

<b>Application Number</b>	14/0790/FUL	<b>Agenda Item</b>	
<b>Date Received</b>	19th May 2014	<b>Officer</b>	Mr Sav Patel
<b>Target Date</b>	18th August 2014		
<b>Ward</b>	West Chesterton		
<b>Site</b>	Cambridge City Football Ground Milton Road Cambridge Cambridgeshire CB4 1FA		
<b>Proposal</b>	Residential development of 106 units comprising a mix of townhouses and apartments including up to 40% affordable housing, open space, hard and soft landscaping, car and cycle parking and associated infrastructure		
<b>Applicant</b>	c/o Agent United Kingdom		

SUMMARY	<p>The proposal accords with the Development Plan for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-The amount of on-site open space is increased from the previous proposal and is acceptable.</li> <li>-Proposed off-site enhancement and provision of recreational facilities is improved.</li> <li>-It is of a high quality design and layout.</li> <li>-Provision for affordable housing and mitigation measures are to be secured via a Planning Obligation</li> </ul>
<b>RECOMMENDATION</b>	<b>APPROVAL</b>

**0.0 BACKGROUND**

0.1 This revised application follows the grant of planning permission 12/1211/FUL in December 2013 for 138 dwellings.

0.2 The application before Members is for 106 dwellings. The site layout has been reorganised to create a central green space and The key differences include:

- Reduction in dwellings from 138 to 106;
- Increase in family housing from 13% townhouses in the consented scheme to 38% in the proposed scheme;
- The layout and arrangement of the proposed development has been revised which sees an overall increase in green open space within the site;
- No underground parking;

0.5 The key issues are debated in assessment section 8 of the report.

## **1.0 SITE DESCRIPTION/AREA CONTEXT**

1.1 The site occupies land to the north-west of the Westbrook Centre, and south-east of Chesterton Community College. It is set away from main street frontages in an area bounded by Victoria Road, Milton Road, and Gilbert Road. The site is made up of a playing pitch, stands and ancillary buildings and facilities, used by Cambridge City Football Club, which lie on the west side of the site, and a large tarmac car parking area, which lies to the east. The site is reached via the Westbrook Centre access road, which turns off Milton Road a short distance beyond Mitcham's Corner.

1.2 The site is listed as No. 5.05 in the Proposals Schedule of the Cambridge Local Plan (2006), which is allocated for residential development subject to certain provisos. The site is within the area of the Mitcham's Corner Strategic Development Brief (2003).

1.3 The site is not within any conservation area. None of the buildings are listed or Buildings of Local Interest.

1.4 There are no protected trees on the site. There is a TPO protecting a walnut tree in the rear garden of 45 Green's Road which is close to the western boundary of the site. There are a large number of substantial trees just beyond the north-western edge of the site in the grounds of Chesterton Community College. These trees are not subject to TPOs.

1.5 The site falls outside the controlled parking zone.

## 2.0 THE PROPOSAL

2.1 The proposal is for the erection of 106 residential units, of which 42 would be affordable (40%). The flatted accommodation would consist of 55 apartments arranged in two blocks; E and I. These blocks would be 5 storeys with a recessed top floor. Below is a table showing the breakdown of the mix of private and affordable units:

Tenure	1bed	2bed	2bed (house)	3bed (house)	4bed (house)	5bed (house)	Total
Private	4	20	10	16	12	2	64
Shared Ownership	5	10	1	5	0	0	21
Social Rented Mix	0	16	2	3	0	0	21
Total	9	46	13	24	12	2	106

2.2 The access into the site has not changed from the consented scheme. However, the visual approach has changed with the revised layout of the housing development. From the access point, a spine road would run south-west through the development and provide five secondary streets running off this. The residential accommodation and open space would be arranged around this street pattern

2.3 The apartment blocks would be located south of the spine road adjacent to Westbrook Centre. Block I would face towards the Central Square and be located adjacent (west) of the main access into the site. Block E would be located 14.5 metres south-west of Block I. Both blocks would contain cycle parking and bin storage for the apartments. Some external cycle parking stands are proposed adjacent to main entrances but the majority of cycle spaces would be located on in the undercroft. Block I would contain 50 cycle parking spaces in one area and Block E 56 spaces in two separate areas. Communal bins would also be provided within the ground floor envelope of each block. Block I would also contain 20 undercroft car parking spaces (including 2 disabled spaces) and 5 spaces adjacent to the access road to the north-east of Block I. Block E does not

contain any undercroft parking provision. Instead all the car parking is located in front and to the side of the block. 18 spaces would be provided to serve Block E.

- 2.4 Both Blocks would be 5 storeys with car parking on the ground floor and a recessed section on the top level. Both blocks have been designed in a similar manner with flat roofs and semi-recessed balconies. However, Block I is the bigger of the two blocks. Both blocks would be 15.2 metres in height above ground level. Block E is rectangular in shape but has a projection on the south-west elevation. As a result this block would be 34.5 metres wide at its widest point, 32.4 at its narrowest and 18.8 metres in depth. Block I is a more regular rectangular shape and would be 42.8 metres wide and 17.2 metres in depth.
- 2.5 The main dwellings have been arranged around the edge of the site with a small cluster of houses located in the centre. The Central Square, which would be the main green space within the development, would be surrounded by houses (rows F, G, H) and Block I on all four sides. The dwellings range from two and three storey townhouses arranged in seven separate linear rows (A, B, C, D, F, G and H). Rows A, D and F accommodate the affordable houses. The bin and cycle storage for each dwelling would be provided within an enclosure which projects along the common boundary. The bin and cycle enclosure would be 1.45 metre in height and contain a flat sedum laid roof.
- 2.6 The dwellings in rows C, D, F, G and H would be three storeys high. Row B would contain dwellings that are two storeys high and in Row A there would be a combination of 2 and 3 storeys high dwellings. All the dwellings would have private gardens and, apart from the two storey dwellings, include large external terraces either at first or second floor level. The rows with first floor terraces are G and H. The rows with second floor terraces are A (three storey dwellings), C, D and F.
- 2.7 One car parking space is provided for each dwelling house, apart from the dwellings in rows G and H, which have integral garages.
- 2.8 The main communal open space would be the 'Central Square', which is centred around rows F, G and H and Block I. A smaller

area known as 'pocket garden' is also provided between rows B and C. Both spaces are to be landscaped with hard and soft landscaping. On-site private open space provision exceeds that previously put forward.

2.9 The application is accompanied by the following supporting information:

1. Application drawings
2. Design and Access Statement
3. Planning Statement
4. Transport Assessment and Framework Travel Plan
5. Ecological Assessment
6. Ground Investigation Report
7. Pre-Development Tree Survey and Arboricultural Method Statement
8. Flood Risk Assessment (Drainage Strategy)
9. Landscape Scheme (within Design and Access Statement)
10. Sustainability Statement
11. Shadow Assessment (within Design and Access Statement)
12. Utilities
13. Air Quality Screening Letter
14. Noise Assessment
15. Public Art Scheme
16. Consultation Statement
17. Affordable Housing Statement (within Design and Access Statement)
18. Open Space Assessment (see Planning Statement)
19. Tall Buildings Assessment (see Planning Statement)
20. Site Waste Management Plan

### 3.0 SITE HISTORY

Reference	Description	Outcome
06/0438/FUL	Residential development	Withdrawn
11/0008/FUL	Proposed residential development of 148 dwellings incorporating affordable housing, open space and landscaping, car and cycle parking and access work.	Refused 10/04/2012 Appeal withdrawn

12/1211/FUL Proposed residential development of 138 dwellings incorporating affordable housing, open space and landscaping, car and cycle parking and access roads and demolition of existing buildings and structures A/C

**4.0 PUBLICITY**

4.1 Advertisement: Yes  
 Adjoining Owners: Yes  
 Site Notice Displayed: Yes  
 Public Meeting/Exhibition (meeting of 23 April 2014): Yes

**5.0 POLICY**

**5.1 Central Government Advice**

National Planning Policy Framework 2012  
 National Planning Practice Guidance 2014  
 Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010  
 Circular 11/95 – The Use of Conditions in Planning Permissions (Annex A)

**5.2 Relevant Development Plan policies**

PLAN	POLICY NUMBER
Cambridge Local Plan 2006	3/1, 3/4, 3/6, 3/7, 3/8 3/11, 3/12 4/2, 4/4, 4/13, 4/15 5/1, 5/5, 5/9, 5/10, 5/14, 6/1 8/1, 8/2, 8/3, 8/4, 8/6, 8/10, 8/16, 8/18 10/1

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

Supplementary Planning Documents	Sustainable Design and Construction Waste Management Design Guide
----------------------------------	--

	<p>Affordable Housing</p> <p>Planning Obligation Strategy</p> <p>Public Art</p>
Material Considerations	<p><u>Central Government:</u></p> <p>Letter from Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government (27 May 2010)</p> <p>Written Ministerial Statement: Planning for Growth (23 March 2011)</p>
	<p><u>City Wide</u></p> <p>Cycle Parking Guide for New Residential Developments (2010)</p> <p>Cambridge City Council) - Open Space and Recreation Strategy (2006)</p> <p>Cambridge City Council Open Space Standards Guidance for Interpretation and Implementation (2010)</p> <p>Cambridgeshire Design Guide For Streets and Public Realm (2007)</p>
	<p><u>Area Guidelines:</u></p> <p>Northern Corridor Area Transport Plan</p> <p>Mitcham's Corner Area Strategic Planning and Development Brief</p>

## 6.0 CONSULTATIONS

### Cambridgeshire County Council (Engineering)

- 6.1 The joint use of the Westbrook access road by commuters and residents would not be ideal. Lay-bys and service bays on the access road would need improvement in order to improve the

pedestrian environment if they are to be adopted. Features of the development layout would prevent adoption of streets as it stands.

- 6.2 The junction layout at Milton Road is not ideal due to the proximity of the bus stop, but no significant accident history. Not possible to demonstrate significant adverse impact from the development.
- 6.3 If Westbrook access road is to be adopted, it would require complete rebuilding. If the new roads within the development were to be adopted they would have to be subject to amendment.
- 6.4 Our signals engineers will require a sum of money, as agreed under the previous scheme to cover work in recalibrating the Mitcham's Corner signals to accommodate changes in traffic patterns.
- 6.5 The 'shared space' concept on the square is confusing and a hybrid scheme that may put pedestrians at risk. The southern face is not shared surface, but almost looks like one, whilst, on entering the other arms the scheme become a true shared surface yet has no visible delineation between the two to reinforce the change. Drivers may, therefore drive through into the shared space from what is, in effect, a traditional carriageway without altering their driving behaviour.
- 6.6 The southernmost face of the square provides a route straight through the square for motor traffic, without significant horizontal deviation. The line of sight perception of motor vehicle drivers and cyclists may be one of priority over other modes.
- 6.7 Highways Officer has raised concerns with the use of the shared surface to the south of the central square, as no provision is made for pedestrian access, and is concerned this could create a potential conflict issues between drivers and pedestrians.

### **Cambridgeshire County Council (Transport)**

- 6.8 No objection. No NCATP contribution required. Contribution of £2000 towards Mitcham's Corner traffic signals required.



Residential Travel Plan required with a target of 10% single occupancy vehicles and Travel information pack with free taster tickets. Car and cycle parking provision accords with the adopted standards

### **Head of Refuse and Environment**

- 6.9 No objections subject to conditions required with respect to: contaminated land, noise assessment, noise insulation, construction hours, construction deliveries, construction noise and vibration, contractors' operations, dust suppression, waste storage.

### **Urban Design and Conservation team**

- 6.10 Subject to conditions on elevational treatment and materials, the submitted scheme is supported in design terms and has the potential to create a well-designed and high quality development.

### **Head of Streets and Open Spaces (Landscape Officer)**

- 6.11 No firm proposals for sustainable drainage which is integral to landscape design and on this basis the proposal is not supported. Concerns also raised with pedestrian links. If minded to approve the following conditions should be applied: full hard and soft landscaping details; softwork specification; groundwork specification; details of the play area/equipment; tree pit and planting details; sustainable drainage details; details of retained features.

### **Sustainability Officer**

- 6.12 The proposal includes a series of energy efficient measures and the use of solar panels to meet the 10% renewable energy provision would comply with policy and is therefore supported.

### **Strategic Housing Manager**

- 6.13 The affordable housing provision within this proposal is supported. The affordable housing provision has good provision tenure mix, good integration of tenures across the site and the design of the affordable units and private units is tenure blind.

### **Head of Streets and Open Spaces (Sustainable Drainage Engineer)**

- 6.14 No comments received to date. Any comments will be reported on the amendment sheet or orally at the meeting. However, the following comments were made on the previous application (12/1211/FUL): Revised surface water strategy, allowing for a 30% climate change factor, should be submitted to demonstrate that the development of the site would not increase the risk of flooding elsewhere.

### **Head of Streets and Open Spaces (Trees)**

- 6.15 No arboricultural objections subject to the measures in Tree Protection Plan being implemented and confirmation that no services installations will impact the retained trees.

### **Anglian Water**

- 6.16 There is capacity to available in the wastewater treatment and foul sewerage network to accept these flows. A condition is recommended on surface water drainage.

### **Environment Agency**

- 6.17 No Objection: Conditions required regarding ground contamination and surface water strategy.

### **Sport England**

- 6.18 As planning permission has been granted for the redevelopment of the site (12/1211/FUL) to which Sport England objected to, Sport England do not wish to object to this application but would like to see off site improvement to Chesterton Community College and Chesterton Recreation Ground which were secured in the previous package of mitigation in the S106 agreement to be applied to this application if approved.

### **Cambridgeshire Constabulary (Architectural Liaison Officer)**

- 6.19 No objection in principle subject to the following issue; height of cycle stores on the 3bed houses would limit surveillance of the

front entrances. Height should be lowered to 1.475 metres. The cycle store for Block E could become a meeting place for anti-social behaviour and feel unsafe for anyone using the store. This store area should be well lit.

### **Cambridgeshire County Council (Education)**

- 6.20 Contributions required for educational provision at pre-school, primary, secondary and life-long learning levels. Contributions also required towards Household waste recycling centres.

### **Cambridgeshire Fire and Rescue Service**

- 6.21 Provision of fire hydrants required via condition (see condition 25) or S106 agreement.

### **Minister of Defence**

- 6.22 No objections to the proposal.

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

- 6.23 No objections following receipt of amendments and further clarification to the scheme.

### **Design and Conservation Panel (Meeting of 12 February 2014 – pre-application stage).**

- 6.24 The Panel's comments were as follows:

Response to context. The presentation included the exploration of the various layout options and the Panel concluded that the option selected appears to be the most viable.

Movement and access (linkages). A land-locked site presents any design team with limitations. However, there is an opportunity to improve permeability providing some issues relating to third party ownership can be overcome. A future link with Gilbert Road if only for pedestrians and cyclists would be a significant breakthrough and thorough exploration of this possibility is to be strongly encouraged.

Scale and massing.

Blocks E and I (overlooking). The Panel expressed concerns as to the likelihood of overlooking by the Westbrook

Centre. The distance from this office block may be over 20 meters but occupants will have direct views into the apartments. Further thought is recommended as to the choice of fenestration to help resolve this issue.

- o Block E. This block was in the Panel's view particularly dominant. The 5<sup>th</sup> floor could be set back as one of a number of measures that could break up the massing for improved sun exposure, and provide an improved relationship with Block C.

- o Block I. The Panel were not supportive of the inclusion of a gabion wall at the base, as this invites wildlife. Surveillance at ground floor combined with robust landscaping would be the Panel's preferred option.

- Interior living spaces (Blocks E & I). Some reservations were expressed regarding the quality of these living spaces. It was felt that single aspect apartments should not be acceptable (particularly with the overlooking risk as already described) although no consensus was reached regarding the appropriateness of the 2.5 meter floor to ceiling heights.

- Townhouses (elevations). The Panel would recommend corner windows without mullions for a more visually pleasing result.

- Affordable housing. The Panel note that the market housing is given the benefit of the main area of amenity, while the majority of the affordable housing is located around a small pocket park. The Panel would prefer to see the affordable housing more effectively integrated.

- Open space and landscaping. Although currently described as a work in progress, the Panel would like to stress the importance of high quality landscaping in the creation of attractive living spaces; providing a sense of place and arrival.

- o Groundfloor thresholds (townhouses). The Panel welcome the visual breakage provided by the individual covered bin stores. This could be further enhanced however by carefully considered landscaping maintained as part of a management plan.

- o Central square (parking). The Panel were disappointed to see parking located within this central space, as parked cars would likely conflict with children's activities. Every effort should be made to relocate the parking to the side road.

- o Typography (central square). The Panel would welcome less emphasis being placed on formal lines of trees to allow for a more community-focussed space.

- Materials palette. In general terms, the Panel were comfortable with the materials palette as presented but would

urge against choosing a perforated, textured brick that would be vulnerable to staining.

□ Code for Sustainable Homes. The Panel understands that new affordable homes require Code Level 4 and not Code 3 as specified in the presentation.

□ SuDs. The Panel would like to emphasise the importance of exploring sustainable drainage options as far as possible.

### Conclusion:

The Panel appreciated the clear and concise presentation of a far superior scheme to the consented scheme by Camal Architects. The revised brief with its emphasis on family housing and private amenity space for all units is a very welcome step forward. The Panel would like to stress the importance of linkages however, and would like to see measures taken to resolve the intervening land ownership issues that currently obstruct the likelihood of improved permeability.

### **VERDICT – GREEN (unanimous)**

6.25 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:

- 9 Albert Street
- 32 Green Road
- 27 Gilbert Road
- 36 Gilbert Road
- 77 Garden Walk
- 6 Springfield Road

And also from

- Arquiva (in objection)
- Chesterton Community College
- Friends of Mitcham's Corner

7.2 The representations can be summarised as follows:

- Concerns with additional traffic movement at junction with Milton Road;
- Concerns with the single point of access into the site;
- Concerns with rogue car parking
- No details of site boundary fencing;
- 6 metre lamp posts not appropriate;
- Better cycle and pedestrian provision should be incorporated;
- Flat roofs are out of character with the area suggest pitched roofs;
- The development is too contained and isolated and could become a gated community;
- Height of Block E and I is inappropriate;
- Regret loss of allotments;
- Object to the removal of the existing electronic communication base station which would detrimentally affect mobile phone coverage in this part of Cambridge and no alternative provision has been proposed or agreed.

7.3 Cambridge, Past, Present and Future - The revised proposed scheme is supported in general but still have concerns with the lack of permeability through the site for cycles and pedestrians.

7.4 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. Affordable Housing
3. Context of site, design and external spaces
4. Public Art
5. Renewable energy and sustainability
6. Disabled access
7. Residential amenity
8. Refuse arrangements
9. Highway safety
10. Car and cycle parking
11. Third party representations

## 12.Planning Obligation Strategy

### **Principle of Development**

- 8.2 The Proposals Schedule of the Local Plan states that site 5.05 should be developed in accordance with the provisions of the Mitcham's Corner Development Brief. The Brief identifies the preferred future use of the CCFC site as:

Residential with on-site open space to meet the Council's adopted standards.

- 8.3 It also notes:

*In addition to on-site open space, the Council would not wish to grant permission for redevelopment involving the loss of the existing recreational facility unless an equal/improved facility can satisfactorily be provided elsewhere in the city.*

- 8.4 The Cambridge Local Plan (2006) makes provision for an increase of approximately 6500 new dwellings within the existing urban area of the city over the period 1999-2016. In my opinion, the principle of residential development is acceptable and in accordance with policy 5.1 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2006) and with the Proposals schedule of that plan and the Mitcham's Corner Development Brief 2003.

- 8.5 The principle of development and loss of open space on this site has been established by the grant of planning permission (12/1211/FUL) for 138 dwellings in 2013. Development Plan policy has not changed since this permission was granted and emerging Local Plan can only be given limited weight. I therefore do not consider it necessary to reiterate the justification for the loss of open space. The applicant has agreed to provide the local enhancement proposals that were agreed in the approved scheme. The 2013 permission remains extant notwithstanding that the applicant now seeks to refine the design and layout of the scheme. This is a significant material consideration.

- 8.6 In these terms, therefore the principle of development on this site including the loss of protected open space has already been established and the proposal would comply with policy 5.1

of the Local Plan. This scheme will also be subject to the same mitigation and enhancement measures that the previous scheme was tied to in the S106 agreement such as contributions towards highway improvements, contributions towards local enhancements to mitigate the loss of open space, contribution towards upgrading of Chesterton Recreation Ground and construction of a pavilion building at Chesterton Community College.

### **Affordable Housing**

8.7 It is proposed that 42 of the 106 residential units are affordable. This equates to 40% and as such meets the requirements for affordable housing provision as set out in the Local Plan. The mix of affordable units is set out below:

Tenure	1bed	2bed	2bed (house)	3bed (house)	4bed (house)	5bed (house)	Total
Private	4	20	10	16	12	2	64
Shared Ownership	5	10	1	5	0	0	21
Social Rented Mix	0	16	2	3	0	0	21
<b>Total</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>106</b>

8.8 The detail of the Affordable housing scheme can be secured through a Section 106 Agreement

8.9 The affordable units are located in five different locations across the site such as in rows A, D and F and Blocks E and I. The cluster sizes and distribution are as follows:

- Row A: 2 shared ownership and 5 social rented
- Row D: 2 shared ownership
- Row F: 4 shared ownership
- Block E: 11 shared ownership and 16 social rented (flats)
- Block I: 2 shared ownership (flats)

8.10 The cluster sizes and maximum number of affordable units accessed from a single stairwell are above the guideline maximum of 12 set in paragraph 23 of the Affordable Housing SPD. 27 affordable units are accessed off one main stair-core in Block E. Therefore, whilst this element of the affordable housing



provision does not comply with the standards in the SPD, the benefits from the clustering pattern/distribution and increase in number of 3 bed units would outweigh this issue. This is a stance supported by the Strategic Housing Officer.

8.11 Annex 2 to the Affordable Housing SPD states that as a guide (allowing for variations from site to site as permitted by Local Plan policy 5/10), the unit size mix in new affordable housing should be:

- 50% 1 and 2 bedroom dwellings, but with no more than 10% 1-bedroom dwellings
- 50% 3 bedroom or larger dwellings, but with no less than 20% 3-bedroom dwellings

8.12 The mix of the 42 affordable units is:

- 5 x 1 bed (12%)
- 27 x 2 bed (of which 3 are houses) (64%)
- 10 x 3 bed (24%)

8.13 The mix of the 64 private units is:

- 4 x 1bed (6%)
- 32 x 2bed (47%)
- 14 x 3 bed (25%)
- 12 x 4bed (19%)
- 2 x 5 bed (3%)

8.14 The overall proportion of one and two-bedroom affordable units proposed, at 76%, is higher than that in the extant permission and suggested in the SPD guidance. Annex 2 of the SPD suggests that the 50/50 split between one-and-two bedroom units and larger units should be 'provided in the urban extensions to Cambridge and on other sites as appropriate to their location and site area'. In my view, the larger proportion of smaller units proposed here is reasonable for a site of this size, in this location, and in light of the private mix. The mix of affordable housing is supported by the Strategic Housing Manager.

8.15 The amount of affordable housing has been redistributed compared to the approved scheme with a better tenure mix and distribution across the site. In my opinion the proposal is

compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 5/5 and 10/1 and the Affordable Housing SPD (2008)

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

8.16 Aside from the reduction in the amount of housing development, a number of other amendments have been made to the site layout and scale and arrangement of housing. I set out below a summary of the key changes:

- The proposed scheme is predominantly 3 storeys dropping to 2 storeys along the south-west boundary adjacent to the existing houses in Green's Road;
- Two 5 storey blocks are proposed along south-west boundary adjacent to the existing Westbrook Centre;
- A Central Square is proposed which is to be landscaped and overlooked by three rows (F, G and H) and Block I;
- A new Pocket Garden is proposed between Row B and C;
- The underground parking has been removed in favour of undercroft parking under Block I;

### Density

8.17 The total site area, minus the access road, is 1.62Ha. Since the application proposes 106 residential units, the gross density is approximately 65 dwellings per hectare (dph).

8.18 The Mitcham's Corner Development Brief 2003 provides guidance that residential development on the main sites in the Brief area should be in the range of 75-100dph. The proposal has a density below the level of the range recommended. However, the arrangement of the scheme is considered to be better balanced in terms of green space and built form and would provide more public and private green space within the site.

8.19 I am of the opinion that the proposal successfully manages the challenges of the proposed density and housing mix. It should also be noted that the Mitcham's Corner Development Brief was produced at a time when Central Government were providing specific guidance on housing density which is no longer the case.

## Scale and Massing

- 8.20 The buildings proposed are predominantly of three storeys but reduce to two storeys along the south-west boundary of the site. Along the north-eastern boundary, adjacent to the rear gardens of Gilbert Road properties, the scale of housing has been increased by a storey from the previous scheme to three storey townhouses with rear gardens. The buildings are set marginally further away from Gilbert Road properties than in the previous scheme. Along the south-western edge of the site, adjacent to Greens' Road properties, the scheme is reduced to two and three storeys (lower than previous), with an open space proposed as a break between blocks K and L.
- 8.21 Blocks E and I are 5 storeys and located adjacent to the boundary with the Westbrook Centre which is of a comparable size. This clustering of Blocks E and I adjacent to an existing buildings would, in my view, reduce the visual impact on the other dwellings and particularly those that adjoin the site. The applicant has carried out a detailed height and massing assessment to demonstrate the height relationship with the Westbrook Centre and from the wider area such as Gilbert Road and Green's Road. Blocks E and I are proposed to be 20 metres away from the Westbrook Centre building and of a comparable height. The fifth floors of Block E and I have been designed to appear ancillary as it would be set in the edge giving the blocks less dominance at rooftop level. I am satisfied with the scale and massing of Blocks E and I.
- 8.22 Whilst the quantum of development has reduced, the number of 3 storey dwellings has increased. The dwellings in Rows C, D, F, G and H are all 3 storey 9.6 metres high. Row A which contains eleven units, would accommodate a mixture of 2 and 3 storey dwellings. The 3 storey dwellings would be located mid-terrace with the 2 storey units either side. The centralised location of the 3 storey units within the row would result in a stepping down from 3 to 2 storey onto the south-west (SW) boundary which is adjoined by the rear gardens in Gilbert Road. In my view this arrangement not only gives the terrace row more architectural interest but also reduces the impact and dominance of the 3 storey units on the rear gardens of the properties in Green's Road. The side elevation of the two storey dwelling within Row A which faces the SW boundary would be 10 metres in depth and 3 metres from the SW boundary at a

height of 6.5 metres. The side elevation of the 3 storey unit closest to the boundary would be 17.5 metres away. The dwellings that face directly towards the side elevation of Row A in Green's Road are set approximately 20 metres away. The side elevation of Row A is located closer to the dwellings in Green's Road than the rear elevation of Row B.

8.23 Row B is a terrace of six 2 storey dwellings which are approximately 6.5 metres in height. The terrace runs parallel to the boundary and is 31 metres wide. The entire rear elevation of Row B would be set off the SW boundary by 8.5 metres. At its nearest point, Row B would be located 13 metres from the rear elevation of the closest property in Green's Road. The first floor rear elevation of the dwellings would contain two bedroom windows. Whilst the proposal would result in new dwellings being introduced closer to the dwellings in Green's Road, this arrangement has already been established in the 2013 permission. I note that the occupant of 32 Greens' Road, which is the closest property to the site, has welcomed the revised scheme subject to further details on street lighting. In these terms, therefore, I am satisfied that the scale and massing of the development adjacent to the south-west boundary is acceptable.

8.24 Prior to the submission of the revised scheme, the revised scheme was presented to the Design and Conservation Panel. In respect of scale and massing they made the following comments:

- Blocks E and I (overlooking). The Panel expressed concerns as to the likelihood of overlooking by the Westbrook Centre. The distance from this office block may be over 20 metres but occupants will have direct views into the apartments. Further thought is recommended as to the choice of fenestration to help resolve this issue.
- Block E. This block was in the Panel's view particularly dominant. The 5th floor could be set back as one of a number of measures that could break up the massing for improved sun exposure, and provide an improved relationship with Block C.
- Block I. The Panel were not supportive of the inclusion of a gabion wall at the base, as this invites wildlife. Surveillance

at ground floor combined with robust landscaping would be the Panel's preferred option.

- 8.25 In respect of the first point, the applicant has undertaken an assessment of similar building to building relationships which have been approved in Cambridge such as in the CB1 Station Road development. I am satisfied with the level of separation between the Westbrook Centre (offices) and Block E and also because offices are mainly occupied during the day on weekdays only which are at times when residential dwellings have lowest occupation levels.
- 8.26 In respect of the second point, the fifth floor of both blocks has been set back from the edges of the building as suggested. This in my view reduces the dominance of the buildings. The applicant has produced a shadow study which demonstrates that neither of the blocks would cause an adverse overshadowing issues on the other aspects of the development and that the existing Westbrook Centre would not adversely affect the apartments in the south-east elevation.
- 8.27 In respect of the third point, the applicant has maintained the use of a gabion wall around the base of Block I. This has been used at other developments in Cambridge such as Accordia. The applicant has considered alternative base materials but from the study and images produced, I am the view that the gabion wall option is the most acceptable, particularly as the variation in tone from the proposed colour of brick helps to define the base level. The Urban Design and Conservation Team has not raised any concerns with the use of gabion walls.
- 8.28 The revised scheme has in my view addressed the mains concerns of the Panel and the reasons for deviation from the Panel's views are justified. I believe this scheme is a well considered proposal and is more sensitive to the context of its neighbours and that the scale of development provides a better and more balanced site arrangement than the previous scheme.

Layout:

- 8.29 The layout of the proposed development is based on a framework of a square and spine road with linked spaces. In my view this basic framework is a coherent and legible design. This also has resulted in a significant reduction in hard

landscaping compared with the previous scheme. The way in which these streets and spaces would function would provide the satisfactory hierarchy of routes, attractive frontages, safe and usable spaces, and natural surveillance required by policy 3/7 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2006), and would not inhibit future occupiers from using cycles as a key element in travel.

8.30 The Mitcham's Corner Development Brief identifies the need for a satisfactory separation between the proposed development and the existing Westbrook Centre. The nearest flat in Blocks E and I would have a separation distance of approximately 20m between their rear elevation and the nearest part of the Westbrook Centre. I am of the view that this is acceptable.

8.31 In terms of permeability through the site to aid movement and linkages to wider areas, the site is extensively land-locked and therefore any such provision is prohibited due to land ownership issues. The Design and Conservation Panel acknowledged this issue when the scheme was presented to them in February. Whilst they see this as being an opportunity to improve permeability, they acknowledge that this can only be achieved if third party ownership issues can be overcome.

#### Public Realm and Landscape

8.32 Suitable landscape buffers around the ground-floor apartments in Block E are provided. The scheme features tree planting along all the streets, a Central Square which has clear routes through it, but is also suitable for a variety of uses and smaller Pocket Garden between Rows B and C. Considerable use of shrubs around Block E and I, within the Central Square and Pocket Garden creates a strong sense of greenery to help soften buildings and enhance views through the site from one side to the other.

8.33 I acknowledge that the height and orientation of the buildings will cause some areas to be shaded for proportions of the day, but I do not consider this to prevent the implementation of good quality landscaping. Nevertheless, the landscape officer has recommended a hard and soft landscape condition to be applied in order for such details to be agreed. This is considered to be acceptable as there is sufficient space within the site and around the proposed buildings to accommodate

meaningful landscape which will benefit the appearance of the scheme.

8.34 The Panel highlighted the importance of high quality landscaping to create attractive spaces and to provide a sense of place on arrival. They welcome the visual breakage provided by the individual covered bin stores. Aside from this they made the following comments on the proposed open space provision:

- Central square (parking). The Panel were disappointed to see parking located within this central space, as parked cars would likely conflict with children's activities. Every effort should be made to relocate the parking to the side road.
- Typography (central square). The Panel would welcome less emphasis being placed on formal lines of trees to allow for a more community-focused space.

8.35 In respect of the first point, the scheme no longer includes any car parking on the Central Square.

8.36 In respect of the second point, whilst formal lines of trees are still being proposed the internal layout of the space has been designed to allow flow through the space from different directions with good levels of natural surveillance. I am satisfied with the provision and layout of open space within the site, as it forms an integrated part of the development.

#### Detailed building design and materials

8.37 The Urban Design and Conservation Team support the scheme subject to details aspects of the scheme such as materials and detailing of elevations being agreed by condition. The design and detailing of the buildings are of high quality and comparable to other residential schemes in Cambridge.

8.38 The revised scheme has also responded to the comments made by the Design and Conservation Panel before the application was submitted. The Panel was comfortable with the materials palette that was presented but urged against choosing a perforated, textured brick that would be vulnerable to staining. I have recommended a materials and a sample condition to ensure the suite and palette of materials are agreed.

- 8.39 Aside from the specific detailed aspects of the scheme presented to the Panel gave the scheme a unanimous 'Green' light.
- 8.40 In my opinion, the proposal achieves acceptable interrelations between buildings, routes and public spaces, creates attractive built frontages, and promotes natural surveillance. It would provide an attractive, high-quality, accessible, stimulating, socially inclusive and safe living environment, and would be compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 3/4, 3/7, 3/11, and 3/12.

#### Open space provision on site

- 8.41 Private gardens are provided for all proposed townhouses. The 3 storey townhouses also benefit from external terraces at first floor. The apartments in Block E and I have 1.5 metre deep balconies. I consider the level of private amenity provision to be acceptable.
- 8.42 The provision of communal open space is provided in two main locations on site. They are as follows.
- The Central Space;
  - Pocket Garden;
- 8.43 Other small pockets of landscaped public space and ecological planting are proposed around the site.
- 8.44 The combined area of open space amounts to 3482sqm of which 3199 comprises informal open space and 283sqm is for play space. 3182sqm of private open space will also be provided which is significantly more than in the previous scheme which was 1258sqm.
- 8.45 Open space requirements are calculated on the basis of the number of people to be accommodated in a development, each unit being assumed to accommodate one person per bedroom, except that single-bedroom units are assumed to accommodate 1.5 people. The total assumed population of the development would therefore be 261 people.
- 8.46 The total informal open space required by the development (at a rate of 18sqm per person) is 4698sqm. On site provision is



3199 sqm. On this basis the on-site provision proposed would be 67% of that total requirement. Whilst this is below the required rate, this is the same level as that provided in the consented scheme. I am therefore satisfied with the level of informal open space provided on this site.

8.47 The total space for children and young people required by the development (at a rate of 2.9sqm per person) is 757sqm. On site provision is 283 sqm. The on-site provision proposed would be circa 38% of that total. This is the same as that provided in the consented scheme. I am therefore satisfied with the level of play space provided on this site.

8.48 The open space proposed on site forms a substantial part of the total requirement for informal open space, and a significant part of the requirement for children's space in policy terms. The Planning Obligation Strategy 2010 states that:

*'The City Council will normally expect all appropriate development to contribute to meeting the additional demand for open space it creates, either on site, or through a commuted payment to provide new open space or improve existing open space provision in the vicinity of the development'*

8.49 In my view, the level of on-site open space in these two categories is acceptable provision and is similar to quantum provided in the previously consented scheme. Any shortfall should be supplemented by a financial contribution to the enhancement of provision elsewhere.

8.50 In my view, subject to appropriate contributions elsewhere being secured through a Section 106 agreement, the provision of informal open space and space for children and young people on site in the scheme is acceptable, and in accordance with policy 3/8 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2006), the Planning Obligation Strategy 2010 and the City Council's Open Space Standards.

8.51 In my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 3/4, 3/7, 3/11, 3/12.

## **Public Art**

- 8.52 As part of the previous scheme, a public art consultant was engaged at a very early point in the design process and a public art strategy for the site, entitled Kickstart, was developed and presented to Public Art Panel in May 2010. The strategy was supported by the Public Art Co-ordinator, and approved by Panel. An updated scheme has been discussed with the Council's Public Art Officer and the delivery plan has been reassessed to ensure that it is relevant to the latest submission whilst retaining the key qualities that were considered to be successful under the previous scheme. Zoe Chamberlain, who was artist appointed for the previous scheme is being retained and will focus on commissioning artwork that helps document and celebrate memories and aspirations for the club whilst they embark on a number of potential years of ground share
- 8.53 In my opinion the continuation and updating of the Kickstart strategy provides a sound basis for public art in connection with this proposal, and is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 3/7 and 10/1 and the Public Art SPD 2010

## **Renewable energy and sustainability**

- 8.54 The proposal seeks to utilise photovoltaic panels on the flat roofs of Blocks E and I. The Council's Sustainability Officer supports the energy strategy. The strategy suggests a 10% reduction in carbon emissions would comply with the policy requirement of 10%.
- 8.55 In my opinion the applicants have suitably addressed the issue of sustainability and renewable energy and the proposal is in accordance with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policy 8/16 and the Sustainable Design and Construction SPD 2007.

## **Disabled access**

- 8.56 15% of the total number of units in the scheme have been designed to Lifetime homes standards. Detailed plans for these units, demonstrating their compatibility with the standards accompany the application. In my opinion, the scheme is in accordance with policy 5/9 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2006).

- 8.57 The Access Officer is satisfied with the proposed disabled access provision. In my opinion, the proposal shows appropriate consideration for the needs of those with disabilities, and complies with or exceeds the requirements of Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 3/7, 3/12 and 5/9.
- 8.58 In my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 3/7 and 3/12.

### **Residential Amenity**

Impact on amenity of neighbouring occupiers

Green's Road

- 8.59 The rear elevations of the proposed 2-storey houses would be at a distance of between 14m and 22m from the rear elevations of the houses at 32-46 Green's Road. The houses along this boundary, particularly those adjacent to the houses in Green's Road (Row A and B are mainly two storey and therefore would be a comparable height to the existing. The terraced in Row A is located side on to the boundary which reduces the mass and scale of the terrace from the adjacent dwellings. The terraces in Row A, B and C have better spacing compared to the previous scheme, which, in my view, created a defined barrier with less spacing. The rear gardens of 38-46 Greens Road and SW boundary of the site are separated by a path that provides access to the rear gardens. The SW boundary of the site would be defined by a 1.8 metre close boarded timber fence.
- 8.60 I do not consider that the proposed two storey houses would cause significant overshadowing of the Green's Road properties; they lie to the north and are not of sufficient height. Equally, because of their height, I do not consider they would create any unacceptable sense of enclosure.
- 8.61 The proposed houses would not be aligned with the rear elevations in Green's Road, so there would not be direct window-to window overlooking. However, the distances between these houses would be limited, and even given the angle of view it is my view that the first floor bedroom windows in Row B could pose a threat to the privacy of the occupiers of 32-46 Greens Road. This issue can be resolved by condition, for example by ensuring projecting visibility screens or canted

windows are installed. Row A is laid out side onto the boundary and so there would not be any direct overlooking issue from this terraced. Row C is located adjacent to the existing allotment site and so would not cause any adverse privacy issues. However, overall, the revised scheme would result in a better relationship with the adjacent housing development in terms of residential amenity compared to the previous scheme.

#### Gilbert Road

8.62 The six townhouses in Row H, each with a rear garden, are close to the common boundary with the rear gardens of Nos. 11-27 Gilbert Road. The separation between these houses and the nearest proposed units is in all cases at least 52.5 metres (measured from the main rear of no.11 Gilbert Road to the rear elevation of unit H.6 in Row H). Furthermore, Gilbert Road gardens are long and in most cases contain significant planting. Any overlooking opportunities would be confined to the rearmost parts of these gardens, and any impact of sunlight from the southwest would be confined to times when the sun is very low in the sky. In neither case would this impact be significant enough to warrant refusal of the application. However, overall, the revised scheme would result in a better relationship with the adjacent housing development in terms of residential amenity compared to the previous scheme.

8.63 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

8.64 I am satisfied that all the units proposed would enjoy reasonable levels of privacy and light. Private amenity space is provided for all the houses, almost all the maisonettes and top floor flats.

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

## **Refuse Arrangements**

- 8.66 All townhouses are provided with an individual store for three bins located at the front of each dwellinghouse in an enclosed storage area. In the apartment blocks (E and I) communal stores accommodating larger bins are provided on the ground floor. The Refuse Officer requested some additional information to be provided to clarify certain points relating to the size and number of sizes for the 4 and 5 bed units, walking distance to and from collection points and tracking details for refuse vehicles. The information requested has been provided and in my view addresses the issues raised by the Refuse Officer. Therefore, the overall refuse strategy and the space provided for townhouses and apartment blocks are acceptable.
- 8.67 I am of the view that all these matters can be resolved by conditions 25-26. Subject to this, I am confident that, with respect to waste and recycling, the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policy 3/12.

## **Highway Safety**

- 8.68 The Highway Officer raises a number of concerns relating to the access junction and relationship with the Westbrook Centre access, mix of traffic movement, and the design of the internal road and the shared space concept on the central square, no refuse vehicle tracking plan details. The Officer suggests that the access road would only require rebuilding if it were to be adopted, and does not raise any issues, other than planning obligation commitments, with regard to the transport impact of the proposal.
- 8.69 The revised scheme in terms of access to the site from Milton Road and its relationship with the Westbrook Centre, has not changed from the consented scheme. Therefore it would be difficult to argue the proposed relationship would have any adverse implications such that it would warrant refusal. Whilst the access road is unlikely to be adopted, the Highway Officer has still raised concerns with the lack of detailing on the access road which defines pedestrian and vehicle areas. The concern relates to the potential conflict between pedestrian and vehicles movement on the shared surface to the south of the central square. In my view, suitable provision has been provided on both sides of the access road with designated pedestrian

walkways in front of Block I and to the south of the Central Square. I am therefore satisfied suitable provision has been designed into the layout of the scheme which makes it distinguishable where the pedestrian and traffic zones are without it being made too deliberate.

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

### **Car and Cycle Parking**

8.71 The proposal car parking provision is as follows:

20	Block I (podium)
18	Block E (external)
51	On-plot (for 2, 3, 4 and 5 beds)
14	Garage (for 4 and 5 beds)
5	Visitor
<b>108</b>	<b>Total</b>

8.72 The application provides on average one space for each one and two bedroom unit and two spaces for each of the 4 and 5bed townhouses, with a small amount of visitor parking close to the entrance to the site. This provision does not exceed the levels set out in the Councils Car Parking Standards, which would equate to a maximum provision of 144 spaces, and but given the central location of the site, it is in accordance with Local Plan policy.

8.73 A number of representations suggest that the car parking provision made is insufficient. In my view this concern is not well-founded. National statistics show that a significant proportion of households in one-and-two-bedroom flats in urban areas typically do not own a car. In my view it is unlikely that any significant demand for car parking space outside the site would be generated by the development.

8.74 Representations also raise concerns that since the present car park on the site is used during the day as car parking space by people coming into the city to work, the cars accommodated will be displaced to on-street spaces nearby, increasing the pressure for space which already exists in the area. I accept that there is the possibility that this may happen. It is City Council policy, however, to promote lower levels of private car

parking in order to promote modal shift, particularly with respect to non-residential uses and where good public transport accessibility exists. In my view, given the pressure for on-street car parking in the vicinity, the elimination of the football ground car park is likely to promote the use of other means of transport, which is in accordance with the sustainability aims of the Local Plan. Increased designation of residents-only parking in the future might help to secure these objectives whilst retaining space for local occupiers. However, given that the new streets within the scheme are not to be adopted, there is a risk that if unmanaged, occupiers of the Westbrook Centre could continue to park on them. I have conditioned the management of parking within the site to exclude this possibility (condition 26).

8.75 Cycle storage space for the 4 and 5 townhouses is provided within widened garages whereas for the smaller dwellings have dedicated external stores which are located adjacent to the driveway.

8.76 The proposal cycle parking provision is as follows:

104	Basement	(for Block E and I)
98	Enclosures	(for 2 and 3 bed townhouses)
52	Garage	(for 4 and 5bed townhouses)
20	Visitor	
<b>274</b>	<b>Total</b>	

8.77 The application provides on average 2.4 spaces for each residential unit within the scheme excluding visitor parking. This provision exceeds the levels set out in the Councils Car Parking Standards, which would equate to a maximum provision of 134 spaces, and is therefore in accordance with local plan policy.

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

### **Third Party Representations**

8.79 I have addressed the majority of the issues raised in the above section but I set out below my response to the any issues I have missed:

Comments	Response
Concerns with additional traffic movement at junction with Milton Road;	The proposal would result in a reduction in traffic movement due to the reduction in the number of dwellings from 138 to 106.
Concerns with the single point of access into the site;	There are land ownership issues on the surrounding land that prohibit access from any other point.
Concerns with rogue car parking	The internal road is unlikely to be adopted and therefore no parking restrictions could be applied. However, I am of the view that the site is laid out to minimise any opportunity of rogue parking.
No details of site boundary fencing;	The Design and Access Statement contains specific details on the boundary treatment. However, this does not appear to relate to the entire site. I have therefore recommended a boundary treatment condition.
6 metre lamp posts not appropriate;	The lighting strategy has been assessed by our Environmental Services Team who considered the type and amount of lighting would minimise glare and overspill. The lighting scheme is therefore acceptable in this context as long as the recommendations within the strategy are followed.
Better cycle and pedestrian provision should be incorporated;	There are land ownership issues on the surrounding land that prohibit access from any other point.
Flat roofs are out of character with the area suggest pitched	The design of the revised scheme has been carefully



<p>roofs;</p>	<p>and thoroughly considered. The roof forms whilst would contrast with the traditional housing development close-by, it would be a successful contrast.</p>
<p>The development is too contained and isolated and could become a gated community;</p>	<p>No gates are proposed to make this scheme a gated community. The site is landlock and due to land ownership issues it has been difficult to provide connections through the site to surrounding area.</p>
<p>Height of Block E and I is inappropriate;</p>	<p>The height of Blocks E and I have been carefully assessed. The Blocks would be no taller than the existing Westbrook Centre. By grouping the Blocks close to the Westbrook Centre it reduces the impact on these buildings on other parts of the scheme.</p>
<p>Object to the removal of the existing electronic communication base station which would detrimentally affect mobile phone coverage in this part of Cambridge and no alternative provision has been proposed or agreed.</p>	<p>There is an extant planning permission which if implemented would require the removal of the mast. The applicant's client has also advised that the telecoms operator's lease is due to expire in 2015 and would be prepared to building around the mast until the lease expires. Landowner issues are civil matters and not material planning consideration in this instance. Whilst I accept the loss of the mast would have a detrimental impact, based upon the information available to me, it would be unreasonable to frustrate this</p>

	application on the basis of a telecoms mast that is intended to be removed from the site next year.
--	---

## Planning Obligation Strategy

8.81 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.

8.82 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 applicants have indicated their willingness to enter into a S106 planning obligation in accordance with the requirements of the Strategy. This is set out in brief in the table below:

<b>Heads of Term</b>	<b>Value</b>
New pavilion at Chesterton Community College playing fields, including Community Access Agreement	£510,328
New clubroom, changing facilities or pitch improvement at Chesterton Recreation Ground	£173,125
Indoor sports facilities	£70,343
Informal open space (off-site)	£20,883
Children and teenagers (off-site)	£48,588
Waste and recycling containers	£12,075
Household waste recycling centre	£20,140
Pre-school education	£77,570
Primary education	£130,950
Secondary education	£147,440

Life-long learning	£16,960
Northern corridor transport plan	£0
Mitcham's corner signal improvements	£2,000
Community chest	£2,000
Monitoring	5%
Travel plan	% modal shift
Affordable housing scheme (on-site)	40%
Public art (on-site)	1%

8.83 The proposed development triggers the requirement for the following community infrastructure:

#### Open Space

8.84 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. This requirement covers outdoor sports facilities, indoor sports facilities, informal open space and provision for children and teenagers.

8.85 The application proposes the erection of two 5-bedroom units, 12 four-bedroom units, 24 three-bedroom units, 59 two-bedroom units and 9 one-bedroom flats. No residential units would be removed, so the net total of additional residential units is 106. A house or flat is assumed to accommodate one person for each bedroom, but one-bedroom flats are assumed to accommodate 1.5 people. Contributions towards children's play space are not required from one-bedroom units. The totals required for the new buildings are calculated as follows:

<b>Outdoor sports facilities</b>					
Type of unit	Persons per unit	£ per person	£per unit	Number of such units	Total £
studio	1	238	238		
1 bed	1.5	238	357	9	3,213
2-bed	2	238	476	59	28,084
3-bed	3	238	714	24	17,136
4-bed	4	238	952	12	11,424

5-bed	5	238	1190	2	2,380
<b>Total</b>					<b>62,237</b>

<b>Indoor sports facilities</b>					
Type of unit	Persons per unit	£ per person	£per unit	Number of such units	Total £
studio	1	269	269		
1 bed	1.5	269	403.50	9	36,31.50
2-bed	2	269	538	59	31,742
3-bed	3	269	807	24	19,368
4-bed	4	269	1076	12	12,912
5-bed	5	269	1345	2	2,690
<b>Total</b>					<b>70,343.50</b>

<b>Informal open space</b>					
Type of unit	Persons per unit	£ per person	£per unit	Number of such units	Total £
studio	1	242	242		
1 bed	1.5	242	363	9	3,267
2-bed	2	242	484	59	28,556
3-bed	3	242	726	24	17,424
4-bed	4	242	968	12	11,616
5-bed	5	242	1210	2	2,420
<b>Total</b>					<b>63,283</b>

<b>Provision for children and teenagers</b>					
Type of unit	Persons per unit	£ per person	£per unit	Number of such units	Total £
studio	1	0	0		0
1 bed	1.5	0	0	9	0
2-bed	2	316	632	59	37,288
3-bed	3	316	948	24	22,752
4-bed	4	316	1264	12	15,168
5-bed	5	316	1580	2	3,160
<b>Total</b>					<b>78,368</b>

8.86 Open space requirements are calculated on the basis of the number of people to be accommodated in a development, each unit being assumed to accommodate one person per bedroom,

except that single-bedroom units are assumed to accommodate 1.5 people. The total assumed population of the development would therefore be 261 people.

8.87 The total informal open space required by the development (at a rate of 18sqm per person) is 4698sqm. On site provision is 3199 sqm. On this basis the on-site provision proposed would be 67% of that total.

8.88 The total space for children and young people required by the development (at a rate of 2.9sqm per person) is 757sqm. On site provision is 283 sqm. The on-site provision proposed would be 38% of that total.

8.89 I am of the view that the contributions proposed towards Chesterton Community College new pavilion and projects in East Chesterton would provide for outdoor sports facilities, which would be used by the inhabitants of the development. I do not consider that seeking an additional contribution for such provision would be justified.

8.90 The open space contributions sought therefore, are as follows:

- Informal open space: £20,883 (33% of £63,283)
- Indoor sports facilities: £70,343.50
- Outdoor sports facilities: £0 (assuming £62,237 waived in favour of off-site improvements)
- Facilities for children and young people £48,588 (62% of £78,368)

8.91 Subject to the completion of a S106 planning obligation to secure these requirements of the Planning Obligation Strategy (2010), I am satisfied that the proposal accords with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 3/8 and 10/1.

#### Community Development

8.92 The Planning Obligation Strategy (2010) requires that all new residential developments contribute to community development facilities, programmes and projects, with contributions calculated by formula. This contribution is £1256 for each unit of one or two bedrooms and £1882 for each larger unit. The total

contribution produced by the formula in this case would be as follows:

<b>Community facilities</b>			
Type of unit	£per unit	Number of such units	Total £
1 bed	1256	9	11,304
2-bed	1256	59	74,104
3-bed	1882	24	45,168
4-bed	1882	12	22,584
5-bed	1882	2	3,764
<b>Total</b>			<b>156,924</b>

8.93 The applicants have suggested that since the provision of the pavilion at the College playing fields will include space that can be used for a variety of community activities, as well as for sport, that this contribution provides the additional community facilities, which the Planning Obligation Strategy requires. I concur with this view. Subject to the completion of a S106 planning obligation to provide this, I am satisfied that those improvements will secure the requirements of the Planning Obligation Strategy (2010) with respect to community facilities. I am satisfied that an additional contribution of £156,924 is not required, and that the proposal accords with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 5/14 and 10/1.

### Waste

8.94 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	51	3,825
Flat	150	55	8,250
Total			12,075

8.95 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.

### Education

8.96 Upon adoption of the Planning Obligation Strategy (2010) the Council resolved that the Education section in the 2004 Planning Obligations Strategy continues to apply until it is replaced by a revised section that will form part of the Planning Obligations Strategy 2010. It forms an appendix to the Planning Obligations Strategy (2010) and is a formal part of that document. Commuted payments are required towards education facilities where four or more additional residential units are created and where it has been established that there is insufficient capacity to meet demands for educational facilities.

8.97 In this case, 106 additional residential units are created and the County Council has confirmed that there is insufficient capacity to meet demand over all four stages of education. Contributions are not required for pre-school education, primary education and secondary education for one-bedroom units. Contributions are therefore required on the following basis.

Pre-school education					
Type of unit	Persons per unit		£per unit	Number of such units	Total £
1 bed	1.5		0	9	0
2+- beds	2		810	97	77,570
Total					77,570

Primary education					
Type of unit	Persons per unit		£per unit	Number of such units	Total £
1 bed	1.5		0	9	0
2+-beds	2		1350	97	130,950
Total					130,950

Secondary education					
Type of unit	Persons per unit		£per unit	Number of such units	Total £
1 bed	1.5		0	9	0
2+-beds	2		1520	97	147,440
Total					147,440

Life-long learning					
Type of unit	Persons per unit		£per unit	Number of such units	Total £
1 bed	1.5		160	9	1,440
2+-beds	2		160	97	15,520
Total					16,960

### Household Waste Recycling Centre

8.98 A contribution is sought from all dwellings towards up-grading existing/providing new Household Waste Recycling Centres to mitigate the impact of new development on these facilities. This development lies within the catchment site for Milton. Contributions are sought on the basis of £190 per house for four new sites giving increased capacity as permanent replacements for the existing temporary site at Milton (£20,140). Subject to the completion of a S106 planning obligation to secure the requirements of the Planning Obligation Strategy (2004), I am satisfied that the proposal accords with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 5/14 and 10/1 and RECAP Waste Management Design Guide SPD 2012.



### Affordable Housing

- 8.99 The development is required to make provision for affordable housing (40%). The detail of the Affordable Housing Scheme can be secured through a Section 106 Agreement.
- 8.100 Subject to the completion of a S106 planning obligation to secure the requirements of the Planning Obligation Strategy (2010), I am satisfied that the proposal accords with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 5/5 and 10/1 and the Affordable Housing SPD (2008).

### Transport

- 8.101 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.
- 8.102 The Highway Authority has made an assessment of the proposal, and it accepts that the proposed development is likely to generate 813 daily trips by all modes. As this total exceeds the daily trips generated by the present use (791) by only 22, which is less than the threshold of 50 net additional trips which triggers contributions, no contribution towards NCATP is required. The applicants have agreed, however, to make a contribution of £2000 towards improving the Mitcham's Corner traffic signals.
- 8.103 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 8/3 and 10/1.

### Public Art

- 8.1024 The development is required to make provision for public art. A strategy for this provision has previously been approved by the Public Art Co-ordinator and the Public Art Panel. The development and implementation of a specific scheme of public art needs to be secured by the S106 planning obligation.

8.105 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 and 10/1 and the Public Art SPD 2010.

### Monitoring

8.106 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

8.107 For this application, the financial contributions (or financial equivalents) for City Council elements (open space, community facilities and waste storage) total £1,116,563. 5% of this total is £55,828, which exceeds the maximum contribution and therefore a monitoring fee of £50,000 is required to cover monitoring of City Council obligations plus the County Council monitoring fee.

### Community Chest

8.108 The Planning Obligation Strategy (2010) allows for development specific planning obligations to be sought. In light of the proposed provision of the allotments, I recommend that a nominal sum of £2,000 is secured for use by any new Residents' Association set up by occupants of the new development who may wish to use the monies towards community based projects within the site. This could include, for example, tools or a basic storage facility(s) for the site.

### Conclusion

8.109 I have considered carefully the planning obligation proposals put forward by the applicants in the light of the legal requirement that any planning obligation be necessary, directly

related to the development and related fairly and reasonably in scale and kind to the development.

8.110 The proposals put forward do not provide a separate financial contribution for community facilities or outdoor sports facilities in line with the total produced by the standard formula used by the Council for these categories. I have explained above why I consider that the proposals for a new pavilion to the College playing fields and extensions and enhancements at Chesterton Rec. playing fields should be regarded as fulfilling these obligations as well as meeting the need for open space to replace the CCFC playing pitch.

8.111 I am satisfied that this properly reflects the need generated by the development. I am of the view that without this 'overlapping' of contributions, the Planning Obligation might fail the test of fairness and reasonableness set by the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Regulations 2010. As it stands, I am satisfied that the obligation passes this test and the other two tests set by the CIL regulations

## **9.0 CONCLUSION**

9.1 The extant permission is a significant material consideration. The proposed scheme delivers a reduced number of dwellings but improves dwelling mix and allows for an improved layout. The mitigation measures secured as part of the previous application are secured.

## **10.0 RECOMMENDATION**

10.1 1 **APPROVE** subject to the satisfactory completion of the s106 agreement by 30 January 2015 and subject to the following conditions and reasons for approval:

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

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

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

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

3. Before starting any external brick or stone work, or any external render or timber, a sample panel of the facing materials to be used shall be erected on site to establish the detail of bonding, coursing and colour and type of jointing and parapet detailing 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. All window frames shall be recessed at least 50-75mm back from the face of the wall/facade.

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

4. No development shall take place until a traffic management plan for the demolition phase has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Demolition shall proceed only according to the approved plan.

Reason: To avoid an unacceptable transport impact. (Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policy 8/2)

5. 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)

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

Reason: 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).

8. Prior to the commencement of the development hereby approved (including any pre-construction, demolition or enabling works), 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 'Noise and Vibration Control On Construction and Open Sites', especially Part 1: 1997 'Code Of Practice (COP) for basic information and procedures for noise and vibration control', Part 2: 'Guide to noise and vibration control legislation for construction and demolition including road construction and maintenance' and Part 4: 'COP for noise and vibration control applicable to piling operations', (if the construction process is to involve piling operations). Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To protect the residential amenity of neighbours, and to avoid pollution. (Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 3/4 and 4/13)

9. In the event of the foundations for the proposed development requiring piling, and piling is agreed as appropriate for the site, prior to the development taking place the applicant shall provide the local authority with a report / method statement for approval detailing the type of piling and mitigation measures to be taken to protect local residents noise and or vibration. Potential noise and vibration levels at the nearest noise sensitive locations shall be predicted in accordance with the provisions of BS 5228-1&2:2009 Code of Practice for noise and vibration control on construction and open sites. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Due to the proximity of this site to existing residential premises and other noise sensitive premises, impact pile driving is not recommended.

Reason: To avoid pollution. (Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policy 4/13)

10. 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: To protect the amenity of neighbours and highway users, and to avoid pollution. (Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 3/4, 4/13 and 8/2)

11. Confirmation or not that an on-site concrete crusher will be used during the demolition stage will be required. If not, confirmation of an appropriate alternative procedure that will be used will be required to be agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To protect the residential amenity of neighbours, and to avoid pollution. (Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 3/4 and 4/13)

12. No development shall take place until details of site lighting during the construction period have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Lighting shall be installed only according to the agreed details.

Reason: To protect the residential amenity of neighbours, and to avoid pollution. (Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 3/4 and 4/13)

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Reason: To avoid adverse effects of pollution. (Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policy 4/13)



14. No development shall commence until a surface water drainage scheme for the site, which shall include maintenance and adoption agreements, based on sustainable drainage principles and an assessment of the hydrological and hydrogeological context of the development, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The scheme shall include:

- Detailed calculations for any proposed storage requirements and discharge rates to a public sewer where applicable.
- Details of where a reduction in flows is achieved to show betterment from the existing system.
- Details of any potential on or off-site flow routes for extreme rainfall events for any proposed surface water drainage where it is outside its design parameters.
- Detailed scheme for the future responsibilities for the management of the surface water drainage scheme

The scheme shall subsequently be implemented and maintained in accordance with the approved details before the development is completed.

Reason: To avoid pollution. (Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policy 4/13)

15. No development shall take place until full details of both hard and soft landscape works have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority and these works shall be carried out as approved. These details shall include proposed finished levels or contours; means of enclosure; car parking layouts, other vehicle and pedestrian access and circulation areas; hard surfacing materials; minor artefacts and structures (eg furniture, play equipment, refuse or other storage units, signs, lighting); full engineering construction details of spaces above car parking; and proposed and existing functional services above and below ground (eg drainage, power, communications cables, pipelines indicating lines, manholes, supports); 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. The submission shall provide full details of the arrangements to allow for extensive root growth of trees within the public highway.

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)

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

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

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

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

18. A landscape management plan, including long term (20 year) design objectives, management responsibilities and maintenance schedules for all landscape areas, other than small privately owned, domestic spaces, shall be submitted to and approved by the local planning authority in writing prior to occupation of the development or any phase of the development whichever is the sooner, for its permitted use. The landscape plan shall be carried out as approved.

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)

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

Reason: to protect the amenity of nearby properties (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/4 and 4/13)

20. Prior to the commencement of development/construction, a noise insulation/mitigation scheme to reduce the level of noise experienced in the residential units as a result of the proximity of the habitable rooms to the Artificial Turf Pitch at Chesterton Community College shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The scheme shall ensure that dwellings achieve the internal noise levels recommended in British Standard 8233:2014 "Sound Insulation and noise reduction for buildings-Code of Practice".

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

Reason: to protect the amenity of nearby properties (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/4 and 4/13)

21. Noise Assessments and Mitigation/Insulation; Plant at the Westbrook Centre (BS 4142:1997)

- a. Prior to the commencement of refurbishment/development works a noise report prepared in accordance with the provisions of British Standard (BS) 4142:1997, "Method for rating industrial noise affecting mixed residential and industrial areas," that considers the impact of industrial noise upon the proposed development shall be submitted in writing for consideration by the local planning authority. The survey should specifically consider noise from plant at the Westbrook Centre.

- b. Following the submission of a BS 4142:1997 noise report and prior to the commencement of refurbishment/development works, 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) for protecting the residential units from noise from the neighbouring industrial use shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The scheme shall achieve the recommended internal noise levels in British Standard 8233:2014 "Sound Insulation and noise reduction for buildings-Code of Practice". These levels shall be achieved with ventilation meeting both the background and summer cooling requirements.

The scheme as approved shall be fully implemented before the use hereby permitted is commenced and prior to occupation of the residential units and shall not be altered without prior approval.

Reason: to protect the amenity of nearby properties (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/4 and 4/13)

22. The new streets to be constructed within the development shall be constructed and permanently maintained to an adoptable standard.

Reason: To ensure acceptable access for waste collection vehicles (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 3/12)

23. Prior to the occupation of any dwelling, the lighting strategy (by itdoeslighting dated 6 May 2014) shall be complied with and fully implemented and shall thereafter be maintained as such.

Reason: In the interests of visual amenity and to ensure that the development will not result in unacceptable light pollution (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/11, 4/13 and 4/15).

24. No occupation shall take place until an agreement on liability for damage to the carriageways within the development has been reached between the applicants and Cambridge City Council.

Reason: to ensure satisfactory arrangements for the collection of waste and recycling (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 3/12)

25. No occupation shall take place in Block E or I until the renewable energy equipment, as specified in the application for that each block, has been installed and tested, and a scheme for future maintenance has been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority.

Reason: To ensure appropriate means for the generation of renewable energy are in place (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 8/16)

26. The development shall not be brought into use until a scheme for the provision of fire hydrants has been implemented in accordance with a scheme that has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: In the interests of community safety Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 3/7 (h).

27. Prior to the occupation of any dwelling, details of Parking Management Arrangements shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The details shall include:

-how parking within the development is to be managed and controlled so that it occurs within designated vehicular parking bays.

-how the proposed measures are to be publicised to potential purchasers.

-how the subsequent enforcement of parking that occurs outside designated vehicular parking bays is to be managed.

Prior to the use of any highway for access to an occupied residential property, the Parking Management Arrangements shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To avoid the proliferation of parking across the site that is uncontrolled and can limit the proper functioning of the site, to ensure that parking management of the site is consistent at an early stage in its development, in the interests of sustainable travel choice and to ensure that the site does not become a parking refuge for commuters (Cambridge Local Plan policies 3/1, 3/7, 8/2 and 8/11)

28. Prior to the occupation of any dwelling, a scheme for bio-diversity enhancement shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure a sustainable development which enhances bio-diversity (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/1 and 3/12).

29. Prior to the occupation of the building hereby approved, full details of a travel plan detailing the measures taken to promote sustainable travel modes shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. The travel plan shall be implemented in accordance with that agreed.

Reason: In the interests of promoting sustainable travel modes for future users of the building, Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 8/3.

30. 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.

**INFORMATIVE:** The Council's document 'Developers guide to Contaminated Land in Cambridge' provides further details on the responsibilities of the developers and the information required when assessing potentially contaminated sites. An electronic copy can be found on the City council's website.

<http://www.cambridge.gov.uk/ccm/content/environment-and-recycling/pollution-noise-and-nuisance/land-pollution.en>

Hard copies of the guide can also be provided upon request.

**INFORMATIVE:** To satisfy standard condition C62 (Noise Insulation), the rating level (in accordance with BS4142:1997) from all plant, equipment and vents etc (collectively) associated with this application should be less than or equal to the existing background level (L90) at the boundary of the premises subject to this application and having regard to noise sensitive premises.

Tonal/impulsive noise frequencies should be eliminated or at least considered in any assessment and should carry an additional 5 dB(A) correction. This is to guard against any creeping background noise in the area and prevent unreasonable noise disturbance to other premises. This requirement applies both during the day (0700 to 2300 hrs over any one hour period) and night time (2300 to 0700 hrs over any one 5 minute period).

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

**INFORMATIVE:** To satisfy the noise insulation condition, the noise level from all plant and equipment, vents etc (collectively) associated with this application should not raise the existing background level (L90) by more than 3 dB(A) (i.e. the rating level of the plant needs to match the existing background level). This requirement applies both during the day (0700 to 2300 hrs over any one hour period) and night time (2300 to 0700 hrs over any one 5 minute period), at the boundary of the premises subject to this application and having regard to noise sensitive premises. Tonal/impulsive noise frequencies should be eliminated or at least considered in any assessment and should carry an additional 5 dB(A) correction. This is to guard against any creeping background noise in the area and prevent unreasonable noise disturbance to other premises.

**INFORMATIVE:** To satisfy condition 15 (surface water drainage), I draw the applicant's/developer's attention to the Environment Agency's letter dated 10 June 2014.



**INFORMATIVE:** If during the works contamination is encountered, the LPA should be informed, additional contamination shall be fully assessed and an appropriate remediation scheme agreed with the LPA. The applicant/agent to need to satisfy themselves as to the condition of the land / area and its proposed use, to ensure a premises prejudicial to health situation does not arise in the future

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

Hard copies can also be provided upon request.

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

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

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

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

- o Guidance on the assessment of dust from demolition and construction

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

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

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

**INFORMATIVE:** To satisfy the noise insulation condition for the building envelope as required above, the Council expects the scheme to achieve the recommended internal noise levels of British Standard 8233:2014 "Sound Insulation and noise reduction for buildings-Code of Practice". Where sound insulation requirements preclude the opening of windows for rapid ventilation and summer cooling, acoustically treated mechanical ventilation may also need to be considered within the context of this internal design noise criteria.

**INFORMATIVE:** It is recommended that the agent/applicant submits a noise prediction survey/report in accordance with the principles of BS4142: 1997 "Method for rating industrial noise affecting mixed residential and industrial areas" or similar, concerning the effects on amenity rather than likelihood for complaints. Noise levels shall be predicted at the boundary having regard to neighbouring premises.

Such a survey / report should include: a large scale plan of the site in relation to neighbouring premises; noise sources and measurement / prediction points marked on plan; a list of noise sources; details of proposed noise sources / type of plant such as: number, location, sound power levels, noise frequency spectrums, noise directionality of plant, noise levels from duct intake or discharge points; details of noise mitigation measures (attenuation details of any intended enclosures, silencers or barriers); description of full noise calculation procedures; noise levels at a representative sample of noise sensitive locations and hours of operation.

Any report shall include raw measurement data so that conclusions may be thoroughly evaluated and calculations checked.

**INFORMATIVE:** This planning permission should be read in conjunction with the associated deed of planning obligation prepared under s.106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended). The applicant is reminded that under the terms of the s106 Agreement you are required to notify the City Council of the date of commencement of development.

**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 30 January 2015, 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 open space arising from the development needs of occupiers, appropriate provision for the loss of existing pitch, community development facilities, education and life-long learning facilities, transport mitigation measures, affordable housing, public art, waste storage, waste management facilities and monitoring in accordance with Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/7, 3/8, 3/12, 5/5, 5/14, 8/3 and 10/1 and as detailed in the Planning Obligation Strategy 2010, the Affordable Housing Supplementary Planning Document 2008, the Public Art Supplementary Planning Document 2010, the RECAP Waste Management Design Guide SPD 2012, 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**