

Application Number	14/0543/FUL	Agenda Item	
Date Received	9th April 2014	Officer	Miss Catherine Linford
Target Date	9th July 2014		
Ward	West Chesterton		
Site	1 Milton Road Cambridge CB4 1UY		
Proposal	Erection of student accommodation comprising 211 student rooms (following demolition of existing buildings) and a commercial unit to be used for Class A1 food retail purposes, together with bicycle and car parking and associated infrastructure.		
Applicant	MGD (Milton Road Cambridge) Ltd And Farnswood Ltd c/o Agent		

<p>SUMMARY</p>	<p>The development accords with the Development Plan for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Due to the reduction in bulk and height of the buildings, and improvements made to the relationship of Blocks A and B with the Portland Arms Public House, the proposals have satisfactorily addressed the previous Reason for Refusal 1 2. Due to the reduction in the bulk and height of Blocks D, E and F and the increase in the breaks between them the proposals have satisfactorily addressed the previous Reason for Refusal 2 3. Due to the increase in width of the main pedestrian entrance on Milton Road the entrance has become more prominent and visible and the proposals have therefore satisfactorily addressed the previous Reason for Refusal 3
----------------	---

	<p>4. Due to the reduction in bulk and height of Blocks C, D, E and F and because Block F is now further from the common boundary with 16 Corona Road the impact on neighbouring residents has significantly improved and the proposals have therefore satisfactorily addressed the previous Reason for Refusal 4</p> <p>5. Adequate cycle parking has now been provided and the proposals therefore satisfactorily address the previous Reason for Refusal 5</p>
RECOMMENDATION	APPROVAL

1.0 SITE DESCRIPTION/AREA CONTEXT

- 1.1 The application site is a 'T shaped' parcel of land situated on Mitchams Corner, at the junction of Milton Road and Victoria Road, with frontages on Milton Road, Victoria Road and Corona Road. The surrounding area is mixed in character with the Staples site opposite to the south; residential properties adjacent to the site on Victoria Road to the west; commercial and residential properties adjacent to the site on Milton Road to the north; and residential properties adjacent to the site on Corona Road to the north.
- 1.2 The site is currently occupied by a 'T-shaped' flat roofed building which is attached to a semi-derelict, vacant garage building which fronts onto Corona Road. The 'T-shaped' building fronts onto Milton Road and Victoria Road. The arm along the northern boundary, which runs east to west, is single-storey in height and fronts onto Milton Road; and the arm that connected to this runs north to south, is two storeys in height and fronts onto Victoria Road.
- 1.3 The site lies within the Castle and Victoria Conservation Area. The Portland Arms Public House is a Building of Local Interest (BLI).

2.0 THE PROPOSAL

2.1 This application follows on from a previous scheme for 260 student and a food retail unit that was refused planning permission by the Planning Committee on 4 December 2013 for the following reasons:

1. The proposed development, in particular Blocks A and B, by virtue of its overall bulk, scale, massing and height and lack of space for landscaping and tree planting would have an adverse impact on the character of the Castle and Victoria Conservation Area and the setting of the Portland Arms public house which is a Building of Local Interest. The development is therefore contrary to policies 3/4, 3/7, 3/11, 3/12, 4/11 or 4/12 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 and advice provided by the National Planning Policy Framework.
2. There is insufficient space between Blocks D, E and F. In consequence the three blocks would read as a continuous block which would dominate views into the site and internal open space. In so doing the development would have an adverse impact on the character of the Castle and Victoria Conservation Area and the setting of the Portland Arms public house which is a Building of Local Interest and fails to provide a high quality environment for future residents. The development is therefore contrary to policies 3/4, 3/7, 3/11, 3/12, 4/11 or 4/12 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 and advice provided by the National Planning Policy Framework.
3. As a consequence of the narrowness of the pedestrian accesses and the poor location of reception space the development fails to integrate well with the surrounding area. In so doing the development is not well connected to the immediate locality and does not create an attractive built frontage to positively enhance the townscape where the development meets the street. The development is therefore contrary to policies 3/4, 3/7 and 3/12 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 and advice provided by the National Planning Policy Framework.
4. The proposed development, by virtue of its scale, height and orientation in relation to adjacent buildings would be likely to have an adverse effect on the amenities enjoyed by residents of

adjacent dwellings in terms of having a visually dominating and enclosing impact and in the case of the houses fronting Corona Road an overshadowing impact. In so doing the development fails to respond positively to its context and does not have a positive impact on its setting. The development is therefore contrary to policies 3/4 and 3/12 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 and advice provided by the National Planning Policy Framework.

5. The proposal fails to provide appropriate cycle parking contrary to policy 8/6 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006
6. The proposed development does not make appropriate provision for public open space, 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, 5/14, and 10/1 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 Northern Corridor Area Transport Plan 2003, and Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Waste Partnership (RECAP): Waste Management Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document 2012.

- 2.2 Full planning permission is sought for the demolition of the existing commercial buildings on the site and the construction of a mixed use development, comprising of 211 student rooms and a 4300sqft food store. The site would have two accesses – a gated, vehicular access on Victoria Road in the same position as the existing access; and the main pedestrian access on Milton Road. The development would consist of six blocks:

Block A

- 2.3 Block A would stand adjacent to the Portland Arms Public House on Victoria Road, set back 4m from the frontage of the Portland Arms (3m further back than the previous application). This building would have a part single and part two storey element adjacent to the Portland Arms and would then step up to 2.5 storeys, with a taller 3.5 storey element located adjacent to the vehicle access. The building would house the site reception, refuse stores, communal study and recreation space,

and student rooms on the ground floor with student rooms above.

Block B

- 2.4 Block B would stand on the opposite side of the Portland Arms on Milton Road with the pedestrian access between the Portland Arms and Block B. This building would be setback 2.4m further forward than the frontage of the Portland Arms; and 8m from the flank wall of the Portland Arms at the narrowest point, increasing in width to 13m on the site frontage. This building would be three storeys in height. The top floor of the section closest to 5 Milton Road would step back by 2.8m from the side of the building. The building would house a food store at ground floor level with student rooms above.

Block C

- 2.5 Block would stand to the rear of Block A, with the vehicular access road to the west the building. The building would stand in line with the boundary with Corona Road and would be 3.5 storeys in height. In the previous application this building was longer, extending to the Victoria Road frontage, and stood at an angle on the site. The building would house student rooms on all floors.

Blocks D, E and F

- 2.6 Blocks D, E and F would be sited parallel to the northern boundary of the site. Part of Block F would front Corona Road and continue the existing terrace. Blocks E and F would abut the common boundary with 5 Milton Road and the Westbrook Centre and Block D would stand 1.6m from the common boundary. The building would read as three interconnected blocks, and would be 3.5 storeys in height, with single storey connecting elements between the blocks. The single storey element between Blocks D and E would be 3m in width and the single storey element between Blocks E and F would be 5m in width. Block F has been brought further away from the common boundary with 16 Corona Road and this separation distance is now 4.4m. The building would house student rooms on all floors.

2.7 Amended plans have been received which show the following revisions:

- Introduction of a 3.3m wide projecting chimney on the east elevation of Block A
- Further details have been submitted in relation to the Corona Road frontage of Block F and the fire escape on the northern side of Block B
- A 0.5m setback has been introduced on the Victoria Road frontage at ground, first and second floor levels of the 2.5 storey element between the Portland Arms Pub and 3.5 storey elements

3.0 SITE HISTORY

Reference	Description	Outcome
06/0075/OUT	Outline consent for residential development and related infrastructure.	A/C
13/1326/FUL	Erection of student accommodation comprising 260 student rooms (following demolition of existing building) and a commercial unit to be used for A1 food retail purposes; together with bicycle and car parking and associated infrastructure.	REF

The Decision Notice for the previously reused application 13/1326/FUL is attached to the report as Appendix 1.

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	3/1 3/4 3/7 3/11 3/12 3/15 4/4 4/11 4/12 5/1 5/12 6/8 7/10 8/2 8/6 8/10 10/1

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

Central Government Guidance	National Planning Policy Framework March 2012 National Planning Policy Framework – Planning Practice Guidance March 2014 Circular 11/95
Supplementary Planning Documents	Sustainable Design and Construction Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Waste Partnership (RECAP) : Waste Management Design Guide Affordable Housing Planning Obligation Strategy Public Art
	<u>Citywide:</u> Arboricultural Strategy Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire

	<p>Strategic Flood Risk Assessment</p> <p>Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (2005)</p> <p>Cambridge and Milton Surface Water Management Plan</p> <p>Open Space and Recreation Strategy</p> <p>Cycle Parking Guide for New Residential Developments</p> <p>Cambridge Shopfront Design Guide</p> <p>Roof Extensions Design Guide</p>
	<p><u>Area Guidelines:</u></p> <p>Buildings of Local Interest</p> <p>Castle and Victoria Conservation Area Appraisal</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, the following policy in the emerging Local Plan is of relevance:

Policy 21: Mitcham’s Corner Opportunity Area

6.0 CONSULTATIONS

Cambridgeshire County Council (Highways Development Management)

- 6.1 The proposed bollards protecting the loading lay by are acceptable to the Highway Authority. The issue of the junction arrangement between the proposed lay by and the existing access to the Portland Arms has not been resolved and two intersecting radii are shown on drawing number 110-00Rev32. The Highway Authority accepts that the access to the Portland Arms is lightly used; however, the conflict still exists and needs to be designed out as far as possible. Conditions are also recommended relating to a traffic management plan, and requiring that the doors of the convenience store open inwards.

Head of Refuse and Environment

- 6.2 No objection, subject to conditions relating to construction hours, construction delivery/collection hours, construction/demolition noise and vibration, dust, noise insulation, plant noise insulation, opening hours for the retail unit, deliveries to the retail unit, odour filtration/extraction, contaminated land.

Head of Streets and Open Spaces (Arboricultural Team)

- 6.3 A condition requiring details of tree protection measures is recommended.

Urban Design and Conservation team

- 6.4 The Urban Design & Conservation Team have reviewed the submitted application and have the following comments to make. By way of background the proposed site has been subject to a previous application (13/1326/FUL) which was refused at planning committee in December 2013. The latest submitted scheme has been subject to a number of pre-application discussion meetings including a workshop that took place in December 2013 and a number of conference calls with the design team in February and March 2014. The pre-application scheme was also reviewed at Cambridge City Council Design & Conservation Panel in March 2014 and received 3 green, 6 amber and 1 red vote.

6.5 The previous scheme (13/1326/FUL) proposed 284 student rooms, which was later reduced to 260 as part of a planning addendum. The revised submitted application proposes a total of 211 student rooms which equates to a 19% reduction in room numbers on the planning addendum, or a 26% reduction on the original planning application. The reduction in student rooms has allowed the height of Blocks A, C, D, E and F to be reduced from 4 full storeys to 3.5 storeys with rooms accommodated within roof spaces.

Existing:

6.6 The site is located within the Castle and Victoria Conservation Area. The Conservation Area Appraisal of June 2012 is relevant. The Victoria Road part of the conservation area is characterised by rows of terraced houses and villas, generally two storey and some rising to three. Exceptions are Alexander House and Staples sites - these are identified in the appraisal as detracting from the area.

6.7 The Bank at Mitcham's Corner and the terraces on Corona Road and Victoria Road are considered buildings important to the character of the conservation area (Conservation Area Appraisal – June 2012) and The Portland Arms PH is a Building of Local Importance. Just north of the site houses nos. 9-19 Milton Road, outside the conservation area are also Buildings of Local Importance.

6.8 The site is currently described within the Cambridge Local Plan (2006) as allocation site 7.04 (for mixed uses including employment B1(a), Local A1 A2, A3 and housing) and includes street frontages to Milton Road, Victoria Road Corona Road. The site is currently occupied by a single storey furniture showroom and two storey office accommodation, which form a "T" shape with the office accommodation running broadly north-south and the retail unit east-west.

Mitcham's Corner Opportunity Area

6.9 The site falls within the Mitcham's Corner Opportunity Area (as contained within the Cambridge Local Plan 2014: Proposed Submission, page 79). Policy 21 States that *'the character of the area will be enhanced by creating a block structure and*

developing building forms that moderate the scale and massing of the development and respond to their context and the prevailing character of the area’...and...‘opportunities for rebalancing the needs of pedestrians and cyclists over motor vehicles, restoring a more active street frontage and contributing to a human-scale environment should be taken’. A possible scheme to improve the highway network has been provided within the submitted D&A Statement (Page 18) and is in accordance with the aspirations of the Mitcham’s Corner Opportunity Area (Figure 3.8) of the Cambridge Local Plan 2014: Proposed Submission.

Scale and massing

Northern Block (C, D, E and F)

- 6.10 We previously raised concerns (application comments on the addendum to 13/1326/FUL) that the proposed arrangement of breaks at 2nd and 3rd floor levels between Blocks D & E and E & F failed to respond to views into the site from Victoria Road and from the central courtyard. The scale of Blocks D, E and F (and C) at 4 full storeys was considered to form a bulky and imposing development along the full length of the northern site boundary.
- 6.11 The revised scheme has reduced the height of Blocks C, D, E and F from 4 full storeys to 3.5 storeys, the 3rd floor accommodation is now located within a pitched roof space. Each block now includes an individual entrance and lift/stair core with shorter corridors. This arrangement has provided the opportunity for wider breaks¹ to be introduced between Blocks at first floor level and above. We support the proposed reduction in scale of the blocks and introduction of breaks which have helped break up the combined length of built form along the northern site boundary.
- 6.12 The revised scheme offsets Blocks D, E and F from one another. Block D has been pulled further south to provide a 3.5m setback from the side garden boundary of No. 5 Milton Road. We support this approach as Block D no longer ‘reads’ as a single combined block with Block E.
-

6.13 Site Section CC indicates the south elevation of Block F has been setback a further 3m from the boundary wall of No. 16 Corona Road (compared to the previous refused application). The Block is now located 4.5m away from this boundary at ground, first, second and third floor levels and has reduced perceived overbearing impacts to No. 16 Corona Road.

Victoria Road (Block A)

6.14 The scale and massing of Block A has been subject to a number of pre-application discussions following concerns that the previous 3 and 4 storey scale of Blocks A and C appeared bulky and dominated the adjacent pub building and 2 storey dwelling (No. 12 Victoria Road).

6.15 Block A has been setback 7m from the back of the footpath on Victoria Road and is now setback 4m from the Portland Arms PH frontage. The block rises from 1 storey immediately adjacent to the west gable end of the Portland Arms PH to 2.5 and 3.5 storeys further west along Victoria Road.

6.16 On further inspection of the helpful 3D Computer Generated Images in the D&A Statement, specifically the image on page 48 (view of Block A beside the Portland Arms PH) and 49 (view looking in the opposite direction) we are concerned that the depth of the east and west elevations and three storey height remains unsatisfactory and appears bulky and overly dominant above the roof of the Portland Arms PH. The south elevation drawing ghosts out the roof floor and the set-back above the brick storey is too slight to counter the bulky roof. In our view, the block will not look domestic in appearance. We suggest investigation of a hipped roof on the 3.5 storey element of Block A at its east and west ends (clad in the same slate as elsewhere). This would reduce the bulky appearance of the roof, particularly when viewed from the east.

6.17 As a footnote, we would add that some of the long street elevations are incomplete or incorrect. On pages 44 of the D&A Statement the 'Site South Elevation' (Victoria Road) Blocks, D, E and F are missing. Also, on page 45, the 'Site West Elevation (Corona Road)' the upper 3rd storey of Block A is incorrect in that it shows slate to the roof. Ironically with this second street scene, this is the type of appearance we are actually advocating e.g. a hipped roof at 3rd storey level on its west (and east) ends.

Milton Road (Block B)

- 6.18 The revised scheme reduces the height of Block B by approximately 1metre. The block now rises to 17.95m. The length of the Milton Road elevation has also been reduced from approximately 30m (shown on the addendum to 13/1326/FUL application) to 23m as a result of the increased width of the student entrance.
- 6.19 Following pre-application discussions the length of the 2nd floor setback on Milton road has been reduced (due to the re-orientation of the north-eastern most student room) and a 3.2m setback introduced on the north elevation. We support this arrangement which has stepped the scale of the building down and improved the relationship with the No. 5 Milton Road dwelling.
- 6.20 During pre-application discussions we raised concerns that the 16m wide south elevation of Block B appeared bulky and prominent looking north along Milton Road. The submitted application has since introduced a projecting stair/entrance core on this facade which has helped break up the width and bulk of this elevation.

Roof plant

- 6.21 The submitted elevations and the roof plan indicates collapsible handrails, solar PV panels and chimneys on the roof areas of Blocks A, B, C, D, E and F. The 3D CGIs contained within submitted D&A Statement (page 52) also show chimneys above the Corona Road Block (although these are missing on the submitted roof plan). Whilst the proposed chimneys are supported and provide articulation of the roofline, they should be functional in some way and we would hope that they could accommodate the vents from bathrooms and kitchens or even provide light wells to upper floors.
- 6.22 Further details of the proposed roof access arrangements need to be provided. We are concerned that the collapsible handrails maybe visible from street level.

Materials and elevation treatment

- 6.23 We support the proposed approach to the materials treatment; the pitched slate roofs, gault brick and projecting bay windows form an improved relationship with the range of building materials in the surrounding context. Following pre-application discussions the single storey element within Block A (containing the refuse store) is now red brick and forms an improved relationship with the adjacent Portland Arms PH. Red brick is also proposed for Block C and provides variation between the Blocks A and E either side. Details and samples of all of the proposed materials will need to be provided as part of a condition should the application be approved.
- 6.24 The Corona Road elevation of Block F has been revised and now includes slate tiled roofs, Flemish bond facing brick with projecting redbrick banding and projecting bay windows at ground floor level. We support this approach which forms an appropriate contemporary interpretation of the existing Corona Road façades.
- 6.25 Following concerns raised at pre-application stages, the dormer windows proposed in all blocks at 3rd floor level have been replaced with velux windows, thereby minimising opportunities for overlooking into adjacent private gardens and reducing the perceived height of individual blocks and the scheme overall.
- 6.26 The 2.5 and 3.5 storey elements on Block A are broken up at 2nd and 3rd floor levels. The 2.5 storey element of Block A should be setback slightly so as to break up the length of the block at Ground and 1st floor levels.
- 6.27 The junction of Block A with the flank of the Portland Arms PH is not detailed as e.g. a section drawing, and so its relation to the flank doorway arch or other features of the PH is not clear. A condition is suggested in order to deal with this.
- 6.28 The general approach to materials is supported in design terms. A number of key details are missing on the submitted elevations and CGIs including stone parapet copings and rainwater goods, and will need to be provided at condition stages.

Residential amenity

- 6.29 We support the proposed 'saw-tooth' windows (as shown on the south elevation of Block F, north elevation of Blocks D and E, and the west elevation of Block A and C at 1st, 2nd and 3rd floor levels) which direct views away from the rear gardens of properties fronting Corona Road and No. 5 Milton Road and provide articulation and variation to the elevations.
- 6.30 The rear elevation of Block B includes a first floor terrace area above the retail unit. Floor plans indicate access to the terrace will be from stairs adjacent to the central courtyard, the northern end of the corridor within Block B and from the fire escape at 2nd floor level. Student access to the terrace may result in potential overlooking of the rear garden of No. 5 Milton Road. Details of the access arrangements and any proposed screening on the north side of the terrace needs to be provided and could form part of a condition should the application be approved.

Arrangement of uses

- 6.31 The main student entrance between Block B and the north elevation of the Portland Arms PH has increased in width from 6m (addendum to 13/1326/FUL application) to 10m, the previous massing at 1st and 2nd floor levels covering the entrance has also been removed improving the legibility of the entrance. The window to the retail unit and entrance/circulation core at ground floor level together with the windows to the student rooms on the upper floor levels has improved surveillance of the student entrance.
- 6.32 The proposed arrangement of the communal spaces (kitchen/living rooms, meeting rooms and circulation cores) fronting the internal courtyard is supported and provides opportunities for surveillance and activity of this space.
- 6.33 The previous application included north facing ground floor rooms and narrow courtyard spaces on the north side of Blocks D, E and F. We raised concerns that these rooms had a poor outlook towards the retaining wall of the Westbrook Centre car park, the amenity spaces were also considered poor due to their orientation and size. The submitted application locates Blocks E and F closer to the northern site boundary with the Westbrook Centre and proposes a corridor, refuse room and mechanical

plant room adjacent to the boundary. These uses are more appropriate for this part of the site and help accommodate the variation in topography between the proposed application site and the Westbrook Centre car park.

Landscape, amenity and thresholds

- 6.34 We understand Landscape colleagues have provided comments separately, however the submitted landscape plan indicates threshold spaces have been introduced to the front of units surrounding the central courtyard at ground floor level and the west elevation of Block B at first floor level. We support this approach which improves the privacy of occupants.
- 6.35 The increased setback of Block A has provided an opportunity for additional tree planting on the Victoria Road street frontage. We support this approach which helps soften the scheme.
- 6.36 Further details of the proposed landscaped area to the north of Block D adjacent to the garden boundary of No. 5 Milton Road needs to be provided, it is unclear if this space will form an amenity function for the north facing student rooms within Block D.
- 6.37 Details of the area in front of the Corona Road elevation of Block F needs to be provided and should form part of a landscaped threshold space as per the existing adjacent units on Corona Road. The submitted 1st floor plan omits the light well to the ground floor units and needs to be provided.

Cycle parking and refuse storage

- 6.38 The previous application proposed a two phase approach to cycle parking, concern was raised that the location and arrangement of cycle parking had the potential to undermine the usable area of the central courtyard. The submitted scheme proposes a total of 200 cycle parking spaces (140 student spaces, 42 guest spaces and 18 spaces associated with the Sainsbury's supermarket). The 140 student spaces represent 100% provision and are in accordance with the Cambridge City Council Cycle Parking Standards (Cambridge Local Plan 2006).
- 6.39 Cycle parking is kept clear of the central courtyard and is mostly located in the northern part of the site (42 spaces adjacent to

Block F and 36 spaces within Block E), clusters of cycle parking are also proposed to the north and south of Block C and adjacent to the student entrance. Visitor cycle parking is proposed outside of the secure confined space of the site in front of Block C and to the south of Block B but is well located for surveillance from the student common room and retail unit. All cycle parking associated with the student use is proposed to be covered. The general approach to cycle parking is acceptable in design terms.

Conclusion:

- 6.40 The submitted scheme has addressed a number of concerns raised with the previous refused scheme (application ref 13/1326/FUL). The introduction of breaks between Blocks D, E and F at 1st, 2nd and 3rd floor levels is supported and has broken up the combined length of development along the northern site boundary. The reduced height of Blocks C and F (through the introduction of student rooms within the pitched roof space), and the increased setback of Blocks E and F (through the reconfiguration of the ground floor uses) has reduced the perceived bulk of these blocks from the rear gardens on Corona Road. The reduction in height of Blocks A, C, D, E and F from 4 full storeys to 3.5 is supported and is more domestic in appearance.
- 6.41 However, despite these changes we are concerned that the east and west gable ends of Block A at roof level (third floor) appear prominent above the roofline of the Portland arms PH. As noted earlier, a hipped roof would help reduce the bulky appearance of this roof area. We would be pleased to discuss this specific point in further detail with the applicant architect as necessary.
- 6.42 The 2.5 and 3.5 storey elements on Block A are broken up at 2nd and 3rd floor levels, however in order to provide a greater level of “separation” to the main bulk of Block A the 2.5 storey element of Block A should be setback slightly so as to break up the length of the block at Ground and 1st floor levels.

Amendments

Block A

- 6.43 The submitted amended floor plans, elevations and Victoria Road CGI indicates a 3.3m wide projecting chimney has been introduced on the east elevation of Block A. We support this amendment in design terms as the approximate 0.5m projection of the chimney helps break up and articulate the east elevation. The proposed chimney helps reduce the prominence of Block A at roof level (third floor) and improves the relationship with the adjacent Portland Arms PH. We understand that all of the proposed chimneys will be functional and will be used for venting/air extraction of the en-suite bathrooms.

Setback of Victoria Road frontage

- 6.44 A 0.5m setback has been introduced on the Victoria Road frontage at ground, first and second floor levels of the 2.5 storey element between the Portland Arms Pub and 3.5 storey elements. We support this amendment which provides a greater degree of separation between the main bulk of the 3.5 and 2.5 storey elements on Block A.

Landscape details

Corona Road

- 6.45 Further details of the Corona Road frontage have been provided on the submitted *Landscape Detail Corona Road* (190-06-Rev30) drawing and indicate that the area in front of Block F will form a 3.4m wide x 18m long light well/void for the ground floor units. Whilst this approach is generally supported (as it forms and improvement from the existing car parking) we are concerned that this area could appear unnecessarily hard, given that it is devoid of any landscaping. We recommend that landscaping and threshold planting is provided within this space so as to improve the outlook from the ground floor student rooms within Block F. Details of the access arrangements to this space have not been provided, it maybe that the ground floor units could have direct access to this space (i.e. similar arrangement to the landscaped area proposed to the north of Block D). Details of the landscape treatment of this area should be conditioned should the application be approved.

6.46 The proposed pavement and metal black painted railing detail in front of the light well is supported and forms a similar appearance to the boundary treatment on the adjacent properties.

Northern Boundary

6.47 The applicant confirmed at the meeting of the 22nd May 2014 that the 1st floor terrace area above Block B will be used for fire escape purposes and will not form part of the wider student amenity space provision. Despite this clarification, further details of the terrace area have been provided on the submitted *Landscape Detail Northern Boundary* (190-07-Rev30) drawing and indicate 1.1m high perimeter railings and a planter (containing Clematis and Hedra growing plants) have been introduced along the northern side of the terrace. We support this approach in design terms as the planter will prevent overlooking of the rear garden of No. 5 Milton Road.

Conclusion

6.48 The proposed amendments to the east elevation of Block A and the submitted further information showing the treatment of the landscaped area in front of Block F (Corona Road) and northern site boundary (Block B terrace) are supported in design and conservation terms. The light well/void proposed on the Corona Road frontage could form part of an amenity space for the ground floor units and should be landscaped to improve the outlook from these units.

6.49 The application is now supported in design and conservation terms.

Policy

6.50 The approach being taken to meet policy requirements in relation to sustainable design and construction and renewable energy provision is supported.

Environment Agency

6.51 The site is located above a Secondary Aquifer, and is within 95m of a surface water course (River Cam). The previous use

of the land as a petrol filling station is potentially contaminative and the site is considered to be of high sensitivity and could present potential pollutant/contaminant linkages to controlled waters. It is recommended that the applicant refers to a number of Environment Agency documents.

English Heritage

- 6.52 The reduction of the scale of the proposed development (since the previous application) and the reworking of its design have made what is proposed more appropriate to the grain and character of the townscape. Nevertheless, it is recommended that the Council give further thought to the design of the scheme, particularly in respect to the design of the roof of Block A.

Cambridgeshire County Council (Archaeology)

- 6.53 The site should be the subject of a programme of archaeological investigation, which can be secured by condition.

Cambridgeshire Constabulary Architectural Liaison Officer

- 6.54 A secure and safe development will be produced. Concern about how visitors are going to be allowed access outside of normal reception hours, unless the reception is manned 24/7.

Cambridgeshire Fire and Rescue Service

- 6.55 Adequate provision must be made for fire hydrants either by way of a condition or S106 agreement.
- 6.56 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 objecting to the proposals:

- 9 Albert Street
- Riverside Court, 7 Chesterton Court
- 82 Chesterton Road

- 85 Chesterton Road
- 97 Chesterton Road
- 8 Corona Road
- 8D Corona Road
- 15 Corona Road
- 65 De Freville Avenue
- 36 Gilbert Road
- 6 Gurney Way
- 26 Herbert Street
- 53 Herbert Street
- 9 Kimberley Road
- 9 Milton Road
- 11 Milton Road
- 43 Milton Road
- 72 Milton Road
- 30 Montague Road
- 33 Montague Road
- 32 Trafalgar Road
- 65 Victoria Road
- 72 Victoria Road

- Petition containing 25 signatures

7.2 The representations can be summarised as follows:

Principle of proposed uses

- No need for another supermarket. It will destroy the local shops
- Rather see family homes built on the site, which are much needed and would improve the area

Context and Character

- The design is ugly and not in keeping with the area
- The proposed building at the end of Corona Road is not in keeping with the current architecture and would be highly detrimental to the appearance of the street
- Overdevelopment
- Out of character
- The redevelopment of this site, the Staples site and the gyratory system should be considered together as one project

Residential amenity

- The development will become a target for drug dealers
- Noise and anti-social behaviour from students
- There is a right of way to the rear of the properties on Corona Road and it is proposed that a gate is put across this access.
- Dominance and enclosure
- Overlooking
- The Portland Arms may disrupt studying students and the could limit future venue licensing applications
- Remote monitoring would not be sufficient. There must be an onsite warden

Traffic, car and cycle parking

- The proposed vehicle access would make the corner onto Milton Road even more dangerous than it is currently
- Lacking of car parking for the retail unit
- Deliveries would block the road
- Mitcham's corner is a high-speed death trap and is particularly dangerous where the main entrance for the site is
- Lack of secure covered cycle parking
- Lack of car parking for students
- Proctorial control does not apply to Anglia Ruskin students
- Some space should be set aside for parking for local residents
- If this development is approved there should be a neighbourhood consultation on the extension of the residents' parking scheme
- HGV deliveries must be timed so that they comply with the overnight restrictions on HGV movements between 10pm and 7am
- Plans make not contribution to solving the hazardous and unpleasant layout of the gyratory system

Other

- Confusion about the expiry date for neighbour comments

7.3 The owners/occupiers of the following addresses have made representations in support of the proposals:

- 2 Corona Road
- 4 Corona Road
- 6 Corona Road
- 14 Corona Road
- 14A Corona Road
- 13 Corona Road
- 16 Corona Road
- 99 Chesterton Road
- 115 Chesterton Road
- Portland Arms, 129 Chesterton Road
- Lask Optician, Chesterton Road
- 22 Milton Road
- Trumpington Gallery, 18 and 20 Victoria Road
- Wallers Butchers, Victoria Road

7.4 The representations can be summarised as follows:

- The site is currently an eyesore and is becoming increasingly unsafe
- The design is in keeping with the area
- Pleased that the site would have security gates and a 24 hour reception
- The site is not big enough to provide a large number of affordable homes for key workers and families
- The development would make the area more vibrant and would support the local businesses, and may kick start further investment
- Significant improvement on the previous application
- Houses and flats that are currently rented to students would become available
- The sloping roofs will soften the look of the buildings and reduce the feeling of being overlooked and the breaks in the buildings make for views inbetween and create a less imposing silhouette
- The behaviour of the students will be better than the anti-social behaviour currently experienced
- The route from Mitchams Corner to ARU is impractical by car at most times of the day

7.5 The owners/occupiers of the following addresses have made representations neither objecting to nor supporting the proposals:

- 3 Ascham Road
- 49 Victoria Park

7.6 The representations can be summarised as follows:

- The application is much improved but it is student housing rather than much needed family houses; it is unrealistic for Sainsburys to be unconcerned about the lack of parking; and ARU students do have cars

7.7 The West Chesterton Labour Party have made representations as follows:

- Parking – This area suffers considerably and changes including this proposal will have a very significant impact not only on local streets but also the subsequent displacement in streets further away. Visitors to Cambridge are likely to come by car
- Deliveries – the number is not identified
- The application will create a gated development
- The scale is welcomed but the context and prevailing character of the area does not appear to have been reflected
- The gyratory system is dangerous and this is not taken into account in the Transport Assessment.

7.8 The Friends of Mitcham's Corner (FMC) have made representations as follows:

- The proposed use of the site for student accommodation and a Sainsburys convenience store is compatible with FMC's vision for the regeneration of Mitcham's Corner
- The arrival of more than 200 students is likely to increase business for local shops and restaurants that are struggling
- Sainsburys will increase footfall helping local businesses and giving residents more choice
- Principal outstanding concern is the safety of the residents. The best solution would be the removal of the gyratory system and the creation of a pedestrian square.

If this cannot be achieved in the same timeframe additional risk assessment and mitigation measures must be considered

- The elevations facing the public realm are bland

7.9 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, impact on the neighbouring Building of Local Interest (the Portland Arms), and the impact on the Conservation Area
3. Public Art
4. Renewable energy and sustainability
5. Residential amenity
6. Refuse arrangements
7. Highway safety
8. Car and cycle parking
9. Third party representations
10. Planning Obligation Strategy

Principle of Development

8.2 The site forms part of Proposal Site 7.04 (Mitcham's Corner Sites) which is allocated for mixed uses, including employment B1(a), local A1, A2, A3 and housing. Policy 7/10 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2006) states that 'the development of speculative purpose-built student hostels will only be permitted if:

- a) Occupancy restrictions exist to ensure the accommodation is only available to full time students attending Anglia Ruskin University or the University of Cambridge;
- b) Appropriate management arrangements are in place to ensure that students do not keep cars in Cambridge;

- c) They are reasonably close or accessible to the institutions they serve; and
- d) They make appropriate provision for students who are disabled.

8.3 The applicant has explained that it is intended that students of Anglia Ruskin University (ARU) would occupy the student accommodation. If the application were to be approved, the occupancy of the student rooms could be restricted to students of ARU or the University of Cambridge through a S106 agreement, and a management plan for the site could be secured by condition. Therefore, it is my opinion that the proposal complies with parts a) and b) of policy 7/10 of the Local Plan. The site is not very close to ARU's main campus on East Road, but as the campus can easily be reached by bicycle, it is my opinion that the application complies with part c) of policy 7/10. It is proposed that 5% of the student rooms are accessible for people with disabilities, and it is therefore my opinion that the proposals also comply with part d) of policy 7/10 of the Local Plan.

8.4 Policy 6/8 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2006) states that 'convenience shopping will only be permitted if:

- a) It is for smaller shops (up to 1400sqm net) in existing centres;
- b) It is a minor extension to existing shop;
- c) It would replace existing provision in the locality; or
- d) It is part of mixed use areas including the Station Area and in the new urban extensions.

8.5 This application proposed a foodstore within an existing centre with a floor area of 400sqm. This complies with part a) of policy 6/8 of the Local Plan and is acceptable in principle. The planning system cannot be used as a mechanism to control competition, and therefore this application cannot be refused because it would increase competition for local shops.

8.6 Planning applications should be determined in accordance with policies in the adopted Development Plan (the Cambridge Local Plan 2006) and advice set out in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). However, after consideration of adopted plans and the NPPF, policies in emerging plans can also be given some weight when determining applications. The emerging revised Local Plan, the Cambridge Local Plan 2014:

Proposed Submission, 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 the adopted development plan and the NPPF has considerably more weight than emerging policies in the revised Local Plan. Policy 21 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2014: Proposed Submission (July 2013) states that a masterplan for the area must be approved before any application is submitted. As the Draft Local Plan currently holds minimal weight, it would be unreasonable to defer or refuse the application for this reason, in my opinion.

- 8.7 In my opinion, the principle of the development is acceptable and in accordance with policies 6/8 and 7/10 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2006). It should be noted that the previous application was not refused on the grounds of the principle of development.

Context of site, design and external spaces, impact on the neighbouring Building of Local Interest (the Portland Arms) and the impact on the Conservation Area

Site Context

- 8.8 The site is within the Castle and Victoria Conservation Area. The Victoria Road part of the conservation area is characterised by rows of terraced houses and villas, generally two storey and some rising to three. Exceptions are Alexander House and the Staples sites, which are identified in the Castle and Victoria Conservation Area Appraisal as detracting from the area.
- 8.9 The Bank at Mitchams Corner and the terrace houses on Corona Rd and Victoria Rd are considered buildings important to the character of the Conservation Area in the Conservation Area Appraisal. The Portland Arms Public House is a Building of Local Interest (BLIs), and 9-19 Milton Road, which are just outside the Conservation Area to the north are also Buildings of Local Interest (BLIs).
- 8.10 The site is currently occupied by a single storey furniture showroom and two storey office building, which form a “T” shape with the office accommodation running broadly north-south and the retail unit east-west.

Scale and massing

Block A (Victoria Road)

8.11 The previous application (13/1326/FUL) was refused for the following reason:

1. The proposed development, in particular Blocks A and B, but virtue of its overall bulk, scale, massing and height and lack of space for landscaping and tree planting would have an adverse impact on the character of the Castle and Victoria Conservation Area and the setting of the Portland Arms Public House which is a Building of Local Interest. The development is therefore contrary to policies 3/4, 3/7, 3/11, 3/12, 4/11 or 4/12 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 and advice provided by the National Planning Policy Framework.

8.12 In this previous application two buildings were proposed on the frontage of Victoria Road. Block A was narrower than currently proposed and further forward, obscuring views of the flank wall of the Portland Arms, and Block C extended to the Victoria Road frontage standing between the vehicle entrance and Block A. As the buildings were further forward there was limited space to the front of them for landscaping and tree planting. It was proposed that Block A was three storeys in height and that Block C was four storeys in height.

8.13 In this current application, Block A would stand adjacent to the Portland Arms Public House, fronting onto Victoria Road and filling the space between the Portland Arms and the vehicle access. The building would abut the Portland Arms and the 'gig room'/barn at the rear of the pub, and would be set back 4m from the frontage of the Portland Arms, and 7m from the back of the pavement. It is proposed that this building would have a part single and part two storey element adjacent to the Portland Arms and would then step up to 2.5 storeys, with a taller 3.5 storey element located adjacent to the vehicular access.

8.14 The Urban Design and Conservation Team raised concerns that the 3.5 storey element would appear bulky and overly dominant over the roof of the Portland Arms and it was suggested that the roof was hipped on the eastern and western ends of the 3.5 storey element of the building. This would have resulted in the loss of student rooms, so in order to break up the bulk of the

roof and end gable a 3.3m wide projecting chimney has been introduced on the eastern elevation off Block A, The Urban Design and Conservation Team support this amendment as projection of the chimney helps to break up and articulate the east elevation of the buildings. The proposed chimney also helps to reduce the prominence of Block A at third floor level and improves the relationship with the Portland Arms.

Block B (Milton Road)

- 8.15 The revised scheme reduces the height of Block B by approximately 1metre. The block now rises to 17.95m. The length of the Milton Road elevation has also been reduced from approximately 30m to 23m as a result of the increased width of the student entrance.
- 8.16 The length of the 2nd floor setback on Milton Road has been reduced (due to the re-orientation of the north-eastern most student room) and a 3.2m setback introduced on the north elevation. This arrangement is supported, as it has stepped the scale of the building down and improved the relationship with 5 Milton Road. The stepping back of the top floor from the front of the building on the northern end adjacent to 5 Milton Road means that the parapet aligns with the ridge of 5 Milton Road. In my opinion, this means that the relationship between Block B and the neighbouring semi-detached, two-storey building is visually appropriate.
- 8.17 In the previous, refused application, the 16m wide south elevation of Block B appeared bulky and prominent looking north along Milton Road. A projecting stair/entrance core has been introduced on this facade which has helped break up the width and bulk of this elevation.

In my view the revisions to Blocks A and B address reason for refusal 1 of the previous scheme.

Blocks C, D, E and F

- 8.18 The previous application (13/1326/FUL) was refused for the following reason:

2. There is insufficient space between Blocks D, E and F. In consequence the three blocks would read as a continuous block which would dominate views into the site and internal open space. In so doing the development would have an adverse impact on the character of the Castle and Victoria Conservation Area and the setting of the Portland Arms public house which is a Building of Local Interest and fails to provide a high quality environment for future residents. The development is therefore contrary to policies 3/4, 3/7, 3/11, 3/12, 4/11 or 4/12 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 and advice provided by the National Planning Policy Framework.

- 8.19 In the previous, refused application, the proposed arrangement of breaks at 2nd and 3rd floor levels between Blocks D & E and E & F failed to respond to views into the site from Victoria Road and from the central courtyard. The scale of Blocks D, E and F (and C) at 4 full storeys was considered to form a bulky and imposing development along the full length of the northern site boundary.
- 8.20 The revised scheme has reduced the height of Blocks C, D, E and F from 4 full storeys to 3.5 storeys, the 3rd floor accommodation is now located within a pitched roof space. Each block now includes an individual entrance and lift/stair core with shorter corridors. This arrangement has provided the opportunity for wider breaks (this application proposes a 3m break between blocks D and E; a 4.5m break narrowing to 3m between blocks B and D; and a 5m break between blocks E and F) to be introduced between Blocks at first floor level and above. The proposed reduction in the scale of the blocks and the introduction of breaks, which have helped break up the combined length of built form along the northern site boundary, are supported
- 8.21 This application offsets Blocks D, E and F from one another. Block D has been pulled further south to provide a 3.5m setback from the side garden boundary of No. 5 Milton Road. This approach is supported as Block D no longer 'reads' as a single combined block with Block E.
- 8.22 In my opinion the alterations to Blocks C, D, E and F have satisfactorily addressed reason for refusal 2 of the previous scheme.

Site entrances

8.23 If granted approval, this site would accommodate a large number of people, and it is my opinion that it should have a clear, welcoming entrance point which is appropriate to its location and which links the site to the wider area.

8.24 The previous application (13/1326/FUL) was refused for the following reason:

3. As a consequence of the narrowness of the pedestrian accesses and the poor location of reception space the development fails to integrate well with the surrounding area. In so doing the development is not well connected to the immediate locality and does not create an attractive built frontage to positively enhance the townscape where the development meets the street. The development is therefore contrary to policies 3/4, 3/7 and 3/12 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 and advice provided by the National Planning Policy Framework.

8.25 The site would effectively be a gated community. There are no policies within the Cambridge Local Plan (2006) which prevent gated communities but they must be appropriate to the context with their surroundings. In my opinion, the previous application was deficient because of the narrow width of the main site access and its lack of presence in the street, which resulted in the site being divorced from the surrounding community. The need for a secure site was not in itself the basis for refusal of the previous scheme. In the previous application, the main entrance on Milton Road was narrower than is proposed now and there were limited opportunities for natural surveillance due to the arrangement of the cycle and refuse stores at ground floor level in Block B. In this application the site entrance has been widened and the refuse and cycle stores relocated into Block A. A glazed stairwell has been introduced on the southern side of Block B and the windows on the retail unit now wrap around the corner, which has provided natural surveillance to the site entrance. Opportunities have also been taken to add clear signage. In my opinion these amendments have overcome and satisfactorily addressed reason for refusal 3 of the previous scheme.

- 8.26 The applicant has confirmed that the occupiers of Corona Road will retain access into the site to enable them to access their garages. The residents of Corona Road that have a right of way over the site will be provided with a code to open the gate. Otherwise the gate will be kept closed for security reasons and to prevent ad hoc parking on the site.

Roof plant

- 8.27 The submitted elevations and the roof plan indicates collapsible handrails, solar PV panels and chimneys on the roof areas of Blocks A, B, C, D, E and F. The 3D CGIs contained within submitted D&A Statement (page 52) also show chimneys above the Corona Road Block (although these are missing on the submitted roof plan). Whilst the proposed chimneys are supported and provide articulation of the roofline, they should be functional in some way and we would hope that they could accommodate the vents from bathrooms and kitchens or even provide light wells to upper floors. It is possible that the collapsible handrails may be visible from the street, and to ensure that they do not have a detrimental visual impact I recommend that details of them are secured by condition (25).

Materials and elevation treatment

- 8.28 The proposed approach to the materials treatment is supported. The pitched slate roofs, gault brick and projecting bay windows form an improved relationship with the range of building materials in the surrounding context. The single storey element within Block A (containing the refuse store) is now red brick and will be compatible with the adjacent Portland Arms. Red brick is also proposed for Block C and provides variation between the Blocks A and E either side. I have recommended that details and samples of all of the proposed materials are secured by conditions (20 and 21).
- 8.29 The Corona Road elevation of Block F has been revised and now includes slate tiled roofs, Flemish bond facing brick with projecting redbrick banding and projecting bay windows at ground floor level. This approach is supported which forms an appropriate contemporary interpretation of the existing Corona Road façades.

- 8.30 The dormer windows proposed in all blocks at third floor level have been replaced with velux windows, thereby minimising opportunities for overlooking into adjacent private gardens and reducing the perceived height of individual blocks and the scheme overall.
- 8.31 The junction of Block A with the flank of the Portland Arms is not fully detailed and its relationship to the flank doorway arch or other features of the Public House is not clear. A condition is suggested in order to deal with this (22).
- 8.32 In my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 3/4, 3/7, 3/11, 3/12.

Public Art

- 8.33 All major developments are required to provide Public Art either on site, if appropriate, or as a commuted sum. A Public Art Strategy has been submitted as part of the application, which proposes a sculpture incorporated into the fabric of the building on the elevations, which would reflect the history of Mitchams Corner. This has not been agreed by the Public Art Officer. In my opinion a suitable Public Art Scheme could be secured through a S106 agreement. Further comments are awaited from the Public Art Officer and will be reported on the Amendment Sheet.
- 8.34 In my opinion 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

- 8.35 Policy 8/16 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2006) states that 10% of the development's total predicted energy requirements must be provided on site from renewable energy sources. To meet the requirements of Policy 8/16, two technologies are being implemented; photovoltaic panels and gas fired Combined Heat and Power (CHP) with an accompanying thermal store to meet hot water demand.
- 8.36 A hierarchical approach to reducing carbon emissions is being taken, which is supported. In order to meet the requirements of Policy 8/16, two technologies are being implemented; photovoltaic panels and gas fired Combined Heat and Power

(CHP) with an accompanying thermal store to meet hot water demand. While gas fired CHP is a low carbon as opposed to renewable technology, its use towards meeting the requirements of Policy 8/16 is considered within the Councils Sustainable Design and Construction Supplementary Planning Document (SPD). The SPD notes that its applicability will be dependent upon the level of carbon savings being achieved, and the suitability of the proposed development for the use of CHP. Given the year round thermal demand associated with student accommodation, and the use of a thermal store, its use is considered appropriate, and indeed this technology has been implemented in a number of student accommodation schemes in the city. With regards to the levels of carbon reduction being achieved, the use of CHP and photovoltaics contributes a 106,068.23 Kg/CO2/annum reduction. Compared to the baseline emissions, this equates to a 15% reduction in emissions, which is supported.

- 8.37 In my opinion the applicants have suitably addressed the issue of sustainability and renewable energy and the proposal is in accordance with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policy 8/16 and the Sustainable Design and Construction SPD 2007.

Residential Amenity

Impact on amenity of neighbouring occupiers

- 8.38 The neighbouring properties that may potentially be directly impacted on by the proposals are 2-16 Corona Road and neighbouring properties on Victoria Road to the west; and neighbouring properties on Milton Road to the north.

The previous application (13/1326/FUL) was refused for the following reason:

4. The proposed development, by virtue of its scale, height and orientation in relation to adjacent buildings would be likely to have an adverse effect on the amenities enjoyed by residents of adjacent dwellings in terms of having a visually dominating and enclosing impact and in the case of the houses fronting Corona Road an overshadowing impact. In so doing the development fails to respond positively to its context and does not have a positive impact on its setting. The development is therefore contrary to policies 3/4 and 3/12 of the Cambridge Local Plan

2006 and advice provided by the National Planning Policy Framework.

Impact on Corona Road

Dominance enclosure and overshadowing

- 8.39 Block C would stand to the east of the neighbouring houses on Corona Road. The building would be 3.5 storeys in height and would stand 6m from the common boundary. In the previous application, this was a longer building that stood at an angle to the common boundary with Corona Road
- 8.40 Blocks D, E and F would stand to the north of the houses on Corona Road and would be 3.5 storeys in height. The frontage of the building would be in line with the terrace with the rest of the building projecting from this at the rear, angling towards 16 Corona Road, to reflect the shape of the site. Block F has been setback a further 3m from the boundary wall of No. 16 Corona Road (compared to the previous refused application). The Block is now located 4.5m away from this boundary at ground, first, second and third floor levels.
- 8.41 With the previous application, my concern was that due to the height and bulk of the buildings and the proximity of them to the common boundaries with Corona Road, the cumulative impact of them would have had a significant detrimental impact on the occupiers of these properties. As Block F now steps away from the common boundary with 16 Corona Road; Block C is a shorter building; the buildings have been reduced in height and the bulk has been reduced through the introduction of a sloping roof it is my view that the development would be far less dominant than previously proposed.
- 8.42 In the previous application, breaks were introduced between Blocks D, E and F but these breaks were at the second and third floor levels, resulting in the interconnecting elements being two storeys in height. Now, it is proposed that the interconnecting elements are single storey in height. In my opinion, this means that Blocks D, E and F no longer read as one long unrelenting built form, which significantly reduces the dominance of these buildings when they are seen from the neighbouring properties and when they are seen from the street.

8.43 Blocks D, E and F would stand to the north of the houses on Corona Road, and due to the orientation of the buildings would not overshadow them. Block C would stand to the east of the neighbouring houses and would cast shadow over the rear gardens of these houses in the morning. However, according to the submitted shadow diagrams the additional overshadowing experienced over and above that already caused by the existing buildings is not significant and it is my view that it would not warrant refusal of the application.

Overlooking

8.44 In comparison with the previous refused application, at ground, first and second floor levels the floor plan of Block F has been reversed so that the corridor is now on the northern side and the student rooms are on the southern side. At first and second floor levels sawtooth windows are proposed on the southern elevation, which would direct views into the site and prevent direct overlooking of the rear gardens of Corona Road. At third floor level sawtooth windows are not proposed, but on this floor the corridor would be on the southern side. These windows would be set within the roof behind a parapet and it is my view that clear views towards the neighbouring houses on Corona Road would not be possible.

8.45 Block C would have windows serving student rooms on the western side of the building. It is proposed that the windows at first and second floor level have sawtooth windows, which would direct views away from the neighbouring properties on Corona Road and towards Block F. At third floor level, the windows would be set within the roof behind a parapet and it is my view that clear views towards the neighbouring houses would not be possible, especially as the separation distance between the Block C and the common boundary with Corona Road is 6m.

Impact on Victoria Road

8.46 Block A would stand to the east of the neighbouring properties on Victoria Road, on the opposite side of the vehicle access, with Block C directly behind it. Block A would stand 7.6 from the common boundary with the adjacent dwelling, 12 Victoria Road. Block C would stand 6m from this common boundary. At

this point, Block A would be 3.5 storeys in height, and Block C would also be 3.5 storeys in height.

Dominance, enclosure and overshadowing

- 8.47 In my opinion, due to the separation distance between the buildings the proposed buildings would not be overly dominant or oppressive. The buildings would stand to the east of the neighbouring properties on Victoria Road and would, therefore, cast shadow over them in the morning. The proposed building would increase the level of overshadowing, but this increase is relatively minimal and not significant enough, in my view, to warrant refusal.

Overlooking

- 8.48 On the western elevation of Block A a window is proposed on all levels, which would serve the corridor. At first, second and third floor levels it is proposed that this window is a sawtooth window directing views towards the site and preventing direct overlooking of the rear garden 12 Victoria Road and gardens beyond this. The windows proposed in the western elevation of Block C would also be sawtoothed at first and second floor levels. At third floor level, the windows would be set within the roof behind a parapet and it is my view that clear views towards the neighbouring houses would not be possible

Impact on Milton Road

- 8.49 Blocks B, D and E would stand to the south of 5 Milton Road. Blocks D and E would be 3 storeys in height, with Block D standing 3.6m from the common boundary with 5 Milton Road, and Block E abutting the common boundary. Block B would abut the common boundary with 5 Milton Road and the top floor of the section closest to 5 Milton Road would step back by 2.8m from the side of the building.

Dominance, enclosure and overshadowing

- 8.50 Due to the orientation of the buildings, Blocks B, D and E would cast shadow over 5 Milton Road. The existing buildings significantly overshadow this neighbour, and although the proposed buildings would overshadow this neighbour to a

greater degree it is my opinion that it would not be at a level great enough to warrant refusal of the application.

Overlooking

- 8.51 Sawtooth windows are proposed on the first and second floors of block D, which will direct views to the west, away from 5 Milton Road. The windows proposed at third floor level would be set within the roof, behind a parapet wall. It is my opinion that this would mean that any views from these windows would not be clear, and it would therefore be unreasonable to refuse planning permission for this reason.

Noise and disturbance, and odour

- 8.52 The site is close to residential properties and the occupiers of them are likely to experience noise and disturbance created by demolition/construction works. To minimize this I recommend conditions relating to contractor working hours, delivery hours, dust suppression, contractor working arrangements (including parking), and noise (3-7)
- 8.53 Concern has been raised about noise and disturbance caused by the students occupying the site, and anti-social behavior. The impact of the development would be greatly reduced if it was well managed and I, therefore, recommend a condition requiring the submission of a Management Plan. Any anti-social behavior would be a matter for the Police. (8)
- 8.54 It is possible that the retail unit may include cooking facilities, such as an instore bakery, and there are also a number of kitchens proposed within the student accommodation. To prevent odour having a detrimental impact on neighbours I recommend a condition requiring details of a filtration system (17).
- 8.55 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.

Amenity for future occupiers of the site

Noise

- 8.56 Mitcham's Corner is a very busy traffic gyratory, and the student rooms facing onto Victoria Road and Milton would experience high level of traffic noise. The submitted noise assessment explains that these rooms would be provided with continuous mechanical supply ventilation, which means that the occupants of these rooms would not need to open their windows, and it is proposed that these windows would include 'high performance' double glazing. All ducts would open away from the noisiest facades and be acoustically treated if necessary. The Environmental Health officer has stated that this is acceptable in principle and I recommend a condition requiring further details (9).
- 8.57 The submitted noise survey also includes an assessment of the impact of noise generated by the Portland Arms, which highlights areas where noise impact from the Portland Arms would impact on the residents of the student accommodation. Block A is potentially the most affected by the Portland Arms. No student rooms are located on the ground floor of the building on this side and no windows are proposed on the side of Block A which would help reduce the impact of noise from the Portland Arms. I recommend a condition requiring the submission of a Noise Assessment, which includes an assessment of and mitigation against the noise from the Portland Arms and its impact on the student rooms in Blocks A and B (9).
- 8.58 The noise survey also includes an assessment of the impact of noise on the shared garden in the centre of the site. This shows that the noise impact from traffic and the Portland Arms is acceptable and within the levels recommended by BS 8233.
- 8.59 Student rooms are proposed above the proposed food store. Deliveries can cause considerable noise, and are a common source of complaint to Environmental Health. The application specifies that the opening hours for the food store would be 07:00 to 23:00 each day. Environmental Health and the Highway Authority have no objections to these opening hours. In order to protect the amenity of the occupiers of the student rooms and neighbouring residents I recommend that the

deliveries are controlled by condition (10) along with opening hours (16),

- 8.60 The application includes the provision of an electricity substation, which is not included in the submitted noise assessment. Electrical substations can produce very low tonal humming. I recommend that this is included in the noise assessment required by condition, along with any noise from plant (9).

Contamination

- 8.61 The site is currently occupied by industrial and warehouse uses. It has a long established history as a garage/motor engineers and more recently a petrol filling station. A review of historic maps has established the former presence of gravel pits on and close to the site and the possibility of infilled ground at the former pits. 5 Milton Road and the site were occupied by dry cleaners and rubber manufacturers, and underground fuel tanks were located in the centre of the site. Environmental Health officers have taken the view that the contamination is not at a level that would preclude development. However, Environmental Health officers and the Environment Agency have recommended that further investigation is carried out which can be secured by conditions. (11,12 and 13).

Air quality

- 8.62 The modelling undertaken demonstrates that air quality at the site will not exceed the National Air Quality Objectives. Environmental Health officers have recommended that air intake for the mechanical ventilation should be from the rear of the building and I recommend a condition requiring this (14).

Amenity space

- 8.63 The courtyard area in the centre of the site is likely to be overshadowed for a significant portion of the day by the large buildings that surround it. It is also my opinion that this space may also be rarely used.
- 8.64 However, even though the amount and quality of the open space provided on site is not ideal it is my opinion that due to the location of Jesus Green close to the site it would be

unreasonable to refuse the application due to a lack of amenity space.

- 8.65 In my opinion the proposal provides 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

- 8.66 Separate refuse strategies are proposed for the food store and the student accommodation. The food store would have internal waste storage controlled by the operator and no details of this have been submitted. The waste associated with the student accommodation would be collected on a weekly basis by a private contractor.

- 8.67 Waste Services have explained that the responsibility for collecting waste from privately managed student accommodation falls to the Local Authority. Therefore, even though the applicant has indicated that they intend to have the waste collected by a private contractor, it is important to ensure there is appropriate provision for waste to be collected by the Local Authority in case the applicant's arrangement with the private contractor ceases. Waste Services have not commented on this application, but it is my opinion that it would be possible to provide the appropriate facilities. I recommend a condition requiring further details of refuse storage provision and collection should the need arise for the Local Authority to collect the waste (15)

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

Highway Safety

The gyratory system

- 8.69 The issues posed by the existing gyratory are recognised by the County Council. Significant change is signalled in the proposed designation of the Mitcham's Corner Opportunity Area, but this application cannot resolve these issues singlehandedly. S106 contributions have been agreed to contribute to survey work and to the modelling of an improved road layout. Northern

Corridor Area Transport Plan contributions are sought to mitigate against the impact of the development and these are to be secured through the S106 agreement.

Servicing for the food store

- 8.70 The Highway Engineer has commented that the location of the servicing access for the foodstore is less than ideal, but it is accepted that an access already exists at this location and that the proposed use would result in a reduction in the number of vehicle using this access. He does not objection to these arrangements on highway safety grounds.
- 8.71 In my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policy 8/2.

Car and Cycle Parking

Car parking

- 8.72 Appendix C (Car Parking Standards) states that for student accommodation up to one car parking space for every ten spaces can be provided, plus disabled parking. Three disabled car parking spaces are proposed. The vehicle access will be controlled by a codeoperated electric gate, and it would not therefore be possible for others to park on the site in an ad hoc manner. The site is close to local amenities on Chesterton Road, the City Centre and public transport routes leads me to the view that this is a reasonable level of car parking provision. The previous scheme was not refused on the basis of concerns regarding lack of car parking for students.
- 8.73 As entry to the site will be controlled, a layby is proposed on Victoria Road for taxis.
- 8.74 Appendix C states that for the food store only disabled parking spaces may be provided. No car parking is proposed for the food store. In order to assess the impact of this on the existing on-street parking on Milton Road, a parking survey has been carried out at the existing Sainsburys store on St Andrews Street and at layby on Milton Road. The conclusion of these surveys is that there is capacity on Milton Road for the level of car parking demand that is likely to be generated by the proposed food store.

Cycle parking

8.75 The previous application was refused for the following reason:

The proposal fails to provide appropriate cycle parking contrary to policy 8/6 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2006)

8.76 In the previous application it was proposed that the provision of cycle parking was phased to enable the applicant to gauge need. This was considered to be unacceptable. It is now proposed that the numbers of cycle spaces required by Appendix D of the Cambridge Local Plan (2006) are provided, which equates to 140 student cycle spaces, 42 visitor spaces, and 18 spaces for the retail unit. It is proposed that each Block has its own cycle parking adjacent to or within the building so that cycle parking does not clutter the courtyard space. It is proposed that the cycle parking is secure and covered. I recommend a condition requiring details (24).

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

Third Party Representations

Rather see family homes built on the site, which are much needed and would improve the area

8.78 The application must be assessed on its merits and other potential uses for the site cannot be considered.

Planning Obligation Strategy

Planning Obligations

8.79 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 Affordable Housing Supplementary Planning Document 2008 provides guidance in terms of the provision of affordable housing and the Public Art Supplementary Planning Document 2010 addresses requirements in relation to public art (amend/delete as applicable). 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

- 8.80 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.

8.81 The application proposes the erection of 211 student rooms. 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	211	50218
1 bed	1.5	238	357		
2-bed	2	238	476		
3-bed	3	238	714		
4-bed	4	238	952		
Total					50218

Indoor sports facilities					
Type of unit	Persons per unit	£ per person	£per unit	Number of such units	Total £
studio	1	269	269	211	56759
1 bed	1.5	269	403.50		
2-bed	2	269	538		
3-bed	3	269	807		
4-bed	4	269	1076		
Total					56759

Informal open space					
Type of unit	Persons per unit	£ per person	£per unit	Number of such units	Total £
studio	1	242	242	211	51062
1 bed	1.5	242	363		
2-bed	2	242	484		
3-bed	3	242	726		
4-bed	4	242	968		
Total					51062

8.82 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

- 8.83 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:

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

- 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.

Transport

- 8.85 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 Northern Corridor Area Transport Plan where the contribution sought per trip is £399.
- 8.86 The Highway Authority has made an assessment of the proposal, on which the following assessment of expected additional trips and contributions is based.

Northern Corridor Area Transport Plan				
Existing daily trips (all modes)	Predicted future daily trips (all modes)	Total net additional trips	Contribution per trip	Total £
956	1110.5	194.5	£399 (NCATP)	£77,605.50

8.87 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.

Opportunity Area

8.88 The Urban Design and Conservation Team has requested that the applicants for this site and of 1 Milton Road opposite, each contribute £5,000 towards supporting the future design and delivery of the Opportunity Area. The joint contribution would initially be used towards two full days of traffic and transport survey work to inform later micro-simulation models for Mitcham's Corner and design options for the revised gyratory. I consider this request entirely reasonable. Whilst emerging policy 21 carries little weight, the Mitcham's Corner Area Strategic Planning and Development Brief (2003) recognises the problems associated with the gyratory as do a number of the third party representations. These initial contributions are the first stage in generating a baseline information set to proceed further. The contributions sought are fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the proposed development and in my view are necessary.

Public Art

8.89 The development is required to make provision for public art. A Public Art Strategy has been submitted as part of the application. Comments are awaited from the Public Art Officer, which will be reported on the Amendment Sheet. Provision of public art on site, or a commuted sum needs to be secured by the S106 agreement and I will report further on this matter on the Amendment Sheet.

8.90 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

8.91 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

8.92 For this application a monitoring fee of £7901.95 is required to cover monitoring of City Council obligations plus the County Council monitoring fee.

Planning Obligations Conclusion

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

9.0 CONCLUSION

9.1 In my opinion the reduction in student room numbers and the improved design has satisfactorily addressed the previous reasons for refusal. The application is therefore recommended for approval subject to conditions and the completion of the S106 agreement.

10.0 RECOMMENDATION

APPROVE subject to completion of the s106 Agreement by 30th November 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. 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 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 written agreement of the local planning authority, 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: Due to the proximity of residential properties to this premises and that extensive refurbishment will be required, the above conditions are recommended to protect the amenity of these residential properties throughout the redevelopment in accordance with policies 4/13 and 6/10 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2006)

5. 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 residential amenity. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006, policy 4/13)

6. Before the development hereby permitted is commenced details of the following matters shall be submitted to and approved by the local planning authority in writing.

- i) contractors access arrangements for vehicles, plant and personnel,

- ii) contractors site storage area/compound,

- iii) the means of moving, storing and stacking all building materials, plant and equipment around and adjacent to the site,

- iv) the arrangements for parking of contractors vehicles and contractors personnel vehicles.

Thereafter the development shall be undertaken in accordance with the approved details.

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

7. Prior to the commencement of demolition the development hereby approved (excluding 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. 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 during the construction period. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 4/13)

8. The development hereby permitted shall not be occupied until a Management Plan for the student accommodation has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To protect the amenity of neighbouring residents. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006, policy 3/7)

9. Prior to the commencement of 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 as approved shall be fully implemented before the use hereby permitted is commenced and shall not be altered without prior approval.

The scheme as approved shall be fully implemented and a completion report submitted prior to the occupation of the residential development. The approved scheme shall remain unaltered in accordance with the approved details.

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

10. All deliveries to the local convenience store shall be via the front of the retail premises on Milton Road. There shall be collections or deliveries only between the hours of 09.30hrs to 16.00hrs and 18.00hrs and 21.00hrs Monday to Saturday; and there shall be no collections or deliveries outside the hours of 09.00hrs and 13.00 hrs on Sundays and Bank Holidays, and there shall not be by articulated vehicles at those times (Sundays and Bank Holidays).

Reason: In the interests of highway safety and residential amenity (Cambridge Local Plan 2006, policies 4/13 and 8/2.

11. No development approved by this permission shall be COMMENCED (excluding demolition) prior to a contaminated land assessment and associated remedial strategy, being submitted to the Local Planning Authority and receipt of approval of the document/documents from the Local Planning Authority. 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 Local Planning Authority 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 Local Planning Authority 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 Local Planning Authority. The Local Planning Authority 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 Local Planning Authority. 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 Local Planning Authority.

(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 residential amenity. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006, policy 4/13.

12. No development approved by this planning permission shall take place (excluding demolition) until a scheme that includes the following components to deal with the risks associated with contamination of the site shall each be submitted to and approved, in writing, by the local planning authority: 1) A preliminary risk assessment which has identified: all previous uses, potential contaminants associated with those uses, a conceptual model of the site indicating sources, pathways and receptors, potentially unacceptable risks arising from contamination at the site. 2) A site investigation scheme, based on (1) to provide information for a detailed assessment of the risk to all receptors that may be affected, including those off site. 3) The results of the site investigation and detailed risk assessment referred to in (2) and, based on these, an options appraisal and remediation strategy giving full details of the remediation measures required and how they are to be undertaken. 4) A verification plan providing details of the data that will be collected in order to demonstrate that the works set out in the remediation strategy in (3) are complete and identifying any requirements for longer-term monitoring of pollutant linkages, maintenance and arrangements for contingency action. Any changes to these components require the express written consent of the local planning authority. The scheme shall be implemented as approved.

Reason: To protect and prevent the pollution of controlled waters (particularly the River Cam and underlying Secondary A Aquifer) from potential pollutants associated with current and previous land uses in line with National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF; paragraphs 109, 120, 121), EU Water Framework Directive, Anglian River Basin Management Plan and Environment Agency Groundwater Protection (GP3:2013) position statements A4 to A6, J1 to J7 and N7.

13. No occupation of any part of the permitted development shall take place until a verification report demonstrating completion of works set out in the approved remediation strategy and the effectiveness of the remediation shall be submitted to and approved, in writing, by the local planning authority. The report shall include results of sampling and monitoring carried out in accordance with the approved verification plan to demonstrate that the site remediation criteria have been met. It shall also include any plan (a "long-term monitoring and maintenance plan") for longer-term monitoring of pollutant linkages, maintenance and arrangements for contingency action, as identified in the verification plan. The long-term monitoring and maintenance plan shall be implemented as approved.

Reason: To protect and prevent the pollution of controlled waters (particularly the River Cam and underlying Secondary A Aquifer) from potential pollutants in line with Environment Agency Groundwater Protection (GP3, 2013) position statements J6 and J7

14. Air intake for the mechanical ventilation shall be taken from the rear of the buildings.

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

15. Prior to the occupation, the on-site storage facilities for waste, including waste for recycling and the arrangements for the disposal of waste shall be provided. The approved arrangements shall be retained thereafter unless alternative arrangements are agreed in writing by the local planning authority.

Reason: To protect the amenities of nearby residents and occupiers of the site (Cambridge Local Plan 2006, policy 3/12 and 4/13)

16. The opening hours shall be between 07.00 hrs and 23.00 hrs Monday to Sunday.

Reason: In the interests of residential amenity. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006, policy 3/7 and 4/13)

17. Prior to occupation, details of equipment for the purpose of extraction and filtration of odours shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The approved extraction/filtration scheme shall be installed before the use hereby permitted is commenced.

Reason: In the interests of residential amenity. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006, policy 4/13)

18. Development shall not begin (excluding demolition) until a scheme for surface water disposal has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Infiltration systems shall only be used where it can be demonstrated that they will not pose a risk to groundwater quality. The scheme shall be implemented as approved.

Reason: To protect and prevent the pollution of controlled waters (particularly the River Cam and underlying Secondary A Aquifer) in line with National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF; paragraphs 109, 121), EU Water Framework Directive, Anglian River Basin Management Plan and Environment Agency Groundwater Protection (GP3:2013) position statements G1 to G13, N7 and N10. The water environment is potentially vulnerable and there is an increased potential for pollution from inappropriately located and/or designed infiltration sustainable drainage systems (SUDS) such as soakaways, unsealed porous pavement systems or infiltration basins.

19. Piling or any other foundation designs using penetrative methods shall not 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 groundwater. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To protect and prevent the pollution of controlled waters (particularly the River Cam and underlying Secondary A Aquifer) in line with National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF; paragraphs 109, 121), EU Water Framework Directive, Anglian River Basin Management Plan and Environment Agency Groundwater Protection (GP3:2013) position statement N7. Piling or any other foundation designs using penetrative methods can result in risks to potable supplies from, for example, pollution / turbidity, risk of mobilising contamination, drilling through different aquifers and creating preferential pathways. Thus it should be demonstrated that any proposed piling will not result in contamination of groundwater.

20. 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)

21. 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, type of jointing 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 the visual amenity of the Conservation Area 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 3/12 and 4/11)

22. Prior to the commencement of construction (excluding demolition and enabling works), details of the link between Block A and the Portland Arms PH are to be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority and the construction carried out in accordance with the details approved.

Reason: In order that the position and nature of the new construction does not adversely affect the appearance of the Building of Local Interest and to comply with Cambridge Local Plan 2006 polices 4/11 and 4/12.

23. No occupation of any new building erected pursuant to this permission 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)

24. 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)

25. Prior to installation full details of the collapsible handrails proposed on the roof shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: In the interests of visual amenity and the impact on the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006, policy 3/12 and 4/11)

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 30th 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, or, public art, in accordance with Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/7, 3/8, 3/12, 5/5, 5/14, 8/3 and 10/1 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, and the Northern Corridor Area Transport Plan 2003.

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