

Application Number	12/1233/CAC	Agenda Item	
Date Received	26th September 2012	Officer	Mrs Sarah Dyer
Target Date	21st November 2012		
Ward	Trumpington		
Site	Demeter House Station Road Cambridge CB1 2RS		
Proposal	Demolition of Demeter House.		
Applicant	Mr Sven Topel c/o Agent		

SUMMARY	<p>The development accords with the Development Plan for the following reasons:</p> <p>An assessment of Demeter House as part of the Conservation Area, which is a heritage asset has been carried out.</p> <p>The demolition of Demeter House is justified by the public benefit that will derive from the development of the site for office accommodation as part of the wider Station Area redevelopment</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 west of the access serving the Warren Close development. The site is occupied by Demeter House.
- 1.2 The northern boundary of the site is the pavement on the south side of Station Road. To the west is Leda House and to the east Daedalus House which is also in office use but which is of a different design to Leda and Demeter Houses. Further to the

west is Jupiter House which completes the office blocks known as the Three Deities. To the south is the Warren Close development which accommodates residential flats. To the rear of the site they take the form of four/five storey blocks with a projecting stair well.

- 1.3 The site is within the Station Area Redevelopment Framework Boundary and within the Central Conservation Area No.1. 32-38 Station Road to the east 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 Conservation Area Consent is sought for the demolition of Demeter House. Parameter Plan 1 of the Outline consent identifies Demeter House as a building that is to be demolished. Whilst this does not negate the need for Conservation Area Consent it is a material consideration.

2.2 The application is accompanied by the following supporting information:

1. Design and Access Statement by TP Bennett
2. Heritage Statement and Addendum to Heritage Statement by Beacon Planning
3. Planning Statement by Savills

3.0 SITE HISTORY

Reference	Description	Outcome
06/0266/OUT	CB1 Station Area Redevelopment	A/C
12/1237/REM	Reserved matters submission for Block J2	Pending determination
	Non Material Amendment for changes to footprint of Block J2 and space between Blocks J1 and J2	Pending determination

4.0 PUBLICITY

4.1 Advertisement:	Yes
Adjoining Owners:	Yes
Site Notice Displayed:	Yes
Public Meeting/Exhibition	No
DC Forum	No

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	ENV6, ENV7
Cambridge Local Plan 2006	4/11 4/13 8/2 9/9

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
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> Air Quality in Cambridge – Developers Guide
	<u>Area Guidelines:</u> Station Area Development Framework/Station Area Conservation Appraisal

6.0 CONSULTATIONS

Cambridgeshire County Council (Engineering)

- 6.1 No objection subject to a condition to secure a Traffic Management Plan for demolition/construction traffic and informatives.

Head of Refuse and Environment

- 6.2 The impacts of the demolition works are capable of control via the planning conditions that have been attached to the Outline consent but the developer should be reminded of this.

Urban Design and Conservation Team

- 6.3 Amendments to the submission have been made but further revisions are necessary before the demolition of Demeter House can be justified.

English Heritage

- 6.4 Demolition of Demeter House

The loss of a building which makes a positive contribution to the Conservation Area, which is a designated heritage asset, has the potential to result in harm. The architectural quality of Demeter House has been devalued by the refurbishment works that were carried out in the 1980s and which included removal of the alternate vertical elements from within the concrete

frame. This has weakened the vertical emphasis within the elevations.

However Demeter House, Leda House and Jupiter House have a group value and the removal of one building will be harmful to the character of the Conservation Area. It would have been better for the redevelopment of this part of Station Road to commence with Daedalus House which has no architectural merit to allow retention of all three Deities in the short term.

Design of Replacement Building

The scale, form and massing conforms to the Parameter Plans and the architectural language reflects the precedent of the Microsoft development opposite. There must be a strong expectation that this design will dictate the overall design form for the J blocks as a whole.

Recommendation

The developer should be asked to consider revising the phasing of the development so that Daedalus House is demolished and redeveloped ahead of the Deities. If the City Council is minded to approve then a condition should be included to prevent demolition in advance of a signed contract for the construction of the building. The developer should also be encouraged to redevelop Daedalus House in advance of Jupiter and Leda Houses. Conditions are recommended in relation to materials, detailing and landscaping.

Design and Conservation Panel (Meeting of 10 July 2012)

- 6.5 The relevant section of the minutes of this panel meeting is attached to the report in respect of the submission for approval of reserved matters (ref. 12/1237).

Conclusion - In general, the Panel felt the scheme respected the parameter plans. The questions about phasing and the building's impact on its neighbours remain the key concerns.

VERDICT – AMBER (unanimous)

The relevant section of the minutes of the panel meeting are attached to this report as Appendix A.

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:

44 Warren Close

7.2 The representations can be summarised as follows:
No objection to the demolition of Demeter House, which is not considered to be an attractive building but raises concern about the impact of the demolition works on residential amenity in Warren Close.

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

8.0 ASSESSMENT

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 demolition
2. Impact on Heritage Assets
3. Other Environmental Impacts
4. Third party representations

Principle of Demolition

8.2 Parameter Plan 1 of the Masterplan indicates Demeter House as one of a number of existing buildings to be demolished across the CB1 redevelopment area. The Outline Planning Consent does not negate the need for Conservation Area Consent but it is a significant material consideration. My report for the Outline Planning Consent (October 2008) concludes that there is no objection in principle to the demolition of Demeter House and the other Deity buildings.

- 8.3 My views have not changed and I consider that subject to the grant of Conservation Area Consent, the principle of the demolition of 32-38 Station Road is acceptable.

Impact on Heritage Assets

- 8.4 The applications for Conservation Area Consent and approval of Reserved Matters are 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 proposed development subject to the imposition of planning conditions to address matters of detail.
- 8.5 The applicants have correctly identified the heritage asset which is affected by the development as the Conservation Area including the Three Deities and the villas on the north side of Station Road. Demeter House and the other two Deities are not listed and are not Buildings of Local Interest and do not have the status of either designated or 'undesigned' heritage assets. However they are clearly an intrinsic part of the Conservation Area and have been identified as having 'positive townscape value' in the Conservation Area Appraisal.
- 8.6 The fact that Demeter House is neither listed nor a Building of Local Interest (BLI) means that its demolition should not be regarded as comparable with the demolition of 32-38 Station Road because the building itself is not a heritage asset. Policy 4/12 of the Local Plan is not relevant because the demolition does not involve a BLI. However Demeter House does form part of the Conservation Area which itself is a heritage asset and policy 4/11 of the Local Plan is relevant as it relates to demolition of unlisted buildings in the Conservation Area.

The Heritage Statement

- 8.7 The Heritage Statement addresses statutory constraints, the history of the site and area, provides a statement of significance and discusses the proposed building and its impact. The Addendum to the Heritage Statement provides an update in the light of revisions to the elevations of the building.
- 8.8 The Heritage Statement refers to the Conservation Area Appraisal and its analysis of the importance of the tree-lined

nature of Station Road and the fact that this characteristic is enhanced by the recessive nature of the buildings and the rhythm they give to the street. The Appraisal also refers to the need for enhancement of the parking areas between the Deities.

8.9 In its review of the history of the site and the area the Heritage Statement refers to the fact that the construction of the Deities were themselves part of a redevelopment in the Station Area. They were constructed in the late 1960s following a design by Fitzroy Robinson and Partners. As built the concrete frame of the building stood proud of the glazing behind which gave the buildings a distinctive vertical proportion. This effect was lost in the 1980s when repairs made the buildings more horizontal in character.

8.10 The Heritage Statement describes the proposed building as follows:

‘The effects of the pavilions in the street is emphasised by the strong masonry frame of the proposed building with peeled back glass corners contributing to the patten of solid and void.....The recessed elements, set back behind the masonry frame, give further animation to the block and help to emphasise the gaps between the buildings, opening up the view into these publicly accessible spaces.’

8.11 This description has been amended in the Addendum document to respond to the amended plans however I remain of the view that the appearance of the new building and the related spaces serves to reflect the positive aspects of the existing Deities grouping and to repair the damage to the streetscene which arose when these buildings were altered.

8.12 The Heritage Statement (and Addendum) concludes that the loss of Demeter House will not cause any harm to the significance of the Conservation Area as the replacement building, as amended, will perpetuate and strengthen the positive characteristics of the area. Further revisions are need to improve the detailed appearance of the building and subject to those further amendments, I agree with this view.

Policy 4/11 of the Local Plan

- 8.13 The supporting text to policy 4/11 requires that when considering the demolition of buildings, which contribute positively to the character of the Conservation Area, the same tests that would apply to the demolition of a listed building should be applied. These tests are set out in policy 4/10.
- 8.14 The Conservation Area Appraisal recognises that Demeter House is a building that makes a positive contribution to the Conservation Area and this is reflected in the approved Parameter Plans. The tests that are set out in the Local Plan therefore have to be considered. They are as follows:
- o The building is structurally unsound
 - o The building cannot continue in its current use and there are no viable alternative uses
 - o Wider public benefits accrue from the development

In this case the first two tests are not passed because the building is sound and can continue in office use. The justification is solely reliant upon the 'public benefit' argument.

- 8.15 Although Conservation Area Consent is needed I would argue that the basis of the public benefit was established at the Outline Consent stage. The redevelopment of the Station Area as a whole is necessary to bring forward the very significant improvements to the transport interchange that include works to the Station, the new Station Square, the bus interchange and Cycle Park. An increased density of development is needed to support these improvements. This development will contribute towards these wider benefits but also brings forward benefits in its own right.
- 8.16 The development will trigger commuted sum payments towards the Southern Corridor Area Transport Plan (SCATP) and the Cambridge Guided Bus (CGB). The CGB has already improved access to the Station Area and infrastructure that will be brought forward by the continued implementation of SCATP will also be of public benefit.
- 8.17 The development also triggers the provision of improvement of the Station Road/Hills Road junction to make it safer for use by

pedestrians. Although this will benefit the occupiers of the building it will also have a wider public benefit.

8.18 The development of the site will also bring forward the first part of the public realm improvements to the south side of Station Road in the form of the linear park and will provide opportunities for public art. These are tangible public benefits which in my view strongly support the redevelopment of this site and particularly the demolition of Demeter House.

8.19 The Urban Design and Conservation team support the proposals for the new office building subject to resolution of matters of detail. Subject to further revised plans being submitted, they do not raise any objections to the demolition of Demeter House.

8.20 I am convinced that, subject to further revisions, the new office buildings will be a positive asset to the Conservation Area for the reasons set out in my report for the reserved matters submission and set out above. This view is shared by the Design and Conservation Panel, English Heritage and the Urban Design and Conservation Team. These views provide the necessary justification for the demolition of Demeter House.

8.21 In my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policy 4/11 and guidance provided by the NPPF.

Other environmental impacts

8.22 I have recommended conditions and informatives as suggested by the Highway Authority officer and which pick up on the views of the Environmental Health Officer.

8.23 In my opinion, subject to compliance with conditions, the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 4/13 and 8/2.

Third Party Representations

8.24 I appreciate the concerns raised by the resident of Warren Close regarding the potential impact of the development on residential amenity. I am confident that the conditions that I have recommended for this application and that are on the Outline consent will address her concerns.

9.0 CONCLUSION

- 9.1 In my view the demolition of Demeter House is justified by the public benefit that will derive from the development of the site for office accommodation as part of the wider Station Area redevelopment. The assessment of the contribution that Demeter House makes to the Conservation Area, which is a heritage asset, has been carried out properly and is supported by officers. I have no objections to the demolition that will facilitate the delivery of the CB1 Masterplan approved under the Outline Planning Consent.

10.0 RECOMMENDATION

APPROVE 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. No development shall take place until a full photographic record and survey by measured drawing and salvage of samples has been made depicting the exterior and interior of the building (including any parts to be demolished) and a copy deposited with each of the following organisations: the Cambridgeshire Collection of the Central Library, Lion Yard, Cambridge; the County Archive, Shire Hall, Castle Hill, Cambridge, and the local planning authority. The precise number and nature of the photographs, drawings and samples to be taken is to be agreed in advance with the local planning authority and the format in which they are to be displayed and titled is to be agreed with the local planning authority before the deposit is made.

Reason: To foster understanding of the building's importance in the national and Cambridge context, and to ensure proper recording of any aspects of the building's special interest which are to be lost or altered. (Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003, policy P7/6 and Cambridge Local Plan 2006, policy 4/12)

3. Prior to the commencement of the development hereby permitted, 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:

- 1 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:

- 2 A specific construction programme
- 3 A plan identifying:
 - (a) The contractor site storage area/compound
 - (b) Screening and hoarding locations
 - (c) Access arrangements for:
 - i. Vehicles
 - ii. Plant
 - iii. Personnel
 - iv. Building material
 - (d) Plant and equipment storage areas
 - (e) Contractor parking arrangements for:
 - i. Construction vehicles
 - ii. Personnel vehicles
 - (f) 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).

INFORMATIVE: Applicants or their agents preparing a survey for archive deposit are advised to refer to "Understanding Historic Buildings: A guide to good recording practice." - English Heritage, 2006.

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: This development involves work to the public highway that will require the approval of the County Council as Highway Authority. It is an OFFENCE to carry out any works within the public highway, which includes a public right of way, without the permission of the Highway Authority. Please note that it is the applicant's responsibility to ensure that, in addition to planning permission, any necessary consents or approvals under the Highways Act 1980 and the New Roads and Street Works Act 1991 are also obtained from the County Council. Public Utility apparatus may be affected by this proposal. Contact the appropriate utility service to reach agreement on any necessary alterations, the cost of which must be borne by the applicant.

Reasons for Approval

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

East of England plan 2008: ENV6 and 7

Cambridge Local Plan (2006): 4/11 4/13 8/2 9/9

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.

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.