

Application Number	13/0978/CAC	Agenda Item	
Date Received	15th July 2013	Officer	Mrs Sarah Dyer
Target Date	9th September 2013		
Ward	Trumpington		
Site	32 - 38 Station Road Cambridge Cambridgeshire CB1 2JH		
Proposal Applicant	Demolition of 32-38 Station Road Mr Sven Topel c/o Agent		

<p>SUMMARY</p>	<p>The development accords with the Development Plan for the following reasons:</p> <p>An assessment of 32-38 Station Road as a Building of Local Interest (BLI) and a heritage asset has been carried out.</p> <p>The demolition of 32-38 Station Road is justified by the public benefit that will derive from the development of the site for office accommodation as part of the wider Station Area redevelopment</p> <p>The decision of the Planning Committee not to offer any evidence in support of the reasons for refusal of applications ref. 12/0496/CAC, 12/0502/FUL, 12/1553/CAC and 12/1556/FUL at the forthcoming Public Inquiry is a material consideration.</p>
<p>RECOMMENDATION</p>	<p>APPROVAL</p>

0.0 INTRODUCTION

0.1 This application and the associated application for planning permission (ref. 13/0997) follow on from the refusals of planning permission and CAC by the Planning Committee in July 2012 and March 2013. These decisions are the subject of appeals to

the Planning Inspectorate which is to be held by Public Inquiry in October this year.

0.2 The previous Conservation Area consent (CAC) applications (Refs. 12/0496/CAC and 12/1553/CAC) was refused for the following reasons:

1. The proposed demolition is contrary to policies 4/11 and 4/12 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2006) and paragraph 136 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2012 in that in the absence of an approved redevelopment scheme that has a contract for redevelopment and which preserves and enhances the character or appearance of the Conservation Area by faithfully reflecting its context or providing a contrast with it, the demolition of the buildings would result in the loss of a heritage asset in the form of Buildings of Local Interest which contribute positively to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.
2. The public benefit from the development fails to provide sufficient justification for the demolition of Buildings of Local Interest, which are recognised as heritage assets. The development is therefore contrary to policy 4/12 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 and to guidance provided by the National Planning Policy Framework.

0.3 With the exception of the sections relating to Consultations and Representations that have been updated to reflect the comments made in relation to this current application, this report is identical to that presented to Planning Committee in March this year.

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 on the south side of Station Road and to the east of the access serving the Warren Close development. The western half of the site is occupied by 32-38 Station Road (Wilton Terrace) which accommodates Woodlands Doctors Surgery and Brookgate's Offices (the applicants). The eastern half of the site was previously occupied by offices serving the Rank Hovis site that have been demolished as part of the CB1

development. This part of the site is currently in use as a contractor's compound.

- 1.2 To the south of the site is the Warren Close housing development and land which is under development for flats with commercial space at ground level. A six storey block of flats at Warren Close sits behind the western half of the site and following the completion of development a public square and a seven storey block of flats will sit behind the eastern half. To the west the site is bounded by the access road serving Warren Close beyond which is office buildings. To the east is Murdoch House a three storey office block with undercroft which fronts the Station. To the north the site is bounded by Station Road beyond which is former Red House site that has planning permission for a hotel and the current station cycle park.
- 1.3 The site is within the Station Area Redevelopment Framework Boundary and within the Central Conservation Area No.1. 32-38 Station Road are buildings of Local Interest as are the Mill and Silo that sit to the southeast. The Station is a listed building. The site falls within the controlled parking zone.

2.0 THE PROPOSAL

- 2.1 Conservation Area Consent is sought for the demolition of the terrace to facilitate the development of the western half of a pair of office buildings. Parameter Plan 1 of the Outline consent identifies 32-38 Station Road as Buildings of Local Interest that are to be demolished. Whilst this does not negate the need for Conservation Area Consent it is a material consideration.
- 2.2 The application is accompanied by the following supporting information:
- Design and Access Statement by Grimshaw
 - Heritage Statement by Beacon Planning
 - Planning Statement by Savills

3.0 SITE HISTORY

Reference	Description	Outcome
05/1166	Conservation Area Consent for demolition buildings on the	A/C

	Rank Hovis site	
06/0266/OUT	CB1 Station Area Redevelopment	A/C
09/0031	Conservation Area Consent for demolition buildings on the Rank Hovis site	A/C
11/1303/FUL	Demolition of 32 – 38 Station Road and erection of two office buildings	Withdrawn
11/1351/CAC	Conservation Area Consent for demolition of 32-38 Station Road	Withdrawn
12/0502/FUL	Demolition of 32 – 38 Station Road and erection of two office buildings	Refused
12/0496/CAC	Conservation Area Consent for demolition of 32-38 Station Road	Refused
	Non Material Amendment for Realignment of SAR	Approved
12/1553/CAC	Conservation Area Consent for demolition of 32-38 Station Road	Refused
12/1556/FUL	Demolition of 32 – 38 Station Road and erection of two office buildings	Refused
13/0997/FUL	Demolition of 32 – 38 Station Road and erection of two office buildings	Pending Consideration

4.0 **PUBLICITY**

4.1	Advertisement:	Yes
	Adjoining Owners:	Yes
	Site Notice Displayed:	Yes
	Public Meeting/Exhibition	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	4/11 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		

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 Refuse and Environment

- 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 The UDC team has provided combined comments on both the full planning application and the application for Conservation Area Consent. The UDC team supported the previous applications and their comments focus on the differences between the current applications and the previous applications.

Taking the design changes in turn the UDC teams comments are as follows:

Reduction in retail space – acceptable but query potential for connecting the café ‘pod’ to the ground floor to enable public access.

Additional car park spaces - acceptable

Minor reduction in cycle parking spaces/re-arrangement of cycle parking spaces – acceptable but details of cover to cycle parking between 50 and 60 required.

Revised car park ramp – further details of the appearance of the ramp and associated structure are needed.

Realignment of Southern Access Road – acceptable.

Salvage of material as part of demolition of 32-38 Station Road – conditions recommended.

Details are needed of window cleaning gantry.

Conclusion

Officers spent considerable time negotiating a revised scheme following the withdrawal of the first scheme in December 2011. It is therefore appropriate that a near identical design is now being proposed.

In summary, subject to the above points of clarification and minor amendments as well as the recommended conditions, it is the view of the UDC team that the applications comply with the Local Plan specifically policies 3/4, 3/7, 3/12, 4/11 and 4/12.

Suggested Conditions

Conditions are recommended to address the following:

1. stonework details
2. non-masonry walling systems
3. glass types
4. joinery
5. low-pitched roof details
6. roof glazing system
7. renewable energy source(s)
8. rooftop plant screening system
9. landscaping scheme
10. coping to the walls
11. photographic record
12. salvage condition

English Heritage

6.4 Summary

The current applications follow the refusal of a broadly similar pair of previous applications, which are now the subject of an appeal and this fresh set of applications have been submitted following the City Council's decision not to defend the reasons for refusal.

The principle of demolition of 32-38 Station Road was given tacit support when the CB1 masterplan was granted outline permission. However, this terrace is classified as a set of buildings of local interest that make a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the conservation area and consent for their demolition should only be granted once a scheme for high quality replacement buildings has been secured. The current proposal requires changes to the approved CB1 master plan, and will provide a pair of buildings to replace the originally proposed Building I2, together with an enhanced new piece of public realm as an anti-chamber to the new Station Square. These changes to the master plan have much to recommend them and the revised design for the new buildings have gone a long way to address the concerns raised by EH over the previous proposal for this site.

Conservation Area Consent for Demolition of 32-38 Station Road (also known as Wilton Terrace)

The NPPF includes a presumption in favour of the conservation of designated heritage assets (para 132). In this instance, while the terrace at 32-38 Station Road is not a designated heritage asset (to date no application for consideration of the terrace for listing has been received by EH), the conservation area in which it is located is a designated asset and this presumption in favour of conservation is therefore relevant. The case for demolition of this terrace would appear to be to enable the implementation of a holistic redevelopment that will deliver an overall enhancement of the conservation area, whereas to retain the terrace would leave an anomaly, a building at odds with its new context. EH has some concerns with this position, since the same might be said of Foster's Mill, but that building is to be retained and adapted for new use. EH note that the scale of buildings approved on the South side of Station Road will

dwarf this terrace, and to retain the terrace would compromise the overall vision for CB1. The expectation must therefore be that if the demolition of this terrace is to be permitted it will bring forward a new development of sufficient quality that will deliver an overall enhancement of the conservation area. This redevelopment includes the provision of a new Station Square, a major new piece of public realm that will enhance the setting of the Grade II listed railway station.

EH conclude that the demolition of Wilton Terrace will result in some harm, but the harm would be less than the substantial harm as set out in the NPPF. The local planning authority will need to weigh this harm against the wider public benefits to be delivered by the proposal, which EH understand to be delivery of substantial employment provision in a highly accessible location and enhancement of the setting of the listed railway station and wider conservation area through the major improvements to the public realm.

Planning permission for Construction of Replacement Office Buildings

EH acknowledges that the revised master plan as illustrated in this application has the potential to deliver an improvement over the currently approved master plan, and in particular the creation of a new piece of quality public realm on the south side of the new office buildings that will form an anti chamber to the new Station Square. This will create a space with a more intimate atmosphere which it will be easier to encourage the development of a café culture to enliven the space. Unfortunately, and as noted in previous comments for this site, the full potential of this space cannot be fully realised until issues surrounding the future of the former silo building on the east side of the space are also resolved. EH requests that the City Council does everything in its powers to ensure that the developers bring forward appropriate proposals for this key part of the development as soon as possible.

EH notes the analysis that has led to the development of a related pair of buildings for this site, including the strategy for incorporating a double height recessed ground floor on Station Road which will relate to the colonnade on the front of the O'Callaghan Hotel that is to be built opposite. EH broadly welcome the revised massing strategy and the vertical

emphasis that is now to be delivered through the expressed stair tower on the Station Road elevation for no. 60. The revised design now incorporates a series of 'giant order' of mullions and transoms that are to be finished in reconstituted stone. These have the potential to reference the design to its Cambridge context, while the subtle variation to the angle of the mullions will provide a sense of movement on the east and west elevations. On the east and west elevations the mullions will project beyond the face of the transoms and there is a risk that rainwater run-off from the mullions will result in pattern staining on the transoms. Great care will be required in the detailing of the mullions to ensure rainwater drips clear of the transoms to avoid this risk.

As noted in previous comments, the south elevation of no. 50 continues to give a degree of concern when read in conjunction with no. 60. The double height recess to the ground floor on no. 60 is not replicated on no. 50 and as a result no. 50 appears stunted. On the west side of no. 50 there is a more successful transition from double height ground floor facing onto Station Road, stepping down to a single storey recess as one moves south. That transition might be reversed on the south elevation, perhaps by raising the solid wall of the plant room over both ground and first floor.

No information is included on how signage is to be incorporated into the proposal, and again this will need to be undertaken with great care.

Recommendation

In respect of the CAC application:

The demolition of Wilton Terrace will result in a degree of harm to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. This harm will need to be weighed against the wider public benefits arising from the creation of significant employment provision in a highly accessible location, coupled with enhancements to the conservation area arising from the fulfilment of the CB1 vision, including the delivery of Station Square. EH also notes that the approval of the CB1 masterplan has given tacit support to the demolition of 32-38 Station Road, but this application should not be approved until such time as Planning Consents is also granted for high quality replacement

buildings that will deliver a real enhancement of the conservation area. EH seek conditions relating to full recording of the building and prevention from demolition until a contract is let for no. 50.

In respect of the design for the replacement building

EH requests that consideration be given to refining the south elevation of no. 50 and recommends conditions to address colour and texture of the reconstituted stone mullions and transoms and detailing to avoid staining.

Victorian Society

- 6.5 Object to the total demolition of this attractive terrace, which contributes to the character of the conservation area in which it sits.

Wilton Terrace has been identified by the Council as an undesignated heritage asset and is on their local list of buildings of interest. It is a strikingly embellished late- Victorian terrace and may well be the work of local architect Richard Reynolds Rowe. The extensive use of polychromatic brickwork, crow-stepped gables and bay spandrel decorations is both attractive and unusual. The rarity of these buildings owing to inopportune demolition in recent times only adds to their significance in the streetscape.

Mention is made of the poor state of the frontage and the unattractive access ramp. This can with relative ease be reordered. At least one of the properties appears to retain some of its original ironwork and this provides a model for the reinstatement of the rest. The front boundary wall also appears to be original. Wilton Terrace makes a positive contribution to the character of the street and the area, in spite of poor-quality building in the recent past. The present day Station Road provides a demonstration of how not to treat historic streets. The same mistake must not be made again.

A brief survey of the immediate vicinity also suggests a number of other sites could provide the land required for new office space, without resorting to demolishing this heritage asset.

As positive contributors to the character of the streetscape, the demolition of these buildings would represent significant damage to the character of the conservation area. The Council has an obligation to ensure that any proposed development either preserves or enhances the conservation area. This proposal would realise the very opposite; destroying one of the last historic buildings at this end of the street and further eroding the character of the area.

Urge the Council to refuse consent for an irrevocably damaging proposal.

Design and Conservation Panel (Meeting of 14 March 2012)

6.6 The conclusions of the Panel meeting were as follows (full comments are set out in the report for the planning application):

In strategic terms, the Panel considers that the new approach is a great improvement. The change in massing, the handling of the frontage at ground level along Station Road and the greater animation of the frontage to the 'anti-chamber' square to the south are welcomed. The 'kit of parts' proposed for the elevations looks promising but further refinement of the design is still needed, as is further examination of the treatment of stair cores at ground level.

VERDICT –

1. The strategy of the massing, the relationship of the stair core with Station Road, the overall strategy for the elevations and the handling of the public realm, GREEN (5), AMBER (1)

2. The 'kit of parts' for the elevations, the handling of the elevations at ground level, the design of the 'fins' and other components and the planting of the terraced area, GREEN (3), AMBER (2)

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

Design and Conservation Panel (Meeting of 13 February 2013)

6.7 The minutes of the Panel meeting were as follows:

Following the last presentation in March 2012 and the refusal in July of the previous application (12/0502/FUL), the Panel were invited to review the amendments made to the scheme, which is the subject of the current application. The amendments include; the pushing back of the façade of No 50 to reduce its apparent bulk and the inclusion of an additional 15 car parking spaces at basement level. The Panel were told that the application is to be recommended for approval at Planning Committee in early March.

The Panel's comments are as follows:

- Set back of No. 50. The Panel welcome the setting back by 3 metres of the façade of No.50. It was felt that this new configuration had several advantages over the previous flush alignment of the two buildings. The benefits arising from the adjustment to the building's alignment were felt to include:-
 - o the introduction of an element of ascending progression injected more interest to the streetscape and sets off the café space more effectively,
 - o had created more 'breathing space' at pavement level which could lead to less potential conflict between pedestrians and cyclists,
 - o allowed for more flexibility regarding the choice of street trees
 - o the generation of an 'implied' space shared with buildings on the opposite side of Station Road.

- Stonework fins. In the Panel's view, the proposed application of the simple components, sometimes projected, rotated and flush was playful and created interest. However, the Panel commented that careful detailing is necessary to prevent the kind of unwelcome shadowing caused by the accumulation of dirt between the joints.

- Entrance (No 50). The Panel are comfortable with the logic of the new entrance. The addition of an etched '50' into the stonework would, in the Panel's view, introduce a playful typographical element and enhance the entrance.

- Additional parking spaces. The pressure to provide additional car parking in order to make the buildings more marketable is understood, and the Panel welcome the determination to deliver the extra spaces without compromising the design.
- Potential wider benefit arising from the demolition of Wilton Terrace (32-38 Station Road). Within the terms of the National Planning Policy Framework, the Panel felt that the removal of the heritage asset is justified as it would enable the implementation of the CB1 Masterplan as a whole, and enhance the Conservation Area.

Conclusion.

The subtle changes deliver a significantly enhanced scheme. A better relationship between the two buildings and the adjoining space has resulted from the move away from them being a matched pair to becoming a *related* pair. The retention of 32-38 Station Road was felt to be at odds with the new context set by the implementation of a holistic redevelopment.

VERDICT – GREEN (unanimous)

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

7.0 REPRESENTATIONS

- 7.1 The owners/occupiers of the following addresses have made representations about either or both of the applications:

27 Aberdeen Avenue
17 Albion Row
122 Argyle Street
4 Ascham Road
89a Barton Road
54 Bateman Street
99 Beaumont Road
1 Belvoir Terrace
1 Blossom Street
18 Brooklands Avenue

22 Brooklands Avenue
15 Cambridge Place
47 Cambridge Place
70 Canterbury Street
32 Catherine Street
3 Cavendish Avenue
16 Cavendish Place
17 Christchurch Street
14 Church Street, Chesterton
17 Clarendon Road (8 letters from 4 residents)
10 The Lawns, Clerk Maxwell Road
26 Cockburn Street
7 Dane Drive
11 De Freville Avenue
61 De Freville Avenue
1 Dennis Court Terrace
7 Doggett Road
42 Doggett Road
57 Eden Street
26 Eltisley Avenue
58 Eltisley Avenue
4 Essex Close
5 Fitzwilliam Road
7 Fulbrooke Road
27 Gilbert Road
266 Glenalmond Avenue
7 Glisson Road
33 Glisson Road
41 Glisson Road
69 Glisson Road
18 Greens Road
17 Guest Road
10 Gwydir Street
21 Hamilton Road
77 Hartington Grove
67 Hemingford Road
75 Hemingford Road
42 Herbert Street
53 Hertford Street
2 Highsett
26 Highsett
32 Highsett
33 Highsett
40 Highsett

46 Highsett
60 Highsett
61 Highsett
62 Highsett
66 Highsett
68 Highsett
69 Highsett
75 Highsett
82 Highsett
79 Hills Avenue
115 Hemingford Road
68 Humberstone Road
34 Kimberley Road
82 Kimberley Road
4 Lyndewode Road
61 Maids Causeway
21 Mandrill Close
59 Mawson Road
72 Mawson Road
112 Mawson Road
119 Mawson Road
57 Mill Road
49 New Square
43 Newton Road
46 Newton Road
1 Old School, Norfolk Street
8 North Terrace
57 Norwich Street
70-72 Norwich Street
2 Petersfield
9 Park Terrace
12 Parker Street
24 Rathmore Road
35 Rathmore Road
24 Ravensworth Gardens
43 Ravensworth Gardens
7 Richmond Terrace
15 Riverside
35 Riverside
40 Riverside
47 Riverside
17 Romsey Road
6 Rustat Road
1 St Barnabas Court

10 St Barnabas Court
11 St Barnabas Court
40 St Barnabas Road
2 Saxon Street
41 Sedley Taylor Road
45 Silverwood Close
30 Station Road
27 Storeys Way
30 Storeys Way
13 Tenison Avenue
6 Tenison Avenue
9 Tenison Avenue
25 Tenison Avenue
36 Tenison Road
94 Tenison Road
116 Tenison Road
118 Tenison Road
11 Trumpington Road
15 Victoria Street
23 Victoria Park
2 Vinter Terrace
1 Warren Close
2 Willis Road
11 Woodlark Road
7 Wootton Way

8 Cherry Garden Lane, Newport
30 Station Road, Whittlesford
20 Hinton Way, Great Shelford
17 Harlton Road, Little Eversden

8 Parsons Hill, Colchester (frequent visitor to Cambridge)

34 Brookvale Road, Southampton (regular visitor to Cambridge by train)
North Horntowie, Ruthven, Huntly, Aberdeenshire (worked in Cambridge for many years)

7.2 The representations can be summarised as follows:

Concerns and objections

Previous proposals and current applications

- a. The proposals are not substantially different and the revisions make no difference.
- b. Objections based on leaflet entitled 'Help Save Our Victorian Heritage' by Friends of Wilton Terrace.
- c. The previous applications were refused on sound grounds which remain relevant.
- d. An outline planning permission should not have been granted in the Conservation Area.
- e. Supports views of BAARA.
- f. A compromise should have been brought forward that did not require demolition.
- g. Approximately 450 people sent objections to the Planning Inspectorate in relation to the current Appeals.
- h. The Council should do the same as the developer and vary the terms of the consent.
- i. It is a pity that the original application did not get the level of publicity that the demolition application is getting now.
- j. Wilton Terrace was not mentioned in the Outline consent.
- k. Query whether demolition would contravene the standards of the NRA.

Loss of Existing Buildings

- a. Conservation Area should be respected.
- b. Existing buildings give grace and grandeur to the City.
- c. Wilton Terrace provides a pleasant change of pace on Station Road.
- d. The existing buildings with their architectural heritage and elegant facades should not be demolished.

- e. The existing buildings are an important example of an earlier age of fine architecture, which should be preserved.
- f. No other terrace in Cambridge has bay windows at the back and encaustic tiles.
- g. The buildings are probably one of the finest examples of Richard Reynolds Rowe work, which includes the Corn Exchange.
- h. Much of historic Cambridge architecture has been lost to development.
- i. Wilton Terrace has been designed to relate to the Station.
- j. Wilton Terrace provides a strong link between the Victorian Station and Victorian town houses on Hills Road.
- k. If Conservation Area Consent is granted, it will make a mockery of the Conservation Area designation.
- l. There is no point in having conservation areas if buildings within them can be demolished.
- m. The buildings should be 'ring-fenced' from demolition given their BLI status.
- n. Demolition of the existing buildings amounts to vandalism against the wishes of residents.
- o. Historic buildings should not be demolished when there is an option not to.
- p. If buildings are retained they will stand the test of time better than the new buildings.
- q. The terrace does not need to be demolished and could be incorporated into the new development.
- r. Renovation of the buildings would be more sustainable.
- s. The buildings should be preserved and linked with the new office building.

- t. The Kings Cross development is a good example of how new and old buildings can be integrated in a satisfactory way.
- u. The developments will result in an unbalancing of the new against the old.
- v. The terrace does not deserve to be demolished to make money.
- w. The loss of the buildings will be regretted in the future.
- x. Allowing these buildings to be demolished as part of the Outline was an error of judgement.
- y. The terrace has distinctive features and makes a positive contribution to Cambridge along with other Reynolds Rowe buildings
- z. Many Victorian buildings have been demolished in the City which is becoming an ugly, bland, crowded complex of buildings. There is little respect for history or aesthetics in the Station Area.
- aa. For many people this is the buildings are their first experience of historic buildings in the City.
- bb. It would be shameful to allow senseless destruction of these buildings.
- cc. The terrace commemorates Joseph Wilton, who founded the Royal Academy in 1768. Alfred Kett owner of Rattee and Kett lived at no. 1 and the terrace is the last remaining reference to the Kett family in Station Road.
- dd. Another famous occupier of Wilton Terrace was Thomas Thwaites Ball who was a Freeman of the City of London and manufacturer of the first artificial fertiliser.
- ee. University buildings are untouchable; why are Cambridge residents buildings at risk of being replaced?

- ff. There is a wealth of evidence to suggest the social and cultural value of retaining older buildings within new development.
- gg. The Station Area Development Framework recommended retention of Wilton Terrace.
- hh. Remember what happened to Petty Cury – the south side of Station Road is horrific apart from Wilton Terrace
- ii. Wilton Terrace was probably the last sight that soldiers had of Cambridge when leaving to fight at Flanders in the First World War.
- jj. The doctor's surgery would be lost as part of the development.
- kk. Wilton Terrace should be converted into flats.
- ll. Retention of Wilton Terrace would make it clear that there was justification in preserving buildings of worth, and that the City Council was prepared to make a stand and not be swayed entirely by financial pressures.

The New Buildings

- a. The new buildings are excessive in height and will dominate the Station.
- b. The proposed twin towers will only contribute to the rapidly growing tower block scenery of the City.
- c. The masterplan promised world class buildings but what is being delivered is reminiscent of any urban high street.
- d. What is built must reflect the uniqueness of Cambridge.
- e. Station Road links one low rise Victorian development to another, the remaining buildings should be retained.
- f. The new buildings look anonymous and like every other modern town, uninteresting and cheap to build.

- g. The proposals represent gross overdevelopment.
- h. The buildings are too large in terms of their height and volume.
- i. The blocks would be totally out of scale and incongruous.
- j. The building has the appearance of an 'outsize radiator'.
- k. Proper account has not been taken of the relationship of the proposed buildings to the Station building which will appear marooned among indifferently designed office blocks
- l. Query whether architect thinks he is designing for Cambridge, Massachusetts.
- m. The new offices could be built behind Wilton Terrace.
- n. There is little confidence that the new buildings will not be contenders for the Carbuncle Cup (CEN 03/08/2013)
- o. The development does not accord with the NPPF which emphasises the desirability of new development making a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness.
- p. A Cambridge architect would be able to blend together the old and the new.
- q. The buildings are too large and dominant and will have an adverse impact on the character and open spaces in the immediate area.
- r. The buildings are too large and dominant near to historic, conservation and residential areas.
- s. The design of the buildings should be of the highest quality possible which has not been the case on other sites in the development.
- t. The buildings will have a negative impact on the listed Station and Mill and Station Road.

- u. The development will be a first impression for thousands of visitors.
- v. Other new buildings do not fit in with the character of the surrounding area, including two new office buildings, one of which dominates the Botanic Gardens.
- w. The Microsoft building is excessively tall and has attracted complaints about after hours lighting. The saving grace of that building was that it did not require the removal of historic buildings.
- x. New buildings should be of an appropriate height in proportion with their location and these buildings will not be.
- y. Planning controls must not be relaxed.
- z. Development caters for a new, youngish population in need of short term accommodation suitable for catching the early train to London.

Impact on residential amenity

There will be a significant loss of light to flats in Warren Close.

Other Issues including Trees, Amenity and Parking

- a. Several beautiful trees will need to be removed which cannot be replaced quickly.
- b. The development will generate the need for parking in local streets with limited capacity.
- c. Mitigation in terms of the introduction of a controlled parking scheme on surrounding streets is not popular with residents as it involves extra expense. The applicants should not be able to wash their hands of this issue
- d. The development will generate a high degree of car parking which is ironic given that the developer is using the argument that they need this development to finance the cycle park.

- e. Insufficient provision is made for car parking.
- f. The development will generate serious parking problems.
- g. Query where car parking is going to be given limited space.
- h. External cycle parking will encourage Station users to park there, all cycle parking should be internal.
- i. Lighting in the building should be switched off at night.
- j. The buildings will generate more traffic close to the Station and add to congestion.
- k. There is an excess of office accommodation in the City and little justification for more.
- l. The number of people accommodated in the offices is too high.
- m. The functions of office workers can be carried out electronically and there is no need for such large offices.
- n. It would be quicker and easier to find new tenants for the existing building.
- o. The argument that the development supports employment objectives is doubtful since jobs would be created if the buildings were renovated.
- p. The move by the government to relax planning controls should be resisted.
- q. Surprised that an 'unelected, secretive politbureau of Town Planners' has been able to bring us to this point, high rise blocks including Hills Road/Cherry Hinton Road area and Parkers Piece have crept past Planning. They are eyesores and blight the skyline.
- r. Weak planners support such developments instead of following their own policies under threat of planning appeals.

- s. Councillors are meant to represent the views of local people in planning matters and this has been strengthened by government statements. Many local people do not want this development.
- t. Councillors have been placed under unfair and possibly illegal pressure.
- u. The applications are a cynical attempt to subvert local democracy.
- v. The decision not to provide evidence in defence of the appeal against the previous decisions was made in secret. If the applications are approved it will invite any developer to threaten an appeal to allow re-submission and approval of the same scheme.
- w. Planning officers take too much notice of developers and too little notice of residents.
- x. Modern planners have no vision.
- y. The Council should hang its head in shame over some of the development that have been allowed in the City centre.
- z. The Planning Committee should start listening to the people of the City and reject the application.
- aa. Public support for retaining these buildings should take priority over keeping a developer happy.
- bb. Other European cities do not destroy their heritage in favour of development. A new Station Area should be planned to retain character and new architecture in scale with existing. The outskirts of Cambridge are now the byword for soulless, speculative and cynical development and the same must not happen to the city centre.
- cc. The Council is in danger of giving room to 'monuments to greed'.

- dd. There are other sites in the city which could accommodate a 'skyscraping monster'. This is Cambridge not Croydon.
- ee. The Council has allowed the Botanic Gardens and the war memorial to be dwarfed by a new office building so is likely to accept the development.
- ff. The planned multi-storey car park, polyclinic and surgery have been eliminated from the Masterplan.
- gg. There is no provision for an alternative site for the existing doctors surgery, which is more necessary than offices and shops.
- hh. The public benefit is un-proven.
- ii. The public benefit of the Station Square should be given up in favour of retention of the Wilton Terrace.
- jj. The developers have said that the Cycle Park is mainly funded by the proposed hotel.
- kk. The public benefits that were previously cited have been dropped – multi-storey car park and polyclinic and the bus interchange is a considerable distance from the station entrance.
- ll. The development that has already been approved will generate more than enough income to fund remaining public benefits e.g. Station Square.
- mm. Several blocks have been constructed which could fund improvements without the need to demolish the terrace.
- nn. Other parts of the development could fund the Station Square works.
- oo. The link road was funded by the Government, the bus interchange by the County Council and the Station improvements will be paid for by Network Rail out of funds from the sale of land for student housing.

- pp. Are Network Rail also funding the Station Square given that they are receiving income from taxis?
- qq. The developers will benefit but local residents will not.
- rr. The developers promised benefits and if they have got their calculations wrong there is no excuse. Their obligations have to be met or they should go into administration.
- ss. The development is remarkable for the lack of rigorous (any?) scrutiny of Brookgate's costings and accounts by the council, all the more serious because there were 16 charges/debentures against the CB1 site in 2010.
- tt. The way in which the developers have behaved in terms of its relation with the public, councillors and council officers verges on the corrupt.

Procedural Issues

- a. Reference is made to a document from 2010 which gave the Council's agreement to demolition of Wilton Terrace. The status of this document is questioned.
- b. Repeated applications are an abuse of the planning system and unfair on objectors.
- c. Notification of the applications co-incided with the school holidays.
- d. The grant of Outline planning permission was against planning policy and against the specific recommendation of CABE.
- e. Reference to the demolition of 32-38 Station Road in early 2010 in the Outline report is a serious breach of policy and due process (Officer note: This matter has been responded to already. This reference was made in relation to the loss of premises for the doctor's surgery.)
- f. The development must be assessed against the NPPF not the guidance in force in 2010.

7.3 Brooklands Avenue Area Residents Association has made representations as follows:

The application represents over-development in both height and mass and provides insufficient evidence of clear public benefits arising from the development.

Height of buildings

Both the old Foster's Mill and the Station itself would be adversely affected by the erection of two massive "glass box" office buildings in such close proximity. The Mill is a significant part of the local skyline and the proposal would breach the policy 3/13. It would also dominate the architecturally important and historic station building, which has two storeys.

Demolition of existing buildings

We object to the demolition of the present Victorian terrace on the site (BLIs), and believe that it should be preserved, as architecturally in keeping with the properties on the other side of Station Road and of the Station itself. In this connection we further note that the houses are designated as "Buildings of Local Interest." As indicated above, the case for demolition cannot be deemed as having been agreed, since as a full application this has to be considered from scratch, and cannot ride on the back of the Masterplan outline. Indeed there is a strong argument for retaining the properties in the interest of balance with the similar buildings on the north side of Station Road, and thereby preserving important features of this part of the Central Conservation Area.

Car and Cycle Parking

There is space for 1000 workers in the building. Car parking provision is inadequate and only 572 cycle parking spaces are proposed. The rest of employees will have to come by foot or public transport.

Comparison with earlier refused applications

The height and massing of the proposed buildings would make them unduly dominant – this still applies especially to number

60, which is unchanged and continues to detract from the Mill. Number 50 is slightly smaller but both buildings dominate the Microsoft Headquarters. There is not attempt to differentiate between the facades of each floor, which Wilton Terrace illustrates well.

Parking provision is inadequate – There has been a small increase in car parking and minimal change in cycle parking but provision is still inadequate.

Insufficient clear public benefit to compensate for loss of a heritage asset – note ‘clear public benefit’ and not ‘clear financial benefit to the developer’. No such clear public benefit has been demonstrated.

It is a ‘monstrous abuse of process’ for the Council to agree behind closed doors that it would grant planning permission for re-submitted application. The Committee had the chance to review their first decision when then second scheme was considered in March 2013 but stood by their refusal. They should do likewise at appeal.

There has been substantial public objection to the scheme as evidenced by unanimous disapproval by third party comments already posted on the website.

The development must be determined with reference to the NPPF and not the guidance that was in force in 2010.

The Committee Report must disclose the clear and tangible evidence produced by the developers for the ‘substantial public benefit’ which the scheme would produce in order to justify the destruction of Wilton Terrace.

7.4 Newtown Residents Association objects to the applications on for the following reasons:

There is clearly considerable opposition for good reason -the road represents fine vernacular architecture in Cambridge, its replacement is modern architecture of no particular lasting value.

There are two buildings in this area that already have been submitted for Building Design's pan-UK Carbuncle Cup award.

This is the official publication for professional architects in this country and is a serious comment on the poor quality of building design here; the committee should take note of this.

Please reconsider the outline permissions already given.

All legal opinions are challengeable. Rather than accept these without question, the RA ask the committee to sift through the fine detail to find a legal challenge to the present proposal. The lawyers are there to find ways to support decisions, not to prevent creative solutions to a problem.

If no such detail can be found then the RA strongly request that the committee refuses the application in any event, on its merit.

The committee must consider outcomes as much as process - the demolition of Wilton Terrace is wrong. If a poor decision was made at outline stage, then rather than compound this by ploughing on regardless, the council may have to take the consequences on the chin, brave the developers but make the right decision for the sake of our architectural legacy to future Cambridge citizens.

7.5 Rustat Neighbourhood Association has made representations as follows:

RNA object to this application, on the grounds that

1. it represents over-development in both height and mass
2. it provides inadequate car parking space.
3. it provides insufficient evidence of any clear public benefit which might justify the destruction of Wilton Terrace, a building we consider to be a heritage asset

Height of buildings

Both the old Foster's Mill and the Station itself would be adversely affected by the erection of two massive glass box office buildings in such close proximity. They would also dominate and dwarf the architecturally important and historic station building which of course only has two storeys.

The Mill is a significant part of the local skyline and we contend that the proposal would breach the terms of section 3/13 Tall Buildings in the current Cambridge Local Plan.

Car parking

The size of this development means that at capacity, there would be some 1000 people working in the offices. 83 car parking spaces, which must include visitor parking, are clearly grossly inadequate. This is of particular concern to my members as our local roads are already extensively used by all day parkers for people working locally or commuting to London. This application is going to make a poor situation even worse.

We acknowledge that, given its location, many workers will arrive by public transport and by bike, but it must be obvious that more than 80 would wish to use their own transport. The excess would then seek to park at no cost in nearby streets. Brookgate themselves acknowledge this by offering to fund a controlled parking survey in the Rustat Road area. To us, it is completely unacceptable that Brookgate should seek to wash their hands of the problems they themselves have created by a one off funding of a survey.

We urge that Brookgate provide additional on site parking spaces to the level that was agreed as the maximum, ie 1 space per 125 sq m of office space. This would result in approximately 130 car parking spaces, a 60% increase from the proposed provision.

Demolition of present buildings

We object to the demolition of the present Victorian terrace on the site, and believe that it should be preserved, as architecturally in keeping with the properties on the other side of Station Road and of the Station itself. In this connection we further note that the houses are designated as Buildings of Local Interest. As indicated above, the case for demolition cannot be deemed as having been agreed, since as a full application this has to be considered from scratch, and cannot ride on the back of the Masterplan outline. Indeed there is a strong argument for retaining the properties in the interest of balance with the similar buildings on the north side of Station Road, and thereby preserving important features of this part of the Central Conservation Area.

Our Association fully supports the arguments put forward by Ron Clifton of BAARA, which compares this application with previously rejected applications. I will not seek to duplicate here the clear and sound arguments that objection puts forward but would wish that you make clear to Planning Committee members our strong support of them.

But I would wish to emphasise that we consider the continual developer creep of Brookgate to be unacceptable. Public amenities proposed in the original plan (multi story car park, GP practice, Drop in Centre etc) have been successively dropped in favour of yet more office space; in other words public amenities have been dropped in favour of additional revenue earning space.

This entire site is a critical gateway to Cambridge. We are concerned that the original concepts are being successively eroded and we will be left with a series of very large office blocks, which will dominate both the station itself and the view from it. So the first views for people arriving by train to visit our lovely city will be of massive and dominating modern office blocks. This surely is not the impact we would want our many visitors to have, a view that is so out of keeping with all that Cambridge stands for. The Draft Local Plan presents a clear vision for our city. These proposed developments, in our view, run counter to that vision

We therefore urge you to recommend rejection of this application

- 7.6 **David Campbell Bannerman MEP** made comments about the previous applications. His comments on this application remain unchanged in relation to his earlier comments given that there is little change in the submission.

Objects to the loss of 32-38 Station Road.

Considers that the developers are showing contempt for local opinion.

The application should be held back pending the determination of the Public Inquiry.

Material Planning issues are:

The proposed development is not part of the Masterplan

The demolition will be harmful to the Conservation Area
The building is a 'significant heritage asset' given its original character and position
There is a presumption against demolition of a BLI
Disagree with developers assessment and considers that the loss of the buildings represents significant harm.
The buildings have Evidential, Aesthetic and Communal value
The development is contrary to the East of England Plan and the NPPF

The loss of the building heavily outweighs the potential gain in amenity.

7.7 **Julian Huppert MP** is concerned that the applications have been submitted without waiting for the Inspector's decision on the previous planning applications. He considers that this seems to be an effort to bypass the Inspectorate process and hopes that the City Council will play due heed to the forthcoming Inspector's decision rather than allowing it to be avoided.

7.8 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

Parameter Plan 1 of the Masterplan indicates 32-38 Station Road as a group of Buildings of Local Interest that are 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 applicant has not provided a full justification for the demolition of 32-38 Station Road that will be necessary when an application is made for Conservation Area Consent for its demolition. Clearly Block I2 cannot be developed without removing 32-38 Station Road. The pivotal role that I2 has in the scheme is considered more fully below but essentially I would conclude that the loss of 32-38 Station Road is justified by the need to increase the density of development across the site in order to achieve the aim of improving the transport interchange. 32-38 Station Road are not worthy of listing and in my view to seek to refuse the masterplan on the grounds that these buildings should be retained alone would be very difficult to substantiate at appeal.'

My views have not changed. I consider that subject to the grant of Conservation Area Consent, the principle of the demolition of 32-38 Station Road is acceptable. I have dealt with the loss of the doctor's surgery as a community facility in my report for the full planning application for the new office buildings.

Impact on Heritage Assets

- 8.8 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 Conservation Area Consent and planning permission are supported by a Heritage Statement as required by paragraph 128 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). 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.

The applicants submissions

- 8.9 The applicants have correctly identified the heritage assets that are affected by the development as 32-38 Station Road which are Buildings of Local Interest (BLIs) and the Conservation Area including the Station and associated buildings, the villas on the north side of Station Road and the Mill. The NPPF includes buildings that are locally listed in the definition of a heritage asset.

- 8.10 The significance of 32-38 Station Road has been assessed using the NPPF and English Heritage's document Conservation Principles, Policies and Guidance 2008. The aspects of moderate significance have been identified as the evidential value as example of a late Victorian terrace which has been the subject of removal of some features of interest and the aesthetic value of the front elevation.

Aspects of low significance included the historical value, communal value, the south/east/west elevations, the interior and the setting. No elements of high significance were recognised.

The level of significance of this part of the Conservation Area is considered by the applicant to be moderate. This is because 32-38 Station makes a moderate contribution to the character.

- 8.11 Most of the Heritage Statement is unchanged in comparison with the document that supported the previous application. This is because the history of the site, the significance of the existing buildings, the character of the Conservation Area and relevant heritage policy has not changed. However there are two key areas where changes have been made to the Heritage Statement. These relate to the impact of the proposed development on significance and the public benefits that will arise from demolition of the buildings and redevelopment of the site.
- 8.12 The new section in the Heritage Statement which considers the impact of the revised proposals heritage assets concludes that the proposed building will not have an adverse impact. This conclusion is supported by officers. The biggest change to the Heritage Statement is the emphasis that is made of the public benefits which will be achieved if the site is redeveloped. This part of the document has been expanded in direct response to the concerns raised by Committee that were articulated in the reasons for refusal of the previous Conservation Area Consent application.
- 8.13 The Heritage Statement addresses the following issues and makes the following observations about public benefits arising from the CB1 development:

Historical Background

The Station Area Development Framework (SADF) proposed the retention of Wilton Terrace but this was recognised as problematic when the detailed masterplan for the area was prepared.

The Rogers Masterplan

The Masterplan which formed the basis of the Outline consent was prepared between 2005 and 2008. The Environmental Statement that supported the Outline application included a Built Heritage section and companion volume that concluded that the loss of Wilton Terrace was justifiable on the grounds that the building has lost its context and was quite difficult to convert to modern commercial or residential use. The replacement of the terrace was recognised as an opportunity to allow a strong pattern of development to be created along this side of Station Road and would contribute towards the wider public benefits arising from comprehensive redevelopment.

Support for the Urban Design Strategy

The Masterplan provides a very clear urban design structure. In relation to Block I2 this was to be the pinnacle in terms of building height but was also to be set forward to create a visual pinch point and focus on the station building. The retention of Wilton Terrace completely undermines the urban design strategy.

Station Road's Evolving Character

Individual sites along the South side of Station Road are being brought forward. For example the approved Block J2 sets a pattern for the other J blocks. The proposed building will sit well with this character.

The Bigger Picture

When the Masterplan was approved it was anticipated that improvements to the Station as a transport interchange would be delivered as part of a comprehensive redevelopment of the area. However the economy has changed and it is no longer possible to deliver the development in one phase or in a series of large parcels. Development opportunities are now more

dependent on dates of tenancy renewals and identification of future occupiers. This means it is easy to lose sight of the bigger picture and the contribution that individual sites make to the resources available for new infrastructure.

The Heritage Statement makes it clear that leaving Wilton Terrace in place or upgrading/extending it will not generate enough money to support the key drivers of the scheme i.e. the key public benefits.

- 8.14 In my view the approach that has been taken in the Heritage Statement to looking back at the rationale behind the redevelopment of Wilton Terrace and making a very clear statement about the importance of the redevelopment of the site in the wider context is very helpful. This information did not form such a robust part of the previous applications and in my view does help to overcome the second reason for refusal of the earlier Conservation Area Consent application.

The relevant policy context and assessment

- 8.15 The policy context for the determination of the application is unchanged from that which prevailed when the earlier applications were determined. 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.*

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

8.17 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.

8.18 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.

8.19 Although Conservation Area Consent is needed I would argue that the basis of the public benefit was established at the Outline Consent stage. The redevelopment of the Station Area as a whole is necessary to bring forward the very significant improvements to the transport interchange that include works to the Station, the new Station Square, the bus interchange and Cycle Park. An increased density of development is needed to support these improvements. This site is the key to the delivery of that vision because it is the only location in the Masterplan where the highest building can be positioned. The demolition of 32-38 Station Road is necessary and justified for this reason. This point of view is now more rigorously supported by information submitted by the applicants which I have addressed above.

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

'The loss of BLIs 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. 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.'

- 8.21 I share the Senior Conservation Officer's view that the design of the new building is an extremely important consideration. All of the discussions with the applicants have been based on the need for the new building to be appropriate for its setting in the Conservation Area.
- 8.22 I am convinced that the new office buildings will be a positive asset to the Conservation Area for the reasons set out in my report on the planning application. The Design and Conservation Panel, English Heritage and the Urban Design and Conservation Team share these views. These views provide the necessary justification for the demolition of 32-38 Station Road. In particular I note the views of English Heritage which supports the adoption of a 'holistic view' to redevelopment in this area and that of the Design and Conservation CB1 Sub-Panel which reached the unanimous conclusion that the revised design for the office building is an improvement over the previous scheme.
- 8.23 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

- 8.24 I have recommended conditions and informatives as recommended by the Highway Authority officer and the Environmental Health Officer.
- 8.25 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

8.26 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 32-38 Station Road is justified by the public benefit that will derive from the development of the site for office accommodation as part of the wider Station Area redevelopment. The assessment of 32-38 Station Road as a BLI and heritage asset has been carried out properly and is supported by officers. I have no objections to the demolition which will facilitate the delivery of the CB1 Masterplan approved under the Outline Planning Consent.

9.2 The benefits of the development are set out in the Heritage Statement and can be précised as follows:

The scheme is an integral part of the CB1 Masterplan. 60 Station Road will fulfil the role of a landmark building as to have been played by Block I2

The scheme retains the key design features of Block I2, it forms the pinnacle to the gradual increase in height along Station Road and focuses views on the Station.

It will provide the revenue to provide a significant proportion of the funding required to deliver the new Station Square. This would not be delivered by smaller buildings on the site or 60 Station Road only.

It will provide revenue to support the provision of the Cycle Park.

High quality office accommodation is needed to attract and retain firms that offer high quality jobs e.g. Microsoft.

It will provide financial contributions towards the Cambridgeshire Guided Bus and the Southern Corridor Area Transport Plan.

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. No works for the demolition of the building(s) or any part thereof shall commence on site until an unconditional contract has been entered into under which one of the parties is obliged to carry out and itself complete the works of development of the site known as 50 Station Road for which planning permission has been granted under application reference 13/0997/FUL and evidence of the said contract has first been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority.

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. (Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003, policy P7/6 and Cambridge Local Plan 2006, policy 4/12)

4. Prior to the commencement of the development hereby permitted, including any demolition or enabling works, a detailed Construction Method Statement (CMS) shall be submitted to and approved by the local planning authority in writing.

The Construction Method Statement shall be accompanied by:

- 1 A statement that demonstrates how the proposal accords with the approved Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP), Eight Issue dated 5 January 2011 (condition 31 of the outline planning permission reference 08/0266/OUT).

In addition the CMS shall also provide:

- 2 A specific construction programme
- 3 A plan identifying:
 - (a) The contractor site storage area/compound
 - (b) Screening and hoarding locations
 - (c) Access arrangements for:
 - i. Vehicles
 - ii. Plant
 - iii. Personnel
 - iv. Building material
 - (d) Plant and equipment storage areas
 - (e) Contractor parking arrangements for:
 - i. Construction vehicles
 - ii. Personnel vehicles
 - (f) The location of contractor offices

Thereafter the development shall be undertaken in accordance with the agreed details unless otherwise agreed in writing by the local planning authority.

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).

5. Notwithstanding the approved plans, no demolition shall take place until a schedule of items to be salvaged from the site and building including details of their reuse, has been submitted to and approved by the local planning authority in writing. The careful removal of these items and their reuse shall then be carried out as approved.

Reason: To ensure that architectural details or features of historic interest, which make a positive contribution to the understanding of the history of the site and the area, are appropriately reused. (Cambridge Local Plan policy 4/12)

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).

INFORMATIVE: 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:

East of England plan 2008: ENV7

Cambridge Local Plan (2006): 4/11 4/12 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.