

<b>Application Number</b>	14/0159/FUL	<b>Agenda Item</b>	
<b>Date Received</b>	12th February 2014	<b>Officer</b>	Mr Toby Williams
<b>Target Date</b>	14th May 2014		
<b>Ward</b>	Trumpington		
<b>Site</b>	Anstey Hall Farm Barns Grantchester Road Trumpington Cambridge Cambridgeshire CB2 9LH		
<b>Proposal</b>	Demolition of modern barn and outbuildings and removal of temporary structures to allow conversion of barns, cart sheds and stables to eight residential units and erection of four dwellings, the creation of a spur access drive from Anstey Hall Drive and associated works.		
<b>Applicant</b>	Hill Residential Ltd & Trumpington Investments Ltd		

SUMMARY	<p>The development accords with the Development Plan for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-The works to the listed and curtilage listed buildings would preserve their special interest.</li> <li>-The character and appearance of Trumpington Conservation and Area would be enhanced and the views and setting of buildings, including the listed buildings Church of St Mary and St Michael and Anstey Hall within it, would be preserved.</li> <li>-The highway safety and transport implications of the proposal are acceptable</li> </ul>
RECOMMENDATION	APPROVAL

**1.0 SITE DESCRIPTION/AREA CONTEXT**

1.1 The site is Anstey Hall Farm barns, a collection of former

agricultural buildings sited on the edge of Trumpington Village to the west of Anstey Hall and to the south of Anstey Farmhouse. The buildings on the application site are in use for domestic storage in association with the occupation of Anstey Hall. The storage includes cars, furniture and household items. The buildings are in various states of disrepair.

- 1.2 The buildings fall within Trumpington Conservation Area and form the western edge to the village. The tallest building is a former threshing barn of timber structure, weather-boarded on its sides with a pantile roof (formerly thatched). The barn is highly visible from Grantchester Road. It is referred to throughout this report as Barn 1. It is listed Grade II and has a strikingly bold form and high ridge line. To the south of Barn 1 is a range of lower cart shed buildings of timber construction including a dovecote which is listed Grade II. Other buildings on the site are curtilage listed, mainly brick and form a series of enclosed yards apart from the southernmost barn, which is of modern construction and is divorced from the main group. The setting is rural, highly sensitive to change and represents one of the few remaining undeveloped former agricultural sites in Cambridge of heritage merit.
- 1.3 Anstey Hall Farmhouse to the north is grade II listed. The Farmhouse and its access are in residential use, are physically separated from the site and in different ownership. To the east, is the Church of St Mary and St Michael, a grade I listed building of high significance dating from the 14<sup>th</sup> century. The Church is surrounded by a grade II listed wall. The grounds and cemetery of the Church which adjoin the site are designated as Protected Open Space. To the east of the Church is the former Vicarage no.1 Grantchester Road, a grade II listed brick building in substantial grounds. To the east and south is Anstey Hall, a grade I listed building dating from the 18<sup>th</sup> century surrounded in part by a listed grade II garden wall and to the front by a grade II listed gateway not currently in use.
- 1.4 The site has a tree preservation order protecting a tree adjacent to the boundary with Anstey Hall Farm to the north, it falls outside the controlled parking zone and is entirely within the Green Belt and is also Protected Open Space and in an area of Best Landscape. The southern boundary of the site adjoins a tree belt which abuts the Trumpington Meadows housing development site, currently under construction. Across

Grantchester Road to the north is a tree belt identified in the Local Plan of Local Nature Conservation Importance.

- 1.5 The site and its buildings can be appreciated in particular in views from the west with the Farmhouse and Church in view, from the south from the Trumpington Meadows site with the Church and Vicarage in view and from the Church itself. The on-set of Trumpington Meadows radically alters the setting of the site from the south, which is to be occupied by housing and a large linear country park running from the M11 in the south to the southern boundary of the site and which incorporates an area of allotments in close proximity to the western edge of the site.

## **2.0 THE PROPOSAL**

- 2.1 Permission is sought for the following:

- Demolition of a modern barn and outbuildings and removal of temporary structures
- The conversion of barns, cart sheds and stables to eight residential units (referred to as units 1-8) including extensions and alterations.
- The erection of four new dwellings (referred to as units 9-12)
- The creation of a spur access drive from Anstey Hall drive and associated works.

- 2.2 The retained converted farm buildings and the new buildings are arranged around a series of open courtyard spaces. Each residential unit would have its own separate private garden space. The spur access would run through a wooded area to the east and south of the Vicarage and the Church.

- 2.3 The application is accompanied by an associated application for listed building consent ref 14/0160/LBC reported separately to this Committee.

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

1. Design and Access Statement
2. Planning Statement
3. Heritage Statement

4. Sustainability Statement and Checklist
5. Site Investigation Report
6. Ecology Report
7. Tree Survey
8. Archaeological Assessment
9. Transport Statement
10. Foul Drainage Report
11. Structural Engineer's Report.

2.5 Amended plans and additional reports have been received which show the following revisions

1. Revised site layout plan
2. Barn 1, revised plans, elevations and sections
3. Barn 5, revised plans and elevations
4. Barn 7, revised plans and elevations
5. New build units: revised plans, elevations and site sections
6. Landscape, drainage and photovoltaic plans
7. Repair schedules for Barns 1 and 7
8. Traffic Survey Note
9. Highways Response to Objection
10. Reptile, Barn Owl and Badger Reports
11. Newt and Bat Survey Note Letter and further bat information

2.6 The amended plans have been re-consulted upon and the responses to the amendments are reported accordingly.

### 3.0 SITE HISTORY

C/64/0157	Replacement of thatch with natural pantiles for roofs of two barns.	A/C
C/71/0539	Construction of new access to Institute from Grantchester Road	A/C
C/89/0995	COU of farm buildings to leisure use	Withdrawn
C/89/0418	COU of farm buildings to workshops and offices	Withdrawn
C/91/0174 C/91/0175	CONVERSION OF FARM BUILDINGS TO RESIDENTIAL USE (22	Ref

	SHORT TERM LETS)(AMENDED BY DRAWINGS and LETTER DATED 8TH APRIL 1991).	
C/91/0954	COU of farm buildings to residential use (22 short term holiday lets) building 2 to office, barn (buildings 3 and 5) to games/ wet weather space	A/C
C/91/0955	Repairs, alterations and extensions; rebuilding of barn 1 and demolition of buildings 12, 16, 19, 20 and extension of building 5	A/C
C/94/0301	New doors and cladding to two barns	A/C
C/94/0188 C/94/0189	NEW VEHICLE ACCESS AND PARKING FOR EXISTING HOUSE (C3) WITH NEW ACCESS ROAD RUNNING ALONG WESTERN BOUNDARY OF ST. MICHAELS PARTIAL DEMOLITION OF BOUNDARY WALL TO CREATE A NEW VEHICLE ACCESS.	Ref
C/94/0714/FUL	REFURBISHMENT OF EXISTING BUILDING AND CHANGE OF USE FROM AGRICULTURE (SUI GENERIS AGRICULTURE) TO STORAGE (B8).	Refused
C/04/0987 C/04/0988	Rebuilding of existing barn, construction of entrance hall and "other" external alterations.	A/C
C/04/0499	Rebuilding of barn including construction of glazed link building and entrance hall.	Red

C/04/0526	Rebuilding of Grade II Listed Building including erection of new link building and entrance hall.	Ref
06/0140/FUL 06/0141/LBC	Erection of conservatory to rear of dwellinghouse.	A/C
C/07/1092/LBC C/07/1094/FUL	Forming an opening 6 metres wide with two new brick piers in wall on west boundary of Anstey Hall. (This connects the track from Anstey Hall to the farm buildings and has been implemented)	A/C
10/0181/LBC 10/0180/FUL	Listed building consent to extend a vehicular driveway and new opening in boundary wall.	Refused Appeal dismissed
14/0875/CLUED	Application for a certificate of lawfulness under Section 191 for use of barn for domestic storage in association with Anstey Hall.	A/C

3.1 Although permitted, the 1991 application (C/91/0954) for holiday lets was not implemented.

3.2 The application for a new opening in the Anstey Hall listed wall under application 10/0181/LBC which was refused and dismissed at appeal is relevant. The appeal decision is attached to appendix 1 and its significance is discussed at paragraphs 8.31 - 8.35.

#### 4.0 **PUBLICITY**

4.1 Advertisement: Yes  
 Adjoining Owners: Yes  
 Site Notice Displayed: Yes

#### 5.0 **POLICY**

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

## 5.2 Relevant Development Plan policies

PLAN		POLICY NUMBER
Cambridge Plan 2006	Local	<p>3/1 3/2 3/3 3/4 3/7 3/8 3/10 3/11 3/12 3/14</p> <p>4/1 4/2 4/3 4/4 4/6 4/7 4/8 4/10 4/11 4/13 4/15</p> <p>5/1 5/2 5/5 5/10</p> <p>8/2 8/3 8/4 8/6 8/10, 8/16</p> <p>9/5</p> <p>10/1</p> <p>I have not quoted all policies relevant to the Southern Fringe Development of Trumpington Meadows to the south as they are not of direct relevance.</p>

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

Central Government Guidance	<p>National Planning Policy Framework March 2012</p> <p>National Planning Policy Framework – Planning Practice Guidance March 2014</p> <p>Circular 11/95</p>
Supplementary Planning Guidance	<p>Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Waste Partnership (RECAP): Waste Management Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (February 2012)</p> <p>Planning Obligation Strategy (March 2010)</p>

	<p>Public Art (January 2010)</p> <p>Sustainable Design and Construction (2007)</p>
Material Considerations	<p><u>City Wide Guidance</u></p> <p>Biodiversity Checklist for Land Use Planners in Cambridgeshire and Peterborough (March 2001).</p> <p>Cambridge Landscape and Character Assessment (2003)</p> <p>Cambridge City Nature Conservation Strategy (2006)</p> <p>Cambridge City Council (2011) - Open Space and Recreation Strategy</p> <p>Balanced and Mixed Communities – A Good Practice Guide (2006)</p> <p>Cycle Parking Guide for New Residential Developments (2010)</p>
	<p><u>Area Guidelines</u></p> <p>Cambridge City Council (2002)–Southern Corridor Area Transport Plan</p> <p>Trumpington Conservation Area Appraisal (2010)</p>

#### 5.4 Status of Proposed Submission – Cambridge Local Plan

Planning applications should be determined in accordance with policies in the adopted Development Plan and advice set out in the NPPF. However, after consideration of adopted plans and



the NPPF, policies in emerging plans can also be given some weight when determining applications. For Cambridge, therefore, the emerging revised Local Plan as published for consultation on 19 July 2013 can be taken into account, especially those policies where there are no or limited objections to it. However it is likely, in the vast majority of instances, that the adopted development plan and the NPPF will have considerably more weight than emerging policies in the revised Local Plan.

For the application considered in this report, there are no policies in the emerging Local Plan are of relevance. The area of land immediately to the west of the proposed retained barns and within the site is designated specifically as protected open space in the submission plan.

## **6.0 CONSULTATIONS**

### **Cambridgeshire County Council (Highways Development Management)**

#### *6.1 Application as Submitted*

Objection: The existing vehicular access onto the public highway is too narrow to allow two vehicles to pass. This may result in vehicles stopping on the public highway to the detriment of highway safety and its efficient operation. It is recommended that:

- the existing access is widened to a minimum of 4.5m.
- the access way is built to adoptable standards.
- SCATP payments relating to 102 trips x £369 = £37,638.00 are secured through a S106

#### *Application as Amended*

The documents address issues raised by local residents and the operator of a local business (the nursery). The proposals will have minimal impact upon the local highway network. The document does not address the issue raised by the Highway Authority, which is the width of the access gates. A condition to require the widening of the gates to 4.5m would overcome the objection.

## **Head of Refuse and Environment**

- 6.2 No objection: The following conditions are recommended: standard construction hours, delivery hours, demolition and construction noise, airborne dust, contaminated land and refuse tracking (see proposed conditions 3-7) which ensure compliance with policy 4/13.

## **Head of Streets and Open Spaces (Landscape Team and Arboricultural Officers)**

- 6.3 No objection: Proposed trees along the Grantchester Road side should be planted in informal groupings. The separate entrance to Unit 3 should be removed. The proposed driveway is supported subject to confirmation from the City Council Arboricultural Officer. Provided the above recommendations are addressed there will be no negative visual impact on the Green Belt.

Conditions are recommended regarding hard and soft landscape details, the construction of the driveway underneath the canopy of the trees, tree protection measures and an Arboricultural method statement.

### *Arboricultural Officer*

There is limited information to assess the impact fully. They concur that the principle of the access is acceptable and some tree losses to accommodate this is also acceptable. Without an Implications Assessment that shows the layout and the tree constraints on the same plan, it is not possible to assess the full impact.

The main part of the development will have no material impact on the better quality trees and with the proposed tree planting will have no impact on the overall contribution of the site's trees to the character of the area in the long term. If minded to recommend approval, the drive issue is insufficient justification alone for refusal, however, it is recommended a condition for tree protection as standard but also the preparation of a management plan for the woodland to mitigate the detrimental impact of the road installation. If minded to recommend refusal for other reasons, the lack of an implications assessment that

clearly shows the road layout in relation to the current tree stock and their RPAs would help justify the refusal.

## **Urban Design and Conservation team**

### 6.4 *Application as Submitted*

#### Summary

Not supported. It is not currently possible to conclude that the scheme is consistent with the character or appearance of the conservation area and the setting of the listed buildings.

---

The application has been the subject of extensive informal discussion and site visits with the applicants and agents.

#### Existing:

A very prominent site on the edge of Trumpington and its Conservation Area (CA); adjoining the grade I listed Church of St Mary & St Michael; the listed Vicarage; and connected to grade I listed Anstey Hall.

The site is important also for being the first bit of the settlement seen when approaching from the Grantchester direction, one of the few areas where real 'countryside' and farmland abut an historic village all but subsumed into the city and amongst the few farm buildings left within the city area.

The site also adjoins the former farmhouse (listed) and immediately adjacent buildings together along with the historic access onto Grantchester Road, now divided from and in different ownership to the rump of the farmyard.

Contains the Listed main barn and dovecote and unlisted but interesting older outbuildings nearby. Also, a mid-C20 'barn' of no architectural interest. There is also a mixture of older and more modern boundaries within the site and much *in situ* concrete paving, overgrown areas and some decent trees.

The roofscape, in particular, is an extremely important feature, with the massive pitched tiled barn roof and the unusual half-hipped dovecote roof being very noticeable.

## Proposed:

### Introduction

The site and the LBs, in particular, have been of concern for some years, having no obvious agricultural use, awkward access [the historic one having been sold off] and little repair & maintenance being carried out. The recent expansion of the village has brought new development close to the site but it remains visibly traditional in type & layout and a strong contrast to the suburban nature of much of the village. Clearly there are issues in terms of what sort of use is appropriate for the site and buildings and, from a conservation point of view, clearly some uses cause less need for alteration than others. However, getting a viable use that will provide the repairs and render the buildings watertight is vital for the buildings and an important concern. In particular, the need to bring the buildings – whether LBs or not – up to a habitable standard if residential use is chosen (as in this case) can be difficult to do in an acceptable manner.

### Newbuild

With the exception of rebuilding of barn 7, the new units would be outside of the historical “envelope” of the farmyard. They would also not be consistent with the courtyard layout - eg the new elements of Units 5,6 & 8 would be attached additions outside the farmyards and units 9 – 12 fully detached from the farmyards. They are not therefore consistent with the established layout.

Units 9 – 12 would be major additions to the existing group in terms of height and building size. There is an existing hierarchy of size and “status” on and around the site from hall and church to vicarage and farmhouse to main barn and down to the smaller ancillary buildings of which most of the courtyards comprise. However, Units 9 – 12 would not fit into this aspect of the character of the setting. They are tall, large and of demonstrative design.

There may be precedent on the site for a rebuilt substantial barn 7, but large buildings outside the farmyard envelope would be out of character with the nature of the group and setting.

The effect of the new-build units on the roofscape of the group is not illustrated in the submitted material but their proximity to existing buildings and scale is in itself enough to indicate significant impact.

If the new-build units deemed to be justified the conservation questions are: Are they in the right location? Are the designs appropriate? In broad terms the layout seems to work in creating another “farmyard” enclosure and something of a formalising way into the whole complex where vehicles & pedestrians come to the centre and then peel off to the various dwellings.

The positioning is slightly awkward in that the gable end of Unit 11 [North elevation] is the first thing that visitors to the site would see after passing through the main opening in the wall. The juxtaposition of different but similar materials could look slightly muddled or overly complex. The roofs are tall and together with the size of the buildings mean the new build dwellings would compete with the Listed original farmhouse and main barn as the heart and *raison d’etre* of the whole historic complex. The facades look rather too ‘busy’ in terms of the ‘modern’ panelling systems criticised elsewhere on barn conversions but could be acceptable here. It would be worthwhile seeing real examples on other sites, if possible.

If new build (in say a tighter and scaled down form) was acceptable for the scheme as a whole, then this end of the site is probably the right location, however its scale, and relationship with the existing farmyard need reconsideration.

### Demolitions

The demolition of the ‘modern’, more industrial-type barn is acceptable. There are also piecemeal demolitions to create amenity space or to allow buildings to be linked, etc. and these will be discussed individually below. However, the Structural Engineer’s report notes that one building remnant Barn 7 / Units 7 & 8] is dangerous and unlikely to be sound enough to be ‘converted’ but could be dismantled and the historic elements salvaged and rebuilt but in a form suitable for habitation.

### Conversions

Detailed and extensive notes regarding the merits of the individual proposals for the conversions are provided. The comments highlight the need for further survey and repair schedules for barns 1 and 7 and amendments to some of the elevations of the barns to reduce the extent of glazing or amend its size or location. Raises questions regarding the type of vertical timber treatment and glazing for some of the units, the use of timber bollards and screens proposed for the subdivision of the yards and some of the linked extensions for units 6 and 8.

### Access and garden wall

This is an important boundary wall to the many LBs around it and is curtilage Listed. This is contentious as a similar application was refused not that long ago; an Appeal was unsuccessful. The changed circumstances are that there is now a real purpose to the driveway and to the opening in the wall. They provide the only realistic means of access to the barns [the Listed ones, in particular] and, hence, give the site a potential future where these LBs are more likely to be repaired & maintained in good order. The demolition of the minor outbuilding is unfortunate but getting an acceptable route through the trees rather inhibits choice. If the remaining outbuilding, the wall and such like can be repaired as part of the creation of the opening, then this is probably a tolerable loss, given the balancing gains elsewhere on the site.

### Conclusion:

There is qualified support for bringing the existing buildings into use but there is a lack of information, on important aspects as described above and the newbuild components are inconsistent with policy 4/10 and 4/11.

### *Application as Amended*

---

*These further comments relate to the proposals as amended by revised drawings and repairs schedules.*

These comments relate to the documents submitted as “Repair schedules – revised incorporating engineer’s comments” June 2014. In previous comments, we considered that the lack of

detailed information about the realistic possibility of converting the main barns on the site prevented full support.

The information now provided goes a long way to illustrating both more detailed inspection and discussion of the existing construction and condition of Barns 1 & 7 as well as more detailed explanation of how repairs and alterations are proposed to be undertaken.

The agents, Cowper Griffith, have fairly recently undertaken a large barn conversion project at Stowe [landscape gardens in Buckinghamshire] for the National Trust and this has been visited to see the finished result. Some of the techniques proposed here have been demonstrated there and some of the design details for the lesser outbuildings at Anstey Hall Farm are similar to those seen at Stowe.

### BARN 1

The revised report now provides more of the information required to make a detailed assessment of the Listed Building (LB). However, there remains the significant difficulty of the structural stability of the building. Therefore a LBC condition is required.

Similarly, at various places in the "*Barn 1 Repair schedule*" with respect to the roof are references e.g. "to engineers details" for various works. The details are not available at this stage and in order to ensure that they are compatible with the character of the listed building, these would need to be covered by a LBC condition.

A number of other, more minor issues are raised and a Method Statement to explain how the replacement is to take place without threatening the structural stability of the LB will be required.

### BARN 7

Similarly to Barn 1, the revised report for this barn improves the level of information available but with differences that reflect the current condition of the different barns. While being of considerable age Barn 7 has been much altered and some of its character degraded.

---

The report now assesses the many cracks and other structural failures and poor repairs / alterations and suggests methods of repair or removal and replacement for each. This now provides a sound basis for putting what is essentially a shell into a condition where it can be added to and converted into dwellings. It does not seek to address the question raised about whether splitting the building into two dwellings is the optimum way of treating it.

### Building Recording

With respect to barns 1 and 7 in particular require a building recording condition

### NEW BUILD HOUSES

---

We note the revised plans reduction in scale and number of the new build elements. The new build units having been reduced in scale are considered to now no longer challenge the scale of the main barn.

Previous comments on the new units being outside of the historical “envelope” of the farmyard remain a concern. Units 9 – 10 in particular seem hard to justify.

*If* new build is acceptable for the scheme as a whole, then at least this end of the site is probably the right location and creating another “farmyard” enclosure is appropriate.

Before any new build elements were occupied, works to the listed buildings should be completed.

### **Revised Conclusion:**

---

Support remains for the general intent of the scheme and the two main buildings have now been better surveyed and assessed from a repair point of view.

We note the revised plans reduction in scale and number of the new build elements. The new build units having been reduced in scale are considered to now no longer challenge the scale of the main barn. The justification for the amount of new-build remains unclear.



Some significant matters (e.g. the issue of the leaning/bowing in Barn 1) remain and as noted above, need to be resolved via Conditions.

---

### **Cambridge City Council Access Officer**

- 6.5 Barns 2 and 3 require wheelchair and flat threshold access from the principal entrance level.

### **English Heritage**

- 6.6 No objection to the principle of development. The proposals as formally submitted are contextually appropriate in this highly sensitive location within the Conservation Area. On balance, the conversion proposals would not cause substantial harm to the significance of the grade II listed barns and would bring them back into beneficial use. The overall scheme would not cause harm to the setting of several highly significant heritage assets including the grade I listed St Mary and St Michael Church and Anstey Hall or the character and appearance of the Trumpington Conservation Area. The proposals are in accordance with the NPPF.

### **Environment Agency**

- 6.7 No objection: Recommends conditions relating to ground contamination and surface water.

### **Cambridge City Council Public Art Officer**

- 6.8 No objection: A commuted sum is appropriate in this instance as there will be no public access to the site. The sum should be equivalent to 1% of the capital construction cost.

### **Cambridge City Council Sustainability Officer**

- 6.9 No objection: The application proposes that the new dwellings be constructed to code 4 of the Code for Sustainable Homes, that the listed buildings thermal performance is enhanced, that water efficiency measures are introduced and solar control glazing is implemented. This is all welcomed.

An indicative surface water drainage layout has been provided, which includes swales and permeable paving in the courtyards. The indicative scheme is acceptable and should be conditioned.

Photovoltaic panels are proposed for units 9-12 to meet the Council's 10% policy and the plans show this. The provision should be conditioned as part of any approval.

### **Cambridge City Council Nature Conservation Officer**

#### *6.10 Application as submitted*

Given the location, nature and condition of the buildings, protected species surveys are required for bats, barn owls and great crested newts. The application should not be determined until these surveys are undertaken particularly as there is a high chance that bats will be present on the site.

#### *Application as Amended*

I am satisfied with the ecological survey effort and recommendations relating to Badgers, Barn Owls and Reptiles.

The additional letter dated 15th July 2014 from Landscape Planning Ltd, regarding bats surveys to date, suggests that no maternity roost is present in any of the buildings proposed for demolition or renovation. However, additional late July and August surveys are still planned to comply with best practice for surveying such sites. I have spoken with the appointed ecologist to discuss whether automated surveying may be appropriate to fully establish how the buildings are being used for roosting and foraging. This approach has yet to be confirmed. Given the scale, structure and location of the buildings I would recommend automated surveys be deployed and no decision be made on the proposals until the remaining proposed surveys are complete.

## **Cambridgeshire Fire and Rescue**

- 6.11 Adequate provision should be made via condition for fire hydrants
- 6.12 The above responses are a summary of the comments that have been received. Full details of the consultation responses can be inspected on the application file.

### **7.0 REPRESENTATIONS**

- 7.1 The owners/occupiers of the following addresses have made representations:

- 1 Grantchester Road
- 3 Grantchester Road

- 7.2 The representations can be summarised as follows:

#### *Green Belt*

- The proposal is contrary to Green Belt policy.
- Other alternative uses should be explored which are less harmful to the Green Belt
- The site is not previously developed land.
- Previously demolished buildings should not be taken into account
- The proposal would merge Trumpington Meadows with the site.

#### *Access and Transport Statement*

- The access arrangements are inadequate, too narrow between gates with limited or no pathway at times outside the entrance from Maris Lane with pedestrians having to use the road.
- The proposal will result in conflict and highway safety issues with users of the nearby nursery.
- Transport Statement is inaccurate and surveys have not been carried out at peak times. The number of car parking spaces is 38 not 27.
- Access should be from near the barns onto Grantchester Road or through Trumpington Meadows which would have better sight lines.

- The traffic survey was carried out during the school holidays of certain schools which high levels of vehicle commuting.
- The trip levels are an underestimation.
- Occupiers are unlikely to walk or cycle from the site.

### *Impact on the Listed Buildings and Conservation Area*

- The intensification of the use of the access would adversely affect the Conservation Area
- The four new dwellings would harm the heritage significance of surrounding listed buildings.
- A widening of the access to 4.5m would be of detriment to the character and appearance of the area
- The access route would be of detriment to the setting of 1 Grantchester Road, a grade II listed building and the Church, a grade I listed building.

### *History*

- Appeal history for 10/0180/FUL demonstrates that there is no justification for making a break in the listed wall. History for C/0188/94 demonstrates that the reasons for rejection apply to an access to the east of the wall.

### *Amenity*

- The boundary of 1 Grantchester Road will be less secure and make it easier for people to access
- Increase in noise levels associated with the use of the access by vehicles and particularly the rumble strip (10m from the boundary).
- Light industrial uses would have less of an impact, especially at weekends.
- Users of the Church and the graveyard are likely to suffer disturbance.

### *Other*

- Commercial venture
- Impact of construction vehicles on the listed wall and trees
- The application proposes changes in height to listed wall not in control of the applicants

- The application should not be determined until the ecological surveys have been undertaken. It will have a negative impact on wildlife
- The proposal is a gated development and would not promote social cohesion
- The existing foul water drainage system running under 1 Grantchester Road is insufficient to cater for the increased demand from the converted barns.
- The public consultation summary is misleading.

7.3 Cambridge Past Present and Future have made a representation, which is summarised as follows:

- The proposals for the demolition, conversion and new build are welcomed.
- The layout and proposed materials would retain a sense of a working farmyard through their limited subdivision.
- The new build accommodation is at the perimeter of the yard forming a distinctive grouping away from historic structures.
- Planting should be native and the belt to the south of the site adjacent to Trumpington Meadows should be reinforced.
- They have a remaining concern regarding the suitability of the access for the number of dwellings proposed but recognise that it negates the need for an additional opening from Maris Lane or Grantchester Road.

7.4 A petition has been received from 43 signatories. The petition sets out an objection to the application on the following basis:

‘We feel that the provision of access/exit at Anstey Hall for vehicles associated with 12 properties on the Anstey Hall Farm Barns site will make the already very congested, Maris Lane/Church Lane/Grantchester Road junction very dangerous for drivers, cyclists and pedestrians (including those wishing to drop off and pick up at the nursery), especially at peak times in the morning and evening when a lot of traffic is likely to leave/enter the new development in connection with work/school run etc.

A Development Control Forum was not requested as part of the petition.

7.5 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. Public Art
4. Renewable energy and sustainability
5. Disabled access
6. Amenity
7. Refuse arrangements
8. Highway safety
9. Car and cycle parking
10. Ecology
11. Trees
12. Third party representations
13. Other Issues
14. Planning Obligation Strategy

### **Principle of Development**

8.2 The site is entirely contained within the Green Belt and includes 8 units to be created from the conversion and extension of existing buildings and 4 new build units arranged in two pairs. It also includes the demolition of buildings and parts of buildings, including a modern building formerly in agricultural use to the south of the cluster. The NPPF sets out Green Belt policy through paragraphs 79 – 92. The most relevant paragraphs are those quoted below which state:

‘79. The Government attaches great importance to Green Belts. The fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open; the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence.

80. Green Belt serves five purposes:

1. to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas;
2. to prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another;
3. to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment;
4. to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns; and
5. to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land...

87. As with previous Green Belt policy, inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances.

88. When considering any planning application, local planning authorities should ensure that substantial weight is given to any harm to the Green Belt. 'Very special circumstances' will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations.

89. A local planning authority should regard the construction of new buildings as inappropriate in Green Belt. Exceptions to this are: ...

- the extension or alteration of a building provided that it does not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building; ...
- limited infilling or the partial or complete redevelopment of previously developed sites (brownfield land), whether redundant or in continuing use (excluding temporary buildings), which would not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt and the purpose of including land within it than the existing development.'

8.3 Policy 4/1 of the Cambridge Local Plan echoes the NPPF advice stating in the supporting text that it is 'for those proposing development in the Green Belt to show the special circumstances to justify development. Proposals that will increase public access, improve amenity and enhance biodiversity will be supported.'

- 8.4 The applicants state that the application will bring about much need housing and accord with policy 5/1 as a windfall site and emerging plan policies which seek to deliver 14,000 new dwellings in the plan period to 2031. In my view, whilst the residential use of the site will partially address housing need and is a use which is compatible with surrounding uses, it should not be considered a decisive factor in the decision to allow housing on this site. Neither should the fact that Green Belt land to the south at Trumpington Meadows being released for housing development be a material consideration of itself, albeit that this has changed the context of the site and perhaps placed a greater importance on the undeveloped gap between it and the Anstey Farm buildings.
- 8.5 In terms of the application of Green Belt policy, I consider the proposal, including the new build, accords with the five purposes as set out in the NPPF above, namely:
1. The proposal would not represent unrestricted sprawl of a large built-up area. The conversion utilises existing buildings. The new build is confined to a corner of the site and seeks to replicate the pattern of courtyard enclosure. The new build is put forward in the context of the demolition of a modern agricultural barn in domestic use.
  2. The new build would be less prominent from Grantchester Road than the modern barn to be demolished and positioned further away from the southern boundary of the site with Trumpington Meadows. It would not represent a merging with Trumpington Meadows or compromise the setting of the Church, Anstey Farmhouse or no 1 Grantchester Road within the Conservation Area.
  3. Additional landscaping to bolster the southern tree belt would enhance the relationship with Trumpington Meadows. The converted barns on the western edge of the site would not lead to any significant harmful change in their outward appearance to Grantchester Road. The rural setting of this part of Trumpington is safeguarded from encroachment.
  4. The setting of the site in this part of Trumpington Conservation Area with the surrounding listed buildings is highly sensitive. The merits of the scheme within this context are discussed in greater detail within the section below but my conclusion is that



the setting of the listed buildings is preserved and the character and appearance of the Conservation Area is enhanced.

5. The barns are in various states of disrepair and the land around them is poorly managed. The bringing of the barns into residential use will safeguard the listed and curtilage listed structures, improve their setting and in my view would not in any meaningful way discourage the urban regeneration of previously developed sites in the City.

- 8.6 In my opinion, the five purposes of the green belt, in the context of the site, would not be compromised.

*Green Belt Exception: Converted and Extended Barns*

- 8.7 I do not consider that there is harm to the Green Belt as a result of the conversions and extensions to the retained farm buildings. I give little weight to those structures already demolished as counting in favour of allowing the development in the Green Belt. However, I consider that there is some merit in justifying the off-setting of the loss of existing structures against the extensions to the buildings, particularly to units 5, 6 and 8 which have the larger new additions. For units 6 and 8, the additions run parallel to the original narrow form of the retained buildings and are designed in such a way to be separate to the host form. They are necessary partly because of the narrow width to units 6 and 8 and to make some pragmatic living space from the conversion. The extension to unit 5 runs perpendicular to its host wing but the same logic applies here. There are no concerns with the wrap around extension proposed for unit 4. The extensions to the retained buildings are not disproportionate and are entirely reasonable in footprint and scale.

*Green Belt Exception: New Build*

- 8.8 Turning to the new build, the NPPF states that a local planning authority should regard the construction of new buildings as 'inappropriate in the Green Belt'. This statement is subject to a number of exceptions. The applicants seek to justify their exception on the basis that the new build would represent limited infilling and the partial redevelopment of a previously developed site.

- 8.9 The argument put forward by the applicants is that the modern agricultural building is no longer in agricultural use but is in lawful use for domestic storage in connection with the occupation of Anstey Hall. The applicants were asked to prove this and they have established, via the grant of a certificate of lawfulness (14/0875/CLUED), that domestic storage has taken place continuously within the building since 1995. On this basis, I conclude that the current use of the modern agricultural building, which is of permanent construction, fits the definition of a previously developed site and the relevant exception is engaged.
- 8.10 On this basis, the new dwellings constitute a potentially acceptable replacement of the modern farm building in principle. The question is whether the proposed impact of the new buildings (together with the demolition of the modern barn) on the openness of the Green Belt is greater or less than existing.
- 8.11 The new dwellings are of a greater combined footprint of 446sqm than the farm building of 317sqm but are narrower in profile. I do not consider the greater footprint to be significant because the siting of the new build units is such that they would have a lesser impact on the openness of the Green Belt than the existing farm building to be demolished (being further away from Grantchester Road and Trumpington Meadows). The design of the new build is such that it would also relate more closely to the existing layout and design of the retained barns than the more incongruous modern barn building to be demolished, which stands more alone within the site, and detracts from the setting of the retained listed and curtilage listed barns.

### *Summary*

- 8.12 My view is that the development accords with policy 4/1 and NPPF guidance in relation to development in the Green Belt. It follows from this conclusion that the development accords with policy 4/2 relating to the protection of open space.

## **Context of site, design and external spaces**

### *Context*

- 8.13 This is a very prominent and important site on the edge of Trumpington and its Conservation Area, adjoining the grade II listed Farmhouse, the grade I listed Church of St Mary & St Michael, the grade II listed Vicarage (no.1 Grantchester Road; and connected to the grade I listed Anstey Hall.
- 8.14 The site is important for being the first bit of the settlement seen when approaching from the Grantchester direction, one of the few areas where real 'countryside' and farmland abut the historic village. The roofscape, in particular, is an extremely important feature, with the massive pitched tiled barn roof and the unusual half-hipped dovecote roof being very noticeable.
- 8.15 The Principal Conservation Officer notes in his response that the site and the listed buildings, in particular, have been of concern for some years, having no obvious agricultural use, awkward access (the historic one having been sold off) and little repair & maintenance being carried out. The recent expansion of the village has brought new development close to the site but it remains visibly traditional in type & layout and a strong contrast to the suburban nature of much of the village.

### *Layout and Context*

- 8.16 The proposed layout comprises 8 converted and extended barns and four new dwellings within the south eastern corner of the site. Access is from the east via the Anstey Hall driveway. The first appreciation of the site is from the eastern approach where the end gables of the new dwellings (units 10 and 11) would be appreciated. The access then swings round into the centre of the site and a series of open, mainly hard surfaced courtyards are created for parking and access, with minimal vertical division of space.
- 8.17 In my view, the proposed open layout preserves a visual connection between the converted buildings and the sense of a working farmyard. I have no concerns regarding the positioning of the new dwellings in this regard, they complement the character and feel of the farmyard style spaces and clearly define the entrance to the site.

8.18 I note that the Conservation Officer still has some concern with regard to the positioning of the new units in terms of their relationship with the converted buildings, being outside the historical 'envelope'. This is not a concern shared by English Heritage or myself. Whilst the new dwellings are the first view of the site from the eastern approach, this is a private view and not as important as views from the west. If the principle of the new build is acceptable, in my opinion this is the best place for it. The new build does not interfere with the key public view of the site from Grantchester Road and is positioned appropriately and sensitively so as to allow the creation of landscaping and green buffer zones to the south and the west of the buildings. The legibility of the site is improved and the new build is contextually appropriate if technically outside the historical 'envelope' of the converted building.

8.19 I accept that there may be views of the new build units from the Church, from the Vicarage and from Trumpington Meadows to the south. In particular, the tower of the Church and the span of units 11 and 12 may be seen in the same view, albeit softened by intervening landscaping. However, I consider the contextual relationship appropriate, both in terms of the design of the new units, their height and their distance from neighbouring listed buildings. They are of a distinctive design, of high quality and relate well, not only to the existing farmyard grouping but also the listed buildings to the north and east.

### *Landscape*

8.20 Each of the 12 dwellings proposed have a decent proportion of private garden space associated with them. The garden spaces are not unduly prominent and have been well thought through so as to minimise the domestication of the barns and their surrounding curtilages. The meadow to the west of units 1, 2 and 3, which face onto Grantchester Road, will not be used for private garden space but will be retained as an open grassland space and managed by a management company. The private spaces for units 1, 2 and 3 are a series of courtyards on their eastern sides. Condition 20 of the permission seeks to remove any permitted development rights from being exercised regarding the use of the meadow on the western and southern sides as private garden.

- 8.21 Similarly, the south side of the site will incorporate additional planting and a SuDS detention basin. The setting of this side of the site, with the removal of the modern agricultural barn, will be greatly improved.
- 8.22 Within the site a combination of high quality hard surfacing materials, including cobbled feature paving, oak screening, permeable paving and brick walling is proposed. This helps to break down the various spaces and subtly define ownership boundaries. The landscaping treatment has the support of the Council's Landscape Officer and in my view is entirely appropriate.

### *Scale*

- 8.23 The new build units comprise two pairs of long and narrow 4 bedroom properties with accommodation on two floors. They would be 7.5m wide and 6.9m high with a series of interestingly shaped ventilation cowls extending higher to 7.3m. The body of the units has been broken down into a steeper pitched element housing the main accommodation and a subservient shallower pitched element extending from it.
- 8.24 The revised plans have reduced the height of the new build elements. Cross-sections have now been provided which show a lower height to the retained Unit 7 which has a substantial roof form. The Conservation Officer's no longer considers the scale of the new build to challenge the scale of the main barn. I agree with this assessment.
- 8.25 I have no concerns with the scale of the majority of the additions to the converted barns. These are all single storey.
- 8.26 Units 7 and 8 are within a substantial brick barn. The roof is not original and the proposal seeks to recreate the original roof shape. The ridge therefore rises from 5.5m to 8.7m. I have no concerns with this aspect of the proposal as it more accurately reflects the historical height and importance of the building within the family of farm buildings on site.

### *Design and Finish*

- 8.27 The new build units are designed as contemporary dwellings which reference the form of the converted barns and buildings.

The external skin of the units is constructed from vertical batten oak cladding, soft red brickwork and a standing seam zinc roof. PV panels are to be inserted on the shallower roof slopes.

- 8.28 The approach to the finish for the converted units is to make minimal changes to the external fabric, however, where interventions are required, the use of vertical oak battens positioned in front of glazed elements is used, together with simple glazed links, roof-lights and the use of existing openings where possible. Conservation officers have provided very detailed notes on the acceptability of the various finishes and for units 1 and 7 in particular. Revisions have been undertaken to the accommodate those concerns.
- 8.29 The agents, Cowper Griffith, have recently undertaken a large barn conversion project at Stowe, Buckinghamshire, for the National Trust and this has been visited to see the finished result. Some of the techniques proposed here have been demonstrated there, such as the vertical oak cladding with recessed glazing behind, and some of the design details, for the lesser outbuildings at Anstey Hall Farm are similar to those seen at Stowe. This has re-assured officers that the design interventions and finishes are broadly acceptable subject to various conditions.

#### *Demolitions*

- 8.30 The demolition of the 'modern', more industrial-type barn is acceptable. There are also piecemeal demolitions to create amenity space or to allow buildings to be linked. Further structural surveys have been carried out by the applicants in relation to Barns 1 and 7 following concerns raised by the Principal Conservation Officer that not enough detail had been provided. Subject to conditions, the Principal Conservation Officer is satisfied that sufficient survey information has been submitted to support in principle the grant of planning permission and listed building consent.

#### *Access and garden wall*

- 8.31 The Principal Conservation Officer assesses this is an 'important boundary wall to the many LBs around it and is curtilage Listed' and that the proposal to partly demolish a section of it as 'contentious as a similar application was refused

not that long ago' to allow for the easier movement of garden machinery. A following appeal was unsuccessful and the Inspector's Decision letter is attached as appendix 1 to this report.

- 8.32 I note the concerns raised by the Inspector in the appeal decision regarding the excessive width and unnecessary impact of the loss of part of the curtilage listed wall to facilitate the proposed access and the 5m + width of the new driveway on the approach to and setting of Anstey Hall. Issues concerning harm to the division between the wooded area and the parkland to the south by creating the gap were raised together with the dominance of the width of the new driveway. There is little difference between the dimensions of what is now proposed compared to the previous scheme and I understand that there has not been a historical connection with the ownership/management of the farm and its buildings and Anstey Hall.
- 8.33 However, the circumstances and need for the break in the Edwardian wall have changed. There is now a real purpose to the driveway and to the opening.
- 8.34 My view and that of the Conservation Officer, is that the access point and the necessary demolition of part of the wall provides the only realistic means of access to the barns. Other access points have been explored by the applicants but have not proven feasible and are outside of their control/ownership. Whilst I recognise that harm would result from the demolition of the wall and the creation of the spur on the setting of Anstey Hall, this is outweighed by the conversion of the barns and their bringing back into active managed use where they are more likely to be repaired & maintained in good order.
- 8.35 To my mind, despite the third party representation, the appeal dismissal should not be seen as an absolute obstacle to the proposed access point given that the Inspector was not considering the benefits of a scheme for the re-use of the barns against the harm identified. Conditions attached to the listed building consent seek to ensure that the remaining outbuilding and the wall are repaired as part of the creation of the opening.

### *Option for Use of the Barns*

- 8.36 Different types of use provide different pressures on the use of listed buildings. From a conservation point of view, some uses cause less need for alteration than others. However, getting a viable use that will provide the repairs and water-tightness that are vital for the buildings is an important concern. In particular, the need to bring the buildings – whether LBs or not – up to a habitable standard if residential use is chosen (as in this case) can be difficult to do in an acceptable manner.
- 8.37 The applicants set out in their planning statement that the residential use of the barns is the most appropriate use and that other potential uses were considered, including agricultural, storage, community and commercial uses. The Design and Access Statement includes an appraisal of the options for the uses.
- 8.38 I accept the appraisal and also that a commercial office use may be equally acceptable from a conservation point of view. However, the applicants have put in detailed plans which demonstrate that the conversion to residential, particularly for Barn 1, but also the Dovecot and Barn 7 is acceptable and will result in minimal harm to the special interest of the buildings. This has been backed up by detailed survey work. This view is supported by English Heritage and following the amended plans, subject to conditions, the Council's Urban Design and Conservation Team support the detail of the proposed conversions.

### *Summary*

- 8.39 The proposed context of the site is highly sensitive and the plans have been subject to considerable scrutiny. My view is that the character and appearance of the Conservation Area and the rural character of the edge of this part of Trumpington would be enhanced by the proposal. As such, the setting and special interest of the farm buildings would be preserved and the setting of adjacent listed buildings would be preserved. The proposal would result in some harm, such as the removal of part of the listed wall and creation of an access spur to identified heritage assets. My view is that this harm has been minimised, is less than substantial and is outweighed by the sensitive conversion and desirability of sustaining and



enhancing the significance of the heritage assets and putting them into viable uses consistent with their conversion. The proposal complies with Cambridge Local Plan policies 3/2, 3/3, 3/4, 3/7, 3/10, 3/11, 3/12, 3/14, 4/2, 4/3, 4/10 and 4/11 and accords with paragraphs 126 to 141 of the NPPF 2012.

### **Public Art**

- 8.40 As part of the submitted Design and Access Statement, a Public Art Delivery Plan (PADP) is submitted. The PADP is a simple statement as how public art will be developed for the site. The Council's Public Art Officer has advised that whilst the application includes the intention to provide on-site public art, the actual development will not have public access and therefore the provision of public art on site will not comply with the Council's Supplementary Planning Document (SPD with a defined public benefit. She recommends that a commuted for the provision of public art off site is provided, which is where the mitigation for this site has the most benefit.
- 8.41 I agree with this analysis and in my opinion, subject to a S106 to secure public art to the value of 1% of the capital construction costs of the project, the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 3/7 and 10/1 and the Public Art SPD 2010.

### **Renewable energy and sustainability**

- 8.42 The new houses will be built to Code 4 of the Code for Sustainable Homes. The converted farm buildings will be subject to enhanced thermal performance, with improved insulation to walls, roofs and floors and more efficient doors and windows. Highly efficient boilers and facilities for recycling water are proposed.
- 8.43 An indicative surface water drainage layout has been provided, which includes swales and permeable paving in the courtyards. The indicative scheme is acceptable and is subject to condition 10.
- 8.44 Photovoltaic panels are proposed for units 9-12 and the western roof slope to unit 5 to meet the Council's 10% policy and the plans show this. The 10% target is secured through proposed condition 11.

8.45 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.

### **Disabled access**

8.46 All the units have level access except the ground floors in units 2 and 3 which have been dropped. The parking areas and paths will be designed and surfaced so that they are suitable for use by wheelchairs and those with mobility difficulties. A disabled parking space is provided within the visitor parking area, however, there is sufficient space within each individual curtilage for disabled parking to occur. The applicants confirm that all of the buildings will meet part M of the Building Regulations.

8.47 In my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 3/7 and 3/12.

### **Amenity of Neighbours**

8.48 Impact on amenity of neighbouring occupiers

8.49 I do not consider there to be any harmful impact on the amenity of the occupiers of the Farmhouse to the north. Units 1 and 2 are inward facing and mainly single storey.

8.50 To the east of units 6, 8, 9 and 10 is the Church and its cemetery further to the south. Units 6 and 8 (east facing) are single storey and positioned some 22m away from the landscaped boundary with the cemetery. The new build units 9 and 10 are closer to the cemetery boundary at 16m but further towards its end. They include a series of first floor bedroom windows facing east. At a ridge height of 6.9m the building envelope would be visible, but it would not have an unduly enclosing impact..

8.51 To the east of the cemetery is the former Vicarage, 1 Grantchester Road. The building is set in substantial grounds and is walled with landscaping. The proposed access route, which would be constructed of bonded gravel, would pass through the woodland area near to the eastern boundary of no.1

and pass round to its south. The occupiers of no.1 have objected on the following grounds in relation to the impact of the scheme on their amenity:

- 8.52 *The boundary of 1 Grantchester Road will be less secure and make it easier for people to access.* It is true that the new access spur will partially open the boundary but this is to be a private drive to only 12 houses. I am doubtful to the extent that members of the public or users of Anstey Hall will either appreciate the spur or see it as an opportunity to access the rear of the house which is bounded by a high wall.
- 8.53 *Increase in noise levels associated with the use of the access by vehicles and particularly the rumble strip (10m from the boundary).* I agree that there may be a perceptible increase in noise as a result of the creation and use of the access. Use of the access by construction vehicles is temporary. Use by cars and particularly at night time will introduce both noise and light into this area. However, no.1 Grantchester Road has a substantial garden and the eastern boundary and the trees within the wooded area adjacent would largely obscure and mitigate the visual presence of the access. The access route does not abut the boundary wall with no. 1 but comes close to it, however, this is a scheme for only 12 dwellings and I do not consider that the noise generated by such low level usage would be significantly harmful to the occupiers of no.1. Vehicles are also likely to be travelling at low speeds.
- 8.54 I propose that the treatment of the access be conditioned as part of any approval to ensure that the rumble strip is removed from the plans and an alternative means of slowing vehicles close to the gap in the wall is proposed. I note that the southern boundary of no.1 is more open, but this does not alter my conclusion that the impact is acceptable (see condition 14).
- 8.55 *Light industrial uses would have less of an impact, especially at weekends.* It is difficult to ascertain whether in fact this would be the case as it would very much depend on the nature of the occupier but certainly weekend use is likely to be less intense than a residential use. This may not necessarily be the case during the week and a commercial use would attract an element of servicing which would bring with it greater demands on the narrow access point and greater noise disturbance. However, on its merits the residential use of the access is acceptable in

terms of residential amenity. The application must be judged on what is being proposed.

8.56 *Users of the Church and the graveyard are likely to suffer disturbance.* I am not in receipt of an objection from the Church but similar to the impact on no. 1 Grantchester Road, use of the access may be audible for visitors to the Church, particularly the cemetery. However, in my opinion, the low level of unit numbers on the site will not give rise to an intensive use of the access to the extent that would render significant harm to visitors of the Church or its graveyard.

8.57 In my opinion the proposal adequately respects the residential amenity of its neighbours and the constraints of the site and I consider that it is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 3/4, 3/7 and 3/12

Amenity for future occupiers of the site

8.58 This is a low density scheme and ample garden or amenity courtyard space is provided for all of the units. The applicants have thought carefully about how to bring in sufficient light, particularly to barn 1, to ensure that its inhabitants are not later forced to apply for additional openings to bring light into the structure. I have no concerns regarding the amenity of future occupiers.

8.59 In my opinion the proposal provides a high-quality living environment and an appropriate standard of residential amenity for future occupiers, and I consider that in this respect it is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 3/7 and 3/12.

### **Refuse Arrangements**

8.60 The access and the layout of the units have been designed to accommodate a refuse truck to turn within the centre of the site where space has been laid out to accommodate the collection of bins.

8.61 In my opinion, the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policy 3/12.

## Highway Safety

- 8.62 The County Council Highways officer has stated that the existing vehicular access onto the public highway is too narrow to allow two vehicles to pass. This may result in vehicles stopping on the public highway to the detriment of highway safety and its efficient operation. This would most likely happen if two vehicles sought to enter the site at the same time whilst one vehicle was exiting resulting in a temporary blockage of the highway. To overcome the objection he recommends that the existing access is widened to a minimum of 4.5m which would allow two vehicles to pass. I have discussed the third party objection to the proposed additional width being less than the normal 5.5m with the Highways Officer and he has confirmed that this width would meet the Manual for Streets guidance and is sufficient for the proposed additional level of use that would arise from the residential use of the site. Condition 13 requires a widening of the access width currently at 3.1m to 4.5m, which is perfectly possible and which would result in a repositioning of the piers and would not in any way compromise the setting of the heritage assets within the vicinity or be likely to affect overhanging trees.
- 8.63 A petition has been received from 43 signatories with an objection on the basis that the vehicles associated with the 12 units will make the already very congested, Maris Lane/Church Lane/Grantchester Road junction very dangerous for drivers, cyclists and pedestrians (including those wishing to drop off and pick up at the nursery), especially at peak times.
- 8.64 The applicants have sought to address these issues through the submission of an additional Traffic Survey Note and detailed response. Although the Highways Officer did not raise these particular issues, I have asked him to comment on this submission and he has concluded that the documents address issues raised by local residents and the operator of a local business (the nursery) and that the proposals will have minimal impact upon the local highway network.
- 8.65 I accept this assessment. From my experience of the local roads in the vicinity of the access point, they are very congested at peak periods and there are undoubtedly existing issues with regard to the weight of traffic in what is essentially a village location. However, I do not consider that the addition of 12

dwelling and the associated vehicular movements would have any significant impact on this existing situation. I also consider it unlikely that it would exacerbate parking problems involving the blocking of the pavement outside the access which causes pedestrians to walk in the road. The site has sufficient parking within it to cater for demand and overspill parking onto the roads outside is very unlikely.

- 8.66 In my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policy 8/2.

### **Car and Cycle Parking**

- 8.67 Ample space is provided within the site for car parking for each of the units together with visitor parking and a disabled space totaling 27 spaces. This equates to 2 spaces per unit and 3 visitor spaces. The third party representation claims there is space to park 38 cars. The D&A statement confirms 32 spaces and is incorrect. Having studied the plan, 27 spaces are laid out and identified for parking. This is the plan which will be approved. I acknowledge that the generosity of the hard surfaced courts may lead to parking in addition to those spaces provided and this would be difficult to control. Nonetheless, I do not consider the scheme would lead to an excessive amount of over parking. Despite being on the edge of Cambridge, the site is in a sustainable location and it is not inconceivable that occupiers would cycle or walk to their intended destination. The site is also close to Trumpington Road, a key transport corridor with bus services into town and is immediately north of the Park & Ride site which hosts the Guided Busway terminus.

- 8.68 Sufficient covered and secure cycle parking provision is made for every unit in accordance with the adopted standards.

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

### **Ecology**

- 8.70 Given the location, nature and condition of the buildings, the Council's Nature Conservation Project Officer has required additional protected species surveys. He has now reviewed the surveys and concluded that he is satisfied with the surveys relating to Badgers, Barn Owls and Reptiles. These reports

recommend mitigation in the form of the installation of two barn owl boxes and reptile fencing in relation to grass snakes present on the site (see condition 19).

- 8.71 Additional late July and August bat surveys are still planned to establish how the buildings are being used for roosting and foraging. Whilst surveys to date suggest that no maternity roost is present in any of the buildings, the Nature Conservation Officer recommends automated surveys are deployed and no decision be made on the proposals until the remaining bat surveys are complete.
- 8.72 My recommendation to Committee is that no decision is issued until this additional survey work is completed and any necessary mitigation measures are agreed with the Council's Nature Conservation Project Officer. Any mitigation is unlikely to materially alter the scheme before Committee. I consider this approach to comply with Cambridge Local Plan policies 4/3 and 4/7.

### **Trees**

- 8.73 The Arboricultural Officer has stated that there is limited information to assess the impact on the trees fully but that the principle of the access is acceptable and some tree losses to accommodate this are also acceptable. Without an Implications Assessment that shows the layout and the tree constraints on the same plan, it is not possible to assess the full impact.
- 8.74 I am advised that if minded to approve, a condition for tree protection as standard but also a management plan for the woodland to mitigate the detrimental impact of the road installation is required. As such, I conclude that the proposal is acceptable and in accordance with Cambridge Local Plan policy 4/4 subject to recommended conditions 15-18.

### **Third Party Representations**

- 8.75 I summarise the third party representations in the table below together with my responses to them.

<i>Green Belt</i>	
-The proposal is contrary to Green Belt policy.	It is compliant with Green Belt policy, see paragraphs 8.2 - 8.12

-Other alternative uses should be explored which are less harmful to the Green Belt	The use is not harmful to the Green Belt
-The site is not previously developed land.	A Certificate of Lawfulness has demonstrated that the modern barn is previously developed and not in agricultural use
-Previously demolished buildings should not be taken into account	I agree
-The proposal would merge Trumpington Meadows with the site.	The southern and western edges of the site would be strengthened. The scheme would not represent a merging with Trumpington Meadows.
<i>Access and Transport Statement</i>	
-The access arrangements are inadequate, too narrow between gates with limited or no pathway at times outside the entrance from Maris Lane with pedestrians having to use the road.	Condition 13 requires the widening of the gates. The applicants cannot reasonably be asked to mitigate existing impacts unconnected to the proposal and the proposal would not significantly alter existing peak flows or materially make worse existing highways issues around the nursery and on the surrounding pavements.
-Transport Statement is inaccurate and surveys have not been carried out at peak times. The number of car parking spaces is 38 not 27.	The Highways Officer does not raise an issue with the survey. Car parking spaces are dealt with under paragraphs 8.67 – 8.69
-Access should be from near the barns onto Grantchester Road or through Trumpington Meadows which would have better sight lines.	See paragraph 8.34



-The trip levels are an underestimation.	The Highways Officer does not raise an issue with the Transport Assessment.
-Occupiers are unlikely to walk or cycle from the site.	I disagree, see paragraphs 8.67 – 8.69
<i>Impact on the Listed Buildings and Conservation Area</i>	
-The intensification of the use of the access would adversely affect the Conservation Area, the setting of 1 Grantchester Road, a grade II listed building and the Church, a grade I listed building.	See paragraphs 8.13 – 8.30
-The four new dwellings would harm the heritage significance of surrounding listed buildings.	See paragraphs 8.13 – 8.30
-A widening of the access to 4.5m would be of detriment to the character and appearance of the area	See paragraphs 8.62
<i>History</i>	
-Appeal history for 10/0180/FUL demonstrates that there is no justification for making a break in the listed wall. History for C/0188/94 demonstrates that the reasons for rejection apply to an access to the east of the wall.	The material circumstances are now different. The benefits of the proposed scheme on the existing heritage assets by bringing them back into a sustainable and viable use outweighs the harm to the listed wall. See paragraphs 8.31 – 8.35.

<i>Amenity</i>	
-The boundary of 1 Grantchester Road will be less secure and make it easier for people to access	See paragraphs 8.48 – 8.57
-Increase in noise levels associated with the use of the access by vehicles and particularly the rumble strip (10m from the boundary).	See paragraphs 8.48 – 8.57
-Light industrial uses would have less of an impact, especially at weekends.	See paragraphs 8.48 – 8.57
-Users of the Church and the graveyard are likely to suffer disturbance.	See paragraphs 8.48 – 8.57
<i>Other</i>	
-Commercial venture	This is not a material consideration
-Impact of construction vehicles on the listed wall and trees	See conditions 15-18.
-The application proposes changes in height to a listed wall not in control of the applicants	This is a civil matter but I consider this a mistake on the plans.
-The application should not be determined until the ecological surveys have been undertaken. It will have a negative impact on wildlife	Additional surveys have been carried out. See paragraphs 8.70 – 8.72 and the formal recommendation.
-The proposal is a gated development and would not promote social cohesion	I agree, it would not promote social cohesion but I do not consider that any residential conversion in this location would. I do not consider this to be a justifiable reason for refusal given the heritage benefits

	of the proposal.
-The existing foul water drainage system running under 1 Grantchester Road is insufficient to cater for the increased demand from the converted barns.	See condition 10
-The public consultation summary is misleading.	I am unable to comment as I was not present at the public consultation.

### **Other Issues**

8.76 The site is 1.89 hectares in size

. Policy 5/5 of the Cambridge Local Plan indicates that housing developments on sites of 0.5 Ha or more will be expected to include 40% or more of the dwellings as affordable housing or an equivalent site area. The red line of the application site includes a large area of woodland to facilitate the access, the access road itself and planting and grassland areas to the south and west of the barns which are not to be developed and which stand very little chance of being developable in the future. The undevelopable 'green' areas (the protected open space, the southern buffer, the undeveloped area south of the church and the woodland) amount to 1.03ha of this figure. The yard area (ie just the space contained by the existing far buildings) accounts for a further 0.21ha whilst the buildings which must be retained accounts for 0.16ha.

8.77 The net developable area of the site is therefore far less than 1.89 and given the site constraints I do not consider that there is any suggestion that the applicants are in any way seeking to avoid the provision of affordable housing against the terms of policy 5/5.

### **Planning Obligation Strategy**

#### **Planning Obligations**

8.78 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:

### Open Space

- 8.79 The Planning Obligation Strategy requires that all new residential developments contribute to the provision or improvement of public open space, either through provision on site as part of the development or through a financial contribution for use across the city. The proposed development requires a contribution to be made towards open space, comprising outdoor sports facilities, indoor sports facilities, informal open space and provision for children and teenagers. The total contribution sought has been calculated as follows.

<b>Outdoor sports facilities</b>					
Type of unit	Persons per unit	£ per person	£per unit	Number of such units	Total £
studio	1	238	238		
1 bed	1.5	238	357		
2-bed	2	238	476		

3-bed	3	238	714		
4-bed+	4	238	952	12	11,424
<b>Total</b>					<b>11,424</b>

<b>Indoor sports facilities</b>					
Type of unit	Persons per unit	£ per person	£per unit	Number of such units	Total £
studio	1	269	269		
1 bed	1.5	269	403.50		
2-bed	2	269	538		
3-bed	3	269	807		
4-bed+	4	269	1076	12	12,912
<b>Total</b>					<b>12,912</b>

<b>Informal open space</b>					
Type of unit	Persons per unit	£ per person	£per unit	Number of such units	Total £
studio	1	242	242		
1 bed	1.5	242	363		
2-bed	2	242	484		
3-bed	3	242	726		
4-bed+	4	242	968	12	11,616
<b>Total</b>					<b>11,616</b>

<b>Provision for children and teenagers</b>					
Type of unit	Persons per unit	£ per person	£per unit	Number of such units	Total £
studio	1	0	0		0
1 bed	1.5	0	0		0
2-bed	2	316	632		
3-bed	3	316	948		
4-bed+	4	316	1264	12	15,168
<b>Total</b>					<b>15,168</b>

8.80 Subject to the completion of a S106 planning obligation to secure the requirements of the Planning Obligation Strategy (2010) and the Cambridge City Council Open Space Standards Guidance for Interpretation and Implementation (2010), I am satisfied that the proposal accords with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 3/8 and 10/1 and the Planning Obligation Strategy 2010 and the Cambridge City Council Open Space Standards Guidance for Interpretation and Implementation (2010)

### Community Development

8.81 The Planning Obligation Strategy (2010) requires that all new residential developments contribute to community development facilities, programmes and projects. This contribution is £1256 for each unit of one or two bedrooms and £1882 for each larger unit. The total contribution sought has been calculated as follows:

<b>Community facilities</b>			
Type of unit	£per unit	Number of such units	Total £
1 bed	1256		
2-bed	1256		
3-bed	1882		
4-bed+	1882	12	22,584
<b>Total</b>			<b>22,584</b>

8.82 Subject to the completion of a S106 planning obligation to secure the requirements of the Planning Obligation Strategy (2010), I am satisfied that the proposal accords with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 5/14 and 10/1 and the Planning Obligation Strategy 2010.

### Waste

8.83 The Planning Obligation Strategy (2010) requires that all new residential developments contribute to the provision of household waste and recycling receptacles on a per dwelling basis. As the type of waste and recycling containers provided by the City Council for houses are different from those for flats,

this contribution is £75 for each house and £150 for each flat. The total contribution sought has been calculated as follows:

<b>Waste and recycling containers</b>			
Type of unit	£per unit	Number of such units	Total £
House	75	12	900
Flat	150		
<b>Total</b>			<b>900</b>

8.84 Subject to the completion of a S106 planning obligation to secure the requirements of the Planning Obligation Strategy (2010), I am satisfied that the proposal accords with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 3/7, 3/12 and 10/1 and the Planning Obligation Strategy 2010.

#### Household Recycling Centres

8.85 A network of Household Recycling Centers are operational across the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough area. Continued development will put pressure on the existing facilities and require expansion of the network. Financial contributions are required in accordance with the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Waste Partnership (RECAP): Waste Management Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (February 2012). These contributions vary according to the nature and scale of the proposed development and are based on any additional costs for the relevant local authority arising out of the need for additional or improved infrastructure, which is related to the proposed development.

8.86 The adoption of the Waste Management Design Guide SPD requires a contribution to be made in relation to all new development where four or more new residential units are created. Policy CS16 of the adopted Minerals and Waste Core Strategy requires new development to contribute towards Household Recycling Centres (HRCs) consistent with the RECAP Waste Management Design Guide SPD.

8.87 For new development in Cambridge the relevant HRC is located at Milton. The following table sets out how the contribution per new dwelling has been calculated for the Milton HRC.

Notes for Milton	Infrastructure/households	Source
4 sites at £5.5 million	£22 million	Cost per site sourced from Mouchel Parkman indicative costs 2009
Total catchment (households)	115,793	WMT Recycling Centre catchment tables CCC mid 2009 dwelling figures
New households	24,273	CCC housing trajectory to 2025 as of December 2010
<u>Infrastructure costs</u> Total number of households in catchment                      x New households in catchment		
£22 million 115,793	x 24,273	= £4,611,730
Total Developer Contribution per household = £190		

The net gain is 12 therefore the necessary contribution towards the HRC is £2,280.

8.88 Subject to the completion of a S106 planning obligation to secure the requirements of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Waste Partnership (RECAP): Waste Management Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (February 2012), I am satisfied that the proposal accords with the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Development Plan (Core Strategy Development Plan Document July 2011) policy CS16.



## Education

- 8.89 Upon adoption of the Planning Obligation Strategy (2010) the Council resolved that the Education section in the 2004 Planning Obligations Strategy continues to apply until it is replaced by a revised section that will form part of the Planning Obligations Strategy 2010. It forms an annex to the Planning Obligations Strategy (2010) and is a formal part of that document. Commuted payments are required towards education facilities where four or more additional residential units are created and where it has been established that there is insufficient capacity to meet demands for educational facilities.
- 8.90 In this case the County Council has not advised if contributions are required. I will report any comments on the amendment sheet.

## Transport

- 8.91 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 Southern Corridor Area Transport Plan (SCATP) where the contribution sought per trip is £369.
- 8.92 The Highway Authority has made an assessment of the proposal, and has advised that a contribution of £37,638 is required towards the SCATP.
- 8.93 Subject to the completion of a S106 planning obligation to secure this infrastructure provision, I am satisfied that the proposal accords with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 8/3 and 10/1 and the Planning Obligation Strategy 2010.

## Public Art

- 8.94 The development is required to make provision for public art and officers have recommended as set out in paragraphs 8.40 to 8.41 above that in this case a commuted public art payment to the S106 Public Art Initiative is appropriate. This commuted sum needs to be secured by the S106 planning obligation.

8.95 Subject to the completion of a S106 planning obligation to secure this infrastructure provision, I am satisfied that the proposal accords with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 3/7 and 10/1 and the Public Art SPD 2010.

### Monitoring

8.96 The Planning Obligation Strategy (2010) requires that all new developments contribute to the costs of monitoring the implementation of planning obligations. It was agreed at Development Plans Scrutiny Sub-Committee on 25 March 2014 that from 1 April 2014 monitoring fees for all financial and non-financial planning obligations will be 5% of the total value of those financial contributions (up to a maximum of £50,000) with the exception of large scale developments when monitoring costs will be agreed by negotiation. The County Council also requires a monitoring charge to be paid for County obligations in accordance with current County policy

8.97 For this application a monitoring fee of £3,730 (i.e. 5% of £74,604 City obligations) plus a 5% value of the public art contribution which is unknown at this point in time, is required to cover monitoring of City Council obligations plus the County Council monitoring fee.

### Planning Obligations Conclusion

8.98 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 The principle of the development within the Green Belt is acceptable both for the conversions and the new build. The heritage impacts of the scheme and the residential use of the barns are acceptable including: the new build; the individual conversions to the former farm buildings; the access; and partial demolition of the wall. In this respect, the scheme has the support of both the Council's Principal Conservation Officer and English Heritage. The scheme would have an impact on the amenity of its neighbours, but these impacts would not be

sufficiently harmful so as to warrant a refusal of planning permission. Subject to condition, the scheme would not compromise highway safety or significantly impact on the existing use of the highway network outside the site. Ecological matters have been considered and subject to further survey work for bats are satisfactory. All other matters have been assessed but none are sufficient to lead me to conclude that the scheme should be refused.

- 9.2 The proposal has been well thought out and will deliver a very high quality residential conversion and extension of the existing farm buildings. The new build will relate well to the conversions and will appear of a contemporary and distinctive form befitting the site. I recommend that permission be granted.

## **10.0 RECOMMENDATION**

**APPROVE** subject to:

-the completion of the s106 Agreement

-the completion of additional bat survey work and the agreement of any necessary mitigation measures with the Council's Nature Conservation Project Officer.

-the following conditions:

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

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

2. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans as listed on this decision notice.

Reason: In the interests of good planning, for the avoidance of doubt and to facilitate any future application to the Local Planning Authority under Section 73 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

3. Except with the prior written agreement of the local planning authority in writing no construction work or demolition shall be carried out or plant operated other than between the following hours: 0800 hours to 1800 hours Monday to Friday, 0800 hours to 1300 hours on Saturday and at no time on Sundays, Bank or Public Holidays.

Reason: In the interests of the amenity of surrounding occupiers (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 4/13)

4. Except with the prior agreement of the local planning authority in writing, there should be no collection or deliveries to the site during the demolition and construction stages outside the hours of 0700 hrs and 1900 hrs on Monday - Saturday and there should be no collections or deliveries on Sundays or Bank and public holidays.

Reason: In the interests of the amenity of surrounding occupiers (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 4/13)

5. Prior to the commencement of the development hereby approved (including any pre-construction, demolition, enabling works or piling), the applicant shall submit a report in writing, regarding the demolition / construction noise and vibration impact associated with this development, for approval by the local authority. The report shall be in accordance with the provisions of BS 5228:2009 Code of Practice for noise and vibration control on construction and open sites and include full details of any piling and mitigation measures to be taken to protect local residents from noise and or vibration. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: In the interests of the amenity of surrounding occupiers (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 4/13)

6. No development shall commence until a programme of measures to minimise the spread of airborne dust from the site during the demolition / construction period has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be implemented in accordance with the approved scheme.

Reason: In the interests of the amenity of surrounding occupiers (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 4/13)

## 7. Contaminated Land Condition

No development approved by this permission shall be COMMENCED prior to a contaminated land assessment and associated remedial strategy, being submitted to the LPA and receipt of approval of the document/documents from the LPA. This applies to paragraphs a), b) and c). This is an iterative process and the results of each stage will help decide if the following stage is necessary.

(a) The contaminated land assessment shall include a desk study to be submitted to the LPA for approval. The desk study shall detail the history of the site uses and propose a site investigation strategy based on the relevant information discovered by the desk study. The strategy shall be approved by the LPA prior to investigations commencing on site.

(b) The site investigation, including relevant soil, soil gas, surface and groundwater sampling, shall be carried out by a suitable qualified and accredited consultant/contractor in accordance with a quality assured sampling and analysis methodology.

(c) A site investigation report detailing all investigative works and sampling on site, together with the results of the analysis, risk assessment to any receptors and a proposed remediation strategy shall be submitted to the LPA. The LPA shall approve such remedial works as required prior to any remediation commencing on site. The works shall be of such a nature as to render harmless the identified contamination given the proposed end use of the site and surrounding environment including any controlled waters.

No development approved by this permission shall be OCCUPIED prior to the completion of any remedial works and a validation report/s being submitted to the LPA and receipt of approval of the document/documents from the LPA. This applies to paragraphs d), e) and f).

(d) Approved remediation works shall be carried out in full on site under a quality assurance scheme to demonstrate compliance with the proposed methodology and best practice guidance.

(e) If, during the works contamination is encountered which has not previously been identified then the additional contamination shall be fully assessed and an appropriate remediation scheme agreed with the LPA.

(f) Upon completion of the works, this condition shall not be discharged until a closure report has been submitted to and approved by the LPA. The closure report shall include details of the proposed remediation works and quality assurance certificates to show that the works have been carried out in full in accordance with the approved methodology. Details of any post-remedial sampling and analysis to show the site has reached the required clean-up criteria shall be included in the closure report together with the necessary documentation detailing what waste materials have been removed from site.

Reason: In the interests of the health and safety of future occupiers (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 4/13)

8. No development shall commence until further details of the circulation route for refuse collection vehicles have been submitted to the local planning authority and approved in writing. The required details shall include a full construction specification for the route, and a plan defining the extent of the area to which that specification will be applied. No dwelling forming part of the development shall be occupied until the refuse vehicle circulation route has been laid out and constructed in accordance with the details thus approved, and thereafter the route shall be maintained in accordance with those details.

Reason: In order to ensure refuse collection will be satisfactory (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/7 and 3/12)

9. No infiltration of surface water drainage into the ground will be permitted other than with the express written consent of the local planning authority, which may be given for those parts of the site where it has been demonstrated that there is no resultant unacceptable risk to controlled waters. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approval details.

Reason. To prevent the increased risk of contamination to controlled waters. National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) paragraph 109 states that the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by preventing both new and existing development from contributing to or being put at unacceptable risk from, or being adversely affected by unacceptable levels of water pollution. Government policy also states that planning policies and decisions should also ensure that adequate site investigation information, prepared by a competent person, is presented (NPPF, paragraph 121).

10. No development shall commence until details of the foul and surface water drainage for the site have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The drainage works shall be constructed in accordance with the approved details prior to the occupation of any part of the development hereby approved.

Reason: To ensure sustainable methods of surface water drainage are implemented and to ensure adequate connections for foul water (Cambridge Local Plan policies 3/1, 3/7, 4/13, 8/18)

11. Prior to the commencement of development of the roof structures of any of the units proposed to accommodate a photovoltaic array, detailed cross-sections showing the integration of the panels into the roof structures shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The submitted renewable energy technologies shall be fully installed and operational prior to the occupation of any of the units hereby approved and shall thereafter be maintained and remain fully operational.

Reason: In the interests of reducing carbon dioxide emissions and to ensure that the development does not give rise to unacceptable pollution. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 4/13 and 8/16).

12. Prior to commencement of development, the position of fire hydrants to serve the development shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: In the interests of the safety of future occupiers.

13. Prior to the commencement of development, a revised plan showing the repositioning of the access gates into the site adjacent to Maris Lane to show a widening of the access to a minimum width of 4.5m between the piers shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The works shall be carried out in accordance with the details prior to the commencement of any development on the site itself apart from works approved by virtue of this condition and those connected with the creation of the new access drive.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety (Cambridge Local Plan policy 8/2)

14. No development shall take place until full details of both hard and soft landscape works have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority and these works shall be carried out as approved. These details shall include proposed finished levels or contours; means of enclosure; car parking layouts, other vehicle and pedestrian access and circulation areas; hard surfacing materials; minor artefacts and structures (eg furniture, play equipment, refuse or other storage units, signs, lighting); proposed and existing functional services above and below ground (eg drainage, power, communications cables, pipelines indicating lines, manholes, supports); retained historic landscape features and proposals for restoration, where relevant and cross-sectional plans and detailed layout plans (removing the proposed rumble strip) for the construction of the access road to demonstrate that adjacent trees will not be adversely affected. Soft Landscape works shall include planting plans; written specifications (including cultivation and other operations associated with plant and grass establishment); schedules of plants, noting species, plant sizes and proposed numbers/densities where appropriate and an implementation programme. It shall include a re-inforcement and new planting on and near to the edges adjacent to the eastern side (next to the cemetery) and the southern edge (adjacent to the housing site).



Reason: In the interests of visual amenity and to ensure that suitable hard and soft landscape is provided as part of the development. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/4, 3/11 and 3/12)

15. No development shall take place until a schedule of landscape maintenance for a minimum period of five years has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The schedule shall include details of the arrangements for its implementation.

Reason: To ensure that the landscaped areas are maintained in a healthy condition in the interests of visual amenity. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/4, 3/11 and 3/12)

16. All hard and soft landscape works shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details, and to a reasonable standard in accordance with the relevant recommendation of the appropriate British Standard or other recognised code of good practice. The works shall be carried out prior to the occupation of any part of the development or in accordance with the programme agreed by the local planning authority in writing. The maintenance shall be carried out in accordance with the approved schedule. Any trees or plants that, within a period of five years after planting, are removed, die or become in the opinion of the local planning authority, seriously damaged or defective, shall be replaced as soon as is reasonably practicable with others of species, size and number as originally approved, unless the local planning authority gives its written consent to any variation.

Reason: To ensure provision, establishment and maintenance of a reasonable standard of landscaping in accordance with the approved design. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/4, 3/11 and 3/12)

17. In this condition retained tree means an existing tree which is to be retained in accordance with the approved plans and particulars; and paragraphs (a) and (b) below shall have effect until the expiration of two years from the date of the occupation of the building for its permitted use.

(a) No retained tree shall be cut down, uprooted or destroyed, nor shall any retained tree be topped or lopped other than in accordance with the approved plans and particulars, without the written approval of the local planning authority. Any topping or lopping approved shall be carried out in accordance with British Standard 3998 (Tree Work).

(b) If any retained tree is removed, uprooted or destroyed or dies, another tree shall be planted at the same place and that tree shall be of such size and species, and shall be planted at such time, as may be specified in writing by the local planning authority.

(c) The erection of fencing for the protection of any retained tree shall be undertaken in accordance with British Standard 5837 and the approved plans and particulars before any equipment, machinery or materials are brought onto the site for the purposes of the development, and shall be maintained until all equipment, machinery and surplus materials have been removed from the site. Nothing shall be stored or placed in any area fenced in accordance with this condition and the ground levels within those areas shall not be altered, nor shall any excavation be made, without the written consent of the local planning authority.

Reason: To protect the visual amenity of the area and to ensure the retention of trees on site. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/4, 3/11, 3/12 and 4/4)

18. Details of the specification and position of fencing, or any other measures to be taken for the protection of any trees from damage during the course of development, shall be submitted to the local planning authority for its written approval, and implemented in accordance with that approval before any equipment, machinery or materials are brought onto the site for the purpose of development (including demolition). The agreed means of protection shall be retained on site until all equipment, and surplus materials have been removed from the site. Nothing shall be stored or placed in any area protected in accordance with this condition, and the ground levels within those areas shall not be altered nor shall any excavation be made without the prior written approval of the local planning authority.

Reason: To protect the visual amenity of the area and to ensure the retention of the trees on the site. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/4, 3/11, 3/12 and 4/4)

19. Prior to the commencement of development, plans and details showing measures to install reptile fencing, the position and details of two barn owl boxes and bat mitigation measures shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The details shall include a programme for the implementation of the mitigation. The mitigation shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

In order to safeguard protected species (Cambridge Local Plan policies 4/3 and 4/7).

20. The areas of amenity grassland immediately to the west of units 1, 2 and 3 and to the south of units 3 and 5 (not including the private garden to unit 5) as shown on the Liz Lake Associates plan 1582 03 Rev F dated 17.03.14 shall not be used as private garden land or communal garden land for domestic use and shall remain free of any structures, including seating, benching, domestic paraphernalia and caravans or other forms of habitation and shall not be subdivided in terms of the erection of fencing or any other form of physical delineation. Prior to the occupation of any of the units, a management plan for the maintenance of these areas shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The plan shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details. For the avoidance of doubt all permitted development rights pertaining to parts 1, 2, 4 and 5 of the General Permitted Development Order 1995 (as amended) are removed.

In order to safeguard the character and setting of the site and the associated heritage assets (Cambridge Local Plan policies 3/2, 3/3, 3/4, 3/7, 3/10, 3/11, 3/12, 3/14, 4/2, 4/3, 4/10 and 4/11).

21. Prior to the commencement of development of units 9, 10, 11 or 12 the modern former agricultural building the subject of application 14/0875/CLUED and all of its associated storage together with all other temporary structures including caravans and workshops and external storage shall be removed from the site.

Reason: In order to comply with Green Belt policy (Cambridge Local Plan policy 4/1)

22. No development shall take place until samples of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure that the appearance of the external surfaces is appropriate. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/4, 3/12 and 3/14)

23. Before starting any brick or stone work, a sample panel of the facing materials to be used shall be erected on site to establish the detail of bonding, coursing and colour and type of jointing and shall be agreed in writing with the local planning authority. The quality of finish and materials incorporated in any approved sample panel(s), which shall not be demolished prior to completion of development, shall be maintained throughout the development.

Reason: In the interests of visual amenity and to ensure that the quality and colour of the detailing of the brickwork/stonework and jointing is acceptable and maintained throughout the development. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/4 and 3/12)

24. All joinery [window frames, etc.] is to be recessed at least 50 / 75mm back from the face of the wall / façade. The means of finishing of the 'reveal' is to be submitted to and approved in writing by the LPA.

Reason: To avoid harm to the special interest of the Conservation Area. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006, policy 4/11).

25. Full details of the means of temporary restraint / stabilisation / support to the retained historic fabric [walls, roofs, etc.] during the works to be submitted to and approved in writing by the LPA. Thereafter the temporary measures shall be installed in accordance with the agreed details [unless the LPA agrees to any variation in writing] until such time that the historic fabric is capable of self-support.

Reason: To avoid harm to the curtilage listed buildings (Cambridge Local Plan policy 4/10)

26. No boiler flues, soil pipes, waste pipes or air extract trunking, etc. shall be installed until the means of providing egress for all such items from the new or altered bathrooms, kitchens and plant rooms has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Flues, pipes and trunking, etc. shall be installed thereafter only in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To avoid harm to the curtilage listed buildings (Cambridge Local Plan policy 4/10)

27. No roofs shall be constructed until full details of the type and source of roof covering materials and the ridge, eaves and hip details, if appropriate, have been submitted to the local planning authority as samples and approved in writing. Roofs shall thereafter be constructed only in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To avoid harm to the curtilage listed buildings (Cambridge Local Plan policy 4/10)

28. All new render is to be approved by the LPA by means of a sample panel to be prepared on site for inspection. It is likely that only traditional render mix designs will be acceptable. Rendered walls shall thereafter be constructed only in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To avoid harm to the curtilage listed buildings (Cambridge Local Plan policy 4/10)

29. No metal-clad or other non-traditional roofs shall be erected until full details of such roofs including materials, colours, surface finishes and relationships to rooflights or other rooftop features have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To avoid harm to the special interest of the Conservation Area. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006, policy 4/11)

30. Full details of the glass type(s) to be used in windows/doors/screens/roofs or other glazed features to be submitted to and approved in writing by the LPA. It may be necessary to submit samples to discharge this Condition. Thereafter the development shall be undertaken in accordance with the agreed details unless the LPA agrees to any variation in writing.

Reason: To avoid harm to the curtilage listed buildings (Cambridge Local Plan policy 4/10)

31. Samples of timber boarding are to be submitted to the LPA for approval for type, fixing method, surface [sawn, planed, etc.] and surface finish [paint or stain] or self-colour. Boarding and finishing shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To avoid harm to the curtilage listed buildings (Cambridge Local Plan policy 4/10)

32. No new, replacement or altered joinery shall be installed, nor existing historic joinery removed, until drawings at a scale of 1:10 of all such joinery (doors and surrounds, windows and frames and balustrades, etc.) have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To avoid harm to the curtilage listed buildings (Cambridge Local Plan policy 4/10)

33. Prior to any painting/varnishing/staining or other external treatment to new or retained joinery, the colour of the external treatment to new or retained joinery shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority by means of the British Standard Number [obtainable from B S Framework for Colour Co-ordination for building purposes, BS 5252: 1976]. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To avoid harm to the curtilage listed buildings (Cambridge Local Plan policy 4/10)

34. Notwithstanding the provisions of Schedule 2, Parts 1 and 2 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995 (or any Order revoking and re-enacting that order with or without modification) all permitted development rights in respect of those classes are hereby removed.

Reason: To safeguard visual amenity of the site and its heritage assets (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/4, 4/10 and 4/11).

35. The new-build houses shall not be occupied until units 1 and 2 (the threshing barn and the dovecot) have been fully repaired to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority in writing.

Reason: To ensure the heritage benefit to the listed buildings is realised through the grant of planning permission for the new build (Cambridge Local Plan policy 4/10).

36. All manhole or similar covers are to be of the infilled type [ie: a steel or other tray containing paving materials to match the surroundings] and if the cover crosses a boundary between two paving material types, the infill shall include both types to match. Works to manhole covers shall thereafter be constructed only in accordance with the foregoing.

Reason: To avoid harm to the curtilage listed buildings (Cambridge Local Plan policy 4/10)

37. Full details of all wall copings, piers and pier capstones including type, design [cross-sectional drawings may be appropriate], fixings and materials, to be submitted to and approved in writing by the LPA. Development must take place only in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To avoid harm to the curtilage listed buildings (Cambridge Local Plan policy 4/10)

## **INFORMATIVES**

Demolition/construction noise and vibration informative

The noise and vibration report should include

a) An assessment of the significance of the noise impact due to the demolition/construction works and suitable methods for this are to be found in BS 5228:2009 Part 1 Annex E - Significance of noise effects. It is recommended that the ABC method detailed in E.3.2 be used unless works are likely to continue longer than a month then the 2-5 dB (A) change method should be used.

b) An assessment of the significance of the vibration impact due to the demolition/construction works and suitable methods for this are to be found in BS 5228:2009 Part 2 Annex B - Significance of vibration effects.

If piling is to be undertaken then full details of the proposed method to be used is required and this should be included in the noise and vibration reports detailed above.

Following the production of the above reports a monitoring protocol should be proposed for agreement with the Local Planning Authority. It will be expected that as a minimum spot checks to be undertaken on a regular basis at site boundaries nearest noise sensitive premises and longer term monitoring to be undertaken when:-

- \* Agreed target levels are likely to be exceeded
- \* Upon the receipt of substantiated complaints
- \* At the request of the Local Planning Authority / Environmental Health following any justified complaints.

Guidance on noise monitoring is given in BS 5228:2009 Part 1 Section 8.4 - Noise Control Targets and in Annex G - noise monitoring.

A procedure for seeking approval from the Local Planning Authority (LPA) in circumstances when demolition/construction works need to be carried out at time outside the permitted hours. This should incorporate a minimum notice period of 10 working days to the Local Planning Authority and 5 working days to neighbours to allow the Local Planning Authority to consider the application as necessary. For emergencies the Local Planning Authority should be notified but where this is not possible the Council's Out of Hours Noise service should be notified on 01233 457457.

Contact details for monitoring personnel, site manager including out of hours emergency telephone number should be provided.



## Dust informative

To satisfy the condition requiring the submission of a program of measures to control airborne dust above, the applicant should have regard to:

\* Control of dust and emissions from construction and demolition - Best Practice Guidance produced by the London Councils:

[http://www.london.gov.uk/thelondonplan/guides/bpg/bpg\\_04.jsp](http://www.london.gov.uk/thelondonplan/guides/bpg/bpg_04.jsp)

\* Guidance on the assessment of dust from demolition and construction

[http://iaqm.co.uk/wp-content/uploads/guidance/iaqm\\_guidance\\_report\\_draft1.4.pdf](http://iaqm.co.uk/wp-content/uploads/guidance/iaqm_guidance_report_draft1.4.pdf)

\* Council's Supplementary Planning Document - "Sustainable Design and Construction 2007":

<http://www.cambridge.gov.uk/public/docs/sustainable-design-and-construction-spd.pdf>

The Considerate Contractors' Scheme (A105)

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 Construction Monitoring Officer in the Planning Department (Tel: 01223 457121).

## Asbestos

Asbestos containing materials (cement sheeting) may be present at the site. The agent/applicant should ensure that these materials are dismantled and disposed of in the appropriate manner to a licensed disposal site. Further information regarding safety issues can be obtained from the H.S.E.

## Concrete Crusher

Notification to the Environmental Growth and Quality team will be required under the Environmental Permitting Regulations if an on site concrete crusher will be used during the demolition stage.

## Contaminated Land Guide

The Council's document 'Developers Guide to Contaminated Land in Cambridge' provides further details on the responsibilities of the developers and the information required to assess potentially contaminated sites. It can be found at the City Council's website on <http://www.cambridge.gov.uk/ccm/content/environment-and-recycling/pollution-noise-and-nuisance/land-pollution.en>.

## Materials

1. Glass types that are tinted, metallic coated, mirrored or are otherwise rendered non-transparent are unlikely to be agreed.
2. Several brickwork sample panels may need to be supplied to illustrate the differing types of new, reconstructed and repaired brickwork on the different buildings.

**2. Unless prior agreement has been obtained from the Head of Planning, in consultation with the Chair and Spokesperson of this Committee to extend the period for completion of the Planning Obligation required in connection with this development, if the Obligation has not been completed by 5 November 2014, or if Committee determine that the application be refused against officer recommendation of approval, it is recommended that the application be refused for the following reason(s):**

The proposed development does not make appropriate provision for public open space, community development facilities, transport mitigation measures, public art, waste facilities, waste management and monitoring in accordance with Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/7, 3/8, 3/12, 5/5, 5/14, 8/3 and 10/1, the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Development Plan (Core Strategy Development Plan Document July 2011) policy CS16 and as **detailed in the**

Planning Obligation Strategy 2010, the Public Art Supplementary Planning Document 2010, the Open Space Standards Guidance for Interpretation and Implementation 2010, the Southern Corridor Area Transport Plan 2002, Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Waste Partnership (RECAP): Waste Management Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document 2012.

**3. In the event that the application is refused, and an Appeal is lodged against the decision to refuse this application, delegated authority is sought to allow officers to negotiate and complete the Planning Obligation required in connection with this development**