

Application Number	13/0409/FUL	Agenda Item	
Date Received	22nd March 2013	Officer	Mr Tony Collins
Target Date	17th May 2013		
Ward	Queen Ediths		
Site	EF Language School 221 Hills Road Cambridge Cambridgeshire CB2 8RW		
Proposal	Partial demolition of an existing language school and replacement with a new side extension with increased social space. The amount of teaching space and Use Class (D1 - Non-residential Education and Training Centres) remains the same.		
Applicant	Ms Bev Garth E F Language Schools Ltd 221 Hills Road Cambridge CB2 8RN		

SUMMARY	<p>The development accords with the Development Plan for the following reasons:</p> <p>The contemporary design of the extension responds well to the original 19th century building, and would enhance the character of this part of Hills Road</p> <p>The extension would not result in significant harm to the residential amenity of neighbours</p> <p>The proposal involves the improvement of language school facilities, but no increase in teaching space.</p>
RECOMMENDATION	APPROVAL

1.0 SITE DESCRIPTION/AREA CONTEXT

- 1.1 The application site is located on the north-east corner of Hills Road and Cavendish Avenue, on the eastern side of Hills Road. The site presently accommodates a two and half storey

property, with modern two storey extensions, which accommodate an established Language School.

- 1.2 The original 2½ storey building mainly occupies the north east corner of the site with the modern two storey form extending southwards, along the eastern boundary. The original property is constructed from gault brick and is believed to have been designed by Richard Reynolds Rowe and is a fine example of a Victorian Villa, with an articulated roof consisting of gable ends and traditional dormer windows.
- 1.3 The site is largely screened from Hills Road and Cavendish Avenue by mature trees that form a protected tree belt around the west and southern boundaries of the site.
- 1.4 To the north of the site is St John's Church, a two storey building with steeply pitched roof, finished in red brick, that sits back on its site to provide landscaping as a buffer between the building and Hills Road. The Church sits behind the established building line that is created by residential properties to the north and south.
- 1.5 To the east and south of the site and to a wider degree, this eastern side of Hills Road, it is residential in appearance. Properties take the form of a domestic scale, mainly 2 to 2 ½ storeys in height with amenity space surrounding the building.
- 1.6 On the western site of Hills Road, nearly opposite the application site is Homerton College. This is a large landscaped site with collegiate type buildings accommodated on the site. Further to the north is the Hills Road/Cherry Hinton junction, which is an urban environment, which is undergoing re-development with large residential and leisure buildings being constructed. To the south of this junction the area quickly descends into a suburban appearance.
- 1.7 Hills Road is a busy arterial road, which carries vehicular traffic to Addenbrookes Hospital and south towards Haverhill and Linton. The site is not located in a Conservation Area, nor are there any listed buildings or Buildings of Local Interest in close proximity to the site. The site is within Character Area 3 of the Hills Road Suburbs and Approaches Study (2012).

2.0 THE PROPOSAL

- 2.1 The application proposes the total demolition of the 1980's extension to the south and east of the original Victorian house, and its replacement by a new two-storey building wrapping round the south and east sides of the building and covering the footprint of the demolished building and the courtyard between it and the original house.
- 2.2 The new building would be clad in buff or salvaged bricks on the ground floor, and standing seam metal on the first floor and the roof. It would have six parallel pitched roofs running east-west across the building. The building would create a new main entrance on the west side, and would contain an atrium café and four classrooms at ground floor level, along with a reception area, staff offices and common room and toilets. Openings through the original ground floor walls of the Victorian house would link the atrium café to a dining room, servery and additional café space in the ground floor of that building. The upper floors of both parts of the building would be given over to classroom space. The application also proposes changes to landscaping around the building.
- 2.3 The proposal follows the refusal of permission for an earlier application 12/0616/FUL. The revised scheme as submitted has been through extensive pre-application discussion.
- 2.4 The application is accompanied by the following supporting information:
1. Design Statement
 2. Arboricultural Method Statement
 3. Tree Survey
 4. Sunlight Study
 5. Landscape Statement
 6. Structural Engineering Report
 7. Sustainability and Building Services Report
 8. Drainage Strategy

3.0 SITE HISTORY

Reference	Description	Outcome
08/0158/FUL	Single storey front extension to create new entrance / reception hall.	Approved with conditions
12/0616	Demolition of the existing non residential language school (Use Class D1 - Non-residential Education and Training Centres) and replacement with a new purpose built language school with on site accommodation for students (Use Class C2 - Residential Schools and Colleges).	Refused

4.0 PUBLICITY

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

5.0 POLICY

5.1 See Appendix 1 for full details of Central Government Guidance, 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
Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003	P6/1 P9/8 P9/9

Cambridge Local Plan 2006	3/1 3/4 3/7 3/11 3/12 3/14 4/4 7/11 8/2 8/6 8/9 8/10 8/18
---------------------------	--

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

Central Government Guidance	National Planning Policy Framework March 2012 Circular 11/95 Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010
Supplementary Planning Documents	Sustainable Design and Construction Waste Management Design Guide Planning Obligation Strategy
Material Considerations	<u>Central Government:</u> Written Ministerial Statement: Planning for Growth (23 March 2011)
	<u>Citywide:</u> Arboricultural Strategy Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Strategic Flood Risk Assessment Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (2005) Cambridge and Milton Surface Water Management Plan Open Space and Recreation Strategy

	<p><u>Area Guidelines:</u> Southern Corridor Area Transport Plan Suburbs and Approaches Study:Hills Road</p>
--	--

6.0 CONSULTATIONS

Cambridgeshire County Council (Engineering)

Initial comment (2nd April 2013)

- 6.1 Transport Assessment required. Increase in delivery vehicles likely. No demonstration that vehicles can enter and leave site in forward gear. No justification for level of car parking. No data on current cycle parking use. Sheffield stands should be provided. Ideally all cycle parking should be covered.

Second advice (4th April 2013)

- 6.2 Now satisfied that vehicles can turn on site and leave in forward gear.

Head of Environmental Services

- 6.3 No objection. Conditions sought to control construction hours, construction deliveries, dust suppression, piling, construction noise, fume extraction and noise insulation, both of the building to protect users against traffic noise, and of any plant to protect neighbour amenity.

Head of Streets and Open Spaces (Tree Team)

- 6.4 No excavation within RPAs is stated, but not demonstrated. This needs to be controlled through a landscape condition. Tree protection conditions required.

Head of Streets and Open Spaces (Landscape Team)

- 6.5 Protection of mature trees is vital. Details of how new railings and cycle racks are to be installed should be controlled by condition.

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

- 6.6 Details of cycle parking provision not entirely clear from application. Staff cycle parking should be covered. Condition required.

Head of Streets and Open Spaces (Sustainable Drainage Officer)

First Advice (22nd April 2013)

- 6.7 Proposed drainage strategy not supported. Condition sought to remedy shortcomings.

Second advice (26th April 2013)

- 6.8 Following discussion with applicants, accept that connecting surface water into the foul network is acceptable in this instance because of the location of the trees and the issues associated with any construction beneath them.
- 6.9 No objection to the proposals but recommend a condition requiring details of attenuation.

Head of Streets and Open Spaces (Nature Conservation Officer)

- 6.10 Bat survey required.

Cambridgeshire County Council (Archaeology)

- 6.11 Records indicate that the site lies in an area of high archaeological potential. It is considered likely that important archaeological remains survive on the site. Prehistoric, Mid-Iron Age and Roman remains have been discovered nearby. Condition requiring archaeological investigation sought

Design and Conservation Panel (Meeting of 13th March 2013)

- 6.12 Conclusion: Panel welcomes the retention of the existing Rowe building and proposed extension of contemporary design. The proposed scheme appears to fit comfortably within the site. It

was felt that further development and articulation of the principal elevations of the proposed new extension in relation to its immediate setting would enhance the scheme.

6.13 VERDICT – GREEN (5), AMBER (2)

6.14 The full relevant section of the minutes of the panel meeting(s) are attached to this report as Appendix A

Access Officer

6.15 Initially had concerns about access from the new part of the building to the lift. (Close examination of the sections has confirmed that ground floor access from the proposed extension through the perimeter line of the existing building to the lift would be satisfactory for wheelchair users, and this concern is resolved.)

6.16 The Access officer recommends the following improvements:

- entrance door wider and power assisted and preferably automatic
- avoidance of dog-leg turn in entrance lobby
- foyer double doors asymmetric, power assisted and preferably automatic
- dropped height section and hearing loop in reception
- hearing loops in classrooms
- fire alarm provision for those with hearing impairments.
- good colour contrast within the building to aid visually impaired users to wayfind.

Disability Consultative Panel (Meeting of 23rd April)

6.17 Comments not yet available. They will be reported on the amendment sheet or verbally at Committee.

6.18 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: 3, 5, 6 and 19 Lady Jane Court

7.2 The Vicar and PCC of the Church of St John the Evangelist have also made representations

7.3 The representations can be summarised as follows:

- overdevelopment of site
- harm to character of the area
- precedent for other commercial developments
- overshadowing to Lady Jane Court
- overshadowing of the church
- loss of privacy to Lady Jane Court
- noise and disturbance
- increased rubbish
- increased traffic
- inadequate car parking
- inadequate bus parking (need for loading bay)
- harm to trees
- harm to boundary wall during construction

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

8.0 ASSESSMENT

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

1. Principle of development
2. Context of site, design and external spaces
3. Trees
4. Disabled access
5. Residential amenity
6. Refuse arrangements
7. Highway safety
8. Car and cycle parking
9. Third party representations
10. Planning Obligation Strategy

Principle of Development

- 8.2 Policy 7/11 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2006) permits the development of existing language schools where existing facilities are being improved, or teaching floorspace is being increased by no more than 10%. In this instance, teaching floorspace will remain at the existing level, but the quality of that space and its appropriateness for current educational practice will be improved.
- 8.3 I do not consider that approval of this application would create a precedent for other 'commercial developments' in the area, as is feared in some representations. This is an improvement to an existing business, not a creation of a new business use. Furthermore, any future application for business use in the area would have to be considered on its own merits. There do not appear to be any nearby sites which are comparable or similar in terms of the potential for 'commercial development' raised in representations.
- 8.4 In my opinion, the principle of the development is acceptable and in accordance with policy 7/11 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2006).

Context of site, design and external spaces

- 8.5 The proposed building would occupy the space presently filled by the earlier extensions and the courtyard between them and the original building. It would have a substantially greater mass than the 1980's extension, through filling the central space, but the increase in height would be only modest. It would respect the building line established by the front elevation of the main building, and would be clearly subsidiary to it, while the roof forms used allude to the character of the original house, but are in a contemporary idiom.
- 8.6 I am satisfied that the design of the building is appropriate to its context, both in its contrasting but respectful relationship with the original building, and in its response to the largely domestic vocabulary of the surrounding area. In my view, it would improve the setting of the main building, and enhance the character of this part of Hills Road. The proposal would retain the trees to the south and west of the site, and a substantial

outdoor amenity area between the buildings and Hills Road. I do not feel that it is an overdevelopment of the site.

- 8.7 By introducing a very legible entrance at the junction of the old and new sections, separating the pedestrian and vehicle access points, improving the landscaping of the heavily-used amenity space in front of the building, and creating a more coherent arrangement for the storage of waste, recycling and cycles, and the accommodation of cars and delivery vehicles, the proposal would markedly improve the way the site functions. It would also provide appropriate modern teaching space to replace the poor-quality provision in the 1980's extension.
- 8.8 The Urban Design and Conservation Manager has emphasized that appropriate detailing (especially at the junction between the new extension and the original building) and materials, are essential to the success of this project in visual terms. I agree with this view, and recommend a number of conditions accordingly.
- 8.9 In my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 3/4, 3/7, 3/11, and 3/12. It would also function well, add to the overall quality of the area, create an attractive and comfortable place to study, optimize the potential of the site to accommodate development, and respond well to local character, in accordance with government advice on good design in Paragraph 58 of the Framework.

Trees

- 8.10 Protection of the existing mature trees on this site is vital, as they are of considerable amenity value. The Arboricultural Officer recommends conditions to ensure adequate tree protection, and also emphasises that discharge of the recommended landscape condition should not be carried out until satisfactory evidence that no excavations will be carried out in the root protection area is provided.

Disabled access

- 8.11 The Access officer's initial concerns about access to the lift have been resolved. The Access officer suggests a number of detailed improvements which could be made within the building, and I recommend an informative to emphasise these points.

They do not, however, represent a conflict with policy 3/7 or 3/12; I am satisfied that the elements of the design which are subject to planning control, particularly the layout of the site, access to the building from outside, and disabled parking provision are compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 3/7 and 3/12.

Residential Amenity

Sunlight

- 8.12 The proposed building lies to the south-west of the west end of Lady Jane Court, and therefore has the potential to affect sunlight in the afternoon. However, the Lady Jane Court site contains a number of trees, including, at the western end, a very large plane, a very large beech, and a very large horse-chestnut. On their own, these trees shade the dwellings in the Court very heavily while they are in leaf. The large trees on the EF site also cast a shadow in this direction, and in this case, several of the relevant trees are evergreen. This means that the opportunity for direct sunlight to reach the west part of Lady Jane Court when the sun is in the south-west is limited. The applicants have submitted shadow diagrams showing the impact of the proposed building in the afternoon at the 'worst case' times, in the winter: at the winter solstice, and on January 15th, February 1st and February 15th. These diagrams demonstrate that the increase in shadowing would be very slight indeed. Since the modelling ignores the trees on the two sites, it is my view that any impact would be even less than the very limited extent shown in the shadow studies. In my view, any increased overshadowing to Lady Jane Court caused by the increased height of the proposed building would be slight, and not sufficient to warrant refusal of the application. I do not consider that the proposal would affect sunlight to any other premises.

Privacy

- 8.13 The proposed building would not include windows on the east elevation facing Lady Jane Court. The flats at this end of the Court have no windows facing towards the EF site. I do not consider that any issues of overlooking arise.

Outlook

- 8.14 The proposed building would be higher than the existing building along the eastern boundary of the site, but this increase would be a limited one (from 4.8m to 6.8m to the eaves, and from 7m to 8.2m at the ridge). The increase would also be mitigated by the more articulated form of the proposed building, and in particular by the east-west valleys in the new roof. I do not consider that the proposed building, by comparison with the existing one, would be visually dominating, or cause an undue sense of enclosure to occupiers of Lady Jane Court, residents in Cavendish Avenue, or users of the church.

Noise and disturbance

- 8.15 I acknowledge that the EF site accommodates a large number of students. However, the building faces Hills Road, and its entrances and amenity space are all on that side of the building. They would remain so under this proposal. I visited the site during the mid-day break in mild weather. A large number of students were on site; the courtyard and lawn on the west side were full of people eating and socialising, and most of the windows on the east side of the original building were wide open. Despite this, very little noise from the site could be heard in the Lady Jane Court access drive, or in Cavendish Avenue. It is important to note that the present application proposes an improvement to facilities, but no increase in teaching floorspace. Given this basic feature of the development, I do not believe it can be convincingly argued that approval would subject neighbouring occupiers to increased noise or disturbance. Construction itself would create both noise and disturbance, but this is not a reason for refusal; I recommend conditions to minimise the impact of construction.
- 8.16 In my opinion the proposal adequately respects the residential amenity of its neighbours and the constraints of the site and I consider that it is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 3/4 and 3/7.

Refuse Arrangements

- 8.17 The application proposes a timber bin enclosure to the north side of the vehicle entrance. This would be an improvement on the current situation where bins are untidily stored in the open

on the south side of the entrance which is used by pedestrians and vehicles. The Waste strategy team have not commented on the application. I recommend a condition to ensure that sufficient space is allowed for bins. I am confident that there is enough space on the site in this area to provide for an increased number of bins if necessary.

- 8.18 In my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policy 3/12.

Highway Safety

- 8.19 The highway authority originally had concerns about the ability of vehicles to turn on site, but these have been resolved. Since the application proposes no increase in teaching space, there is no justification for requiring a Transport Assessment, no likelihood of increased deliveries, and no reason to question the level of car or cycle parking, as suggested by the highway authority. Similarly, neither conditions nor reasons for refusal could be justified by the issues raised by respondents about car and bus parking; these impacts would not be altered by the proposed extension.

- 8.20 In my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policy 8/2.

Car and Cycle Parking

Car Parking

- 8.21 The application proposes to alter car parking provision on the site from four spaces to three standard spaces plus one disabled space. The maximum provision acceptable under the City Council Car Parking Standards would be 27 spaces. The proposed provision is below this maximum, but is in accordance with the City Council standards, which are expressed as maximum levels. The Council encourages lower levels of on-site car parking space at non-residential sites, especially when they are well-served, as this site is, by public transport.

Cycle Parking

- 8.22 The application states that the site can accommodate up to 360 students and 40 staff, and that those levels will be unaltered

after the proposed changes. The proposal provides 192 cycle parking spaces, which is fewer than the 380 spaces required by the City Standards for a non-residential institution of this size. However since at present the site provides only 100 spaces, and the proposal would almost double this provision, despite there being no increase in students, it would not be reasonable to cite this as a reason to refuse the application. As the cycle parking spaces are largely under the trees, and exact details are not shown, I recommend conditions to control their size and spacing and also the construction method. I also recommend an informative urging the applicants to move towards provision at the level of the City Council Standards.

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

Nature conservation

8.24 It is possible that bats roost in the buildings to be demolished. A bat survey is necessary to establish this. I have asked the applicants to carry this out, and if it is completed, it will be reported on the amendment sheet. If it is not completed, before Committee, consideration of the application may have to be deferred until it has.

Third Party Representations

8.25 I do not consider the objections which refer to increases in rubbish, traffic, pressure on car parking space or bus pick-up parking are well founded; they assume an increase in activity, but the application proposes no increase in teaching space.

8.26 I have addressed the following issues in the paragraphs indicated: overdevelopment (para 8.6), harm to character of the area (para 8.6), precedent for other commercial developments (para 8.3), overshadowing (para 8.12), loss of privacy (para 8.13), noise and disturbance (para 8.15), and harm to trees (para 8.10).

8.27 The issue of harm to any boundary wall during construction is a civil matter between the landowners concerned.

Planning Obligations

- 8.28 The application proposes no residential accommodation, and provides only the same area of teaching space as the existing buildings. It is not a major application. In my view it does not trigger any requirement for community infrastructure.

9.0 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 samples of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

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

3. Before starting any brick or stone work, a sample panel of the facing materials to be used shall be erected on site to establish the detail of bonding, coursing and colour and type of jointing and shall be agreed in writing with the local planning authority. The quality of finish and materials incorporated in any approved sample panel(s), which shall not be demolished prior to completion of development, shall be maintained throughout the development.

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

4. No development, other than demolition, shall commence until full details of the following architectural features have been submitted to, and approved in writing by the local planning authority. This may require drawings at 1:20. Development shall proceed only in accordance with the agreed details.

main entrance
roof ridges and eaves
recessed masonry panels
door and window joinery
junctions with the original building
metal shutters
fire escape stairs

Reason: To ensure the building responds appropriately to its context. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/4 and 3/12)

5. Except with the prior written agreement of the local planning authority no construction work or demolition shall be carried out or plant operated other than between the following hours: 0800 hours to 1800 hours Monday to Friday, 0800 hours to 1300 hours on Saturday and at no time on Sundays, Bank or Public Holidays.

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

6. Prior to the commencement of the development hereby approved (including any pre-construction, demolition, enabling works or piling), the applicant shall submit a report in writing, regarding the demolition / construction noise and vibration impact associated with this development, for approval by the local authority. The report shall be in accordance with the provisions of BS 5228:2009 Code of Practice for noise and vibration control on construction and open sites and include full details of any piling and mitigation measures to be taken to protect local residents from noise and or vibration. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

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

Reason: To protect the amenity of neighbouring occupiers. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/4 and 4/13)

7. Except with the prior written agreement of the local planning authority, there should be no collection or deliveries to the site during the demolition and construction stages outside the hours of 0700 hrs and 1900 hrs on Monday - Saturday and there should be no collections or deliveries on Sundays or Bank and public holidays.

Reason: Due to the proximity of residential properties to this premises and that extensive refurbishment will be required, the above conditions are recommended to protect the amenity of these residential properties throughout the redevelopment in accordance with policies 4/13 and 6/10 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2006)

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

Reason: To protect the amenity of neighbouring occupiers and highway users (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 3/4)

9. No development shall take place until a site visit has taken place involving the retained arboriculturalist, the developer and the City Council Tree Officer to agree tree works and the location and specification of tree protection barriers and temporary ground protection. Development shall proceed thereafter only in accordance with the agreed details.

Reason: To protect trees of amenity value. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 4/4)

10. The agreed means of tree protection shall be retained on site until all equipment, and surplus materials have been removed from the site. Nothing shall be stored or placed in any area protected in accordance with this condition, and the ground levels within those areas shall not be altered nor shall any excavation be made without the prior written approval of the local planning authority.

Reason: To protect trees of amenity value. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 4/4)

11. No development other than demolition shall take place until full details of both hard and soft landscape works have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority and these works shall be carried out as approved. These details shall include proposed finished levels, demonstration that no excavation will be carried out within Root Protection Areas; means of enclosure; car parking layouts, other vehicle and pedestrian access and circulation areas; hard surfacing materials; minor artefacts and structures including cycle hoops, picnic tables and railings; services above and below ground including drainage, power, and communications cables. Soft Landscape works shall include planting plans; written specifications (including cultivation and other operations associated with plant and grass establishment); schedules of plants, noting species, plant sizes and proposed numbers/densities where appropriate and an implementation programme.

Reason: In the interests of visual amenity and to ensure that suitable hard and soft landscape is provided as part of the development. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/4, 3/11 and 3/12)

12. No development shall take place until full details of surface water attenuation have been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority.

Reason: To avoid the risk of flooding. (Cambridge Local Plan policy 4/16)

13. Prior to the commencement of development/construction, a noise insulation scheme detailing the acoustic noise insulation performance specification of the external building envelope (having regard to the building fabric, glazing and ventilation) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The scheme shall achieve the internal noise levels recommended in British Standard 8233:1999 "Sound Insulation and noise reduction for buildings-Code of Practice".

The approved scheme shall be fully implemented and a completion report submitted prior to the occupation of the noise sensitive development. The approved scheme shall remain unaltered in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To protect the amenity of future occupiers from noise. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/4 and 4/16)

14. No development other than demolition shall take place until full details of the provision for the storage of waste and recycling have been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority.

Reason: To ensure satisfactory waste storage (Cambridge Local Plan policy 3/12)

15. Before the development/use hereby permitted is commenced, details of equipment for the purpose of extraction and/or filtration of fumes and or odours shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The approved extraction/filtration scheme shall be installed before the use hereby permitted is commenced.

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

16. No unbound material shall be used on the surface of the vehicle access within 6m of the boundary of the public highway.

Reason: To prevent the spread of debris onto the highway. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 8/2)

17. No development shall take place within the site until the applicant, or their agent or successors in title, has secured the implementation of a programme of archaeological work in accordance with a written scheme of investigation which has been submitted by the applicant and approved in writing by the local planning authority.

Reason: To ensure that an appropriate archaeological investigation of the site has been implemented before development commences. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 4/9)

18. No development shall commence until details of facilities for the covered, secured parking of bicycles for use in connection with the development hereby permitted shall be submitted to and approved by the local planning authority in writing. The approved facilities shall be provided in accordance with the approved details before use of the development commences.

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

INFORMATIVE: To satisfy the condition requiring the submission of a program of measures to control airborne dust above, the applicant should have regard to:

Cambridge City Council's Supplementary Planning Document 'Sustainable Design and Construction 2007':

<http://www.cambridge.gov.uk/public/docs/sustainable-design-and-construction-spd.pdf>

Control of dust and emissions from construction and demolition - Best Practice Guidance produced by the London Councils:

http://www.london.gov.uk/thelondonplan/guides/bpg/bpg_04.jsp

INFORMATIVE: To satisfy the standard condition on noise insulation, the noise level from all plant and equipment, vents etc (collectively) associated with this application should not raise the existing background level (L90) by more than 3 dB(A) (i.e. the rating level of the plant needs to match the existing background level). This requirement applies both during the day (0700 to 2300 hrs over any one hour period) and night time (2300 to 0700 hrs over any one 5 minute period), at the boundary of the premises subject to this application and having regard to noise sensitive premises. Tonal/impulsive noise frequencies should be eliminated or at least considered in any assessment and should carry an additional 5 dB(A) correction. This is to guard against any creeping background noise in the area and prevent unreasonable noise disturbance to other premises.

It is recommended that the agent/applicant submits a noise prediction survey/report in accordance with the principles of BS4142: 1997 "Method for rating industrial noise affecting mixed residential and industrial areas" or similar. Noise levels shall be predicted at the boundary having regard to neighbouring premises.

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

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

INFORMATIVE: The applicant is advised that the accessibility of the building for people with disabilities would be significantly improved if the following enhancements were incorporated:

- entrance door wider and power assisted and preferably automatic
- avoidance of dog-leg turn in entrance lobby
- foyer double doors asymmetric, power assisted and preferably automatic
- dropped height section and hearing loop in reception
- hearing loops in classrooms
- fire alarm provision for those with hearing impairments.
- good colour contrast within the building to aid visually impaired users to wayfind.

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:

Cambridge Local Plan (2006): policies 3/1, 3/4, 3/7, 3/12, 4/4, 4/13, 4/16, 7/11, 8/2

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 Mon 8am - 5:15pm, Tues, Thurs & Fri 9am - 5:15pm, Weds 9am - 6pm.

APPENDIX A

Notes of the relevant section of the meeting of Design & Conservation Panel, Wednesday 13th March 2013

Attendees:

Terry Gilbert	RTPI (Chair)
Russell Davies	RTPI
Kieran Perkins	RIBA
Ian Bramwell	RIBA
Jo Morrison	Landscape Institute
Tony Nix	RICS
Jon Harris	Co-opted member

Officers:

Jonathan Hurst	City Council
Christian Brady	City Council
Matthew Paul	City Council

3. Presentation - Revised proposals for the EF Language School, 221 Hills Road.

The scheme seen by the Panel in July 2012, verdict – RED (1), AMBER (1) and GREEN (3) was refused at Committee on grounds of over- development. The current scheme, which is at pre-application stage, provides for the retention of the original late-Victorian Rowe building, the provision of improved and additional classrooms, additional common room and ancillary facilities and disabled access. Presentation by Richard Owers and David Valinsky of NRAP Architects.

The Panel's comments are as follows:

Development Strategy and concept

- The Panel supported the general principles of the proposed design, in particular the creation of an airy columned space between the 'perforated box' of the existing Rowe building and a peripheral 'ruined' garden wall - and the better resolution of the entrance and landscaping that the new scheme affords. The choice of roof form was questioned – with some members of the

Panel feeling that strong gable ends would create a more balanced elevation to Hills Road than the current hip arrangement, when taken with the very forceful and characterful northern end of the existing Rowe building.

- The material palette of masonry and metal cladding was thought appropriate, although some concern was expressed as to the possible slavish application of the design precedent, particularly in the extensive use of zinc in the new extension. It was felt the precise nature of the masonry might bear further development and that the 'additional' material – currently described as zinc – might be selected to provide a more emphatic contrast with the 'background' materiality of the house and peripheral wall.

- Whilst the subservience of the extension was generally felt to be appropriate, the Panel felt that there was still scope for its identity to be more distinctive by re-considering the following aspects:-
 - Hills Road elevation -the interface between the original main building, the extension and the new entrance can arguably be made more emphatic and distinctive through the further development in the design of these elements. In addition, the potentially attractive views of the original building and the extension through the trees from Hills Road invited further design development of the space in front.
 - Access to Lady Jane Court elevation. While it is understood that there may be concerns from neighbours the Panel felt nonetheless, that the classrooms behind this elevation might benefit from direct views out if at all possible. .
 - Cavendish Avenue elevation. It was felt that the external stair on this elevation was something of a missed opportunity - as it could potentially be a more active, intermediate space – between the central orientation space and the outside landscape – perhaps with a degree more enclosure, and not simply an emergency escape route.

- **Trees.** The Panel welcome the intention to keep within the original footprint and thereby protecting the existing trees along the boundary line.

- **Cycle parking.** The Panel welcome the proposal to provide permeable surface treatments.

Conclusion.

The Panel welcome the retention of the existing Rowe building and proposed extension of contemporary design. The proposed

scheme appears to fit comfortably within the site. It was felt that further development and articulation of the principal elevations of the proposed new extension in relation to its immediate setting would enhance the scheme.

VERDICT – GREEN (5), AMBER (2)