

Application Number	12/1622/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	The demolition of all buildings on the site (existing British Transport Wing, part of the northern wing of the railway station building, the canopy over the station platform, the Cityroomz hotel building, the railway offices and art workshop, and the station cycles building) and the construction of a new multi-storey cycle park and hotel building consisting of 3353 sqm of cycle parking, comprising 2850 cycle parking spaces, together with 6565 sqm of hotel (C1) floorspace and 577 sqm of retail (A1/A3/A4/A5) at ground floor level. A 510 sqm cycle shop and hire area including facilities for repairs are also included as part of the proposals.		
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 part of the listed station building. 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 deliver a significant public benefit in terms of the 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 north of main part of the Station building, to the west of the railway line, to east of the former Focus DIY site and to the south of the part of the Station Car Park and Carter Bridge. The site currently accommodates a number of buildings and structures including the northern wing of the Station, the canopy over the railway platform, the Cityroomz Hotel building, the railway offices and Art Workshop and the building occupied by Station Cycles. The remainder of the application site accommodates part of the Station car park.
- 1.2 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 Full planning permission is sought for demolition of the existing buildings and structures on the site and the construction of a building to accommodate a multi-storey cycle park, hotel and retail space. This new building will form the northern 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. The building occupied by Station Cycles falls outside the Conservation Area and only planning permission is needed for its demolition.

- 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 cycle park/hotel building will accommodate 2580 cycle parking spaces on three levels – ground, first and second floors behind the main part of the hotel which will front the Station Square. Two wings will project above the cycle parking space to accommodate hotel rooms on three levels – third, fourth and fifth floors. A retail unit extending to 577 sq m is proposed at ground floor level alongside the hotel reception facing the square. A second retail unit is proposed to accommodate a cycle shop on the western elevation which has associated space for cycle hire activities. A third retail unit is located at the north western corner of the building. Further details of the proposals are set out in my Assessment
- 2.4 The application is accompanied by the following supporting information:
 1. Covering letter from Savills
 2. Planning Application Forms
 3. Plans and elevations – Drawing list by Formation Architects and Oxford Architects
 4. Design and Access Statement (including Waste Management Strategy) by Formation Architects and Oxford Architects
 5. Heritage Statement by Beacon Planning
 6. Planning Statement by Savills
 7. Acoustic Report by Hilson Moran

8. Air Quality Assessment by Mott MacDonald
9. Archaeological Statement by Cambridge Archaeological Unit
10. BREEAM Pre-assessment report by Hilson Moran
11. Daylight Report by Mott Macdonald
12. Ecology Report by RPS
13. Energy Strategy by Hilson Moran
14. Sustainability Checklist by Hilson Moran
15. Estate Management Strategy by Bidwells
16. Drainage strategy by Mott Macdonald
17. Vibration Report by Hilson Moran
18. Noise Survey Report by Hilson Moran
19. Geo-Environmental and Geotechnical Assessment by Mott Macdonald
20. Landscape Report (including Landscape Management Plan) by Robert Myers
21. Transport Assessment (inc. Travel Plan) by Mott Macdonald
22. Cycle Park Information by Oxford Architects
23. Public Art Delivery Plan prepared by Commissions East
24. Cycle Park Indicative Construction Costs by Oxford Architects
25. Draft s106 Agreement prepared by Mills and Reeve

2.5 The application has been amended in the following ways:

- ☐ Response to comments from County Highways
- ☐ Trip generation information in relation to SCATP and CGB contributions
- ☐ Confirmation that no car parking spaces are to be provided for use by hotel staff and guests and there is to be no valet parking.
- ☐ Response to Cycle and Walking Officers comments
- ☐ Details of the route between the Cycle Park and Devonshire Road/Carter Bridge
- ☐ Segregated cycle parking for hotel staff and guests
- ☐ Confirmation of number of public cycle parking spaces (2874 spaces or 3298 if double stackers only are used on the upper levels)
- ☐ 5% of cycle spaces to be allocated as a premium cycle parking facility
- ☐ Response on number of cycle hire spaces
- ☐ Details of wheeling ramp
- ☐ Confirmation of use of CCTV, lighting and security in the Cycle Park

- ☐ Confirmation of use of inward opening doors, fire evacuation lifts to BS8300 standards.
- ☐ Request for delivery hours to be 7am to 11pm and opening hours of hotel restaurant 4am to 11.30pm and other units 6am to 11.30pm.
- ☐ EHO conditions considered acceptable.
- ☐ Green roof to be included to periphery of roof
- ☐ Bat survey of the British Transport Police wing

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
12/1622/FUL	(Adjacent site) Block A1/A2 of CB1 Station Area Redevelopment – office/retail/landscaping	Pending consideration
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
	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

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 4/10 4/11 4/12 4/13 4/14 4/15 5/11 6/3 6/10 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	Sustainable Design and Construction

Planning Documents	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

	<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 north eastern façade present at danger and should be amended.

The potential to include a lift for cyclists less able to use the stairs is questioned.

Details of the width of the ramp, aisle widths and cycle parking space dimensions should be shown on the plans.

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

- 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 listed building 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

The Noise Survey report concludes that the following mitigation measures will be needed to achieve a 'good' internal noise standard:

Very high performance secondary/double glazing
Very high performance non-glazed facade
Mechanical ventilation

A noise insulation scheme condition is recommended to ensure the exact specifications to be installed.

Acoustic Report - Plant Noise

The conclusions of the Acoustic Report are agreed and plant can be attenuated and suitably located to ensure background noise is not raised by more than 3dB (A). Details of plant are not known at this time and a plant noise condition is recommended. Plant rooms should be acoustically treated.

Vibration

The Vibration Report concludes that vibration will be at an acceptable level. This is satisfactory.

Sub-Station

Noise from the substation can be controlled via the plant noise condition but an informative is recommended.

Hotel

Bar/Retail/Cafe – an informative is recommended regarding licensing.

Restaurant/Cafe - The standard odour control condition is recommended.

Opening Times (retail, cafe, restaurant)

A condition to restrict opening hours/deliveries to 07:00-23:00 is recommended. (These would not apply to the opening hours of the hotel or the hours of use of the Cycle Park.)

Contaminated Land

The Contaminated Land Report identifies multiple sources of contamination on the site and in the surrounding areas. A comprehensive intrusive investigation is now required in order to adequately assess any contamination. This can be secured by condition.

Air Quality

The Air Quality Assessment contains discrepancies and these will be drawn to the attention of the consultants direct. However as no car parking provision is associated with the development there should be no detriment to air quality.

Waste Strategy

No conditions are recommended. A rubbing rail would prevent damage in the service corridor.

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:

Principle of the proposals is supported in terms of the uses and general organisation of them within the building.

Concerns regarding the day lighting levels for some rooms within the central court and the close proximity between bedrooms within this space.

Detailed design of all elevations needs further work and as proposed the north elevation is unacceptable.

Cannot support the proposed application in its current form and a number of adjustments and amendments are required.

Existing Buildings:

The application contains a Heritage Statement gives a good broad history of the site around the railway station and the evolution of the various elements of the LB. The main focus of the design is the colonnade at the front of the station which is at the termination of the vista down Station Road. Most of the historic railway / industrial setting around the site have been

gradually eroded by now but minor outbuildings or subsidiary wings, such as the Parcels Office and Police Station remain.

The Heritage Statement analysis gives the Police Station a rating of *moderate significance* and suggests that it was not purpose-built and has had various uses and alterations over time.

Proposals:

Delivery of the wider masterplan

Significant concern is raised about the ability to deliver the wider masterplan as a result of the deletion of the multi-storey car park. A key new 'street' was envisaged in the Outline to create a high quality pedestrian and cycle link to connect the new Station Square through to Devonshire Road and the Carter Cycle Bridge. The application does not create this connection and the retention of the surface level car parking, outside of this application boundary, appears to limit the delivery of Buildings F2, G1 and G2 results in a sizeable and unresolved area of the masterplan.

The 'street' should be provided as part of this application or any reconfiguration of the surface level car parking. It should be possible to establish a high quality route that allows for the car park to remain but which creates the pedestrian and cycle connection needed as part of the wider masterplan. It should also be possible for this route to have tree planting provided ahead of any subsequent redevelopment of the remainder of B1 and F2.

General comments

The proposals have to fulfil the challenging brief of successfully integrating the hotel, restaurant, Cycle Park and retail proposed uses on a somewhat constrained site dictated by the retention of the surface level car park and the 'modular' nature of the hotel pod bedrooms which limit the flexibility of the building. The overall approach to the location and distribution of the different functions appears to be well resolved but there are concerns about the quality of the hotel rooms.

Scale and Massing and roofscape

Overall the proposals sit within the height envelope created by the Outline Application. The length of the building is considerably shorter than that envisaged in the outline. Whilst a smaller footprint has some advantages in terms of reducing the mass of the building, the proposals will result in a sizeable unresolved area of the masterplan and give the north elevation a truncated appearance.

Whilst the footprint is smaller, the UDC team is concerned about the lack of articulation at the upper level of the building and in particular how the horizontal line created by the coping along the west and east elevations does little to break down the 'front' and return wings of the building.

In addition, the plant enclosure forms a poorly articulated roofscape and does not respond to the opportunity to create and help provide an understanding of the hierarchy of the elevations. It is simply another 'box' added to the top floor. The roofscape created by this building will be visible from many longer/intermediate views and therefore needs to work much harder and particularly from views looking north across the Station Square. No information has been provided to demonstrate the need for such an extensive plant enclosure or to show how technologies such as PV will be integrated. In our view, there is an opportunity to design the plant into the proposals in a more architecturally integrated way and to provide articulation and interest at roof level.

Daylight and shadow impact

The Daylight Report concludes that a number of rooms fronting on to the courtyard fall below the guidelines and a recommendation is made that windows need to be increased in size to achieve 'adequate' daylight levels. The windows appear to be the same size as other windows and clarification is needed on this point.

Elevations, materials and signage – general comments

The elevations use the principles of 'base', 'middle' and top to order the elevations. A coping is proposed to create a well-

defined top. This ordering is acceptable in principle although a further level of refinement, discussed below, is required.

The use of the brick and re-constituted stone is supported but the final tone of these elements will be crucial in order to achieve an acceptable relationship with the listed station building. Other materials are acceptable although details of the junctions between materials needed at a larger scale e.g. the metal panel details to the side of each bedroom window, the profile and depth of the coping. The colours in relation to the stone plinth at ground floor level are not identified on submitted elevations and there is variation between drawings contained within the submitted D&A Statement.

The recesses created to either side of the proposed 'supporting' stone and brick columns are less than 100mm which will give the building a 'flat' elevation. A greater sense of depth is needed to improve articulation and provide a greater sense of mass to these elements.

There is also are related concern about the overall the proportioning of the windows voids and the brickwork 'bands' that divide them. As shown those on the west and east elevations they are poorly proportioned in terms of the relative hierarchy of these parts of the elevation in relation to the rest of the building and an emphasis needs to be introduced to balance the massing and perceived function of elements e.g. lintels vs. columns and the 'role' in the building. There may be some benefit in extending the proposed coping upwards on the south elevation and returns, to form a parapet to help screen the plant enclosure.

Signage

The creation of zones for signage for the cycle park and retail units is supported. However, there is a lack of consistency about how signage is to be integrated on the building. The 'IBIS' sign is located on either the strong vertical masonry column on some elevations or set with the recessed brick panels on others. The UDC team view is that the latter is more successful and the proposals should be amended to resolve this concern.

South elevation (to Station Square)

At pre-application discussions the importance of achieving a well-resolved relationship between the southeast corner of the proposals and the existing station building was emphasised. The option of stepping the building line back has been pursued and was the supported option at the pre-application discussion in October 2012 although further design development was noted as being required. The east and west corners of this elevation are setback by 800mm which creates a shadow line and provides some modelling and articulation of this elevation and a logic to the location of the hotel entrance on one corner and the cycle parking pedestrian entrance/exit on the other.

Details of the proposed coping need to be explored further. As proposed it gives the top of the building a compressed appearance.

Long views looking north towards this elevation will reveal that the plant enclosure will be highly visible. Further consideration of how roof plant is integrated is needed including consideration of whether a more pronounced parapet is needed.

West elevation (addresses the end of the northern access road)

Part of this elevation has a crucial role to play in closing the end of the view created along the proposed northern access road. At pre-application stage the way in which the 'front' of the building and the receding wings should interface to create a defined 'end stop' to this street was discussed. Officers highlighted the need to create some definition and therefore hierarchy between the front 'Station Square' building and the bedroom wings behind through the use of a well-defined recess.

At ground floor the identification of the cycle park entrance and the cycle shop is well resolved.

The junction between these elements has proven to be a challenging part of the elevation. The junction between the ground floor uses in the hotel, the cycle park, bedrooms above and some of the service functions of the various uses all interface within the proposed 'recess' located between the columns. A key concern of the UDC team is how the recessed junction between the front and returns of the building has been

resolved and the way in which the coping continues through at the upper level to create a very strong horizontal feature that undermines any sense of recess below. There are also a number of issues with the way in which the various functions 'read' with the overlap between part of the bar on the ground floor, cycle stands visible on some levels and the bedrooms then above. As proposed the junction remains unresolved and is not helped by the coping detail and lack of any meaningful recess.

In addition the proportions of the lintel between the top of the second floor cycle park and third floor bedrooms above appears insubstantial.

At the plant level this should be broken into more distinct elements to provide articulation and modelling of the roofscape and visual break between the Station Square frontage and the west facing bedroom wing.

East elevation (addresses the railway and station platform)

The concerns about the detailed design of the recess between the front and return wings, as noted for the west elevation, apply to this elevation. The use of 'hit and miss' brickwork to provide lighting and ventilation of the cycle park pedestrian access is supported.

North elevation

A small retail unit is proposed at the ground floor northwest corner and has the potential to provide a degree of activity and surveillance although it would require the transparency to be maintained with the shop fit out. Maintaining transparency of retail unit windows has been an issue elsewhere on the CB1 scheme.

However the balance of the elevation effectively presents a 6 storey blank facade to this aspect. As proposed this is unacceptable in design terms and further design development is required.

Options for how the elevation could be improved are as follows:

- ☐ Corner bay windows could be introduced to help the west and east elevation rooms turn the corner.
- ☐ A green wall could help to soften this elevation.
- ☐ The roof above the cycle park could be better expressed and linked with a greater degree of transparency to the centre section of the cycle park.

Conclusion:

- 6.5 Whilst outside the scope of this application, the UDC team have significant concerns about the ability to implement the rest of the northern part of the CB1 masterplan and the absence of a high quality pedestrian and cycle route up to Carter Cycle bridge and through to Devonshire Road.

Further work is required to resolve the proportions and details of the elevations and to consider and resolve plant through the creation of a well-articulated roofscape.

As proposed the scheme currently fails to meet Policies 3/4, 3/7 and 3/12 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2006) and is therefore not supported in Urban Design and Conservation terms.

Additional comments on the application for Listed Building Consent

- 6.6 If this element of the LB is 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 /1622 / FUL on this matter.

Whilst the 'masterplan' process always assumed demolition of the LB wing 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 LBC 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 problem is that this application [and that for the replacement building] should be running in parallel with one for the redevelopment and enhancement of the main LB, the railway station, so that the works are coordinated in a reasonable fashion. What would not be acceptable would be for the demolition of elements of the LB to be permitted only for a later application to provide that sort of floorspace and building scale elsewhere for want of a proper overview of how the railway station is to operate in conjunction with the new buildings envisaged in the earlier masterplan.

The Police Station is of modest interest and significance; it is typical of many others connected with railway operation, built of local materials and altered whenever necessary for functional reasons. Such interest as it has is tied to it being one of the last remnants of the goods, functional & industrial [i.e.: non-passenger] side of the railway on this site and, for that reason, its 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 this building 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 – especially LBs – 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 drawings indicating the extent of demolition show that some of the building elements are relatively modern and of little significance and that the C19 part of the railway station that will be revealed can be made good in a coherent manner which will be fit to be seen [subject to detailed design and good standards of materials and workmanship] although the proposed plant enclosure is of concern. These matters should be resolved via planning conditions.

Response to additional information

- 6.7 Further information is to be submitted in relation to the elevations of the building and related information following consideration of revised plans by the Conservation and Design CB1 Sub Panel. 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)

- 6.8 *Application as submitted*

The Energy Strategy sets out a hierarchical approach to reducing carbon emissions resulting in a 17.1% reduction in comparison with a Part L compliant scheme which is supported.

In terms of energy provision, both renewable energy technology (photovoltaic panels) and low carbon technologies (gas fired CHP) are used. The use of CHP is supported and this approach delivers a reduction of 15% which is supported.

The development is targeting BREEAM Excellent which is supported. However calculations are questioned and clarification is needed.

- 6.9 *Response to additional information*

The consultants have confirmed that due to the use of Combined Heat and Power, 2 credits are likely to be possible, which is welcomed. With regard to BREEAM credits for water consumption, the applicant was encouraged in relation to achieving 3 out of 5 credits for water, and therefore their response that the 3 credits should be available is supported.

Access Officer

- 6.10 Generally happy, hotel bedrooms are good. Passenger lifts will need to meet BS standards. (This has been confirmed by the applicants).

Head of Streets and Open Spaces (Tree Team)

6.11 No comments received.

Head of Streets and Open Spaces (Landscape Team)

6.12 *Application as submitted*

CARTER BRIDGE LINK

The footprint of B1 is now significantly reduced from the Outline application, which condenses the building and positions car parking on adjacent land. The most significant impact in this change is the loss of the high quality landscaped areas linking the Carter Bridge to Station Square which includes; road, footpath, avenue trees and improvements to the Carter Bridge access.

Improving congestion around the station was one of the key aims of CB1 and the Carter Bridge/Station Square link formed part of this. The link between the Carter Bridge and Station Square falls outside of the boundary for this application, however the alignments of the kerbs in this application should allow the flexibility for this link to be included in the future. The Carter Bridge to Station Square link is an important asset for CB1.

PUBLIC REALM

Kerb alignment - The alignment of the kerb on the west side of the building should allow for flexibility to develop the Carter Bridge/Station Square link. The alignment of the kerb north of the loading bay should be moved approximately 1.4m west so the kerb along this frontage has a straight edge. This will result in future proofing a straight 6m wide road (following the same orientation) linking to the north with an approximately 3.8m wide area retained for continuous footpath and tree planting to the west of this road. I

To achieve this link will result in the loss of a row from the proposed car parking to the west of the link road and will provide a positive public realm asset.

Loading Bay - The location narrows the footpath creating a pinch point and also prevents planting trees and blocks views out of the entrance to the cycle storage when large vehicles are parked here. It should be noted that this loading bay would be utilised all day and cyclists will also be accessing the cycle park all day, resulting in a very busy area. The loading bay should be moved further away from the cycle park entry and the loading bay provided as a mountable kerb with a change in paved texture to discourage activities other than loading access and to be used as footpath when the loading bay is not in use.

Street Trees – Two Ornamental Pear trees are proposed, but the Public Realm and Landscape Strategy for CB1 showed ten trees planted evenly along the west frontage of Block B1, this would be equivalent to about 5 trees along the reduced frontage. At least 4 trees should be provided for along this frontage.

AMENITY SPACE

No outdoor amenity space is provided for hotel guests; however the CB1 development provides public amenity space nearby. The applicant should consider using a green roof with light shafts to provide light into cycle parks in the void between the Hotel rooms. Green/brown roofs would improve the outlook from internal hotel rooms and offer multiple benefits in terms of surface water management, amenity, biodiversity, water quality improvements, carbon reduction, noise attenuation, urban heat island effect reduction and can more cost effective than conventional roofs.

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).

6.13 *Response to additional information*

Further information is to be submitted in relation to the landscape treatment around the building. The Landscape team will be asked to comment on these details and their comments will be provided on the Amendment Sheet or orally at the Committee meeting.

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

6.14 *Application as submitted*

The Cycle Park will be a significant asset for the city and so this application is welcomed.

Access:

Cycle and pedestrian access to the Cycle Park and station from the north and south has to be considered as part of this application as it will affect the safety, convenience and attractiveness of the area for those on foot and cycle. It will also affect the attractiveness of the cycle park for users.

Of particular concern is the route through the car park and the junction of the Northern Access Road, taxi route and route to the car park. With regard to the latter there will be a strong desire line for cyclists coming from the south to cross the square to the west and then join the access road to the cycle park and this movement needs to be catered for – the current design will make it very difficult for cyclists to cross the road safely. The danger is that a difficult junction may encourage cyclists to use the alternative route around the hotel and in front of the station which is not suitable and is likely to cause conflict with pedestrians. A mini roundabout could be considered at the junction to cater for all movements and which would serve to slow all traffic.

With regard to the route from Devonshire Road/ Carter Bridge to the station and cycle park, this application needs to indicate

how a safe and attractive route for pedestrians and cyclists will be provided.

Detail of flush kerbs at the entrance to the cycle park is needed.

The Cycle Park

There seems an excessive amount of parking associated with cycle hire. This should be reduced in order to provide more cycle parking for those who cannot use the ramps due to disability or type of cycle. This area should be signed as a special area for use by those who cannot use the ramp for reasons of disability or type of cycle only (i.e. tricycles, cargo bikes).

It is not clear from the application who will use the secure area of cycle parking – it is assumed that this will be for the retail and hotel staff and for guests of the hotel but this would number 75 spaces in total whereas 152 spaces are provided. More detail is needed on who these spaces are for.

Detail is needed of the wheeling ramp design. The wheeling ramps themselves should be widened to make sure people can pass each other and consideration should be given to widening the steps if possible.

6.15 Response to additional information

Further comments are awaited from the Cycling and Walking officer. These will be provided on the Amendment Sheet or orally at the Committee meeting.

Head of Streets and Open Spaces (Sustainable Drainage Officer)

- 6.16 The Drainage Strategy and Green Roof are supported. A condition is recommended to control the details of the Green Roof.

Head of Streets and Open Spaces (Nature Conservation Officer)

- 6.17 Evidence of potential for presence of bats in the northern wing is required.

Otherwise proposed enhancements are supported particularly the Green Roofs.

Details are needed of locations for nest boxes.

Response to additional information

Further comments are awaited from the Nature Conservation Officer. These will be provided on the Amendment Sheet or orally at the Committee meeting.

Head of Streets and Open Spaces (Public Art Officer)

- 6.18 The public art for the Pink Phase of CB1 is being delivered in two phases. The submitted Public Art Delivery Plan (PADP) refers to Stage 2. Stage 1 relates to the proposed residential development on the adjacent site. The Stage 1 and Stage 2 PADPs will need to be combined in one document for submission and approval.

The public art proposals should be artist led and it disappointing to see that the location for public art have been led by the designers.

Clarification is needed in relation to the Research and Development budget. The temporary commission and Public Programme will need to be submitted for approval. Maintenance arrangements need to be established and evidence of implementation of the Public Programme and budget spending will be needed when the projects have been implemented.

English Heritage

- 6.19 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

- 6.20 The Victorian Society was formally consulted on the application because the demolition works involve listed buildings.

The Victorian Society objects to the application on the grounds that the proposed hotel and cycle park, by virtue of their size and location, would harm the setting and character of the station.

Natural England

- 6.21 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

- 6.22 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

- 6.23 No comments received.

Cambridge Airport (Air Safeguarding)

- 6.24 No safeguarding issues.

Cambridgeshire Constabulary (Architectural Liaison Officer)

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

British Transport Police (Crime Reduction and Architectural Liaison Officer)

- 6.26 Advice has been provided to the applicants. The proposal to secure the cycle park between 'the last train and the first train' is supported but careful thought needs to be given to how this relates to fire exits from the hotel.

Cambridgeshire County Council (Archaeology)

- 6.27 No comments received.

Cambridgeshire Fire and Rescue

- 6.28 A condition is recommended to secure provision of fire hydrants.

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

- 6.29 Multi Storey Cycle Park/ Hotel (B1)

- ☐ Access. The Panel would have liked to have been able to better understand the night-time servicing arrangements north of the Square, and be given details on the operation of a link between B1 and the railway footbridge.
- ☐ Cycle parking spaces. The proposed cycle parking provision in terms of amount and detailed arrangements were welcomed.
- ☐ Station Square elevation. This is in need of animation, particularly at the northwesterly tip where the façade is at its weakest. In the Panel's view, the addition of a canopy along this façade would help address the Square, provide solar shading for the hotel restaurant and encourage animation. This could be no more than 2meters in depth to accommodate the growing trees and cycle movements at street level. Further development of the base façade at ground and first floor levels would help to establish a greater relationship with the Station building.
- ☐ Northern approach. High quality signage along this blank façade would provide the building with a sense of identity and provide additional animation.
- ☐ Perforated metal screens. The Panel were generally comfortable with the handling of these screens, although there was some concern that they would appear stark on the elevation facing the railway line. Any issues relating to wind

vibration (whistling) and potential light pollution could be resolved with good detailing.

- Rooftop: plant and equipment. Details re. appearance and materials are required.
- Devonshire Road. The Panel would welcome the provision of a clearly delineated access for pedestrians and cyclists from the surface car park to Devonshire Road. The use of a similar palette of materials applied to create a shared surface as proposed for the Station Square would be welcomed.

Conclusion

The concept of a single building comprising a hotel and cycle parking is welcomed. As with A1 /A2 the Panel would wish to emphasise the architectural importance of a colonnade to set an enclosure line for B1 at a scale that relates to the listed station.

VERDICT – AMBER (unanimous)

Design and Conservation Panel (Meeting of February 2013)

6.30 Michael Richter of Formation Architects presented a response to the design issues raised at the July 2012 Sub-Panel and consultation comments subsequently provided in relation to the submitted planning application. Amendments include the following:

- Improved overall proportions and light levels into the cycle park (red panels removed).
- Eastern elevation (track side) now a mirror image of the Western elevation.
- Northern elevation – now with more substantial brick columns and recessed panels intended for greater relief.
- Roofscape. A 2m high plant enclosure, set back but visible from long views.

The Panel's comments are as follows:

- Southern elevation. The Panel were disappointed that a colonnade of comparable quality and depth to that proposed for One The Square was not envisaged. It was judged to be a missed opportunity to take advantage of a south-facing position and to provide for greater animation. As regards the recessed

wings the Panel felt that the use of this feature could benefit from further examination to realise a more comfortable relationship between the recessed section and the horizontal emphasis of the dominant middle elevation. The south elevation is the most important façade to the scheme, providing enclosure to the northern end of the Station Square, and there is a strong case for additional investment in this elevation with a more restrained treatment to the other elevations.

- Change in rhythm (western elevation). The Panel were informed this change was in response to the internal layout, but felt this layout should be re-examined to create for a more visually coherent façade treatment.
- Fenestration (attic level). In the Panel's view, the top row of windows would 'read' more effectively if a layer of brickwork was introduced between the window heads and the reconstituted stone cornice...
- Roofscape (renewables). The Panel note that further work will be undertaken to examine the potential for solar panels. Any solar panels should be contained within the rooftop plant enclosure.
- Plant enclosure. The Panel were disappointed not to see a more integrated approach to the design of the plant enclosure. There appeared to be very little relationship between the plant enclosure and the rest of the building. While it was noted that the enclosure conformed to the limits set out in the parameters of the outline planning permission, its overall height should be kept to a minimum, and more consideration should be given to its impact in long views from the southern end of Station Square...
- Link with station footbridge. The Panel noted that due to operational issues, this link is not currently being provided. However, it was further noted that the option to provide a footbridge link would be still be technically possible in the future.

Conclusion

The Panel felt that the proposals did not have the stature expected of a building in this most prominent of locations overlooking the proposed square and adjoining the listed station building. The absence of a colonnade of comparable scale and grace to that proposed for One, The Square is a source of disappointment.

VERDICT – RED (2), AMBER (3)

Design and Conservation Panel (Meeting of June 2013)

- 6.31 Michael Richter presented the revisions made since the April 10th meeting. Each of the Panel's comments from that meeting were examined and options explored.

The Panel's response was as follows:

- ☐ The Panel thanked the architects for their systematic, detailed and well documented response to the concerns recorded in the minutes of the 10th April meeting.
- ☐ **Proposed southern elevation**
- ☐ Colonnade The Panel were advised that the Parameter Plan is silent on the provision of a colonnade in the building fronting the northern edge of the Station Square. That being the case, the Panel felt they could make no further comment on the inclusion of a colonnade and concluded that the architects' preferred option as presented in Study 5 was acceptable.
- ☐ Canopies. The Panel welcome the addition of canopies over both the main hotel and cycle park entrances for the added symmetry and coherence to the southern elevation.
- ☐ Columns. The Panel welcome the adjustment made to the column widths at each end, but would like some reassurance that this does not become a weakness at the turn of the corner.
- ☐ Signage. The Panel would urge that any signage is discreet on this important elevation overlooking the station Square.
- ☐ 'Link' building near station. This older building which includes the coats of arms of some of the original colleges within its brickwork, is to be demolished. The Panel would suggest a similar attention to detail set within the bay windows of the restaurant. This would help to soften the building's verticality and at street level, draw the eye to small features of interest.
- ☐ **West elevation.** The Panel felt the proposed revision was a substantial improvement compared to the application drawings resulting from the combination of changes.
- ☐ Perforated panels (cycle park enclosure). These were not discussed with the architects but from the documentation provided, the Panel felt this approach was appropriate. The

presentation of mock-ups at a future meeting would be welcomed.

- **North elevation** The Panel acknowledged that both Study 1 and the proposed revision were superior to the application drawing for the north elevation. It was suggested that more glazing at the street/ surface parking level would be welcomed from a 'Secure by Design' approach.
- **Ventilation strategy.** The Panel were generally comfortable with the change from partial, to ventilation that was fully mechanical. The Panel were informed this would not impact on the building's aspirations in terms of BREEAM standards and has resulted in a welcome reduction of the plant enclosure which was raised as a key concern last time.
- **Materials.** The Panel noted that the choice of palette was still in development but were encouraged by the type of materials cited. However, some caution was expressed concerning the use of metal, as any projecting elements could appear stark.

Conclusion

The Panel's previous concerns, particularly regarding most of the elevations and the impact of the plant enclosure on long views, have been largely addressed. However, the vote reflects a divided judgement regarding the extent of the need for further improvements.

VERDICT – AMBER (3) GREEN (3)

- 6.32 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.

Cycle parking

Too many cycles are abandoned in the current facility. This could be avoided by charging for parking with money refunded on collection or users given a time limit after which cycles will be removed.

Short stay provision should be provided for cyclists using shops and buying rail tickets.

Other Issues

The replacement hotel should provide rooms at a reasonable rate as Cityroomz does.

7.3 Cambridge Cycling Campaign has made representations as follows:

The Campaign enthusiastically supports the application.

The CCC refers the comments of the Highway Authority.

Stepped Ramps – CCC are persuaded that the proposed ramps will cope well with high volumes of movements. There is potential for the building to be extended which could incorporate a cycleable ramp. A cycleable ramp would have been three times longer.

Lifts –spaces are provided at ground level to cyclists with disabilities and untypical cycles. A condition to secure a management regime for these spaces is needed. However a lift would be helpful.

Connection to island platform – the cycle park has been designed to facilitate a link to the bridge to the island platform and a condition should added to ensure the design accommodates this link.

Free cycle parking – a planning condition should be imposed to ensure that no more than 5% of spaces can be charged for.

Overnight closure – a condition should be imposed to ensure that the cycle park remains open while trains are running, including when the last train is late.

Route through Station Square – this route needs to be clarified to avoid conflicts with vehicles.

7.4 Cambridge City Licensed Taxis Ltd has made representations on both this site and One The Square 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.

7.5 David Campbell Bannerman MEP has made objections which relate to the Block A1/A2 and the loss of City Roomz.

7.6 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.

- 7.7 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:

- ☐ The northern wing of the Station (also known as the British Transport Police wing) and the canopy over the railway platform which are part of the listed Station building
- ☐ 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 these buildings:

The northern wing of the Station

8.235 The Applicant's Additional Conservation Issues Report and Planning and Heritage Statement – Proposed Works to Cambridge Railway Station set out their case for the removal of the BTP wing. A plan is included which demonstrates that was it to be retained the BTP wing would significantly impact upon the operation of the taxi drop off and pick up area at the northern end of the square. Concern is expressed that this would necessitate moving this vehicle dominated area to the south in front of the colonnaded element of the Station to the detriment of its setting and against the aim of providing a clear pedestrian space in front of the Station

8.236 Essentially the arguments in favour of the demolition of the BTP wing are three fold. Firstly it is argued that this wing is a later addition to the Station and its removal will enable the original concept of the station building with central arcaded element and two wings to be re-

introduced. Secondly the retention of the BTP wing would have an adverse impact on the function and appearance of the new Station Square as detailed above. Thirdly the removal of the BTP will enable the Station Square and the transport interchange generally to operate more effectively through providing a substantial car-free space in the centre of the square.

- 8.237 It is my view that given the substantial community benefit that will arise from the masterplan proposals and the proposed works to the Station the removal of the BTP wing is acceptable. I am convinced by the Applicants submission that demonstrates that proper consideration has been given to retaining the BTP wing and incorporating it into the scheme.

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 the hotel/cycle park but also Block A1/A1, 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

- 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 B1. This block is identified in the approved Parameter Plans as accommodating retail space and car and cycle parking on the ground floor with office space and car and cycle parking above.
- 8.8 Block B1 extends 38 metres along the north side of the proposed Station Square and 110 metres alongside the railway line. The retail/office space to the frontage extends up to 16 metres into the block. The maximum height of Block B1 is 18m (excluding permitted tolerances). The parameter plan for Block B1 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 a retail unit and hotel reception where the building fronts Station Square. The hotel use is a deviation from the Parameter Plans and the retail use extends back 29 metres into the block which is a further change.
- 8.10 A cycle shop, retail space, cycle hire store and access to the upper cycle parking area are located behind the retail/hotel space. This also represents a deviation from the Parameter Plans. On the upper floors the hotel use is a change from the Parameter Plans but the cycle parking use accords with them.
- 8.11 The proposed building does not extend to the maximum footprint of Block B1. It extends 58 metres alongside the railway in comparison with 110 metres permitted by the Parameter Plan for Block B1. Land, which falls outside the proposed building but within Block B1, forms part of a larger area which is to be laid out as a surface level car park for use by Station users. This proposal is the subject of an application for a Certificate of Lawful Use which is currently under consideration (application reference 13/0211/CL2PD). This application seeks to establish that the works to reconfigure the Station Car Park are permitted development.

- 8.12 Because the proposed uses do not accord with the Parameter Plans for Block B1, 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 A1/A2. The application for Block A1/A2 also proposes a deviation from the approved Parameter Plans. In that case a hotel and polyclinic use is to be replaced by an office use. The proposed hotel use in Block A1 was to be in the order of 6479 sq metres which is broadly compatible with the current proposal of 6565 sq metres of hotel space. Similarly the amount of retail space proposed for Block B1 at 576 sq metres is consistent with the amount of retail space that is now being brought forward at 577 sq metres albeit that the retail units are in a different configuration. The Cycle Shop and hire area is an additional amount of retail provision but is justified in my view.
- 8.13 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.

Context of site, design and external spaces

- 8.14 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

- 8.15 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

- 8.16 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 accommodates the pedestrian entrance to the Cycle Park in its southeast corner and the hotel reception/bar on the south west corner. Between these two spaces sits the retail unit. On the western side there is the access to the Cycle Park for cyclists, the cycle shop and a further retail unit which wraps around the northwest corner. The main cycle parking areas are on the first and second floors with an internal stepped/ramped access. The hotel accommodation is on the frontage to Station Square and above the Cycle Park at third, fourth and fifth storey height.
- 8.17 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	18 m	18m
Parameter Plan Height including Plant/Lift Overrun	20m	20.5m

- 8.18 The table demonstrates that the building will sit within the parameters for the maximum height of Block B1 when the +/- 0.5 metre tolerance is applied.
- 8.19 In considering the layout and height of the building I am mindful that it does not extend to the full parameter plan boundary for Block B1. In fact it represents just over half the sized building that was originally envisioned for this site. I am also aware of concern that the Multi Storey Car and Cycle Park is not be delivered at this time. Both of these facts mean that the Masterplan is not being delivered in the way that was expected in 2008. There is no mechanism to force the developer to bring forward the Masterplan in full and we must make a decision on this application on its own merits.

Building Design – Elevations and Materials

- 8.20 The front elevation of the building faces Station Square and will read together with Station Buildings and the new buildings which are proposed including on Block A1/A2 which is under consideration. This elevation has been the subject of a number of studies by the architects which were considered by officers at the pre-application stage. As submitted the final design incorporated the following (as described in the Design and Access Statement):
- ☐ The corners are recessed to create a well-proportioned central section.
 - ☐ The use of reconstituted stone on the ground and first floor to give the building a solid base and the use of brick above relates positively to the Station.
 - ☐ A shallow arcade is provided which together with the proposed arcade to Block A1/A2 will create a pedestrian scale to the Square.
 - ☐ The window openings have a 2:3:1 proportion and include metal panels which emphasis the vertical proportions of the building.
 - ☐ Grey panels indicate the floor plates and create a subtle horizontal banding.
- 8.21 Following comments from the Conservation and Design CB1 Sub-Panel and the UDC team the elevations have been amended. The positive aspects of the features described

above have been retained such as the recessed corners. The following amendments are also in the course of being made:

- ☐ Reduced size of plant room and mechanical ventilation introduced throughout
- ☐ Horizontal louvres to plant room
- ☐ Increased parapet height to reduce visibility of plant room

Front elevation to Station Square

- ☐ Grey spandrel panels under windows and glazed terracotta panels beside windows.
- ☐ Canopy over cycle entrance
- ☐ 900 mm recess on ground floor front elevation and bay windows on first floor central bays

Side elevation to Carter Bridge link and Northern Access Road (NAC)

- ☐ Grey spandrel panels under windows and metal panels beside windows
- ☐ Proportions of brick piers and lintels revised and groove in brickwork introduced
- ☐ Alterations to gap between front and rear parts of the building.
- ☐ Options for cladding of cycle park investigated

Rear Elevation

- ☐ Additional brick piers and textured brickwork and potential for windows to be introduced.

8.22 I attended the Conservation and Design Panel CB1 Sub Panel meeting in June and the revisions were favourably received, although the vote was split on the need for further work. The UDC team supports the direction in which the revisions are going. I will be able to present full revised plans to the Committee meeting. In my view subject to the proposed revisions being translated into amended plans, the quality of the cycle park/hotel building will be appropriate to its location. I have also recommended a number of planning conditions to control materials and detailing.

External Space – Design and Materials

- 8.23 There are three external spaces that form part of the development, the access to Station Square off the Northern Access Road and the threshold spaces to the south and west of the building. These are hard surfaced areas and include a service bay. The Landscape Officer makes some helpful comments about the wider context and in particular the importance of the link between the Station Square/Northern Access Road and the Carter Bridge. The majority of this link will be within the Station Car Park and works to improve the Carter Bridge itself are secured via the s106 Agreement for CB1. However it is essential to make sure that this development does not compromise the route and have raised this with applicants.
- 8.24 In response the application has been amended to show a pedestrian/cycle route through the adjacent car park on a 'raised table'. This will help to segregate taxi/car drivers from other road users and encourage low vehicle speeds. The kerb line has not been realigned to the west. This would result in a reduction in the number of car parking spaces in the car park which I understand is not acceptable to the applicant or Network Rail.
- 8.25 The Cycling and Walking officer has also raised concerns about access to the Cycle Park by cyclists and has discussed her concerns with the applicants direct. The applicant's response refers to the wider context in terms of both the link to the Carter Bridge discussed above and the Station Square, the details of which have now been submitted as part of a reserved matters submission. That part of the access which falls within the application site is the link between the NAR and the Station Square. The applicants have indicated that they would be willing to consider the incorporation of a mini-roundabout into this space but this is subject to comments from the Highway Authority and a road safety audit. I have recommended a condition to secure submission and approval of the highway layout in this area.

External Space – Tree removal and planting

- 8.26 There are no existing trees which will all be removed as part of the development. Two new ornamental pear trees are to be

planted as part of the development at the end of the Northern Access Road. The trees have an ultimate height and spread of 8 m by 3 m. In my view there is limited scope for additional tree planting alongside the building given the need for the service bay and clear access to what will be a heavily used cycle park.

Nature Conservation

- 8.27 The City Council's Nature Conservation Officer has highlighted the need to consider the presence of bats in the northern wing of the Station. A survey has been carried out and the Nature Conservation Officer has been consulted. I will provide an update on the Amendment Sheet or orally at the Committee meeting.
- 8.28 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

- 8.29 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.
- 8.30 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.
- 8.31 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.

- 8.32 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.
- 8.33 I am convinced that, subject to further refinement of the elevations of the building and controls over the details of the elevations and the materials, the hotel/cycle park building will be a positive asset to the Conservation Area. This view is supported by the Design and Conservation Panel CB1 Sub Panel and the Urban Design and Conservation Team. These views provide the necessary justification for the demolition of the existing buildings.
- 8.34 English Heritage raised concerns about the lack of an arcade and the elevations of the building as submitted. The revisions have not introduced an arcade but will provide a more well defined ground and first floor with a limited set back and bay windows to accent the central bays. The comments from English Heritage were provided by the representative of English Heritage on the Design and Conservation CB1 Sub Panel and he has been present when the revisions were discussed.
- 8.35 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

- 8.36 A Public Art Delivery Plan has been submitted in support of the application. Block B1 falls within the Pink 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. Public art for the Pink Phase is to be delivered in two related parts. The first part will be brought forward with the development of Blocks C1/C2, D1 and F1 (the Skanska scheme) and the second with the hotel/cycle park Block B1.
- 8.37 The agreed activity for the Pink Phase which is set out in the Public Art Strategy for CB1 refers to collaboration between

artist, designer and landscape architect that is potentially part of the fabric of the building'. Although the Phase is being undertaken in two stages, this approach will be taken with both building projects – the proposed multi-storey cycle park and the residential project. This focus will be carried through to all stages of the public art programme for the Pink Phase with joint research and development activity, public and community programme and temporary projects investigating issues of collaboration

8.38 The artist collective Troika have been appointed to undertake the Pink Phase Cycle Park and Hotel permanent commission on recommendation of the CB1 Public Art Steering Group following a limited competition in November 2012. Following discussion with the CB1 Public Art Steering Group they have been asked to respond to the external and publicly accessible internal spaces of the building. Troika are currently working up their proposals with the architects.

8.39 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

8.40 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 photovoltaic cells and gas fired CHP. Further information has been submitted regarding calculations and the Senior Sustainability Office supports the proposals.

8.41 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

8.42 The Design and Access Statement addresses disabled access and the Access Officer supports the application. 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

- 8.43 The closest residential units are numbers 39 to 43 Ravensworth Gardens which have rear facing windows that overlook the railway line. The biggest impact for the occupiers of these houses will be the demolition of the building which currently accommodates Cambridge Cycles. These houses currently back onto the Station Car Park and the removal of the building will open up views towards the new hotel/cycle park. Given the separation distance of over 50 metres 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.
- 8.44 The CB1 Masterplan allows for the development of new dwellings with blocks F1 and F2 which are closer to the proposed building than existing houses. However the building will be separated from them by the access road serving the car park which will reduce its impact.

Noise and disturbance

- 8.45 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. The applicants have requested that delivery hours be 7am to 11pm and opening hours of hotel restaurant 4am to 11.30pm and other units 6am to 11.30pm. I have not imposed an opening hours condition on either the cycle park or the hotel and have used the opening hours recommended by the EHO for the café/shop units i.e. 7 am to 11 pm.
- 8.46 In my opinion the proposal adequately respects the residential amenity of its neighbours and the constraints of the site and I consider that it is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 3/4 and 3/7.

Refuse Arrangements

- 8.47 Space for storage of waste for the hotel, the retail units and other shops within the Station is provided within the building.

The Design and Access Statement references the RECAP Waste Management Design Guide. The EHO is content with this arrangement and I have recommended a condition to secure the arrangements.

- 8.48 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

- 8.49 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/Substation 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 hotel.

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.

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

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

Transport Impact

- 8.51 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.
- 8.52 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.
- 8.53 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

- 8.54 The Highway Authority has raised concern about outward opening doors, provision of a lift for less well able bodied cyclists and details of ramps etc. The revised plans indicate doors will not be outward opening and further details have been provided of the internal layout. A lift is not proposed but a separate area is available on the ground floor for cyclists who find access to upper levels difficult. I have recommended the conditions/informatives as requested.
- 8.55 In my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policy 8/2.

Car and Cycle Parking

Car Parking

- 8.56 No car parking provision is made for use by hotel staff or guests or staff or customers of the retail/café/restaurant units. The hotel is highly accessible using alternative means of transport to the private car and the applicant has provided a list of locations where similar IBIS hotels have been established without on-site car parking including several London locations, Leeds, Nottingham, Bristol and Sheffield. They have also referred to paragraph 39 of the NPPF which sets out a range of criteria against which the car parking standards should be considered.
- 8.57 I have looked at the websites for the IBIS hotels referred to by the applicants. Typically car parking is referred to as being available locally as is the case here in the form of the Cambridge Leisure car park.
- 8.58 Lack of car parking provision was in issue for the Red House hotel scheme on Station Road. In that case the concerns of Committee were overcome by the provision of a valet parking arrangement with cars being parked in the Cambridge Leisure car park. In my view the situation is different in terms of the hotel now proposed. In particular the Red House hotel is proposed to be a high grade hotel not a budget hotel and the determination of the application for the Red House hotel pre-dated the NPPF.
- 8.59 The applicants have confirmed that they do not wish to consider valet parking as there is no justification for this in terms of the brand of hotel or highway terms.
- 8.60 The potential for overspill car parking to take place in surrounding residential areas has been an issue elsewhere in CB1 and I would recommend that a post development survey be carried out to establish the impact of this potential overspill and mitigation in terms of a residents parking scheme if residents decided that they wanted one.
- 8.61 I do not consider that there is any justification for refusal of planning permission on the basis of lack of car parking for hotel guests and staff. In reaching this view, the very highly

accessible location of the site has had a strong bearing on my opinion.

Cycle Parking

8.62 The provision of cycle parking for Station users is a key part of the Station Area redevelopment proposals. As revised, the development will deliver a total of 2874 cycle parking spaces. 80 spaces will be available for use by staff at the hotel/retail units and the remaining 2794 will be available for Station users. A further 268 spaces will be provided in association with the cycle hire facility.

8.63 The types of cycle parking will be as follows:

Type of parking space	Number
Double Stacker	2218
Secure Double Stacker	132
Sheffield Stands	490
Secure Sheffield Stands	20
Off Gauge Spaces	14
Cycle Hire Spaces (Double Stacker)	268

8.64 I support the concept of a mix of types of cycle parking for public use (82% double stackers/18% Sheffield stands). The proportion of upper level cycle spaces is 41% and ground level i.e. Sheffield and lower level on the stacked spaces is 59%. In my view the number and quality of the cycle parking provision should be supported. The provision of the Cycle Park is vital to the delivery of the wider Masterplan and has the support of the Cambridge Cycling Campaign.

8.65 In terms of cycle parking for staff, the parking standards indicate that one space should be provided for every two members of staff in the hotel. The Transport Assessment assumes that there will be 58 members of staff at the hotel which equates to a requirement for 29 spaces. It is anticipated that 27 members of

staff will be employed in the retail units. The provision of 80 spaces for hotel/retail staff is appropriate in my view and allows for some secure storage for cycles used by hotel guests.

- 8.66 No allocated provision is made for hotel guests, customers of the retail units or staff at the Cycle Shop. This is acceptable in my view. If hotel guests have their own cycles it is likely that they will have arrived by train and there is justification for them to use the Station Cycle Park. There will be on street parking in the Square and this has been relied upon in other cases to serve the retail units.
- 8.67 The applicants have also confirmed that 5% of the cycle parking spaces will be in the form of premium parking spaces. This amounts to 20 Sheffield stands and 132 double stackers located on the first floor of the Cycle Park. These spaces will be in a secure area and users will pay a fee. This level of secure parking provision is supported by the Cambridge Cycling Campaign. In my view the proportion of secure parking should be controlled by condition to ensure that it is not altered without the consent of the Council. Similarly I have recommended conditions to control the proportion of Sheffield stands to double stackers. In my view subject to compliance with these conditions the Cycle Park will provide a suitable standard of cycle parking.
- 8.68 The s106 Agreement associated with the Outline consent requires the submission and approval of a Cycle Park Management Plan (CPMP) prior to the commencement of Block B1 (and Blocks F2 and G2). This requirement will not apply to the development as it is now being brought forward as a full planning application. For this reason I consider it necessary to secure the CPMP via the s106 Agreement that is needed for this application.
- 8.69 The CPMP is a detailed written plan for the Cycle Park including future maintenance and management, funding arrangements for future maintenance and responsibility for maintaining the Cycle Park. The CPMP has been submitted and is under consideration by officers.
- 8.70 In my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 8/6 and 8/10.

Third Party Representations

- 8.71 I have addressed the majority of the issues raised via third party representations above. The following table indicates the relevant sections of my Assessment.

Issue	Reference
Loss of Existing Buildings	Impact on Heritage Assets
The New Buildings	Context of site, design and external spaces
Management of cycle parking	Car and Cycle Parking

Third party representations also raise issues about charges for hotel rooms and issues relating to access to the Station Square by taxis.

8.72 Charges for hotel rooms

The replacement hotel should provide rooms at a reasonable rate as Cityroomz does.

There is no planning policy justification for restricting the charges for hotel rooms.

8.73 Representations from Cambridge City Licensed Taxis Ltd (CCLT)

CCLT has made representations about this application and the application for Block A1/A2. 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 the T-junction on the west side of the building which will facilitate access into the new Station Square. Details of the arrangements within the Square itself are not included and 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 added a condition 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.

8.74 Representations from David Campbell-Bannerman MP and Glisson Road Tenison Road Residents Association

These representations relate to the application for Block A1/A2.

Planning Obligations – need to amend all of this

Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010

- 8.75 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.

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. 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. The proposed development triggers the requirement for the following community infrastructure:

S106 Agreement relating to the Outline Planning Consent

8.76 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 B1 falls within the Pink phase of the development.

8.77 The implementation of development in the Pink Phase e.g. Block B1 would trigger the following commuted payments/infrastructure under the Outline consent:

- ☐ Submission and approval of the Public Art Delivery Plan for the Pink Phase
- ☐ Delivery of CCTV
- ☐ Residents Parking Scheme
- ☐ Pink 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
- ☐ Submission of details of Carter Bridge cycle ramp works
- ☐ Submission of detailed design for the Cycle Park and Cycle Park Management Plan
- ☐ Travel Plan Co-ordinator and Travel Plan
- ☐ Affordable Housing/Commuted payments for Open Space/Northern Residential Park/Station Road Open Space/Commuted payments for community

facilities/Provision of Community Room/Commuted payments for Education (not relevant for Block B1)

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

- 8.78 I have addressed the issue of the Public Art Delivery Plan at paragraphs 8.36 and 8.39 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.
- 8.79 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.

Delivery of CCTV

- 8.80 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.
- 8.81 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

- 8.82 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.

Sub-phase payments towards SCATP and CGB

8.83 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 Pink Phase which is not subdivided into sub-phases.

8.84 The following table sets out the commuted payments that are due under the Outline Planning Permission for the Pink Phase.

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

	SCATP contribution	CGB contribution
Pink Phase	£108,214	£383,695
Overall Total		£491,909

8.85 The commuted sums that are required in connection with Block B1 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

8.86 The outline s106 Agreement requires that any cycle parking space that is removed from the Pink 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 B1.

Submission of details of the Northern Access Road

8.87 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.

- 8.88 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. (Please note that the s106 Agreement is a complex document and that I have heavily précised its contents).

Submission of details of the Carter Bridge cycle ramp works

- 8.89 The Outline s106 requires the submission of a detailed design for the Carter Bridge cycle ramp works concurrently with the submission of the reserved matters for Block B1. 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. The details of the Carter Bridge works have been submitted and are under consideration.
- 8.90 The outline s106 Agreement goes on to require that the detailed design for the Carter Bridge works be agreed before any works commence on Blocks F1, F2 and G2 and that these be implemented before occupation. Given that there is no link between the commencement/occupation of Block B1 and the delivery of the Carter Bridge works in the outline s106 Agreement it is not reasonable to seek to establish such a link now.

Detailed design for the Cycle Park and Cycle Park Management Plan

- 8.91 The outline s106 Agreement links the occupation of Block B1 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. This application 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 B1.

- 8.92 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.

Travel Plan Co-ordinator and Travel Plan

- 8.93 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.

Monitoring

- 8.94 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

- 8.95 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 B1 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 multi- storey car and Cycle Park and officers and is now intended for use as a Cycle Park

and hotel. 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 Cycle Park/hotel building has undergone a series of iterations which have resulted in a high standard of building design as befits its location adjacent to the station and as a prominent part of the new Station Square. The development delivers the new Cycle Park which is an essential part of the CB1 development. The development requires the demolition of the northern wing (British Transport Police wing) of the station which is part of the listed building. In my view the loss of this part of the station, that was shown as 'to be demolished' as part of the Masterplan is justified both by the quality of the new Cycle Park/hotel building and the public benefits associated with the development, in the form of the cycle parking facility.
- 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 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. 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).

6. 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).

7. 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).

8. 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).

9. 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).

10. 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)

11. 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).

12. 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)

13. 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).

14. 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)

15. 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)

16. 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)

17. 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)

18. 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)

19. 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).

20. 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)

21. 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)

22. 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)

23. 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)

24. 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)

25. 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)

26. 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)

27. 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)

28. 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)

29. 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)

30. 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)

31. 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)

32. 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)

33. 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)

34. 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.

35. 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)

36. 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)

37. 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)

38. No more than 5% of the public cycle parking hereby approved shall be secured as premium cycle parking, without the prior written approval of the local planning authority.

Reason: To ensure that adequate non-changeable cycle parking is publicly available. (Cambridge Local Plan policy 9/9)

39. No more than 82% of public cycle parking provision shall be in the form of double stacker style cycle parking, without the prior written approval of the local planning authority.

Reason: To ensure that adequate non-changeable cycle parking is publicly available. (Cambridge Local Plan policy 9/9)

40. Notwithstanding the details shown on the approved plans, full details of the proposed layout of the highway within the application 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.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety for all road users. (Cambridge Local Plan policies 8/2 and 8/4)

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 13 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 14, 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: Sub Station: Electricity substations are known to emit electromagnetic fields. The NRPB has set standards for the release of such fields in relation to the nearest premises. With this in mind, an informative should be attached advising the applicant to contact The Health Protection Agency, Radiation Protection Division, Chilton, Didcot, Oxon OX11 0RQ, tel: 01235 831600 for advice regarding the electric/magnetic fields that are associated with electric substations

INFORMATIVE: Fume Filtration/Extraction To satisfy condition 12, 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 4/10 4/11 4/12 4/13 4/14 4/15 5/11 6/3 6/10 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 2013, 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, 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