

Application Number	14/1697/FUL	Agenda Item	
Date Received	7th November 2014	Officer	Mrs Angela Briggs
Target Date	6th February 2015		
Ward	Petersfield		
Site	Anglia Ruskin University East Road Cambridge CB1 1PT		
Proposal	Demolition of the existing Bryant and Mellish Clark buildings and removal of the external escape stair to the David building and construction of a Science Centre (Use Class D1) with associated alterations to the east elevation of the Lord Ashcroft Building, landscaping and access alterations.		
Applicant	c/o Agent United Kingdom		

SUMMARY	<p>The development accords with the Development Plan for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> The proposed development would enhance the character of the area; <input type="checkbox"/> The proposed development would not harm the character of the bordering Conservation Area; <input type="checkbox"/> The proposed development would not have a significant impact on neighbouring properties.
RECOMMENDATION	APPROVAL

1.0 SITE DESCRIPTION/AREA CONTEXT

1.1 The site is located at the University’s East Road site, directly to the south of Broad Street. The site is currently occupied by the Bryant and Mellish Clark buildings which are teaching facilities in the Science faculty. The application site has an area of 0.4ha.

- 1.2 The Bryant building is a part single, part two storey building with a total gross internal area of 1,521sq.m. The Mellish Clark building is a three storey building, though linked to the single storey sculpture studio, totalling a gross internal area of 2,063sq.m. Both buildings are primarily brick, though with sections of render and also metal cladding to the sculpture studio.
- 1.3 The application site is located on the northern boundary of the East Road campus with the recently developed Lord Ashcroft Building (LAB) directly to the west and the David and Mumford buildings to the south. The Peter Taylor building is located to the east and provides student residences. All other adjacent buildings on the University site provide teaching and ancillary support services, such as staff offices. The Mumford building contains the University's library facility.
- 1.4 Broad Street contains residential properties and St Matthew's Primary School. The residential properties are three storey, with the third storey provided within the roof space. These properties are located on the opposing side of Broad Street to the application site and are comparatively modern additions, constructed in the 1990s. The primary school is located on the western extent of Broad Street.
- 1.5 Broad Street connects onto East Road and provides access to those residential properties on Flower Street and Broad Street, whilst also providing means of access to the primary school and the University. Streets beyond Broad Street to the north and east are largely residential in nature, including Norfolk Terrace and Flower Street. These contain pre-1900 terraced properties of a formal character.
- 1.6 Broad Street is relatively narrow with parking prohibited by double yellow lines on all but the designated parking spaces.
- 1.7 The application site is located outside, though adjacent to, the Mill Road Character Area of the Central Conservation Area. The boundary of the Conservation Area runs along the northernmost extent of Broad Street, including the residential properties and primary school. Other heritage designations in proximity of the application site include the Mill Road Cemetery, which is a Grade II Registered Park and Garden, St Matthew's

School and the Ruskin building. Whilst not statutorily designated, these are identified as Buildings of Local Interest (BLIs).

2.0 THE PROPOSAL

- 2.1 The application seeks planning consent for the demolition of the existing Bryant and Mellish Clark buildings and removal of the external escape stair to the David building, and the construction of a Science Centre (Use Class D1) with associated alterations to the east elevation of the Lord Ashcroft Building, landscaping and access alterations. The proposed development will not result in a related increase in student numbers.
- 2.2 The University has resolved that the provision of a new Science Centre is its primary focus for the next stage of re-development on the campus. The proposed new Science Centre will be a major new facility seeking to bring together teaching, postgraduate and staff facilities for the different departments which fall within this Faculty.
- 2.3 The proposal would include a 304 seat lecture theatre and a 202 place 'super-laboratory'. This latter space is a new way of teaching whereby classes from different disciplines can be taught in the same space at the same time, providing flexibility and maximising access to facilities.
- 2.4 The proposed building would broadly follow the site boundary on Broad Street, though set back to create a hard landscaped area. To the east, the building is set back even further, retaining the existing service access into the site. The proposed building is an equivalent height of 2.5 residential storeys on the frontage with Broad Street. The maximum height of the building is 15.3m to the ridge, which is set in towards the centre of the site, with the roof cascading down, gradually reducing in height towards Broad Street where it is a maximum height of 7.15m to the eaves.
- 2.5 The proposed building would connect directly onto the David building, which is already used by the Science departments. Services for the building are designed into the roof space of the building, as well as within a proposed plant room on the eastern side of the building. The air handling units are located on the southern extent of the roof, set behind a parapet. Provision is

also made for solar photovoltaic panels. The panels would be located on the south western side of the roof space. A total of 500sq.m of panels would be provided. The existing substation will remain and is located directly to the south of the proposed building.

- 2.6 The existing access between the Bryant and Mellish Clark buildings would be removed as part of the proposal. A new pedestrian and cycle access into the site would be created between the existing LAB and the proposed Science Centre. This access would also be used by emergency vehicles. The existing service access for deliveries, waste vehicles and emergency vehicles would remain at the eastern end of Broad Street, with some minor modifications to the access entrance. This service access would be gated to prevent unauthorised access.
- 2.7 Given the demolition of the Bryant building and the relocation of the access point to between the LAB and the proposed Science Centre, sections of the eastern elevation of the LAB would become visible. The proposals consequently include alterations to this elevation, including a glazed section on the eastern corner, with the remainder of the elevation in-filled with brickwork to match the existing.
- 2.8 The access into the proposed building would be via a renewed courtyard between the Science Centre and the Mumford building. There will not be direct pedestrian access from Broad Street, except a fire escape.
- 2.9 Landscaping forms part of the proposal, with the creation of a renewed courtyard in between the Science Centre and the Mumford building. Two London Plane trees are proposed to be removed to make way for the new emergency vehicle access in between the LAB and the Science Centre building. The proposed landscaping strategy incorporates low level planting adjacent to the proposed building entrance. The Landscaping along the Broad Street frontage would be completely hard, using appropriate paving designs to suit all users.

2.10 **THE APPROVED MASTERPLAN**

- 2.11 The University Masterplan (BDP, March 2009) was approved as part of the application, Ref: 08/1575/FUL for the proposed LAB

that has since been constructed. The Masterplan, therefore, acts as a material planning consideration for proposed development that comes forward on the East Road site.

- 2.12 The Masterplan sets broad parameters for development and states that *“The vision of the masterplan is to create an inspiring educational environment for staff students and residents to enjoy which is flexible, sustainable and reflects and reinforces the University’s own unique sense of culture and place within Cambridge”* (page 1).
- 2.13 The masterplan indicates the proposed demolition of the Bryant and Mellish Clark buildings and their replacement with a 1/2 storey, 2/3 storey and 3/4 storey building. These were based on assumed education floor to floor heights, which are typically 3.75-4m.
- 2.14 The masterplan suggests that the development at this location provides an opportunity to improve visual impact and the public realm on Broad Street.
- 2.15 The masterplan indicates the redevelopment of the Bryant and Mellish Clark buildings, to form a Science and Technology hub, in combination with the existing David building. The proposed submission reflects this intention, although the artists impression in the masterplan indicates an extension of the LAB design further down Broad Street, which was intended for illustrative purposes only.
- 2.16 The application has been amended by alterations to the vehicular access points from Broad Street into the site in order to respond to comments raised by the local highway authority and landscape team. The changes have resulted in the removal of the proposed street trees.

3.0 SITE HISTORY

- 3.1 The campus has an extensive planning history, of which the following are particularly relevant:

Reference	Description	Outcome
08/1575/FUL	Erection of D1 education building following demolition of Rackham Building and relocation of cycle	Approved

store.

08/1721/FUL	Erection of modular building for Class D1 educational use for a temporary period of three years on existing tennis court.	Approved
08/1722/FUL	Erection of modular building for D1 educational use for a temporary period of three years adjacent to the Ruskin building.	Approved
10/1272/FUL	Erection of D1 educational building and external alterations to electricity sub-station.	Approved
13/0077/FUL	Creation of new science lab and associated preparation laboratory. Associated works to the lobby, relocation of main entrance, new windows, doors and associated external works including a temporary stair enclosure.	Approved

4.0 **PUBLICITY**

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

5.0 **POLICY**

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

5.2 Relevant Development Plan policies

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

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

Central Government Guidance	National Planning Policy Framework March 2012 National Planning Policy Framework – Planning Practice Guidance March 2014 Circular 11/95
Supplementary Planning Guidance	Sustainable Design and Construction (May 2007) Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Waste Partnership (RECAP): Waste Management Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (February 2012) Public Art (January 2010)
	<u>Area Guidelines</u> Mill Road Area Conservation Area Appraisal (2011)

5.4 Status of Proposed Submission – Cambridge Local Plan

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

6.0 CONSULTATIONS

Cambridgeshire County Council (Highways Development Management)

As submitted:

- 6.1 The access from Broad Street is inadequate. The applicant's tracking diagram indicate that a vehicle in the easternmost parking bay would be stuck by a servicing vehicle and a large area of the footway would be overrun. It would appear that the scheme could not be delivered in a practicable way. The western access requires a vehicle to over-swing the footway, specifically at a point where tactile paving indicates to the partially sighted or blind that it is safe to stand. Until this aspect of the application is resolved, the Highway Authority recommends the proposal be refused planning permission.

As amended:

- 6.2 The layout of the access from Broad Street is now adequate. The flagged paving at the western access would introduce excessive maintenance issues and must be replaced with concrete pavements, at least within the public highway. The tactile paving at the service entrance would, similarly, have issues of durability and further serves no function. It would confuse a visually impaired person and must be removed.

Head of Refuse and Environment

- 6.3 No objection subject to conditions relating to: Contaminated land; Construction/demolition noise, vibration and piling; Construction hours; Construction collection/delivery hours; piling; Dust; Building/plat noise; Waste and Recycling.

Urban Design and Conservation Team

- 6.4 The Urban Design and Conservation Team support the application.
- 6.5 The proposed Science building has an appropriate relationship to the residential properties opposite.
- 6.6 The applicant has shown that there are distinct glimpse views of the building from areas around the site. However, these will not unduly affect the character or appearance of the Conservation Area. In addition there will be little impact, if any, on the setting of any of the listed buildings in the vicinity which already have to contend with a number of modern buildings on the site which are of no particular architectural or historic interest.
- 6.7 The choice of materials is appropriate for this University site. In our view a red brick (with a natural coloured mortar, not dark joints) would better reflect other red-faced brick buildings on the existing campus and will provide a good contrast to the buff brick opposite: there is a clear distinction between the residential and the institutional uses in this way. Other materials are considered of a good quality and appropriate, e.g. anodized aluminium, timber.
- 6.8 The scale and height of the building is broadly in accordance with the approved masterplan. While the scheme includes a relatively large, long building, the type of teaching and working facility being provided is entirely suitable and appropriate on a University campus. The distant views indicated in section 7 of the Design and Access Statement demonstrate that very little of the new building will be seen from outside the site, other than from Broad Street where the main elevation of the building is situated in terms of views from a public street. A minor part of the new building will also be seen from the Mill Road Cemetery, but this amount is considered so minimal to be almost neutral in terms of its impact.

- 6.9 The sunlight/daylight studies indicate that there is a minor net negative impact of additional shadow caused by the new building, however this is only at the later part of the afternoon, and even then does not adverse effect much of the southern elevations of these residential units. In addition the scale and length of the building is not untypical of other buildings within the existing campus.
- 6.10 Finally, the area of the new building to be accessed from a new, southern internal court indicates a welcoming, high quality entrance arrangement accessed from other connected spaces within the campus and from Broad Street along the west elevation of the new building. The scale and detailed design and fenestration and materials of this southerly building elevation, along with the easterly projecting 'wing' of the building is designed with a strong, contemporary approach and includes varying elevational treatments to help animate from within this space.
- 6.11 Conclusion:

"The proposed building represents a high quality, much needed facility as part of the growing and changing campus for Anglia Ruskin University. As such, it will be a positive addition to the facilities on the campus and will complement the changing face of the site against this edge of the Central Conservation Area. The building has been carefully thought through in terms of design and materiality, in addition it is generally compliant with intended location, scale and mass of any building for this location within the 2009 site-wide masterplan which was endorsed by the Council as part of the approval of the Lord Ashcroft Building. The proposal therefore accords with Policies 3/4, 3/7, 3/12 and 4/11 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2006)".

Head of Streets and Open Spaces (Landscape Team)

- 6.12 No objection, subject to conditions relating to hard and soft landscaping, and landscape works maintenance plan.

Design and Conservation Panel (Meeting of 14th January 2015)

6.13 Level change.

The positive response to the Panel's comments from July is appreciated. However, there was still some concern expressed among Panel members that due to the change in level, residents in Flower Street and other surrounding streets would effectively be looking up at the site which due to its scale, could have an imposing effect.

6.14 Trees on Broad Street.

Although the articulation of the elevation is welcomed, the exclusion of the trees was regretted, but understood. The Panel were aware that this was an internal matter and that in the extremely challenging restricted environment of Broad Street, trees would be unable to reach their full growth potential.

6.15 A revised Masterplan for the site.

This is a heavily developed site relieved by connected areas of landscaping. As current arrangements are based on a 2009 Masterplan, the Panel felt strongly that commitment to improving the hard and soft landscaping of both courtyards would significantly help to define the kind of spaces that are aspired to. The very positive example of the courtyard in the Lord Ashcroft Building shows what an impact positive spatial planning can bring. By contrast, the tight new courtyard for the Science Centre scheme will be cluttered by cars and motorbike parking.

The Panel note that the hard/soft landscaping to the south of the David Building is not included in the current planning application. This had been raised at the pre-application stage. The Panel would wish to see firm commitment shown to this important amenity space. 6

6.16 Corner to Mumford Theatre.

The Panel felt this was highly restricted as a connection point with high footfall at peak periods. The University is advised to consider options for making this link more generous, possibly by reducing the cycle parking provision below the Mumford Theatre to provide a more generous route.

The lack of clarity over the status of this link further emphasises the need for an updated masterplan that can make a fresh evaluation of the connectivity of the various elements of the site.

6.17 Materials (darker brick).

The Panel welcome the choice of a darker brick that makes an effective distinction from the residential elements on Broad Street. The choice of a coloured mortar is questioned however, as it was felt that the brick should be matched with the mortar used elsewhere on the site.

6.18 Parking.

The Panel expressed their disappointment that the presentation did not include holistic planning, for example for car or bike parking arrangements. Failure to examine this proposal in the context of the site as a whole reveals the current incrementalist approach of the University towards planning its site.

6.19 Conclusion

The Panel would like to thank the architects for showing the video which provided greater appreciation of the internal space and organisation of the new building.

The proposal has the Panel's overall support; the scale, mass and detailing has been significantly improved with the change in storey heights dealt with innovatively on the Broad Street elevation. Issues raised in relation to the gate have been addressed and the flue/chimney arrangements clarified satisfactorily.

There is clearly a pressing need to revisit the Masterplan for Anglia Ruskin University East Road campus. As there is such an ambitious investment strategy behind this scheme, there is a clear need to look again holistically at the various functional needs of the East Road campus.

VERDICT – GREEN (unanimous)

Disability Consultative Panel (Meeting of 25th November 2014)

6.20 The Panel's comments are as follows:

- 6.21 Lecture theatre: The furniture needs to be movable for the benefit of wheelchair users.
- 6.22 Distances: With long distances between the different rooms/facilities, the Panel would recommend the provision of resting points and shorter distances between WCs for the benefit of the ambulant disabled.
- 6.23 Revolving doors: The architects are advised to explore more popular alternatives such as a standard, button activated or automatic door.
- 6.24 Conclusion:
The Panel expressed concern regarding the height and scale of this development, particularly in relation to neighbouring properties and its potential impact on Mill Road Cemetery.
- 6.25 The Panel agreed to provide further feedback on the access features following circulation of the Design & Access Statement. (Link to be circulated.)

7.0 REPRESENTATIONS

- 7.1 The owners/occupiers of the following addresses have made representations:
- 39, 51, 59, 61 Norfolk Terrace
 - 28, 29 Broad Street
 - 12 Blossom Street
- 7.2 The representations can be summarised as follows:
- Out of context with the traditional character of the Conservation Area;
 - Impact on residential amenity (over-shadowing);
 - Over-development of the site;
 - Concern about additional traffic;
 - Concern about noise and disturbance during construction;
 - Impact on emergency service access;
- 7.3 The above representations are a summary of the comments that have been received. Full details of the representations can be inspected on the application file.

8.0 ASSESSMENT

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

1. Principle of development
2. Context of site, design and external spaces
3. Trees and Landscaping
4. Impact on the character of the Conservation Area
5. Public Art
6. Renewable energy and sustainability
7. Disabled access
8. Residential amenity
9. Refuse arrangements
10. Highway safety
11. Car and cycle parking
12. Third party representations

Principle of Development

8.2 Policy 7/8 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2006) is relevant. The policy seeks to support the upgrade and limited further development of the University's East Road site to provide teaching, administrative, residential, social and amenity facilities, provided that:

- a) Development accords with an agreed Masterplan; and
- b) There is a reduction in private parking on site.

8.3 The proposal accords with the agreed Masterplan, approved in 2009 as part of the development for The Wrap and the LAB building. The Masterplan identifies the proposed demolition of the Bryant and Mellish Clark buildings and their replacement with a 1/2, 2/3, and 3/4 storey building that could be used to form a Science and Technology hub. In my view, the proposal accords with these parameters and therefore is acceptable.

8.4 The proposal does not intend to increase private parking on site, nor would it result in a reduction in parking as the University has already extensively reduced parking on site through the development of The Wrap and the LAB. There is, however a re-configuration of existing motorcycle and disabled

parking within the courtyard area of the development, which are only used when necessary. I therefore consider that the proposal meets the second criteria.

- 8.5 In my opinion, the principle of the development is acceptable and in accordance with policy 7/8 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2006).

Context of site, design and external spaces

- 8.6 The proposal would result in the demolition of the Bryant and Mellish Clark buildings which are 1/2 storey buildings. These buildings are not considered to be architecturally significant within the street scape, and therefore I consider that their loss would not harm the character of the area. The proposal seeks to replace the Bryant and Mellish Clark with a new Science Centre including a large lecture theatre, which is partly sunken below ground level, science laboratory/classes, offices and other related spaces. The combined floor space of the existing buildings is 3,584sq.m. The proposed building totals 7,625sq.m, and represents a net increase in space of 4,041sq.m (approx. 13% increase).
- 8.7 The proposed Science Centre includes a 2.5 storey building elevation stepped back from the pavement edge to Broad Street, rising to five storeys as it moves away from the domestic scale of the adjacent residential area into the academic institution buildings on the site. The eaves height at the Broad Street elevation is 7.15m. The roof design represents a cascade system in which it is broken up at each storey level so that visually, it appears less dominant along the roof scape and makes the building less bulky, in my view. Furthermore, the 2.5 storey level along the Broad Street frontage would harmonise with the scale of the domestic houses along Broad Street, opposite. The overall height of the building at its highest point is 15.3m, which reflects the height of the adjacent buildings of The Wrap.
- 8.8 Although the Masterplan adopted at the time of the planning application for the LAB suggested a two storey construction on the site of the Bryant building, the storey heights imagined would have been significantly higher than domestic. The proposed design takes a different approach but is in the spirit of that Masterplan by placing a domestically scaled elevation onto

the Broad Street frontage. Half a storey is sunk below pavement level, the eaves line is aligned with the adjacent dwellings and the fenestration is domestic in size. The modelling of the Broad Street elevation has been indented to reflect the bay windows, which is characteristic of this locality. However, the elevation facing into the campus (south elevation) is more institutional to reflect the academic character of ARU. This elevation also comprises a series of horizontal louvres at a higher level whilst continuing the brick and glass from the Broad Street elevation. It is intended that a red coloured brick would be used for the brick work areas of the building to tie in with the red brick of the Ruskin building, and the red panels of the LAB. I consider that this choice of brick is acceptable, would enhance the development and contrast successfully with the buff brick on the domestic buildings opposite.

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

Trees and Landscaping

- 8.10 The amended plans seek to alter the landscaping along Broad Street, in response to concerns raised by the Landscape Team specifically regarding the proposed trees and their impact on the proposed building. The proposed trees would have also meant the removal of one existing car parking space, which are designated to the local residents. The trees along this frontage have now been removed from the scheme and is supported by the Landscape Team. The removal of the two existing London Plane trees within the campus are also considered to be acceptable. In terms of landscaping, there would be some low level soft landscaping near the proposed building and the courtyard would be renewed with hard landscaping. I consider that this approach is acceptable given the size of the space and the relationship between the proposed building and the Mumford building. The courtyard would also reflect the existing route from The Wrap and therefore unite this paved area successfully.
- 8.11 In my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 3/7 and 3/11.

Impact on the character of the Conservation Area

- 8.12 The site is not situated within the Conservation Area. However, it is on the edge of the Mill Road Conservation Area. The properties opposite, along Broad Street, are within the Conservation Area. Policy 4/11 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2006) is relevant and seeks to protect Conservation Areas from inappropriate development and relates to development *“which affect the setting of or impact on views into and out of Conservation Areas...”*.
- 8.13 The Conservation Officer is of the view that the proposed development would not harm the character of the Conservation Area. I would concur with this view, and consider that the proposed building would make a positive contribution to the edge of the Conservation Area and enhance the historic character of the wider locality.
- 8.14 In my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policy 4/11.

Public Art

- 8.15 A Public Art Strategy has been submitted with the application, which identifies the approach and themes for the site. The Strategy aims to deliver on-site public art which would equate to 1% of construction costs, in accordance with the Public Art SPD. Comments from the Public Art Officer are currently awaited and I will report these on the amendment sheet.
- 8.16 In my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 3/7 and 10/1 and the Public Art SPD 2010.

Renewable energy and sustainability

- 8.17 Policy 8/16 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2006) is relevant. A Renewable Energy strategy is submitted as part of this application, confirming how this will be achieved. This sets out the anticipated energy requirements of the proposed building and consequently calculates the energy generated and carbon saving from the proposed sources of renewable energy. This includes 500sq.m of photovoltaic panels which would be installed on the proposed building's roof, as well as air source heat pumps. The proposed strategy results in 49% of the

building's energy being generated from low carbon sources, delivering a total carbon saving of 20.7%, which exceeds the policy requirement and guidance set out in the SPD.

- 8.18 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

- 8.19 The proposed building is designed to allow all users to navigate through the building by ramps and lifts and corridors that are sufficiently wide enough. I am confident that the comments from the Disability Panel members can be incorporated within the internal design of the proposed building to ensure complete DDA compliance.
- 8.20 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

- 8.21 The site is in close proximity to some residential properties, particularly nos.22, 23, 24, 25, 26 (flats) Broad Street and 27, 28 and 29 Broad Street (terrace houses). The site is also close to the residential properties further afield at Flower Street, Blossom Street and Norfolk Terrace.
- 8.22 In terms of outlook, the occupiers of the Broad Street dwellings would see a noticeable change in the Broad Street frontage from a 1-2 storey building to a 2.5 storey building. As I have explained above, the Broad Street elevation would rise up to 2.5 storeys with the building then rising up as it steps away from the Broad Street frontage. The proposed building (from the main facade of the building) would be stepped back from the pavement edge by 3.2m and would be approximately 11m away from the dwellings across the road.
- 8.23 Nos. 22 – 26 Broad Street, is an apartment building which is perpendicular to the proposed building. Beyond this building is

a private car parking area for the residents with an ancillary garage building.

- 8.24 One of the concerns raised by neighbours is loss of sunlight/daylight. A sunlight and daylight analysis is submitted with the application which forms part of the Design and Access Statement. This analysis considers the impact, existing and proposed. In addition, the cross sectional design of the building has been adjusted so that the pitched roof profile facing Broad Street, when viewed at a height of 2m at the ground floor windows of the properties opposite, would not rise above an angle of 25deg (from 28deg) from the horizontal. The sunlight/daylight analysis concentrates on the impact during the 21st March Equinox on an hourly basis from 8am until 6pm. The diagram illustrates that the main impact would be from 3pm until 5pm which shows some loss of sunlight to the lower and mid area of the apartment building and a slight loss of sunlight, below ground floor windows, of the properties opposite. In my view, I do not consider that this impact is significant to warrant refusal of the application on this basis, because the time span of this loss is minimal compared with the unaffected hours of the rest of the day. Furthermore, the 21st March equinox is when the sun is at its mid-point in the sky (at midday), and therefore I consider that the impact will lessen as the season progresses towards the summer equinox when the sun would be at its highest level.
- 8.25 In terms of potential noise and disturbance from additional traffic, the proposed development does not include plans to increase car parking or additional vehicle parking of any kind associated with the proposed building. Therefore I have no reason to believe that the development would give rise to an unacceptable level of traffic. I understand that construction traffic is also a concern. I agree that this will cause some disruption, as in all cases of new development. However, I have recommended a condition to control contractor arrangements, to ensure that this impact is reduced and is at a tolerable level within this small residential area (condition 17).
- 8.26 In terms of the concern raised about over-development, I do not consider that this would constitute over-development of the site because it reflects the scale of development on both sides of the road, and seeks to enhance the courtyard space between the proposal and the Mumford Building. A hard landscaped

area in front of the building also helps to give the proposal 'space to breath' within the street scape, and therefore improving the built relationship with the residential properties along Broad Street.

- 8.27 In terms of the concern about the proposed building being out of character with the area, I disagree with this view, and have set out my reasons above as to why I consider this proposal is acceptable in its context and with neighbouring buildings.
- 8.28 In relation to the impact on emergency service access, the proposal seeks to retain the access to the rear. The new access formed in between the proposed building and LAB will also allow emergency vehicles to enter the site. The access has been designed in accordance with the local highway authority requirements and is therefore considered to be acceptable, although details of the hard paving areas along the access road, will be required as part of a condition relating to landscaping (condition 14).
- 8.29 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.

Refuse Arrangements

- 8.30 Service and waste vehicles would gain access to the University site via the existing access to the east of Broad Street and would therefore continue to operate in the same way post development. However, the information submitted does not contain specific details on the proposed waste and recycling provision/strategy. I recommend that a condition is appropriate requesting further details (condition 12).
- 8.31 In my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policy 3/12.

Highway Safety

- 8.32 The local highway authority was initially concerned about the new access arrangement from Broad Street and requested further information. The agent submitted an amended tracking diagram of the Broad Street access for the highway authority to

consider. The diagram also includes the removal of the proposed street trees in order to retain the existing number of car parking spaces, which the highway authority considers are required for local residents. The highway authority has advised that the diagram adequately overcomes their concern and supports the application in terms of highway safety. I would concur with their view that the proposed development would not have a detrimental impact on highway safety.

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

Car and Cycle Parking

- 8.34 The proposed development does involve the removal of eight disabled parking spaces. However, these will be relocated in order to comply with and support the need for access for all. Five spaces will be provided running parallel with and to the north of the existing cycle parking below the Mumford building canopy (along the edge of the renewed courtyard). The remaining three would then be located to the north of the Peter Taylor building.
- 8.35 The proposed development would not result in additional car parking spaces on site, and car parking on site has already been significantly reduced as part of The Wrap development.
- 8.36 In terms of cycle parking, the proposed development would not increase student or staff numbers. Therefore there is not a requirement for additional cycle parking as a result of the development. There are a significant number of cycle parking under the canopy of the Mumford building, which would be directly opposite the proposed building.
- 8.37 In my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 8/6 and 8/10.

Third Party Representations

- 8.38 I have addressed the concerns raised by third parties in the above paragraphs.

9.0 CONCLUSION

- 9.1 In conclusion, I consider that the proposed development is acceptable, responds positively to the character of the area, and would not have a significant impact on neighbour amenity. I therefore recommend the application for approval.

10.0 RECOMMENDATION

APPROVE subject to the following conditions:

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

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

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

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

3. 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)

4. Prior to commencement of development, full details of the capital construction costs of the development shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority in writing.

To expend not less than 1% of capital construction costs on the provision of the Public Art.

Prior to the commencement of development, with the exception of any works of demolition or below ground works, a Public Art Delivery Plan and Public Art Maintenance Plan shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

The Public Art Delivery Plan shall include:

Details of the Public Art and artist commission; Details of how the Public Art will be delivered, including a timetable for delivery; Details of the location of the proposed Public Art on the application site or within the development, including a location plan; A breakdown of costs and how one percent of the capital construction costs will be spent on the provision of Public Art;

The proposed consultation to be undertaken with the local community including ward councillors on the proposed Public Art; and the proposed engagement with the local community to promote the Public Art once completed.

The Public Art Maintenance Plan shall include:

Details of how the Public Art will be maintained for the life of the Public Art, including how often maintenance will be needed; The proposed insurance of the Public Art against loss or damage for the life of the Public Art; How any repairs would be carried out, including how and to where the Public Art would be moved, if that is necessary; and how the Public Art would be repaired/replaced in the event that it is damaged/destroyed completely;

The approved Public Art Delivery Plan shall be fully implemented in accordance with the approved timetable.

On completion of the Public Art it shall be maintained, repaired, insured and (if necessary) replaced in accordance with the approved Public Art Maintenance Plan, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Once in place, the Public Art shall not be moved or removed otherwise than in accordance with the approved Public Art Maintenance Plan.

Reason: To ensure the public art makes a positive and contribution to the site (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 3/7).

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

7. 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)

8. 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 policy 4/13 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2006).

9. In the event of the foundations for the proposed development requiring piling, prior to the development taking place the applicant shall provide the Local Planning 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.

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

10. Prior to commencement 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 nearby properties (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 4/13)

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

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

12. Prior to the commencement of development, full details of the on-site storage facilities for commercial waste, including waste for recycling shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Such details shall identify the specific positions of where wheeled bins, or any other means of storage will be stationed and the specific arrangements to enable collection from within 10m of the kerbside of the adopted highway/ refuse collection vehicle access point and the arrangements for the disposal of waste shall be provided and shall include provision for a minimum of 50% recycling/organic capacity. The approved facilities shall be provided prior to the commencement of the use hereby permitted and shall be retained thereafter unless alternative arrangements are agreed in writing by the local planning authority.

Reason: To protect the amenities of nearby residents/occupiers and in the interests of visual amenity. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/12 and 4/13)

13. Prior to the commencement of development, details of any proposed external lighting shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority before the buildings is occupied. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: In the interests of amenity. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/11 and 4/15)

14. No development shall take place until full details of both hard and soft landscape works have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority and these works shall be carried out as approved. These details shall include proposed finished levels or contours; means of enclosure; car parking layouts, other vehicle and pedestrian access and circulation areas; hard surfacing materials; minor artefacts and structures (eg furniture, play equipment, refuse or other storage units, signs, lighting); proposed and existing functional services above and below ground (eg drainage, power, communications cables, pipelines indicating lines, manholes, supports); retained historic landscape features and proposals for restoration, where relevant. Soft Landscape works shall include planting plans; written specifications (including cultivation and other operations associated with plant and grass establishment); schedules of plants, noting species, plant sizes and proposed numbers/densities where appropriate and an implementation programme.

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

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

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

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

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

17. 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)

INFORMATIVE: The applicant is advised that any granting of Planning Permission does not constitute a permission or licence to a developer to carry out any works within, or disturbance of, or interference with, the Public Highway, and a separate permission must be sought from the Highway Authority for such works.

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

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.

Demolition/Construction noise/vibration report

The noise and vibration report should include:

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

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

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

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

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

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

A procedure for seeking approval from the Local Planning Authority (LPA) in circumstances when demolition/construction works need to be carried out at time outside the permitted hours. This should incorporate a minimum notice period of 10 working days to the Local Planning Authority and 5 working days to neighbours to allow the Local Planning Authority to consider the application as necessary. For emergencies the Local Planning Authority should be notified but where this is not possible the Council's Out of Hours Noise service should be notified on 0300 303 8389.

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

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

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

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

Guidance on the assessment of dust from demolition and construction

http://iaqm.co.uk/wp-content/uploads/guidance/iaqm_guidance_report_draft1.4.pdf

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

INFORMATIVE: To satisfy condition 10 (plant noise insulation), the rating level (in accordance with BS4142:2014) 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 correction in accordance with BS4142:2014. 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 15 minute period).

It is recommended that the agent/applicant submits a noise prediction survey/report in accordance with the principles of BS4142: 2014 Methods for rating and assessing industrial and commercial sound 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.

It is important to note that a full BS4142:2014 assessment is not required, only certain aspects to be incorporated into a noise assessment as described within this informative.

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: The application should take into account British Standard BS7258: Laboratory Fume Cupboards which sets out heights that are required for adequate dispersion.