

Application Number	14/0922/FUL	Agenda Item	
Date Received	16th June 2014	Officer	Mr John Evans
Target Date	15th September 2014		
Ward	Castle		
Site	Westminster College Maddingley Road Cambridge CB3 0AA		
Proposal	Erection of a new building comprising study centre, library, radio and tv studio, meeting rooms, 7 study bedrooms, 2 fellows flats together with alterations to the Grade II listed boundary wall and external works and tree and shrub planting.		
Applicant	Mr Westminster College Maddingley Road Cambridge CB3 0AA United Kingdom		

SUMMARY	<p>The development accords with the Development Plan for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) The revised proposal will not detract from the character and appearance of adjacent Listed Buildings or the wider Conservation Area. 2) The revised footprint, mass, articulation and overall design of the building will harmoniously integrate with the existing family of buildings on campus. 3) The previous design reasons for refusal have been addressed.
RECOMMENDATION	APPROVAL

1.0 SITE DESCRIPTION/AREA CONTEXT

1.1 The application site is within Westminster College campus situated at the junction of Maddingley Road and Lady Margaret Road. Westminster College is an Arts and Crafts style building

constructed between 1897 and 1900. It is brick construction largely in Tudor style with elements of 17th classicism and Art Nouveau. The entire range of Westminster College is Grade 2 Listed.

- 1.2 To the north of the site are 1 and 2 Westminster College Bounds, which are two storey buildings which are part of Westminster College and are also Grade 2 Listed. The site gently slopes from the north of the site to the south adjacent to Madingley Road.
- 1.3 A substantial brick wall which varies in height from 1.5m to 2.2m encloses the site, behind which is a mature belt of predominantly deciduous trees. The most prominent tree is a relatively large Holm Oak in the south west corner of the site, the canopy of which is visually prominent when travelling west to east along Madingley Road. It is a category 2 tree with a life expectancy of approximately 20-40 years and is subject to a Tree Protection Order. All of the mature trees on the boundary are protected from felling by reason of being within a Conservation Area.
- 1.4 To the south of the site, across Madingley Road are the open playing fields of St Johns College.
- 1.5 The site falls within the Castle and Victoria Road Area of the Central Conservation Area and is adjacent to the West Cambridge Conservation Area.
- 1.6 The site was designated as protected open space within the 2011 Open Space and recreation strategy.
- 1.7 The site is within the City's Air Quality Management Area. There are car parking restrictions (double yellow lines) on Madingley Road and Lady Margaret Road.

2.0 THE PROPOSAL

- 2.1 This revised application seeks permission for the erection of a new building to accommodate the Woolf Institute, comprising a study centre, library, radio and TV studio, meeting rooms, seven study bedrooms, two fellows flats and associated external works.

- 2.2 The Woolf Institute is a leading research institute which studies the relationships between Christians, Jews and Muslims. There is no direct affiliation with Westminster College, although the two institutions share common research objectives. The Woolf Institute is currently based in Wesley House, Jesus Lane.
- 2.3 The proposed building has a rectangular shaped footprint, with a semi circular projection on the ground floor north east corner, accommodating a study area. There are four levels of accommodation which includes a basement and a recessed upper roof level. The building has a traditional design and appearance, and is divided into two sections with twin gables at the southern end. The main eaves level rises 7.2m and the overall roof height stands 12.7m to the top of the recessed upper floor.
- 2.4 The building will be constructed in a handmade red brick, Clipsham stone and handmade dark plain clay roof tiles.
- 2.5 The Woolf Institute will employ 20 full time staff at the site and will hold conferences twice a month for approximately 50 delegates.
- 2.6 There is a concurrent application for Listed Building consent for alterations to the Grade 2 Listed boundary wall. A report for the application reference 14/0923/LBC is also on the agenda.
- 2.7 The application is accompanied by the following supporting information:
 1. Design and Access Statement
 2. Planning Statement
 3. Heritage Assessment
 4. Archaeology Evaluation Assessment
 5. Ground Investigation Report
 6. Drainage and Flooding Strategy
 7. Ecology Appraisal
 8. Tree Survey
 9. Public Art Delivery Plan
 10. Renewable Energy Statement
 11. Sustainability Checklist
 12. Transport Technical note

2.8 The application is brought before Planning Committee because the previous major application on the site was dealt with by Planning Committee.

3.0 SITE HISTORY

Reference	Description	Outcome
13/1469/FUL	Erection of new building comprising study centre, library, radio and TV studio, meeting rooms, 10 study bedrooms, 2 fellows flats together with associated external works and tree and shrub planting.	Refused
14/0923/LBC	Alterations to Grade 2 Listed boundary wall	Concurrent application

The previous application was refused for the following reasons:

1. The proposed building, by reason of its disproportionately large footprint, height, scale, massing, in particular the oversized rotunda and unattractive rear stairwell, will be an intrusive, incongruous development, detracting from the special setting, character and appearance of the Grade II Listed Westminster College. The applicant has failed to demonstrate that the public benefits from the development outweigh the harm to a designated heritage asset and it has not been demonstrated that the proposed building will have a positive impact on or respond positively to its context or setting and as such, the proposal is contrary to Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/4, 3/12, 4/2 and 4/10 and advice contained within the NPPF.

2. The proposed building, by reason of its disproportionately large footprint, height, scale, massing, in particular the oversized rotunda and unattractive rear stairwell, will be an intrusive, incongruous development, detracting from the character and appearance of the Central and West Cambridge Conservation Areas, causing unacceptable harm to these Heritage Assets. Contrary to Local Plan policy 4/11 the design of the proposed development would adversely affect views across the conservation areas and fail to preserve or enhance their character and appearance, neither faithfully reflecting their context nor providing a successful contrast. The applicant has failed to demonstrate that the public benefits from the development outweigh the harm to the designated heritage assets and it has not been demonstrated that the proposed building will have a positive impact on or respond positively to its context or setting and as such, the proposal is contrary to Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/4, 3/12, 4/2, 4/10 and 4/11 and advice contained within the NPPF.
3. The proposed building, by reason of its disproportionately large footprint, height, scale, and massing results in unresolved tensions between the future users of the new building and future pressure for tree works/removals. The proposed south facing accommodation will have a gloomy aspect which will inevitably result in significant pressure for continued works to trees, the presence of which are an important part of the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. In so doing the proposal has not responded appropriately to the site constraints and fails to have a positive impact on its setting contrary to Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/4, 3/11, 4/4, 4/10 and 4/11 and Government Guidance contained within the NPPF.
4. The proposed development does not make appropriate provision for public open space, transport mitigation measures or waste facilities and monitoring in accordance with Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/7, 3/8, 3/12, 5/14 and 10/1 and as detailed in the Planning Obligation Strategy 2010, the Open Space Standards Guidance for Interpretation and Implementation 2010, the Western Corridor Area Transport Plan 2003 and Peterborough Waste Partnership (RECAP): Waste Management Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document 2012.

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
Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Plan (Development Plan Documents) July 2011	CS16
Cambridge Local Plan 2006	3/4 3/7 3/9 3/11 3/12 4/2 4/3 4/4 4/10 4/11 4/12 4/13 4/15 5/1 5/12 7/7 7/10 8/2 8/6 8/16 10/1

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

Central Government Guidance	National Planning Policy Framework March 2012 Circular 11/95 Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010
-----------------------------	---

Supplementary Planning Documents	Sustainable Design and Construction Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Waste Partnership (RECAP) : Waste Management Design Guide Planning Obligation Strategy Public Art
Material Considerations	<u>Central Government:</u> Letter from Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government (27 May 2010) Written Ministerial Statement: Planning for Growth (23 March 2011) National Planning Practice Consultation
	<u>Citywide:</u> Arboricultural Strategy Biodiversity Checklist Cambridgeshire Design Guide For Streets and Public Realm
	<u>Area Guidelines:</u> Western Corridor Area Transport Plan Conservation Area Appraisal: Castle and Victoria Area

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 emerging policies which are relevant.

6.0 CONSULTATIONS

Cambridgeshire County Council (Highways Development Management)

6.1 Preliminary comment

Consultation with Growth and Economy, Traffic Signals and Safety Teams required.

Interim comments:-

6.2 Following implementation of any Permission issued by the Planning Authority in regard to this proposal the residents of the new dwelling will not qualify for Residents' Permits (other than visitor permits) within the existing Residents' Parking Schemes operating on surrounding streets. This should be brought to the attention of the applicant, and an appropriate informative added to any Permission that the Planning Authority is minded to issue with regard to this proposal.

I will report full comments from the Highways Authority on the pre committee amendment sheet.

Urban Design and Conservation Team

6.3 This has been the subject of extensive informal discussion and site meetings.

A previous application for a building with a similar specification was refused on design grounds relating to its scale, materials and appropriateness for a site in the CA and adjacent to an LB. It is considered that the new design overcomes most of the objections to the earlier scheme.

- 6.4 The location within the college grounds is acceptable in conservation and design terms, being far enough from the trees & shrubbery and well placed in relation to “The Bounds”. The relationship to the main college buildings works well, as shared facilities [dining hall, etc.] face the new Institute across a new court which is formed more-or-less to the traditional college layout.
- 6.5 The form of the new block, with a double gable reflecting the strongly gabled character of the existing college, plenty of vertical emphasis from fenestration and the rooftop flues/chimneys in a steeply pitched roof, would sit comfortably with the existing LBs and their settings.
- 6.6 The particular feature of a semi-circular room projects at ground floor level towards the Westminster buildings. At third floor level a deck of accommodation sits between the inner roof slopes. Views of the new building have been presented in the form of photomontages which indicate that it will not have an adverse effect on the wider CA. The unusual tower of the existing college will remain the main focus of distant views towards this site.
- 6.7 The proposed materials: handmade red brick, Clipsham stone (rather than the Portland stone of the refused scheme) and handmade dark plain clay roof tiles; should sit well alongside the existing LBs and nearby buildings. Other materials include bronze finish standing seam panels and powder coated aluminium window frames.
- 6.8 There are some reservations about the amount of floor-to-ceiling glazing in the entrance foyer – between the two main bays – but the fine detail can be determined via suitable conditions. Also, the third floor pavilion ought not to be permitted in terms of materials to appear as visually prominent above and between the tiled roofs - the proposed dark zinc roof covering may help achieve this but a balcony screen to the Madingley Road terrace deck is shown sitting only a little way back from the twin gables (and could beneficially be set further back) and the glazing/framing around the pavilion should be dark in colour. Again, these matters can be controlled via conditions (as can the large surface level vents (south end) and a skylight (north end) shown but not detailed on the drawings).

- 6.9 The landscaping of the new building will be important to providing a new setting for the Western end of the existing college, a new, somewhat more formal court [this college hasn't really had one before] between old and new, a green buffer zone to two adjacent roads.
- 6.10 A new pedestrian entrance is proposed for the new Institute in matching stone and bricks reclaimed from the part of the wall to be demolished to make the new opening. The piers are indicated as being slimmer in comparison with others along the wall as befits a smaller scale entrance. Its position and scale are considered acceptable. No details of the gate itself are provided and these will therefore need to be confirmed via a condition on any listed building consent.
- 6.11 Subject to the recommended conditions covering masonry, balcony screens and roof materials, the applications are considered to comply with Local Plan 2006 policies 4/10 and 4/11 and are therefore supported.

English Heritage

- 6.12 English Heritage recommended refusal of the previous scheme, which would have been prominent from adjacent roads. The design for which approval is now sought is of a far less obtrusive character. English Heritage consider what is proposed to be broadly sympathetic to the character of both the College and the Conservation Area. It might be argued that the intensification of the development of the site might to some degree erode its historic aesthetic character, but if so it seems reasonable to suppose that any harm that might follow would be balanced by public benefits arising from the development.

Head of Refuse and Environment

- 6.13 No objections subject to construction hours, traffic noise and contaminated land related conditions.
- 6.14 The offices and seminar room with glazing on the Madingley road façade need to incorporate adequate noise insulation to the building envelope to ensure internal noise levels are achieved in accordance with BS 8233:2014 whilst achieving a reasonable level of ventilation.

Head of Streets and Open Spaces (Landscape Team)

6.15 The landscape team have reviewed the documents submitted for the above application and have the following comments:

1. The Landscape Team support the scheme in general, but there are concerns that the landscape details have not been fully considered.
 - a. There are concerns about the integration between the proposed and existing landscapes, particularly in relation to the new footway access from Madingley Road through the site to the steps leading to the adjacent college buildings. These should ideally align as the current design is awkward and not really useable with the offset jog at the base of the steps.
 - b. Shrub/understory planting could be provided around the new/existing car parking area in front of Westminster College to screen and separate it further from the pedestrian access. Pathway for the fire tender access is noted and should remain clear. Has fire tender path acknowledged existing Yew tree and the potential for dense low branches inhibiting access? Has fire tender path acknowledged the probability that cars may be parked in the spaces provided which might inhibit access?
 - c. How will the box hedge on the Lady Margaret Road aspect be accessed and maintained given the proposed underplanting under the trees?
 - d. We question the purpose of the single tree planted within the courtyard green space. It may be preferable to maintain an open green space free of trees, however, if there is a reason for the tree to be there, please supply a supporting statement within the Design and Access Statement
 - e. Three cycle hoops shown adjacent to the Westminster College building do not sit within adequate space required for cycle stands. Realigning the footpath with the steps will move the footpath away from the edge of the building and may provide enough space.
 - f. There is potential for including a perennial shrub border along an edge of the grass courtyard which could reinforce the proposed use pattern as well as potentially preventing desire lines forming through the lawns.

Head of Streets and Open Spaces (Tree Team)

6.16 Awaiting comments.

Cambridgeshire County Council (Archaeology)

- 6.17 The site has archaeological interest and site investigations are required. Condition recommended.

Design and Conservation Panel (Meeting of 14 May 2014)

- 6.18 The revised pre-application proposal for a new headquarters for the Woolf Institute set within the grounds of the Grade II Listed Westminster College. The original proposal was the subject of a Panel site visit in August 2013 (GREEN -3, AMBER -4) but was refused at Planning Committee in January this year primarily on grounds of height, scale and massing.

Amendments include the reduction in height by one storey, the setting back of the southern boundary by 2.5 metres, a revised entrance, the removal of the tower and a palette of materials more in keeping with the existing college buildings.

The Panel's comments are as follows:

□ Response to context. In the Panel's view the scheme was responsive to its context and could be successfully assimilated into the Westminster College campus. When preparing to submit the Planning application however, the Panel would stress the importance of identifying views that would help to convey the building's impact and the nature of its wider context. Winter views for example or typical views from street level where the building may not be very visible would help to provide a fuller appreciation of its assimilation and compatibility.

□ Movement and access. Some concern was expressed regarding the indicative location of the cycle parking to the east of the proposed building's entrance. It was felt that parking in such a position would undermine the quality of the welcome and setting to the Woolf Institute's building. The relocation of the cycle parking would have the added advantage of providing additional function space within the courtyard. Planting used creatively could help to shield cycle parking for a more pleasing result.

□ Courtyard and landscaping. The Panel were broadly comfortable with the courtyard arrangement as well as the patio

areas to the west and south. However, as much work is needed on the landscape design, the Panel decided to reserve its position in the absence of this detail.

Detailed design:

- Top storey. Insufficient justification was made for this lightweight extension or attic detail and the Panel remain unconvinced as to its appropriateness. Further consideration is recommended.
- Southern elevation. Some justification for the glazed 'slot' would have been welcomed. As this feature does not function as an entrance its appropriateness was questioned.
- Other details. The Panel welcome the inclusion of terraces. The appropriateness of the glass balcony on the drum was questioned but overall did not generate huge concern as it was felt that if executed well, would not be too prominent.
- Palette of materials. The provision of material samples would have been helpful. However, the Panel welcome the use of dark plain tiles, the use of Ancaster stone, hand-made bricks of a similar colour to Westminster College's main building and the measures being taken to avoid staining.

Conclusion

The scale and massing has been reduced by 200sqm and is pulled back making the scheme more responsive to its context. Although the attic element is questioned, the division of the eastern elevation into three separate elements helps to reduce the building's bulk even further. This acknowledgement of context is also apparent in the materials palette. In terms of the landscaping, the Panel are hopeful that a comprehensive scheme will be developed which will enhance both the setting of the Institute and Westminster College's main buildings.

VERDICT – GREEN (unanimous)

Cambridge City Council Access Officer

6.19 The accessible room bathroom layout needs improvement.

There needs to be hearing loops in chapel, teaching rooms, common rooms and receptions.

There needs to be good colour contrast to aid people with visual impairments wayfind.

Senior Sustainability Officer

6.20 The general approach to sustainable design and construction and renewable energy provision is supported.

Public Art Officer

6.21 Awaiting comments. I will update on the pre committee amendment sheet.

6.22 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:

23 Arran Close, Cherry Hinton

7.2 The representations can be summarised as follows:

- Support application.

7.3 The above representation is a summary of the comments that have been received. Full details of the representation can be inspected on the application file.

The consultation period ended on 8 July 2014. Any further representations received will be reported on the pre committee amendment sheet or orally at the committee.

8.0 ASSESSMENT

8.1 The key 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. Residential amenity
7. Refuse arrangements
8. Highway safety
9. Car and cycle parking
10. Planning Obligation Strategy

Principle of Development

Protected Open Space

- 8.2 The site is not allocated as Protected Open Space within the 2006 Local Plan. This notwithstanding, the wording of the policy is clear that open spaces protected include undesignated areas which fulfil at least one of the criteria to assess open space included in the plan. The site was included within the Open Space and Recreation Strategy 2011, because of its importance as a green break in the urban framework. The open spaces of colleges throughout the area contribute to the verdant character of this part of the Castle ward.
- 8.3 Development will not be permitted which would be harmful to the character of, or lead to the loss of open space of environmental and/or recreational importance unless the open space uses can be satisfactorily replaced elsewhere and the site is not important for environmental reasons, in accordance with Local Plan policy 4/2. This includes private open spaces that contribute to the character, environmental quality or biodiversity of the area.
- 8.4 The revised reconfiguration of accommodation and facilities in my view falls within the criteria of a 'legitimate educational need' set out within the Open Space and Recreation Strategy. The development would result in the loss of informal green space on campus, but it is not a formal area for sports. Given that the open space does not serve a formal recreation purpose, refusal on the grounds of recreational importance would not in my view be justified.

- 8.5 The visual amenity impact from the development is the key issue and should be assessed under paragraphs 132 and 133 of the NPPF which state that substantial harm to the setting of a Grade II Listed Building should be only be allowed in exceptional circumstances. This revised application addresses the previous design reasons for refusal (discussed below), so the principle of loss of informal open space is in this case justified on the basis of educational benefits.

Speculative Student Accommodation

- 8.6 The development of speculative student hostel accommodation will only be permitted in the City subject to a) occupancy conditions ensuring that the accommodation is only available to full time students of Cambridge University or Anglia Ruskin University, (b) appropriate arrangements are in place to ensure students do not keep cars in Cambridge, (c) they are reasonably close to the institutions they serve and (d) they make appropriate provision for students who are disabled. This application is made by the Woolf Institute and is within the campus of Westminster College. I do not therefore feel the proposal should be assessed against the criteria of policy 7/10 because the development is not 'speculative' in nature.
- 8.7 To take the view that the Woolf Institute is not a part of Cambridge University for the purposes of applying 7/10 would be too narrow. It has a very close affiliation with the University, demonstrated by the fact that some of catering facilities will be accommodated within Westminster College buildings. In my opinion, whilst not in name, the ties between the University and the Woolf Institute are sufficiently developed to demonstrate the student accommodation is not speculative in nature.
- 8.8 This approach is consistent with the Council's consideration of application 08/1090/FUL, for the proposed erection of a student accommodation block for The Evangelical Lutheran Church of England in connection with Westfield House Theological College, Westfield Lane. In this case, rather than being speculative development in the strictest sense, the development was for student accommodation developed by a theological college (Westfield House Theological College) for use by its full-time students. The use of the accommodation was capable of being restricted to use by the college only, by a planning condition. In the case of the application proposal, a suitable

planning condition can ensure that the accommodation is restricted for the use of the Woolf Institute or Westminster College. (Cambridge University and ARU occupation would be acceptable under the criteria of Local Plan policy 7/10. See Condition 15).

- 8.9 In light of the above, the key policy relevant to this scheme is the later section of policy 7/7. Planning permission will be granted for windfall and student hostel sites subject to, a) amenity considerations, b) their proximity to the institutions they serve, c) supervision, if necessary and d) provided it does not result in the loss of family accommodation. The proposal is not in conflict with any of these criteria.

New community facilities

- 8.10 The proposal is supported in principle by Local Plan policy 5/12, being a new community facility.
- 8.11 To summarise, the development of Protected Open Space would not cause significant harm to the setting of the Grade II Listed Westminster College. The proposal is therefore in accordance with Cambridge Local Plan policies 4/2, 4/10 and 4/11, the Open Space and Recreation Strategy (2011) and Government Guidance contained with paragraphs 74 and 132 of the NPPF. The previous application was not refused on the grounds that the development was unacceptable in principle.

Context of site, design and external spaces

- 8.12 The key design issues relate to the impact of the building upon the character and appearance of the Conservation Area, the impact on adjacent trees, and the setting of the nearby Grade II Listed College buildings. I discuss below how the amended scheme addresses the previous design reasons for refusal.
- 8.13 The previously proposed building was considered unacceptable because of its incongruous mass and detailed design in this sensitive setting, in close proximity to two listed buildings. A landmark building was previously proposed, with strident Portland stone cladding, which was unacceptable in such a prominent setting, which is visible from both Madingley Road and Lady Margaret Road.

Design and layout

- 8.14 The character of the existing Westminster College is a central spine of relatively narrow span, with recessed wings. This results in the overall scale of the building not appearing bulky or overbearing within its setting of green space. The principle of some development on the site is considered acceptable by officers. Any new building in this location should be subservient to the hierarchy of buildings on the campus and have a detailed design which reflects its context of narrow span wings, pitched roofs and red brick materials.
- 8.15 The application proposal achieves a successful relationship in its context in part because of a small reduction in footprint by approximately 200sqm; a more favourable siting in relation to the southern tree belt, and crucially revised articulation of the footprint and elevations into four articulated elements, which reduces the building's overall bulk. In my view the revised footprint of the building, in combination with its completely revised elevation treatment will integrate successfully with the existing family of buildings on the campus, in accordance with Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/4, 4/10 and 4/11.

Scale, Mass and detailed design

- 8.16 The revised application proposal will positively integrate with the adjacent Listed Buildings of the main Westminster Range. This is because the design of the building reflects its sensitive context, rather than seeking a direct contrast. The principal eaves level is broadly consistent with the Westminster College main range and Lucy Cavendish College to the west of Lady Margaret Road. Importantly, the form of the building comprises of a double gable which provides a strong, positive relationship with the Grade 2 Listed Bounds to the north, which was a significant shortcoming of the previously refused application. Perspective views have been provided which demonstrate the building will integrate harmoniously with the Madingley Road and Lady Margaret Road street scene.
- 8.17 The previously proposed application was refused in part because of the oversized rotunda and unattractive rear stairwell, considered to be intrusive and incongruous. In response, these elements do not form part of the revised scheme and the building has been entirely reconfigured. The application

proposal is far less commanding in its appearance at the junction with Madingley Road and Lady Margaret Road. The steeply pitched roof forms will reflect the main College range, and the dormers and bay features are appropriately designed to integrate with the Arts and Crafts style of buildings adjacent. Notwithstanding some reservations from the Design and Conservation Panel, in my view the upper roof level accommodation will not be unduly prominent and will not detract from the overall proportions of the building. In my view, the proposed building will harmoniously integrate Madingley Road and Lady Margaret Street scene, in accordance with Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/4, 3/12 and 4/11.

- 8.18 The proposed materials palette, with a handmade red brick (exact type to be agreed by condition 2) and roof tiles should result in a high quality finish. The Urban Design and Conservation Team has some concerns regarding the prominence of the balcony screen on the roof level, but I am confident suitable materials can be agreed through the discharge of conditions 2 and 3.

Trees and external spaces

- 8.19 The refused application proposed a cramped and constrained footprint with large areas of glazing facing south. This would have been likely to result in significant pressure for continued tree works/removals when the building was occupied. This issue formed reason for refusal number 3 of 13/1469/FUL. Given the site orientation, the south end of the site is shaded throughout the daytime. Adequate consideration has now been given to the impact on the dense tree belt immediately to the south of the building. The siting of the proposed building has been moved further to the north and the southern elevation is no longer a principal outlook for the library and study rooms. I will report the Arboriculture Officer's comments on the amendment sheet or orally at the committee.
- 8.20 The proposed landscaping will enhance its overall setting and will provide a strong connection with the existing family of buildings on campus. I note from the Council's Landscape officer comments that improvements can be made to the new footpath access from Madingley Road. This can be ensured through the discharge of landscape condition 9.

8.21 There is no objection to the new pedestrian access through the Listed wall. Details of the gate can be ensured through the imposition of condition 13. This part of the scheme may provide an opportunity to integrate the required public art into the development. (See paragraph 8.29).

8.22 In summary, the bulk, scale and articulation of the amended building positively responds to the setting of the adjacent Grade 2 Listed Westminster main range and wider Conservation Area. Reasons for refusal 1 and 2 of 13/1469/FUL have therefore been addressed. Subject to the views of the Arboriculture officer, reason 3 has also been addressed. There will be no harm to these Heritage Assets and the proposal is therefore in accordance with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 3/4, 3/7, 3/11, 3/12, 4/10, 4/11, 4/4 and Government Guidance contained within paragraph 132 of the NPPF.

Public Art

8.23 The applicant has submitted a Public Art Delivery Plan (PADP) to provide the required 1% of capital construction costs through public art on the site. The Council's public art officer is considering this proposal and I will provide an update on the pre Committee amendment sheet. In my opinion this aspect of 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

8.24 The applicant has submitted a Sustainability Checklist in accordance with Local Plan policy 3/1. The scheme intends to incorporate photovoltaic panels to provide 10% of the developments energy requirements through on site renewable energy technologies. This approach is considered acceptable by the Council's Senior Sustainability Officer.

8.25 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

- 8.26 The building will accord with Part M of the Building Regulations and will be accessible for disabled people. The Access Officer's comments on internal layout will be brought to the applicants attention. In my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 3/7 and 3/12.

Residential Amenity

- 8.27 Given the location of the site within the campus of Westminster College there will not be any impact on other residential properties.
- 8.28 The new building will have a significant impact on The Bounds, a part of Westminster College, to the north. The distance between the two buildings is sufficient to avoid overshadowing of this building. The relationship of the proposed new building and The Bound is one of character rather than amenity and discussed in the design section above.
- 8.29 The impact of road noise on future occupiers can be addressed through condition 7. In my opinion the proposal adequately respects the residential amenity of its neighbours and the constraints of the site and I consider that it is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 3/4 and 3/7. The previous application was not refused on grounds of residential amenity.

Refuse Arrangements

- 8.30 Refuse arrangements could be adequately incorporated into the existing provision at Westminster College. In my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policy 3/12.

Highway Safety

- 8.31 The County Council have considered this scheme and are satisfied the scheme will not present any highway safety issues. No new vehicle accesses will be created. In my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policy 8/2.

Car and Cycle Parking

Car Parking

8.32 The adopted car parking standards recommend a provision of one space for every three members of non-residential staff, plus one space per resident warden/staff. In this case three disabled spaces are provided. I am satisfied that this provision is appropriate given the sustainable location of the site and on the basis that a travel plan is agreed.

Cycle Parking

8.33 In my view the proposed 16 spaces appears to underestimate demand. The adopted cycle parking standards suggest that approximately 30 spaces would be appropriate for the likely number of full time staff and delegated. One Cycle parking space is require per residential unit and one space for every two members of staff using the academic parts of the building. I am satisfied this issue could be dealt with through the imposition of a suitable planning condition 12.

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

Planning Obligation Strategy

8.35 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 proposed development triggers the requirement for the following community infrastructure:

Open Space

8.36 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.

While it is recognised the site does not serve as an area for formal sport, the applicant has not demonstrated that adequate sports provision is made at Westminster College or elsewhere, to meet the requirements of the Planning Obligation Strategy.

The site will result in the loss of a large proportion of informal amenity at the college.

The totals required for the new buildings are calculated as follows:

Outdoor sports facilities					
Type of unit	Persons per unit	£ per person	£per unit	Number of such units	Total £
studio	1	238	238	7	1666
1 bed	1.5	238	357	2	714
2-bed	2	238	476		
3-bed	3	238	714		
4-bed	4	238	952		
Total					2380

Indoor sports facilities					
Type of unit	Persons per unit	£ per person	£per unit	Number of such units	Total £
studio	1	269	269	7	1883
1 bed	1.5	269	403.50	2	807
2-bed	2	269	538		
3-bed	3	269	807		
4-bed	4	269	1076		
Total					2690

Informal open space					
Type of unit	Persons per unit	£ per person	£per unit	Number of such units	Total £
studio	1	242	242	7	1694
1 bed	1.5	242	363	2	726
2-bed	2	242	484		
3-bed	3	242	726		
4-bed	4	242	968		
Total					2420

8.37 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).

Waste

8.38 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:

Waste and recycling containers			
Type of unit	£per unit	Number of such units	Total £
House	75		
Flat	150	9	1350
Total			1350

8.39 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.

Transport

8.40 Contributions towards catering for additional trips generated by proposed development are required. The site lies within the Western Corridor Area Transport Plan.

8.41 The applicants have submitted a transport assessment on which the following assessment of additional trips and contributions is based. The methodology for calculating the trip rates and required contribution is currently being negotiated with the County Council. I will provide an update on the pre Committee amendment sheet or orally at the committee.

8.42 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

- 8.43 The development is required to make provision for public art and officers have recommended above that in this case provision for public art should be made on site. This needs to be secured by the S106 planning obligation. Subject to a S106 planning obligation to secure this infrastructure provision, the proposal accords with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 3/7 and 10/1 and the Public Art SPD 2010.

Monitoring

- 8.44 The Planning Obligation Strategy (2010) requires that all new residential 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.

Planning Obligations Conclusion

- 8.45 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 revised, footprint, scale and massing of the building will integrate harmoniously with the existing family of buildings on campus. There will be no harm to the character and appearance of adjacent Listed Buildings or the Conservation Area. APPROVAL is recommended.

10.0 RECOMMENDATION

1. **APPROVE** subject to completion of the s106 Agreement by 1 September 2014 and 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. 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)

3. Except with the prior written agreement of the local planning authority 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: To protect the amenity of the adjoining properties. (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: To protect the amenity of the adjoining properties. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 4/13)

5. In the event of the foundations for the proposed development requiring piling, prior to the development taking place the applicant shall provide the local authority with a report / method statement for approval detailing the type of piling and mitigation measures to be taken to protect local residents noise and or vibration. Potential noise and vibration levels at the nearest noise sensitive locations shall be predicted in accordance with the provisions of BS 5228-1:2009 Code of Practice for noise and vibration control on construction and open sites. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details. Due to the proximity of this site to existing residential premises and other noise sensitive premises, impact pile driving is not recommended.

Reason: To protect the amenity of the adjoining properties.
(Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 4/13)

6. Prior to the commencement of development/construction, a noise insulation scheme detailing the acoustic noise insulation performance specification of the external building envelope of the residential units (having regard to the building fabric, glazing and ventilation) to reduce the level of noise experienced in the residential units as a result of the proximity of the habitable rooms to the high ambient noise levels in the area be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The scheme shall achieve internal noise levels recommended in British Standard 8233:2014 'Guidance on sound Insulation and noise reduction for buildings'. The scheme as approved shall be fully implemented before the use hereby permitted is commenced and shall not be altered without prior approval.

Reason: In the interests of the amenities of future occupants,
Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 4/13.

7. Before the development/use hereby permitted is commenced, a scheme for the insulation of the building(s) and/or plant in order to minimise the level of noise emanating from the said building(s) and/or plant shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority and the scheme as approved shall be fully implemented before the use hereby permitted is commenced.

Reason: To protect the amenity of nearby properties
(Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 4/13)

8. 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: To protect the amenity of nearby properties (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 4/13)

9. 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. 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.

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)

10. 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)

11. No development shall take place within the site until the applicant, or their agent or successors in title, has secured the implementation of a programme of archaeological work in accordance with a written scheme of investigation which has been submitted by the applicant and approved in writing by the local planning authority.

Reason: To ensure that an appropriate archaeological investigation of the site has been implemented before development commences. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 4/9)

12. No development shall commence until details of facilities for the covered, secured parking of bicycles for use in connection with the development hereby permitted shall be submitted to and approved by the local planning authority in writing. The approved facilities shall be provided in accordance with the approved details before use of the development commences.

Reason: To ensure appropriate provision for the secure storage of bicycles. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 8/6)

13. Prior to the installation of a gate in the approved new pedestrian entrance within the listed boundary wall, full details shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans.

Reason: To avoid harm to the special interest of the listed building (Cambridge Local Plan 2006, policy 4/10).

14. Notwithstanding its representation on the approved drawings, the positioning, materials and design for the south elevation 3rd floor terrace screen and handrail shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to installation. The 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) or setting of the listed buildings (Cambridge Local Plan 2006, policy 4/10).

15. The development hereby permitted shall be used as a residential institution for students attending full-time courses of education at the University of Cambridge, Anglia Ruskin University or the Woolf Institute.

Reason: To ensure purpose built student accommodation meets the need of these institutions (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 7/10).

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

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 1 September 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, transport mitigation measures or waste facilities and monitoring in accordance with Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/7, 3/8, 3/12, 5/14 and 10/1 and as detailed in the Planning Obligation Strategy 2010, the Open Space Standards Guidance for Interpretation and Implementation 2010, the Western Corridor Area Transport Plan 2003 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