

Application Number	12/1612/LBC	Agenda Item	
Date Received	4th February 2013	Officer	Mrs Sarah Dyer
Target Date	1st April 2013		
Ward	Petersfield		
Site	British Transport Police Station 55 Station Road Cambridge Cambridgeshire		
Proposal	Demolition of the British Transport Police Wing of the grade II listed station building		
Applicant	Mr Sven Topel		

SUMMARY	The development accords with the Development Plan for the following reasons: An assessment of the British Transport Police Wing and the 1960s Station Platform Canopy as parts of the listed Station buildings and a heritage asset has been carried out. The demolition of British Transport Police Wing and the 1960s Station Platform Canopy is justified by the public benefit that will derive from the delivery of the Cycle Park and Station Square as part of the wider Station Area redevelopment
RECOMMENDATION	APPROVAL

1.0 SITE DESCRIPTION/AREA CONTEXT

- 1.1 The application site forms part of a larger area, which is the subject of the CB1 Station Area Redevelopment proposals for which outline planning permission was granted in April 2010. The application site runs around the existing British Transport Police (BTP) wing of the Station which is attached to the northern wing of the Station building and around the canopy which serves Platform 6 at the Station.
- 1.2 To the south of the site is the existing taxi rank that serves the Station, to the north the station car park, to the east the railway

line and to the west the access to the car park, Cityroomz hotel, railway offices and an art gallery which is part of the CB1 development.

- 1.3 The site is within the Station Area Redevelopment Framework Boundary and within the Central Conservation Area No.1. The Station buildings, which include the British Transport Police (BTP) wing and the canopy to the platform are grade II listed and Cityroomz Hotel is a Building of Local Interest (BLI). There are two trees on the site adjacent to the northern wing, which are subject to protection by virtue of their location in the Conservation Area. The site falls within the controlled parking zone.

2.0 THE PROPOSAL

- 2.1 Listed Building Consent is sought for the demolition of the British Transport Police (BTP) wing and the canopy to the platform. Parameter Plan 1 of the Outline consent identifies the BTP wing and the platform canopy as part of a listed building to be demolished. Whilst this does not negate the need for Listed Building Consent it is a material consideration.

- 2.2 The application is accompanied by the following supporting information:

1. Design and Access Statement by Formation Architects
with Oxford Architects
2. Heritage Statement by Beacon Planning

- 2.5 The application has been amended in the following ways:

- ☐ 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	(Adjacent site) Demolition of 'CityRoomz' building (former Sleeperz Hotel), and former railway offices to north	Pending consideration
12/1608/FUL	Adjacent site) Block B1 of CB1 Station Area Redevelopment – retail/hotel/Cycle Park	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
Cambridge Local Plan 2006	4/10 4/11 4/12 4/13 8/2 9/9

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
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> Air Quality in Cambridge – Developers Guide
	<u>Area Guidelines:</u> Buildings of Local Interest Station Area Development Framework/Station Area Conservation Appraisal New Town and Glisson Road Area Conservation Appraisal

6.0 CONSULTATIONS

Cambridgeshire County Council (Engineering)

- 6.1 No objection subject to a condition to secure a Traffic Management Plan for demolition/construction traffic and informatives.

Head of Environmental Services

- 6.2 Environmental Protection

Construction Method Statement

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

Urban Design and Conservation Team

- 6.3 Existing:

The application contains a Heritage Statement that 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 has 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.

- 6.4 Proposed:

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 [ie: 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.

6.5 Conclusion:

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

6.6 Suggested Conditions

- o Photographic record
- o Consultation with County Archaeology
- o Demolition method statement
- o No demolition before contract let
- o Detailed plans for alteration of railway station platform canopy
- o Means by which items of architectural/historic interest will be preserved, protected and treated.

English Heritage

6.7 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

- 6.8 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.

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

- 6.9 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)

6.10 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:

- o Improved overall proportions and light levels into the cycle park (red panels removed).
- o Eastern elevation (track side) now a mirror image of the Western elevation.
- o Northern elevation – now with more substantial brick columns and recessed panels intended for greater relief.
- o 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)

6.11 VERDICT – AMBER (3) GREEN (3)

The minutes of this meeting are not currently available and will be attached to the Amendment Sheet.

- 6.12 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 support the application.

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

8.0 ASSESSMENT

- 8.1 From the consultation responses and representations received and from my inspection of the site and the surroundings, I consider that the main issues are:
 - 1. Principle of demolition
 - 2. Impact on Heritage Assets
 - 3. Other environmental impacts
 - 4. Third party representations
 - 5. Planning Obligation Strategy

Principle of Demolition

- 8.2 Parameter Plan 1 of the Masterplan identifies the BTP wing and the platform canopy as part of a listed building to be demolished. In the report that was considered by Planning Committee in October 2008 the following comment is made about the demolition of these buildings:

- 8.235 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.

- 8.3 My views have not changed. I consider that subject to the grant of Listed Building Consent, the principle of the demolition of the BTP wing and the platform canopy is acceptable.

Impact on Heritage Assets

- 8.4 In this section of my report I consider the submissions made by the applicant and make my assessment against the policy context. The applications for Listed Building Consent/Conservation Area Consent and planning permission are supported by a Heritage Statement as required by paragraph 128 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). An Addendum has also been produced which explains why it is necessary to demolish Cityroomz and the Station Offices buildings even though these buildings are not beneath the footprints of the new building or the Station Square. Officers in the Urban Design and Conservation Team have not raised any concerns about this analysis and support the scheme subject to the imposition of planning conditions to address matters of detail.
- 8.5 The applicants have correctly identified the heritage assets that are affected by the development as the Station Building which is a listed building, Cityroomz which is a Building of Local Interest (BLI) and the Conservation Area. The NPPF includes buildings that are locally listed in the definition of a heritage asset.
- 8.6 The significance of these buildings has been assessed using NPPF and other guidance. The aspects of high/moderate significance have been identified as the main central section and north wing of the Station. The British Transport Police wing and Cityroomz are regarded as being of moderate significance and the 1960s station platform canopy of no significance. The Station Offices are of moderate/low significance.

The applicants submissions in relation to the BTP wing and the station platform canopy

- 8.7 The Heritage Statement starts by looking at the history of Station buildings and then looks at the individual elements that are affected by demolition and development. The Station building is assessed in detail and the main central section is determined to be of 'high significance' and the North Wing of 'high/moderate significance'.

- 8.8 The BTP wing is determined to be of 'moderate significance'. The history of the BTP wing prior to 1887 is unclear. A plan from 1887 shows the building as free standing and of a different design than its present form. By 1927 the building was linked to the Station. During the 1960s the use by the BTP had begun. The BTP wing also make a contribution to the Conservation Area in enclosing the space to the north of the Station but this space is currently cluttered by taxi and cycle parking.
- 8.9 The station platform canopy is determined to be of 'no significance'. It was constructed in the 1960s and replaced a 19th century canopy of which part remains which is unaffected by the demolition works.
- 8.10 The Heritage Statement then considers the impact of the development on significance. It is considered by the applicants that the BTP wing was neither part of the original station buildings nor part of the major alterations that took place in 1863. The BTP wing has been significantly altered over the years and internally does not have any features of architectural or historic interest. They also consider that the BTP wing is not of particular significance either in terms of its historic fabric, to our understanding of how the station functioned or to the wider station area. The List description for the station does not make reference to the buildings/structures that are proposed for demolition.

The relevant policy context and assessment

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

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

- ☐ *the nature of the heritage asset prevents all reasonable uses of the site*

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

8.12 Local Plan policy is not silent on the issue of demolition of listed buildings as heritage assets and requires that the demolition will only be permitted if the building is structurally unsound or it cannot continue in its current use/there are no viable alternative uses and wider public benefits will accrue from redevelopment. The advice in both the policy and the NPPF helps to identify how an assessment of the application should be made.

8.13 Both the policy and the NPPF look to establish either a clear public benefit or compliance with a set of criteria. It is important to note that a justification for demolition does not need to establish both a public benefit argument and compliance with the criteria or test established by policy/guidance.

8.14 In this case the nature of the heritage asset does not prevent use of the site and the buildings are currently in beneficial use. No evidence has been brought forward regarding the availability of grant funding or public/charitable ownership. The justification in this case is solely reliant upon the 'public benefit' argument.

8.15 Although listed building consent is needed I would argue that the basis of the public benefit was established at the Outline Consent stage. The redevelopment of the Station Area as a whole is necessary to bring forward the very significant improvements to the transport interchange that include works to the Station, the new Station Square, the bus interchange and Cycle Park. In this case the Cycle Park facility cannot be brought forward in its current form unless the northern wing of the station buildings is removed.

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

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

8.17 I share the Senior Conservation Officer's view that the design of the new building is an extremely important consideration. All of the discussions with the applicants have been based on the need for the new building to be appropriate for its setting in the Conservation Area. I also appreciate the views of the Senior Conservation Officer regarding the need to consider works to the station itself in parallel with this application. Unfortunately the Station Change works are not in the control of the applicants and are being pursued by Network Rail separately. For this reason a parallel consideration has not been possible.

8.18 I am convinced that the new Cycle Park/hotel building will be a positive asset to the Conservation Area for the reasons set out in my report on the planning application. This view is shared by the Design and Conservation Panel, and the Urban Design and Conservation Team. These views provide the necessary justification for the demolition of the BTP wing of the station. In particular I note the views of English Heritage which support the ‘potential for enhancement of the Conservation Area through comprehensive redevelopment’ and that question whether the BTP wing would be worthy of BLI status.

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

Other environmental impacts

- 8.20 I have recommended conditions and informatives as recommended by the Highway Authority officer and the Environmental Health Officer.
- 8.21 In my opinion, subject to compliance with conditions, the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 4/13 and 8/2.

Third Party Representations

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

9.0 CONCLUSION

- 9.1 In my view the demolition of the BTP wing of the Station is justified by the public benefit that will derive from the provision of the Cycle Park as part of the wider Station Area redevelopment. The assessment of BTP wing as part of a listed building and heritage asset has been carried out properly and is supported by officers. I have no objections to the demolition which will facilitate the delivery of the CB1 Masterplan approved under the Outline Planning Consent.

10.0 RECOMMENDATION

APPROVE subject to the following conditions and reasons for approval:

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

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

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

Reason: To avoid the creation of cleared sites detrimental to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/4 and 4/11)

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

Reason: To foster understanding of the building's importance in the national and Cambridge context, and to ensure proper recording of any aspects of the building's special interest which are to be lost or altered. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006, policy 4/10 and 4/11)

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

Reason: To ensure that the reuse of any aspects of the building's special interest which are to be lost or altered is properly considered. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006, policy 4/10 and 4/11)

5. Prior to the commencement of development [including demolition] a Demolition and Construction Environmental Management Plan (DCEMP) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The DCEMP shall include the consideration of the following aspects of demolition and construction:

- a) Demolition, construction and phasing programme.

- b) Contractors' access arrangements for vehicles, plant and personnel including the location of construction traffic routes to, from and within the site, details of their signing, monitoring and enforcement measures.
- c) Construction/Demolition hours which shall be carried out between 0800 hours to 1800 hours Monday to Friday, and 0800 hours to 1300 hours on Saturday and at no time on Sundays, Bank or Public Holidays, unless in accordance with agreed emergency procedures for deviation. Prior notice and agreement procedures for works outside agreed limits and hours.
- d) Delivery times for construction purposes.
- e) Soil Management Strategy.
- f) Outline Waste Management Plan (OWMP).
- g) Noise method, monitoring and recording statements in accordance with the provisions of BS 5228-1: 2009.
- h) Maximum noise mitigation levels for construction equipment, plant and vehicles.
- i) Vibration method, monitoring and recording statements in accordance with the provisions of BS 5228-2: 2009.
- j) Maximum vibration levels.
- k) Dust management and wheel washing measures in accordance with the provisions of London Best Practice Guidance: The control of dust and emissions from construction and demolition.
- l) Use of concrete crushers.
- m) Prohibition of the burning of waste on site during demolition/construction.
- n) Site lighting.
- o) Drainage control measures including the use of settling tanks, oil interceptors and bunds.
- p) Screening and hoarding details.
- q) Access and protection arrangements around the site for pedestrians, cyclists and other road users.
- r) Procedures for interference with public highways, including permanent and temporary realignment, diversions and road closures.
- s) External safety and information signing and notices.
- u) Consideration of sensitive receptors.
- v) Prior notice and agreement procedures for works outside agreed limits.
- x) Complaints procedures, including complaints response procedures.
- y) Membership of the Considerate Contractors Scheme.

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

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

6. No demolition shall take place until full details of how the railway station platform canopy is to be altered and made good have been 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 protect the special interest and amenity of the listed building and the conservation area. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006, policy 4/10 and 4/11)

7. No demolition shall take place until full details of the means of preservation, protection and treatment of the following items of architectural / historic interest have been submitted to and approved by the local planning authority in writing:

a) All cast iron historic railway station platform columns, brackets and similar remnants.

b) All walling, roofing, etc. of the 1888 element of the railway station.

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

The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To protect the special interest and amenity of the listed building and the conservation area. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006, policy 4/10 and 4/11)

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

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

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

Reasons for Approval

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

Cambridge Local Plan (2006): 4/10, 4/11 4/13 8/2 9/9

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.