

Application Number	12/1608/FUL	Agenda Item	
Date Received	4th February 2013	Officer	Mrs Sarah Dyer
Target Date	6th May 2013		
Ward	Trumpington		
Site	Station Area Redevelopment Land To The North Of Station Road And To The West Of The Railway Line Station Road Cambridge Cambridgeshire		
Proposal	Demolition of existing buildings (City Roomz Hotel and former railway offices) and construction of a new office building comprising: 14,326 sq.m office floorspace (Class B1a) and 1,205 sq.m of retail/cafe and restaurant floor space (Class A1/A3/A4/A5), including ancillary accommodation / facilities with a single level basement (4,020 sq.m) to accommodate 92 car parking spaces, associated plant and 568 cycle parking spaces; roof level plant and hard and soft landscaping, including the final phase of the Station Road Open Space.		
Applicant	Brookgate CB1 Ltd		

SUMMARY	The development accords with the Development Plan for the following reasons: The proposed building is of a scale, massing and design which are appropriate to its setting within an Area of Major Change and of a sufficiently high quality to justify the removal of a Building of Local Interest. The Outline consent for the Station Area development is a very significant material consideration and the development accords with that consent in all regards with the exception of the use of the building. The development will facilitate public benefits in terms of the Station Square and Cycle Park. The application includes mitigation
---------	---

	measures to ensure that all of the impacts of the development are dealt with both independently and as part of the wider Masterplan
RECOMMENDATION	APPROVAL

1.0 SITE DESCRIPTION/AREA CONTEXT

- 1.1 The application site forms part of a larger area, which is the subject of the CB1 Station Area Redevelopment proposals for which outline planning permission was granted in April 2010. The site lies to the west of the Station building and the railway line, east of the former Red House site and north of Station Road. It is surrounded on three sides by other development plots within the CB1 Masterplan and on the fourth side by the proposed new Station Square. The site currently accommodates substantial parts of the Cityroomz Hotel building and the railway offices and Art Workshop. The remainder of the application site accommodates part of the Station car and cycle park.
- 1.2 The site is within the Station Area Redevelopment Framework Boundary and within the Central Conservation Area No.1. The Station buildings are grade II listed and Cityroomz Hotel is a Building of Local Interest (BLI). There are several trees on the site including trees on the Station Road frontage, which are subject to protection by virtue of their location in the Conservation Area. The site falls within the controlled parking zone.

2.0 THE PROPOSAL

- 2.1 Full planning permission is sought for demolition of the existing buildings on the site and the construction of a building to accommodate office use and retail space. This new building will form the western side of the new Station Square. The application differs from most of the previous applications that have been brought forward within the CB1 Station Area site because it is not an application for reserved matters. In this case a reserved matters application could not be submitted because the use of the building does not conform to the approved Parameter Plans. Separate applications for Conservation Area Consent for the demolition of the Cityroomz

Hotel building, the railway offices and Art Workshop and listed building consent for the demolition of the northern wing of the Station and the canopy over the railway platform have also been made. Reports to address these applications appear elsewhere on the Agenda.

- 2.2 Although the application is not constrained by the Outline permission, the approved Parameter Plans which represent the approved Masterplan are a significant material consideration in the assessment of the application. I will make reference to the Masterplan throughout my Assessment as the applicants have done in the supporting material for the application.
- 2.3 The building will accommodate 14,326 sq.m of office floor space on part of the ground floor and the upper floors with retail units wrapping around the east and north sides of the ground floor only. A basement parking area will accommodate 92 car parking spaces, associated plant and 568 cycle parking spaces. The building is rectilinear in shape and suitable for either a single occupier or multiple occupiers. The application also includes landscaping proposals for part of the Station Square and the Station Road Open Space. Further details of the proposals are set out in my Assessment
- 2.4 The application is accompanied by the following supporting information:
 1. Design and Access Statement by Pringle Brandon Drew Architects
 2. Heritage Statement by Beacon Planning
 3. Planning Statement by Savills
 4. Acoustic Report by Hilson Moran
 5. Air Quality Report by Hilson Moran
 6. Archaeological Statement by Cambridge Archaeological Unit
 7. BREEAM Pre-assessment report by Hilson Moran
 8. Car Park Ventilation Strategy by Hilson Moran
 9. Daylight Report by Mott Macdonald
 10. Draft s106 Agreement by Mills and Reeve
 11. Ecology Report by RPS
 12. Energy and Sustainability Statement by Hilson Moran
 13. Estate Management Strategy by Bidwells
 14. Surface/foul water strategy by Mott Macdonald
 15. Ground Contamination report by Mott Macdonald

16. Landscape Proposals by Robert Myers
17. Landscape Management Plan by Robert Myers
18. Transport Assessment (inc. Travel Plan) by Mott Macdonald
19. Waste Management Strategy by Mott Macdonald

2.5 The application has been amended in the following ways:

- ☐ Response to comments by Walking and Cycling Officer
- ☐ Response to comments from County Highways
- ☐ Response to Environmental Services on waste storage
- ☐ Response to Nature Conservation Officer on bat surveys
- ☐ Amendments to tree species
- ☐ Revised BREEAM assessment
- ☐ Additional trip generation information in response to comments made by County Highways
- ☐ Further information regarding the omission of the polyclinic from the CB1 development proposal
- ☐ Revised BREEAM assessment
- ☐ Additional trip generation information in response to comments made by County Highways
- ☐ Further information regarding the omission of the polyclinic from the CB1 development proposals
- ☐ Revised Landscape plan in response to comments from Landscape Officer.

3.0 SITE HISTORY

Reference	Description	Outcome
08/0266/OUT	CB1 Station Area Redevelopment	A/C
12/1600/CAC	Demolition of 'CityRoomz' building (former Sleeperz Hotel), and former railway offices to north	Pending consideration
12/1612/LBC	Demolition of northern wing of the Station and the canopy over the railway platform	Pending consideration
12/1608/FUL	(Adjacent site) Block B1 of CB1 Station Area	Pending consideration

	Redevelopment – hotel/cycle park/retail	
13/0211/CL2PD	Certificate of Lawfulness under section 192 for the Station car park	Pending consideration

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 3/6 3/7 3/11 3/12 3/13 3/15 4/4 4/11 4/12 4/13 4/14 4/15 6/10 7/2 8/2 8/3 8/4 8/5 8/6 8/9 8/10 8/11 8/13 8/16 8/18 9/1 9/9 10/1

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

Central Government Guidance	National Planning Policy Framework March 2012 Circular 11/95 Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010
Supplementary Planning Documents	Sustainable Design and Construction Waste Management Design Guide Planning Obligation Strategy Public Art
Material Considerations	<u>Central Government:</u> Letter from Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government (27 May 2010) Written Ministerial Statement: Planning for Growth (23 March 2011)
	<u>Citywide:</u> Biodiversity Checklist Cambridge City Nature Conservation Strategy Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Strategic Flood Risk Assessment Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (2005) Cambridge and Milton Surface Water Management Plan Cambridgeshire Quality Charter for Growth Cambridge City Council - Guidance for the application of Policy 3/13 (Tall Buildings and the Skyline) of the Cambridge Local Plan

	(2006) (2012) Cambridge Walking and Cycling Strategy Cambridgeshire Design Guide For Streets and Public Realm Air Quality in Cambridge – Developers Guide Cambridge Shopfront Design Guide Cambridge Cluster at 50 The Cambridge economy: retrospect and prospect Final report to EEDA and partners March 2011
	<u>Area Guidelines:</u> Southern Corridor Area Transport Plan Buildings of Local Interest Station Area Development Framework/Station Area Conservation Appraisal New Town and Glisson Road Area Conservation Appraisal

6.0 CONSULTATIONS

Cambridgeshire County Council (Engineering and New Communities)

Application as submitted

- 6.1 Comments awaited from New Communities team and Traffic Signals section.

Comments on engineering aspects:

Outward opening doors on the façade facing the Station present a danger and should be amended.

The cycle parking is reached by stairs, or if accessed down the ramp requires passage through the whole car park, exposing cyclists to maximum risk of conflict with other vehicles.

Details of the width of the ramp, aisle widths and car parking space dimensions should be shown on the plans. Dimensions at the narrowest points between buildings and kerbs, rather than at wider points are required so that minimum pedestrian/cycle widths can be assessed.

The northernmost car parking space is obstructed by a pillar.

The developer will need to satisfy, at their own expense, the requirements of the Highway Authority in demonstrating that the basement structure is able to support the adjacent highway.

In view of the proposed change in the regulations governing change of use an informative should be added in relation to qualification for Residents' Permits within the existing Residents' Parking Schemes operating on nearby streets.

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

Response to additional information

Further information is to be submitted in relation to the access ramp to the car park and car parking spaces. The Highway Engineer will be asked to comment on these details and his comments will be provided on the Amendment Sheet or orally at the Committee meeting.

6.2 Cambridgeshire County Council (New Communities) (comments for Blocks B1 and A1/A2)

Trip generation information comparing trip generation that was agreed as part of the outline permission for the original land uses should be provided along with a comparison with the new proposed land uses.

An overall summary table is needed comparing the total trip generation of the previous uses for both sites together in total compared with the new proposed uses for both sites together.

Comparison tables showing AM and PM peaks and daily 24 hour trip information broken down by mode are needed.

SCAPT and CGB contributions – the transport assessments do not include any information on the proposed s106 contributions and what SCAPT and CGB contributions are proposed as a result of this change in land use.

Response to additional information

Information has been submitted by the applicants and a response is awaited from the County Transport team. This will be provided on the Amendment Sheet or orally at the Committee meeting.

Head of Environmental Services

6.3 *Application as submitted*

Combined comments for full planning application and conservation area consent.

Construction/demolition

During construction and demolition, noise, vibration and dust has the potential to harm the locality amenity if not controlled. A Demolition and Construction Environmental Management Plan (DCEMP) should be secured by condition.

Acoustic Report - Traffic Noise

BS compliant noise levels can be achieved with sealed double glazing and mechanical ventilation. A full ventilation and glazing scheme will be required and a noise insulation scheme condition is recommended.

Acoustic Report - Plant Noise

Further information is needed about the predicted noise at the site boundary. Details of plant are not known at this time and a plant noise condition is recommended.

High level standby generator

Noise from the generator will need to be controlled as to not adversely affect the amenity. The emergency generator condition and informative is recommended.

Retail, cafe, restaurant uses

The standard odour condition is recommended.

A condition to restrict opening hours/deliveries to 07:00-23:00 is recommended.

Contaminated Land

The scope of works submitted is acceptable but a full contaminated land condition is recommended.

Air Quality

The Air Quality Assessment does not use up to date information but given level of car parking provision there are no objections.

Waste Strategy

Advisory comments only relating to width of doors, protection strips and door holders, controlled entry, dropped kerbs and use of bin compactors.

Licensing and Food and Occupational Safety

Informatives are requested.

Urban Design and Conservation Team

6.4 *Application as submitted*

Comments on the Planning Application

Overall conclusion:

Overall the proposals are supported in design and conservation terms subject to the amendments to the plans and clarification of the screening, car park entrance and ground floor/threshold/car park venting on the west elevation.

Existing:

The Heritage Statement has a fair outline of the history of the site and the coming of the railway to Cambridge. The land associated with the railway was much more extensive in the mid-C19 onwards [as with most towns] and consisted of much goods & freight area [for grain, coal, etc. shipment] as well as the buildings for the running of the railway – engine sheds, workshops, etc.. The passenger buildings and platform are listed [although a new platform and footbridge have recently been built adjacent], Cityroomz is a BLI and the other buildings lie within the CA.

The buildings proposed for demolition have a vernacular appearance being of Gault-type brick and Welsh slated roofs [albeit now changed] and functional detailing like doors & windows. The buildings have clearly evolved over the years with changes of requirements in running the railway but still have a solid, utilitarian air about them. The offices have quite domestic features like sash windows and barge boards but also a fine metal ridge ventilator. The stores have an unusual feature of heavy armoured metal shutters to the semi-basement windows. These are reputed to stem from the Second World War when the building was a control centre for railways in East Anglia.

Historically this part of the CA was where the semi-industrial part of the city [milling, transport, etc.] met the suburban C19 residential part and the changes over time mean that, because the railway is now mainly passenger traffic to Cambridge, there are few remnants of that older pattern left. The goods sidings, warehousing & workshops, the mill silo and so on are gone and the uses and buildings from the mid-C20 [the office blocks, D I Y supply shed, etc.] surround the historic passenger station.

Proposals:

The proposed scheme accords with the Outline scale parameters and footprint established on Parameter Plan 4. In terms of the delivery of the wider Masterplan the scheme sits within the movement, landscape and block structure established in the Outline.

General comments

The overall approach to the layout and distribution of uses is supported. The fit out of retail space must not compromise the elevations.

Daylight and shadow impact

The conclusions of the Daylight Report on Overshadowing are supported.

Elevations, roofscape, materials and signage

The overall approach to the detailing of the elevations is supported.

The proposed roofscape has been well considered and successfully integrates the proposed plant and other functional needs in an elegant and controlled way.

The large-scale drawings submitted are helpful in understanding the more complex details of fixings and junctions between materials in terms of the depth and layering etc. However, further details are required to establish the proposed design and materials for various elements.

The detailing of the ground and first floors creates an effective placeholder for subsequent signage associated with the retail uses. It will be crucial that the placement and detail of signage is controlled as part of tenant fit out in order to maintain the design integrity and quality of these elevations.

South elevation (to Station Road)

The building line established in the Outline, which is designed (along with I1 opposite) to capture and frame the Station facade, creates a strong diagonal feature to the southwest corner of the elevation to highlight the entrance. Further information showing how the ground floor junction between the stonework on the south and west elevations will be detailed is needed. The stonework should be continued up to the horizontal stone band at the top of the first floor to provide additional massing to the corner.

West elevation (addresses the pocket park)

There are inconsistencies between the submitted plans and elevations and revised plans are needed.

No details have been provided about the screening/walling for the switch room or the bin store and further information is needed about the basement car park entrance.

At pre-application discussions it was discussed how the ground floor would be designed to open onto the proposed park to improve activity along this edge – this has not been translated through to the submitted plans.

Further details of the car park venting are needed including how these will be designed/managed/controlled and what will be seen from both the street and from office space inside?

East elevation (addresses the Station Square)

The east elevation will form a key 'first impression' of Cambridge for visitors exiting the Station. The D&A Statement explains in some detail how the existing west elevation of the Station has been analysed and used to provide a rationale for the ordering and design of the east elevation. The approach is supported in design and conservation terms.

The detailing of the junction between the ground floor and the first floor allows for the creation of a more generously proportioned opening to address the street, frame the retail space and provide a 'placeholder' for associated signage. The stonework configuration creates an effective screen at the first floor and is an example demonstrating the care with which the functional needs of the building have been 'designed in'.

Given the prominence of this elevation opposite the Listed Station, it is vital that the fit out of the retail units is controlled in terms of quality and signage. This includes needing to maintain the transparency of glazing and not allowing 'standard' box fascias and signage to undermine the architectural quality of the building. It would also be useful to understand how combining units will be managed in design terms.

North elevation (addresses the northern access road)

Overall the elevation is supported in design terms. However, details of the screening to the switch room are needed.

Servicing

No details of the servicing area for the retail units have been provided and no details of the refuse store screening and doors have been shown on the submitted drawings. In addition, no details of the materials and quality of the screening for the plant/switch room have been provided.

6.5 Additional comments on the application for Conservation Area Consent

If the buildings [including the BLI] are to be demolished, then the quality and suitability of the proposed replacement building(s) both for the Conservation Area (CA) and the nearby listed building (LB) must be assessed before any scheme can be supported. (see above)

Whilst the 'masterplan' process always assumed demolition of the BLI and other railway buildings, no consent has ever been granted and the changed circumstances since 2008 and changes to the proposals for this area of the larger scheme mean that this CAC application must be assessed against current policies. It also is tied inextricably to the application for the replacement building and the two things must be seen, assessed and balanced together.

The buildings are of modest interest and significance; they are typical of many others connected with railway operation, built of local materials and altered whenever necessary for functional reasons. Such interest as they have is tied to their being the last remnants of the goods & industrial [ie : non-passenger] side of the railway on this site and, for that reason, their loss would be a pity. However, this is not Swindon or York - the town is not a railway town and, for the foreseeable future, will have the listed station as a permanent reminder of the way the town grew in the C19 partly because of the railway. The station itself does not have a particularly appropriate setting [a matter addressed in the masterplan] and the relationship between it and these buildings is rather lost due to the demolition of other, intervening

railway buildings and the loss of sidings, etc. which have been replaced by a rather ramshackle car park. The context has changed.

Whilst the loss of historic buildings is regrettable, this can be partly offset by making good architectural & historic records / surveys to be kept in public archives, salvaging any items of interest for display or reuse and, possibly, marking their passing in plaques, street names or the like. Also the materials of construction can be salvaged for reuse to maintain an appropriate level of sustainability.

The loss of historic buildings in a prominent location in the CA is always a matter for regret and the policies at national & local level are against such a loss except in cases where there is a demonstrable benefit to be derived. In this case, the decision makers who granted outline permission for the 'masterplan' were aware of the presumed demolition and assessed it to be worthwhile. The consent for the whole development was consulted upon at that time. All the discussions about the replacement building were predicated on the design having to be assessed as of suitable quality to meet the policy 'tests'.

6.6 Conclusion:

Overall the proposals are supported in design and conservation terms subject to the amendments to the plans described in these comments and clarification of the screening, car park entrance and ground floor/threshold/car park venting on the west elevation.

6.7 Suggested conditions:

Conditions are recommended to address the following:

1. stonework details
2. sample panel
3. details of colonnade
4. details of roof
5. renewable energy source(s)
6. rooftop plant screening system
7. non-masonry walling systems
8. green roof
9. balustrades and railings

- 10.glass walling systems
- 11.brise soleil and external shading devices
- 12.locations for signage
- 13.external lighting and signage strategy
- 14.joinery
- 15.rainwater disposal systems
- 16.hard landscaping works

Informatives are suggested relating to transparent glazing and shopfront design.

6.8 *Response to additional information*

Previous comments relating to the junction at the 'point' on the west and north elevations and response from the applicant are noted. The merits of not extending the masonry element up to the soffit of the first floor are not convincing and the corner needs some additional 'mass' given its the prominence on the Station Road frontage. Details of the junction between north and west elevations can be covered under the appropriate masonry condition.

Other concerns related to inconsistencies between the plans and elevations that have now been resolved with the submission of the revised drawings.

The UDC team also requested further details of a number of elements on the west elevation. In summary these were:

- Details of the screening/walling for the switch room or the bin store;
- Information about the basement car park entrance;
- Ground floor openings onto the proposed park to improve activity along this edge (also discussed at D&C Panel on the 10th April 2013); and
- Details of the car park venting.

The screening/walling to the switch room or bin store could be conditioned should the application be approved.

Plans and elevations need to be amended to indicate the provision of opening doors/windows on to the street to the west of the building. Details of the final system can be covered by condition.

No further details have been submitted relating to the car park entrance or the venting of the basement. These details are considered to be fundamental to the overall design and detailing of the building and accordingly cannot be covered by condition. Accordingly details of these two elements are needed

6.9 *Response to additional information*

Further information is to be submitted in relation to the vents to serve the car park, access to the car park and the ground floor west elevation. The UDC will be asked to comment on these details and their comments will be provided on the Amendment Sheet or orally at the Committee meeting.

Senior Sustainability Officer (Design and Construction)

6.10 *Application as submitted*

Many of the elements being implemented are welcomed notably the provision of eco-roofs and use of rainwater/greywater harvesting.

A hierarchical approach to reducing carbon emissions is being proposed, which should result in a 23.4% reduction in carbon emissions compared to a Part L 2010 compliant development (regulated emissions only). This level of carbon reduction is supported.

The applicant is proposing an approach that utilises the benefits of passive solar design and renewable energy technologies. The Sustainable Design and Construction SPD is supportive of the use of passive solar design in contributing towards the 10% renewable energy requirement. Together the passive solar design and renewable energy technologies achieve a 14.9% CO₂ reduction based on regulated emissions only, which is to be supported as it exceeds the 10% requirement for regulated loads, and is close to the renewables aspiration set out in the masterplan and outline planning permission.

When total energy loads are taken into account, the percentage carbon reduction that can be attributed to passive solar design and renewables is around 8 to 9%, which while slightly below the 10% requirements of Policy 8/16, is still supported when set

against the wider carbon reduction and sustainability measures being implemented as part of this scheme.

The proposals are targeting the BREEAM excellent standard, with a score of 72.27%. This score is quite close to the minimum threshold for BREEAM excellent and as such it will be very important for all of the possible credits to be achieved.

While the general approach to the BREEAM assessment is supported, there is one area where clarification would be welcomed in relation to WAT01 (water consumption). At present, the BREEAM assessment shows that 2 credits are definite (equating to a 25% improvement) with a further credit identified as being possible (which would equate to a 40% improvement). Given the specification of rainwater/greywater harvesting for landscape irrigation and all WC and urinal flushing, clarification as to whether this would be sufficient to guarantee the achievement of at least 3 credits for this category, if not more, would be welcome.

6.11 *Response to additional information*

The revised Assessment shows a higher predicted score of 75.3% (as opposed to the original score of 72.27%). This new score does now give more comfort that the minimum required score for BREEAM 'Excellent' will still be achieved in this situation. It will still be important for all of the credits identified as "possible" to be achieved in order for BREEAM 'Excellent' to be reached.

Access Officer

6.12 No comments received.

Head of Streets and Open Spaces (Tree Team)

6.13 No comments received.

Head of Streets and Open Spaces (Landscape Team)

6.14 *Application as submitted*

PUBLIC REALM

Clarification of the extent of the landscape works is needed.

Ilex Nellie Stevens is proposed for the frontage of Station Square, which departs from the approved Quercus libani in the Public Realm and Landscape Strategy. Considering the scale and prominence of the building and the wide, open spaces of the Station Square, Ilex Nellie Stevens will become lost against the scale of the built form and look insignificant. In pre-application discussions the Landscape Team encouraged the applicant to reconsider the use of an evergreen tree in favour of a deciduous tree. Ilex Nellie Stevens is not accepted and should be replaced with a suitable medium sized deciduous tree; the landscape team welcomes discussion with the applicant to confirm species.

Tree species proposed in the Public Realm and Landscape Strategy was for Tilia intermedia Pallida (pleached) along the northern access road. The current proposal indicates one Ornamental Pear tree along this boundary. This is acceptable given the north frontage of this building will now be a retail edge and there will not be adequate space to establish more street trees along this frontage.

VISUAL AMENITY SPACE

The Design and Access statement (page 33) shows an amenity space for workers on the roof with images of seating and shade canopies which is supported but details are needed.

ACCESS AND MOVEMENT

With 92 Car park spaces proposed for the basement, in addition to 558 cycle parks, the entrance will be very busy during peak hours. The proposal indicates drop down bollards, which are activated by a fob to drop the bollards. With the large number of cars and bikes moving through this space and all cars requiring the bollards to be lowered, we need to ensure cars will not back up along the Northern Access Road and cause a hazard.

Details of the fob/intercom infrastructure and where these are located is required.

CONCLUSION

The proposed development has the potential to make a very positive contribution to the Station Area with the capitalisation of the opportunities identified above. Subject to the incorporation of the suggested amendments, the proposed development of 1 The Square can be supported on landscape, visual and amenity grounds.

CONDITIONS

Conditions are recommended to secure:

- ☐ Fully detailed soft landscape proposals, to include detailed planting plans, written specifications (including plant schedule with size, spacing and densities of proposed plants), and an implementation programme.
- ☐ Fully detailed hard landscape proposals to include full construction details and specifications of levels, all hard surfacing materials, furniture, boundary treatments, lighting etc.
- ☐ A maintenance plan for the entire site (to include a 5-year replacement-planting regime at least).

Head of Streets and Open Spaces (Public Art Officer)

- 6.15 The public art commissions comprise of a permanent commission with a budget of £354,000 and linked to this is a temporary project (or series of projects) with a budget of £40,000 supported by a Research and Development budget of £7500. The PADP explains that the permanent commission could be a single significant Work or a contribution to the whole Square and will be informed by the design process and on-going public engagement through the public programme which is set out in further detail in section 5.

I welcome the submission of the Public Art Delivery Plan (PADP) for the Station Square and in the main, it is acceptable and formatted as previous PADP's.

In terms of the permanent Work, no theme is specified and, it is expected that the Works/s should reflect the achievements and aspirations of the City and could make reference to the history of the site, its importance as a travel hub or its social function. I support that the brief is not constrained however this should include the emotional meaning of travelling as a suggestion for the artist to explore, as this offers opportunity's across the square for interventions. The artist brief should be amended to add this to the list of considerations, as well as in the PADP.

The PADP outlines the basic principles for the Public Programme, as all the other PADP's have done and the budget for this phase is £25,000 and the temporary work but more detail will be needed. Clarification is also needed in respect of the Research and Development and temporary works budget and regarding care and maintenance.

Evidence, of what has been delivered on previous phases and which relates to the approved PADP's should be submitted, when a phase is completed. This should include documentation of the Public Programme and what it has achieved and evidence of budgets spent.

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

6.16 *Application as submitted*

Detail of the gradient of the steps is needed - this should be no more than 25 % (1 in 4), preferably 20% - and height of basement needed.

Additional visitor parking is needed for the retail units, if not those using the shops are likely to park by the columns causing an obstruction.

This visitor parking could be managed with a sign on the racks stating that they are for users of the shops only and not for long stay parking. Cycles which have obviously been left by station users could be ticketed in a similar way as that suggested by the management plan for the proposed visitor parking on Station Road.

6.17 *Response to additional information*

Information has been provided to confirm that the cycle park ramp gradient will be 1:2, which is the same as Microsoft. A gentler gradient should be requested.

Head of Streets and Open Spaces (Sustainable Drainage Officer)

- 6.18 The drainage strategy submitted with this application is supported. The inclusion of a green roof and permeable paving is also strongly supported

Head of Streets and Open Spaces (Nature Conservation Officer)

- 6.19 Evidence of potential for presence of bats in the Cityroomz hotel and railway offices is required.

Details are needed of locations for nest boxes.

6.20 *Response to additional information*

The bat survey information is acceptable.

English Heritage

- 6.21 English Heritage has provided a combined response on all four of the current applications because they consider them to be closely interrelated.

Summary

The applications include demolition of buildings. The need for demolition of these structures was identified in the Masterplan and in granting Outline consent it is assumed that the City Council has taken the view that there is a greater public benefit to be derived from the redevelopment that justifies the loss of the buildings. It is therefore important the new buildings deliver on the vision and are of high quality. EH has some concerns regarding the Cycle Park and Hotel building and recommends modifications.

Demolitions

It is clear from the Heritage Statement that the north wing was built as a separate building and is listed only by virtue of the fact that it is attached to the listed station building. It would not merit listing in its own right and it is uncertain if it would have been identified as a BLI.

In 2008 EH requested that consideration be given to an alternative Masterplan layout to enable retention of the Cityroomz building. This alteration was not made and Outline consent has been granted. EH now acknowledges the potential for enhancement of the Conservation Area through comprehensive redevelopment.

Conditions are recommended to ensure that demolition is prevented until permission has been granted for a replacement building and a contract let.

Replacement Buildings

Block A1/A2

The Design and Access Statement for One The Square (Block A1/A2) shows that the design has evolved following careful analysis of the site context. This building has the potential to provide an appropriate enclosure to the west side of the new square subject to details being secured by condition.

Block B1

The siting and massing of the Cycle Park/Hotel has the potential to read as part of a 'family' with One The Square. However aspects of the design will detract from the Square. In particular the building does not include a double height arcade that is incorporated in One The Square and this should be reconsidered. Also sketches in the Design and Access Statement suggest an ordered masonry elevation incorporating an arcade and ground and first floor, with a range of tall, linked windows to the 2nd, 3rd and 4th floors and a separate set of 'attic' windows to the 5th floor. This has not been followed through on the elevations and needs to be reconsidered.

The Victorian Society

6.22 No comments received.

Natural England

6.23 The application does not fall within the scope of development that NE would routinely comment on. Advice should be sought from the Council's ecologist.

Environment Agency

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

Anglian Water

6.25 No comments received.

Cambridge Airport (Air Safeguarding)

6.26 No safeguarding issues.

Cambridgeshire Constabulary (Architectural Liaison Officer)

6.27 No particular crime concerns but the following steps should be considered:

- 1) that access to the underground cycle parking can only be allowed on fob/car access and that the entrance doors are self-closing
- 2) Cycle entrance and storage area be covered by CCTV viewed either by security office or main reception
- 3) That the underground car park be secured out of hours.

This cycle park will become a serious crime generator and must be sufficiently lit and covered by CCTV to address this.

Cambridgeshire County Council (Archaeology)

6.28 No comments received.

Design and Conservation Panel (Meeting of 10 July 2012) (Pre-application)

6.29

- ☐ Frieze level. The Panel saw this as an appropriate reference to the Station building.
- ☐ Proposed frontages. The Panel welcome the level of activity or engagement at street level, on both the Station Square and Station Road frontages.
- ☐ Cycle route. Some reservations were expressed as to the current arrangements. It was felt that cyclists would likely cut across to the Station in front of A1/A2 therefore jeopardising the quality of the active frontages instead of taking the route west of A2 from the Southern Access Road.
- ☐ A1. The subtle line of sight through to the Station building was seen as particularly successful.
- ☐ Servicing. Although the frequency of deliveries is so far undetermined, the Panel felt that in accordance with the principles of shared space, a servicing area on the north elevation would be far more successful than on the western elevation. The proposed lay-by could be used for this.
- ☐ Taxi drop-off area. The Panel questioned the positioning of the drop-off area as it was felt the traffic circulation would undermine the valuable open space.
- ☐ Palette of materials. Reconstituted stone above could be mixed with genuine stone at lower levels. Further detail would be welcomed.
- ☐ Colonnade/ canopy (above frieze level onto Station Square, western frontage). The Panel noted the preference for a deep floor plate to the ground floor commercial units with a minimum recess with a canopy to provide for spill-out opportunities onto the pavement. The Panel were left unconvinced that the principles of the colonnade as set out in the 2008 Design & Access Statement were being adhered to. The Panel emphasised the architectural importance of a colonnade to set an enclosure line back within block A1/A2 (and B1) and to establish a scale that relates to the listed Station building. The Panel welcome the addition of solar shading (canopy) on the entrance façade (Station Road frontage).

- SW corner. This is a prominent corner with plenty of scope for animation. The Panel would encourage exploration into the integration of Public Art in this area.

Conclusion

It was the Panel's view that Blocks A1/A2 would benefit from further consideration of the incorporation of a colonnade and in demonstrating how the external spaces can provide important animation.

VERDICT – AMBER (unanimous)

Design and Conservation Panel (Meeting of 10 April 2013)

6.30 The presentation by John Drew and Yorgos Kapourniotis addressed the principal design issues raised at the Sub-Panel meeting in June 2012 and how these have been resolved. The issues concerned:-

- The colonnade recess – set back 3m at ground and first floor level as suggested by the Panel.
- Access and servicing – to be accommodated off the westerly rear service corridor.
- Retail signage – to be enclosed within the 'glass box' of each retail unit to provide a level of control (together with 'banners' fitted to the columns along the station square elevation).
- Material. A mixture of natural and reconstituted stone is proposed for the facades (natural stone at street level). The glazed shop fronts will have aluminium framing.

The Panel's comments are as follows:

- **Colonnade** The Panel welcomed the assertiveness and depth of setback of the colonnade which was judged to relate well to the Station building. In abandoning the idea of incorporating canopies on the elevation facing the Station (a decision endorsed by the Panel), the Panel discussed how the pedestrian spaces would be defined. Concerns regarding the likely conflict between pedestrians and cyclists remain. The Panel look forward to reviewing how the public realm fronting One The Square succeeds in contributing to the creation of a unified and well managed space.

- **Access and servicing.** At the previous presentation of the scheme the Panel expressed the view that the northern elevation appeared to be an appropriate location for servicing. However, the Panel were reminded that the Western Access Road was designed to be a service road under the masterplan and would free up the northern facade for a 'live' retail frontage, help prevent delays on the Northern Access Road as well as serve the proposed hotel fronting Station Road. Whilst accepting the rationale for the siting of the servicing area on the west the Panel were not convinced by the assertion that there would be no implications on the public realm. Concerns were expressed about the potential impact of the assortment and volume of traffic movements on the quality and use made of the Northern Park. The Panel note that: there will be restricted hours for servicing, that the vehicles concerned are likely to be smaller delivery vehicles as opposed to articulated lorries and that the shared surface materials and construction will be appropriately robust.
- **Signage** Glass box' shop fronts. The Panel supported the proposals for the combination of banners and signage. The Panel made a strong plea for the quality of the proposed Station Square facade/elevation to be assured through property management so as to ensure that any physical changes over time made by different occupiers of the ground floor units would not undermine the building's aesthetic integrity and have a negative impact on the public realm.
- **Materials and louvers** It was acknowledged that one of the keys to the successful realisation of the quality of the proposals was the combination of the natural stone with the reconstituted material. In noting that further study into the various textures and colours is being undertaken the Panel suggested using natural stone in the public realm would contribute to the overall sense of quality. Reserving the reconstituted stone for the upper floors would create the illusion that natural stone has been applied throughout.
- **Louvers.** The Panel commented favourably on the slender dimensions of the louvers and the wrap around corner detail on the southern elevation of the building. A note of caution was expressed regarding the vulnerability of these horizontal elements to damage from pigeon excrement and would therefore require regular maintenance (this would

include the glass 'shelf' at the top of the individual shop fronts within the colonnade)..

Conclusion

Overall, the Panel were supportive of the scheme for One The Square, which if realised as proposed, and is well maintained and managed would deliver a dignified and sophisticated building befitting a key entrance to the City. The Panel look forward to being assured that the quality and functionality of the Northern Park will not be compromised by the way in which the service area is allowed to operate and that the Western Access Road proves to be a successful controlled shared surface.

VERDICT – GREEN (unanimous)

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 (including representations received on all four related applications)

7.1 The owners/occupiers of the following addresses have made representations:

3 Ascham Road
72 Devonshire Mews

7.2 The representations can be summarised as follows:

Concerns and objections

Loss of Existing Buildings

Existing buildings such as the northern wing of the station should be retained and incorporated into the development in common with St Pancras and Kings Cross.

New Building

It is considered that the design is a fine example of external treatment, which lives up to the objectives of the earlier design

code and that it promises a frontage worthy of its location opposite the station.

7.3 Cambridge City Licensed Taxis Ltd has made representations on both this site and the Hotel/Cycle Park as follows:

Introduction – CCLT represent over 200 licensed taxi drivers within Cambridge. CCLT objects to the impact of cycles and other traffic on taxis using the Northern Access Road (NAR) and the Station Square. CCLT will be submitting detailed representations in relation to the application for Station Square.

The Development – reference is made to the application details and to the application for the surface car park for 459 spaces which is understood to be permitted development.

Development Plan and other policies – reference is made to Local Plan policy 9/9, Transport 2010 – The Ten Year Plan', the Cambridgeshire Local Transport Plan (2006-2011) and the Station Area Development Framework. CCLT consider that these documents emphasise the importance of improving taxi facilities at the Station, enhancing the ability of taxis to provide a public transport service and providing facilities for disabled people. The proposals fail to meet these policy objectives and it would be unlawful for the City Council to approve them.

Transport Implications of the development – congestion at the Tenison Road/NAR junction will cause significant numbers of taxis and other vehicles to queue on the NAR which will adversely affect the occupiers of flats fronting this road. Delays will also lead to increased taxi fares and there will be an impact on the ability of taxis to service the rank. This situation can be resolved by allowing taxi access off Station Road via the bus gate.

Station Square – there will be greater potential for conflicts between taxis, pedestrians, cyclists and other road users in the Square.

Conclusion – consent should only be granted for the hotel, cycle store and car park if the Council is satisfied that the Square layout will allow taxis to enter, circulate and exit safely and efficiently.

7.4 David Campbell Bannerman MEP has made objections which relate to the Block A1/A2 and the loss of City Roomz as follows:

The CityRoomz hotel is set in an old railway warehouse which is an attractive and important historic building which could be easily conserved and reused within the overall CBI plan, and which is only threatened by road access proposals - proposals which are more flexible than the site being used for major development.

This proposed demolition and new development is within the large Cambridge No. 1 Conservation area and the loss of this building would pose considerable harm to the conservation area. It would be a sad loss both for our community and for our city if this building were not retained as it is a characterful, interesting building, and is important to the context of the listed station buildings opposite.

The building is a Building of Local Interest and referred to in the New Town and Glisson Road Conservation Area Appraisal. The current building also has "Communal Value" due to the large number of people who park or ride their bikes past it each day. There will also be those who have stayed in the building itself who will not wish to see it demolished.

The developers report very much plays down the real significance of this building. This building could be used as part of proposed retail unit development - it would be a characterful restaurant, coffee house or shop, or as bike storage / bike hire to replace the existing premises.

The main drive behind destroying this historic building is to simply give more road access for the developers of yet another unremarkable 6 story glass and metal building, near to this site.

The CityRoomz building has played an important part in the history of Cambridge. With it Robert Sayle was able to grow his business which would later go on to be the John Lewis Partnership. Rather than be demolished, this building should be kept as a tribute to the man and the growth he brought to Cambridge.

The application should be refused.

7.5 Glisson Road and Tenison Road Residents Association objects on the following grounds:

1. The deviation from the master plan considered in 2008 is not acceptable. The proposed changes when taken into consideration with the other office permissions listed below mean that there are fundamental changes to the original scheme

We have examined the various granted / current permissions and pending appeals for Cb1

The original outline for the scheme was 53,294 sq m of Class B1a (Office) 08/0266

Since then the office permissions have been

10/0797 Block E1 (Microsoft) 9808 sq m built

12/0502 Block I2 (50 Station Road) 7806sq m appeal pending

12/0502 Block I2 (60 Station Road) 8621 sq m appeal pending

12/1237 Block J2 7453 sq m approved

12/1608 Block A1/A2 14,326 sq m current application

together this makes 48,014 sq m

This leaves office blocks I1, J1, J3, J4 and G1 and G2 (the latter two probably will not be built as they are in the car park)

Clearly these office blocks are not going to only account for the 5,000 sq m remaining from the outline.

If granted this application is going to result in a massive increase in traffic in our area from cars and delivery vehicles.

2. Car parking

Once again the Developers have departed from the agreed standard in 08/0266 It appears the proposed ratio is 1 space to every 160 sq m of office space not the 1 to 125 agreed in 2008.

The justification for this appears to be that the modal split for journey to work by car is reduced from the 32% in the outline permission to 5%. This is a hypothesis is not tested and in our view will result in a large amount of overflow car parking in residential streets within walking distance.

The stock response to this complaint in the past has been that air quality needs to be considered. Perhaps the Council should also take into account the changes to vehicle design including reduced levels of pollution and hybrid or electric vehicles which are now starting to be introduced.

3. There is no open space included in this scheme. In summer time many office workers like to relax outside during lunch times and breaks. If this proposal is separate from the master plan then it cannot rely on the small spaces included in that scheme and should have its own open space.

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

8.0 ASSESSMENT

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

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

Principle of Development and Relationship with the CB1 Masterplan

- 8.2 The application has two key parts; demolition of all buildings on the site and the erection of a new building. The approved Parameter Plans that form the Masterplan for the Station Area

redevelopment include both of these elements and in my view establishes the principle for the development.

Demolition of Existing Buildings

8.3 The application includes the demolition of the following buildings/structures:

- ☐ Cityroomz Hotel building which is a Building of Local Interest (BLI)
- ☐ The railway offices and Art Workshop and the building occupied by Station Cycles which are not listed

8.4 Parameter Plan 1 of the Masterplan indicates buildings that were to be demolished to accommodate the development. All of the buildings/structures set out above are shown as to be demolished. In the report that was considered by Planning Committee in October 2008 the following comment is made about the demolition of Cityroomz:

Cityroomz Hotel (formerly Sleeperz)

8.240 Sleeperz is acknowledged in the SADF as the best surviving example of a non-listed station building. Like the BTP wing, the retention of Sleeperz would compromise the operation of the Station Square and I am convinced by the applicant's arguments in favour of its retention

8.5 The Committee Report does not refer to the other buildings that are to be demolished but it does refer to the need for Listed Building Consent or Conservation Area Consent for the demolition of the buildings referred to above. My views have not changed with regard to the demolition of these buildings. I also accept the applicant argument that the removal of these buildings needs to be seen in the context of the wider site.

8.6 The demolition of these buildings needs to be regarded in the context of not only the delivery of Block A1/A1 but also, the hotel/cycle park, the Station Square and the reconfigured Station Car Park. I have addressed the issue of demolition in greater depth in the following section 'Impact on Heritage Assets' and in my reports for the Listed Building Consent and Conservation Area Consent.

Uses to be accommodated in the proposed building

Parameter plan compliance

- 8.7 The outline planning permission for CB1 established an approved mix of uses for the CB1 Masterplan area set within a series of development blocks. The building which is the subject of this application falls within Block A1/A2. This block is identified in the approved Parameter Plans as accommodating a hotel use in Block A1 and a non-residential institution use within Block A2 with the potential for some retail use at ground floor. Basement parking was proposed with vehicle access from the west side. At the time of the outline application the proposed non-residential use was indicated as being a polyclinic.
- 8.8 Block A1/A2 extends 78 metres along the west side of the proposed Station Square, 84 metres along the east side of the Station Road elevation and 38 metres along the north side of Station Road and southern side of the proposed Northern Access Road (NAR). The retail space to the frontage extends up to the full width of the block on the south and east sides. The maximum height of Block A1/A2 is 23m (excluding permitted tolerances). The parameter plan for Block A1/A2 indicates the maximum envelope within which development can be brought forward.
- 8.9 The building that is proposed does not accord with the uses permitted by the Parameter Plans. On the ground floor it is proposed to accommodate retail units along the east and north side, the office reception on the south side and office accommodation on the west side. On the upper floors there will be office use only. The office use is a deviation from the Parameter Plans and the retail use is proposed in different parts of the block which is a further change.
- 8.10 The proposed building extends to the maximum footprint of Block A1/A2. The building incorporates a set-back on the top floor on the north, south and east sides and a set back at ground/first floor on the east elevation as shown on the Parameter Plan.

- 8.11 Because the proposed uses do not accord with the Parameter Plans for Block A1/A2, full planning permission is required. However the mix of uses proposed is compatible with the range of uses permitted within the wider Masterplan area. This application needs to be seen in the wider context and particularly alongside the application that has been submitted for Block B1. The application for Block B1 also proposes a deviation from the approved Parameter Plans. In that case an office use is replaced by a hotel use. The proposed hotel use in Block A1 was to be in the order of 6479 sqm which is broadly compatible with the current proposal of 6565 sqm of hotel space within Block B1.
- 8.12 The amount of retail space that is being brought forward for Block A1/A2 is approximately 500 sqm less than that previously proposed for Block A1/A2 at 1205 sqm compared with 1720 sqm and the retail units are in a different configuration. However The Cycle Shop and hire area which is accommodated in Block B1 represents 510 sq m of additional retail provision in that block which brings the total amount of retail space across the two block into conformity with the Parameter Plans.
- 8.13 The proposals increase the amount of office floorspace across the two blocks. 710 sqm of office floorspace is 'lost' from Block B1 and 14,326 sqm of office floorspace 'created' in Block A1/A2. This is clearly a deviation from the Parameter Plans and the approved Masterplan. However the scale of office floorspace proposed is compatible with the scale of floorspace in the combined hotel/polyclinic scheme at 14,124 sqm. As the applicants point out the consequence of this is an increase in B1(a) floorspace within CB1, but it does not increase the commercial floorspace, it simply replaces some commercial floorspace with B1(a) office accommodation.

Increase in office floorspace

- 8.14 The applicants have also submitted information in support of this increase in office floorspace. Central to their argument in support of the increase in office floorspace is the Cambridge Cluster at 50 The Cambridge economy: retrospect and prospect Report (March 2011) which was reported to the Development Plans Steering Group in June 2011.

- 8.15 At their meeting the DPSG endorsed the content of the Report as an evidence base for the review of the Local Plan and as a material consideration in planning decisions. Councillors queried the status of the Report at the meeting and were advised that it was not new policy at that stage and that its weight and applicability as a material consideration in the determination of planning applications would need to be determined in relation to the specific circumstances of each case/situation.
- 8.16 I agree with the applicants that the Cambridge Cluster at 50 Report should be a material consideration in the determination of this application. The Report is complex and considers amongst other things the roles which the City has in the local and regional context. The Report does refer to the continuing need for more office floorspace and the desire for occupiers to have a City centre location, for example to enable easy access to London. In this sense it is supportive of more office accommodation at the Station Area.
- 8.17 The applicants consider that it is imperative that the tenant led demand of such office accommodation is recognised. There is demand but this may leak away if the appropriate buildings are not provided around the station in time. They consider that the role of CB1 is changing as the economy changes and it is the City's best opportunity to meet the short and short-medium term needs for high quality, HQ style buildings in a city centre location. In their view the proposals for One The Square reflect this demand and meet this identified need.
- 8.18 The Planning Policy team have reviewed the arguments that I have set out above and concur with them. They also note that the principle of providing more office accommodation in this location accords with the Employment Land Review Update 2012.

Omission of the polyclinic

- 8.19 The applicants also observe that shortly after the 2008 resolution to grant planning permission for the CB1 Masterplan, Government policy and funding shifted away from large polyclinics. This rendered the delivery of a polyclinic within CB1 unviable. To facilitate the construction of the multi-storey cycle

park without significant public funding, the hotel has been relocated approximately 17m across the Station Square.

- 8.20 I have carried out my own research which has established that in 2010 the government decided to put on hold all plans to increase numbers of polyclinics and to relocate GPs to them pending a review of policy under the new coalition government. I am not aware of that review having been carried out to date.
- 8.21 I also asked the applicants for further clarification regarding the loss of the polyclinic and they have responded as follows:

The agents acting for Brookgate (Savills) have a specialist team dealing with health related development and have significant experience in this area. The experience extends to LIFT (Local Improvement Finance Trust) schemes which is an initiative designed to deliver new types of care. This type of scheme is most closely related to the original polyclinic concept.

The team produced a report which considers the provision of healthcare in Central Cambridge and the additional demand likely to arise from the new development.

In terms of LIFT schemes, the team note that typically floorspace for such schemes is between 1000 sq m and 3000 sq m which is significantly less than the floorspace in Block A2. Where larger LIFT schemes have been brought forward, these tend to be in depressed, low-value areas that are targeted for regeneration.

- 8.22 The conclusions reached by the team are as follows:

- ☐ The end user for the polyclinic withdrew some years ago.
- ☐ The economic and policy climate has changed radically since 2008.
- ☐ The current provision of surgeries in a 1 mile radius is in line with expectations and serves the term time student population.
- ☐ Woodlands Surgery is re-locating off site.
- ☐ Block G2 is available for a new health use.
- ☐ The demands of the new population can be readily absorbed by existing practices.
- ☐ The current design delivers 7645 sq m floorspace which would accommodate 45 doctors and involve relocation of

all surgeries in a 1 mile radius. This is 15 times larger than a typical GP surgery and 2/3 time larger than a typical LIFT scheme.

- There is no demand for a health use and the replacement with an alternative use will not prejudice the provision of health care locally.

In my view the arguments in favour of the omission of the polyclinic are robust and should be accepted.

Restriction on occupation of office development

- 8.23 Policy 7/2 of the Local Plan permits new office development for occupation by a business that can demonstrate that it provides an essential service for Cambridge as a local or sub-regional centre or exceptionally where there is a proven need for a regional function only. This is sometimes known as a 'local user condition'. The s106 Agreement for the outline application secures such control over the future occupation of office development within the scheme and it is necessary to secure the same arrangement for this proposal. This can be achieved through the s106 Agreement.
- 8.24 In my opinion the principle of development is acceptable and accords with the CB1 Masterplan and policies 3/1 and 9/9 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006.

Environmental Assessment

- 8.25 The applicants have requested a Screening Opinion under the Environmental Impact Regulations to establish whether an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) is needed. This is supported by a Legal Opinion by a leading Counsel in this field. The response to the Screening Opinion has been published. The development is above the threshold (site area 0.5 ha) where an EIA could be required. However in this case officers are of the view that the application details include sufficient information to enable the full impacts of the development to be properly considered and have concluded that an EIA is not required.

Context of site, design and external spaces

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

Building Design – Layout and Height

Building Design – Elevations and Materials

External Space – Design and Materials

External Space – Tree removal and planting

Nature Conservation

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

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

Building Design – Layout and Height

8.28 The layout of the building at ground floor presents a number of ways in which the uses within it will interact with the external environment. The frontage to Station Square (east elevation) accommodates retail units under a colonnade and retail units face the street on the frontage to the NAR (north elevation). The west elevation faces the proposed Station Road open space and could allow for a high degree of interaction if the office space is designed to open up into this area. The formation of the access between the building and the open space allows for access to the basement car park and for servicing but more importantly will provide for a low trafficked access for cyclists accessing the Cycle Park from the west and

south. The south elevation is angled as suggested by the Parameter Plans to ensure that views of the Station building are protected. This also provides a focus for the entrance to the office which is set under the main façade and is a double height space

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

Table – Comparison between approved Parameter Plans and Proposed Development		
	Parameter Plan	Proposed Development
Parameter Plan Height occupied floorspace	23m	22.5m
Parameter Plan Height including Plant/Lift Overrun	25m	24.6m
Parameter Plan set back at top floor	3m	3m
Parameter Plan set back at ground floor	3m	3m (2.5m to shopfront)
Parameter Plan set back at first floor	3m	3.2m

- 8.30 The table demonstrates that the building will sit within the parameters for the maximum height of Block A1/A2

Building Design – Elevations and Materials

- 8.31 The building has a pivotal role within the Masterplan. It faces Station Square and will read together with Station Buildings and the new buildings which are proposed including on Block B1 which is under consideration. It will also address Station Road, the NAR and the Station Road Open Space and will need to relate well to new buildings that are proposed in this area including the hotel proposed for the Red House site.
- 8.32 Very extensive pre-application discussions have taken place which have resulted a building of high quality overall. The design of the elevations follows the base, middle and top approach. This has been delivered by the shopfronts and first floor office accommodation being positioned within a colonnade to produce a firm base on the Station Square side and stone pillars ‘securing’ the building to the ground on the other sides. A horizontal and vertical grid of stone occupies the ‘middle’ part of the building and the uppermost floor is set back. The roof plant area forms part of the uppermost floor which is predominately office accommodation. This allows the elevations of the top of the building to be designed as part of an integrated whole with rest of the elevation and not as an ‘add-on’. The predominant material will be reconstituted stone with glazing and aluminium framing for the shopfronts and panels for the uppermost floor.
- 8.33 In my view the elevations and materials are highly appropriate for the location of the building. The emphasis in the Station Square should be on the Station Buildings and Block A1/A2 which will be immediately visible on arrival in Cambridge. As with other buildings in CB1 the choice of materials will be critical and conditions to control final detailing essential.
- 8.34 The UDC team, English Heritage and the Conservation and Design CB1 Sub Panel support the application. However there are some outstanding matters in relation to the vents for the basement car park, the car park access and the windows on the west elevation that need to be resolved. I am expecting amended plans on these issues and will provide an update on the Amendment Sheet or orally at the Committee meeting. I have recommended conditions to control the detailed design of the building.

External Space – Design and Materials

- 8.35 In addition to the threshold spaces to the north and south of the building there are three external spaces that form part of the development, the final phase of the Station Road Open Space, part of the Station Square and a green roof.

Station Road Open Space

- 8.36 The Station Road Open Space will be surrounded by the Microsoft building, Block C1/C2 of the CB1 development, Block A1/A2 and the hotel on the Red House site. With the exception of the hotel, as each of the developments takes place it will facilitate the delivery of the Open Space. The final (eastern) part of the Open Space will be provided as part of the scheme for Block A1/A2. This will take the form of hard surfacing and planting which will link up to provide a coordinated space. A north/south route will be provided through the space which will provide pedestrians and cyclists with an alternative to the Station Square for accessing the Cycle Park and other areas. Bollards will be installed to control vehicle access to the space.
- 8.37 At the time of writing this report the access arrangements to serve the car park have yet to be resolved. This could have an impact on the quality of this space and I am expecting plans to be submitted in advance of the Committee meeting. I will provide an update on the Amendment Sheet or orally at the Committee meeting.

Station Square

- 8.38 The site includes a small part (12m wide) of the western side of the Square. This will be laid out as a paved space with five trees and seating. This space will link into the Station Square proposals which have recently been brought forward under a reserved matters submission.

Green Roofs

- 8.39 A Green/Brown roof is proposed under and around the photovoltaic cells which are to be installed on the roof. They will not be accessible but will provide opportunities for wildlife and ecological benefits.

External Space – Tree removal and planting

- 8.40 A number of trees are to be removed from the Station Road frontage and four trees elsewhere on the site. Four lime trees are proposed to be planted on Station Road and five holly trees in the Station Square. One new ornamental pear tree is to be planted as part of the development at the end of the Northern Access Road. In my view there is limited scope for additional tree planting alongside the north side of the building given the need to retain a clear footway and the location of the retail units.
- 8.41 Five hornbeam trees and three field maples are to be planted in the Station Road Open Space.
- 8.42 The Landscape Officer is generally supportive of the scheme. I agree with her comments regarding tree species for the Station Square and raised this with the applicant. The trees have been changed to Turkish Hazel, which are appropriate and supported by the Landscape Officer. The open areas around the building will be very well used and in my view have been designed to cope with this issue. The Highway Engineer has not raised any concerns about the potential for congestion being caused by vehicles accessing the building. I have recommended conditions to control the detailed proposals for landscaping.

8.43 Nature Conservation

The City Council's Nature Conservation Officer has highlighted the need to consider the presence of bats in the Cityroomz hotel building. The applicants have carried out a further survey in response to his comment and he is content with the outcome. Further surveys are not required.

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

Impact on Heritage Assets

- 8.45 The applications for Block B1 and Block A1/A2 are supported by Heritage Statements as required by paragraph 128 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). An Addendum has also been produced which explains why it is necessary to demolish Cityroomz and the Station Offices buildings even though these buildings are not beneath the footprints of the new

building or the Station Square. Officers in the Urban Design and Conservation Team have not raised any concerns about this analysis and support the scheme subject to the imposition of planning conditions to address matters of detail.

- 8.46 The applicants have correctly identified the heritage assets that are affected by the development as the Station Building which is a listed building, Cityroomz which is a Building of Local Interest (BLI) and the Conservation Area. The NPPF includes buildings that are locally listed in the definition of a heritage asset.
- 8.47 The significance of these buildings has been assessed using NPPF and other guidance. The aspects of high/moderate significance have been identified as the main central section and north wing of the Station. The British Transport Police wing and Cityroomz are regarded as being of moderate significance and the 1960s station platform canopy of no significance. The Station Offices are of moderate/low significance.
- 8.48 The demolition of the existing building is addressed in detail in my reports about the applications for Listed Building Consent (LBC) and for Conservation Area Consent (CAC). Those reports conclude that the LBC/CAC should be supported provided that the replacement buildings are an appropriate replacement which will enhance the Conservation Area.
- 8.49 I am convinced that the office/retail building will be a positive asset to the Conservation Area. This view is shared by the Design and Conservation Panel CB1 Sub Panel, English Heritage and the Urban Design and Conservation Team. These views provide the necessary justification for the demolition of the existing buildings.
- 8.50 In my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 4/10, 4/11 and 4/12 and guidance provided by the NPPF.

Public Art

- 8.51 A Public Art Delivery Plan has been submitted in support of the application. Block A1/A2 falls within the Green Phase of the CB1 development and although the application is a full planning application it is proposed that public art be provided via the

same route as if a submission of reserved matters had been made.

- 8.52 The Green Phase includes a major permanent commission, a temporary project with associated research and development programme and a public engagement programme supporting these activities. The CB1 Public Art Strategy refers to the major permanent commission as: 'A partnership between artist, landscape architect and lighting engineer on the development of the public square and its context. The project might involve interactive lighting, landscaping, a sculptural intervention or a combination of these'
- 8.53 Given the significance of the site it has been agreed that the whole programme of activity (permanent and temporary projects, and supporting research and development) should be undertaken by one artist. An Artists Brief for the permanent work has been drafted but an Artist has not yet been appointed.
- 8.54 The City Council Public Art Officer supports the Public Art Delivery Plan subject to some amendments to provide clarification and further information. In my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan (2003) policies P6/1 and 9/8 and Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 3/7 and 10/1 and the Public Art SPD 2010

Renewable energy and sustainability

- 8.55 The application is supported by an Energy Strategy and BREEAM Pre-Assessment. The Senior Sustainability Officer is satisfied with the approach which includes use of passive solar design and renewables. Further information has been provided regarding calculations for BREEAM and the Senior Sustainability Officer supports the approach that is being adopted.
- 8.56 In my opinion the applicants have suitably addressed the issue of sustainability and renewable energy and the proposal is in accordance with the Sustainable Design and Construction SPD 2007.

Disabled access

- 8.57 The Design and Access Statement addresses disabled access. In my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 3/7 and 3/12.

Residential Amenity

Impact on amenity of neighbouring occupiers

- 8.58 The closest residential units are on the Ravensworth Gardens development and the development will be more than 50m away. Given this separation distance I do not consider the impact in terms of loss of outlook or enclosure, overshadowing or overlooking to be so significant as to justify refusal of planning permission. In any event when the development of Blocks D1 and F1 of the Masterplan takes place the new buildings on those sites will obscure a substantial part of the office building from view.
- 8.59 Proposals for Block F1 and Block C1/C2 are currently at the pre-application advice stage having been the subject of an application that was withdrawn last year. Block F1 which faces the northern elevation of the office building will be separated from it by the NAR and there will be a separation distance of around 30m between the buildings. Block C1/C2 presents a flank elevation toward the office building and there will be a separation distance of about 15m. Notwithstanding the lack of detailed plans for Blocks F1 and C1/C2 I consider that they can be designed in such a way as to provide a high quality of design whilst taking the presence of the office building into account.

Noise and disturbance

- 8.60 The Environmental Health Officer (EHO) has recommended conditions relating to construction activities, opening times, plant noise and odour which I have included in my recommendation.
- 8.61 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 and Servicing Arrangements

- 8.62 A waste storage area is provided on the ground floor with access onto the space to the west of the building. A servicing route is also provided to the retail uses in this location and a swept path analysis demonstrates that service vehicles will be able to access and egress in forward gear. The EHO is content with this arrangement.
8. 63 In my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policy 3/12 and conforms to the RECAP Waste Management Design Guide.

Other environmental impacts

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

Construction Phase Impacts – these can be addressed by the imposition of a condition to require the submission and approval of a Demolition and Construction Environmental Management Plan (DCEMP).

Road traffic noise – I have recommended a condition that will enable suitable glazing to be installed to address this issue.

Plant noise/Standby Generator noise – I have recommended a condition to secure details of plant to protect the amenity of neighbours.

Odour – the occupier of the retail/café area is not yet known and I have recommended a condition to secure odour controls should this prove necessary.

Opening Times – I have recommended a condition that restricts opening times and deliveries to the retail/café/restaurant uses. I have also recommended a condition to restrict delivery hours to the offices.

Contaminated land – I have recommended a condition to secure a full contaminated land investigation and remediation strategy.

Air Quality – the EHO is satisfied that the level of car parking is such that it will not have an adverse impact on air quality.

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

Transport Impact

- 8.66 The application is supported by a Transport Assessment (TA) that has been carried out under the guidance of the County Council. The TA addresses the existing conditions, the proposed development, trip generation and assignment and junction capacity. The TA has considered the effect of re-routing traffic along the NAR to serve the Station Square and concludes that doing so will be likely to result in queuing at the Tenison Road/NAR and Tenison Road junctions. This impact was recognised at the Outline planning stage.
- 8.67 The TA also compares the traffic flows associated with the office use compared with the previously proposed hotel/polyclinic use and conclude that a lower level of traffic will be generated by the office use.
- 8.68 The County Council have reviewed the TA and have asked for further information. Detailed trip generation data has been provided and I am expecting the County Transport team to comment on this shortly. This will establish an appropriate level of commuted payments towards SCATP and the CGB.
- 8.69 In my view provided that an appropriate level of the commuted payments towards SCATP and CGB can be agreed then the transport impacts of the development will have been adequately addressed. In my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 8/2, 9/9 and 10/1.

Highway Safety

- 8.70 The Highway Authority has raised concern about outward opening doors, the width of the car park ramp and the car park layout. Revised plans have been submitted to indicate that doors will not be outward opening, but further work is needed in relation to the car park ramp and layout. I will provide an update on the Amendment Sheet or orally at the Committee

meeting. I have recommended the conditions/informatives as requested.

- 8.71 In my opinion, subject to the satisfactory resolution of outstanding issues, the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policy 8/2.

Car and Cycle Parking

Car Parking

- 8.72 A total of 92 car parking spaces are provided in the basement including five spaces that are large enough for use by disabled people.
- 8.73 The adopted car parking standards allow for a maximum of one car parking space per 100 m² of office floorspace and disabled parking only for retail uses. By application of these standards a maximum of 144 car parking spaces could be provided. The level of provision is lower than this maximum. In my view this is appropriate given the highly accessible nature of the site by non-car modes and the low level of air quality.

The following table sets out the comparative number and ratio of car parking in the CB1 development to date:

SITE ADDRESS	NUMBER OF SPACES	PARKING RATIO
50/60 Station Road (First Scheme)	60	1 per 274 sqm
50/60 Station Road (Second Scheme)	76	1 per 209 sqm
Microsoft (excluding temporary car park)	35	1 per 280 sqm
22 Station Road	40	1 per 186 sqm
Block A1/A2		1 per 156 sqm

- 8.74 The parking ratio for Block A1/A2 is greater than the ratio for other development in CB1. In my view refusal of the application on the grounds of inadequate car parking could not be

substantiated at appeal. However in common with other development at CB1, I would recommend that a pre- and post-development parking survey be carried out to demonstrate the impact of 'overspill' parking on residential amenity in nearby residential streets and that the setting up of a Resident's Parking Scheme be funded by the developer if necessary.

Cycle Parking

- 8.75 548 cycle parking spaces are provided in the basement with a further 10 visitor spaces adjacent to the office entrance. The application has been revised so that a total of 576 cycle parking spaces are located in and around the building. Application of the adopted cycle parking standards indicates that 49 spaces should be provided for use by the retail units and 478 for the office space, a total of 527 cycle spaces. The cycle parking provision accords with planning policy in terms of overall numbers.
- 8.76 306 cycle parking spaces are in the form of Sheffield stands and 252 on double stackers. This equates to 77% of spaces at ground level and 23% at upper level. This is better than the ratio of ground to upper level space in other parts of CB1.
- 8.77 The Walking and Cycling Officer has recommended that some visitor cycle parking be located in the Square for use by visitors to the retail units. The amended landscape scheme allows for 26 such spaces. I agree that if this is provided it will need to be carefully managed. A Cycle Parking Management Plan can be secured by planning condition which could consist of the following:
- ☐ Discreet signage on the stands to deter authorised use
 - ☐ Active surveillance of cycle parking
 - ☐ Removal of unauthorised cycles within 24 hours of two written warnings
- 8.78 In my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 8/6 and 8/10.

Third Party Representations

- 8.79 A representation has been made in support of the development. The other representations have been addressed in my assessment but are reviewed below.

Representations from Cambridge City Licensed Taxis Ltd (CCLT)

- 8.80 CCLT has made representations about this application and the application for Block B1. CCLT are concerned that proper provision should be made for taxis to enter and leave the area in front of the Station. In its conclusion CCLT state that in the view of their members 'consent should only be granted for the hotel, cycle store and car park if the Council is satisfied that the Square layout will allow taxis to enter, circulate and exit safely and efficiently'.

This application includes a small section of the new Station Square but it does not relate to any vehicle circulation space which will be the subject of a separate application.

Access was a matter that was approved at the Outline stage and access to the Square via the Northern Access Road was agreed in principle as part of the Outline approval. The provision of the T-junction is in accordance with the agreed access arrangements. However I have recommended a condition on the permission for the Cycle Park to allow this layout to be reviewed in the light of comments from the Cycling and Walking Officer.

The application for the Square has been brought forward as a reserved matters submission in accordance with the Outline approval. I do not consider that there are grounds for deferral of this application pending the determination of the application for the Station Square. There is also no planning policy reason for refusing the applications for the Hotel/Cycle Park/Office on these grounds.

The proposals for the Station Car Park amount to permitted development and therefore it would not be possible to refuse planning permission for them.

Representations from David Campbell Bannerman MEP

- 8.81 Most of the issues raised are addressed in the sections of my report that relate to context of site, design and external space and impact on Heritage Assets. CityRoomz hotel is partially on the site of the office building but mainly effects the provision of the Station Square.

I have checked the history of site as part of the Robert Sayle business and the John Lewis Partnership and found this information on the John Lewis website:

‘Though now known as John Lewis Cambridge, Robert Sayle was a much-loved Cambridge department store, which has stood proud as one of Cambridge's retail landmarks for over 160 years. In 1934 the Selfridge Provincial Stores (SPS) group bought the shop. However, with the outbreak of war the future looked bleak and the Selfridge family decided to sell the whole of the SPS group. Spedan Lewis, the son of John Lewis, was looking to expand his own growing empire and in 1940 the John Lewis Partnership bought the shop along with fourteen other department stores.’

I do not think that this demonstrates a reason for resisting the principle of demolition.

Representations from Glisson Road Tenison Road Residents Association

- 8.82 Deviation from the Masterplan

The office floorspace referred to in the representation is correct and whilst this development will not exceed the overall floorspace figure established by the Outline consent it is likely to be exceeded as other blocks are brought forward. This application is for full planning permission and is not bound by the restrictions of the Outline consent. I have discussed the issue of the principle of introduction of additional office floorspace in paragraphs 8.14 to 8.18. However the representation from GTARA is principally in relation to the increased amount of traffic that will be generated as a result of more offices.

I am awaiting further comments from the County Council Transport team regarding the trip rate and trip generation data that has been submitted recently. My interpretation of this data is that the vehicular trips generated by the use of Block A1/A2 will be much reduced in comparison with the original hotel/polyclinic use (176 trips/614 trips (daily)). This is because the trip rate for the health uses is much higher than that for office uses.

I have received similar data for Block B1 which is to accommodate a hotel. This indicates that vehicular traffic associated with the hotel will amount to 59 car trips and HGV traffic for the hotel/retail units 8 movements per day. This level of traffic remains well below that which was anticipated by the scheme including the polyclinic.

8.83 Car Parking

This development is not bound by the conditions set out in the Outline planning consent. However the Outline planning consent does not establish a parking ratio for the development. Condition 57 of the Outline consent requires that the maximum parking ratio be limited to one space for every 125 sq m of floorspace. The reason for this is to promote sustainable development and to mitigate against impacts on air quality.

The ratio of car parking for Block A1/A2 is one of the highest in the CB1 development. The potential for adverse impacts from 'overspill' parking is capable of being addressed by the proposed pre and post development parking surveys.

8.84 Open Space

The development includes the final phase of the Station Road Open Space. I understand the view that additional office space should bring forward further amenity space for users but there is no policy justification for this. The development makes provision for break out space on the ground floor and the roof space is also proposed to be accessible.

Planning Obligations

Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010

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

(a) necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms;

(b) directly related to the development; and

(c) fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development.

8.86 In bringing forward my recommendations in relation to the Planning Obligation for this development I have considered these requirements. The Planning Obligation Strategy (2010) provides a framework for expenditure of financial contributions collected through planning obligations. The Public Art Supplementary Planning Document 2010 addresses requirements in relation to public art (amend/delete as applicable). The applicants have indicated their willingness to enter into a S106 planning obligation in accordance with the requirements of the Strategy and relevant Supplementary Planning Documents and to reflect the s106 Agreement associated with the Outline consent.

S106 Agreement relating to the Outline Planning Consent

8.87 Although this is a full planning application which would result in the grant of a freestanding planning permission, it is my view that an understanding of the s106 Agreement for the Outline consent remains important. . (Please note that the s106 Agreement is a complex document and that I have heavily précised its contents). Block A1/A2 is in the Green phase of the development.

8.88 The implementation of development in the Green Phase e.g. Block A1/A2 would trigger the following commuted payments/infrastructure under the Outline consent:

- ☐ Submission and approval of the Public Art Delivery Plan for the Green Phase
- ☐ Local User condition restriction
- ☐ Delivery of CCTV
- ☐ Residents Parking Scheme
- ☐ Scheme for Station Square including a Management Plan and arrangements for the relocation of the British Transport Police (BTP)
- ☐ Sub-phase payments towards SCATP and CGB
- ☐ Replacement of cycle parking spaces during the delivery of the Pink and Green Phases pending delivery of the Cycle Park.
- ☐ Submission of details of the Northern Access Road
- ☐ Travel Plan Co-ordinator and Travel Plan
- ☐ Submission and approval of the detailed design for the Cycle Park and Cycle Park Management Plan and completion of the works before commencement of Block A2 (under Variation to s106 dated 18 October 2012).
- ☐ Submission and approval of the Second Phase of the Station Road Open Space and completion of the works before commencement of Block A2 (under Variation to s106 dated 18 October 2012).

8.89 The mitigation measures that are identified for the Green Phase are capable of being secured via the section 106 Agreement for Block A1/A2.

Submission and approval of the Public Art Delivery Plan for the Green Phase

8.90 I have addressed the issue of the Public Art Delivery Plan at paragraphs 8.51 to 8.54 above. The s106 Agreement is needed to secure the approval of the PADP and its delivery in the same way as for other parts of the CB1 development.

8.91 As part of this development the Aid and Abet Art Workshop in the former railway offices will be lost. The provision of an Art Workshop as part of the CB1 development as a whole has been secured via the s106 associated with the outline consent. It has been accepted in that document that the location of the Art Workshop may change as the development is carried out. I therefore have no grounds to object to the loss of the Art Workshop from its current location but the s106 for Block A1/A2

needs to reference the need to provide an alternative location for this facility.

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

Occupation Restriction (Offices)

- 8.93 A Local User Condition is needed to ensure that the development is occupied in accordance with Development Plan policy. I have addressed this issue in paragraph 8.23.
- 8.94 Subject to the completion of a S106 planning obligation to secure the restriction on occupation, I am satisfied that the proposal accords with Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan (2003) policies P6/1 and 9/8 and Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 7/2, 9/9 and 10/1

Delivery of CCTV

- 8.95 CCTV provision has been secured for previous phases of the CB1 development under the outline s106 Agreement. It is necessary to secure this provision in association with Block A1/A2 to cover the public spaces and to ensure a comprehensive provision.
- 8.96 Subject to the completion of a S106 planning obligation to secure the delivery of CCTV, I am satisfied that the proposal accords with Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan (2003) policies P6/1 and 9/8 and Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 3/7, 9/9 and 10/1

Transport Related Requirements

Residents Parking Scheme

- 8.97 Overspill parking from the development has the potential to have an adverse impact on the amenity of residents in the vicinity of the site. A pre-construction and post occupation parking survey is necessary to assess the impact of the

development the outcome of which may be the establishment of a Residents Parking Scheme. The costs of carrying out the survey and setting up the Scheme should be borne by the applicant.

Scheme for Station Square including a Management Plan and arrangements for the relocation of the British Transport Police (BTP)

- 8.98 The Outline s106 requires the submission of a detailed design for the Station Square and a Station Square Management Plan concurrently with the submission of the first reserved matters for the Green Phase. This trigger has not been reached because a submission for reserved matters has not been made. The current application is for full planning permission and does not require the submission of these documents. A reserved matters submission has been made for the Station Square.
- 8.99 The outline s106 Agreement goes on to require that the detailed design for the Station Square, the Station Square Management Plan and a relocation strategy for the BTP be agreed before any works commence as part of the Green Phase and that these be implemented before occupation. It is essential that the development of Block A1/A2 and Block B1 is linked to the approval and provision of the Station Square in the same way.

Sub-phase payments towards SCATP and CGB

- 8.100 Contributions towards the SCATP and CGB have been brought forward by the applicants as part of the application. The s106 for the Outline Planning consent required the payment towards SCATP and CGB on commencement of the Green Phase which was subdivided into two sub-phases. Part A relates to Block A1/A2

- 8.101 The following table sets out the commuted payments that are due under the Outline Planning Permission for the two sub phases of the Green Phase.

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

Green Sub Phase	SCATP contribution	CGB contribution
Part A (A1/A2)	£98,472	£349,042
Part B (K1/I1)	£66,466	£236,455
Total	£164,938	£585,497
Overall Total		£750,435

- 8.102 The commuted sums that are required in connection with Block A1/A2 cannot be agreed until I have had feedback from the County Transport team. I will provide an update on this issue on the Amendment Sheet or orally at the Committee meeting.

Replacement of cycle parking spaces during the delivery of the Pink and Green Phases pending delivery of the Cycle Park

- 8.103 The outline s106 Agreement requires that any cycle parking space that is removed from the Green Phase is replaced pending delivery of the Cycle Park so that cycle parking facilities are maintained. This requirement also needs to be reflected in the Agreement for Block A1/A2.

Submission of details of the Northern Access Road

- 8.104 The Outline s106 requires the submission of a detailed design for the Northern Access Road (NAR) concurrently with the submission of the first reserved matters for either the Pink or the Green Phase. This trigger has not been reached because a submission for reserved matters has not been made. The current application is for full planning permission and does not require the submission of these documents.
- 8.105 The outline s106 Agreement goes on to require that the detailed design for the NAR be agreed before any works commence as

part of the Green Phase and that these be implemented before occupation. It is essential that the development of Block A1/A2 and Block B1 is linked to the approval and provision of the Northern Access Road in the same way.

Travel Plan Co-ordinator and Travel Plan

- 8.106 The outline s106 Agreement secures the submission and approval of a Travel Plan and provision of a Travel Plan Co-ordinator for each block in the Masterplan. These provisions need to be secured for Block A1/A2.

Detailed design for the Cycle Park and Cycle Park Management Plan

- 8.107 The outline s106 Agreement (as amended) links the occupation of Block A2 to the completion/use of the Cycle Park and implementation of the Cycle Park Management Plan. This was necessary to ensure that the Cycle Park is provided in the context of the wider Masterplan. The parallel application for Block B1 brings forward the details for the Cycle Park and the Cycle Park Management Plan has been submitted but it is necessary to secure the provision via the s106 Agreement for Block A1/A2.
- 8.108 Subject to the completion of a S106 planning obligation to secure the commuted payments, junction improvements, car parking survey and mitigation and the Travel Plan Co-ordinator, I am satisfied that the proposal accords with Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan (2003) policies P6/1, P9/8 and P9/9, Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 8/2, 8/3, 9/9 and 10/1 and the Planning Obligation Strategy 2010.

Second Phase of the Station Road Open Space

- 8.109 The outline s106 Agreement (as amended) links the provision of the second (final) phase of the Station Road Open Space to the delivery of Block A2. This was necessary to ensure that this Open Space is brought forward in the context of the wider Masterplan. The final part of the Station Road Open Space has been brought forward as part of this development but it is necessary to secure its provision via the s106 Agreement for Block A1/A2.

8.110 Subject to the completion of a S106 planning obligation to secure the provision of the second phase of the Station Road Open Space, I am satisfied that the proposal accords with Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan (2003) policies P6/1 and 9/8 and Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 3/8, 9/9 and 10/1.

Monitoring

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

Planning Obligations Conclusion

8.112 It is my view that the planning obligation is necessary, directly related to the development and fairly and reasonably in scale and kind to the development and therefore the Planning Obligation passes the tests set by the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010. The planning obligation has a strong relationship with the s106 Agreement for the Outline Planning Consent and will ensure that all the mitigation measures associated with Block A1/A2 are secured.

9.0 CONCLUSION

9.1 The application that has been brought forward whilst not a reserved matters submission is strongly aligned with the Parameter Plans that were approved under the Outline consent for the CB1 Masterplan. The key difference is in the use of the building which was to be used as a hotel/polyclinic and is now intended of office use. I have explained in my assessment why I consider that this change is acceptable in the context of the wider Masterplan.

9.2 The design of the office building is of a very high standard as befits its location opposite the station and as a prominent part of the new Station Square. The development is closely linked to the provision of the new Station Square and the Cycle Park which are essential parts of the CB1 development. The

development requires the demolition of the City Roomz hotel which is a Building of Local Interest and the former railway offices which are within the Conservation Area. There has been some public comment about the loss of these buildings including by David Campbell Bannerman MEP. In my view the loss of these buildings, that were shown as 'not to be retained' as part of the Masterplan is justified both by the quality of the new office building and the public benefits associated with the development.

- 9.3 The Committee are not bound by the constraints of the Outline consent but it is a very significant material consideration. The new buildings respect the approved Parameter Plans in terms of their height, scale and massing. The Screening Opinion for Environmental Impact Assessment concluded that the development does not amount to EIA development.

- 9.4 My recommendation is one of approval.

10.0 RECOMMENDATION

1. APPROVE subject to the satisfactory completion of the s106 agreement by 30 November 2013 and subject to the following conditions and reasons for approval:

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

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

2. All management and maintenance of ecology shall be carried out in accordance with the approved Ecology Report by RPS dated December 2012 as supplemented by Response to comments made on the Ecological Management Plan by RPS dated 4 April 2013.

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

3. Prior to occupation, a certificate following a post-construction review shall be issued by an approved BREEAM Licensed Assessor to the Local Planning Authority, indicating that the BREEAM rating EXCELLENT or higher has been met. In the event that such a rating is replaced by a comparable national measure of sustainability for building design, the equivalent level of measure shall be applicable to the proposed development unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

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

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

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

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

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

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

6. The approved cycle parking facilities shall be provided before occupation and shall thereafter be retained and shall not be used for any other purpose unless otherwise agreed in writing by the local planning authority.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

14. No development approved by this permission shall be commenced prior to a contaminated land assessment and associated remedial strategy, being submitted to the local planning authority and receipt of approval of the document/documents from the local planning authority. This applies to paragraphs a), b) and c). This is an iterative process and the results of each stage will help decide if the following stage is necessary.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

15. Prior to the commencement of development [including demolition] a Demolition and Construction Environmental Management Plan (DCEMP) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The DCEMP shall include the consideration of the following aspects of demolition and construction:
- a) Demolition, construction and phasing programme.
 - b) Contractors' access arrangements for vehicles, plant and personnel including the location of construction traffic routes to, from and within the site, details of their signing, monitoring and enforcement measures.
 - c) Construction/Demolition hours which shall be carried out between 0800 hours to 1800 hours Monday to Friday, and 0800 hours to 1300 hours on Saturday and at no time on Sundays, Bank or Public Holidays, unless in accordance with agreed emergency procedures for deviation. Prior notice and agreement procedures for works outside agreed limits and hours.
 - d) Delivery times for construction purposes.
 - e) Soil Management Strategy.
 - f) Outline Waste Management Plan (OWMP).
 - g) Noise method, monitoring and recording statements in accordance with the provisions of BS 5228-1: 2009.
 - h) Maximum noise mitigation levels for construction equipment, plant and vehicles.
 - i) Vibration method, monitoring and recording statements in accordance with the provisions of BS 5228-2: 2009.
 - j) Maximum vibration levels.
 - k) Dust management and wheel washing measures in accordance with the provisions of London Best Practice Guidance: The control of dust and emissions from construction and demolition.
 - l) Use of concrete crushers.
 - m) Prohibition of the burning of waste on site during demolition/construction.
 - n) Site lighting.
 - o) Drainage control measures including the use of settling tanks, oil interceptors and bunds.
 - p) Screening and hoarding details.
 - q) Access and protection arrangements around the site for pedestrians, cyclists and other road users.

- r) Procedures for interference with public highways, including permanent and temporary realignment, diversions and road closures.
- s) External safety and information signing and notices.
- u) Consideration of sensitive receptors.
- v) Prior notice and agreement procedures for works outside agreed limits.
- x) Complaints procedures, including complaints response procedures.
- y) Membership of the Considerate Contractors Scheme.

The development shall then be undertaken in accordance with the agreed plan.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

19. The emergency generator hereby approved shall only be used in the event of mains power failure or as part of routine maintenance and repair which shall only take place for the length of time specified by the manufacturer between the hours of 8am - 6pm Monday to Friday, 9am -1pm Saturday and no time Sunday or Public Holidays. It shall not be used as an alternative supply in the event of disconnection from the mains supply.

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

20. The waste storage facilities hereby approved shall be provided prior to the commencement of the occupation and shall be retained thereafter unless alternative arrangements are agreed in writing by the local planning authority.

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

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

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

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

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

23. Deliveries shall only be made to the development between 07:00 and 23:00.

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

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

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

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

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

26. Before starting any stone work (artificial and/or real), 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 the 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, 3/12 and 4/11)

27. Prior to the commencement of development with the exception of below ground works, full details of the external elevations of the switch room/bin store shall be submitted to and approved by the local planning authority in writing. The development shall be carried in accordance with the approved details.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

35. Prior to commencement of occupation a signage strategy for use in association with the occupation of the development shall be submitted to and approved by the local planning authority in writing. The approved signage strategy shall thereafter be retained and all external signage shall conform to the strategy unless otherwise agreed in writing by the local planning authority.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

41. Prior to the commencement of development, with the exception of below ground works, full details of all doors and windows on the west elevation. Including the means by which the windows shall be opened shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. This may consist of large-scale drawings and/or samples and should facilitate the use of adjacent external space. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

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

42. Prior to the commencement of development, with the exception of below ground works, full details of the entrance to the car park, including the appearance and operation of the access door and associated infrastructure shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. This may consist of large-scale drawings and/or samples. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

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

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

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

44. Prior to the commencement of development full details of a scheme for the provision and location of fire hydrants to serve the site, shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority in writing. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details, which shall be fully implemented prior to the first occupation, and shall be retained thereafter unless otherwise agreed in writing by the local planning authority.

Reason: To ensure the provision of adequate water supply infrastructure to protect the safe living and working environment for all users and visitors in accordance with the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/7, 3/12 and 9/9.

45. No development shall commence until details of hard and soft landscape works including the green roof have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. 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. Hard landscaping works shall include full construction details and specifications of levels, all hard surfacing materials, furniture, boundary treatments and lighting.

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 3/2, 3/4, 3/7, 3/11, 3/12, 4/2, 4/3, 4/4 and 9/9)

46. No development shall take place until a schedule of landscape maintenance for a minimum period of five years has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The schedule shall include details of the arrangements for its implementation.

Reason: To ensure that the landscaped areas are maintained in a healthy condition in the interests of visual amenity. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/2, 3/4, 3/7, 3/11, 3/12, 4/2, 4/3, 4/4 and 9/9)

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

Reason: To ensure satisfactory arrangements are in place for replacement planting to ensure proper provision of landscaped areas (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/2, 3/4, 3/7, 3/11, 3/12, 4/2, 4/3, 4/4 and 9/9)

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

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

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

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

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

Council's Supplementary Planning Document - "Sustainable Design and Construction 2007":
<http://www.cambridge.gov.uk/public/docs/sustainable-design-and-construction-spd.pdf>

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: Noise insulation To satisfy condition 17 for the building envelope as required above, the Council expects the scheme to achieve the 'good' internal noise levels of British Standard 8233:1999 "Sound Insulation and noise reduction for buildings-Code of Practice". Where sound insulation requirements preclude the opening of windows for rapid ventilation and summer cooling, acoustically treated mechanical ventilation may also need to be considered within the context of this internal design noise criteria.

INFORMATIVE: Plant noise insulation To satisfy condition 18, 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: Emergency Generator To satisfy condition 19 the noise level from the emergency generator associated with this application should not raise the existing background level (L90) by more than 10 dB(A).

INFORMATIVE: Fume Filtration/Extraction To satisfy condition 16, details should be provided in accordance with Annex B of the, "Guidance on the Control of Odour and Noise from Commercial Kitchen Exhaust Systems, prepared by Netcen on behalf of Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (DEFRA) dated January 2005 available at:
<http://www.defra.gov.uk/publications/2011/03/25/odour-noise-kitchen-exhaust-pb10527/>

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

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

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

Advice to Applicant:

Surface Water Drainage:

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

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

General Informatives:

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

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

Foul Water Drainage:

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

Pollution Control:

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

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

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

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

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

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

Reasons for Approval

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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