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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target Date</th>
<th>Ward</th>
<th>Site</th>
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<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st April 2013</td>
<td>Petersfield</td>
<td>CityRoomz Station Road Cambridge CB1 2TZ</td>
</tr>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposal</th>
<th>Applicant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Demolition of 'CityRoomz' building (former Sleeperz Hotel), and former railway offices to north.</td>
<td>Mr Sven Topel</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SUMMARY**

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

An assessment of the Cityroomz hotel as a Building of Local Interest and the railway offices as a building in a Conservation Area and both as heritage assets has been carried out.

The demolition of Cityroomz hotel and the railway offices is justified by the public benefit that will derive from the delivery of new office accommodation which will trigger contributions to transport infrastructure and the Station Square as part of the wider Station Area redevelopment.

**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 application site runs around the existing CityRoomz hotel building and the former station offices. The former railway offices currently accommodate Aid and Abet which is a temporary art workshop provided as part of the CB1 development.
1.2 To the south of the site is the existing cycle parking area that serves the Station, to the north are other buildings including that which is occupied by Station Cycles, to the east the wing of the station which known as the British Transport Police wing and the station car park and to the west further car parking and the former Focus site.

1.3 The site is within the Station Area Redevelopment Framework Boundary and within the Central Conservation Area No.1. The Station buildings, which include the British Transport Police (BTP) wing and the canopy to the platform are grade II listed and Cityroomz Hotel is a Building of Local Interest (BLI). There are two trees on the site adjacent to the northern wing, 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 Conservation Area Consent is sought for the demolition of CityRoomz hotel building and the former station offices. Parameter Plan 1 of the Outline consent identifies the CityRoomz hotel building as a BLI to be demolished and the former railway offices as an ‘other building to be demolished’. Whilst this does not negate the need for Conservation Area Consent it is a material consideration.

2.2 The application is accompanied by the following supporting information:

1. Design and Access Statement by Pringle Brandon Drew
2. Heritage Statement by Beacon Planning

3.0 SITE HISTORY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>08/0266/OUT</td>
<td>CB1 Station Area Redevelopment</td>
<td>A/C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/1608/FUL</td>
<td>Adjacent site) Block B1 of CB1 Station Area Redevelopment –</td>
<td>Pending consideration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>retail/hotel/Cycle Park</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/1612/LBC</td>
<td>(Adjacent site) Demolition of northern wing of the Station and the canopy over the railway platform</td>
<td>Pending consideration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/1622/FUL</td>
<td>(Adjacent site) Block A1/A2 of CB1 Station Area Redevelopment – office/retail/landscaping</td>
<td>Pending consideration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13/0211/CL2PD</td>
<td>Certificate of Lawfulness under section 192 for the Station car park</td>
<td>Pending consideration</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**4.0 PUBLICITY**

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

**5.0 POLICY**

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

5.2 Relevant Development Plan policies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PLAN</th>
<th>POLICY NUMBER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
### 5.3 Relevant Central Government Guidance, Supplementary Planning Documents and Material Considerations

|                            | Circular 11/95  
|                            | Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010  
| Material Considerations    | Central Government:  
|                            | Letter from Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government (27 May 2010)  
|                            | Written Ministerial Statement: Planning for Growth (23 March 2011)  
|                            | Citywide:  
|                            | Air Quality in Cambridge – Developers Guide  
|                            | Area Guidelines:  
|                            | 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)**

6.1 No objection subject to a condition to secure a Traffic Management Plan for demolition/construction traffic and informatives.
Head of Environmental Services

6.2 Environmental Protection

Construction Method Statement

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.

Urban Design and Conservation Team

6.3 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:
If the buildings [including the BLI] are to be demolished, then the quality and suitability of the proposed replacement building(s) both for the CA and the nearby LB must be assessed before any scheme can be supported. The detailed assessment by U D & C Section is to be found at 12 /1608 / FUL on this matter.

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 [i.e.: 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.
Conclusion:

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’.

English Heritage

6.4 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.

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

6.5

☐ 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)

6.6 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.

6.7 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
2 Highsett, Hills Road
Highsett, Hills Road
34 Porson Road

7.2 The representations can be summarised as follows:

*Concerns and objections*

**Loss of Existing Buildings**

Cityroomz Hotel should not be demolished until a replacement building is approved and ready to be constructed.

Support for views of English Heritage (2)

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.

**The New Building**

A double height arcade should be incorporated into the ground floor.
The design is wholly unworthy of its important location and a redesign is necessary. The building does respect the location in terms of its height and change in fenestration in line with the height of the station. The fenestration to the upper floors is at odds with the enclosing nature of the square and emphasises the height. There is a lack of detail at a human scale on the elevation. The standard of design of One The Square should not be lowered by this building. The application should be refused.

The City does not need another glass and steel monstrosity.

7.3 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.

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

8.0 ASSESSMENT

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

1. Principle of demolition
2. Impact on Heritage Assets
3. Other environmental impacts
4. Third party representations
5. Planning Obligation Strategy

Principle of Demolition

8.2 Parameter Plan 1 of the Outline consent identifies the CityRoomz hotel building as a BLI to be demolished and the former railway offices as an ‘other building to be demolished’. In the report that was considered by Planning Committee in October 2008 the following comment is made about the demolition of these buildings:

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.
8.3 My views have not changed. I consider that subject to the grant of Conservation Area Consent, the principle of the demolition of CityRoomz hotel and the former railway offices is acceptable.

Impact on Heritage Assets

8.4 In this section of my report I consider the submissions made by the applicant and make my assessment against the policy context. The applications for Listed Building Consent/Conservation Area Consent and planning permission are supported by a Heritage Statement 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.

8.5 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.

8.6 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.

The applicant’s submissions in relation to Cityroomz and the former Station offices

8.7 An Addendum has been produced to the Heritage Statement which looks particularly at Cityroomz and the station offices. In terms of their artistic significance, this is considered to be low for both buildings. Cityroomz is considered to be of moderate significance given its association with the Sayles family in the
19th century. Both buildings are considered to be divorced both functionally and physically from the other station buildings.

**The relevant policy context and assessment**

8.8 The advice in the NPPF on dealing with the removal of heritage assets is as follows:

*Where a proposed development will lead to substantial harm to or total loss of significance of a designated heritage asset, local planning authorities should refuse consent, unless it can be demonstrated that the substantial harm or loss is necessary to achieve substantial public benefits that outweigh that harm or loss, or all of the following apply:*

- the nature of the heritage asset prevents all reasonable uses of the site
- no viable use of the heritage asset itself can be found in the medium term through appropriate marketing that will enable its conservation
- conservation by grant-funding or some form of charitable or public ownership is demonstrably not possible
- the harm or loss is outweighed by the benefit of bringing the site back into use.

8.9 Local Plan policy is not silent on the issue of demolition of BLIs as heritage assets and requires that the demolition will only be permitted if the building is demonstrably incapable of beneficial use or reuse or there are clear public benefits arising from the development. The advice in both the policy and the NPPF helps to identify how an assessment of the application should be made.

8.10 Both the policy and the NPPF look to establish either a clear public benefit or compliance with a set of criteria. It is important to note that a justification for demolition does not need to establish both a public benefit argument and compliance with the criteria or test established by policy/guidance.
8.11 In this case the nature of the heritage asset does not prevent use of the site and the buildings are currently in beneficial use. No evidence has been brought forward regarding the availability of grant funding or public/charitable ownership. The justification in this case is solely reliant upon the ‘public benefit’ argument.

8.12 Although Conservation Area Consent is needed I would argue that the basis of the public benefit was established at the Outline Consent stage. The redevelopment of the Station Area as a whole is necessary to bring forward the very significant improvements to the transport interchange that include works to the Station, the new Station Square, the bus interchange and Cycle Park. The demolition of Cityroomz and the former Station offices is necessary and justified for this reason.

8.13 In reaching this view I am mindful of the Senior Conservation Officer’s view as follows:

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

8.14 I share the Senior Conservation Officer’s view that the design of the new building is an extremely important consideration. All of the discussions with the applicants have been based on the need for the new building to be appropriate for its setting in the Conservation Area.

8.15 I am convinced that the new office building will be a positive asset to the Conservation Area for the reasons set out in my report on the planning application. This view is shared by the Design and Conservation Panel, English Heritage and the Urban Design and Conservation Team. Similarly the new Station Square will be a positive asset to the Conservation Area. These views provide the necessary justification for the demolition of Cityroomz and the former Station offices. In particular I note the views of English Heritage which
acknowledges the potential for enhancement of the Conservation Area through comprehensive redevelopment.

8.16 In my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 4/11 and 4/12 and guidance provided by the NPPF and overcomes the reasons for refusal of the previous application.

Other environmental impacts

8.18 I have recommended conditions and informatives as recommended by the Highway Authority officer and the Environmental Health Officer.

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

Third Party Representations

8.20 I have addressed the issues raised in this report and in the related report on the planning application.

Representations from David Campbell Bannerman MEP

8.21 Most of the issues raised are addressed in the sections of my report on the office building 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.

9.0 CONCLUSION

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

10.0 RECOMMENDATION

APPROVE subject to the following conditions and reasons for approval:

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

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

2. The demolition hereby permitted shall not be commenced until a contract for the redevelopment in accordance with planning permission 12/1608/FUL or 12/1622/FUL, has been let.

   Reason: To avoid the creation of cleared sites detrimental to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/4 and 4/11)
3. No development shall take place until a full photographic record and survey by measured drawing and salvage of samples has been made depicting the exterior and interior of the building (including any parts to be demolished) and a copy deposited with each of the following organisations: the Cambridge Collection of the Central Library, Lion Yard, Cambridge; the County Archive, Shire Hall, Castle Hill, Cambridge, and the local planning authority. The precise number and nature of the photographs, drawings and samples to be taken is to be agreed in advance with the local planning authority and the format in which they are to be displayed and titled is to be agreed with the local planning authority before the deposit is made.

Reason: To foster understanding of the building's importance in the national and Cambridge context, and to ensure proper recording of any aspects of the building's special interest which are to be lost or altered. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006, policy 4/11 and 4/12)

4. Prior to demolition a method statement for the controlled demolition of the building, the salvaging of materials of construction [bricks, slates, etc.], architectural details [joinery, flooring, stained glass, carved and/or moulded work, door furniture, chimney pots, decorative metalwork, etc.] and structural timber, etc. and the sustainable recycling of these materials shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The local planning authority shall then be supplied with written proof of the successful recycling of the materials.

Reason: To ensure that the reuse of any aspects of the building's special interest which are to be lost or altered is properly considered. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006, policy 4/11 and 4/12)

5. 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).

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

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

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

Reasons for Approval

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