too small to warrant an EIA but it is also argued that it is consistent with the original EIA – this is inconsistent.

Were there to be a sequence of full applications the traffic generation may be small for each but could exceed the current Masterplan limits cumulatively.

7.7 The s106 Agreement

The full application allows restrictions established by the Outline consent to be avoided and sets a precedent.

The s106 will free the developer from the obligations established by the Outline s106 Agreement. Overall funding of provisions and works is diminished e.g. traffic calming.

Given the commercial success of Microsoft the s106 package should be renegotiated for the whole scheme.

The Full application could be a way of avoiding triggering payments under the original s106 Agreement. A new s106 Agreement should be drawn up on the basis that the current application is deemed to be fulfilling the CB1 Masterplan.

7.8 Brooklands Avenue Area Residents Association has made representations as follows:

The application represents over-development in both height and mass.

A separate full application should not have been submitted rather than a Reserved Matters application. If the full application were to be agreed it would create an unwelcome precedent, and might render the original scheme, agreed at outline stage, redundant.

An Environmental Impact Assessment should be required. The application is not a Reserved Matters application: it is a full stand-alone application and must be viewed entirely on its own merits and not with reference to the CB1 Masterplan agreed in outline.

A full Traffic Impact Assessment is also required; as is consideration of other matters such as car parking, open space provision, accessibility to emergency vehicles and waste collection and demolition of existing buildings.

Height of buildings

Both the old Foster's Mill and the Station itself would be adversely affected by the erection of two massive "glass box" office buildings in such close proximity. The Mill is a significant part of the local skyline and the proposal would breach the policy 3/13. It would also dominate the architecturally important and historic station building that has two storeys.

Demolition of existing buildings

We object to the demolition of the present Victorian terrace on the site, and believe that it should be preserved, as

architecturally in keeping with the properties on the other side of Station Road and of the Station itself. In this connection we further note that the houses are designated as “Buildings of Local Interest.” As indicated above, the case for demolition cannot be deemed as having been agreed, since as a full application this has to be considered from scratch, and cannot ride on the back of the Masterplan outline. Indeed there is a strong argument for retaining the properties in the interest of balance with the similar buildings on the north side of Station Road, and thereby preserving important features of this part of the Central Conservation Area.

For all the above reasons we urge the City Council to reject the proposed applications.

7.9 Cambridge Past Present and Future has made representations as follows:

It is recognised that outline planning permission has already been granted but CambridgePPF believes that the City Council should give very serious consideration to the groundswell of public opinion against the demolition of this Victorian terrace.

The determination of the application should be delayed to allow more time for an assessment of the practicality of retention of Wilton Terrace. CambridgePPF believes that the most sensible course for the Council would be to defer the decision on these applications so that more time can be given to explore the practicality of retaining the terrace and the feasibility of incorporating it into the overall design of the CB1 development.

The terrace is recognised by the City Council as comprising 'Buildings of Local Interest', that could be regarded as being a 'Significant Heritage Asset' to the local community and their demolition would be a loss to the heritage value of the locality.

7.10 Cambridge Cycling Campaign has made representations as follows:

The Campaign supports the application in respect of the provision of cycling facilities. We reiterate the comments we submitted in connection with the previous withdrawn application ref. 11/1303/FUL. We noted then with approval (1) that cycle parking is at ground level, (2) there is ample secured and

sheltered provision, and (3) there is an acceptable number of Sheffield stands around the site for visitors and others looking for convenient and probably short term parking.

While there is a small increase in the number of cycle spaces provided, it is disappointing to note that its locations have been changed. About half of the staff cycle parking in the earlier design was in the central space, with access to the front of the buildings, very much more convenient to the front entrances than in the revised design.

Cycle parking can now only be accessed at the rear of the building, with a long walk around, and creating the temptation to walk down the car ramp to take the lift from there. In fact this application greatly impairs staff access to the cycle parking. We urge that the cycle parking location revert to the earlier design.

7.11 Sustrans has made representations as follows:

More information is needed about how users will move between cycle parking and entrances.

There is concern about access to cycle parking over car park ramp and access from this area into the building and between the main cycle park and the building entrance.

Servicing vehicles may block the main cycle park access.

The external cycle parking areas will need to be managed so that they are available to users of the building only.

7.12 David Campbell Bannerman MEP has also made objections, which relate to the loss of 32-38 Station Road. He considers that the loss of these buildings and the new development to be harmful to the Conservation Area. He considers that the existing buildings have a greater value than suggested by the applicants. In his view the level of harm caused by the loss of 32-38 Station Road heavily outweighs the potential gain of amenity.

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

8.0 ASSESSMENT

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

1. Principle of development
2. Environmental Assessment
3. Context of site, design and external spaces
4. Impact on Heritage Assets
5. Public Art
6. Renewable energy and sustainability
7. Disabled access
8. Residential amenity
9. Refuse arrangements
10. Other environmental impacts
11. Transport Impact
12. Highway safety
13. Car and cycle parking
14. Third party representations
15. Planning Obligation Strategy

Principle of Development

8.2 The application has three key parts demolition of 32-38 Station Road, a realignment of the Southern Access Road (SAR) and the erection of a pair of office buildings. The approved Parameter Plans that form the Masterplan for the Station Area redevelopment include all of these elements and in my view establishes the principle for the development.

Demolition of 32-38 Station Road

8.3 Parameter Plan 1 of the Masterplan indicates 32-38 Station Road as a group of Buildings of Local Interest that are to be demolished. In the report that was considered by Planning Committee in October 2008 the following comment is made about the demolition of these buildings:

‘The applicant has not provided a full justification for the demolition of 32-38 Station Road that will be necessary when an application is made for Conservation Area Consent for its demolition. Clearly Block I2 cannot be developed without removing 32-38 Station Road. The pivotal role that I2 has in the

scheme is considered more fully below but essentially I would conclude that the loss of 32-38 Station Road is justified by the need to increase the density of development across the site in order to achieve the aim of improving the transport interchange. 32-38 Station Road are not worthy of listing and in my view to seek to refuse the masterplan on the grounds that these buildings should be retained alone would be very difficult to substantiate at appeal.'

- 8.4 My views have not changed. The demolition of 32-38 Station Road was thoroughly considered at the Outline Planning stage as part of the Environmental Assessment and in my view, subject to the grant of Conservation Area Consent, the principle of the demolition of 32-38 Station Road is acceptable. I have addressed the issue of demolition in greater depth in the following section 'Impact on Heritage Assets' and in my report for the Conservation Area Consent.
- 8.5 The demolition of 32-38 Station Road will also result in the loss of the doctor's surgery, which occupies part of the building. The loss of such a community facility is contrary to Policy 5/11 of the Local Plan unless the facility is replaced as part of the development, is to be relocated to an equally accessible location or is no longer needed.
- 8.6 There is a continuing need for the surgery and it is not relocated as part of the development therefore the only way in which this policy objection can be overcome is to secure the relocation of the surgery. This was the option that was pursued by the Outline consent and it was secured by the s106 Agreement. I would recommend that the s106 Agreement for this site be similarly worded to secure relocation of the surgery prior to the commencement of 50 Station Road.

Realignment of the Southern Access Road (SAR)

- 8.7 The Outline approval for the Masterplan included approval of access arrangements including the SAR. The SAR was intended to run to the east of Block I2 between Blocks I1 and I2. 50 and 60 Station Road are roughly in the same location as Block I2 and the SAR is to run to the east of them. It will be located slightly further east and on a North/South alignment whereas the previous alignment was NorthNortheast/SouthSouthwest. The realigned SAR will be on

land that was previously going to accommodate Block I1. The principle of the SAR is acceptable because it is in roughly the same location as previously proposed. I have addressed the visual impact and highway safety impact of the realigned SAR in greater depth in the following sections 'Context of site, design and external spaces' and 'Highway Safety' and in my reports for the Non Material Amendment and discharge of Condition 48 of the Outline Planning consent.

The New Office Buildings

- 8.8 The Outline approval for the Masterplan shows Block I2 as an office building with the potential for retail use along the North (Station Road) and East (SAR) elevations. The proposed development accords with this disposition of uses within a pair of buildings that have a larger footprint.
- 8.9 The quantum of development is much greater than for Block I2 because the footprint of the site is larger including land that was previously going to form the SAR and part of the adjacent Block I1. The accommodation schedule for the Masterplan shows an indicative floorspace of 11506 sq m for Block I2 that compares with 16427 sq m now proposed. Whilst it is important to remember that this is a freestanding application the floorspace that is proposed does not exceed the overall office floorspace permitted by the Outline Consent.
- 8.10 In my view the office/retail use and the quantum of floorspace proposed are acceptable in principle. My assessment addresses the impacts of the office development in greater depth.

The Fall Back Position

- 8.11 In considering the principle of development it is also important to have an awareness of the 'fall back position'. In this case if planning permission is refused the applicants could revert to the Outline Planning Permission and bring forward a 'reserved matters' submission. If this submission accorded with the constraints set out by the Parameter Plans including the 75% build out of Block I2 it would be very difficult to justify a refusal. Such an application, if approved would result in the construction of a building of radically different scale to the prevailing character of the Station Area prior in 2008 but one which would

be compatible with the buildings currently under construction. In my view, given the fall back position, it would be sensible to focus consideration on whether the design and appearance of the building is appropriate to its context and not on whether a 9 storey building is acceptable in principle.

Restriction on occupation of office development

- 8.12 Policy 7/2 of the Local Plan permits new office development for occupation by a business that can demonstrate that it provides an essential service for Cambridge as a local or sub-regional centre or exceptionally where there is a proven need for a regional function only. This is sometimes known as a 'local user condition'. The s106 Agreement for the outline application secures such control over the future occupation of office development within the scheme and it is necessary to secure the same arrangement for this proposal. This can be achieved through the s106 Agreement.
- 8.13 In my opinion, the principle of the development is acceptable and in accordance with policies 3/1 and 9/9 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006.

Context of site, design and external spaces

- 8.14 In my view the following issues are of relevance to this part of my Assessment:

The Masterplan, Parameter Plans and the Design and Access Statement for the Outline application

Footprint of the building in comparison with approved Masterplan

Building Design – Layout

Building Design – Height

Building Design – Elevations and Materials

Building Design – Phasing

External Space – Realignment of the SAR

External Space – Design and Materials

External Space – Tree removal and planting

Nature Conservation

The Masterplan, Parameter Plans and the Design and Access Statement for the Outline application

8.15 The development is not constrained by the approved Parameter Plans in the same way as applications for reserved matters. However in assessing whether or not the design of the building is appropriate for its context it is useful to consider the Parameter Plans and the assumptions that underpin them. The parameter plans set a threshold on matters such as the footprint and height of the blocks as they come forward in their detailed form and the approvals of the parameter plans were predicated on the assumption that buildings of such height and mass would be acceptable in the context of the site.

8.16 The key Parameter Plans that relate to the design of buildings and spaces are:

- PP3 Building Layout (+ maximum balcony/canopy overhang 1.5m)
- PP4 Building and Ground Conditions (building height (maximum height of occupied floorspace + maximum plant/lift motor rooms 2 m), building height above proposed ground level, proposed ground level (+/- 0.5m tolerance), existing ground level and proposed ground floor setback)
- PP6 Public Realm and Open Space

The Design and Access Statement that was submitted to support the Outline application informed these Parameter Plans.

8.17 Block I2 that is approved for this part of the Masterplan was always intended to be the largest new block in the scheme. In the report that was considered by Planning Committee in October 2008 the following comment is made about Block I2:

'Part of the argument in favour of a tall building on Block I2 is that in order to fulfil the key aim of providing for a high quality transport interchange a certain level of development will need to be brought forward to fund such a facility. Insurmountable constraints in terms of the setting of the listed Station buildings, the Mill and Silo, the desire to create a civic space in front of the Station surrounded by buildings of an appropriate scale to the space with fixed parapet height and the proximity of development of a domestic scale at the edges of the site lead to the only conclusion that if a tall building is to go anywhere it can only be accommodated on the site of Block I2.'

- 8.18 At the time of the Outline consent concerns were expressed about the impact, which a building that extended to the maximum parameter plan envelope could have on the site context. For this reason the maximum floor area of the block was set at 75% of the block as a whole. The Design and Access Statement set out how such a volume may be brought forward for example by providing two linked blocks with a full height atrium.
- 8.19 The architects for 50 and 60 Station Road have revisited the Design and Access Statement. In particular they have considered massing, rhythm, height and articulation. The pair of buildings that is proposed reflects the two linked buildings massing option that was set out the Design and Access Statement. The rhythm of building volumes and open spaces along Station Road is also respected and the pair of buildings is set forward in the street that was another key requirement of the original Design and Access Statement.
- 8.20 60 Station Road is one storey higher than 50 Station Road that supports the principle established by the Masterplan that building height should increase along Station Road and culminate in this location. The assumption that Block I2 would only be built out to 75% of its potential development envelope also means that the building needs to be strongly articulated to reduce its mass. The proposed buildings have achieved this and I explain this in more detail below.
- 8.21 The applicants have clearly considered the key elements of the original Design and Access Statement for this part of the Station Area Development. In general the principles of the Design and Access Statement have been respected. The main difference

between the approved Parameter Plans and the development that is being brought forward is the extent of the footprint of the block.

Footprint of the building in comparison with approved Masterplan

- 8.22 A plan has been provided which shows the maximum approved footprint of Blocks I1 and I2 and the approved alignment of the SAR overlaid on the current scheme. This plan shows that the western edge of the SAR is to be relocated between 11 m and 19 m to the east. The eastern elevation of the new building is positioned between 11 m and 16 m beyond the eastern edge of Block I2 as approved. On the Station Road frontage the proposed buildings are 11 m or 20% wider than the approved Block I2 and to the rear 16 m or 30% wider.
- 8.23 The footprint of the pair of buildings is much greater than the approved maximum footprint for Block I2. However the detailed design of the buildings reduces their visual impact significantly.

Building Design – Layout

- 8.24 The pair of buildings presents a frontage to Station Road 56 m wide. From second floor level upwards there is a 9 m wide gap between the two buildings and the floor plans for each block are rectangular. At ground and first floor levels the main part of each building is set back approximately 6 m under a colonnade. Within the colonnade are two double height glazed projections that serve as reception areas. Between the two buildings at first floor level is a glazed 'pod' that is accessible from both buildings and could serve as a meeting space. The stair core serving 60 Station Road projects from the Northeast corner of the building at Station Road/SAR.
- 8.25 A retail space is accommodated in the Southeast Corner of 60 Station Road. It is also set back under a colonnade by approximately 2.8 m facing the SAR and between 2 m and 5.8 m to the rear facing the public square. The south eastern corner of the building is chamfered under this double height colonnade and the southern elevation at ground and first floor level is set at an angle. An access road wraps around the rear of the building serving the basement car park, cycle store and servicing area.

8.26 The layout of the building at ground and first floor level is highly articulated i.e. it is not a simple ‘boxlike’ structure. The double height colonnade and the ‘cutting back’ of the south elevation help to give the building a ‘human scale’ on the street and significantly reduce its mass and bulk at the lower levels; in my view the design is appropriate to its context in this regard. The street frontage of the building is greater than that envisaged when Block I2 was under consideration but given the degree of articulation and the success of the gap between the two buildings in my view this is an acceptable deviation from the Masterplan.

Building Design – Height

8.27 The overall height of the building is not constrained by the Outline Planning Consent in this case. However it is useful to compare the proposed scheme with the approved Parameter Plans. This will enable a consideration to be made about how well the building will sit in the overall Masterplan.

Table – Comparison between approved Parameter Plans and Proposed Development		
	60 Station Road	50 Station Road
Parameter Plan Height occupied floorspace	34.1m	34.1m
Parameter Plan Height including Plant/Lift Overrun	36.1m	36.1m
Proposed Height occupied floorspace	32.4m	28.5m
Proposed Height including Plant/Lift Overrun	36.1m	32.4m
Proposed Height to Parapet	32.8m	29m

Proposed Height to Stair Tower	35.4	n/a
Proposed Top Floor Set Back North elevation/Station Road 9 (excluding stair tower)	4.6m	4.6m
Proposed Top Floor Set Back South elevation/Public Square (excluding stair core)	4.6m	4.6m

- 8.28 The table demonstrates that both buildings sit within the parameters for the maximum height of Block I2. 60 Station Road is proposed to be one storey taller than 50 Station Road at 9 storeys plus roof plant. I share the views of the Urban Design and Conservation Team that this is the correct approach and that it is an advantage over the earlier (2011) scheme for the site. 60 needs to be a more dominant structure to meet the vision of the Masterplan which is to have increasing building heights along the south side of Station Road culminating at this point.
- 8.29 The stair tower on the north eastern corner of number 60 further emphasises the visual importance of this building and provides a highly appropriate visual end stop for the access on the opposite side of Station Road. Number 50 is subservient in terms of height and this combined with the absence of any projecting stair tower reduces the visual impact of number 50 in relation to number 60 on Station Road.
- 8.30 To the south the height differential also works well. The taller number 60 will sit opposite the tallest block in the Blue Phase at 22.5m forming the south and north sides of a new public space. Number 50, at its lower height will sit more comfortably with the existing block on Warren Close.

- 8.31 I have no objections to the approach that has been adopted to building height. Both buildings will sit well with other building in this part of the Masterplan.

Building Design – Elevations and Materials

- 8.32 The treatment of the elevations and the material are very similar for the two buildings. The predominant material is reconstituted stone which is used to set up a grid which wraps around both buildings. Glazing is set back behind the stone grid and at roof level where the building is set back zinc panels and glazing is used.

Station Road

- 8.33 The Station Road elevation is crucial in marking the arrival point for the building and addressing what is the most important street in the Masterplan Area. The stair tower to number 60 is a deliberately dominant feature and will have a significant impact on the streetscene. It will be finished in natural stone and glazing which will allow views into the internal staircase. The stair tower projects from the front of the building on a triangular footprint and will be visible to users of Station Road traveling east or west. It will provide a good visual termination for the linear open space on the south side of Station Road and the access road opposite.
- 8.34 The colonnade allows the buildings to be set back from the street at ground and first floor level but the solidity is maintained internally so that the buildings ‘meet the street’ and an appropriate base is provided. The Addendum to the Design and Access Statement explains how the solid element behind the reception area would work. The Urban Design and Conservation Team are satisfied with the revised details.
- 8.35 The first floor pod that projects out from between the two buildings sits on a concrete slab and is fully glazed; it has a ‘green’ roof. The glazed upper floors behind the stone grid provide an appropriate ‘middle’ section for the building and are reminiscent of the Deity buildings to the west. The double height grid on the upper floors below parapet level invigorates the facade and helps to reduce the mass and bulk to the buildings.

8.36 At roof level the set back reduces the impact of the uppermost floors. The Urban Design and Conservation Team raised concerns in relation to the appearance of the plant room. In response the architects have revised the plans to ensure that the plant room is reduced in scale and has a form and design that works well with the lower floors. The views that are included in the addendum to the Design and Access Statement demonstrate that the appearance of the plant room is radically reduced and the façade treatment and stair tower dominate the Station Road elevation. The Urban Design and Conservation Team are satisfied with the revised plans.

Elevations to Public Space/SAR/Warren Close Access Road

8.37 These elevations of the buildings are more subtle than the Station Road elevation. 60 Station Road retains its two-storey colonnade to the south but 50 Station Road does not. This approach is appropriate because the cycle store is located to the south of 50 Station Road. The gap between the two buildings is maintained above ground floor level and access is provided to the ramp serving the underground car park and the cycle parking area at ground/semi basement level.

8.38 The elevation to the SAR includes the projecting stair tower, which is glazed to allow full view of the stairs, and the colonnade continues along this elevation. The principle of the stone grid is followed but the vertical spacing becomes tighter at the northern end to reflect the internal arrangements of the building. The same method is employed on the west elevation of 50 Station Road where it faces the Warren Close access road to accommodate the stair core, which is a much less dominant feature on this building. There is no colonnade on the western side where the building sits flush with the pavement.

8.39 In my view the treatment of the elevations and the choice of materials are very successful. The elevational treatment will reduce the scale of what was always to be a significant building in the Masterplan and the materials reflect the need to produce buildings of high quality as part of the redevelopment of this area.

Building Design – Phasing

- 8.40 The pair of buildings has been designed so that they can either be built together or as two separate phases. The applicant explains in the Design and Access Statement that this assists in the viability of the development. It is likely that Number 60 would come forward first because it occupies a site that is currently vacant. The Design and Access Statement illustrates what the streetscene would be like if only Number 60 is built. Although there is a great disparity between the proposed height of Number 60 and the existing height of 32-38 Station Road this is not uncommon in this area of Major Change. I do not think that there is any justification for requiring that the development be carried out as one project or that this can be controlled.

External Space – Realignment of the SAR

- 8.41 The realignment of the SAR is not significant in itself but it does introduce changes to the external environment around the proposed buildings and the wider Masterplan. The SAR previously had an alignment that formed part of a wider grid of routes through the site to the rear of the blocks fronting the Station Square and the Bus Interchange. The function of this route is unchanged by the realignment but the visual impact is altered. Instead of forming a crossroad with the access running to the North side of Station Road the SAR is off set and the stair tower to Number 60 closes the vista. The grid of routes through the area was considered to be of importance to the Masterplan but I do not think it was given such a degree of importance that it is sacrosanct. The realignment of the SAR is crucial to the delivery of the development on this site and in my view should be supported.

External Space – Design and Materials

- 8.42 The development delivers the SAR and completes another part of the public square to the south. The SAR will be surfaced in asphalt with red granite setts to mark the junction and the entry into the public square. This treatment continues into the servicing space and entry to the car park/cycle park. The public square and the hard surfaced areas around the building will be finished in paving slabs to match the hard surfacing elsewhere on CB1.

8.43 There are six types of planted area in and around the building:

Tree planting to the Station Road and SAR frontages (see below)

A Green Roof on the projecting pod to the Station Road frontage

Sedum roofs on the cycle shelter

Pleached lime trees on the wall to the service area

An elevated terrace garden over the Car Park ramp to the south.

A roof terrace on the top floor of each building

The details of these planting areas are set out in the Landscape Proposals document. Both the terrace areas are accessible to people occupying the buildings.

8.44 On street cycle parking is accommodated on the Station Road and SAR frontage. The revised plans reduce the amount of parking to Station Road, which I think is appropriate given that this is the entrance to the buildings and needs to be unobstructed physically and visually. There are still a large number of on street cycle space alongside the SAR. This parking extends 29 metres along the SAR with no breaks to allow for crossing the road. I have asked the applicant to reconsider this arrangement and will report back on the Amendment Sheet or orally at the meeting.

External Space – Tree removal and planting

8.45 There are existing trees in front of and behind 32-38 Station Road which will all be removed as part of the development. Agreement in principle to the removal of these trees was given as part of the Outline Planning permission.

8.46 New trees are to be planted as part of the development in the form of five small leafed lime trees on the Station Road frontage and four pear trees on the SAR. The lime trees have an ultimate height and spread of 10 m by 4.5 m and the pear trees 8 m by 3 m.

Nature Conservation

8.47 The Ecology report that supports the application refers to the wider scheme for ecological mitigation that has already been

agreed in relation to the wider development. The contribution that this site is to make is in terms of tree and shrub planting, features such as kestrel boxes and bat tubes are proposed on adjacent buildings. The additional information that has been submitted clarifies this point and both the City Council's Nature Conservation Officer and Natural England support this approach.

Conclusion - Context of site, design and external spaces

8.48 Officers have worked hard with the architects and landscape consultants to address the concerns raised in relation to the earlier (2011) application. In my view this work has been fruitful and the revised plans show that the building will be of a very high quality, which is crucial for this part of the Masterplan. The well articulated frontage to Station Road would not appear dominant and overbearing as suggested by some of the comments made by third party representations. The projecting stair core will provide a focal point on Station Road and the building, as a whole will portray a very positive image to anyone visiting the City for the first time in my view.

I am concerned by the comments made that the building is not suitable for Cambridge and would be more at home in other cities/towns. I feel that this stems from a lack of understanding about the detailed design of the buildings and the way in which the materials will work together. I have requested a model from the applicants and this will be available at Committee to aid understanding of these two issues.

8.49 In my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 3/4, 3/7, 3/11, 3/12.

Impact on Heritage Assets

8.50 The application is supported by a Heritage Statement as required by paragraph 128 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). Officers in the Urban Design and Conservation Team have not raised any concerns about this analysis and support the scheme subject to the imposition of planning conditions to address matters of detail.

8.51 The applicants have correctly identified the heritage assets that are affected by the development as 32-38 Station Road which

are Buildings of Local Interest (BLIs) and the Conservation Area including the Station and associated buildings, the villas on the north side of Station Road and the Mill. The NPPF includes buildings that are locally listed in the definition of a heritage asset.

- 8.52 The significance of 32-38 Station Road has been assessed using the NPPF and English Heritage's document Conservation Principles, Policies and Guidance 2008. The aspects of moderate significance have been identified as the evidential value as an example of a late Victorian terrace, which has been the subject of removal of some features of interest and the aesthetic value of the front elevation. Aspects of low significance included the historical value, communal value, the south/east/west elevations, the interior and the setting. No elements of high significance were recognised. The level of significance of this part of the Conservation Area is considered by the applicant to be moderate. This is because 32-38 Station makes a moderate contribution to the character.
- 8.53 The demolition of 32-38 Station Road is addressed in some detail in my report about the application for Conservation Area Consent (CAC). That report concludes that the CAC should be supported provided that the replacement buildings are an appropriate replacement that will enhance the Conservation Area.
- 8.54 The Senior Conservation Officer's view on the CAC is as follows:
- 'The loss of BLIs in a prominent location in the CA is always a matter for regret and the policies at national & local level are against such a loss except in cases where there is a demonstrable benefit to be derived. In this case, the decision makers who granted outline permission for the 'masterplan' were aware of the presumed demolition and assessed it to be worthwhile. All the discussions about the replacement building were predicated on the design having to be assessed as of suitable quality to meet the policy 'tests'.'
- 8.55 I am convinced that the new office buildings will be a positive asset to the Conservation Area. The Design and Conservation Panel, English Heritage and the Urban Design and

Conservation Team share my view. These views provide the necessary justification for the demolition of 32-38 Station Road.

- 8.56 In my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 4/11 and 4/12 and guidance provided by the NPPF.

Public Art

- 8.57 The application does not bring forward any detailed proposals for public art. It is anticipated that this will be secured via the s106 Agreement that will require the submission and approval of a Public Art Delivery Plan. In my view this is an appropriate way forward. I would normally expect a development of this scale to include public art proposals within the planning application, however in this case I do not think this is essential.
- 8.58 Although the application is a 'freestanding' full planning application in my view public art must be considered in the wider CB1 Masterplan context. The applicants are happy with this approach. A CB1 Public Art Strategy has already been agreed and pre-submission discussions have commenced on a proposal for public art in Station Road. It seems sensible to me that this site should be part of that proposal and this can be secured via Public Art Delivery Plan.
- 8.59 Subject to the submission and approval of a Public Art Delivery Plan, in my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan (2003) policies P6/1 and 9/8 and Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 3/7 and 10/1 and the Public Art SPD 2010

Renewable energy and sustainability

- 8.60 The application is supported by an Energy and Sustainability Statement and BREEAM Pre-Assessment. A Sustainable Development Checklist has also been completed. Both the Senior Sustainability Officer and the Sustainable Drainage Officer have been working closely with the applicant's consultants.
- 8.61 The Energy and Sustainability Statement and the further information submitted by the applicants indicate that the emphasis of their approach has been through passive design

such as improved building fabric and external shading. The Senior Sustainability Officer is satisfied with this approach and accepts that the development is not strictly compliant with Policy 8/16. The approach to meeting BREEAM 'excellent' and the overall levels of carbon reduction being achieved are fully supported.

- 8.62 I have encouraged the applicants to give further consideration to the use of photovoltaic panels and will report back on the Amendment Sheet or orally at the meeting.
- 8.63 The development is within an Area of Major Change within with SUDS should be investigated. The Sustainable Drainage Officer does not raise objections to the approach adopted by the drainage engineers but further work is needed. I have recommended conditions to capture the need for this.
- 8.64 In my opinion the applicants have suitably addressed the issue of sustainability and renewable energy and the proposal is in accordance with the Sustainable Design and Construction SPD 2007.

Disabled access

- 8.65 The Design and Access Statement does not address the question of disabled access in any great depth. However the Access Officer has no objections. He has raised a few issues that can be dealt with by conditions/informatives.
- 8.66 In my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 3/7 and 3/12.

Residential Amenity

Impact on amenity of neighbouring occupiers

Warren Close

- 8.67 The closest residential units are the flats on Warren Close development to the south of the site of 50 Station Road. A single block accommodates numbers 130 to 153 Warren Close. This block sits approximately 9 metres off the site boundary at its closest point and will be 21 metres from the main body of the office building. Car parking which serves the flats sits adjacent

to the boundary. The flat block is 6 storeys high and therefore not an insubstantial building in itself but 50 Station Road will be two storeys higher plus roof plant. The principle outlook from the flats is toward the open space to the south but there are some secondary windows and the stair core on the north elevation facing the application site.

- 8.68 The new buildings will sit to the north of the existing flat block, which means the flats will overshadow the offices and not the other way around. The key residential impacts therefore arise from overlooking, increased sense of enclosure, loss of privacy and noise and disturbance.

Overlooking and loss of privacy

- 8.69 There is potential for overlooking or interlooking between the offices and the flats but the impact of this is reduced significantly by the size and secondary nature of window on the north side of the flats. The only internal space that will be overlooked is the stair core and externally the car park. I do not consider that this will be an adverse impact and could be argued as a benefit in terms of natural surveillance.

Increased sense of enclosure

- 8.70 The relative scale of the buildings will lead to an increased feeling of enclosure particularly in the car park area serving the flats. However this is more than compensated for by the larger public space that will be provided to the northeast.

Noise and disturbance

- 8.71 The location of the access to the car park and the cycle park may generate additional noise to the north of the flats but in my view the level of disturbance unlikely to be significant. The Environmental Health Officer (EHO) has recommended conditions relating to construction activities, opening times, plant noise and odour that I have included in my recommendation.
- 8.72 The other flats within Warren Close will be further away from the development and will not be significantly affected once the buildings are completed. It is worth noting that no

representations have been received from residents of Warren Close.

CB1 Blue Phase

- 8.73 This phase of the CB1 development is currently under construction to the south of the application site. Block L1 is the closest to the site. It will be located 15 metres from the site boundary and there will be a minimum building-to-building distance of 30 metres. The space between Block L1 and 60 Station Road will form the new public space between the Park and the Station Square.
- 8.74 Block L1 is a substantial building at 7 storeys but 60 Station Road will be two storeys higher plus roof plant. The orientation is favourable in terms of overshadowing and the impacts on residential amenity will be similar to those described in relation to the Warren Close flats. The key difference is that some flats in Block L1 have a principal outlook toward the new offices; however the potential overlooking impact is mitigated to some degree by the separation distance of 30 metres.
- 8.75 In my opinion the proposal adequately respects the residential amenity of its neighbours and the constraints of the site and I consider that it is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 3/4 and 3/7.

Refuse Arrangements

- 8.76 Space for storage of waste is provided in the basement and a collection point is identified adjacent to the service bay. The EHO is content with this arrangement subject to a condition to secure the detailed arrangements. The Waste Management Strategy that has been submitted references the RECAP Waste Management Design Guide.
- 8.77 In my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policy 3/12 and conforms to the RECAP Waste Management Design Guide.

Other environmental impacts

8.78 The EHO has identified the following issues as of relevance to the consideration of the application. I have set out below my recommendations on how they can be addressed.

- Construction Phase Impacts – these can be addressed by the imposition of a condition to require the submission and approval of a Construction Method Statement. I can see no reason why this should not be related to the Construction Environmental Management Plan that has been agreed for the wider site.
- Road traffic noise – I have recommended a condition that will enable suitable glazing to be installed to address this issue.
- Plant noise – I have recommended a condition to secure details of plant to protect the amenity of neighbours.
- Odour – the occupier of the retail/café area is not yet known and I have recommended a condition to secure odour controls should this prove necessary.
- Opening Times – I have recommended a condition that restricts opening times and deliveries to the retail/café/office uses.
- Air Quality – the EHO is satisfied that the level of car parking is such that it will not have an adverse impact on air quality.
- Contaminated land – the eastern part of the site (60 Station Road) has been adequately assessed but a condition is required to address the western part (50 Station Road).

8.79 In my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 4/13 and 4/14.

Transport Impact

- 8.80 The application is supported by a Transport Assessment (TA) that has been carried out under the guidance of the County Council. The TA addresses the existing conditions, the proposed development, trip generation and assignment and junction capacity. It concludes that the impact of additional traffic will have a minimal effect on the operation of the Station Road/Tenison Road and Hills Road/Station Road junctions. It also asserts that the proposed traffic is likely to replace outgoing traffic from the existing development and that there will be a reduction in traffic on Station Road arising from fewer bus movements.
- 8.81 The County Council have reviewed the TA and have not raised any concerns about the conclusions that have been reached.
- 8.82 The s106 Agreement associated with the Outline planning consent required improvements to the Hills Road/Station Road junction prior to the commencement of occupation of the Red Phase of the development. The application site is within the Red Phase but its occupation will not automatically trigger the junction improvements because it would be a freestanding permission. Given that this trigger was regarded as an appropriate timescale for the impact of the CB1 development to begin to affect the use of the junction it is my view that it would be reasonable to link the occupation of 50 or 60 Station Road to the completion of the improvement works via the s106 Agreement.
- 8.83 In a similar way the s106 Agreement associated with the Outline planning consent allowed commuted payments towards SCATP and the CGB to be deferred from the first/Yellow Phase to the Red Phase. This was to reduce the burden of commuted payments in addition to payments to Network Rail for improvements to the Station. Although the development of 50 and 60 would not automatically trigger the payment of these deferred sums it is appropriate to secure them via the s106 Agreement on the basis that the trigger point of the commencement of the Red Phase has effectively been reached. The applicant is happy with this approach.
- 8.84 The applicants have provided a detailed study of the floorspace proposed against floorspace permitted and have taken the

deferred payments into account. This results in a contribution towards SCATP of £221, 181 and CGB of £785,022. I have set out below a comparison between this figure and that required via the Outline s106 for Block I2 only in my section on Planning Obligations.

- 8.85 In my view the works to the junction and the commuted payments towards SCATP and CGB adequately address the transport impacts of the development. In my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 8/2, 9/9 and 10/1.

Highway Safety

- 8.86 The application includes the realignment of the Southern Access Road and the detailed access arrangement for the building. The Highway Authority has raised no objection to these details on the grounds of highway safety. However the volume of traffic generated by the development, in conjunction with anticipated additional traffic from the wider development triggers the need for improvements to be made to the Hills Road/Station Road junction. These improvements will need to be secured via the s106 Agreement.
- 8.87 In my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policy 8/2.

Car and Cycle Parking

Car Parking

- 8.88 A total of 60 car parking spaces are provided in the basement including six spaces that are large enough for use by disabled people. The potential for a phased development has been addressed by the design which allows the car park ramp and 30 spaces to be provided in the first phase for 60 Station Road and a further 30 spaces for 50 Station Road when it is completed.
- 8.89 The adopted car parking standards allow for a maximum of one car parking space per 100 m² of office floorspace and disabled parking only for retail uses. By application of these standards a maximum of 164 car parking spaces could be provided. The level of provision is much lower than this maximum. In my view

this is appropriate given the highly accessible nature of the site by non-car modes and the low level of air quality.

8.90 The applicant has clarified the size of car parking spaces and aisle widths. The size of spaces is compatible with other development in the wider site and the fact that the car parking will be managed and allocated means that the size of spaces can be reduced. The Highways Authority officer still maintains some concerns about the size of spaces. Whilst I can understand his view I accept the applicant's argument that the car parking is in a managed and controlled space.

8.91 The Highway Authority officer has raised the issue of the potential adverse impact of overspill parking in adjacent residential areas. Residents also raised concerns about the potential for this at the Development Control Forum.

8.92 This issue was addressed in the s106 Agreement for the Outline consent via a car parking survey. I would recommend that a similar requirement be included in the s106 Agreement for this application. This will require a pre and post development parking survey to be carried out and mitigation measures in the form of a Residents Parking Zone put into place if that is the wish of residents. In my view this is an appropriate way to tackle what I recognise as a significant area of concern for residents and is consistent with the Outline consent.

8.93 I have recommended a condition to ensure that disabled parking spaces are made available to those who need them.

Cycle Parking

8.94 The application has been revised so that a total of 576 cycle parking spaces are located in and around the building. 26 spaces are to be allocated for use by the retail units and the remainder (550) will be available for the offices. Application of the adopted cycle parking standards indicates that up to 27 spaces should be provided for use by the retail units and 260 spaces for 50 Station Road and 287 spaces for 60 Station Road a total of 547 cycle spaces. The cycle parking provision accords with planning policy in terms of overall numbers. I have recommended a condition that addresses the issue of phasing of the development.

8.95 The cycle parking as revised delivers cycle parking in four ways:

- Ground level cycle parking on Sheffield stands between the office buildings (60 spaces)
- Ground level parking on double stackers in a cycle store to the rear of 50 Station Road (212 spaces)
- Basement/lower level parking under the cycle store behind 50 Station Road (176 spaces)
- 128 spaces on Sheffield stands adjacent to Station Road, the Southern Access Road and to rear of 60 Station Road.

8.96 I support the concept of a mix of types of cycle parking (67% double stackers/33% Sheffield stands). In order to accommodate the number of cycle spaces needed the revised plans have introduced a basement and increased the amount of double stackers. The proportion of upper level cycle spaces is 34% with ground level i.e. Sheffield and lower level on the stacked spaces is 66%. This does not compare favourably with the approved Microsoft scheme where a 25% proportion of upper level spaces were negotiated. I have asked the applicant to review cycle parking provision again and will report back on the Amendment Sheet or orally at the meeting.

8.97 22% of cycle parking is on street. This has a visual impact that I have addressed above and is challenging in terms of availability for use by the occupiers of the development and their visitors. I have raised this issue with the applicants and their response is that the CB1 'estate' will be a managed environment and they consider the occupiers of the building and the Management Company will be able to control the use of cycle parking spaces. They have submitted a Cycle Parking Management Plan that details how this will work.

8.98 The Cycle Parking Management Plan includes a cycle parking management strategy, which will consist of the following:

- Discreet signage on the stands to deter authorised use

- Allocation of a space on arrival for visitors
- Active surveillance of cycle parking
- Registration of cycles used by staff and the issue of a Bicycle Permit to be displayed on the cycle
- Requests for immediate removal of unauthorised cycle by concierge
- Removal of unauthorised cycles within 24 hours of two written warnings.

A similar system currently operates at the Mott MacDonald Offices on Station Road. In my view this level of control is acceptable and will ensure that cycle parking space is available for authorised users only. I have recommended a condition to secure compliance with the Cycle Parking Management Plan.

8.99 The applicants have also revised the Travel Plan to address the concerns raised by the Cycling and Walking Officer. This document sets out how users of the buildings will be encouraged to use non-car modes of transport. The implementation of the Travel Plan needs to be secured by the s106 Agreement and secured by condition.

8.100 In my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 8/6 and 8/10.

Third Party Representations

8.101 I have addressed the majority of the issues raised via third party representations above. The following table indicates the relevant sections of my Assessment.

Issue	Reference
Loss of Existing Buildings	Impact on Heritage Assets
The New Buildings	Context of site, design and external spaces
Other Issues relating to Trees, Amenity and Parking	Context of site, design and external spaces Residential amenity

	Car and cycle parking
Loss of outlook from Daedalus House	The impact of new development on the occupation of offices is not as sensitive as the impact on residents. In this case Daedalus House is separated from the site by the Warren Close access and is itself to be replaced as part of the wider redevelopment.

Third party representations also raise concerns about procedural issues and the s106 Agreement.

Procedural Issues

8.102 *The previous application was rejected and so should this application.*

The previous application was withdrawn and therefore has very little weight in the determination of the current application.

8.103 *The application should be refused as a departure from the Outline consent. If the proposals are pursued this should be as part of a new Outline application.*

The application is for full planning permission and must be decided on its own merits. The fact that it is a departure from the Masterplan is not a material consideration or grounds for refusal because the Masterplan does not have any status as planning policy or a guidance document.

The Planning Authority has no power to insist that a new Outline application be submitted.

8.104 *If the current application is agreed then further full applications could be made each on the basis that it is a variation from the Outline consent or future applications could be made as Reserved Matters. Either way the cumulative impact would exceed the overall parameters of the Masterplan.*

Were there to be a sequence of full applications the traffic generation may be small for each but could exceed the current Masterplan limits cumulatively.

If further full planning applications are made the Planning Authority must determine them. There is a potential for the overall parameters of the Masterplan to be exceeded in such a scenario but cumulative impact would be a material consideration.

8.105 *Either the decision on the application should be deferred until a variation to the Masterplan which adheres to the aggregate parameters is agreed or the City Council should agree with the applicants that no further full applications can be made until a new Masterplan is agreed.*

The Planning Authority has no powers to do this. There are no grounds to defer making a decision on the application in my view or for resisting any further full applications.

8.106 *New Environmental Impact Assessment and Traffic Impact Assessments are needed.*

The applicants have requested a Screening Opinion under the Environmental Impact Regulations to establish whether an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) is needed. This is supported by a Legal Opinion by a leading Counsel in this field. The response to the Screening Opinion has been published and the conclusion is that an EIA cannot be required because the development is below the threshold set by the regulations.

A Transport Assessment has been carried out that has been reviewed by the County Council Transport team.

8.107 *The development is argued to be too small to warrant an EIA but it is also argued that it is consistent with the original EIA – this is inconsistent.*

The Counsel's advice provided by the applicants concludes that the Planning Authority cannot lawfully require an EIA and the Council's legal officers support this view. I acknowledge the inconsistency in the applicant's submission and have regarded

reference to the original EIA as a matter of fact but which does not have a bearing on the outcome of this application.

8.108 *The determination of the application should be delayed to allow more time for an assessment of the practicality of retention of Wilton Terrace*

I do not consider that this is a justifiable reason to delay the determination of either the planning application or the application for Conservation Area Consent. The applicants have been working for some time on a scheme that is predicated on the removal of the terrace and this is supported by the Parameter Plans. It is interesting to note that 125 Hills Road is a Building of Local Interest, which, during the determination of the Outline consent, was 'saved' from demolition and is indicated on the Parameter Plan as to be retained. This building has been successfully integrated into Block M6. In my view if it was felt that 32-38 Station Road should also be retained and integrated into the development then this should have been secured as the Outline Planning stage.

The s106 Agreement

8.109 *The full application allows restrictions established by the Outline consent to be avoided and sets a precedent.*

The s106 will free the developer from the obligations established by the Outline s106 Agreement. Overall funding of provisions and works is diminished e.g. traffic calming.

The Full application could be a way of avoiding triggering payments under the original s106 Agreement. A new s106 Agreement should be drawn up on the basis that the current application is deemed to be fulfilling the CB1 Masterplan.

The impact of this development needs to be mitigated in the same way as the Outline application. I have set out in the following section the mitigation measures that will be secured via the s106 Agreement which are the same as for the Outline application for this block. I have ensured that no mitigation measures are 'avoided'.

The commencement of the Red Phase of the CB1 development within which this site primarily falls triggers payments towards the Southern Corridor Area Transport Plan (SCATP) and the Cambridge Guided Bus (CGB) both for the Red Phase and payments that were deferred from the earlier Yellow Phase (student accommodation). The applicants have given a commitment to make these deferred payments in addition to those required in connection with the development of 50/60 Station Road.

It is proposed that the s106 Agreement includes a paragraph that effectively removes the requirement for the applicant to make payments in accordance with the original s106 when building works commence. This is to avoid double counting and is entirely reasonable in my view. It does not mean that the applicant is seeking to avoid the obligations laid down in the s106 Agreement associated with the Outline consent.

8.110 *Given the commercial success of Microsoft the s106 package should be renegotiated for the whole scheme.*

The application relates to 50/60 Station Road only and does not open up the opportunity to renegotiate the s106 package as a whole.

Planning Obligations

Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010

8.111 The Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010 have introduced the requirement for all local authorities to make an assessment of any planning obligation in relation to three tests. If the planning obligation does not pass the tests then it is unlawful. The tests are that the planning obligation must be:

- (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.

8.112 In bringing forward my recommendations in relation to the Planning Obligation for this development I have considered

these requirements. The Planning Obligation Strategy (2010) provides a framework for expenditure of financial contributions collected through planning obligations. The Affordable Housing Supplementary Planning Document 2008 provides guidance in terms of the provision of affordable housing and the Public Art Supplementary Planning Document 2010 addresses requirements in relation to public art (amend/delete as applicable). The applicants have indicated their willingness to enter into a S106 planning obligation in accordance with the requirements of the Strategy and relevant Supplementary Planning Documents. The proposed development triggers the requirement for the following community infrastructure:

S106 Agreement relating to the Outline Planning Consent

8.113 Although this is a full planning application that would result in the grant of a freestanding planning permission, it is my view that an understanding of the s106 Agreement for the Outline consent remains important. 50/60 Station Road will be constructed on the site of what would have been Block I2 and part of Block I1. Block I2 falls within the Red phase of the development and Block I1 in the Green phase.

8.114 The implementation of development in the Red Phase e.g. Block I2 would trigger the following commuted payments/infrastructure under the Outline consent:

- Submission and approval of the Public Art Delivery Plan for the Red Phase.
- Local User condition restriction
- Relocation Strategy for Woodlands Surgery
- Hills Road/Station Road junction works
- Sub-phase payments towards SCATP and CGB including deferred payments
- Agreement of Travel Plan Co-ordinator and Travel Plan

8.115 The implementation of development in the Green Phase e.g. Block I1 would trigger the following commuted payments/infrastructure under the Outline consent:

- Submission and approval of the Public Art Delivery Plan for the Green Phase
- Local User condition restriction

- Scheme for Station Square including a Management Plan
- Sub-phase payments towards SCATP and CGB
- Submission of details of the Northern Access Road
- Agreement of Travel Plan Co-ordinator and Travel Plan

8.116 The mitigation measures that are identified for the Red Phase are capable of being secured via the section 106 Agreement for 50/60 Station Road for the reasons that I have set out in my Assessment. Only a small part of the Green Phase falls within the application site and development of this site does not preclude development within Block I1. Under these circumstances I think it would be unreasonable to expect this development to comply with the requirements for the Green Phase. However I can report that officers are currently in pre-application discussions about both the Northern Access Road and the Station Square and it is anticipated that both projects will be the subject of planning applications later in the year.

Transport

8.117 The applicants have brought forward contributions towards the SCATP and CGB as part of the application. The s106 for the Outline Planning consent required the payment towards SCATP and CGB on commencement of Block I2, which is identified as Part C of the Red Phase for the purposes of the s106 Agreement only.

8.118 The following table sets out the commuted payments that are due under the Outline Planning Permission in all three sub phases of the Red Phase. These figures include payments of £261,093 for SCATP and £926,604 for CGB that were deferred from the Yellow Phase and the contributions that arise from the development of the Red Phase (SCATP £223,483 and CGB £793,126) a total of £2,204,306* for these transport impact mitigation measures.

Table – SCATP/CGB Contributions as set out in s106 for Outline Consent

Red Sub Phase	SCATP contribution	CGB contribution
Part A (J1/J2)	£184,119	£653,497
Part B (J3/J4)	£129,363	£459,168
Part C (I2)	£171,055	£607,066
Total	£484,537	£1,719,731
Overall Total		£2,204,268

* From Committee Report November 2009

**From s106 and subject to minor adjustment (£38)

8.119 The commuted sums that have been brought forward in connection with 50/60 Station Road have been increased to take account of the increased floorspace and the following payments will be made on commencement of each phase of the development:

Table - SCATP/CGB Contributions as offered by applicants in respect of 50/60 Station Road

Phase	SCATP contribution	CGB contribution
50 Station Road	£104,424	£370,625
60 Station Road	£116,757	£414,397
Total	£221,181	£785,022
Overall Total		£1,006,203
Total for Red Phase including Part A and Part B		£2,432,350

8.120 A comparison between the two tables demonstrates that the contributions that have been brought forward for 50/60 Station Road are compatible with those set out in the s106 for Block I2. The contributions include the deferred payments from Yellow Phase and take account of the increase in floorspace. It can

also be demonstrated that if other parts of the Red Phase come forward as planned the total contribution toward transport mitigation in the form of commuted payments will be exceeded.

8.121 The development also generates the need for improvements to the Hills Road/Station Road junction when considered in conjunction with other development within the CB1 Masterplan area.

8.122 Overspill parking from the development has the potential to have an adverse impact on the amenity of residents in the vicinity of the site. A pre construction and post occupation parking survey is necessary to assess the impact of the development the outcome of which may be the establishment of a Residents Parking Scheme. The costs of carrying out the survey and setting up the Scheme should be borne by the applicant.

8.123 The funding and agreement of a Travel Plan Co-ordinator is also needed.

8.124 Subject to the completion of a S106 planning obligation to secure the commuted payments, junction improvements, car parking survey and mitigation and the Travel Plan Co-ordinator, I am satisfied that the proposal accords with Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan (2003) policies P6/1, P9/8 and P9/9, Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 8/2, 8/3, 9/9 and 10/1 and the Planning Obligation Strategy 2010.

Public Art

8.125 The development is required to make provision for public art and in this case provision for public art should be made on site via the submission and approval of a Public Art Delivery Plan (PADP). The PADP should be required to relate to the approved CB1 Public Art Strategy and the PADP for the Red Phase.

8.126 Subject to the completion of a S106 planning obligation to secure this infrastructure provision, I am satisfied that the proposal accords with Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan (2003) policies P6/1 and 9/8, Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 3/7, 9/9 and 10/1 and the Public Art SPD 2010.

Loss of Community Facility (Doctor's Surgery)

8.127A Relocation Strategy is needed to ensure that all reasonable endeavours are made to relocate the surgery before the development of 50 Station Road. I have addressed this issue in paragraph 8.5.

8.128 Subject to the completion of a S106 planning obligation to secure the Relocation Strategy for Woodlands Surgery, I am satisfied that the proposal accords with Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan (2003) policies P6/1 and 9/8 and Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 5/11, 9/9 and 10/1

Occupation Restriction (Offices)

8.129A Local User Condition is needed to ensure that the development is occupied in accordance with Development Plan policy. I have addressed this issue in paragraph 8.13.

8.130 Subject to the completion of a S106 planning obligation to secure the restriction on occupation, I am satisfied that the proposal accords with Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan (2003) policies P6/1 and 9/8 and Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 7/2, 9/9 and 10/1

Monitoring

8.131 The Planning Obligation Strategy (2010) requires that all new residential developments contribute to the costs of monitoring the implementation of planning obligations. The costs are calculated according to the heads of terms in the agreement. The contribution sought will be calculated as £150 per financial head of term and £300 per non-financial head of term. Contributions are therefore required on that basis.

Planning Obligations Conclusion

8.132 It is my view that the planning obligation is necessary, directly related to the development and fairly and reasonably in scale and kind to the development and therefore the Planning Obligation passes the tests set by the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010. The planning obligation has a strong relationship with the s106 Agreement for the Outline Planning

Consent and will ensure that all the mitigation measures associated with Block I2 are secured for 50/60 Station Road.

9.0 CONCLUSION

- 9.1 The application that has been brought forward whilst not a reserved matters submission is strongly aligned with the Parameter Plans that were approved under the Outline consent for the CB1 Masterplan. The key difference is in the site area, which extends the mass and scale of the blocks towards the Station. This brings with it a number of benefits including a realignment of the Southern Access Road to allow a larger public space to the south forming an ante-chamber to the Station Square.
- 9.2 The scheme that has been brought forward is deliverable either in one phase or more likely two phases. The applicants have stated that Block I2 as approved is not deliverable in the current market and I have no reason to refute this view. It is important that the momentum that has begun to deliver change in the Station Area is not lost. Only by bringing forward new development such as 50/60 Station Road will the vision for the Station Area be delivered.
- 9.3 There has been a significant amount of opposition to the proposed development from local people. This is based on both a feeling that the existing Wilton Terrace/32-38 Station Road should not be demolished and that the new buildings are not appropriate for the site. I respect this point of view but I do not share it. Although Conservation Area Consent is needed for the demolition of Wilton Terrace, the need to remove these buildings to accommodate Block I2 was clear at the Outline Planning Stage. The terrace was not identified as worthy or retention and incorporation into the CB1 development at that stage. On this basis my negotiations have been predicated on the assumption that if the new buildings were of high quality and would make a positive contribution to the Conservation Area then the principle of demolition was acceptable.
- 9.4 I am not alone in my view that 50 and 60 Station Road are well designed buildings that respond well to their context and will enhance the Conservation Area. The Design and Conservation CB1 Sub-Panel, English Heritage and the City Council's Design and Conservation team share my view. All three groups have

been highly influential in bringing forward a revised design for the buildings following the withdrawal of the previous scheme for the site.

- 9.5 The Committee are not bound by the constraints of the Outline consent but it is a very significant material consideration. The new buildings respect the approved Parameter Plans in terms of their height and broad location. The Screening Opinion for Environmental Impact Assessment concluded that the development does not amount to EIA development. The key to the assessment of this application and the related application for Conservation Area Consent for Wilton Terrace is to consider whether or not the new building is of a high quality appropriate for its setting and role as key building within the Station Area. My answer to this question is 'yes' and for that reason I recommend approval.

10.0 RECOMMENDATION

1. **APPROVE** subject to the satisfactory completion of the s106 agreement by 30 November 2012 and subject to the following conditions and reasons for approval:

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

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

2. All management and maintenance of landscaping shall be carried out in accordance with the approved Landscape Management Plan by Robert Myers Associates dated April 2012 PL2.

Reason: To ensure satisfactory arrangements are in place to ensure the proper management and maintenance of landscaped areas (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/4, 3/7, 3/8, 3/11, 4/2, 4/3, 4/4 and 9/9).

3. All management and maintenance of ecology shall be carried out in accordance with the approved Ecology Report by RPS dated April 2012 as supplemented by Response to comments made on the Ecological Management Plan by RPS dated 5 July 2012.

Reason: To ensure satisfactory arrangements are in place to ensure the proper management and maintenance of ecology (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/4, 3/7, 3/8, 3/11, 4/2, 4/3, 4/4 and 9/9).

4. Any trees or plants provided as part of any landscaping scheme, within a period of 5 years from the completion of the development, which die, are removed or become seriously damaged or diseased, shall be replaced in the next planting season with others of similar size and species as those originally planted, unless the local planning authority gives written consent to any variation. No development within the site for which reserved matters approval is sought shall commence until the landscaping scheme has been approved in writing by the local planning authority. The scheme shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details unless otherwise agreed in writing by the local planning authority.

Reason: To ensure satisfactory arrangements are in place for replacement planting to ensure proper provision of landscaped areas (Cambridge Local Plan policies 3/2, 3/4, 3/7, 3/11, 3/12, 4/2, 4/3, 4/4 and 9/9)

5. Prior to the commencement of works to provide the cycle store, full details of proposed facade greening/climbing plants to elevations of the proposed cycle stores adjacent to the southern boundary including a maintenance plan for its long term retention shall be submitted to and approved by the local planning authority in writing. The development shall be carried in accordance with the approved details.

Reason To ensure the satisfactory provision of green facades in the interests of long term visual amenity (Cambridge Local plan policies 3/7. 3/11 and 9/9)

6. Prior to the occupation of 50 Station Road, a certificate following a post-construction review shall be issued by an approved BREEAM Licensed Assessor to the Local Planning Authority, indicating that the BREEAM rating EXCELLENT or higher 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 unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In the interests of reducing carbon dioxide emissions and promoting principles of sustainable construction and efficient use of buildings

(Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 8/16 and Supplementary Planning Document 'Sustainable Design & Construction' 2007).

7. Prior to the occupation of 60 Station Road, a certificate following a post-construction review shall be issued by an approved BREEAM Licensed Assessor to the Local Planning Authority, indicating that the BREEAM rating EXCELLENT or higher 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 unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In the interests of reducing carbon dioxide emissions and promoting principles of sustainable construction and efficient use of buildings

8. The approved renewable energy technologies to meet the approved carbon emissions of 50 Station Road shall be fully installed and operational prior to the occupation of 50 Station Road and shall thereafter be maintained and remain fully operational in accordance with an approved maintenance programme, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the local planning authority.

Reason: In the interests of reducing carbon dioxide emissions (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 8/16 and Supplementary Planning Document 'Sustainable Design & Construction' 2007).

9. The approved renewable energy technologies to meet the approved carbon emissions of 60 Station Road shall be fully installed and operational prior to the occupation of 60 Station Road and shall thereafter be maintained and remain fully operational in accordance with an approved maintenance programme, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the local planning authority.

Reason: In the interests of reducing carbon dioxide emissions (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 8/16 and Supplementary Planning Document 'Sustainable Design & Construction' 2007).

10. 5% of all parking spaces shall be suitable for, and reserved for, people with disabilities.

Reason: To ensure an appropriate level of car parking provision for people with disabilities (Cambridge Local Plan policy 8/10 and appendix C).

11. Prior to commencement of development a delivery plan for the phased delivery of cycle parking for use in association with 50 and 60 Station Road shall be submitted to and approved by the local planning authority in writing. The approved facilities for each building shall be provided in accordance with the approved delivery plan before occupation of each building and shall thereafter be retained and shall not be used for any other purpose unless otherwise agreed in writing by the local planning authority.

Reason: To ensure appropriate provision for the secure storage of bicycles (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 8/6).

12. Prior to the commencement of development, full details of access to below ground cycle storage areas shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details, which shall be fully implemented in accordance with the approved cycle parking delivery plan, and shall be retained thereafter unless otherwise agreed in writing by the local planning authority.

Reason: To provide convenient and safe access to cycle storage areas. (Cambridge Local Plan policy 8/6)

13. Prior to the commencement of first occupation full details of the security arrangements to provide for safe use of the basement car and cycle parking areas, shall be submitted to and approved by the local planning authority in writing. The approved provisions for safe use of car and cycle parking facilities shall be provided prior to the first occupation and shall be retained thereafter in respect of the occupation of both 50 and 60 Station Road unless otherwise agreed in writing by the local planning authority.

Reason: To provide convenient and safe access to cycle storage areas. (Cambridge Local Plan policy 8/6)

14. Prior to the commencement of development, with the exception of below ground works, a Travel Plan and Cycle Parking Management Plan shall be submitted to and approved by the local planning authority in writing. The approved Travel Plan and Cycle Parking Management shall thereafter be first implemented upon first occupation of either 50 or 60 Station Road and shall be maintained and implemented unless otherwise agreed in writing by the local planning authority.

Reason: To ensure satisfactory arrangements are in place to secure work place travel planning and the management of cycle parking.(Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 8/2, 8/3 and 8/6).

15. Prior to commencement of development, a detailed surface water strategy shall be submitted to and approved by the local planning authority in writing. The strategy shall demonstrate how the management of surface water within the context of the approved details of the CB1 strategic site wide surface water strategy. The strategy shall maximise the use of measures to control water where it falls as far as practicable to limit the rate (peak flow) and quantity (volume) of run-off and improve the quality of any run-off before it leaves the site and enters the strategic site wide system.

The strategy shall include details of all flow control systems and the design, location and capacity of all strategic SUDS features and shall include ownership, long-term adoption, management and maintenance scheme(s) and inspection arrangements/responsibilities, including detailed calculations, levels and flow routes to demonstrate the capacity of the measures to adequately manage surface water within the site without the risk of flooding to land or buildings.

The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved surface water drainage strategy.

Reason - To ensure a satisfactory and sustainable method of surface water drainage and to prevent increased risk of flooding to third parties. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 4/13 and 8/18 and Supplementary Planning Document 'Sustainable Design & Construction' 2007).

16. Prior to commencement of development, a detailed foul water drainage strategy shall be submitted to and approved by the local planning authority in writing.

The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved foul water drainage strategy.

Reason - To ensure a satisfactory and sustainable method of foul drainage and to prevent increased risk of flooding to third parties. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 4/13 and 8/18 and Supplementary Planning Document 'Sustainable Design & Construction' 2007).

17. Infiltration systems should only be used where it can be demonstrated that they will not pose a risk to groundwater quality. A scheme for surface water disposal needs to be submitted to and approved by the local planning authority. The scheme shall be implemented as approved.

Reason: The site is acknowledged to be potentially contaminated in submitted documents. Soakaways and other infiltration sustainable drainage systems (SUDS) must not be constructed in contaminated ground. The water environment is potentially vulnerable and there is an increased potential for pollution from inappropriately located and/or designed infiltration sustainable drainage systems (SUDS) such as soakaways, un tanked porous pavement systems or infiltration basins. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 4/13 and 8/18 and Supplementary Planning Document 'Sustainable Design & Construction' 2007).

18. Piling or any other foundation designs using penetrative methods will not be permitted other than with the express written consent of the local planning authority, which may be given for those parts of the site where it has been demonstrated that there is no resultant unacceptable risk to groundwater.

Reason. The site is potentially contaminated and intrusive foundation solutions could lead to the contamination of groundwater in the underlying aquifer. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 4/13 and 8/18 and Supplementary Planning Document 'Sustainable Design & Construction' 2007).

19. Prior to the commencement of any development, a scheme for the provision and implementation of pollution control of the water environment shall be submitted and agreed in writing with the Local Authority. The works/scheme shall be constructed and completed in accordance with the approved plans.

Reason. To prevent the increased risk of pollution to the water environment. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 4/13 and 8/18 and Supplementary Planning Document 'Sustainable Design & Construction' 2007).

20. Each phase of the development approved by this permission shall not be commenced prior to a contaminated land assessment and associated remedial strategy, being submitted to the LPA and receipt of approval of the document/documents from the LPA. This applies to paragraphs a), b) and c). This is an iterative process and the results of each stage will help decide if the following stage is necessary.

(a) The contaminated land assessment shall include a desk study to be submitted to the LPA for approval. The desk study shall detail the history of the site uses and propose a site investigation strategy based on the relevant information discovered by the desk study. The strategy shall be approved by the LPA prior to investigations commencing on site.

(b) The site investigation, including relevant soil, soil gas, surface and groundwater sampling, shall be carried out by a suitable qualified and accredited consultant/contractor in accordance with a quality assured sampling and analysis methodology.

(c) A site investigation report detailing all investigative works and sampling on site, together with the results of the analysis, risk assessment to any receptors and a proposed remediation strategy shall be submitted to the LPA. The LPA shall approve such remedial works as required prior to any remediation commencing on site. The works shall be of such a nature as to render harmless the identified contamination given the proposed end use of the site and surrounding environment including any controlled waters.

Each phase of the development approved by this permission shall be not be occupied prior to the completion of any remedial works and a validation report/s being submitted to the LPA and receipt of approval of the document/documents from the LPA. This applies to paragraphs d), e) and f).

(d) Approved remediation works shall be carried out in full on site under a quality assurance scheme to demonstrate compliance with the proposed methodology and best practice guidance.

(e) If, during the works contamination is encountered which has not previously been identified then the additional contamination shall be fully assessed and an appropriate remediation scheme agreed with the LPA.

(f) Upon completion of the works, this condition shall not be discharged until a closure report has been submitted to and approved by the LPA. The closure report shall include details of the proposed remediation works and quality assurance certificates to show that the works have been carried out in full in accordance with the approved methodology. Details of any post-remedial sampling and analysis to show the site has reached the required clean-up criteria shall be included in the closure report together with the necessary documentation detailing what waste materials have been removed from site.

Reason: In order to ensure that any contamination is identified on the site before the commencement of the scheme, to enable any mitigation/remediation measures to be implemented during the development phase and to ensure protection of controlled waters. (Cambridge Local Plan policy 4/13)

21. Prior to the commencement of the development of 50 Station Road, including any demolition or enabling works, a detailed Construction Method Statement (CMS) shall be submitted to and approved by the local planning authority in writing.

The Construction Method Statement shall be accompanied by:

A statement that demonstrates how the proposal accords with the approved Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP), Eight Issue dated 5 January 2011 (condition 31 of the outline planning permission reference 08/0266/OUT).

In addition the CMS shall also provide a specific construction programme

A plan identifying:

- The contractor site storage area/compound
- Screening and hoarding locations
- Access arrangements for vehicles, plant, personnel and building materials
- Plant and equipment storage areas
- Contractor parking arrangements for construction vehicles and personnel vehicles
- The location of contractor offices

Thereafter the development shall be undertaken in accordance with the agreed details unless otherwise agreed in writing by the local planning authority.

Reason: To ensure the environmental impact of the construction of the development is adequately mitigated and in the interests of the amenity of nearby residents/occupiers (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 4/13).

22. Prior to the commencement of the development of 60 Station Road, including any demolition or enabling works, a detailed Construction Method Statement (CMS) shall be submitted to and approved by the local planning authority in writing.

The Construction Method Statement shall be accompanied by:

A statement that demonstrates how the proposal accords with the approved Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP), Eight Issue dated 5 January 2011 (condition 31 of the outline planning permission reference 08/0266/OUT).

In addition the CMS shall also provide a specific construction programme

A plan identifying:

- The contractor site storage area/compound
- Screening and hoarding locations
- Access arrangements for vehicles, plant, personnel and building materials
- Plant and equipment storage areas
- Contractor parking arrangements for construction vehicles and personnel vehicles
- The location of contractor offices

Thereafter the development shall be undertaken in accordance with the agreed details unless otherwise agreed in writing by the local planning authority.

Reason: To ensure the environmental impact of the construction of the development is adequately mitigated and in the interests of the amenity of nearby residents/occupiers (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 4/13).

23. Prior to occupation of 50 Station Road, full details of a scheme for odour control to minimise the amount of odour emanating from 50 Station Road, including full technical details for the operation for extract flues shall be submitted to and approved by the local planning authority in writing. The scheme as approved shall be fully implemented prior to the occupation of the building.

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

24. Prior to occupation of 60 Station Road, full details of a scheme for odour control to minimise the amount of odour emanating from 50 Station Road, including full technical details for the operation for extract flues shall be submitted to and approved by the local planning authority in writing. The scheme as approved shall be fully implemented prior to the occupation of the building.

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

25. Prior to occupation of 50 Station Road a noise attenuation/insulation scheme and/or phased attenuation measures (having regard to the building fabric, glazing and mechanical ventilation) shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority in order to demonstrate the scheme shall achieve internal noise levels recommended in British Standard 8233:1999 'Sound Insulation and Noise Reduction for Buildings - Code of Practice'. The approved scheme shall be fully implemented and a completion report submitted prior to the occupation of 50 Station Road. The approved scheme shall remain unaltered in accordance with the approved details unless otherwise agreed in writing by the local planning authority.

Reason: To protect amenity of the occupants of noise sensitive development (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 4/13).

26. Prior to occupation of 60 Station Road a noise attenuation/insulation scheme and/or phased attenuation measures (having regard to the building fabric, glazing and mechanical ventilation) shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority in order to demonstrate the scheme shall achieve internal noise levels recommended in British Standard 8233:1999 'Sound Insulation and Noise Reduction for Buildings - Code of Practice'. The approved scheme shall be fully implemented and a completion report submitted prior to the occupation of 60 Station Road. The approved scheme shall remain unaltered in accordance with the approved details unless otherwise agreed in writing by the local planning authority.

Reason: To protect amenity of the occupants of noise sensitive development (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 4/13).

27. Prior to occupation of 50 Station Road, full details of a scheme for the insulation of the building(s) and/or plant in order to minimise the level of noise emanating from 50 Station Road and/or plant shall be submitted to and approved by the local planning authority in writing. The scheme as approved shall be fully implemented prior to the occupation of 50 Station Road.

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

28. Prior to occupation of 60 Station Road, full details of a scheme for the insulation of the building(s) and/or plant in order to minimise the level of noise emanating from 60 Station Road and/or plant shall be submitted to and approved by the local planning authority in writing. The scheme as approved shall be fully implemented prior to the occupation of 50 Station Road.

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

29. Prior to the commencement of occupation of 50 Station Road, full details of the on-site storage facilities for trade waste, including waste for recycling shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Such details shall identify the specific positions of where wheelie bins, paladins or any other means of storage will be stationed and the arrangements for the disposal of waste. The approved facilities shall be provided prior to the commencement of the use hereby permitted and shall be retained thereafter unless alternative arrangements are agreed in writing by the local planning authority.

Reason: To protect the amenities of nearby residents/occupiers and in the interests of visual amenity. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 4/13)

30. Prior to the commencement of occupation of 60 Station Road, full details of the on-site storage facilities for trade waste, including waste for recycling shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Such details shall identify the specific positions of where wheelie bins, paladins or any other means of storage will be stationed and the arrangements for the disposal of waste. The approved facilities shall be provided prior to the commencement of the use hereby permitted and shall be retained thereafter unless alternative arrangements are agreed in writing by the local planning authority.

Reason: To protect the amenities of nearby residents/occupiers and in the interests of visual amenity. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 4/13)

31. Prior to the commencement of occupation of 50 Station Road, full details of the means by which waste will be collected from the site, including the means by which refuse containers will be moved to the street frontage for collection and returned to the refuse store after the collection of waste and the location of on-street storage on collection days, shall be submitted to and approved by the local planning authority in writing. The approved arrangements shall be retained thereafter unless alternative arrangements are agreed in writing by the local planning authority.

Reason: To protect the amenities of nearby residents/occupiers and in the interests of visual amenity. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 4/13)

32. Prior to the commencement of occupation of 60 Station Road, full details of the means by which waste will be collected from the site, including the means by which refuse containers will be moved to the street frontage for collection and returned to the refuse store after the collection of waste and the location of on-street storage on collection days, shall be submitted to and approved by the local planning authority in writing. The approved arrangements shall be retained thereafter unless alternative arrangements are agreed in writing by the local planning authority.

Reason: To protect the amenities of nearby residents/occupiers and in the interests of visual amenity. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 4/13)

33. The retail/café/restaurant units shall only be open for trade between 07:00 and 23:00.

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

34. Deliveries shall only be made to 50 and 60 Station Road and associated retail/café/restaurant units between 07:00 and 23:00.

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

35. No construction work shall be carried out or plant operated other than between the following hours: 0730 to 1800 Monday to Friday, 0800 to 1300 on Saturdays and at no time on Sundays, Bank or Public Holidays unless otherwise agreed in writing by the local planning authority in advance.

Reason: To protect the amenity of nearby residents/occupiers (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 4/13).

36. Notwithstanding the information detailed on the approved plans, no building or structure shall exceed 50m AOD in height.

Reason: In the interests of safety and to safeguard the operation of Cambridge Airport. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 3/4)

37. Prior to the commencement of the development hereby approved, with the exception of below ground works, full details including samples of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of both 50 and 60 Station Road shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure that the appearance of the external surfaces is appropriate. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/4, 3/12 and 3/14)

38. Before starting any stone work (artificial and/or real), a sample panel of the facing materials to be used including for the plinth(s) and colonnade columns shall be erected on site to establish the detail of bonding, coursing and colour and type of jointing and shall be agreed in writing with the local planning authority. The quality of finish and materials incorporated in any approved sample panel(s), which shall not be demolished prior to completion of development of both 50 and 60 Station Road, shall be maintained throughout the development.

Reason: In the interests of visual amenity and to ensure that the quality and colour of the detailing of the brickwork/stonework and jointing is acceptable and maintained throughout the development. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/4, 3/12 and 4/11)

39. Prior to the commencement of the development hereby approved, with the exception of below ground works, full details of the proprietary roof glazing system including material(s), edge and flashing methods, etc. shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Large-scale cross-section drawings may be appropriate to show details. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure that the appearance of the external surfaces is appropriate. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/4, 3/12 and 4/11)

40. Prior to the commencement of the development hereby approved, with the exception of below ground works, full details of glass type(s) to be used in curtain walling/windows/doors or other glazed features shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure that the appearance of the external surfaces is appropriate. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/4, 3/12 and 4/11)

41. Prior to the commencement of the development hereby approved, with the exception of below ground works, full details of non-masonry walling systems to be used shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure that the appearance of the external surfaces is appropriate. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/4, 3/12 and 4/11)

42. No metal-clad or other non-traditional roofs shall be erected until full details of such roofs including materials, colours, surface finishes and relationships to rooflights or other rooftop features have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure that the appearance of the external surfaces is appropriate. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/4, 3/12 and 4/11)

43. Prior to the commencement of development, full details of all external joinery [whether of metal, timber or hybrid construction] including frames, thresholds, mullions, transoms, finishes, colours, etc., shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure that the appearance of the external surfaces is appropriate. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/4, 3/12 and 4/11)

44. Prior to the commencement of development, with the exception of below ground works, full details of colonnade soffits shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. This may consist of large-scale drawings and/or samples. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure that the appearance of the external surfaces is appropriate. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/4, 3/12 and 4/11)

45. Prior to the commencement of the development hereby approved, with the exception of below ground works, full details of all coping to the walls shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Large-scale cross-sectional drawings may be appropriate for depicting some details. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure that the appearance of the building is appropriate. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/4, 3/12 and 4/11)

46. Prior to commencement of occupation of either 50 or 60 Station Road a signage strategy for use in association with the occupation of 50 and 60 Station Road shall be submitted to and approved by the local planning authority in writing. The approved signage strategy shall thereafter be retained and all external signage shall conform to the strategy unless otherwise agreed in writing by the local planning authority.

Reason: To ensure that the appearance of the building is appropriate. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/4, 3/12 and 4/11)

47. Prior to the commencement of the development hereby approved, with the exception of below ground works, full details, in terms of materials, fixing, surface finish & colour, of all metalwork [stairs, balustrades, grilles, railings, brackets, window cleaning gantries & associated equipment, columns, louvres, grilles, mesh or wire frames etc.] shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure that the appearance of the building is appropriate. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/4, 3/12 and 4/11)

48. Prior to the commencement of development, with the exception of below ground works, full details of external visible masonry brackets, clamps, restraints and other support systems shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. This may consist of large-scale drawings and/or samples. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure that the appearance of the external surfaces is appropriate. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/4, 3/12 and 4/11)

49. Notwithstanding the details shown on the approved plans, full details of the external treatment of the cycle store adjacent to the southern boundary shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority prior to commencement of works to provide the cycle store. The development shall be implemented and maintained in accordance with the approved details

Reason: To ensure that the appearance of the external surfaces is appropriate. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/4, 3/12 and 4/11)

50. No rooftop plant shall be constructed on 50 Station Road until such time as full details, to a large scale, of any rooftop plant screening systems to be installed, where relevant, have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. This may include the submission of samples of mesh/louver types and the colour(s) of the components. Colour samples should be identified by the RAL or BS systems. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure that the details of development are acceptable. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/4, 3/12 and 4/11)

51. No rooftop plant shall be constructed on 60 Station Road until such time as full details, to a large scale, of any rooftop plant screening systems to be installed, where relevant, have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. This may include the submission of samples of mesh/louver types and the colour(s) of the components. Colour samples should be identified by the RAL or BS systems. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure that the details of development are acceptable. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/4, 3/12 and 4/11)

52. Prior to the commencement of development of 50 Station Road, with the exception of below ground works, full details of all solar panels [water pre-heat, etc.] and/or photovoltaic cells, including type, dimensions, materials, location, fixing, etc. shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. In bringing forward such details the applicant is encouraged to site such features so as not to be visible from ground level. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure that the appearance of the external surfaces is appropriate. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/4, 3/12 and 4/11)

53. Prior to the commencement of development of 60 Station Road, with the exception of below ground works, full details of all solar panels [water pre-heat, etc.] and/or photovoltaic cells, including type, dimensions, materials, location, fixing, etc. shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. In bringing forward such details the applicant is encouraged to site such features so as not to be visible from ground level. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure that the appearance of the external surfaces is appropriate. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/4, 3/12 and 4/11)

54. Prior to the commencement of occupation of 50 Station Road, a lighting plan including details of the height, type, position and angle of any external lighting shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The development shall be implemented and maintained in accordance with the approved plan.

Reason: To ensure that the appearance of the external surfaces is appropriate. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/4, 3/12 and 4/11)

INFORMATIVE: Highways - Buildings footings or basements must not extend out under the public highway except in the case of basements with the express permission of the Highway Authority and under licence. Adopted areas should also exclude areas under balconies except under licence (Section 177 of the Highways Act 1980)

INFORMATIVE: Highways - The applicant is advised that any granting of 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 a separate permission must be sought from the Highway Authority for such works.

INFORMATIVE: Highways - Notwithstanding any consent granted under the relevant planning act/s, the applicant is advised that before any works are carried out on any footway, carriageway, verge or other land forming part of the public highway the express consent of Cambridgeshire County Council as the Local Highway Authority will be required. All costs associated with any construction works will be borne by the developer. The developer will not be permitted to drain roof water over the public highway, nor across it in a surface channel, but must make arrangements to install a piped drainage connection. No window or door will be allowed to open over a highway and no foundation or footing for the structure will be allowed to encroach under the public highway.

INFORMATIVE: Highways - Notwithstanding any consent granted under the relevant planning act/s, the applicant is advised that before any works are carried out on any footway, carriageway, verge or other land forming part of the public highway the express consent of Cambridgeshire County Council as the Local Highway Authority will be required. All costs associated with any construction works will be borne by the developer.

INFORMATIVE: Food Safety - As the premises are 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 Food and Occupational Safety (FOS) Team of the Refuse and Environmental Service at Cambridge City Council on telephone number (01223) 457890 for further information.

INFORMATIVE: Licensing - If the premises are intended to provide alcohol, regulated entertainment or food after 11pm or before 5 am they may require a Premise Licence under the Licensing Act 2003. The applicant is advised to contact The Licensing Team of Refuse and Environmental Service at Cambridge City Council on telephone number (01223) 457899 for further information.

INFORMATIVE: Meeting the needs of disabled people
In order to meet the needs of disabled people, the applicant is recommended to take the following advice into account in the detailed design of the building:

The main door should be automated. Side doors alongside revolving doors would best be electrically opening or asymmetrical of which one is at least 900mm.

Reception and cafe bars need dropped height counters and hearing loop.

INFORMATIVE: New development can sometimes cause inconvenience, disturbance and disruption to local residents, businesses and passers by. As a result the City Council runs a Considerate Contractor Scheme aimed at promoting high standards of care during construction. The City Council encourages the developer of the site, through its building contractor, to join the scheme and agree to comply with the model Code of Good Practice, in the interests of good neighbourliness. Information about the scheme can be obtained from The Considerate Contractor project Officer in the Planning Department (Tel: 01223 457121).

INFORMATIVE: Advice from the Environment Agency

Advice to Applicant:

Contaminated soil that is, or must be disposed of, is waste. Therefore, its handling, transport, treatment and disposal is subject to waste management legislation, which includes:

Duty of Care Regulations 1991

Hazardous Waste (England and Wales) Regulations 2005

Environmental Permitting (England and Wales) Regulations 2010

The Waste (England and Wales) Regulations 2011

The CLAIRE Definition of Waste: Development Industry Code of Practice (version 2) provides operators with a framework for determining whether or not excavated material arising from site during remediation and/or land development works are waste or have ceased to be waste. Under the Code of Practice:

excavated materials that are recovered via a treatment operation can be re-used on-site providing they are treated to a standard such that they are fit for purpose and unlikely to cause pollution

treated materials can be transferred between sites as part of a hub and cluster project

some naturally occurring clean material can be transferred directly between sites.

Developers should ensure that all contaminated materials are adequately characterised both chemically and physically, including in line with British Standards BS EN 14899:2005 'Characterisation of Waste - Sampling of Waste Materials - Framework for the Preparation and Application of a Sampling Plan' for material to be removed from site, and that the permitting status of any proposed treatment or disposal activity is clear. If in doubt, the Environment Agency should be contacted for advice at an early stage to avoid any delays.

If the total quantity of waste material to be produced at or taken off site is hazardous waste and is 500kg or greater in any 12 month period the developer will need to register with us as a hazardous waste producer. Refer to our website at www.environment-agency.gov.uk for more information.

Land contamination investigations should be carried out in accordance with BS 5930:1999-2010 'Code of Practice for site investigations' and BS 10175:2011 'Investigation of potentially contaminated sites - Code of Practice' as updated/amended. Site investigation works should be undertaken by a suitably qualified and experienced professional. Soil and water analysis should be fully MCERTS accredited.

Soakaways and other infiltration Suds must not be constructed in contaminated ground. The use of infiltration drainage would only be acceptable if a phased site investigation showed the presence of no significant contamination. The use of non infiltration Suds may be acceptable subject to our agreement. We would need to be consulted on the results of the site investigation and on any protection measures.

The maximum acceptable depth for infiltration Suds is 2.0 m below ground level, with a minimum of 1.2 m clearance between the base of infiltration Suds and peak seasonal groundwater levels. We consider that deep bore and other deep soakaway systems are not appropriate in areas where groundwater constitutes a significant resource (that is where aquifer yield may support or already supports abstraction). Deep soakaways increase the risk of groundwater pollution. See our Groundwater Protection GP3 documents, particularly Part 4 P4-7, for further information.

Please also see our advice to the LPA on land contamination.

We recommend that developers should:

1. Follow the risk management framework provided in CLR11, 'Model Procedures for the Management of Land Contamination', when dealing with land affected by contamination;
2. Refer to our "Guiding Principles for Land Contamination" for the type of information that we require in order to assess risks to controlled waters from the site. The Local Authority can advise on risk to other receptors, for example human health;
3. Refer to our "Verification of Remediation of Land Contamination" report;
4. Refer to our "Groundwater Protection: policy and practice (GP3)" documents (<http://www.environment-agency.gov.uk/research/library/publications/40741.aspx>);
5. Refer to our 'Position Statement on the Definition of Waste: Development Industry Code of Practice'; and
6. Refer to our website at www.environment-agency.gov.uk for more information.

Surface Water Drainage:

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

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

General Informatives:

Any culverting or works affecting the flow of a watercourse requires the prior written Consent of the Environment Agency under the terms of the Land Drainage Act 1991/Water Resources Act 1991. The Environment Agency seeks to avoid culverting, and its Consent for such works will not normally be granted except as a means of access.

The granting of planning approval must not be taken to imply that consent has been given in respect of the above.

Foul Water Drainage:

All foul sewage or trade effluent, including cooling water containing chemical additives, or vehicle washing water, including steam cleaning effluent shall be discharged to the public foul sewer with the prior approval of Anglian Water services.

Pollution Control:

Surface water from roads and impermeable vehicle parking areas shall be discharged via trapped gullies.

Prior to being discharged into any watercourse, surface water sewer or soakaway system, all surface water drainage from lorry parks and/or parking areas for fifty car park spaces or more and hardstandings should be passed through an oil interceptor designed compatible with the site being drained. Roof water shall not pass through the interceptor.

Surface water drainage from covered or underground parking areas shall be discharged to the public foul water sewer with the prior approval of Anglian Water Services.

Drainage from open parking areas that will discharge, directly or otherwise, to a surface watercourse must be first passed through an oil interceptor. The Environmental Permitting Regulations make it an offence to cause or knowingly permit any discharge that will result in the input of pollutants to surface waters.

Site operators should ensure that there is no possibility of contaminated water entering and polluting surface or underground waters

INFORMATIVE: This planning permission should be read in conjunction with its associated deed of planning obligation prepared under s.106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended)

Reasons for Approval

1. This development has been approved, conditionally, because subject to those requirements it is considered to generally conform to the Development Plan, particularly the following policies:

East of England Plan policies: SS1 SS3 E3 T1 T2 T4 T9 T13
T14 T15 ENV6 ENV7 WM6 CSR1 CSR2

Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan policies: P6/1
P9/8 P9/9

Cambridge Local Plan (2006): 3/1 3/4 3/6 3/7 3/11 3/12 3/13 4/4
4/11 4/12 4/13 4/14 4/15 5/11 7/2 8/2 8/4 8/6 8/9 8/10 8/16 8/18
9/1 9/9 10/1

2. The decision has been made having had regard to all other material planning considerations, none of which was considered to have been of such significance as to justify doing other than grant planning permission.

These reasons for approval can be a summary of the reasons for grant of planning permission only. For further details on the decision please see the officer report online at www.cambridge.gov.uk/planningpublicaccess or visit our Customer Service Centre, Mandela House, 4 Regent Street, Cambridge, CB2 1BY between 8am to 6pm Monday to Friday.

2. Unless prior agreement has been obtained from the Head of Planning, in consultation with the Chair and Spokesperson of this Committee to extend the period for completion of the Planning Obligation required in connection with this development, if the Obligation has not been completed by 30 November 2012, or if Committee determine that the application be refused against officer recommendation of approval, it is recommended that the application be refused for the following reason(s):

The proposed development does not make appropriate provision for transport mitigation measures/infrastructure provision, mitigation of potential for overspill parking, the funding and agreement of the a Travel Plan Co-Ordinator, public art, relocation of a community facility, restriction on occupation of offices and monitoring in accordance with Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/7, 5/11, 7/2, 8/2, 8/3, 9/9 and 10/1, Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003 policies P6/1, P9/8 and P9/9 and as detailed in the Planning Obligation Strategy 2010, the Public Art Supplementary Planning Document 2010 and the Southern Corridor Area Transport Plan 2002.

3. In the event that the application is refused, and an Appeal is lodged against the decision to refuse this application, delegated authority is sought to allow officers to negotiate and complete the Planning Obligation required in connection with this development

LOCAL GOVERNMENT (ACCESS TO INFORMATION) ACT 1985

Under Section 100D of the Local Government Act 1972, the following are “background papers” for each report on a planning application:

1. The planning application and plans;
2. Any explanatory or accompanying letter or document from the applicant;
3. Comments of Council departments on the application;
4. Comments or representations by third parties on the application as referred to in the report plus any additional comments received before the meeting at which the application is considered; unless (in each case) the document discloses “exempt or confidential information”
5. Any Structure Plan, Local Plan or Council Policy Document referred to in individual reports.

These papers may be inspected on the City Council website at:

www.cambridge.gov.uk/planningpublicaccess

or by visiting the Customer Service Centre at Mandela House.

**Cambridge City Council
Design & Conservation (CB1) Sub-Panel**

Notes of the meeting Wednesday 14th March 2012

Present:

Dr Nick Bullock	Chair
Terry Gilbert	RTPI (vice Chair)
Richard Owers	RIBA
Carolyn Gohler	Cambridge Past, Present & Future
Jon Harris	Co-opted Member
David Grech	English Heritage

Officers:

Glen Richardson	City Council
Sarah Dyer	City Council
Jonathan Brookes	City Council

Presenters:

Neven Sidor	Grimshaw Architects
Eric Osborne	Grimshaw Architects
Robert Myers	Robert Myers Associates

Observers:

Sven Topel	Brookgate Developments
Derek Ford	Brookgate Developments
Jon Burgess	Beacon Planning

1. Apologies – Oliver Caroe

2. Introduction to 50/60 Station Road by Glen Richardson.

A note prepared by Glen Richardson explaining the background to today's presentation had been circulated in advance.

A proposal for this site was last seen by the Panel in November 2011 (verdict AMBER). City Council officers working on the scheme throughout last year expressed significant concerns on issues such as its compliance with the approved CB1 parameter plans (principally the requirements for the I2 block), whether the buildings were a matched pair, the overall height of the building(s) and the approach to fenestration, materials and renewables, amongst others. The application was submitted without, in effect, these matters being fully resolved and was then reviewed by the sub-panel at the November meeting.

In early December 2011, officers gave a clear steer to the applicant that the submitted application could not be supported on design grounds. The architects then took the officer comments and over a series of meetings and design iterations have produced a scheme which, in officer opinion at least, is better resolved overall and which is improved in respect of scale, mass, materials and composition.

The lead architect, Neven Sidor, described the features of the amended proposal. These included the following:

- o Differentiation between the different sides of the buildings.
- o A landscape scheme adapted to the new architectural layout.
- o The facades now seen as an expression of light, not mass, as demonstrated by detailed modelling.
- o A design without louvers this time around, and instead with reconstituted stone fins and of a more solid nature
- o A glazed entrance lobby
- o A view through to the station building down the Southern Access Road.
- o A more generous colonnade facing Station Road.
- o A public artwork setting the tone for Station Road.

The Panel's comments are as follows:

- The Panel welcomed the new design strategy for the development with its revised massing and the clear differentiation of the two buildings.
- The Station Road frontage. The Panel welcome the double height of the ground floor of the two towers and the more generous approach to the design of this area. This and the redesign of the 'Pod' is likely to generate more activity along this frontage could, with the proposed cycle racks, lead to greater conflict between cyclists and pedestrians. The Panel expressed some scepticism about the adequate management of the cycle parking and the ability of the developer to prevent its use by rail travellers.
- The South Square frontage. The Panel welcomed the chamfering of the south-eastern corner of No 60 at street level and the view through to the Station Square and the level of animation at the northern edge of the South Square that this will make possible.
- The Café area, the Station Road frontage. The Panel questioned whether the area would be as open as it appeared from the presentation and asked that the dimensions of this space be

checked. While the Panel generally favoured the openness of the area around the café, there was concern about the possible crowding of activity with the café, pedestrians en route to the station and cyclists leaving their bikes.

- The 'Pod'. The Panel welcome the architectural language and animation of this single height space set against the double height of the two foyers.
- The Stair cores, No 60 and 50. The Panel favoured the differentiation and the placing of the two cores and the way that the core to No 60 would clearly signal the position of the development on Station Road.
- West elevation of No 50. The core does not continue to ground level and the Panel thought that the choice of stone or precast units for the elevation of the 'base' element of the building, particularly around the junction of the western and the Station Road elevations, needed further consideration. The Panel also raised the issue of the detailed topography of the area and the need to consider carefully the relative levels in the handling of the ground floor of the development.
- Rear stair core No 60. There is no visible expression of the stair tower, and the members of the Panel questioned this arrangement, in particular the treatment of the stair core especially at ground floor level.
- Details of the cladding of the frame, the 'fins' and the base elements. The Panel are confident that the proposed 'kit of parts' will provide the basis for a successful treatment of the elevations but feel that further refinement of the proposals for both sets of elevations is necessary to recognise, for example, the different conditions for the northern and the southern elevations.
- The choice of the 'family' of materials. In general terms, the Panel favours the development of an architectural language with a restrained palette of materials.
- The detail design of the 'fins'. The Panel raised the dangers of weather staining on the 'fins' and looks forward to seeing the details of the design that will address this issue.
- Reconstituted stone elements. Although the Panel recognise the reasons behind this choice of material, careful control of the finishing, handling and installation of these elements will be needed to avoid the kind of chipping seen on other developments in the City.
- The Panel would welcome an approach to detailing that would take account of the approach adopted for neighbouring buildings.

- Green roof over cycle parking (No 50). This is welcomed. Opportunities for green roofs above other parts of the building should also be explored.
- Tree guards/shelter. The Panel consider that tree guards must be made to a robust design if they are to succeed.
- Planting (in the space between buildings) facing south. The Panel are confident that this arrangement would be successful, but recommend some protective measures being taken against a possible wind “vortex”, perhaps through the inclusion of a taller glazed element at the southern end of the open terrace.
- The panel note the scheme will have a BREEAM Excellent rating.
- Public art. The Panel welcome the suggestion that the stair tower of No 60 might be used for public art. The form that this might take needs to be determined in consultation with the City’s Public Art Panel.

Conclusion

In strategic terms, the Panel considers that the new approach is a great improvement. The change in massing, the handling of the frontage at ground level along Station Road and the greater animation of the frontage to the ‘anti-chamber’ square to the south are welcomed. The ‘kit of parts’ proposed for the elevations looks promising but further refinement of the design is still needed, as is further examination of the treatment of stair cores at ground level.

VERDICT –

1. The strategy of the massing, the relationship of the stair core with Station Road, the overall strategy for the elevations and the handling of the public realm, GREEN (5), AMBER (1)

2. The ‘kit of parts’ for the elevations, the handling of the elevations at ground level, the design of the ‘fins’ and other components and the planting of the terraced area, GREEN (3), AMBER (2)

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.**