

**PLANNING COMMITTEE****1<sup>st</sup> April 2015**

<b>Application Number</b>	<b>14/1154/FUL</b>	<b>Agenda Item Officer</b>	
<b>Date Received</b>	17th July 2014	Mr Tony Collins	
<b>Target Date</b>	16th October 2014		
<b>Ward</b>	Abbey		
<b>Site</b>	Wests Garage Ltd Cambridge CB5 8HD	217 Newmarket Road	
<b>Proposal</b>	The erection of new student housing (202 study bedrooms) and associated communal facilities, cycle parking, and external landscaping following demolition of the existing buildings.		
<b>Applicant</b>	HUB Cambridge LLP		

SUMMARY	<p>The development accords with the Development Plan for reasons which include the following:</p> <p>The scale and amended massing of the development respond appropriately to the context, including the conservation area.</p> <p>Independent consultants engaged by the Council have endorsed the applicants' assessment that the building would not cause unacceptable impacts on daylight or sunlight to neighbouring residential properties, and the proposal would not have any other unacceptable impacts on the residential amenity of neighbours</p> <p>The building provides an acceptable level of residential amenity for future occupiers</p>
RECOMMENDATION	APPROVAL

**A.0 INTRODUCTION**

A.1 A report on this application was prepared and placed on the agenda for Planning Committee of 3<sup>rd</sup> December 2014. The recommendation was for refusal. The reasons for refusal set out in that agenda are attached to this report as Appendix A. After publication of that agenda, the applicants asked that a decision be deferred in order to allow them to make further amendments to the scheme. This was agreed, and the application was not discussed at December Committee. Amendments have now been made to the scheme, and additional information has also been submitted. The changes, and the additional information, are set out in section 2 below.

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

- 1.1 The site is a roughly rectangular site of 0.36 ha at the corner of Newmarket Road and River Lane. It is has been occupied since the 1950's by a motor vehicle business. Vehicle repair operations on this site have gradually diminished in favour of vehicle sales. The desire to create additional vehicle sales space lies behind the present site owners' wish to relocate
- 1.2 The site is not allocated in the Cambridge Local Plan (2006), nor in the Cambridge Development Plan 2014 Draft Submission. It lies within the area of the Eastern Gate SPD, and within the Eastern Gate Opportunity Area in the Draft Submission.
- 1.3 The site falls outside any conservation area, but the boundary of the Riverside section of City of Cambridge Conservation Area No.1 (Central) runs along the western and northern boundaries of the site. There are three rowan trees just outside the northeast boundary of the site (within land owned by the City Council) which are protected by their position within the conservation area.
- 1.4 The site falls within the controlled parking zone.

## **2.0 THE PROPOSAL**

- 2.1 The application proposes the removal of all buildings on the site (and the three rowan trees on adjacent land to the north), and the erection of buildings to house 202 students.
- 2.2 The scheme comprises four components grouped round a central courtyard which would be at basement level (one storey below

Newmarket Road street level). On the west side would be a two-storey building (termed the ‘pavilion’ building) while ranges along Newmarket Road, River Lane and Rowlinson Way would form a single main building enclosing the other three sides of the courtyard. The pavilion would have rooms facing the courtyard only, while the other three ranges would be double-banked, with rooms facing both the courtyard and the street.

- 2.3 The main entrance would be at the corner of River Lane and Newmarket Road. There would be a subsidiary entrance half-way along the River lane frontage. There would be a large double-height common room on the Newmarket Road side, allowing views out to the basement-level courtyard, with a reception point alongside the corner entrance. Cycle storage would be provided within the building off Newmarket Road and Rowlinson Way and bin stores off Rowlinson Way and River Lane. The upper floors, whose configuration is described in the assessment below, would contain student rooms grouped with shared kitchens.
- 2.4 The application was originally accompanied by the following supporting information:
  1. Design and Access Statement
  2. Planning Statement
  3. Heritage Statement
  4. Foul and Surface Water Drainage Strategy
  5. Geoenvironmental Desk Study
  6. Daylight and Sunlight Report
  7. Energy Statement
  8. Ventilation Statement
  9. Transport Statement and Travel Plan
  10. Noise Impact Assessment
  11. Sustainability Statement and Checklist
- 2.5 In October 2014, amended plans and an addendum to the Design and Access Statement were received which showed the following amendments and additional information:
  - Extended mullions to the rear windows on the Newmarket Road range to protect privacy in Godesdone Road. (Diagrams to show arcs of visibility are also included)
  - Bronze cladding and blind windows to rear of pavilion block facing Godesdone Road gardens

- Shadow studies of courtyard
- Comparison of courtyard with equivalent space in student accommodation at the Brunswick site.
- Enlarged windows in courtyard elevations.
- Sunlight and daylight analysis for courtyard rooms
- Shadow analysis of site context with and without the development
- BRE sunlight and daylight analyses of 6-24 River Lane
- Additional facade detailing (soldier courses, stone mouldings, rusticated brick piers)
- Specifications for photographs and CGI images in the application
- Additional information on River Lane tree planting

2.6 In January, amended plans and a revised Design and Access Statement were received which showed the following amendments:

- Reduction in massing at western end of Newmarket Road range
- River Lane frontage set back from street
- Revised tree planting scheme in River Lane and Rowlinson Way.
- Pitched roofs added to pavilion building and Rowlinson Way range
- Reconfiguration of communal area in Newmarket Road range to allow views into courtyard through double-height space

2.7 The following additional information was also provided:

- Daylight and sunlight study for the amended proposal
- Verified views of amended scheme from Newmarket Road, River Lane and Coldhams Lane
- Methodology for verified views

### 3.0 SITE HISTORY

3.1 There is extensive history on this site in connection with the garage use, stretching back from 2006 to the 1960's, but the only relevant previous application is shown below.

Reference	Description	Outcome
13/1780	The erection of new student housing (257 study bedrooms)	Withdrawn

and associated communal facilities, cycle parking, and external landscaping following demolition of the existing buildings.

## 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 Local Plan 2006	3/1 3/4 3/7 3/8 3/11 3/12 3/13 4/4 4/11 4/13 4/14 7/10 8/2 8/3 8/6 8/9 8/10 10/1

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

Central Government	National Planning Policy Framework March
--------------------	--

Guidance	<p>2012</p> <p>National Planning Policy Framework – Planning Practice Guidance March 2014</p> <p>Circular 11/95</p>
Supplementary Planning Guidance	<p>Sustainable Design and Construction (May 2007)</p> <p>Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Waste Partnership (RECAP): Waste Management Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (February 2012)</p> <p>Planning Obligation Strategy (March 2010)</p> <p>Public Art (January 2010)</p> <p>Eastern Gate Supplementary Planning Document (October 2011)</p>
	<p><u>City Wide Guidance</u></p> <p>Arboricultural Strategy (2004)</p> <p>Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (November 2010)</p> <p>Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (2005)</p> <p>Cambridge and Milton Surface Water Management Plan (2011)</p> <p>Cambridge City Council (2011) - Open Space and Recreation Strategy</p> <p>Cambridge City Council - Guidance for the application of Policy 3/13 (Tall Buildings and the Skyline) of the Cambridge Local Plan (2006) (2012)</p>

	<p>Cambridge Walking and Cycling Strategy (2002)</p> <p>Cambridgeshire Design Guide For Streets and Public Realm (2007)</p> <p>Cycle Parking Guide for New Residential Developments (2010)</p> <p>Air Quality in Cambridge – Developers Guide (2008)</p>
	<p><u>Area Guidelines</u></p> <p>Cambridge City Council (2002)–Eastern Corridor Area Transport Plan</p> <p>Riverside and Stourbridge Common Conservation Area Appraisal (2012)</p> <p>Newmarket Road Suburbs and Approaches Study (October 2011)</p>

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

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

For the application considered in this report, the following policies in the emerging Local Plan are of relevance:

## **6.0 CONSULTATIONS**

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

First comment (25<sup>th</sup> July 2014)

- 6.1 On-street works acceptable in principle. Building should be pulled back from River lane frontage to allow wider footway. Residents will not qualify for residents' parking permits.

Second comment (19<sup>th</sup> August 2014)

- 6.2 Holding objection because further information required. Expected to generate fewer motorised trips than the present use. Framework Travel Plan required. Preferred cycle route should be identified. Cycle parking meets City Council Standards, but confirmation that it is adequate to meet expected need is required.

Third comment (25<sup>th</sup> September 2014)

- 6.3 Further information required with respect to Tripos Court traffic data submitted. Cycling officer's concerns reiterated. Acceptability of proposed build-outs in River Lane to accommodate trees confirmed.

Fourth comment (10<sup>th</sup> November 2014)

- 6.4 No information submitted requires further comment from the highway authority.

Fifth comment (13<sup>th</sup> March 2015)

- 6.5 Issues require addressing before highway authority can give full advice.
- 6.6 Section 4.1 of the Transport Statement identifies a large number of pedestrians and cyclists accessing and egressing the development. Having reviewed the count data contained in the appendices it is apparent that the site is used as a through route by pedestrians and cyclists rather than 'stopping' at the site. This information was requested in our previous response but not yet provided. It is important that the applicant revisits the count

information to exclude those using the site as a through route to understand the net increase in trips generated by the site and distributing onto the surrounding highway network.

- 6.7 The County Council requested that further information be provided to detail whether the counts provided for Tripos Court encapsulate all movements. There are concerns that the survey does not capture all movements including deliveries and servicing which brings into question whether there is a secondary access and potential loss of trips. This information was requested in our previous response but not yet provided.
- 6.8 Concerns have been raised by local residents about cyclists from the development exiting onto Newmarket Road to access Anglia Ruskin University and the Cambridge Retail Park, particularly the potential for those to cycle on path to access crossing points. The County Council request that further consideration/ explanation should be provided to this issue and whether further mitigation is required. This should be accompanied by the number of pedestrians and cyclists expected to cross at this location on Newmarket Road and whether a crossing facility is required.

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

- 6.9 First Comment (18<sup>th</sup> August 2014)
- 6.10 No objection. Conditions recommended with respect to: Demolition and Construction Environmental Management Plan (DCEMP), assessment and insulation against traffic noise, assessment and insulation against noise from the adjacent public house, plant noise insulation, contaminated land and waste and recycling. Informatives recommended with respect to: Housing Health & Safety Rating System (HHSRS), noise insulation, waste and recycling.
- 6.11 Second comment (10<sup>th</sup> February 2015, following amendments)
- 6.12 First comments apply. Additional condition requested to reflect updated guidance.

## **Urban Design and Conservation Team**

### First advice (19<sup>th</sup> August 2014)

- 6.13 Scheme needs to be amended to address a number of concerns identified in these comments.
- 6.14 The privacy of Godesdone Road would be better safeguarded through the introduction of screens at the second floor rear section of the Newmarket Road block. Further articulation of the roof form is needed.
- 6.15 In terms of shadow studies and daylighting, the scheme fails to provide certainty in terms of the proposed courtyard amenity space which appears to fail the criteria identified in the BRE guidelines. In addition, the impact on neighbouring properties is unclear.
- 6.16 The daylighting study highlights significant failings in terms of the VSC and ADF assessment resulting in a number of poor quality living spaces. Further breaks and articulation of the building massing may be required to resolve the concerns highlighted.
- 6.17 In the submitted D&A Statement, the applicant has provided a series of views to demonstrate the impact of the proposals from surrounding streets. The applicant has not provided the 'specification' of each view such as the eye height and focal length. As such it is not possible to verify whether what is shown are accurate visual representations. The SPD at paragraph 3.4.12 states that applicants '*will be expected to produce accurate 3D computer models to inform an appropriate massing of their development proposals and to demonstrate the impact on any key views and vistas*'. Given the proximity to the Conservation Area and the close proximity of properties and associated amenity spaces on Godesdone Road and Beche Road, the applicant needs to confirm the accuracy of submitted views.
- 6.18 In terms of the elevations, the materials palette is acceptable as is the vertical proportioning of the building. A further level of 'richness and detail' is needed to help break up the monolithic qualities of the elevations and help the scheme respond more appropriately to the finer grain of the adjacent Conservation Area.

The linear form of the Rowlinson Way block needs to be further articulated.

- 6.19 Confirmation is needed that the trees proposed along River Lane can actually be delivered. These are crucial to helping to integrate the development into its context. Details of improvements to the Newmarket Road public realm are also needed.
- 6.20 As proposed the scheme fails to meet Policy 3/4, 3/7 and 3/12 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2006) and cannot be supported in Urban Design & Conservation terms.

Second advice (5<sup>th</sup> November 2014, following amendments)

- 6.21 Amendments and clarifications reviewed. Further comments, to address the urban design and conservation issues raised. We have reviewed this information and have the following comments to make.
- 6.22 Privacy of Godesdone Road residents – extended mullions resolves this concern.
- 6.23 Further articulation of the roof of the pavilion block – not sufficient; building still reads as strongly horizontal
- 6.24 Photo specifications suggest rear of the Newmarket Road block will read more significantly than previously thought and that it will impact on existing Godesdone Road properties - overbearing scale.
- 6.25 Shadow studies have been provided that show that the courtyard will be heavily shaded for over 6 months of the year – not acceptable. Comparison with Brunswick House student scheme – not valid because of level and degree of connection with exterior spaces.
- 6.26 Overshadowing in River Lane: analysis reveals that 3 of the existing houses opposite fail the BRE assessment as a result of the proposals. This indicates that the continuous built form and scale of this end is too great and fails to respond to the established context. Reduction in storey heights, combined with a more broken form is required.

- 6.27 Some courtyard units previously failed the BRE VSC and ADF assessment larger windows have resolved these concerns.
- 6.28 The introduction of the rusticated brickwork and sill and window head details all combine to provide both visual and shadow interest.
- 6.29 Rowlinson Way elevation, metal panels go some way to break up the linear nature of the block, but roof form still reads as a strong horizontal against the more varied forms of the adjacent Conservation Area. A further issue regarding overlooking of the rear gardens to houses fronting on to River Lane has been identified that needs to be resolved.
- 6.30 No confirmation has been provided that the trees on River Lane can be delivered.
- 6.31 Photo specifications have now been provided which reveal that the images shown on pages 36, 38, 39 of the Design & Access Statement Addendum were taken with a 17mm focal length, view across the Conservation Area is 22mm and photomerge images on pages 42, 43, 44 are all taken with an 18mm focal length. This has the effect of misrepresenting the scheme and making it appear less dominant than it will be in reality. Therefore the scheme will appear closer and more dominant than shown in each of these images and raises significant concerns about whether the overall scale and massing is appropriate for the existing established context.
- 6.32 The scheme has not addressed concerns of the D&C Panel regarding the bulky form of the Newmarket Road and River Lane building.
- 6.33 Conclusion: Overall the scheme fails to resolve a number of concerns and additional information has revealed significant new concerns which relate to the overall massing and consequent negative impacts of the scheme. As such it is likely that the proposals represent overdevelopment of the site and that an alternative development form is needed. Application in its current form fails to satisfy Policies 3/4, 3/7, 3/11, 3/13 and 4/11 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2006). Not supported.

Third advice (17<sup>th</sup> March 2015, following further amendments)

- 6.34 The full text of this advice is attached to this report as Appendix B. The conclusion is set out in full below.
- 6.35 The proposals will result in a significant change to the corner of Newmarket Road and River Lane. The verified views demonstrate the impact of the scheme in a more accurate way and allay previous concerns about how the proposals will sit in their context. As a result, the overall impact on the Conservation Area of the revised proposals is considered to be acceptable.
- 6.36 The amendments to the Godesdone Road and Rowlinson Way blocks to introduce a series of pitched gables, have removed previous concerns about the overly horizontal form addressed concerns about the impact of the horizontal forms of the proposed buildings that abut the adjacent Conservation Area.
- 6.37 In terms of the sunlight and daylight impacts, the usability of the amenity space has been independently assessed and is considered to be acceptable. The impact on properties to the east of the site on River Lane has been independently assessed and is considered to be acceptable.
- 6.38 The amendments to the scheme and additional information provided have improved the overall scheme and clarified the potential level of impact on the Conservation Area and adjacent properties. Overall the proposals are considered to be acceptable in design and conservation terms.

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

First comment (17<sup>th</sup> August 2014)

#### Courtyard:

- 6.39 Unclear how drainage strategy requirements and landscape proposals will interact. Large attenuation tank required to manage storm water drainage will conflict with tree planting strategy. Absence of tree planting will mean a loss of quality.
- 6.40 Greatly concerned about the quality of daylight in the courtyard space. Brunswick House not comparable with this application. In-paving planting around the seating areas unsustainable and not

supported. Access to courtyard awkward. Access from the ground floor common room should be provided.

### Streetscape

- 6.41 Disappointed by lack of articulation of the building frontage and lack of tree or shrub planting on Newmarket Road.
- 6.42 Street trees along River Lane are vital to making the development settle into its surroundings. Need utilities survey and highway authority approval to demonstrate deliverability. Rear aspect of the Rowlinson Way block should be pulled back to allow for either the retention of the existing trees or for the provision of new trees. This boundary represents the edge of the conservation area and the trees help to soften and illustrate this edge.

### Summary:

- 6.43 Not supported because of drainage/landscape interface issue, shadowing in the courtyard and requirement for streetscape softening.

Second comment (14<sup>th</sup> February 2015)

### Courtyard

- 6.44 The courtyard space has decreased in size in order to allow for the changes to the River Lane frontage to occur. It's a difficult compromise to consider as they are equally valuable spaces. This change makes it even more important for a high quality landscape design to be produced which takes advantage of every positive element and adequately addresses the negative aspects. The proposed landscape plan seeks to achieve this with a specialised palette of plants suitable for low light situations, interesting seating arrangements and high quality materials.
- 6.45 The central open space is now achieving 2hrs of sunlight on the 21<sup>st</sup> of March which fulfils the BRE guidance. The applicant also states that the current scheme is an improvement to the previous iteration because of the improvement to the percentage of sunlight totals. An independent sunlight/shadowing assessment was completed by eb7 which verifies these statements and for that

reason, we are satisfied with the open space proposals in terms of size and aspect.

- 6.46 The relationship between the common spaces available within the lower ground and the courtyard is a welcome solution to the access issues highlighted in previous comments.

### Streetscape

- 6.47 We are disappointed with the lack of consideration given to the Newmarket frontage in respect to the lack of tree or shrub planting which would soften the impact of such a monolithic structure. The hotels opposite have both provided street trees within their curtilages and we feel this could have been mirrored at this key location too.

### Conclusion

- 6.48 Landscape can now support the proposed scheme.

### **Senior Sustainability Officer (Design and Construction)**

- 6.49 Use of photovoltaics, CHP and air-source heat pumps acceptable. 10% carbon saving exceeded. Noise implications of air-source heat pumps must be addressed. Green and brown roofs supported.

### **Head of Streets and Open Spaces (Walking and Cycling Officer)**

- 6.50 Cycle parking acceptable. Flush kerb needed for exit from Newmarket Road. Building should be set back from River Lane corner to allow for increased pedestrian use.

### **Access Officer**

- 6.51 Should be 12 disabled rooms. Should be one disabled parking space for every disabled occupier. Parking spaces should not be on the external road. Location of disabled rooms not clear. Recommendations on detailed design of rooms.

### **Environment Agency**

- 6.52 No objection subject to conditions on ground contamination, infiltration of water, piling, surface water drainage and pollution control. (No changes to this comment following amendments to scheme.)

### **Anglian Water**

- 6.53 Foul sewerage network has capacity. Surface water/ flood risk assessment satisfactory.

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

- 6.54 No objection to the proposal from a crime prevention or security perspective.
- 6.55 Support: main entrance design, security staffing for at least 16 hours/day, visitor access strategy.
- 6.56 Recommend: changes to recessed entrance off River Lane, fire doors on River Lane to be alarmed, student access fobs to be for main entrance and individual cluster only, ground floor windows to be blocked by internal screen or to have restricted opening, improved lighting and CCTV to cycle store.

### **Design and Conservation Panel (Meeting of 14th May 2014)**

- 6.57 The conclusions of the Panel meeting were as follows:
- 6.58 **Courtyard.** Strong reservations were expressed as to the success of this central 'green oasis'. Located one storey below street level and flanked by elevations of five storeys, the Panel felt this would likely be a dank, gloomy area where planting beds would struggle to receive appropriate levels of sunlight. (Data on shadow/sunlight analysis would have been a helpful addition to the presentation.) The fact that drainage for the courtyard was yet to be examined was an additional concern. The design team are also recommended to explore the less ambitious possibility of using the courtyard as a more flexible outdoor gathering space for students, subject to effective management.

- 6.59 **River Lane elevation.**

- o Street trees. The Panel welcome the intention to introduce a new line of replacement street trees along this elevation that would help to offset the scale of the proposed development of this site. However, as the width of River Lane reduces significantly as it approaches Newmarket Road and there would likely be servicing requirements below ground, the deliverability of substantial re-planting was questioned.
- o Scale and massing. This was seen as a particular issue along this frontage and needs to be revised. As proposed, it appears longer and taller than the Newmarket Road elevation, with fenestration that fails to adequately break up the mass. A reduction in the scale is needed, with a stepping down for a less monolithic appearance. A reduction in the length of the facade to allow for replacement trees at the end of River Lane/Rowlinson Way junction could also contribute towards a more successful integration of a new development located adjacent to a Conservation Area.
- o Ground floor level accommodation (defensible spaces). Scepticism was expressed as to the likely success of these recessed areas as further opportunities for planting. It is the Panel's view that the proposed railings are likely to encourage the accumulation of litter, while poor levels of sunlight would make successful planting a challenge.
- o Student drop-off. For a proposal comprising 248 student rooms, the Panel were disappointed that a management plan for arrivals/departures at peak times was yet to be considered.
- o Servicing/car parking. The Panel understands that the City Council as landowner was yet to grant vehicular access to the scheme from Rowlinson Way.

**6.60 Newmarket Road frontage.** The Panel were broadly comfortable with the arrangement of the fenestration and vertical banding. The exploration into landscape improvements on Newmarket Road should also be investigated.

**6.61 River Lane/Newmarket Road corner.** This was seen as bulky and in need of re-examination.

**6.62 Student rooms.** Very little flexibility of layout or furniture is permissible in the narrow (2.2m wide) rooms. The architects are strongly advised to revisit the modules to create more useful, higher quality living spaces.

6.63 **Materials.** Very few comments were made as to the materials palette although it was generally regarded that the bronze-coloured cladding could be successful. (The architects are advised to angle the metal cills at a gradient that discourages pigeons from roosting.)

6.64 **Conclusion.** This development was presented as the creation of a 'gateway' in the context of the changing character of Newmarket Road. However, as the site abuts a Conservation Area comprising primarily two-storey residential dwellings, the Panel would have welcomed greater appreciation of the scheme's context and how this has informed its scale and massing particularly in relation to the impact on the modest dwellings on the western side of River Lane. The meanness of the student rooms underlines the overdeveloped nature of the proposal as a whole. The landscaping and opportunity for street trees particularly along River Lane and also Newmarket Road requires further consideration.

#### 6.65 **VERDICT – RED (5), AMBER (1)**

#### **Design and Conservation Panel (Meeting of 11<sup>th</sup> February 2015)**

6.66 The Panel considered the most recent iteration of the scheme. Its conclusions were as follows:

6.67 The Panel appreciated that several adjustments had been made in response to comments from the previous review in May 2014.

6.68 **Eastern elevation.** The setting back of this elevation is a welcome improvement, as it allows for an improved public realm along River Lane both in terms of planting and greater separation from adjacent properties.

6.69 **Vertical townhouses.** The Panel was told that the massing of the building was seen as a series of vertical townhouses. This assertion was questioned, not least as massing of this development seems predominantly to consist of long horizontal blocks.

6.70 **Central courtyard.** The Panel continues to have concerns about this space being located a floor below the street and entrance level. Although the submission of additional technical information

on sunlight exposure is noted, (though it was not shown to the Panel), there were still concerns about overshadowing of the space from the surrounding blocks. In addition the circulation routes down to the courtyard seem very unclear and indirect.

- 6.71 **Context of Newmarket Road** This development needs to respond more effectively to its new context of the taller hotels along Newmarket Road.
- 6.72 **Termination to Coldham's Lane.** Although the Panel were informed of the SPD's limited specifications for this area, there was nevertheless the view that a more positive marker was needed for this end of Coldham's Lane. The view across from Coldham's Lane is a key view of the scheme, which does not yet live up to its potential to hold the opposite corner. Local sensitivities regarding building heights in this area are understood.
- 6.73 **Elevations to Newmarket Road** Although this elevation has developed, the Panel felt that the rigid grid of windows currently shown falls short of what a building in this prominent position requires. It was suggested that the horizontal bands of fenestration to the nearby Premier Inn achieve a degree of flexibility in window placement. Further work is needed here.
- 6.74 **Design of windows.** Further thought is also needed in terms of the detailed design of the windows to the student rooms to achieve daylighting, views, ventilation, sound attenuation, privacy and security. A very generic window design is currently illustrated on the elevations.
- 6.75 **Student rooms and adaptability.** The Panel questioned the proposed room width of 2.25 metres, which seems tight and allows for no flexibility in the layout of furniture. Issues around possible future change of use and adaptability are worth considering as more generous room widths would allow for a wider range of uses.
- 6.76 **Studio rooms** The Panel questioned whether the recessed windows achieved any benefits. At ground floor level they could become unsightly litter traps.
- 6.77 **Circulation corridors.** The Panel questioned the need for double corridors to achieve room groupings. They seemed to be very

narrow and, with no exposure to natural light, would need to be artificially lit at all times.

6.78 **Renewables/sustainability.** The Panel would encourage a more holistic approach to an environmental strategy for the development that goes beyond the token inclusion of PV panels.

6.79 **Conclusion.** Although the Panel welcome the improved visibility through to the courtyard from the ground floor cafe, and the set-back on the eastern elevation allowing River Lane more breathing space, it was felt that the design team have still failed to respond to the fundamental points raised at the last review. The majority Red vote should have prompted a substantial re-think, yet key areas of concern such as the quality of the accommodation and sunken courtyard remain substantially unchanged. This is a high profile site which deserves a better scheme.

#### 6.80 **VERDICT – RED (6), AMBER (2)**

6.81 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 made representations objecting to the proposal on the basis of the original drawings:

52 Abbey Road	11 Godesdone Road
69 Beche Road	12 Godesdone Road
82 Beche Road	14 Godesdone Road
84 Beche Road	20 Godesdone Road
85 Beche Road	45 River Lane
86 Beche Road	51 River Lane
94 Beche Road	48 Riverside
6 Godesdone Road	27 Silverwood Close
10 Godesdone Road	

7.2 Representations of objection on that basis were also received from:

Riverside Area Residents Association  
CHS Limited, the housing association responsible for houses in  
River Lane, Rowlinson Way and Stevenson Court  
The user of a garage on Rowlinson Way

7.3 The representations can be summarised as follows:

#### Principle

- Introduces transient population
- Intensity of use
- Wasted opportunity to build houses

#### Context and design

- Overlarge scale
- Too massive
- Inappropriate development model (Double-banked, pushed to edges of site)
- Unbroken rooflines
- Sets precedent for harmful development in historic high street
- Not appropriate to mimic scale of buildings south of Newmarket Road
- Not in keeping with conservation area
- Creates canyon
- Appropriating highway land for cycle parking and bin collection
- No improvement to public realm

#### Neighbour amenity

- Overlooking towards: Godesdone Road, Beche Road, rear of west side of River Lane, opposite side of River Lane
- Overshadowing: in River Lane, in Godesdone Road
- Plant noise
- Rubbish
- Polluted air funnelled down river Lane
- Increased pedestrian traffic through housing area to the east
- Loss of privacy – River Lane
- Noise

#### Amenity for future occupiers

- Not enough leisure space or services for student occupiers

- Courtyard overshadowed

### Highway issues

- Highway safety issues
- Cycle entrance from Newmarket Road unsafe
- Obstruction from delivery vehicles in River Lane
- Pedestrian safety at risk from narrower pavements
- Highway safety at corner
- Pick-up and drop-off
- Traffic generation

### Car parking

- Contractors parking
- Disabled parking
- Pressure on car parking

### Other issues

- Images misleading
- If City Council developed the garage area to the north this would create problems
- Impact on local doctors and dentists
- Unsatisfactory disabled access
- Archaeology

- 7.4 Several of the above respondents, including Riverside Area Residents Association and CHS also commented on the scheme as amended up to December 2014. All of these responses indicated that the amendments have no impact on their fundamental objections to the scheme as submitted.
- 7.5 Representations in support of the application have been received from the Estates Co-ordinator at Anglia Ruskin University
- 7.6 Following the latest amendments, further representations have been received from the owners or occupiers of the following addresses:

86 Beche Road  
10 Godesdone Road  
12 Godesdone Road  
20 Godesdone Road  
8 River Lane  
10 River Lane  
14 River Lane  
16 River Lane  
46 River Lane  
51 River Lane  
73 River Lane  
48 Riverside  
and from Riverside Area Residents Association, and CHS.

- 7.7 The additional representations on the revised scheme can be summarised as follows:

#### Principle

- Introduces transient population
- Intensity of use
- No significant improvement on original scheme

#### Context and design

- Overlarge scale
- Too massive
- Unbroken rooflines
- Bulky form
- Sets precedent for harmful development in historic high street
- Not appropriate to mimic scale of buildings south of Newmarket Road – north side should form key context
- Not in keeping with conservation area
- Tall form not needed at River Lane corner
- Newmarket Road frontage too bleak
- Impinges on views across conservation area
- Fails to abide by guidance of Eastern Gate SPD
- Storey heights exceed SPD guidance
- Poorly designed by comparison with application at Cheddars Lane

### Neighbour amenity

- Overlooking towards: Godesdone Road, Beche Road
- Overshadowing: in River Lane,
- Interference with rights to peaceful enjoyment of property
- Low levels of daylight to neighbours
- Visual domination of Godesdone Road properties by Rowlinson Way range and pavilion building
- Noise from access to cycle parking

### Amenity for future occupiers

- Not enough leisure space or services for student occupiers
- Courtyard overshadowed
- Vertical house model should be employed

### Highway issues

- Unsafe cycle route
- Highway safety at corner
- Pick-up and drop-off
- Cycle path in Rowlinson Way not possible

### Car parking

- Disabled parking
- Pressure on car parking

### Other issues

- Images misleading
- Deficiencies in drawings

- 7.8 Representations in support of the revised proposal have been received from the Estates Co-ordinator at Anglia Ruskin University. The co-ordinator states that the room sizes proposed are considered appropriate by the University.
- 7.9 The above representations are a summary of the comments that have been received. Full details of the representations can be inspected on the application file.

## **8.0 ASSESSMENT**

- 8.1 From the consultation responses and representations received and from my inspection of the site and the surroundings, I consider that the main issues are:
1. Principle of development
  2. Context of site, design and external spaces
  3. Public Art
  4. Renewable energy and sustainability
  5. Disabled access
  6. Residential amenity
  7. Refuse arrangements
  8. Highway safety
  9. Car and cycle parking
  10. Third party representations
  11. Planning Obligation Strategy

### **Principle of Development**

- 8.2 This is not an allocated site. The principle of development for student accommodation would be in accordance with development plan policy provided that clauses in a Section 106 agreement were in place to restrict occupancy to full-time students of the city's two universities and to prevent such occupiers from keeping cars in the city. The applicants are prepared to enter into such an agreement, although it has not yet been completed.
- 8.3 In my opinion, subject to an appropriate legal agreement to restrict occupancy, the principle of the development is acceptable and in accordance with policy 7/10 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006.

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

#### Scale and massing

- 8.4 The proposed buildings would increase in height from north-west to south-east. The 'pavilion' building on the west side of the site, backing on to Godesdone Road gardens, and the Rowlinson Way range to the north would have two storeys above ground level, the River Lane range would begin at two storeys, rise to three storeys after the first three bays, rise again

to a set-back fourth storey after a further three bays, before reaching four full storeys for the last two bays. The full four storey height would be maintained on the diagonal façade at the corner, and along the eastern half of the Newmarket Road frontage. The most recent amendment has altered the configuration at the western end of this range; after the recess in the middle of this frontage, the fourth storey would now be set back for three further bays rather than the previous four and then reduce to three storeys for the final two bays (previously only the final bay was at three storeys).

- 8.5 I have assessed the scale and massing of the proposal against the existing built form which surrounds the site and against the guidance given in the Eastern Gate SPD. I have also considered the advice given by the Urban Design and Conservation team. I also note the concerns very strongly expressed in representations that the storey heights of the proposal do not correspond to the guidance in the SPD and that the proposal does not adhere to the maximum storey heights set out in Figure 39 of the SPD.
- 8.6 However, the SPD makes it clear in Section 3.4 that the heights are recommendations, that the creation of varied heights is important, and that proposals seeking to exceed the recommended storey heights must be tested in a robust way. In my view, the verified images submitted provide this robust testing. I consider that the 50mm lens views, which give a reasonable indication of what the eye would see, indicate that the proposal would respond appropriately to the Corner House, the houses on the opposite side of River Lane, and the houses to the north of the site on River Lane. The proposed buildings would not in my view dominate, nor read jarringly against the scale of these neighbouring buildings. The proposed building does not attempt to replicate the scale of the south side of Newmarket Road, which would in my view be inappropriate. The relationship with the buildings to the west on Newmarket Road is less comfortable, but I do not consider it reasonable to require development on this site to be configured on the basis that the present scale and forms immediately to the west will remain as they are in the long term. The SPD recommend an increase from the present heights on that site in any future development.

- 8.7 I note the particular concern about the four-storey section of the building raised in representations, and the associated assertion that additional height at the River Lane corner is not required. I accept that additional height at this point is not necessary, but in my view, the varying storey height of the proposed building lends interest to the elevations and conforms to the guidance in the SPD, which emphasises the value of varied roof heights. I remain of the view, notwithstanding representations, that setting back the uppermost storey at the corner of the site, whilst conforming strictly to the recommended maximum height in the SPD, would detract from, rather than improve the scheme.
- 8.8 I acknowledge and agree with the assertion of Riverside residents that the double-banked, corridor-based, edge-of-site development model has created difficulties for the scheme's designers, but that model in itself cannot form a reason for refusal, and in my view, the proposal as now configured has successfully overcome the difficulties created by that model. I also note the reference in representations to the student accommodation proposal recently submitted at Cheddars Lane. This application, however, must be judged on its own merits, and not by comparison with other proposed schemes nearby.
- 8.9 The existing buildings in the rear of the site are single-storey, but they have high gabled roofs, and in my view, notwithstanding neighbour representations which are strongly to the contrary, the two-storey height proposed for the pavilion and Rowlinson Way buildings is an appropriate reflection of this, and an acceptable response to the predominance of two-storey, pitched roof houses in the conservation area to the north and west. In my previous report, I identified the strongly horizontal form of these buildings as being unacceptable. The applicant's response to this has been to change the roof form of these blocks to a series of pitched planes. In my view, this is a significant and positive amendment. The apexes of these pitched roofs are above the level of the parapet originally shown, but the valleys are below that line. The pitched roofs are in my view an appropriate allusion to the forms of the commercial roofs currently in place, and relate well to the character of the conservation area. Paragraph 3.4.14 of the Eastern Gate SPD states: '[policy]... is intended to avoid long unvaried rooflines of large new buildings forming dominant and intrusive horizontal bands on the skyline, which would detract from the roofscape of the conservation area and the skyline of

the city...]. It is my view that in this most recent amendment, the two rear blocks are well-articulated, and their form would now avoid harmful impact on the character of the conservation area in line with the above paragraph from the SPD.

- 8.10 In this revised scheme, the reduction in mass at the west end of the Newmarket Road range, the set-back from River Lane, and the improved articulation of the Rowlinson Way range and the pavilion building have addressed the issues which previously concerned me about the massing. The verified images now submitted comply in a robust way with the requirements of Paragraph 3.4.9 of the Eastern Gate SPD, and confirm my view that the design now proposed is compliant with that guidance and acceptable. I am satisfied that the proposal would not have a harmful impact on the conservation area, and is appropriate in its context on the north side of Newmarket Road. I concur with the advice of the Urban Design and Conservation team that the proposal is acceptable in design terms, and complies with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 3/4, 3/12 and 4/11.
- 8.11 I concur with the advice of the Urban Design and Conservation team that the proposal responds in an appropriate manner to its context, including the immediately adjacent conservation area, and is acceptable in design terms.

#### Architectural detail

- 8.12 In this application, the applicants have responded to concerns about the horizontal mass of the building on both Newmarket Road and River Lane at the time of the previous application by introducing a number of elements which break up that mass and emphasize verticality. Recessed glazed section on both frontages, vertical window shapes, substantial reveals and the clear division of all the frontages into 5m wide, two-window bays which reflect the proportions of nearby houses, are all successful in this respect. In my view these features would diminish the perceived mass of the building and create a more comfortable relationship with the conservation area to the north and west.
- 8.13 Additional details introduced since the original submission of this application include a brickwork soldier course and stone moulding above the ground floor, rusticated brickwork piers around the entrance, and most recently, pitched roofs to both

the pavilion building backing on to Godesdone Road gardens, and the Rowlinson Way range. In my view these are positive changes, which would respond well to the local context, enhancing articulation, increasing the legibility of the principal entrance, and making a more successful transition from Newmarket Road to the character of the conservation area.

### Materials

- 8.14 The application proposes a limited palette of materials; the building would be clad mostly in buff brick with pale mortar, and bronze metal would be used for doors, windows and metal cladding at the upper levels. In my view these materials would respond well to the local context. Appropriate quality could be secured by condition. In my view, the detailing and materials of the proposal are appropriate for the context and in accordance with policies 3/4 and 3/12 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006, and the guidance in paragraphs 3.4.18 to 3.4.20 of the Eastern Gate SPD.

### Landscape

- 8.15 The application proposes a central courtyard at basement level. The courtyard is now smaller than originally proposed because of the westward shift of the River Lane Range. I share the view of the landscape team that, on balance, this sacrifice is justified by the benefit achieved on the street frontage. In my report to December Committee, I expressed concerns about the quality of this courtyard space. The present amended scheme addresses this point in two ways: by the creation of a double-height communal space alongside the courtyard, and by an improved landscaping scheme. The double-height space would enable views into and out of the courtyard, making the access route to it more obvious, and enlivening its appearance. The landscaping scheme would make use of plants which thrive at lower levels of sunlight. As I have previously indicated, independent consultants have confirmed that the light levels in the courtyard should be regarded as adequate for a development of this type. The sustainable drainage officer has stated that he does not have concerns about the courtyard. I share the view of the landscape team that the revised proposal is acceptable in landscape terms.

- 8.16 In my earlier report in December, I expressed concerns about the loss the existing rowan trees in Rowlinson Way. I shared the view of the urban design and landscape officers that the introduction of substantial street trees in River Lane to soften and ‘green’ this part of the development is absolutely essential if the transition from the development into the established conservation area to the north is to be successful. It was my view then that because of uncertainty about the position of utilities in River Lane, the scheme as then configured could not guarantee the provision of appropriate replacement trees, and that consequently, harm would be caused to the character of the conservation area. The scheme as now amended is pulled back from Rowlinson Way at the north end of the River Lane range, allowing the insertion of three new trees as direct replacements for the existing rowans in this location. In addition, the relocation westwards of the River Lane frontage creates a significantly wider public realm at this point, allowing four new street trees to be planted at the south end of River Lane within the application site. In this way, the possibility of conflict with existing underground services is eliminated. Subject to conditions, I am confident that these trees could flourish. Both sets of trees would thus enhance the point of entry into the conservation area and soften the appearance of the new building.
- 8.17 I note the reservations expressed by the landscape team and respondents about the absence of trees on the Newmarket Road frontage, but this is not a specific aspiration of the SPD, and given the building line elsewhere on this side of the street, it would not be reasonable to expect developers to push the building frontage sufficiently far back on this side to accommodate significant trees. In my opinion, the landscaping proposals, both in the courtyard and the street, are acceptable. In this respect, the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 3/4, 3/7, 3/11, 4/4 and 4/11.

#### Design and Conservation Panel comments

- 8.18 I note that when presented with the amended scheme, Panel not only reiterated the firm ‘red’ verdict it had given to the earlier iteration of the scheme, but also indicated that in its view, the current design fails to respond to earlier Panel comments, and is of insufficient merit for the site. This is a very clear steer, but although I share some of the panel’s misgivings about the

design, I do not consider that any of the issues Panel have raised in their analysis of the present scheme merit a refusal of the application. These issues require detailed assessment, and I set out in the table below my response to the Panel's concerns.

1	Vertical townhouses	The Newmarket Road and River Lane frontages are essentially horizontal, but in my view the fenestration patterns, articulation and detailing are successful in breaking up this horizontal mass in both cases and the design is successful to some extent in alluding to the town house form visually, even though it does not follow it functionally. I do not believe this comment could sustain a reason for refusal.
2	Central courtyard	The courtyard is a limited space, but the external consultants' review of daylight and sunlight information confirms that the light levels should be regarded as acceptable. I do not believe a refusal reason based on courtyard shortcomings could be sustained in this context.
3	Context - opposite side of Newmarket Road	Panel's verdict appears to suggest that new development on the north side of Newmarket Road should emulate more closely the forms already approved on the south side. I do not agree with this view; the two sides of the street have different histories and characters, and in my view the present scheme is successful in achieving a 'middle way' in terms of scale, massing and detail, between the approvals already granted and partly implemented on the south side, and the character of the conservation area to the north. I am firmly of the view that it would not

		be appropriate for a scheme on this site to mimic recent and imminent development on the south side of the road more closely.
	Termination to Coldham's Lane	In my view, Panel's suggestion that the centre of the Newmarket Road elevation of this site should act as a visual termination to Coldham's Lane is not well-founded. To create additional height at this point on the frontage, or to insert some distinctive feature here would be at odds with the guidance in the Eastern Gate SPD, which does not indicate any need for a marker at this point, and would unbalance the elevation when seen from east or west along Newmarket Road.
4	Newmarket Road elevation	Panel's concern is about the fenestration grid on this elevation. In my view, the vertical consistency of window placement is one of the elements which helps to emphasise vertical lines in the elevation and break up the horizontal form, making at least a partial allusion to the town house form. To eliminate these vertical lines would in my view re-emphasise the horizontal form of the range, which would be undesirable in my view, and would conflict with the wish to reduce horizontality expressed elsewhere by Panel.
5	Window design	I note panel's concerns that the window designs shown might either provide insufficient privacy for occupiers, or lead to visual 'untidiness' which would detract from the appearance of the elevations. In my view, this depends on the exact materials used, in particular whether

		clear, tinted, fritted or obscure glass, or other insert panels are used. This can be controlled by condition.
6	Room widths	Panel's view on the greater flexibility offered by wider rooms may be valid, especially if at some future date there is a need to change the building's use, but this is a matter of internal layout and could not form a reason for refusal.
7	Recessed windows	In my view, the recessed windows to studios would make a valuable contribution to the articulation of the building. I accept that they have some potential to trap litter, as can any form of articulation on a street frontage at ground floor level, but this issue can be addressed by condition. It would not be a reason to refuse the application.
8	Double corridors	I share Panel's bafflement at the applicant's insistence on using this configuration, but it is a matter of internal layout, and it could not form a reason for refusal of the application.
9	Renewable energy	The proposal is compliant with Local Plan policy on renewable energy and the Council's Sustainable Development Officer is content with this element of the design. Additional contributions to sustainability, as recommended by Panel, would be welcome, but their absence could not justify refusal of the application.

- 8.19 To summarise, Panel's concerns are either matters which could be addressed by condition (recessed windows, window design), issues over which Planning control does not have a remit (double corridors, room widths), policies with which the proposal

is already fully compliant (renewable energy, light to courtyard), or suggestions which in my view would detract from the scheme, or raise problems elsewhere (height, fenestration pattern, termination to Coldham's Lane). These points are firmly made in the Panel's advice, but having considered each of them carefully, in consultation with the Urban Design and Conservation team, I do not consider that any of them would justify refusal of the application.

### **Public Art**

- 8.20 The applicants' expressed willingness to contribute to a wider public art scheme for the Eastern Gate area, in accordance with the Eastern Gate SPD, is acceptable in principle, although an Agreement has not yet been completed. Subject to such an agreement, the proposal is in accordance with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 3/7 and 10/1 and the Public Art SPD 2010.

### **Renewable energy and sustainability**

- 8.21 The application proposes the use of photovoltaics, combined heat and power and air source heat pumps. The Sustainability officer is content that the carbon savings generated by the scheme would exceed the 10% required by policy. The noise implications of air source heat pumps would need to be controlled by condition. The Sustainability officer is also content with other measures to increase sustainability, including the use of green and brown roofs.
- 8.22 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**

- 8.23 The proposal provides for disabled access and provides 16 accessible rooms, which are not all grouped in one place. The issues about detailed design raised by the access officer are not subject to planning control but are either covered by Part M of the Building Regulations or could be addressed by informatics.

- 8.24 I note concerns raised by the access officer and in representations that on-site disabled car parking is not provided. Parking spaces immediately adjacent to the site would, however make access to the development through the River Lane entrance very convenient.
- 8.25 In my opinion the proposal is compliant in respect of disabled access with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 3/7, 3/12 and 7/10.

## **Residential Amenity**

### Impact on amenity of neighbouring occupiers

#### Sunlight and daylight

- 8.26 The applicants have submitted a full daylight and sunlight study with respect to houses on the opposite side of River Lane. I do not consider that daylight or sunlight would be adversely affected in any other direction. In my previous report to Committee, in December 2014, I expressed concerns that the proposed range of the building fronting River Lane would overshadow the front of the houses opposite during the afternoon and evening. The Council has engaged independent consultants, eb7 to review the applicants' daylight and sunlight assessment. The review report is attached to this report as Appendix C.
- 8.27 The consultants' conclusions with respect to daylight for River Lane houses is as follows:

*Looking at the overall impacts of the proposal on neighbouring daylight, it is true to say that there are isolated instances where noticeable impacts would occur. With the proposal in place the retained daylight to these windows would be in line with those commonly found in urban areas. On balance, applying professional judgement to the flexibility applied within this report, we would consider the conclusion on daylight to these neighbours to be valid, and the impacts to be acceptable and in line with the intentions of the BRE guidance.*

- 8.28 The consultants' conclusions with respect to sunlight for River Lane houses is as follows:

*The analysis indicates that there would be no noticeable impact to these neighbours' sunlight by reference to the Annual Probable Sunlight Hours (APSH) assessment. As such, we would agree with the conclusions of this report in that the impacts on the neighbours sunlight would be considered acceptable.*

- 8.29 I accept the advice of the independent consultants engaged by the Council that the impacts of the proposal on daylight and sunlight to neighbouring properties are acceptable.

#### Privacy

- 8.30 In my view, the first series of amendments to the scheme, which introduced 'extended mullions' on windows on the rear of the west end of the Newmarket Road range, would resolve my earlier concerns about possible overlooking from these windows and protect the privacy of residents of Godesdone Road. I do not consider there would be any unacceptable loss of privacy for Godesdone Road residents from the River Lane range windows, because even were it possible to see over the pavilion block, the distance involved would be in excess of 40m. Similarly, even if rear elevations and rear gardens of houses in Beche Road would be visible from upper windows in the rear of the Newmarket Road range, the distances involved would be more than 75m. I do not consider this to be unacceptable. In my previous report to Committee in December, I raised concerns about loss of privacy for the occupiers of No. 33 River Lane. The latest revision reduces the number of first-floor windows in the Rowlinson Way range, which face this house and its garden, and extends the canted window configuration further west along this range, so that only the two windows furthest from River Lane would remain 'uncanted'. In my view, this resolves the issue of loss of privacy in this direction. The south side of the curtilage of No.33 is currently not overlooked, and the arrangement of canted windows would effectively eliminate such overlooking from the scheme. It would also reduce overlooking to gardens further north on River Lane, and in my view, given the mutual overlooking which already exists, no significant loss of privacy would occur in this direction. Beche Road houses and gardens are too far away and too affected by

existing overlooking for the same concern about the Rowlinson Way range to apply to them.

#### Visual domination

- 8.31 At the time of my previous report to Committee in December, verified views had not been provided. Without them, I had concerns about visual domination of adjacent properties at the west end of the Newmarket Road range and the south end of the River Lane range. The present revised scheme has pulled the whole of the River Lane range back from the highway, increasing the separation of the proposed building from No.6 River Lane, for example, from 11m to 15.5m. The revised scheme has also reduced the massing of the third floor at the west end of the Newmarket Road range. Having studied the verified views now provided, I am of the view that the buildings proposed, in their amended form, would not cause an unacceptable degree of visual domination in either of these locations. I do not consider that the relatively modest heights at the rear of the pavilion building and the west end of the Rowlinson Way range would lead to unacceptable visual domination of houses in Godesdone Road, which would be at a distance of 22m and 18m respectively. I do not consider that the issue of visual domination is of concern anywhere else on the site.

#### Noise and disturbance

- 8.32 I note neighbour concerns on this issue. However, given the very busy nature of Newmarket Road, the distance of the building from its neighbours, the fact that student accommodation is not likely to lead to a large number of motor vehicle movements, the positioning of the main entrance on Newmarket Road, and the fact that a relatively low proportion of the student rooms face outwards towards nearby houses, I do not consider that the impacts of noise, movement and light from the building on neighbouring occupiers would be unacceptable. I am also mindful of the fact that the premises could revert to vehicle repair activity, which generates considerable noise, without requiring planning permission. I am of the view that the particular issues associated with pick-up and drop-off at the beginnings and ends of university terms could be addressed by a condition requiring a management plan. I do not consider that the impact of increased pedestrian traffic to Tesco, or additional

rubbish would cause significant harm to neighbouring occupiers.

- 8.33 The reduction in mass now proposed at the west end of the Newmarket Road frontage, and the setting back of the River Lane frontage, which are supported by verified views, have resolved my earlier concerns about undue visual domination at 2-16 Godesdone Road and 6-16 River Lane, while the reduction of the number of first-floor windows on Rowlinson Way, together with the application of the canted configuration to all but two of the remaining windows here has resolved my earlier concerns about loss of privacy at 33 -39 River Lane. As far as daylight and sunlight are concerned, a review by independent consultants has concluded that the impact on the sunlight and daylight of neighbours would be acceptable using BRE guidelines. It is my view therefore that the proposed scheme would not have any unacceptable impact on the residential amenity of neighbouring occupiers and is in this respect compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 3/4 and 3/12.

#### Amenity for future occupiers of the site

- 8.34 In my report to Committee in December, I indicated concerns about the quality of the courtyard space. I have indicated above that I consider the revisions to the courtyard, including amended planting and the creation of a double-height internal communal space alongside the courtyard on the south side, would significantly improve the quality of that space and its amenity value to future occupiers. The independent consultants have confirmed that the levels of daylight and sunlight available to the courtyard, and to rooms looking on to it are acceptable
- 8.35 In my opinion the proposal as now configured would be a high-quality living environment and would provide an appropriate standard of residential amenity for future occupiers, and I consider that in this respect it complies with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 3/7 and 3/12.

#### Refuse Arrangements

- 8.36 I am of the view that adequate space is provided for the storage of waste and recycling on site. A management plan would be

necessary to ensure satisfactory arrangements for collection and retrieval of bins, but this could be addressed by condition.

- 8.37 In my opinion, subject to such a condition, the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policy 3/12.

### **Highway safety and the highway network**

- 8.38 The highway authority previously raised issues about the narrowness of the footway at the corner of the site. The set-back of the River Lane frontage appears to be to address this issue, although the highway authority has not yet so far commented. The authority has also requested additional information relating to existing and future trip generation, a travel plan, and information relating to cycle access to road crossings to the west of the site. Such information has not been supplied and the County Council cannot therefore properly assess the impact the proposal might have on the highway network. In my view it is likely that mitigating measures secured through conditions or legal agreement will be sufficient to address the highway authority's concerns, and ensure that the proposal is compliant with policy 8/2 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006. The highway authority has not raised concerns about the safety of the cycle entrances, nor has the cycling officer. The highway authority has not raised concerns about obstruction from delivery vehicles.
- 8.39 I will provide updated information about submission of transport information and highway authority advice on the Amendment Sheet or at Committee.

### **Car and Cycle Parking**

- 8.40 The proposal provides no car parking space on site. It provides disabled parking spaces within the street parking spaces on River Lane. In the view of the Access Officer this is not appropriate. He is also of the view that one disabled parking space should be available for every accessible room – 16 in this case. I acknowledge that the disabled car parking provided in this way is limited. To refuse the application on this basis, however, would rely on the requirement in policy 7/10 to make appropriate provision for students who are disabled. Policy 7/10 does not define either the quantum or the proximity to rooms which is necessary to make disabled car parking 'appropriate'

and in my view such a reason would be difficult to defend. Student use of cars can be precluded by a Section 106 agreement, and I do not consider that the application would increase pressure on car parking in the area, which is controlled. Pick-up and drop-off of students at term ends can also be controlled, by a management plan, secured by condition. The cycling officer has indicated that the cycle parking proposed is adequate.

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

### **Third Party Representations**

- 8.42 I have listed the issues raised below and indicate either the paragraph above where they are addressed, or my assessment of them.

<b>Principle</b>	
Introduces transient population	8.2
Intensity of use	8.2, 8.32, 8.38
Wasted opportunity to build houses	8.2
<b>Context and design</b>	
Overlarge scale	8.4-8.7, 8.9-8.11
Too massive	8.4-8.7, 8.9-8.11
Bulky form	8.4-8.6, 8.8-8.10
Inappropriate development model (Double-banked, pushed to edges of site)	8.8
Unbroken rooflines	8.4, 8.6, 8.7, 8.9, 8.10
Sets precedent for harmful development in historic high street	8.4, 8.6, 8.10
Not appropriate to mimic scale of buildings south of Newmarket Road; north side should form context	8.6
Not in keeping with conservation area	8.4, 8.5, 8.9-8.11
Tall form not needed at River Lane corner	8.7
Newmarket Road frontage too bleak	8.17

Impinges on views across conservation area	8.6
Fails to abide by guidance of Eastern Gate SPD	8.6
Storey heights exceed SPD guidance	8.6
Poorly designed by comparison with Cheddars Lane	8.8
Creates canyon	I do not accept that the scheme would have this impact
Appropriating highway land for cycle parking and bin collection	Only to a very limited degree. Acceptable in my view
No improvement to public realm	No policy basis to require this
<b>Neighbour amenity</b>	
Overlooking	8.30
Overshadowing	8.26-8.29
Rights to peaceful enjoyment of property	8.26-8.32
Low levels of daylight to neighbours	8.26-8.29
Visual domination of Godesdone Road	8.31
Plant noise	Condition could address this
Rubbish	8.32
Polluted air funnelled down river Lane	I do not consider there is evidence for this.
Increased pedestrian traffic through housing area to the east	8.32
Loss of privacy – River Lane	River Lane house frontages are already exposed to public view from the street
Noise	8.32 +condition
<b>Amenity for future occupiers</b>	
Not enough leisure space or services for student occupiers	8.34-35
Courtyard overshadowed	8.34-35
<b>Highway issues</b>	
Highway safety issues	8.38-39

Cycle entrance from Newmarket Road unsafe	8.38-39
Obstruction from delivery vehicles in River Lane	8.38-39
Pedestrian safety at risk from narrower pavements	8.38-39
Highway safety at corner	8.38-39
Pick-up and drop-off	8.24-5, 8.40 + condition
Traffic generation	8.38-8.39
<b>Car parking</b>	
Contractors parking	condition
Disabled parking	8.40
Pressure on car parking	8.40
<b>Other issues</b>	
Images misleading	8.6
If City Council developed the garage area to the north this would create problems	Civil matter
Impact on local doctors and dentists	No policy basis to use this as reason for refusal
Unsatisfactory disabled access	8.23. Not raised by access officer. I
Archaeology	condition

## Planning Obligations

- 8.43 The Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Regulations 2010 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.
- 8.44 In bringing forward my recommendations in relation to the Planning Obligation for this development I have considered these requirements.

- 8.45 The CIL regulations also bring into effect from 6<sup>th</sup> April 2015, new restrictions on the ability of local councils to collect pooled contributions for infrastructure.
- 8.46 The Planning Obligation Strategy (2010) provides a framework for expenditure of financial contributions collected through planning obligations and the Public Art Supplementary Planning Document 2010 addresses requirements in relation to public art. The applicants have indicated their willingness to enter into a S106 planning obligation in accordance with the requirements of the Strategy and relevant Supplementary Planning Documents. The proposed development triggers the requirement for the following community infrastructure:

#### Open Space

- 8.47 The Planning Obligation Strategy requires that all new residential developments, including student accommodation contribute to the provision or improvement of public open space. New student accommodation is included in this requirement unless the institution which the occupying students attend can demonstrate that it already provides suitable open space top meet the Council's standards for all its students including those to be accommodated in the development.
- 8.48 The application proposes 202 student units, each of which is assumed to be occupied by one person. Officers recommend that since the Council's ability to seek pooled contributions will shortly cease, ruling out contributions for overall provision of open space and sports facilities in this part of the city, negotiations with the applicant address the funding of specific named facilities or improvements which will meet the open space and recreation needs of the 202 occupiers of this site. Officers seek delegated authority to negotiate agreement to the funding of such projects on the basis that the scale of such a contribution is calculated using the formulae previously used to seek pooled contributions. In this case, the figures arising from those formulae would be 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	202	48076
1 bed	1.5	238	357		
2-bed	2	238	476		
<b>Total</b>					<b>48076</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	202	54338
1 bed	1.5	269	403.50		
2-bed	2	269	538		
<b>Total</b>					<b>54338</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	202	48884
1 bed	1.5	242	363		
2-bed	2	242	484		
<b>Total</b>					<b>48884</b>

- 8.49 Potential future occupiers of the proposed development might attend institutions which already provide sufficient open space and facilities in these categories. Were this to be ensured through a Section 106 agreement, the level of contribution expected in one or more of the above categories might be significantly reduced or eliminated. Subject to the completion of a S106 planning obligation to secure the requirements of the Planning Obligation Strategy (2010) in accordance with the Cambridge City Council Open Space Standards Guidance for Interpretation and Implementation (2010), I am satisfied that the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 3/8 and 10/1 and the Planning Obligation Strategy 2010 and the Cambridge City Council Open Space Standards Guidance for Interpretation and Implementation (2010).

## Waste

- 8.50 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. My provisional assessment is that on the basis of £39 per student room, a sum of £7878 is required.
- 8.51 Subject to a S106 planning obligation to secure the requirements of the Planning Obligation Strategy (2010), the proposal is in accordance with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 3/7, 3/12 and 10/1 and the Planning Obligation Strategy 2010.

## Public Art

- 8.52 The development is required to make provision for public art and officers have recommended as set out in paragraph 8.15 above that in this case a commuted public art payment to the S106 Public Art Initiative is appropriate, provided that in accordance with the CIL regulations 2010 the contribution is made towards a scheme which contributions from no more than four other schemes have already been made. This commuted sum needs to be secured by the S106 planning obligation.
- 8.53 Subject to the completion of a S106 planning obligation to secure this infrastructure provision, the proposal is in accordance with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 3/7 and 10/1 and the Public Art SPD 2010.

## Planning Obligations Conclusion

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

## **9.0 CONCLUSION**

- 9.1 In my view the principle of student accommodation on this site is acceptable.

- 9.2 The changes made to the scheme since its removal from the Planning Committee agenda of 4<sup>th</sup> December 2014, and the additional information supplied have addressed all the issues which led me to recommend refusal on that occasion. Subject to any concerns the highway authority has about additional transport accommodation being resolved, I now recommend 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. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans as listed on this decision notice.

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

3. Prior to the commencement of development, a Demolition and Construction Environmental Management Plan (DCEMP) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The DCEMP shall include the consideration of the following aspects of demolition and construction:

- a) Demolition, construction and phasing programme.
- b) Contractors' access arrangements for vehicles, plant and personnel including the location of construction traffic routes to, from and within the site, details of their signing, monitoring and enforcement measures.

- c) Construction/Demolition hours shall be carried out between 0800 hours to 1800 hours Monday to Friday, and 0800 hours to 1300 hours on Saturday and at no time on Sundays, Bank or Public Holidays, unless in accordance with agreed emergency procedures for deviation. Prior notice and agreement procedures for works outside agreed limits and hours.
- d) Delivery times for construction/demolition purposes shall be carried out between 0730 to 1800 hours Monday to Friday, 0800 to 1300 hours on Saturdays and at no time on Sundays, bank or public holidays, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the local planning authority in advance.
- e) Soil Management Strategy.
- f) Noise method, monitoring and recording statements in accordance with the provisions of BS 5228-1: 2009.
- g) Maximum noise mitigation levels for construction equipment, plant and vehicles.
- h) Vibration method, monitoring and recording statements in accordance with the provisions of BS 5228-2: 2009.
- i) Maximum vibration levels.
- j) Dust management and wheel washing measures in accordance with the provisions of London Best Practice Guidance: The control of dust and emissions from construction and demolition.
- k) Use of concrete crushers.
- l) Prohibition of the burning of waste on site during demolition/construction.
- m) Site lighting.
- n) Drainage control measures including the use of settling tanks, oil interceptors and bunds.
- o) Screening and hoarding details.
- p) Access and protection arrangements around the site for pedestrians, cyclists and other road users.
- q) Procedures for interference with public highways, including permanent and temporary realignment, diversions and road closures.
- r) External safety and information signing and notices.
- s) Consideration of sensitive receptors.
- t) Prior notice and agreement procedures for works outside agreed limits.
- u) Complaints procedures, including complaints response procedures.
- v) Membership of the Considerate Contractors Scheme.

Reason: To protect the amenity of neighbouring residents and users of the highway. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/4, 4/13 and 8/2

4. Prior to the commencement of development/construction, a noise insulation scheme detailing the acoustic noise insulation performance specification of the external building envelope of the residential units (having regard to the building fabric, glazing and ventilation) to reduce the level of noise experienced in the residential units as a result of the proximity of the habitable rooms to the high ambient noise levels in the area be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The scheme shall achieve the internal noise levels recommended in British Standard 8233:1999 "Sound Insulation and noise reduction for buildings-Code of Practice".

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

Reason: To ensure acceptable living standards for future occupiers. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/7, 3/12, and 4/13)

5. Prior to the commencement of development, a noise report shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority that considers the impact of noise from the neighbouring public house on the bedrooms/living rooms of the development. Following the submission of the 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 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.

To ensure acceptable living standards for future occupiers.  
(Cambridge Local Plan 2006, policies 3/7 and 4/13)

6. Before the development/use hereby permitted is occupied, a scheme for the insulation of the plant in order to minimise the level of noise emanating from the 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 neighbouring occupiers.  
(Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/4 and 4/13)

7. No development approved by this permission shall be COMMENCED prior to a contaminated land assessment and associated remedial strategy, being submitted to the LPA and receipt of approval of the document/documents from the LPA. This applies to paragraphs a), b) and c). This is an iterative process and the results of each stage will help decide if the following stage is necessary.
  - (a) The contaminated land assessment shall include a desk study to be submitted to the LPA for approval. The desk study shall detail the history of the site uses and propose a site investigation strategy based on the relevant information discovered by the desk study. The strategy shall be approved by the LPA prior to investigations commencing on site.
  - (b) The site investigation, including relevant soil, soil gas, surface and groundwater sampling, shall be carried out by a suitable qualified and accredited consultant/contractor in accordance with a quality assured sampling and analysis methodology.
  - (c) A site investigation report detailing all investigative works and sampling on site, together with the results of the analysis, risk assessment to any receptors and a proposed remediation strategy shall be submitted to the LPA. The LPA shall approve such remedial works as required prior to any remediation commencing on site. The works shall be of such a nature as to render harmless the identified contamination given the proposed end use of the site and surrounding environment including any controlled waters.

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

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

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

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

Reason: To protect the future occupiers of the site from pollution (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/7 and 4/13)

8. No development approved by this planning permission shall take place until a scheme that includes the following components to deal with the risks associated with contamination of the site shall each be submitted to and approved, in writing, by the local planning authority:

1) A preliminary risk assessment which has identified: all previous uses; potential contaminants associated with those uses; a conceptual model of the site indicating sources; pathways and receptors; and potentially unacceptable risks arising from contamination at the site.

2) A site investigation scheme, based on (1) to provide information for a detailed assessment of the risk to all receptors that may be affected, including those off site.

3) The results of the site investigation and detailed risk assessment referred to in (2) and, based on these, an options appraisal and remediation strategy giving full details of the remediation measures required and how they are to be undertaken.

4) A verification plan providing details of the data that will be collected in order to demonstrate that the works set out in the remediation strategy in (3) are complete and identifying any requirements for longer-term monitoring of pollutant linkages, maintenance and arrangements for contingency action. Any changes to these components require the express written consent of the local planning authority. The scheme shall be implemented as approved.

Reason: To protect the quality of controlled waters in the local area. (Cambridge Local Plan policy 4/13)

9. If, during development, contamination not previously identified is found to be present at the site then no further development (unless otherwise agreed in writing with the local planning authority) shall be carried out until the developer has submitted a remediation strategy to the local planning authority detailing how this unsuspected contamination shall be dealt with and obtained written approval from the local planning authority. The remediation strategy shall be implemented as approved.

Reason: To protect the quality of controlled waters in the local area (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 3/14).

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

Reasons: To protect the quality of controlled waters in the local area (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 3/14)

11. Piling or any other foundation designs using penetrative methods shall not be permitted other than with the express written consent of the Local Planning Authority, which may be given for those parts of the site where it has been demonstrated that there is no resultant unacceptable risk to groundwater. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To protect the quality of controlled waters in the local area. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 3/14)

12. No development approved by this planning permission shall take place until such time as a scheme to provide surface water drainage has been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority. The scheme shall be fully implemented and subsequently maintained, in accordance with the timing / phasing arrangements embodied within the scheme, or within any other period as may subsequently be agreed, in writing, by the local planning authority.

Reason: To provide a satisfactory method of surface water drainage and to prevent the increased risk or exacerbation of flooding to existing property, and to protect the quality of controlled waters in the local area. (Cambridge Local Plan policies 4/13, 4/16 and 8/18)

13. Prior to the commencement of any development, a scheme for the provision and implementation of pollution control of the water environment shall be submitted and agreed in writing with the Local Authority. The works/scheme shall be constructed and completed in accordance with the approved plans.

Reason: To prevent the increased risk of pollution to the water environment. (Cambridge Local Plan policies 4/13, 4/16 and 8/18)

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

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

15. 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)

16. Full details of all non-masonry walling systems, cladding panels or other external screens including structural members, infill panels, edge, junction and coping details, colours, surface finishes/textures and relationships to glazing and roofing are to be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. This may consist of large-scale drawings and/or samples. Thereafter the development shall be undertaken in accordance with the agreed details unless the local planning authority agrees to any variation in writing.

Reason: To accord with Policy 3/4 and 3/12 of the 2006 Cambridge Local Plan.

17. Full details of all windows and doors, as identified on the approved drawings, including materials, colours, surface finishes/textures are to be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. This may consist of large-scale drawings and/or samples. Thereafter the development shall be undertaken in accordance with the agreed details unless the local planning authority agrees to any variation in writing.

Reason: To accord with Policy 3/4 and 3/12 of the 2006 Cambridge Local Plan.

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

Reason: In the interests of the visual amenity 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 policy 3/12).

19. 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)

20. The development shall not be occupied until a plan for the future management of the proposed street trees has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The approved plan shall be adhered to thereafter.

Reason: To secure adequate replacement trees (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/7 and 4/4)

21. The development shall not be occupied until a programme for the planting of the proposed street trees in River Lane and Rowlinson Way has been agreed with the local planning authority. Tree planting shall be implemented in accordance with the agreed plan.

Reason: To ensure the provision of suitable replacement trees. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 4/4)

22. Prior to the commencement of the development, full details and plans for the on-site storage facilities for waste and 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 to enable collection from within 10m of the kerbside of the adopted highway/ refuse collection vehicle access point. Details should include the on-site storage facilities for waste, including waste for recycling, the storage facilities for the separation of waste for recycling and composting within the individual student flats/clusters, and the arrangements for the disposal of waste detailed; these arrangements shall subsequently be provided and shall include provision for a minimum of 50% recycling/organic capacity. The approved arrangements shall be retained thereafter unless alternative arrangements are agreed in writing by the local planning authority.

Reason: To ensure appropriate arrangements for waste storage and collection. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 3/12)

23. The development hereby approved shall not be occupied until an operational management plan for the site, which provides details of site management, security, delivery handling, waste collection management, litter control and term end pick-up and drop-off arrangements has been submitted to and approved in writing by, the local planning authority. Occupation of the site shall take place only in accordance with the approved management plan.

Reason: To protect the amenity of neighbouring occupiers and highway users, and to ensure efficient operation of the highway network and protect highway safety. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/4, 3/7, 3/12 and 8/2)

**INFORMATIVE:** The applicant is advised that to satisfy the noise insulation condition for the building envelope as required above, the Council expects the scheme to achieve the 'good' internal noise levels of British Standard 8233:1999 '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:** The applicant is advised that to satisfy the condition relating to plant noise, the rating level (in accordance with BS4142:1997) from all plant and equipment, 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).

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:** The Housing Act 2004 introduces the Housing Health & Safety Rating System as a way to ensure that all residential premises provide a safe and healthy environment to any future occupiers or visitors.

Each of the dwellings must be built to ensure that there are no unacceptable hazards for example ensuring adequate fire precautions are installed; all habitable rooms have adequate lighting and floor area etc.

The applicant/agent is advised to contact the Residential Team at Mandela House, 4 Regent Street, Cambridge and Building Control concerning fire precautions, means of escape and the HHSRS

**INFORMATIVE:** The applicant is advised to note the following guidance about waste and recycling storage and collection. Further advice on waste provision for developments is available on our website.

Doors to bin stores should be sufficient in widths to allow the movement of bins at their widest and prevent entrapment of limbs. This is likely to be a minimum of 20cm in addition to the widest bin contained in the bin store.

Walls and doors should have protection strips to prevent damage and a mechanism for holding doors open should be available.

Doors should ideally be keypad entry or standard fire brigade keys. We do not support the use of electronic key fobs.

Roller shutters on bin stores can be considered to save space however the additional noise impacts should be considered.

Dropped kerbs should be provided to allow for ease of movement of bins to the collection vehicle and the pathway should be 1.5m in width taking the most direct route avoiding passing parked cars.

We do not advise the use of bin compactors, as they often cause excessive damage to bins or cause waste to get stuck inside bins. If bin compactors are used on site you should advise your waste collection contractor.

It is noted that in many areas residents are expected to pull bins past parking bays this is not recommended and often leads to bins being left out on the pavements or grassed areas.

For infill applications consideration should be given to parking arrangements alongside or opposite the access to the site. If car parking is currently permitted the consideration of parking restrictions may be required to ensure access is not inhibited.

Bins should be ordered direct from the Council's Waste Strategy team 10 weeks in advance of first occupation to ensure they arrive in time for the first residents moving in.

**1. 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.**

**2. Unless prior agreement has been obtained from the Head of Planning, in consultation with the Chair and Spokesperson of this Committee to extend the period for completion of the Planning Obligation required in connection with this development, if the Obligation has not been completed by 1 June 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 transport mitigation measures, open space, waste storage or public art in accordance with Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/7, 3/8, 3/12, 8/3 and 10/1 as detailed in the Planning Obligation Strategy 2010, the Public Art Supplementary Planning Document 2010 and the Eastern Corridor Area Transport Plan 2002.'

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

**4. DELEGATED AUTHORITY** is to officers to negotiate appropriate contributions to specific projects within the fields of open space provision and transport mitigation measures to a level equivalent to the previous tariffs for pooled contributions. **DELEGATED AUTHORITY** is also **GRANTED** to agree appropriate mitigation measures within a legal agreement to address the concerns outlined in the highway authority's most recent request for additional information.