

Application Number	13/0646/FUL	Agenda Item	
Date Received	28th May 2013	Officer	Mrs Angela Briggs
Target Date	27th November 2013		
Ward	Trumpington		
Site	Gonville Hotel And Gresham House Gonville Place Cambridge CB1 1LY		
Proposal	Demolition of Gresham House, and refurbishment and extension of Gonville Hotel to provide an additional 43 bedrooms and new spa/treatment rooms, with internal and external remodelling of the existing hotel to create a new dining area and hotel entrance, and associated external works and landscaping		
Applicant	Mr c/o Agent		

<p>SUMMARY</p>	<p>The development does not accord with the Development Plan for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The proposal fails to enhance or preserve the character and appearance of the Conservation Area, and the setting of the Listed Buildings; 2. The proposal would have a detrimental impact on the amenities of the neighbouring properties; 3. Adverse impact on air quality of the area due to additional car/taxi trips to and from the Hotel; 4. Necessary mitigation measures have not been secured via s106 agreement; 5. Loss of two residential units from
----------------	---

	within Gresham House.
RECOMMENDATION	REFUSAL

1.0 SITE DESCRIPTION/AREA CONTEXT

- 1.1 The application site is located on the southern side of Gonville Place. It is directly opposite Parkers' Piece, which is a substantial area of protected open space. The Gonville Hotel has views across Parkers' Piece. Gresham House form part of the north eastern boundary of the site. There are residential buildings on the opposite side of Gresham Road. Gresham Court (the former Owen Webb House) is a Grade II Listed Building. The properties on Drosier Road form the south eastern boundary of the site. There are residential properties adjacent to the south western boundary of the site on Gonville Place which are two to three storey Victorian terrace housing. The Gonville Hotel is a three storey building which was originally built as a house. The wings either side were constructed in the late 1970s and forms the main part of the hotel. There have been various additions to the rear of the hotel. The area to the front of the hotel is used for hotel residents' parking. There is limited cycle parking provision currently on-site. The main access to the Hotel is from Gonville Place, however there is a secondary access to the rear from Drosier Road, which is seldom used and remains locked, unless it is required. All service vehicles arrive and leave the hotel via the main entrance from Gonville Place.
- 1.2 The wider area comprises a typical mix of City Centre uses. To the north east of the site, along Gonville Place, is the Queen Anne Multi-storey car park, Cambridge Medical Centre, and the Kelsey Kerridge Sports Centre. To the south east, along Gresham Road, are residential properties, mainly of Victorian architecture, and Hughes Hall and Cambridge University Cricket Club (Fenners), which is a flat roof apartment block of three storeys. To the south west, along Hills Road, are a mix of commercial and office buildings, including the premises at 1 Hills Road currently occupied by Cambridge Assessment. To the north west, along Regent Street are a mix of commercial uses.
- 1.3 The application site falls within the Central Conservation Area and as such the New Town and Glisson Road Area

Conservation Appraisal is relevant. The site also bounds the Cambridge Historic Core Conservation Area and therefore this appraisal is also relevant. The Roman Catholic Church on the junction of Lensfield Road and Hills Road is a Grade II listed Building, and is a dominant feature of this part of the Conservation Area. Other Listed buildings within the vicinity include Gresham Court (Owen Webb House) and 3 and 3a Gresham Road, all of which are Grade II Listed. There are no buildings designated as Buildings of Interest adjacent to or within close proximity of the application site. However, the original Gonville Hotel building (former Georgian house) is locally listed as a Building of Local Interest.

- 1.4 Another significant feature of the site and its surroundings are the trees, on the northern boundary of Gresham House. This consists of a dense and mature group of trees and other vegetation which screens Gresham House from views from Parkers' Piece. There are also trees along the boundary with Gresham Road, some of which are over-grown Leylandii. Most of these trees are covered by a Tree Preservation Order. Those which are not protected by an Order are protected by virtue of their location in the Conservation Area. There is a large London Plane Tree to the front of the Gonville Hotel, which is a significant and dominant tree in the Gonville Place/Parkers' Piece street scape. This is also covered by a Tree Preservation Order.
- 1.5 The site falls outside the Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) and within the Air Quality Management Area (AQMA).

2.0 THE PROPOSAL

- 2.1 The application seeks planning permission for the demolition of Gresham House, and refurbishment and extension of Gonville Hotel to provide an additional 43 rooms and new spa/treatment rooms, with internal and external remodelling of the existing hotel to create a new dining area and hotel entrance, and associated external works and landscaping. The total number of bedrooms that would be provided is 127 (existing + proposed).

2.2 The proposal is essentially two-fold:

1) Extension and remodelling of the existing hotel. This would involve creation of a new internal reception area, new bar and lounge area and extension to the front elevation, enlarging the existing restaurant area by an additional 40 covers, and a new entrance porch.

2) Demolition of Gresham House and re-development of the site to create 43 new bedrooms and a day spa/treatment rooms.

2.3 As part of the remodelling of the existing hotel, some site layout improvements are proposed which include the following:

- Relocation of car parking bays – total of 37 car parking spaces;
- New designated cycle parking area – total of 52 cycle parking spaces;
- Relocation of existing site facilities workshop/office;
- New bin store;
- External lighting;
- Public Art;
- Landscaping works.

2.4 The application is accompanied by the following supporting information:

1. Planning Statement;
2. Design & Access Statement;
3. Sustainable Development Checklist;
4. Statement of Community Involvement;
5. Heritage Statement;
6. Archaeological Desk Based Assessment;
7. Ecological Assessment;
8. Tree Survey and Arboricultural Impact Assessment;
9. Transport Assessment & Travel Plan;
10. Landscape Strategy Report;
11. Renewable Energy Report;
12. Mechanical & Electrical Statement (relating to noise);
13. Utilities Report;
14. Ventilation/Extraction Statement;
15. Water Efficiency Statement;
16. Desktop Contamination Report;
17. Surface Water Assessment;

- 18.Foul Sewerage Assessment;
- 19.Site Waste Management Plan;
- 20.Public Art Delivery Plan;
- 21.Noise Assessment;
- 22.Air Quality Report.

3.0 SITE HISTORY

- 3.1 This application is also accompanied by a Conservation Area Consent application for the demolition of Gresham House (Ref: 13/0647/CAC).

Gonville Hotel:

Reference	Description	Outcome
10/1318/FUL	Air conditioning condensers and extract plant on the roof with the addition of safety balustrade.	Approved
C/00/0319	Erection of single storey extension to glazed conservatory and three storey bedroom wing extension together with internal alterations.	Approved
C/01/1258	Alterations to front elevation of existing Gonville Hotel.	Approved
05/0136/FUL	Retention of air conditioning plant and erection of acoustic enclosure.	Approved

Gresham House, 2 Gresham Road:

Reference	Description	Outcome
C/03/0346	Change of use of ground floor to conference/meeting rooms and conversion to the first floor to 3No. flats and demolition of garage/ store.	Approved
C/71/0218	Alterations to form dwelling units and conservatory on ground floor, plus two flats on first floor	Approved

C/81/0875 Erection of boundary wall Approved

4.0 PUBLICITY

4.1	Advertisement:	Yes
	Adjoining Owners:	Yes
	Site Notice Displayed:	Yes
	Public Exhibition:	No
	DC Forum (meeting of 14 th August 2013):	Yes

The minutes of the DC Forum are attached to this report as Appendix 1. Details of the public exhibition are contained within section 12.0, page 38 of the Design & Access Statement.

The pre-application public exhibition was arranged by the applicants.

5.0 POLICY

5.1 See Appendix 1 for full details of Central Government Guidance, East of England Plan 2008 policies, Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003 policies, Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies, Supplementary Planning Documents and Material Considerations.

5.2 Relevant Development Plan policies

PLAN	POLICY NUMBER
Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Plan (Development Plan Documents) July 2011	CS16
Cambridge Local Plan 2006	3/1 3/4 3/7 3/11 3/12 3/14 4/4 4/7 4/8 4/10 4/11 4/12 4/13 4/14 4/15 5/3 5/4 6/3

	8/2 8/6 8/10 8/16
--	-------------------

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

Central Government Guidance	<p>National Planning Policy Framework March 2012</p> <p>Circular 11/95</p> <p>Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010</p>
Supplementary Planning Documents	<p>Sustainable Design and Construction</p> <p>Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Waste Partnership (RECAP) : Waste Management Design Guide</p> <p>Planning Obligation Strategy</p> <p>Public Art</p>
Material Considerations	<p><u>Central Government:</u></p> <p>Letter from Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government (27 May 2010)</p> <p>Written Ministerial Statement: Planning for Growth (23 March 2011)</p>
	<p><u>Citywide:</u></p> <p>Arboricultural Strategy</p> <p>Biodiversity Checklist</p> <p>Cambridge and Milton Surface Water Management Plan</p> <p>Cambridge Walking and Cycling Strategy</p> <p>Air Quality in Cambridge – Developers Guide</p>

	<p><u>Area Guidelines:</u></p> <p>Southern Corridor Area Transport Plan</p> <p>Buildings of Local Interest</p> <p>Conservation Area Appraisal:</p> <p>Cambridge Historic Core New Town and Glisson Road</p>
--	---

6.0 CONSULTATIONS

Cambridgeshire County Council (Engineering)

- 6.1 No objection, subject to the dimensions of the car parking spaces to be confirmed. This will be reported on the amendment sheet.

The requirement for SCATP payments is triggered by the proposal.

Head of Environmental Services

Environmental Quality:

Conditions requested relating to construction/demolition pollution to protect the interests of neighbouring amenities

Noise Assessment:

Report from Cass Allen considered dated 25th April 2013. Traffic noise will be adequately mitigated. Recommend noise insulation condition.

Plant noise has been assessed and is generally acceptable, however further tests and analysis are required to ensure that amenity of adjacent properties are protected. This can be secured by condition.

Hours of Use:

Delivery times and refuse collection times have been stated, which are considered to be acceptable and should be controlled by conditions. Spa opening hours are also stated as being 0700 – 2200hrs, which is considered to be reasonable. A condition to secure these times should be appended.

Odour:

Any odour produced on site likely to affect the local amenity including the kitchen extracts serving the proposed spa require assessment and suitable filtration. Recommend condition requiring further details of filtration/extraction.

Contaminated Land:

A Phase I Preliminary Contamination Assessment has been undertaken for the site and the potential of contamination of the site has been identified. As a result of this, the Environmental Health Team consider the site to be conditionable for contaminated land. If planning permission is granted it is recommended that the full contaminated land condition be attached.

Air Quality:

The intensification is predicted to double the number of car/taxi trips to and from the hotel, increasing annual average daily traffic flow by 2.7% (and up to 3.4% at peak hours)

The Assessment shows that there is an increase in predicted levels of Nitrogen Dioxide by up to 0.27 microgrammes per cubic metre and in predicted levels of Particulate Matter (PM10) by up 0.32 microgrammes per cubic metre at and around the site related to the intensification of use at the site. Predicated levels of air pollution at the Receptor Points at and adjacent to the site will remain, just, below the National Air Quality Objectives. The hotel buildings are set back from the road, so the Environmental Health team do not have concerns about the impact of poor air quality at the site.

However, any increase in air pollution within the AQMA is contrary to the Local Plan Policy 4/14, which states that development within or adjacent to an AQMA will only be

permitted if it would have no adverse effect upon air quality within the AQMA. Therefore, this application if permitted, would be contrary to the Local Plan.

Urban Design and Conservation Team

No objections to the extensions and alterations to the existing Gonville Hotel building, however object to the redevelopment of the Gresham House site for the following reasons:

Scale and Massing

The submitted Gresham Road Street Elevation (drawing 1193-P-GH-101) indicates the proposed new hotel accommodation and spa facilities are separated into three blocks. Blocks A and B are linked together at ground floor level, whilst Blocks B and C essentially form a single combined block, but are visually separated by the recessed glazing area to the corridor at 1st and 2nd floors.

The existing Gresham House addresses the street in a subtle way with its 15m wide gable end fronting the road. We consider that the proposed 4.5m break between blocks A and B is insufficient to effectively break down scale and bulk of the building, particularly from views looking northwest and southeast along Gresham Road. As a result Blocks A, B and C read more as one long (approximately 54.5m) block of development.

The pre-application scheme indicated the proposed building was setback approximately 6.5m from the existing boundary wall along Gresham Road (adjacent to the spa changing rooms). The submitted application now indicates the proposed spa accommodation within Block C projects forward at ground floor level and is, at its closest point, 2.5m from the site boundary. We are concerned that the combined length of the building and proximity to Gresham Road means the scheme is very dominant in the street scene. This will be very imposing on this side of Gresham Road which will affect the setting of nos. 3 and 3A Gresham Road, opposite, and the character of the New Town and Glisson Road Conservation Area. Nos. 3 and 3A Gresham Road are grade II listed and their setting arguably includes the street scape and Gresham House opposite. The impact of the proposals would be to harm the setting of these listed buildings.

The submitted floor plans indicate that the hotel bedrooms within blocks A and B project forward at ground and first floor levels and are setback adjacent to the ground floor link corridor. The 2nd floor is setback further to include four roof terrace areas. Whilst we support the proposed articulation of the Gresham Road elevation, we are concerned that the narrow 2m setback of the hotel rooms on the front face of the building at the second floor level does little to break down the scale and bulk of the proposed building.

Roofscape

The existing Gresham House forms a well-articulated building with a varied pitched roof form and chimneys that relate to other chimneys at No. 3 and 4 Gresham Road. The proposed three storey new hotel accommodation building rises to 10m and includes a flat roof, the 10.6m high glazed stair core (between Blocks B and C) does little to articulate any interest in the proposed roof line. As a result the building appears bulky and is a stark contrast to neighbouring properties.

Landscaping

The landscape strategy report (page 2) indicates 11 trees are identified for removal on arboricultural grounds and a further 16 trees and one tree group removed to accommodate the new development.

Three new trees are proposed along the Gresham Road frontage. We remain to be convinced that these trees will provide the necessary screening of the proposal. The long elevation of the proposed new building will remain highly visible.

Overlooking

The submitted 1st and 2nd floor plans indicate southwest facing bedrooms within Block A. Section A-A as included in application drawing 1193-P-G-105 indicates these rooms are approximately 5m from the rear garden boundary of No. 8 Drosier Road. As a result, it is likely these hotel rooms will potentially result in direct overlooking of this rear garden, with a resulting negative and overbearing impact on the amenity of the occupants at the property, though this will be subject to confirmation of any potential screening by any retained trees/vegetation.

We also consider that there will be an impact on the outlook of No.4 Gresham Road. The proposed three storey building will present a largely blank, imposing south facing elevation to the occupants of that property, at best without windows to the detriment of the occupant's amenity.

Materials and elevations

Submitted elevations indicate the proposed new building will largely comprise of buff coloured facing brickwork, standing seam metal cladding (mainly used for the third floor) and aluminium window frames with timber infill panels. The single storey area accommodating the spa uses comprises primarily of stone cladding.

We are concerned that the proposed northeast elevation of Block C, fronting Gresham Road appears overly dominant due to the large expanse of brickwork on the 1st and 2nd floors. This Block will be highly visible due to the close proximity to the Gresham Road pedestrian entrance and the limited tree planting in this area.

The Gresham Road elevation presents a series of "cube" forms to the public. Some of these cube forms are projecting, some recessive, with roof terraces at second floor level. In our view Blocks A, B and C have little relation to the context of the immediately surrounding, established form on Gresham Road. At a detailed level, the choice of timber window panels and standing seam cladding, along with the bulky, cube-like form do not compliment the established residential characteristics of No.s 3a, 3, 4 and 6 Gresham Road and Owen Webb House.

Conclusion

Whilst the changes proposed to the ground floor of the existing hotel building are supported, the Urban Design and Conservation team remain concerned over the scale, bulk, and design of the proposed new hotel accommodation and consider it will have a detrimental impact on the character of Gresham Road. Furthermore, the Urban Design and Conservation team do not consider the demolition of Gresham House and its replacement meets the tests of relevant Cambridge Local Plan Policies 4/10 and 4/11 and the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) paragraph 138. As a result the Urban Design & Conservation Team do not support the applications.

ADDENDUM – received from the Urban Design and Conservation Team, 23rd August:

The Cambridge Historic Core Conservation Area Appraisal.

In the section on Gonville Place, this states in considering that certain redevelopment opportunities (Queen Anne car park and YMCA) are unlikely to become available, that:

“More likely is the conversion and possible extension of the buildings either side of Gresham Road. Any redevelopment of these buildings would need to respect the form and setting of the buildings, the landscaping and trees and the potential impacts on Parkers Piece.”

Thus the Appraisal recognised that Gresham House itself (not just the landscape and trees) is of sufficient significance to warrant retention via conversion/extension.

Taken with the New Town & Glisson Road Conservation Area Appraisal map indicating Gresham House to be a “Building important to the character” (of the conservation area), there is a clear assignment of value to the building and expectation (in documents that were subject to extensive public consultation and which have been formally adopted by the Council) of its retention.

This is in contrast to the current development proposals.

Planning Policy Officer

No objection to the principle of the hotel extension. Possible issues with regard to the loss of the two residential flats (policy 6/3) currently in use within the second floor of Gresham House (but not linked or affiliated to the hotel business).

Senior Sustainability Officer (Design and Construction)

No objection. In relation to the renewable/low carbon energy, the provision of a gas fired Combined Heat and Power (CHP) Unit is proposed which, given the year round thermal demand associated with a hotel and spa is supported and meets the requirements of Policy 8/16.

Head of Streets and Open Spaces (Tree Team)

No objection subject to a condition relating to tree protection during construction.

Head of Streets and Open Spaces (Landscape Team)

No objection to the remodelling, extensions and new layout to the existing Gonville Hotel part of the site. Object to the hotel extension and spa building. The visual impact of the spa building will negatively impact on the amenity of the Protected Open Space (Parkers' Piece) and Conservation Area, which is contrary to Policy 4/2. Secondly, the scale/length of the spa building will be too dominant on the street scape of Gresham Road and will be at odds with the adjacent villa character, which is contrary to Policy 3/7.

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

Cycle parking for guests and staff should be covered. There should be some visitor parking supplied next to the main entrance. The spa visitor parking is not very visible and would be better placed next to the main entrance path

Travel Plan:

All staff should be provided with a cycle map. Also should be available to guests.

Provision of information about cycle hire is welcome but could be further enhanced.

Head of Streets and Open Spaces (Sustainable Drainage Officer)

Object. The proposals are unclear in terms of the actual method of surface water disposal and only list possibilities. There is a large increase in impermeable area and there is no provision to ensure there is not an increase in flood risk which is not consistent with the NPPF. The proposals also do not take into account the Cambridge Strategic Flood Risk Assessment which requires a minimum of 20% reduction in surface water discharge from a previously developed site.

Natural England

Insufficient information on bats. Further work is required to assess the impact on bats, through disturbance to individuals, or from damage or destruction of a roost, in accordance with 'Bat Surveys – good practice guidelines'.

Anglian Water

The surface water strategy/flood risk assessment submitted with the application relevant to Anglian Water is unacceptable. A condition requiring more details about surface water drainage is therefore recommended.

Cambridgeshire Constabulary (Architectural Liaison Officer)

No objection subject to adequate CCTV equipment being installed, particularly along Gresham Road where natural surveillance is generally poor.

Cambridgeshire County Council (Archaeology)

No objection subject to condition requiring a brief for archaeological works.

Design and Conservation Panel (Meeting of 14th August 2013)

The Panel's comments are as follows:

- Gresham House. In the Panel's view, as the last remaining villa in the area not to be re-developed it could be argued that its very survival increases its value and can help to tell the story of how the area's architecture has evolved over time. The Panel were disappointed that alternative options to demolition did not seem to have been explored exhaustively and were not persuaded that Gresham House's retention and refurbishment, either as a whole or in part, had been examined as part of a thorough options appraisal of the development/redevelopment opportunities across the wider site.
- New hotel accommodation and Spa within the Gresham House site. The Panel found the proposed building mass and elevational treatment to be unconvincing. The relationship

between the single storey spa and the 3 storey hotel is rather awkward and fails to provide sufficient enhancement. Concern was also expressed as to the appropriateness of floor to ceiling windows at ground level within a hotel context and questioned the appropriateness of the materials palette in the Conservation Area -specifically the choice of composite panelling.

- The Gonville Hotel entrance. The Panel noted that the principal hotel building had been extended incrementally and incorporated a Georgian house as part of the main entrance. The Panel felt that an opportunity had been missed to reassert the Georgian features, such that the main entrance would be more distinctive and exude a timeless quality.
- Landscaping. The retention of an area of green space and the existing trees to the north west end of the Gresham House site and the existing boundary walls and tree screen along Gresham Road was welcomed. However, it was felt that the proposed re-modelling of the hotel's forecourt landscaping would benefit from further work so as to better project (along with the restored Georgian house entrance) a presence be-fitting of its prominent frontage within the Conservation Area and the aspirations of an enhanced star rating for the establishment. It was suggested that the tall trees screening along Gonville Place should be retained as part of the forecourt's enhancement.

Conclusion:

Although not listed at a national or local level, the Panel would support the view that Gresham House has importance in the context of the Conservation Area and that all options for its retention should be vigorously explored. Overall, the quality of the new development and refurbishments were regarded as not being of a sufficient quality to compensate for the demolition of Gresham House and the resulting harm to the wider setting.

VERDICT – RED (3), AMBER (1)

Disability Consultative Panel (Meeting of 2nd July 2013)

The Panel felt unable to provide detailed comments due to the absence of comprehensive Access statement. Vehicular access and parking were questioned. The doors of the accessible WC also need to open outwards.

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 the applications:

Objecting:

1A(x2), 'Figtrees' 3(x2), 3A	Gresham Road
1(x3), 3, 4(x2), 5, 6(x2) 7, 8(x2), 11(x4)	Gresham Place
26	St. Barnabas Road
11(x2)	Harvey Road
26	Herbert Street
8(x2), 19, 36, 40, 44(x2), 61, 62, 65(x2)	Glisson Road
15, 25, 27	Lyndewode Road
57, 72, 104	Mawson Road
7, 18	Tenison Avenue
47(x2), 116	Tenison Road
15(x2), 18, 22, 27	Fenners Lawn, Gresham Road
7(x2), 8	Drosier Road
42	Devonshire Road
12	Rectory Farm, Little Wilbraham
9	Park Terrace
61(x2)	Highsett, Hills Road
15	Gainsborough Close

Gonville and Caius College (owners of 'Cobwebs' 4 Gresham Road)	

Supporting:

- Cambridgeshire Chambers of Commerce.

7.2 The representations can be summarised as follows:

Objecting:

- The loss of Gresham House as a Local Heritage Asset;
- The impact of the proposal on the character and appearance of the Conservation Area;
- Poor Design: Scale, mass, bulk, out of character;
- The impact on the residential amenities of nearby residents, from potential over-looking and noise and disturbance from hotel residents and plant;
- Traffic implications – from cars potentially using Gresham Road as a 'drop-off' rather than using the main entrance via Gonville Place;
- Potential impact on cyclists and pedestrians who regularly use Gresham Road.

Supporting:

- There is a need for further high quality hotel accommodation in the centre of Cambridge, as identified by the City Council's April 2012 Hotel Future Study. The expansion of the hotel will encourage our visitors to stay in the City rather than seek accommodation elsewhere.

7.3 The Glisson Road/Tenison Road Residents Association have submitted a petition objecting to the proposal and requesting a Development Control Forum. The petition consists of 106 signatures and their grounds for calling a DCF are as follows:

"To discuss the possibility of modifying the scheme to retain the existing building and mitigating the impact on nearby residential property in terms of traffic noise and amenity"

7.4 A copy of an on-line petition with 541 local signatures has also been submitted objecting to the proposal. This accompanies the minutes of the DCF.

7.5 SUSTRANS have made a representation as follows:

- The Transport Assessment (TA) is inaccurate and based on unrealistic figures. The TA should be rewritten.

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

8.0 ASSESSMENT

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

1. Principle of development
2. Context of site, design and external spaces
3. Impact on the character of the Conservation Area and Listed Buildings
4. Impact on Trees
5. Public Art
6. Renewable energy and sustainability
7. Residential amenity
8. Air Quality
9. Highway safety
10. Car and cycle parking
11. Third party representations
12. Planning Obligation Strategy

Principle of Development

8.2 The proposal to expand existing hotel accommodation is generally supported by Policy 6/3 of the Local Plan 2006.

8.3 Gresham House currently incorporates two self-contained flats at first floor level of the building (both of which were occupied at the time of my site visit on 13th June 2013) and which are accessed independently from the Gonville Hotel, and via an external metal staircase from Gresham Road. Loss of Housing is covered under Policy 5/4 of the Local Plan and their loss as

part of a re-development or change of use will not be supported. The proposal is therefore contrary to the aims and objectives of this policy.

- 8.4 The Cambridge Hotel Futures Study 2012 was endorsed in June 2012 for use as an evidence base for the review of the Local Plan and as a material consideration in planning decisions. However the Hotel Study does not take precedent over the planning policies contained within the current Local Plan in determining planning applications and proposals must also be considered against all other planning material considerations.
- 8.5 The Study has identified a need for between 979 and 2013 new hotel bedrooms up to 2031. The Study also notes the limited number of 4 star and boutique style hotels within the City Centre and as such proposals to provide such accommodation would be supported by the Study.
- 8.6 The proposal, in my view, meets the first line of the Policy 6/3 in that it would be strengthening the range of short-stay accommodation in Cambridge, furthermore by assisting the viability of the rest of the Gonville Hotel, it would also be helping to maintain the range of short-stay accommodation in the City Centre.
- 8.7 The second part of Policy 6/3 seeks to ensure that where there is existing residential use on the site (as there is in Gresham House); this should be retained as permanent residential accommodation. Paragraph 6.10 of the supporting text adds some detail to this requirement. This paragraph states that there is an appropriate balance to be achieved between protecting residential properties and meeting the needs of visitors. The supporting text goes on to state that private residential accommodation to be occupied by the proprietor will be secured by planning conditions to ensure there is no loss of residential units. It is clear from the supporting text that this policy does not seek to re-provide residential units unconnected to the hotel use, but that re-provided residential accommodation is connected to the new/on-going hotel use. This would be more appropriate in small scale guest houses and Bed and Breakfasts, where on-site residential accommodation is required for the efficient running of the Guest House/B&B. In my view, it is unusual for hotels of this scale to provide an on-

site residential accommodation, particularly as the Hotel does not close during the night and is managed by staff who rotate around the clock. The proposal does not intend to re-provide the residential units, and as such would not strictly accord with this part of the policy. However, I do not believe that the policy aims to achieve this requirement in order to make the scheme wholly acceptable. Furthermore, I believe that there are clear economic benefits of providing additional high quality hotel accommodation in this location, which in my view would outweigh the need to insist that residential accommodation should be incorporated within the re-development.

- 8.9 In my opinion, the principle of the development is acceptable and in accordance with policy 6/3.

Context of site, design and external spaces

- 8.10 The Gonville Hotel has recently been upgraded from a 3 star hotel to a 4 star. The Hotel is subscribed to the Best Western brand. The upgrading has been achieved through the improvements made to the internal accommodation and commodities within the hotel building. However, in order to retain the 4 star rating, the hotel is required to invest further to bring forward more bedrooms (of no less than 100 in total) and a leisure type of facility (the spa).
- 8.11 There are two main elements to the proposal: The total demolition of Gresham House and construction of a new building comprising of a day spa and 43 additional hotel bedrooms; Remodeling of the ground floor of the existing hotel to include a small extension to create a new and improved dining room and entrance together with significant changes to the landscaping and layout of the existing hard standing area to the front of the hotel, and external façade of the building.
- 8.12 The site is within the Central Conservation Area and is appraised in the New Town and Glisson Road Conservation Area Appraisal.
- 8.13 The site is related to two distinct character areas; Gresham Road, and Gonville Place. These two areas are quite different in terms of the scale and bulk of the buildings. Gresham Road is characterised strongly by residential Victorian architecture in which there are large buildings fronting the road of mainly 3-4

storeys with gaps in between. The site is in close proximity to The Owen Webb building, and nos.3 and 3A Gresham Road, which are listed. The character is somewhat interrupted by the Fenners apartment block, which is a flat roof three storey building set back from the road. Gonville Place is characterised by larger scale buildings which bound the perimeter of Parkers' Piece, such as the Kelsey Kerridge Sports Centre, the Queen Anne multi-storey car park, Parkside Swimming Pool, and the YMCA building, all of relatively large proportions. There are the four remaining houses along Gonville Place (1-4a Gonville Place) that are of a similar scale and period to the dwellings along Gresham House. The setting of Gresham House is softened by the mature trees and vegetation that bounds with Gonville Place and along the boundary with Gresham Road. Gresham House cannot be seen from Parkers' Piece and its main presence is Gresham Road. The Gonville Hotel building, on the contrary, is part of the Gonville Place character. The original part of the hotel was formerly a dwelling and is 19th Century. The building has since been substantially extended either side of it and stands how we know it today. The Gonville Hotel is designated as a Building of Local Interest, but Gresham House is not.

Alterations and Landscaping:

- 8.14 Taking the first element of the proposal and the alterations to the existing Gonville Hotel, the scheme seeks to create a fully glazed single storey extension to the dining hall on the Gonville Place elevation. The extension is of a contemporary style and in my view, is a positive contribution and would help to activate the frontage of the hotel. I therefore consider this to be acceptable. The scheme also proposes to render the recessed parts of the flank elevation of the original 19th Century house. This seeks to break down the long Gonville Place elevation into three separate elements and frame the original Gonville House building. I consider this to be acceptable.
- 8.15 The existing front entrance porch is proposed to be removed and replaced with a new fully glazed porch with a lead roof. This element also seeks to improve the façade of the building and the use of traditional materials. I therefore consider this to be acceptable.

- 8.16 Lastly, the proposals for the existing hotel will result in a more appropriately landscaped frontage to Gonville Place which, in my view, will improve the appearance of the area by removing some of the parking to the front of the hotel and softening the elevation. It would also, in my opinion, create a better outlook for the people dining in the new extension and remove much of the 'hard' parking area which currently dominates the Gonville Place frontage.

Demolition of Gresham House and New Wing to Hotel:

- 8.17 Turning to the second element, and one which is more fundamental, in my view, is the demolition of Gresham House and the proposed three storey building, incorporating a day Spa, external hot tub, and some cycle parking. In terms of scale and massing, the submitted Gresham Road Street Elevation (drawing 1193-P-GH-101) indicates the proposed new hotel accommodation and spa facilities are separated into three blocks. Blocks A and B are linked together at ground floor level by a glazed building, whilst Blocks B and C essentially form a single combined block, but are visually separated by the recessed glazing area to the corridor at 1st and 2nd floors.
- 8.18 The existing Gresham House addresses the street in a subtle way with its 15m wide gable end facing the road (note that the building frontage does not front the road). In my view, the proposed 4.5m break between blocks A and B is insufficient to effectively break down the scale and bulk of the building, particularly from views looking northwest and southeast along Gresham Road. As a result, Blocks A, B and C read more as one long (approximately 54.5m) block of development.
- 8.19 The proposed spa accommodation within Block C projects forward at ground floor level and is, at its closest point, 2.5m from the site boundary. The combined length of the building together with this close proximity to Gresham Road, means that in my view, the scheme will be very dominant in the street scene. This will be very imposing on this side of Gresham Road which will affect the setting of nos. 3 and 3A Gresham Road, opposite, and the character of the Conservation Area adversely.
- 8.20 The submitted floor plans indicate that the hotel bedrooms within blocks A and B project forward at ground floor and first

floor levels and are set back adjacent to the ground floor link corridor. The 2nd floor is setback further to include four roof terrace areas. Whilst this setback is welcome, in design terms, to help articulate this elevation to Gresham Road, I am concerned that the narrow 2m setback of the hotel rooms on the front face of the building at the second floor level does little to break down the scale and bulk of the proposed building.

8.21 Therefore, I conclude that the scale and massing of the proposed building is unacceptable.

8.22 In terms of height, the existing Gresham House forms a well-articulated building with a varied pitch roof form and chimneys that relate to other chimneys at nos.3 and 4 Gresham Road, and rises to approximately 7.4m. The proposed three storey new hotel accommodation building rises to 10m and includes a flat roof, the 10.6m high glazed stair core (between Blocks B and C) does little to articulate any interest in the proposed roof line. As a result, in my view, the building will appear to be excessively high and bulky in stark contrast to neighbouring properties.

8.23 Gresham House is now accessed via the Gonville Hotel, although the two residential flats are accessed via a small gated entrance from Gresham Road. There is also another gated access further up Gresham Road, within the boundary wall of the site, and set back, which I understand is not used, however the gates remain in situ. Views of Gresham House can be seen from this access. It is proposed that the pedestrian entrance to the Spa facility would be from this existing access. Cyclists could also use this access. This entrance would be emphasised by the removal of some mature trees and planting along the boundary and therefore making the spa and hotel accommodation building even more dominant and prominent within the street scape, which in my view adds to the objection on design grounds.

8.24 In terms of materials, the proposed building will largely comprise buff coloured facing brick, standing seam metal cladding (mainly used for the third floor), and aluminum window frames with timber infill panels. The single storey area accommodating the spa comprises primarily stone cladding. I am concerned that the proposed northeast elevation of Block C, fronting Gresham Road will appear overly dominant due to the

expanse of brickwork on the first and second floors. This block will be highly visible due to the close proximity to the Gresham Road pedestrian entrance and the limited tree planting in this area

- 8.25 The Gresham Road elevation presents a series of 'cube' forms to the public. Some of these 'cube' forms are projecting, some are recessive, with roof terraces at second floor level. In my view, Blocks A, B and C have little relation to the context of the immediately surrounding, established form on Gresham Road. At a detailed level, the choice of timber window panels and standing seam cladding, along with bulky, cube-like form do not complement the established residential characteristics of nos. 3, 3A, 4, and 6 Gresham Road, and Owen Webb House.
- 8.26 In my opinion the proposal fails to comply with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 3/4, 3/7, 3/11, 3/12.

Impact on the Character and Appearance of the Conservation Area and Listed Buildings

- 8.27 The application is supported by a Heritage Statement. Officers in the Urban Design and Conservation Team have raised concerns about the analysis approach and disagrees with its conclusions.
- 8.28 The site is within the Central Conservation Area and is appraised in the New Town and Glisson Road Conservation Area Appraisal. The Gonville Hotel is a Building of Local Interest, which has been greatly extended, and there are three Listed Buildings in close proximity to Gresham House. The concern is that the proposed demolition of Gresham House and the new development will have a detrimental impact on the setting of the listed buildings and the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.
- 8.29 The proposed development is considered to have a detrimental impact on the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. I have explained how this would impact on design grounds. However, Policy 4/11 seeks development in Conservation Areas to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Conservation Area by faithfully reflecting its context or providing a successful contrast with it. I consider that the proposal fails to achieve this because the quality of the

replacement building relates poorly to the historic environment, and neither preserves or enhances its setting.

- 8.30 The elements relating to the development at the existing Gonville Hotel, are considered to be acceptable, and in my view would not harm the character and appearance of the Conservation Area, or the Building of Local Interest and as such complies with Policy 4/12 of the Local Plan.
- 8.31 The element relating to the demolition of Gresham House and the construction of a new building to provide 43 additional bedrooms and a day spa is considered to have a detrimental impact on the character and appearance of the Conservation Area, and harmful to the setting of the adjacent Listed Buildings.
- 8.32 I am not convinced that the proposal can be successfully integrated within the historic setting, in this form. I am of the view that the large proportions of the blocks and 'cube' like design significantly detracts from the Victorian character of Gresham Road. The proposal, in my view, fails to respect the scale and form of the existing historic buildings and neither enhances or preserves the character of the Conservation Area.
- 8.33 In my opinion the proposal fails to comply with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 4/10 and 4/11.

Impact on Trees

- 8.34 Policy 4/4 relates to trees, and requires that development which involves the felling, significant surgery or potential root damage to trees of amenity or other value will not be permitted unless there are demonstrable public benefits arising from the proposal. The proposed development would lead to the removal of 11 trees on Arboricultural grounds, and a further 16 trees and one tree group would be removed to accommodate the development. It is proposed to plant five new trees in strategic locations at the boundary of the site, to complement the existing screening and enhance the hotel entrance. A full Arboricultural report and plans has been submitted, detailing the removal of the trees, and the re-planting of new ones. The proposal seeks to retain the trees along the Gonville Place boundary which screen Gresham House from view from Parkers' Piece. The proposal also seeks to retain the large London Plane Tree to the front of the Gonville Hotel on Gonville

Place. Notwithstanding my concern about the dominance of the new hotel accommodation on Gresham Road because of the removal of some trees, the method for removal and re-planting, as described within the arboricultural report and plans is considered to be acceptable.

- 8.35 In my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan 2006, policy 4/4.

Public Art

- 8.36 The application includes a Public Art proposal. The requirement for a Public Art scheme is enshrined within the Public Art Supplementary Planning Document, which should either be provided on-site or secured through s106 as a financial contribution, amounting to 1% of construction costs. Further comments are awaited and will be reported on the Amendment Sheet or orally at the meeting.

Renewable energy and sustainability

- 8.37 The application is accompanied by a Renewable Energy Report. Policy 8/16 of the Local Plan relates to Renewable Energy, and requires major developments to provide at least 10% of the development's total predicted energy requirements on-site, from renewable energy sources. Photovoltaics were considered as an option but are not suitable because there is insufficient space on the roof to accommodate the number of photovoltaic panels required to meet the 10% renewable energy test. A Combined Heat and Power (CHP) system is proposed, and would be installed within the mechanical services plant room. The proposed method is considered to be acceptable, and is therefore supported.
- 8.38 In my opinion the applicants have suitably addressed the issue of sustainability and renewable energy and the proposal is in accordance with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policy 8/16 and the Sustainable Design and Construction SPD 2007.

Residential Amenity

Impact on amenity of neighbouring occupiers

- 8.39 The submitted first and second floor plans indicate southwest facing bedrooms within Block A. Section A-A as included in application drawing 1193-P-G-105 indicates these rooms are approximately 5m from the rear garden boundary of no.8 Drosier Road. As a result, it is likely these hotel rooms would result in direct overlooking of this rear garden. I also consider that this elevation is imposing with numerous windows facing in this direction and the building being in close proximity to the boundary. As such, this elevation would appear dominant and intrusive towards no.8 Drosier Road, which in my view, is unacceptable.
- 8.40 I also consider that there would be an impact on the outlook of no.4 Gresham Road ('Cobwebs'). The proposed three storey building would present a largely blank, imposing south facing elevation to the occupants of that property and its proximity to the boundary would appear unduly over-bearing at a height of approximately 10m.
- 8.41 In my opinion the proposal fails to respect the residential amenity of its neighbours and the constraints of the site and I consider that it does not comply with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 3/4 and 3/7.

Air Quality

- 8.42 The site lies within the Air Quality Management Area (AQMA), and therefore Policy 4/14 of the Local Plan is relevant. The Environmental Health team are concerned that the small increase in car/taxi traffic, as a result of the intensification of the use of the site, will have an adverse impact on air quality in the area. The Policy seeks to ensure that all developments within the AQMA do not have an adverse effect upon air quality. The submitted Air Quality Assessment suggests that the intensification is predicted to double the number of car and taxi trips to and from the Hotel. As a result of these predicted figures it is anticipated that an increase of Nitrogen Dioxide around the site will be increased. The assessment does not provide any mitigation measures to minimise this impact and as such the proposal is not supported and is contrary to policy 4/14.

Highway Safety

- 8.43 The Local Highways Authority raise no objection in terms of highway safety regarding the proposals.
- 8.44 In my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policy 8/2.

Car and Cycle Parking

Car Parking

- 8.45 The extension and refurbishment of the hotel will allow the existing car parking to be re-arranged on site and consolidated to the side and rear of the building. The site currently provides 59 car parking spaces, of which four are disabled spaces. The approach of rearranging the car parking would free up space for a better organized vehicle drop-off area at the hotel entrance, new landscaping in front of the proposed dining room extension, and a designated cycle parking area. The re-arrangement of the car parking would result in a reduction of 15 spaces, providing a total of 37 spaces. The car parking provision would fall below the car parking standards as set out in the Local Plan (requirement would be 85 spaces, based on a total of 127 hotel bedrooms). However I consider that there are other factors that suggests that this reduction in car parking provision could be supported. Firstly, I consider that the proposed re-configuration of the hotel forecourt helps to enhance the visual approach to the hotel and help to assimilate it with the greener surrounding context. The current impression is hard on the eye, with a vast amount of concrete dominating the frontage. This would be significantly reduced, in my view, by the removal of some car parking spaces here. Secondly, the hotel is located close to the City Centre and is easily accessible by walking, cycling and public transport. It would be possible for visitors to choose not to use a private car.

Cycle Parking

The hotel currently has an under provision of cycle spaces on-site (8 spaces). The proposal would include the provision of 52 cycle spaces. The cycle parking provision is intended to be used by staff, day spa/treatment visitors and the restaurant,

rather than hotel residents, exclusively. Eight cycle spaces have been designated for spa users and are located at the spa entrance, off Gresham Road. The remaining cycle spaces are located on the Gonville Hotel site and are intended to be used by all hotel users, including staff. It is unlikely that overnight guests will cycle to the hotel. This provision is over and above the requirement as set out in Local Plan policy 8/6. Included within this provision is an opportunity for guests to hire bikes whilst in Cambridge, which can be offered on-site and has been included within the Hotel's Travel Plan.

The location of the proposed cycle parking has been raised by the Cycling and Walking Officer in her response. There are two areas of cycle parking on the site; A small area of eight spaces close to the Spa entrance, and the remaining 42 are situated to the northeast end of the site behind a gated access. Whilst I agree that it would be a benefit to place some cycle parking next to the main entrance to the hotel, I consider that this would alter the uncluttered visual appearance and approach to the hotel. The locations and level of provision of the cycle parking in my view is acceptable.

8.46 In my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 8/6 and 8/10.

Third Party Representations

8.47 I have covered the first four points of concerns raised by third parties. The concern raised about the proposed Spa entrance being used as a regular 'drop off' by vehicles and impact on cyclists and pedestrians are noted. The Local Highway Authority have not indicated this to be a significant concern from a public highway safety point of view. I understand that the end of Gresham Road is heavily used by mainly cyclists and pedestrians as they approach the traffic lights on Gonville Place, and I have seen evidence from the DCF that cars often use this area as a turning area. The Highways Authority have not suggested that these actions would be exacerbated by the development of the Gresham House site. As such, I conclude that I cannot recommend refusal of the proposal on the basis of highway safety.

Planning Obligations

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

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

(b) directly related to the development; and

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

In bringing forward my recommendations in relation to the Planning Obligation for this development I have considered these requirements. The Planning Obligation Strategy (2010) provides a framework for expenditure of financial contributions collected through planning obligations. The Public Art Supplementary Planning Document 2010 addresses requirements in relation to public art. The applicants have indicated their willingness to enter into a S106 planning obligation in accordance with the requirements of the Strategy and relevant Supplementary Planning Documents. The proposed development triggers the requirement for the following community infrastructure:

Transport

8.49 Contributions towards catering for additional trips generated by proposed development are sought where 50 or more (all mode) trips on a daily basis are likely to be generated. The site lies within the South Corridor Area Transport Plan where the contribution sought per trip is £369. Further information regarding this issue will be reported on the Amendment Sheet.

8.50 In the absence of a S106 planning obligation to secure this infrastructure provision, the proposal is contrary to Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan (2003) policies P6/1, P9/8 and P9/9, Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 8/3 and 10/1 and the Planning Obligation Strategy 2010.

Public Art

- 8.51 The development is required to make provision for public art. The submitted Public Art Delivery Plan does not give sufficient details of how the public art will be incorporated within the proposal. Further information about Public Art provision will be reported on the Amendment sheet.

Monitoring

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

Planning Obligations Conclusion

- 8.53 It is my view that the planning obligation is necessary, directly related to the development and fairly and reasonably in scale and kind to the development and therefore the Planning Obligation passes the tests set by the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010.

9.0 CONCLUSION

- 9.1 In conclusion the proposed development is considered to have and unacceptable impact on the character and appearance of the Conservation Area, and to the setting of the nearby Listed Buildings. The proposal would also have a significant impact on the amenity of neighbouring properties. The proposed development also fails to adequately address the issue of air quality within the Air Quality Management Area. Therefore refusal is recommended.

10.0 RECOMMENDATION

1. REFUSE for the following reasons:

1. The proposal to extend the Gonville Hotel creating an additional 43 bedrooms and a Day Spa/Treatment facility would have a detrimental impact on the character of Gresham Road. The proposed extension would replace Gresham House, a large detached two storey Victoriana Villa, located at the end of Gresham Road and nestled within a mature landscaped and "Sylvian" setting, sitting gable end to the road. The proposed contemporary design of the building would not respect the historic scale, grain or rhythm of buildings particularly along Gresham Road. The proposed extension would be three storeys in height, and its design form is 'cube like', comprising of three main elements. By virtue of the scale, bulk and massing of the building and its poor relationship with the historic environment, these 'cube like' elements would detract from the prevailing Victoriana street scape that is Gresham Road. As such the proposal fails to enhance or preserve the character of the Central Conservation Area, and would significantly affect the setting of the nearby Listed Buildings, 3 and 3A Gresham Road, and Owen Webb House. The proposal would therefore be contrary to policies 3/4, 3/7, 3/11, 3/12, 4/10, 4/11, and 4/12 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006.
2. The proposed development by virtue of its height, scale, mass and proximity to the boundary with no.8 Drosier Road, would have an adverse effect on their private amenity space, which would be 5m away. This impact would be exacerbated by the removal of natural vegetation and trees which would be necessary to facilitate the development. In doing so, the development would create an unacceptable sense of enclosure and erode the space between the buildings and their boundaries that is characteristic of the area. As such the proposal fails to respect the reasonable residential amenities of neighbouring properties, contrary to the aims and objectives of policies 3/7, 3/11, 3/12 and 3/14 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006.
3. In the absence of information to demonstrate that the use of the development from additional car/taxi movements will not have an adverse impact on air quality in the area which suffers from poor air quality and is designated an Air Quality Management Area, the development is contrary to Policy 4/14 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006.

4. The proposed development does not make appropriate provision for transport mitigation measures, public art and monitoring in accordance with Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/7, 3/8, 3/12, 8/3 and as detailed in the Planning Obligation Strategy 2010, the Public Art Supplementary Planning Document 2010 and the Southern Corridor Area Transport Plan 2002.

Determined under delegated powers by:

Designation - Development Control Manager

Date:

Declaration of Interest for case officer

Does the case officer have any interest (whether financial or not) in the application or application site or any personal or business connection with the applicant(s)?

9 Yes

10 No

If yes, please confirm that full details of any interest or connection have been provided to the [Head of Planning] [Director of Environment]

Signed

Declaration of Interest for officer with delegated powers

Does the officer with delegated powers have any interest (whether financial or not) in the application or application site or any personal or business connection with the applicant(s)?

11 Yes

12 No

If yes, please confirm that full details of any interest or connection have been provided to the [Head of Planning] [Director of Environment]

Signed