SUMMARY

The development accords with the Development Plan for the following reasons:

1. A finely balanced view has been arrived at on the basis of all the professional opinions and extensive research and monitoring that has been undertaken. I am on the view that the proposed works will not harm the character or fabric of the listed building and is compliant with guidance provided by the National Planning Policy Framework (2012) and policies 4/10 and 4/11 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2006);

2. The supporting information details that the reduction in CO₂ emissions would be 17.7%. Policy 8/17 of the
Cambridge Local Plan does not stipulate that the development should achieve at least 10% of the developments energy through renewable sources, but it is desirable. As such, this proposal clearly exceeds the recommendations of the policy and the Sustainable Design and Construction SPD 2007; and

3. The proposed development provides appropriate disabled accommodation for students and fellows and introduces some changes that provide wheelchair compatible surfaces within the Courtyard. The proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policy 3/7.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RECOMMENDATION</th>
<th>APPROVAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

A.0 Members of Planning Committee are requested to make a resolution for this application that the report below should form the Council’s case to the Secretary of State. As objections have been received from both English Heritage and a National Amenity Society, The Georgian Group and that Officer recommendation is one of approval, the Secretary of State needs to be notified prior to the formal determination of the application.

1.0 SITE DESCRIPTION/AREA CONTEXT

1.1 New Court is located within the main campus of Trinity College, directly to the south of Neville’s Court, west of Bishop’s Hostel and The Backs to the east of the site. The building presently accommodates a large proportion of second and third year undergraduates as well as some graduates and fellows.

1.2 New Court is a Grade I Listed Building, which is set within Trinity College, which is a Grade II Registered Park and Garden. For these reasons the site is of great historic interest.

1.3 Trinity College was established in 1546. In 1820, the College identified that additional accommodation was required and
instructed William Wilkins to design a new building, which was in the Tudor Gothic style and was ready for occupation by October 1825. This became known as New Court.

1.4 The elevations of the building face both public and private areas. In terms of the external elevations, the west elevation faces onto The Backs and the south elevation faces onto Garret Hostel Lane, both public. The internal courtyard elevations are accessible by the front private areas. The Heritage Statement by Beacon Planning, which accompanies this application, has identified these elevations as very high (west), moderate (south) and high significance (internal) respectively.

1.5 The building has been in continuous use as student accommodation since its initial construction and has undergone a continuous cycle of repair, refurbishment and adaptation. The original plan form is largely still evident. Externally, change has been more limited, with the major exception of the render, which has been replaced and subsequently patched and repaired over the years.

1.6 The surrounding area is predominantly collegiate and the site lies within City of Cambridge Conservation Area 1 (Central).

2.0 THE PROPOSAL

2.1 The applicant seeks listed building consent for works as listed below;

1. Refurbishment of accommodation and offices to a high specification;
2. Provision of new and the refurbishment of existing bathrooms and gyp rooms;
3. Internal alteration to accommodate an increase in the number of student bedrooms;
4. Provision of disabled student bedrooms and fellows’ teaching sets;
5. Upgrades to service infrastructure;
6. Increased thermal performance, through the installation of insulated internal lining and refurbishment of windows;
7. Introduction of renewable energy and sustainable technologies; and
8. The reinstatement of external render.
2.2 I have described each of these works in more detail within the assessment as each of these aspects of the proposal need considerable analysis.

2.3 The College have undertaken an assessment of their estate and have identified that the rooms within New Court are inadequate for contemporary student use. They fail to meet the expectations of students who seek modern facilities. The building also needs to be upgraded in order to meet the requirements of Environmental Health and the Fire Service with a rationalisation of the shared facilities and addition of gyp rooms and en-suite rooms.

2.4 The services to New Court, including the mechanical and electrical services are inadequate, inefficient and inaccessible and need to be upgraded.

2.5 At present the thermal performance of the building is unsustainable. In order to heat the ground floor rooms, the heating remains on throughout October to May at a temperature that forces the upper floor occupants to live with their windows open.

2.6 For these reasons, Trinity College seek to undertake significant refurbishment works adopting a long term view. Not only do they seek to upgrade existing facilities, but they also wish to improve the thermal performance of the existing building to make it comfortable for future occupants. In order to support the principle of this proposed development, Trinity College have undertaken significant amounts of research and monitoring for a period of more than 2 years prior to the submission of this planning application to ensure that the proposed development is an exemplar development for the technical monitoring and modelling studies.

2.7 The proposed development seeks to develop a sustainable approach to retrofitting a historic building in relation to the climate change agenda and the impacts of this particular objective are discussed in greater detail within the report.

2.8 On 19th October 2012 following a technical meeting with relevant parties, additional supporting information was submitted for review. There were also revised drawings
formally submitted that removed the service lining within the bedrooms, except where specifically covering service trunking.

2.9 Further to this, on 6th November 2012 revised drawings were submitted that removed the proposed photovoltaic panels that were located on the top of the dormer windows that face Garret Hostel Lane, which were 18 in total. The two rows of panels on the main roof slope remain as part of the proposals.

2.10 The application is accompanied by the following supporting information:

1. Design and Access Statement
2. Heritage Statement
3. Sustainability Statement
4. Technical Paper
7. Plans

2.11 The application is brought before Planning Committee because the proposal is the first of its kind in the Country. A balance needs to be struck between the aspiration of providing a sustainable solution and the historic importance of the building. Officers are of the view that this is a matter for Planning Committee under the guidance of officers.

3.0 SITE HISTORY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12/1054/LBC</td>
<td>Repairs to staircases and landings in New Court - Grade I Listed Building.</td>
<td>Approved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/1057/FUL</td>
<td>Installation of photovoltaics and 3 dormers to south roofslope; installation of new window openings, blocking of existing window openings, and replacement window frames to existing windows, south elevation.</td>
<td>Pending</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/0045/FUL</td>
<td>Installation of 20no. boreholes,</td>
<td>Perm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1no. manifold chamber and interconnecting pipes.

4.0 PUBLICITY

4.1 Advertisement: Yes
    Adjoining Owners: Yes
    Site Notice Displayed: Yes
    Design and Conservation Panel (meeting of 21st March 2012 and 29th August 2012): Yes

The minutes of both the Design and Conservation Meetings are attached to this report as Appendix 1.

5.0 POLICY


5.2 Relevant Development Plan policies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PLAN</th>
<th>POLICY NUMBER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>East of England Plan 2008</td>
<td>SS1 ENV6 ENV7 ENG1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supplementary Planning Documents</th>
<th>Sustainable Design and Construction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Material Considerations</td>
<td>Central Government:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Letter from Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government (27 May 2010)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Written Ministerial Statement: Planning for Growth (23 March 2011)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Area Guidelines:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conservation Area Appraisal:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cambridge Historic Core</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.0 CONSULTATIONS

Cambridgeshire County Council (Engineering)

6.1 No comment.

Urban Design and Conservation Team

6.2 Forming a recommendation is primarily about balancing the two aspects (Technical & Historic Environment) and assessing the benefits, if any, of permitting the alterations versus the losses, if any, of undertaking the works.

The local planning authority's technical advisor, BRE, has seen revisions to various aspects of the design that, with appropriate conditions relating to education, monitoring and mitigation, should allow the alterations to take place without adversely affecting the historic fabric or, should adverse effects occur, that they can be mitigated.

The assessment by Urban Design and Conservation of the historic environment aspects indicates that there are three sub-
categories of alteration within the overall scheme in respect of impact upon the listed building and its character and setting:
i) those that are broadly acceptable and where the impact is modest; these include the installation of the additional dormers, the wholesale changing of the glazing [subject to technical assessment] and overhauling of the windows, the installation of the ground source heat system and installation of some PV panels.
ii) those that have more impact and there are officer reservations about the degree of loss of historic fabric or character but which may be made acceptable through control of detailed design via conditions; these include the underfloor heating, re-rendering the external walls, moving of shutters & boxes and mechanical ventilation system.
iii) those that are either unacceptable or require a fair degree of modification [which may be obtainable via Conditions and detailed redesign]; these include the PV panels on the roofs of the dormers, relationship of internal wall linings to cornices & overall historic character and the loss of internal partitions particularly at ground floor. The PV panels to the dormers have now been withdrawn, the inner wall linings have been reduced in area and some aspects of their relationship to cornices can be controlled via conditions to the point where these matters might be moved to sub-category (ii) above. Other statutory consultees seem less concerned about the other matter – loss of internal partitions and historic room layout – and, again, this may be reduced in impact via conditions.

The balance to be drawn between the strong reservations about the third group of alterations and the technical aspects suggests that if there is any doubt about either the alterations providing the claimed improved building performance or the alterations would or might have adverse effects upon the fabric, then the recommendation should be for refusal. Conversely, if the technical report indicates that the purpose of the scheme can be achieved with some certainty, that the alterations will not threaten the listed building in the long term and that the situation can and will be monitored in an acceptable fashion, then the balance would be towards a recommendation for approval.
Senior Sustainability Officer (Design and Construction)

First Response 20th August 2012

6.3 The principal behind the proposals for the refurbishment of New Court is supported, and it is clear that what is being proposed has been informed by detailed study of the existing fabric of the building, and modelling of the impacts of internal on this fabric. What will be crucial in the implementation of these proposals is detailed monitoring to ensure that no negative impacts occur, and continuing liaison with the City Council and English Heritage.

There are a couple of areas where further information would be welcomed. The first relates to page 44 of the Technical Paper, which deals with the specification of the internal insulation for the project. It would be helpful to have clarification as to the measures being proposed to ensure that this does not happen. Also, with regards to the role of renewable energy as part of this proposal, it would be helpful if the applicant could provide a breakdown of the carbon reduction being achieved through the use of the ground source heat pump and the photovoltaic panels, expressed in Kg/CO₂/annum and as a percentage of overall emissions.

Second Response 13th September 2012

Following a letter dated 12th September 2012 from the agent, which provides the information requested in the previous response, the Senior Sustainability Officer is supportive of the proposals. She is pleased to see that the approach being taken with regards to the insulation seeks to minimise any risk of incorrect specification, which would have harmed the fabric of the building. The levels of carbon reduction being achieved from the use of the ground source heat pumps and photovoltaic panels are supported, and will exceed the requirements of Policy 8/16 of the Local Plan.

Access Officer

6.4 General support for the proposal subject to a presentation to Disability Consultative Panel.
The proposals to improve WC and kitchen facilities exploit areas that already have partitions and add to areas of more recent alteration. Given their limited impact on the buildings significant and the undoubted need they do not oppose the changes in principle.

The addition of boxing in such an extensive way as to almost appear as panelling is questionable. The individual elements of furniture (wardrobes, desks, wash-stands) appear as distinct additions. However, the boxing seeks to link these elements together and effectively clad the whole walls. There seems no requirement for this and a more ‘traditional’ use of wall channels would be better in terms of conserving the historic character of the rooms.

The proposal to install insulated linings on the external walls of each room raises a number of issues about the long-term conservation of the fabric, the immediate impact of the work on the character of the interiors and the relationship between the proposed linings and the historic treatment of the walls.

- Agreement that the insulated linings would not cause the amount of moisture in these walls to rise to detrimental levels that might precipitate decay and that there is not the need to return the insulation onto the cross-walls. This is provided that there is provision of long-term monitoring and that if moisture levels rise to a potentially harmful point that appropriate action is taken.

- While the assessment of the linings’ technical performance is reassuring, how the construction of the new lining would affect the historic significance of the rooms remains problematic. There is some historic precedent of installing linings on the rooms external walls, but to install them throughout the building would change the present character of a large number of rooms and remove any historic lath and plaster linings that survive. Instead where this plaster existing, insulation could be provided using material, which is blown into the cavities.
- The new linings would also result in an alteration to the relationship between the wall surface and the windows and shutters. Although it is proposed to re-set the surrounds, the re-creation may be compromised by the shadow gap left at the top and sides.

The existing windows are single glazed casements and the sashes may be original or at least replaced in an appropriate style and form during an earlier period of the buildings history. In the view of English Heritage they are critical elements of its architectural interest and make a strong contribution to its significance.

- English Heritage consider that the replacement of the glazing in practice may prove difficult because glazing bars might require replacement, and window may have to be altered to adapt to the additional thickness and weight of the glass.

- The visual impact of the replacement glass will remove the variety and visual texture that exists with the existing glazing, that may not be original. On balance, they are of the view that secondary glazing would be more appropriate and do not share the applications view that such an intervention would be unsympathetic. Even if it is accepted there would be no significant loss of historic joinery arising from the installation, a degree of harm to the significance of the building would result from the installation of the double glazed units.

The installation of photovoltaic panels would harm the character of the building. The hard, reflective qualities of such panels make them discordant and distracting additions to the historic roofscape.

English Heritage are of the view that listed building consent should be refused as they do not consider that the public benefit arising from the improved thermal performance of the building should be held to justify harm to New Court.

**Second Response (3rd December 2012)**

English Heritage considers that some of the proposed improvements intended to improve the thermal performance of
New Court would result in harm to its historic significance. In accordance with paragraph 132 and 134 of the National Planning Policy Framework a clear and convincing justification for these proposals is required. Although some amendments have been made to the proposals and additional technical information submitted, we maintain our recommendation that the application should be refused.

Acknowledgement of the amendments has been made with the most prominently sited photovoltaic panels being deleted from the scheme and the rationalisation of the use of boxing services for the bedrooms. These are welcome changes and go some way to reducing the harmful impact of the proposals.

Notwithstanding the amendments and additional technical information submitted, the impact of the historic significance of the building from the proposed installation of double glazing units in the existing window frames and lining the external walls of all the rooms remain.

**Cambridgeshire County Council (Archaeology)**

**First Response 25th July 2012**

6.6 Records indicate that the site lies in an area of high archaeological potential and as such the site should be subject to a programme of archaeological investigation as required by condition.

**Second Response 25th September 2012**

Following an e-mail from the agent expressing concern over the need/level of archaeological intervention the County Archaeologist remains of the opinion that the recommended condition is imposed given that some of the excavation pits are 1200 mm deep.

**Design and Conservation Panel (Meeting of 12th March 2012, pre-application discussions)**

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

6.7 In relation to the application of the dry lining to the internal walls, the Panel were unanimous in the view that any measure...
to insulate the walls should be minimally intrusive and applied in a way that could be removed in the event of failure. Further to this, the Panel felt that the introduction of a shadow gap added complication to the layout and may also create problems of maintenance and possibly exacerbate problems of cold bridging.

One of the Panels central concerns was that as much of the original fabric should be retained but that if further investigation revealed that the existing cornices dated from the refurbishment carried out by David Roberts in the 1970’s, it was agreed that there would be no objection to carrying the lining up to the ceiling and replacing the cornice.

**VERDICT – Green (7), Amber (2) and 1 abstention.**

In relation to the wholesale replacement of the windows, the Panel were concerned regarding the precedent that would be established by agreeing such a change. Therefore the Panel would not support the replacement of the windows. The alternative is to use secondary glazing. Despite acknowledgement of the shortcomings of secondary glazing, the Panel considered that the use of secondary glazing was favourable. There was also discussion about the insertion of a new form of double glazing into the existing casements and this would be preferable to both wholesale replacement and secondary glazing.

**VERDICT – Support for replacing the existing fabric (2); Support for secondary glazing (7) with 1 abstention.**

**Design and Conservation Panel (Meeting of 29th August 2012)**

The submitted scheme has chosen to replace the existing glass with a slim lined double glazing that will be inserted into the existing casements. Some concerns were raised regarding the risk of condensation associated with this glazing option. The long-term monitoring of moisture levels built into this scheme provides some comfort on this matter and is to be praised.

**VERDICT – Green (4) providing that there is minimal loss of the timber fabric and the historic glass can be used elsewhere in an appropriate context.**
The Panel remain unconvinced that the narrowness of the lane will result in only a momentary glimpse of the proposed PV panels on Garret Hostel Lane. It is the view that harm would be done to the public view of this historic lane and would set a dangerous precedent.

**VERDICT – Red (4) with 1 abstention**

The principle of selective dry lining was supported as the Panel were persuaded that the problems of cold-bridging was not a significant issue given the applicants intention to measure the moisture levels in the long term.

The Panel felt that, except where new service pods are attached to the room walls, the manner in which the proposed dry-lining invades and blocks the visually significant cornices is decidedly uncomfortable. Taking guidance from the Panel’s English Heritage representative, the Panel would prefer the logic of the dry-lining carried up the wall, and to see the existing cornices and sometimes picture rails relocated (or replicated) over it.

**VERDICT – Support for the principle of dry lining (4) and 1 abstention; resistance to proposals relating to the loss of the cornice and picture rail amber (1), red (4) and 1 abstention.**

All of the minutes of the panel meetings are attached to this report as Appendix 1.

**Disability Consultative Panel (Meeting of 12th September 2012)**

6.8 The Panel felt this was a great scheme, clearly intended to provide better quality, inclusive student accommodation. The architects are praised for introducing 21st century safety, performance and sustainability standards while maintaining as far as possible, the historic fabric of the building.

**The Society for the Protection of Ancient Monuments**

6.9 No comment and will defer to the views of the other national amenity societies.
The Georgian Group

First Response (4th December 2012)

6.10 The Group’s Casework Panel raise no objection to the new environmental performance measures in principle. However, the Group recommends that all historic lathe and plaster be retained when making alterations to the interior of the building. This will avoid the loss of historic fabric that contributes to the building’s character positively and could outperform its proposed substitute, in terms of the contribution to the reduction of the building’s energy footprint.

The Group recommends that a new drawing be provided, for approval, showing the existence and retention of historic lathe and plaster. If this aspect of the proposed scheme cannot be removed from the application 12/0836/LBC they recommend that it be refused.

Second Response (8th December 2012)

The Group has noted the architect’s further advice regarding the performance of synthetic insulation measures

The above notwithstanding, our objections regarding the loss of historic fabric on this front remain unaddressed and we therefore kindly request that these are considered when determining the application. Whilst The Group has no objections to improving the energy performance of the building in principle it is our position that there are a range of tools that can be employed to reduce the building's energy footprint and that these should be selected carefully with the aim of reducing the loss of historic fabric as far as possible.

The current scheme uses a range of solutions, most of which involve no loss of historic fabric and we have no objection to these. Where the measures involve the loss of fabric we consider this to be an unacceptable and unnecessary solution.

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 No representations have been received

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. Impact upon the Heritage Asset
   a) Heritage Appraisal
   b) Technical Appraisal
   c) Technical versus Heritage Implications
3. Renewable energy and sustainability
4. Disabled access

Principle of Development

8.2 Policy 4/10 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 states that development affecting Listed Buildings and their settings will not be permitted unless:

   a) It is demonstrated that there is a clear understanding of the building’s importance in the national and Cambridge context including an assessment of which external and internal features and aspects of its setting are important to the building’s special interest; and
   b) The proposed works will not harm any aspects of the building's special interest or the impacts can be mitigated to an acceptable level for example by being easily reversible; or
   c) Where there will be an impact on the building's special interest, this is the least damaging of the potential options and there are clear benefits for the structure, interest or use of the building or a wider public benefit;
   d) And features being altered will be reused and/or properly recorded prior to alteration.

8.3 Officers appreciate the objectives that the applicant has set out in the Design and Access Statement and for this reason, the general principle of the motives behind the alterations
supported. As part of the submission for Listed Building Consent, the applicants have demonstrated that they fully understand the importance and significance of this building both within the Cambridge and wider national contexts.

8.4 There is no objection in broad principle to the proposed development. However, considerable assessment of how the proposed works will be managed and incorporated so that they do not harm any aspect of the building’s special interest are explored in considerable depth in the relevant sections of the report below. There is a need to use robust strategies for the long-term management of the building and its occupants in conjunction with mitigation policies that allow the proposed works to be reversed, should the monitoring results demonstrate that harm is occurring to the fabric of the listed building.

Impact on the Heritage Asset

8.5 The National Planning Policy Framework (2012) refers to heritage assets as a building, monument, site or area, which is identified as having a degree of significance meriting consideration in planning decisions, because of its heritage interest. They are valued components of the historic environment and include assets identified by the local planning authority.

8.6 The National Planning Policy Framework (2012) goes on to state in paragraph 132 that the more important the asset, the greater the weight should be placed upon the asset’s conservation. As heritage assets are irreplaceable, any harm or loss should require clear and convincing justification.

8.7 Paragraph 132 continues to say: “Substantial harm to or loss of designated heritage asset of the highest significance, notably…grade I and II* listed buildings….should be wholly exceptional”.

8.8 Paragraph 133 goes on to say: “Where the application will lead to substantial harm to or total loss of significance of a designated heritage asset, local planning authorities should refuse consent unless it can be demonstrated that the substantial harm to or loss of significance is necessary to
achieve substantial public benefits that outweigh that harm or loss”.

8.9 In order to determine if this application for works to the listed building are either wholly exceptional or that they are necessary to achieve substantial public benefits that outweigh the harm, an assessment needs to be made to (a) quantify the harm to the fabric and character of the listed building and (b) whether the proposed measures to improve the thermal performance of the building are achievable from analysis of the technical data submitted.

8.10 These two strands of consideration are discussed in detail below and only once these two strands have been fully considered can the discussion move onto weighing up the outcomes of each strand to understand if the proposed works are acceptable and in this circumstance is wholly exceptional and achieves substantial public benefit.

a) Historic Appraisal

8.11 This application proposes alterations to many elements of the listed building each of which needs to be considered both separately, on its own merits, and as a comprehensive scheme, taking into consideration the technical assessment.

8.12 The listed building is relatively plain in its appearance and has had several programmes of upgrade or alteration over time. The external appearance is designed very much to create a particular relationship with adjacent buildings and the river, but this was considered so important a matter that it affects the internal design to the point of compromising the functionality in some respects. The character of the interior of the listed building has been altered in an ad hoc way over the years but there remains a strong sense of the plainness & austerity of the original. The visual connection between the exterior and the interior and the simple internal detailing of rooms is important in conveying the character of the building.

**Exterior**

**Render**
8.13 The proposals include the replacement of render on the internal facing elevations, fronting into the courtyard. It appears that the original render was largely removed in the 20th Century and was replaced with a render that has no particular historic or architectural merit. For this reason there is no objection to the careful removal of the existing render (condition 14) and its replacement with an appropriate lime based render mix that shall be agreed through the imposition of a condition (15).

Windows

8.14 The replacement of windows is asserted to be an important feature of improving the energy performance of the building. However, the loss of such historic joinery is normally unacceptable in listed buildings. The view of English Heritage is that the windows are critical elements of the buildings architectural interest and makes a strong contribution to its significance. There is no conclusive evidence that the windows are original, but if they are replacements, then they are of an appropriate style and form to the original building.

8.15 English Heritage are apprehensive about whether the existing frames will have the ability to be altered in such a manner and that additional replacement joinery may be required. However, the application makes the case that the existing joinery can be improved and that it is structurally capable of having the glass replaced with a narrow-gap double-glazed unit without the need for substantial alteration.

8.16 In response to concerns, the applicants have ‘mocked up’ one window within the courtyard with the proposed glazing units to demonstrate the change to the external appearance of the listed building. Whilst it is noticeable because of a change in reflectivity and the spacer bar between panes, the effect upon the character of the listed building is in the view of officers considered to be relatively modest. It may be that it is noticeable when the observer is specifically looking for it or because the mock up is the only example amongst many existing windows, but generally on a building of this size, the alteration is acceptable.

8.17 However, the windows are not entirely uniform throughout the listed building with joinery having been repaired and individual panes of glass replaced over the years. The counter argument
made by English Heritage is that if all the windows are upgraded uniformly, there may be a rather unnatural sense of ‘sameness’ rather than an expected inevitable variance via evolution over time and a visual texture from the differences in glazing.

8.18 If permission is forthcoming, then it is the view of officers that with the imposition of an appropriate condition (12) the historic glass could be salvaged and kept for repairs to other historic windows around the college where replacement windows will not be supported, thereby retaining the existing glazing.

8.19 There is another important factor to take into account and that is the setting of precedent. Whilst the wholesale replacement of windows is not proposed here, nonetheless it is the wholesale replacement of glass, which is unlikely to be acceptable in many cases and particularly where it would not be part of a comprehensive scheme that included other upgrades. It is a fact that double-glazing is not a cost- or ‘carbon’-effective improvement measure on its own and there are many other measures that should be undertaken prior to considering double-glazing to get the optimum results. It is important to understand the particular nature of this case and recognize that it does not set an unfortunate precedent. I recommend that an informative is imposed to stress the exceptional nature of this application and the level of diligent research and monitoring that has been undertaken prior, during and post application submission.

8.20 In conclusion, the acceptability of the installation of double-glazing in this case must rest upon the installation being part of a comprehensive scheme of upgrades that are demonstrably proven to genuinely improve the on-going overall energy performance of the listed building.

8.21 On its own, the wholesale replacement of glazing is considered to harm the appearance of the listed building and if permission were sought for this element of work on its own, the support of officers is unlikely to be forthcoming. However, this application presents a package of works, which as a whole represent a scheme that will provide improved living conditions for occupants and improved energy performance for the building. I appreciate that in the first instance, the windows will be uniform in appearance, but over time a similar series of events are likely
to take place, where glazing panels will be replaced, to a standard that the thermal performance of the building is not compromised, but to the degree that the texture of the glazing may alter and give the visual richness that English Heritage are concerned will be forever lost.

8.22 It is a balanced judgement that if the performance of the building achieves the proposed efficiency, then it is the view of Officers that as paragraph 133 of the NPPF (2012) states, the application demonstrates that the substantial harm to or loss of significance is necessary to achieve substantial public benefit that outweighs that harm or loss. Although English Heritage is of the view that there is no public benefit, my view is that without these alterations users of the College will continue to be dissatisfied with the standard of facilities. Without the improvements, there is a concern that students may seek alternative accommodation and that the building will be harmed as a consequence. By this, I mean that substantial improvements may not be made and the building will continue to dry out, as is the existing case to a level where the fabric of the building is harmed. While I appreciate that there are alternative methods of achieving improvements to the performance of the building, the College are of the view that they wish to take a long-term view of the sustainability of the building and as such have proposed an extensive programme of works to achieve a significantly improved outcome.

8.23 Before a final view can be arrived at in relation to this sensitive discussion regarding the replacement of glazing in the existing windows, consideration of the technical documents needs to be undertaken, which is in a later section of the report. The final view will be exercised in the historic versus technical appraisal section of my assessment.

Landscape

8.24 Within the courtyard it is proposed to insert 20 boreholes that will be in association with the ground source heat pump (GSHP) as well as the distribution network from some sub-surface services. Planning approval has been sought through an earlier full planning application (12/0045/FUL). This application for listed building consent needs to consider the impact on the fabric and character of the listed building at the interface of where these external works pass through the walls of the listed
building. It is considered that the proposed works are acceptable and to ensure that the setting of the listed building is retained, a condition (37) that refers to the making good of external areas is required.

Rainwater Goods

8.25 An integral part of the overall proposal is to deal with moisture and damp within the building in an efficient way. An important aspect of this is how rainwater is disposed of. The scheme mentions improving drainage (in Garrett Hostel Lane) to help the wall construction to work in a more traditional, and successful way. However, if this drainage is then permitted to decline in functional terms, and leakages in the pipework develop, then there is the risk that the fabric of the building may be harmed through excess moisture. Therefore, it is considered to be appropriate for a condition (4) that requires the production of and adherence to a “Maintenance & Decoration Manual” which will include the requirement that rainwater goods are regularly inspected, maintained & overhauled.

PV Panels

8.26 The application proposes to install photovoltaic panels on the south facing roof slopes of the building. These roof slopes face onto Garret Hostel Lane and as a consequence the panels will be visible from some vantage points such as Garret Hostel Bridge. Originally, the application sought permission for two rows of panels on the roof slope as well as panels on top of the dormer windows. The view of officers was that because the panels would have to be angled on top of the dormer windows, they would be visible from the Lane and would be harmful to the character and setting of the listed building. For this reason, the application was amended to propose the two rows at the top of the roof slope only.

8.27 From Garret Hostel Bridge, there will be a limited view of approximately 6 panels, before the building follows the curve of the Lane and as such it is considered that the impact would be modest. From street level no other panels will be visible given that narrow nature of the Lane and the height of New Court. Instead the installation will be much more prominent for the occupants of higher level rooms in Trinity Hall across the lane. However, the view is that the installation of such panels will
result in a minimal alteration to the neighbouring occupants enjoyment of the building at the higher levels.

**Dormer Windows**

8.28 The additional dormers proposed on the south facing elevation are acceptable, subject to them being of similar design & construction to the existing. This can be appropriately conditioned (16) to ensure the above.

**Interior**

**Insulated Wall Linings**

8.29 In order to accommodate the proposed insulated linings, which will be located on the external wall of the bedrooms, some elements of the rooms historic fabric such as the window shutters and associated boxes will have to be moved. This also assists with exposing the existing cornices, which has been encouraged through pre-application discussions. These alterations allow for the shutters to function for their traditional purposes, but the proposed insulated linings result in details such as picture rails and skirtings being obscured behind the linings. The argument put forward by the applicants is that the details remain in situ and the lining is reversible, but there is an agreement that the occupants will be unaware of the presence of these features concealed behind fixtures.

8.30 There are views that while the over-layering of the rooms with the modern linings, built-in furniture and service voids may be ‘convenient’ in basic, functional terms, it robs most of the building of its features that define it as a historic building. I appreciate the view that the proposals seek to remove the older character of the bedrooms, but I believe that there remains a level of detailing through the retention of the cornice at the top of the wall and the shutters that will function as originally intended, to mitigate the obscurity of other historic features such as the picture rails and skirtings. Those features will remain, albeit it behind the new wall furniture, but providing that conditions (10, 21, 24) are imposed to ensure that the features are not damaged during the re-plastering of the walls and that drawings are produced at a large scale to understand how the plastering will be achieved, I consider that this element of the proposals is acceptable in historic terms.
8.31 In order to facilitate the insulated wall linings, it is proposed to remove the existing plaster on the walls and replace with a consistent modern lime based plaster. There are two types of existing plaster, gypsum and historic lath and plaster. There is no concern with the removal of the gypsum, although both the Georgian Group and English Heritage are both opposed to the removal of the historic lath and plaster linings. However, the applicants have been unable to obtain a true record of how many rooms had the historic wall lining and when or how it was replaced previously. The consultees have suggested that alternative techniques are used for insulating the walls, such as blowing insulation into the wall cavity. This approach would lead to a piecemeal technique to the insulation of the walls in order to achieve the required thermal insulation and providing that conditions (10, 21, 24) are imposed as suggested above.

8.32 The proposed development seeks to install en suite bathrooms and generally fits them into the building in an appropriate way. However, there are some instances where these are not well details and these need to be controlled through condition (20) including the locations for air extract systems and their trunking not only for the bathrooms but the kitchens too.

8.33 The proposed works also seek to reorder the student rooms with the most significant works occurring on the ground floor where it is proposed to remove a spine wall adjacent to the hallway. These works are in order to facilitate the formation of DDA compliant rooms and en suite bathrooms.

Conclusion

8.34 There are a number of elements to this proposal that may not be acceptable, primarily the wholesale replacement of glazing that would not be deemed acceptable if it is demonstrated that the anticipated thermal improvements are not achieved. Each of the aspects of development would not bring about the required improvements on their own and as such they need to work cohesively together to bring about the requirements and to consider if the proposed alterations balance in favour of demonstrating that the limited harm to the listed building is necessary to achieve substantial public benefit that outweighs that limited harm.
b) Technical Appraisal

8.35 The objectives of the applicants are to improve both the living conditions for the occupants (students) and the energy performance of the listed building. The agents make many assertions to support the case. The assertions on two aspects of the performance of the listed building are highly technical and have been reviewed independently by a consultant appointed by the local planning authority; these are whether the proposed scheme of works will actually produce the improvements in energy efficiency asserted and, even if the proposals do work, whether they provide any sort of threat to the historic fabric of the listed building.

8.36 Trinity College have undertaken a significant amount of research and monitoring of the existing and proposed situations prior to the submission of the planning application. This work has been commended by a number of the statutory consultees as it provides a substantial basis on which to consider the proposals.

8.37 As part of the determination of this application, the City Council have procured an independent expert from the Building Research Establishment (BRE), who has reviewed all the documentation and provided Officers with a report detailing their professional view on the predicted outcomes that the proposed scheme of works seeks to achieve and the realism of those expectations.

8.38 Initially a report was prepared by BRE, dated 10th October 2012, which raised concerns about the proposed methods and practices. This document formed the agenda for a technical meeting with attendees from both the applicant and Council on 15th October 2012. Following this meeting additional information and data was exchanged, which informed the final report of 29th October 2012, all of which have been published online and is attached as appendix 2 of this report.

Assessment of Existing Building Materials

8.39 The initial views were that by insulating the building in the proposed way to improve the thermal performance, there was a risk to the fabric of the building and that there may be an increase in condensation and as a consequence possible mould
growth. Therefore, the initial starting point for the project was to ascertain the built form of the building and the actual materials used. This would then enable assessment of the effect of applying the proposed thermal insulation.

8.40 The applicants commissioned testing on 20 core samples that were taken from measured points in the building to ascertain the actual brick used in the build. However, given the nature of the building, it was a case that higher quality bricks were used on the important and outer elevations, while lower quality bricks were used in other locations. For this reason, there remains a degree of uncertainty about the make up of bricks, particularly those on the Garret Hostel Lane elevation. However, it is the view of BRE that it is unlikely that any sample size would result in a definitive understanding of the range of bricks used and that the practical solution is to ensure that a robust mechanism for reporting on the conditions of the wall, by way of in-situ monitoring and the creation of a mitigation strategy, which can be required by conditions (5, 6, 33, 34) will be an acceptable method for dealing with this risk.

**Insulated linings of internal walls**

8.41 In order to improve the thermal performance, it is proposed to insulate the internal walls of the external elevation within the bedrooms with a wood fibre insulation board that will be full height but cut back to reveal the extant, historic cornice line.

8.42 Discussion has focused around whether this would create a ‘cold-bridge’ (a weak spot in the insulation) that would lead to condensation and risk of mould growth on the historic wall and if the insulation should return along any dividing or party wall.

8.43 It has been demonstrated by the design team that the omission of the insulated return does not result in an elevated risk to the listed building and that providing on-going in-situ modeling is designed to monitor and report the results to ensure that the parameters detailed in the technical papers are achieved and consistently maintained. This will be required through appropriate conditions (33 and 34).
Service Linings

8.44 Utilities and services need to be upgraded internally. Within the rooms it had been proposed to introduce a void on the walls of the rooms, which would be a ventilated air gap between the proposed insulation layer (as above) and a layer of wood paneling. In principle this is a pragmatic solution to dealing with services by allowing relatively easy access to cabling and ductwork, rather than them being buried in the walls, floors or ceilings.

8.45 However, BRE had a concern in their preliminary report that the ventilation rate of the air gap may not be achievable. As a consequence there would have been an elevated risk that the void would have become a source of stagnant air, which would have enabled the formation of condensation and mould growth. Taking this concern on board, revised proposals have been submitted that rationalise the usage of boxing for service voids to areas that are only needed. In accordance with these amended proposals and providing that in-situ monitoring is provided, through an appropriately worded conditions (33 and 34) to ascertain the levels of moisture, this revised proposal is acceptable.

User Behaviour and Intervention

8.46 One of the principle driving objectives for the proposed refurbishment of New Court is the unsustainable heating regime of the building. During the winter months the heating remains at a high temperature in order to heat the ground floor rooms, but causes occupants on the upper floors to live with their windows permanently open for ventilation and cooling. Through the proposed programme of development it will allow for the internal temperature of this part of the building to be lower and will result in fewer windows being opened. The greatest element of risk to the building is the behaviour and heating requirements of the occupants, the majority of who are likely to change on a yearly basis. It has been proposed by the design team that an information sheet is provided to occupants to explain the operation of the vent and heating systems. It is also suggested that this information sheet explains how their behaviour will result it the controls cutting in, such as in winter if windows are open then the heating for that room will be temporarily turned off. Therefore, it is recommended that a condition (35) is
imposed that requires the submission of an occupant information sheet prior to occupation for agreement with the local planning authority.

8.47 In addition to this a wider mitigation strategy will include training to the housekeeping and maintenance departments, who will be able to identify problems on a daily basis. It can also include regular reviews with occupants about the usability of the systems and the user comfort that they provide. This will enable a mechanism for dialogue, which is considered to be critical to performance of the systems.

Conclusion

8.48 The BRE report concludes that the strategy set out by the design team is achievable based upon the production of a robust mitigation strategy that clearly reports on the findings and outputs of the in situ monitoring. Providing that this strategy is produced, which will provide the comfort required in order to understand what is happening to the building in the long-term, the proposals will achieve the level of reduction that the College wish to obtain.

8.49 The cumulative effect of multiple risks that were identified in the preliminary report by BRE have now been reduced to a single risk, which is the assumptions that have been made regarding the actual building materials that have been used in the Garret Hostel Lane elevation. However, providing that the in-situ monitoring and the mitigation strategy are conditioned and reviewed, it is the view of BRE that this will be a manageable risk.

8.50 It should be considered that there has been extensive research and recording of data for more than 2 years prior to the application submission and that through the imposition of conditions there will be an on-going responsibility to the College to monitor the building for the foreseeable future. Without this considerable amount of research and the commitment by the applicant, support from BRE may not have been forthcoming.

Historic versus Technical

8.51 This report assesses the level of harm that the proposed works may have to the fabric and the interest of the listed building.
Taking into consideration the views of statutory consultees there is evidently a level of disagreement about the degree of harm that may arise. Assessing the proposals in terms of both historic impact and technically as to whether the combination of technologies will achieve the aspiration to improve the thermal performance of the building. There is a fine balanced judgement that needs to be arrived at.

8.52 The elements of the proposal that have raised significant concern with English Heritage are the installation of the photovoltaic panels on the south elevation; the wholesale replacement of glazing within the existing windows; the installation of linings to the external walls and the associated resetting of the window surrounds and shutter boxes; and a concern shared jointly with The Georgian Group which is the removal of historic lath-and-plaster linings.

8.53 Council Officers have worked collaboratively with English Heritage and the applicants and their design team for more than 2 years prior to the submission of the application. During that time discussions have lead to amendments and refinements of the proposed works. The procurement of a consultant by the City Council has also assisted in developing those discussions and alterations.

8.54 The outcome of the BRE report is that there is a single quantified risk to the fabric of the building. BRE consider that through the imposition of conditions that require the submission of monitoring and mitigation strategies, the proposed package of works, will bring about the level of improved thermal performance that the applicant seeks to achieve.

8.55 In accordance with the NPPF (2012) any harm should be permitted only if on balance it is justified by public benefits arising from the proposal. In balancing the harm and public benefits, the weight attached to the conservation of the significance of New Court should be proportionate to its significance, in this case reflected in the listing on the building as Grade I, the highest listing.

8.56 Grade I and II* listed buildings make up less than 10% of the country’s building stock and there is a view that for this reason, the contribution of improvements to their thermal performance will have a modest impact on climate change on a national
scale. I appreciate this view, but consider that the view has been arrived at on the basis that because the contribution is so modest, there is no significant public benefit, classified as the impact on climate change. My view in the instance of the public benefit that would arise is that it is the applicants wish to continue using New Court as a functional building, providing accommodation to its students. While minimal alterations could be made as they have in previous years, in an adhoc manner, these alterations have resulted in interventions that in the view of the City Council's Conservation Officer are harmful and they have welcomed their removal as part of this application. Subsequently, the applicants have sought to adopt a holistic view that is aspiring to achieve a high thermal performance that will bring about rewards to the College for 30 or more years, thereby making a long term commitment to the building. For this reason, I consider that the proposed works do bring about a public benefit to those who work and live at the College, to visitors and to residents of the City as the building will be maintained and used for a functional purpose. If the proposed works were not permitted and the adhoc alterations allowed to continue, then the functionality of the building is likely to be compromised.

8.57 I have arrived at this balanced view because of the confirmation of the technical consultant procured by the City Council that there is a minimal risk to the fabric of the listed building through the proposed works. This is in addition to the view that the proposed works will bring about the thermal improvements, which the applicant expects. I accept that the proposed works will to a degree alter the appearance of the building, namely the lack of visual texture in the glazing, but that to introduce secondary glazing into the rooms would not be acceptable and would intrude into the room, making it difficult for the shutter boxes to function in the way they were originally intended.

8.58 This finely balanced view has also been arrived at on the basis of the extensive research and development and monitoring that has been undertaken for the period before the application submission and the commitment of the College to continue this monitoring for a number of years afterwards as required through the imposition of conditions.

8.59 On consideration of all the professional views, on balance I am of the view that this proposal is acceptable. The proposal is

**Renewable energy and sustainability**

8.60 In order to achieve the enhanced thermal performance there are a number of measures being incorporated into the strategy:

- The enhancement of air tightness;
- Vapour permeable insulation;
- Mechanical ventilation with heat recovery;
- A ground source heat pump with 20 x c.100 m boreholes installed within the courtyard; and
- A photovoltaic array mounted on the south facing roof.

8.61 The package of measures is predicted to achieve reductions of 75% of energy use and 88% of annual carbon emissions when compared to the existing situation.

8.62 The above measures are all supported in principle, as are the levels of carbon reduction being achieved. Of the utmost importance with these proposals is ensuring that the proposed measures do not have a negative impact on the fabric of the building, which has clearly suffered from previous inappropriate interventions. It is clear that the measures being proposed have been chosen as a result of detailed monitoring of existing building conditions, with the aim of balancing the need to enhance the environmental performance and thermal comfort of the building while maintaining, and indeed offering further protection, to the fabric of the building. The monitoring that is being proposed will be vital in ensuring that the proposed measures behave in the manner predicted through the WUFI modelling, and proposals to share the results of the modelling with both the City Council and English Heritage are welcomed. It is considered that the submission of the detailed proposals for modelling to the City Council should be secured by way of condition. This should include a clear programme for the submission of monitoring data, as well as an outline of the steps that would be taken should the monitoring identify any unforeseen negative impacts.

8.63 The supporting information details that the reduction in CO$_2$ emissions would be 17.7%. Policy 8/17 of the Cambridge Local
Plan does not stipulate that the development should achieve at least 10% of the developments energy through renewable sources, but it is desirable. As such, this proposal clearly exceeds the recommendations of the policy and the Sustainable Design and Construction SPD 2007.

**Disabled access**

8.64 The Disability Consultative Panel and the Access Officer all concluded that New Court was best placed to provide disabled accommodation for students and Fellows. After a presentation to the Panel they praised the introduction of wheelchair compatible surfaces in the Courtyard and that subject to some small changes, which could be undertaken at the more detailed design stages, the proposal was acceptable.

8.65 In my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policy 3/7.

9.0 **RECOMMENDATION**

**FOR RECOMMENDATIONS OF APPROVAL**

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. Prior to the commencement of works, a Phasing Plan shall be submitted to and approved by the local planning authority in writing. Unless otherwise agreed in writing by the local planning authority, the works shall be carried out in accordance with the approved phasing plan.

   Reason: To clarify how the site is to be phased in the interests of providing a co-ordinated development (Cambridge Local Plan policy 3/6).
3. The means of preservation, protection and treatment of the following items of architectural / historic interest shall be agreed in writing prior to the commencement of any works on site by the local planning authority:

i] Lath-and-plaster ceilings
ii] Decorative cornices
iii] Staircase balustrades
iv] Decorative stonework
v] Fireplaces including their surrounds, grates, hearthstones and tiling
vi] Stone and other floors

Reason: To avoid harm to the special interest of the listed building (East of England Plan 2008 policy ENV6 and Cambridge Local Plan 2006, policy 4/10)

4. Prior to the occupation of the first completed phase of works a user manual for the future maintenance & decoration of the Listed Building is to be produced to ensure that such works are not undertaken in a way that negates, reverses or undermines the technical construction and decorative alterations hereby permitted. The manual should cover:

i] The use of the 'building management systems' (BMS) controlling - electronically or otherwise - heating systems, ventilation systems and the like.
ii] The forming of apertures [for any purpose whatsoever] in the walling, flooring & ceilings including the historic fabric, insulation, moisture control and other layers.
iii] The redecoration of all surfaces.
iv] The alteration of all services (electrical, water, drainage, gas, etc.).
v] The repair & maintenance of all drainage systems and rainwater goods.
vii] The production and display of occupant information sheets with notes on the following items :-

a) Need to maintain cross flow ventilation
b) Not to obstruct new voids
c) Not to use alternative forms of heating
d) Not to dry clothes in the room
e) Not to seal, alter or change the ventilation system
The user manual shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority and all maintenance and decoration shall be undertaken in accordance with the requirements of the manual thereafter.

Reason: To avoid harm to the special interest of the listed building (East of England Plan 2008 policy ENV6 and Cambridge Local Plan 2006, policy 4/10)

5. The performance and operation of the services installed in the Listed Building shall be monitored for alignment or otherwise with the parameters of the systems and equipment hereby approved. The performance and operation of the historic fabric of the Listed Building (both unchanged and changed as hereby approved) shall be monitored for comparison between pre- and post-refurbishment states of actual performance and modelled predictions.

The scheme of monitoring [including duration] and location of monitoring devices shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority prior to the commencement of works of each individual phase and the monitoring and review of the results shall be undertaken annually for a period of seven years and the necessity for the Review Panel [Condition 32] to meet thereafter shall be reviewed on the seventh year.

Reason: To avoid harm to the special interest of the listed building (East of England Plan 2008 policy ENV6 and Cambridge Local Plan 2006, policy 4/10)

6. A recording system shall be installed on completion of the approved works in each individual phase to record weather & climate data to inform the management of the building services installed that are related to changes in natural ambient temperature, natural precipitation and the adjustment of the systems and equipment hereby approved shall be modified accordingly to maintain alignment with the approved performance parameters thereafter.

Reason: To avoid harm to the special interest of the listed building (East of England Plan 2008 policy ENV6 and Cambridge Local Plan 2006, policy 4/10)
7. Prior to the installation of the Mechanical Ventilation with Heat Recovery (MVHR) plant and all chimney flue-lining systems, full details shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Systems that utilise concrete fill or other irreversible means of lining existing and/or historic chimneys are unlikely to be approved. Flue linings and MHVR plant shall thereafter be constructed only in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To avoid harm to the special interest of the listed building (East of England Plan 2008 policy ENV6 and Cambridge Local Plan 2006, policy 4/10)

8. Where historic joinery is to be retained and repaired, new work shall match the existing in every respect, including material, style, moulding detail and workmanship. Where historic door or window furniture such as hand-made iron hinges and latches remain, these are to be carefully preserved and reused. Full details of works to the following items shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority:

i] Removal & relocating of window shutters, shutter boxes, moulded below window panels, architraves.
ii] Removal, upgrading (for fire protection) and reinstalation of interior and exterior doors
iii] Stair handrails

Thereafter joinery work shall be undertaken only in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To avoid harm to the special interest of the listed building (East of England Plan 2008 policy ENV6 and Cambridge Local Plan 2006, policy 4/10)

9. All existing historic timber floorboards are to be protected during the works. Where such boards have to be lifted to allow for service runs, this is to be done with care [no ripping, splitting, power sawing or other crude methods are permitted] and the boarding is to be reinstated to match exactly in every respect the historic laying and fixing method unless otherwise agreed in writing by the local planning authority. Thereafter the development shall be undertaken in accordance with the agreed details unless the local planning authority agrees to any variation in writing.
10. Prior to the application of any new plaster in each individual phase, all new plaster is to be approved by the local planning authority by means of a sample panel to be prepared on site for inspection. It is likely that only traditional lime plaster mix designs will be acceptable. Thereafter plaster shall only be applied in accordance with the approved mix design. Items removed prior to re-plastering the interior such as picture rails and skirtings shall be reinstated to the satisfaction of the local planning authority prior to new room linings being installed. No element of new room linings [insulation, membranes] shall be bonded irreversibly to the plasterwork of the interiors of the listed building.

Reason: To avoid harm to the special interest of the listed building (East of England Plan 2008 policy ENV6 and Cambridge Local Plan 2006, policy 4/10)

11. Prior to any cast iron repair in each individual phases, full details of the means of cast iron repair shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Thereafter cast iron items shall only be repaired in accordance with the approved method.

Reason: To avoid harm to the special interest of the listed building (East of England Plan 2008 policy ENV6 and Cambridge Local Plan 2006, policy 4/10)

12. Prior to the removal of existing panes of historic glass within each individual phase, their removal and storage in a safe and secure manner shall be agreed with the local planning authority. Any plans to remove from storage, to dispose of, to reinstate or to reuse these items elsewhere are to be notified to and agreed in advance in writing by the local planning authority.

Reason: To avoid harm to the special interest of the listed building (East of England Plan 2008 policy ENV6 and Cambridge Local Plan 2006, policy 4/10)
13. Prior to the installation of any MVHR ducting, full details of the means of routeing and fixing the ducting and associated fixings [other than via chimneys; see Condition 7] shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Thereafter the ducting shall be routed and fixed only in accordance with the approved method.

Reason: To avoid harm to the special interest of the listed building (East of England Plan 2008 policy ENV6 and Cambridge Local Plan 2006, policy 4/10)

14. Prior to the removal of any existing render from the external walls in each individual phase, full details of the method [which may include preparing test sample patches for assessment by the LPA] shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Thereafter render shall only be removed in accordance with the approved method.

Reason: To avoid harm to the special interest of the listed building (East of England Plan 2008 policy ENV6 and Cambridge Local Plan 2006, policy 4/10)

15. Prior to the application of any new plaster on the external walls of each individual phase, it shall be approved by the local planning authority by means of a sample panel to be prepared on site for inspection. It is likely that only traditional lime plaster mix designs will be acceptable. Thereafter plaster shall only be applied in accordance with the approved mix design.

Reason: To avoid harm to the special interest of the listed building (East of England Plan 2008 policy ENV6 and Cambridge Local Plan 2006, policy 4/10)

16. No dormers shall be constructed until full details, at a scale of 1:10, showing the construction, materials, rainwater disposal and joinery of the dormers, including their cheeks, gables, glazing bars and mouldings, have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Dormers shall thereafter be constructed only in accordance with the approved details.
17. No rooflights shall be installed until full details of rooflights have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Rooflights which stand proud of the plane of the roof are unlikely to be approved. Rooflights shall thereafter be installed only in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To avoid harm to the special interest of the listed building (East of England Plan 2008 policy ENV6 and Cambridge Local Plan 2006, policy 4/10)

18. No boiler flues, soil pipes, waste pipes or air extract trunking shall be installed until the means of providing egress for all such items from the new or altered bathrooms, kitchens and plant rooms has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Flues, pipes and trunking shall be installed thereafter only in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To avoid harm to the special interest of the listed building (East of England Plan 2008 policy ENV6 and Cambridge Local Plan 2006, policy 4/10)

19. All redundant and disused services including cables, pipes, ducts, vents, grilles, trunking, switchgear, wiring, extractor fans, air conditioning plant, conduits shall be removed carefully from the historic building and the resulting areas made good to match the nearby historic work or to the satisfaction of the local planning authority. Redundant and disused services shall be removed thereafter only in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To avoid harm to the special interest of the listed building (East of England Plan 2008 policy ENV6 and Cambridge Local Plan 2006, policy 4/10)
20. Full details of the junction between glazed 'clerestory' en suite bathroom partitions and ceilings shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority prior to the commencement of such works in each individual phase. Thereafter all junctions between clerestory glazing and ceilings are to be constructed only in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To avoid harm to the special interest of the listed building (East of England Plan 2008 policy ENV6 and Cambridge Local Plan 2006, policy 4/10)

21. Full details of the junction between retained historic cornices and internal wall linings are to be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority prior to the commencement of such works in each individual phase. Thereafter all junctions between retained historic cornices and internal wall linings are to be constructed only in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To avoid harm to the special interest of the listed building (East of England Plan 2008 policy ENV6 and Cambridge Local Plan 2006, policy 4/10)

22. Where historic doors (internal or external) are to cease functioning as means of entry/exit they are to be locked shut and retained in situ unless otherwise agreed in writing by the local planning authority. Where the overlaying or other means of covering the door is agreed, full details of the proposed works shall be submitted to and approved by the local planning authority prior to installation. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To avoid harm to the special interest of the listed building (East of England Plan 2008 policy ENV6 and Cambridge Local Plan 2006, policy 4/10)
23. Where new partition walls intersect with or abut historic walls, the new work must be scribed around any decorative cornice, picture, dado or plate-rail, fireplace and/or surround, skirting board or any other projecting feature unless otherwise agreed in writing by the local planning authority. Under no circumstances whatsoever shall such partitions or other new work be cut into historic fabric. Where fixings have to be made into historic fabric, this shall be done in a reversible way.

Reason: To avoid harm to the special interest of the listed building (East of England Plan 2008 policy ENV6 and Cambridge Local Plan 2006, policy 4/10)

24. The following items may be temporarily removed from the Listed Building for repair / renovation but must be reinstated in their original locations unless otherwise agreed in writing by the local planning authority:

i] Moulded picture rails  
ii] Moulded dado or similar rails  
iii] Skirting boards  
iv] Door & window surrounds, architraves, decorative moulded details.

Reason: To avoid harm to the special interest of the listed building (East of England Plan 2008 policy ENV6 and Cambridge Local Plan 2006, policy 4/10)

25. Brickwork is to match exactly the historic work nearby in terms of bond, mortar mix design, joint thickness, pointing technique, brick dimension, colour and texture of bricks. Second-hand or salvaged bricks are to be entirely cleaned of paint, soot and any other coatings before use. The method of brick installation and raking out of existing joints must be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority by means of sample panels prepared on site. Thereafter brickwork shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To avoid harm to the special interest of the listed building (East of England Plan 2008 policy ENV6 and Cambridge Local Plan 2006, policy 4/10)
26. Stonework is to match exactly the historic work nearby in terms of bond, mortar mix design, joint thickness, pointing technique, block dimension, colour and texture of stone. The method of block installation and raking out of existing joints must be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority by means of sample panels prepared on site. Thereafter stonework shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To avoid harm to the special interest of the listed building (East of England Plan 2008 policy ENV6 and Cambridge Local Plan 2006, policy 4/10)

27. Full details of connections of external service runs [from the college court] to internal services [within the Listed Building], particularly where they pass through historic fabric, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority prior to the commencement of such works in each individual phase. Thereafter connections shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To avoid harm to the special interest of the listed building (East of England Plan 2008 policy ENV6 and Cambridge Local Plan 2006, policy 4/10)

28. Before any concrete or other material such as floor screed is placed adjacent to historic fabric or features, an interlayer such as builder’s paper or polythene sheet is used to cover the fabric or feature to ensure that the new material cannot bond irreversibly to it. Details of how this is to be achieved are to be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority prior to the commencement of such works in each individual phase. Thereafter separation of new from historic fabric shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To avoid harm to the special interest of the listed building (East of England Plan 2008 policy ENV6 and Cambridge Local Plan 2006, policy 4/10)
29. Prior to the commencement of works to insert or alter openings to the plant room and tank room [GF Stairs K & L] full details shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Thereafter development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To avoid harm to the special interest of the listed building (East of England Plan 2008 policy ENV6 and Cambridge Local Plan 2006, policy 4/10)

30. Prior to the commencement of works to insert of automatic door opening / closing mechanisms, full details shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Thereafter development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To avoid harm to the special interest of the listed building (East of England Plan 2008 policy ENV6 and Cambridge Local Plan 2006, policy 4/10)

31. Where an opening is to be created between rooms, prior to its creation, full details of the dimensions of the opening and the resultant stub walls and downstand, the linings and architraves to finish the opening and the reinstatement of the flooring between rooms shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Where partitions are to be removed in their entirety, the form of construction of the existing and of the replacement or reconfigured partitions shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Thereafter development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To avoid harm to the special interest of the listed building (East of England Plan 2008 policy ENV6 and Cambridge Local Plan 2006, policy 4/10)
32. In order for the energy efficiency improvement measures to function at the optimum level, all elements of the scheme [insulation, ventilation, heating, etc.] have to work together. Prior to the commencement of works, full details of a complete implementation plan and timetable for installation of all elements of the improvement measures shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Thereafter all measures are to be implemented and operated in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To avoid harm to the special interest of the listed building (East of England Plan 2008 policy ENV6 and Cambridge Local Plan 2006, policy 4/10)

33. A Review Panel for reviewing the results of the use of the User Manual [see Condition 4 above], the Monitoring Programme [see Condition 5 above] and the Mitigation Strategy [see Condition 34 below] for the Listed Building is to be set up to ensure that effective overview of the performance of the works and state of the historic fabric and that appropriate action / mitigation is taken in the event of monitoring revealing adverse or unexpected events / effects. The set up, constitution and frequency of meeting [see also Condition 5] of the Review Panel shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Thereafter meetings of the Review Panel shall be undertaken in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To avoid harm to the special interest of the listed building (East of England Plan 2008 policy ENV6 and Cambridge Local Plan 2006, policy 4/10)

34. In the event that the Monitoring Programme [Condition 5] or other reporting procedure [Conditions 5 & 35] reveals adverse results or failure of systems or fabric to comply with set or expected parameters, a Mitigation Scheme for assessing the causes and putting into place appropriate remedial measures shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Thereafter remedial measures are to be undertaken in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To avoid harm to the special interest of the listed building (East of England Plan 2008 policy ENV6 and Cambridge Local Plan 2006, policy 4/10)
35. In order for the energy efficiency improvement measures to function at optimum level occupant behaviour has to be modified to prevent system controls being over-ridden, performance of equipment undermined and construction being damaged by inappropriate behaviour. A scheme for the education of occupants on the comfort parameters of the systems, the necessity to treat the construction and equipment with respect and the procedure for reporting faults is to be submitted to and approved in writing by the LPA. See also subsection [vi] of Condition 3. Thereafter all occupants of the Listed Building will be educated in compliance with the approved scheme.

Reason: To avoid harm to the special interest of the listed building (East of England Plan 2008 policy ENV6 and Cambridge Local Plan 2006, policy 4/10)

36. A Specialist Site Supervisor [or Clerk of Works] is to be appointed to oversee all construction works including demolition and adaptation of historic fabric, use of traditional materials and techniques, installation of non-standard equipment and services and compliance with specifications, approved drawings and manufacturer's installation procedures. Thereafter all works will be supervised and commissioned in accordance with the specifications.

Reason: To avoid harm to the special interest of the listed building (East of England Plan 2008 policy ENV6 and Cambridge Local Plan 2006, policy 4/10)

37. A hard landscaping scheme, including full details of surface and boundary treatments, is to be submitted to and approved in writing by the LPA. Landscape works shall thereafter be constructed only in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To avoid harm to the special interest of the listed building (East of England Plan 2008 policy ENV6 and Cambridge Local Plan 2006, policy 4/10)

38. Full details of the design and installation of the renewable energy source(s) including plant, mounting frames/brackets, screening systems etc...to be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The installation shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.
Reason: To avoid harm to the special interest of the listed building (Cambridge Local Plan 2006, Policy 4/10).

39. Full details of all additional ancillary plant and equipment associated with renewable energy systems and the means of installing _ fixing them to the building to be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The installation shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To avoid harm to the special interest of the listed building.

INFORMATIVE: This application is of an exceptional nature, which has been accompanied by extensive research and monitoring prior to, during and post application submission. This research and the data that it has produced has allowed a variety of experts within the field to analyse and consider the level of harm that the proposed works may have to the fabric and character of the listed building. The wholesale replacement of glazing within existing casements would not normally be acceptable to officers in a listed building of this status if the above work had not been undertaken and were not required as part of a wider comprehensive set of improvements to achieve the increase of thermal performance in the building.

INFORMATIVE: It will be expected that items vulnerable to damage during the works will be protected by means of fixed boxing or thick padding [of foam plastic or rubber] and this will be maintained for the full duration of all works to the Listed Building.

INFORMATIVE: Discharge of the foregoing Conditions cannot be made by the unaccompanied submission of Working Drawings. Each submission shall be cross-referenced to the appropriate part of the appropriate drawing or sample and related to the numbered Condition as described in the Notice of Decision.
INFORMATIVE: The requirements to comply with the Control of Asbestos at Work Regulations 2002 and other similar legislation does not supersede or override the requirements of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990. Undertaking surveys for the presence of asbestos may well require an application for Listed Building Consent and failure to obtain such consent may result in criminal prosecution.

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: SS1, ENV6, ENV7, ENG1


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.

3. In reaching this decision the local planning authority has acted on guidance provided by the National Planning Policy Framework, specifically paragraphs 186 and 187. The local planning authority has worked proactively with the applicant to bring forward a high quality development that will improve the economic, social and environmental conditions of the area.

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.