

## APPENDIX A

### Reasons for recommendation of refusal in December 2014

1. Because of its height, unbroken length and poorly articulated roofline, the Newmarket Road range of the building would be poorly integrated into the locality, reading discordantly against the prevailing character on the north side of this road, creating an uncomfortable discontinuity of scale against the Corner House public house at its eastern end, and causing an unacceptable sense of visual domination for occupiers of houses on the east side of Godesdone Road. The application lacks the robust computer modelling necessary to support its claim that a full four-storey height on Newmarket Road and River Lane would not have a harmful impact on the surrounding context, and would be contrary to the Eastern Gate SPD, policies 3/4, and 3/12 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006, and government guidance on good design in Section 7 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2012.
2. Because of its height, limited articulation, and position hard up against the back of a narrow footway on River Lane, the eastern range of the building would overwhelm the houses on the opposite side of River Lane, overshadowing and visually dominating them to an unacceptable degree, contrary to policies 3/4 and 3/12 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 and government guidance on good design in Section 7 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2012.
3. The limited articulation, and particularly the largely unbroken horizontal form, of the northern Rowlinson Way range and the western 'pavilion' building would create a sense of overbearing bulk which would not respect the character of surrounding buildings in Godesdone Road, River Lane and Beche Road, would be poorly integrated with the locality, and would detract from the character of the Riverside section of City of Cambridge Conservation Area No.1 (Central), contrary to policies 3/1, 3/4, 3/12 and 4/11 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006, and government guidance on good design and conserving the historic environment in Sections 7 and 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2012.
4. The proposed basement courtyard would be heavily shaded because of the scale and massing of the proposed buildings, and would be poorly related to the communal functions of the building at street level. The application also fails to demonstrate that adequate drainage and appropriate tree planting can be reconciled in the courtyard. For these reasons, the landscape design would be poorly related to the function of the building and would not create outdoor space which is usable, safe and enjoyable, contrary to policies 3/7 and 3/11 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 and government guidance on good design in Section 7 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2012.

5. The application fails to demonstrate the deliverability within River Lane of street trees of sufficient scale to enable the eastern range of the building to be well-integrated into the locality and the Riverside section of City of Cambridge Conservation Area No.1 (Central), contrary to policies 3/1, 3/4, 3/11, 3/12, 4/4 and 4/11 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006, and government guidance on good design and conserving the historic environment in Sections 7 and 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2012.
6. The evidence submitted with the application is insufficient to demonstrate that the proposal would not have a harmful impact on the highway network or highway safety, contrary to policies 8/2 and 8/3 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 and government guidance in Section 4 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2012.
7. Occupancy of the speculative purpose-built student accommodation proposed is not limited to full-time students of the University of Cambridge or Anglia Ruskin University, nor do management arrangements exist to ensure occupiers do not keep cars in the city, nor could it be guaranteed that this location is suitably close to the educational institution involved. These issues render the proposal contrary to policy 7/10 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006.
8. The proposed development does not make appropriate provision for open space and sports facilities, waste facilities, public art and monitoring in accordance with Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/7, 3/8, 3/12 and 10/1, and as detailed in the Planning Obligation Strategy 2010, Public Art SPD and the Open Space Standards Guidance for Interpretation and Implementation 2010.