

**Application Number** 14/1797/FUL **Agenda Item**

**Date Received** 14th November 2014 **Officer** Mr Toby Williams

**Target Date** 13th February 2015

**Ward** Market

**Site** Judge Business School Trumpington Street  
Cambridge Cambridgeshire CB2 1AG

**Proposal** Demolition of unlisted former hostel buildings fronting onto Tennis Court Road (Bridget's and Nightingale) and construction of an extension to the former Addenbrooke's Hospital Building for the Cambridge Judge Business School including a link to Keynes House, a new substation and associated cycle parking and landscaping.

**Applicant** University of Cambridge

SUMMARY	<p>The development accords with the Development Plan for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-The replacement building is of high quality design.</li> <li>-The demolition of the hostel buildings is justified.</li> <li>-The setting of the listed buildings would be preserved and the character and appearance of the Conservation Area would be enhanced.</li> </ul>
RECOMMENDATION	APPROVAL

**1.0 SITE DESCRIPTION/AREA CONTEXT**

- 1.1 The site is the old Addenbrooke's hospital (currently occupied by the Judge Business School), Nightingale and Bridget's Hostels which front onto Tennis Court Road, Keynes House and the curtilage of these buildings.
- 1.2 The old Addenbrooke's building is a large Grade II listed building in a prominent position, set back in a formal courtyard

bounded by listed railings to Trumpington Street. It is visible from Tennis Court Road, in glimpse views between the hostel buildings and in longer views from Regent Street.

- 1.3 The old Addenbrooke's building was constructed as a hospital in 1766 when the first patients were admitted. It has been much extended since, notably in the 1860's by Matthew Digby Wyatt. Subsequent to the listing, it was converted for the Judge Business School (JBS) by the architect John Outram and opened in 1996 following the relocation of Addenbrookes hospital to the south of the city. The conversion works undertaken by Outram were radical and extensive. They include two newer brick blocks called the Ark and the Castle that sit on the Tennis Court Road side of the site and extensive internal works, mainly a gallery, to the former hospital building itself that are contained within the 1860's brickwork shell.
- 1.4 The Outram works to the listed building are extremely unusual and specific to the listed building, displaying a colourful array of architectural features inside and outside the building, including new brickwork, door panelling, services and decoration which are now an intrinsic part of the character of the listed building.
- 1.5 Nightingale and Bridget's Hostels are not listed or Buildings of Local Interest. They are currently vacant, most recently occupied by Anglia Ruskin University for 121 students to the summer of 2014.
- 1.6 To the front of the site, facing Trumpington Street, is Keynes House which is curtilage listed.
- 1.6 The site and its buildings fall within the Central Conservation Area.
- 1.7 Opposite and within landscaped grounds are the Downing College buildings, the two closest of which are contemporary additions and not listed. To the north and adjacent to Nightingale Hostel is Kings Hostel, a grade II listed building. To the south, on the same side of the street as Bridget's Hostel, is the University Department of Pharmacology, a modern functional building.

## **2.0 THE PROPOSAL**

- 2.1 The proposal seeks to provide additional teaching, office, breakout and dining spaces for the Judge Business School, in particular for its executive education sector (4,790sqm). The provision of this space requires the removal of the two hostel buildings and the provision of a purpose built facility. Rectangular in shape, it would occupy a footprint and height (with a recessive 4th storey) not dissimilar to the two hostel buildings. It would link to the existing Ark building and the former hospital building via double height, single storey plinth providing a courtyard and landscaped podium space above.
- 2.2 At ground floor level, the main circulation and teaching spaces would be provided together with kitchen and delivery facilities. Upper floors would contain additional kitchen, dining, teaching and meeting spaces. The roof would accommodate a flat solar pv and solar thermal array which would not be visible from street level. The basement would contain plant.
- 2.3 The new building would be constructed from brick, with pre-cast concrete detailing to the windows. It would be set back 600mm further than the existing hostel buildings from Tennis Court road allowing for a widening of the pavement to 2m. The façade of the proposed building onto Tennis Court Road is recessed half way along its length by a 4.5m deep cut at a width of 18m, which allows for a break in the building form and which is occupied by a 2<sup>nd</sup> floor terrace.
- 2.4 Servicing arrangements are unaltered from Tennis Court Road. The main entrance to the JBS would remain from Trumpington Street through the old hospital building, but secondary access into the new building would be available from Tennis Court Road. New cycle parking is proposed. A new substation would be provided to the rear of Keynes House, together with an elevated walkway to the old Addenbrooke's building.
- 2.5 The application is accompanied by the following information.
- Planning Statement
  - Design and Access Statement
  - Heritage Statement
  - Archaeological Evaluation
  - Economic Impact Assessment

- Energy Statement
- Ecological Assessment
- Transport Assessment
- Travel Plan
- Condition and Conversion Survey
- Roof Plant Environmental Noise Assessment
- Ground Investigation Report
- Ventilation and Extraction Report
- Demolition Method Statement

2.6 The application has been amended to address a number of issues raised by consultees. The amendments, which have been subject to further consultation, include:

- Revised plans for the southern elevation and works/link to the Ark building
- Increased cycle parking provision
- Deletion of the removal of the main exterior front door to the old Addenbrooke's building
- Report Investigating the Potential to Retain the Hostel Buildings
- Additional Transport Assessment and Travel Plan Addendum Report

2.7 The proposal is accompanied by a separate application (14/1805/LBC) for listed building consent which is to be considered elsewhere on this agenda. The proposed alterations to the listed building would not be justified if the application for planning permission was refused.

### **3.0 SITE HISTORY**

3.1 There is no relevant planning history for the site.

### **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, 3/11, 3/12, 3/13, 3/14 4/10, 4/11, 4/13, 5/4 7/5, 7/9 8/2, 8/3, 8/6, 8/16 10/1
Key SPD and guidance	Planning Obligation Strategy SPD Central Conservation Appraisal

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

Central Government Guidance	National Planning Policy Framework March 2012 National Planning Policy Framework – Planning Practice Guidance March 2014 Circular 11/95 Ministerial Statement (1 December 2014) by Brandon Lewis Minister of State for Housing and Planning (Department of Communities and Local Government)
-----------------------------	---

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>
City Wide Guidance	Cambridge City Council - Guidance for the application of Policy 3/13 (Tall Buildings and the Skyline) of the Cambridge Local Plan (2006) (2012)
Area Guidelines	<p>Cambridge City Council (2002)–Southern Corridor Area Transport Plan:</p> <p>Cambridge Historic Core Conservation Area Appraisal (2006)</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, there are no policies in the emerging Local Plan of relevance.

## 6.0 CONSULTATIONS

### Cambridgeshire County Council (Highways Development Management)

#### 6.1 *Application as submitted*

##### Traffic and Transport

Holding Objection: Further information is required regarding existing and future trip generation to and from the site. Trumpington Street is identified as an accident cluster site and therefore the County Council request that the applicant consider the manoeuvres associated with the accidents identified.

The proposals include the removal of 15 car parking spaces, with 26 spaces being provided post occupation. Details have not been provided how many staff will be allocated spaces and whether the parking for Browns staff and the car club will remain, therefore further information is required.

There are currently 222 cycle parking spaces provided on site, this is to be increased by 80 additional spaces to 302 spaces. The cycle parking standards require one cycle parking space be provided for all students using the site and 1 for every 2 members of staff. The County Council recommend that cycle parking be provided in accordance with minimum standards.

The Southern Corridor Area Transport Plan is referred to in the policy section of the document although no attempt has been made to calculate the level of contribution. This is required.

Having reviewed the Transport Statement and Travel Plan submitted in support of the application the County Council require that further information be provided prior to being in a position to comment fully on the application.

##### Highway Safety

No objection: The application provides additional footway on the Tennis Court Road frontage of the site. The Highway Authority would be willing to accept any additional footway width as highway maintainable at the public expense and this should be dedicated under Section 37 of the Highways Act 1980.

A Traffic Management Plan condition is recommended.

## 6.2 *Application as amended*

Officer Note: An additional Transport Assessment and Travel Plan Addendum report has been submitted to address the issues raised by the County Council Transport Team. At the time of writing this report, no further comments have been received. I will report these on the Amendment Sheet or orally at Committee.

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

- 6.3 No objection subject to conditions relating to construction and delivery hours, piling and a contaminated land informative.

### **Urban Design and Conservation Team**

## 6.4 *Application as submitted*

In essence, with respect to the demolition of the hostels and replacement building issues, the hostels make a limited positive contribution to the conservation area and there is conflict with Policies 4/10 and 4/11 of the Local Plan, but this should not be an outright obstacle if a suitable replacement building is proposed. With reference to NPPF paragraph 134, the “less than substantial harm” of the demolition would need to be outweighed by the public benefits of the proposal.

### Proposed

The overall concept of providing additional facilities for the Business School to remain on the site is accepted; they have stated that the building and the very particular architecture of John Outram, with the historic building, provide the ‘identity’ of the school.

### *The Hostel Buildings.*

The demolition of the Bridget’s and Nightingale hostels buildings is said to be central to providing the quantity of development proposed by the Judge Business School. There has been some analysis submitted about the potential for reuse of these

buildings. The application contains a report about refurbishing them as hostels/student accommodation – which the Business School say they do not need. There does not however, appear to have been serious consideration of a design that re-uses and extends the existing buildings to provide facilities that the Business School does want. This is required.

### *The Replacement Building.*

The general choice of materials is appropriate. However, in order that they work together cohesively within the building as well as with adjacent buildings, a condition addressing the detailed choice is advised.

### *Scale and massing*

A number of concerns were raised at pre-application stages relating to the bulk and unbroken length of built form along the Tennis Court Road street frontage as well as the loss of glimpsed views between the hostel buildings to the rear elevation of the old Addenbrooke's Hospital Building. The submitted long distance views from the adjacent Downing College site indicate the proposed building will be screened due to the arrangement of existing buildings within the Downing site and the extent of tree cover.

The proposed scheme includes an external roof terrace at second floor level on the Tennis Court Road frontage. The terrace is set back approximately 3.5m and extends approximately 17m in width.

### *East Elevation*

The existing hostel buildings incorporate a number of windows at basement and ground floor level, the majority of which are at head height with few at waist level. Most of these windows are barred and have obscured glazing for privacy.

The submitted scheme proposes a series of vertical windows along the Tennis Court Road. The proportion of glazing at ground floor level has increased from 10% to 20%. The height of the proposed window cills has reduced from 2165mm to 1550mm. The lower cill level is supported.

## *South Elevation*

The south elevation of the existing Bridget's Hostel includes a number of windows and an entrance door at ground floor level. Further thought to the arrangement of materials, detailing, openings and their position is required for this elevation to strengthen its visual presence, proportions and overall composition.

### Conclusion:

Little consideration has been given to an alternative approach whereby benefits could be obtained without demolition of the hostels. The south elevation of the proposed building is unsatisfactory in the visual contribution to the aspect along Tennis Court Road. In terms of the NPPF, any public benefits of the proposals need to be weighed against the (less than substantial) harm of the demolitions.

---

## 6.5 *Application as amended*

There have been a number of meetings with the applicant to discuss the proposals.

The amended/revised plans address the south elevation (to service yard/Tennis Court Road) of the new building; and the east and northern (external) elevations of the "Ark" – the Outram extension of the main building.

Three outstanding areas of concern in relation to the impact of the proposals on heritage assets were recently discussed:

1. Panelling of windows on the east wall of the Ark
2. Panelling of decorative corner pier on northern elevation of the Ark
3. Removal of doors to north entrance/lobby area

Taking each of these matters in turn we comment as follows:

1. In our view, impacts on the Ark remain in relation to the east wall (what will become a corridor) due to the proposed removal of the colourful and particular windows framing/surrounds (beside the coloured brick piers now to be retained). Such

removal is, in our view, detrimental and not agreed at this stage, however we consider that this can be agreed at a later date and to address the matter we suggest a condition to enable acceptable treatment to be agreed.

2. The lower level, including decorative piers, of the northern (external) elevation of the “Ark” would be clad. We understand that the central panels are for aesthetic consideration in order to “tie” the space together with the new lobby area being created. Discussion at the 10<sup>th</sup> March meeting with the applicant, agent and architect revealed that structural constraints necessitated the placing of structural piers at either side/end of this elevation. We questioned in detail the requirement and evidence to justify such piers as they in effect “cover up” a key decorative building feature of the Ark. The agent undertook to supply the Council with further structural information to explain this requirement. We have not yet seen this information, however we now have a better understanding of why a pier is necessary in this location. While undesirable in heritage terms, it was explained that the “grid” construction of the first floor above this lobby area necessitated a pier being placed directly in front of this decorative column.
3. The proposed removal of the original Outram doors in the canted north entrance screen remains a further adverse aspect on the original Outram design – especially for the sake of plain replacements. These are not agreed at this stage so a condition is required to enable acceptable replacement.

Confirmation of the omission from the overall scheme of the removal of the Outram front doors from the main front façade is welcomed and supported.

### Hostel Buildings Report

The report sets out to justify the existing proposals in terms of (what is considered by the applicant) the cellular nature of the hostels and square metre comparisons. The study however does not include an architectural study of other (perhaps radical) options of remodelling and extension.

In terms of the replacement of the Hostels in the conservation area by the proposed block fronting Tennis Court Road, the massing, materials, and more recently the adjustments made to

fenestration of the south facing elevation, are considered acceptable in design terms.

### Conclusion

The revised drawings go some way to ameliorating the concerns set out in our original comments in respect of the impact the proposals on the listed building. However, it remains that conditions are required to still control certain changes as set out above. Finally, before the application is determined it would be helpful to see the promised justification by way of illustration of the structural requirements of the first floor construction outside the canted north screen and to agree same as evidence for the pier referred to in section 2 above.

In addition to these conditions, standard conditions as set out in our previous comments dated 31 December, 2014, are also required.

With the conditions outlined in sections 1 and 3 above and the further evidence requested in section 2, we conclude that the applications are acceptable in design terms and comply with policies 4/10 (Listed Buildings) and 4/11 (Conservation Areas) of the Cambridge Local Plan (2006).

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

- 6.6 No objection: The applicant has submitted a sustainability statement outlining their approach to sustainable design and construction. The document clearly demonstrates that the principles of sustainable design and construction have been integrated into design development. For example, one of the key objectives for the project is to deliver a building that achieves the highest possible environmental and sustainability standards, which is evident in the targeting of a BREEAM 'excellent' rating for the scheme.

Key elements that have been integrated into the design include:

-The creation of efficient floor plates to optimise passive environmental strategies (shallow floor plan and high ceilings to maximise daylighting and natural ventilation);

-Exposed thermal mass in the form of exposed in-situ concrete soffits, combined with secure night ventilation to further assist a passive cooling strategy.

-The integration of shading devices into the architectural design of the building, with the use of pre-cast fins to help prevent excessive solar gain and deep external reveals as part of the façade design.

All of these measures are supported. Other measures being incorporated to help the building achieve the targeted BREEAM 'excellent' rating include:

-The hierarchical approach to reducing energy requirements and associated carbon emissions, which means that the building can achieve the 25% reduction in CO2 emissions compared to Part L 2010;

-The specification of water efficient sanitary ware and appliances to enable achievement of a 40% reduction in potable water use;

-Sustainable sourcing of materials and measures to reduce construction waste.

The applicant has submitted an Energy Statement setting out carbon calculations and a feasibility assessment of a range of renewable energy technologies. The preferred technologies to be utilised are photovoltaic panels and solar thermal panels. Together these technologies are predicted to reduce emissions and represent a 10.3% reduction. This approach is supported.

The overall approach to integrating sustainable design and construction into the design of the scheme, and the proposals related to renewable energy provision are supported.

### **Access Officer**

- 6.7 No objection: Where doors are double and unpowered, one leaf should be at least 800mm. The decoration could include good colour contrast to aid visually impaired users. Raked auditoriums could have wheelchair access at top and bottom of theatres and handrails on steps. This is generally a very good access proposal.

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

### **6.8 *Application as submitted***

I cannot support the application as it currently stands because of the following reasons:

-Although there is a discussion around site discharge there are no actual proposals for what the final surface water discharge rate is to be.

-A plan indicating the contributing areas should be provided to justify the contributing area, any green planting areas however small should be excluded from this calculation.

Whilst the application has demonstrated there is no flood risk to the development by no commitment to a discharge rate it has not demonstrated that flood risk will not be increased as a result of the development.

## **Head of Streets and Open Spaces (Public Art Officer)**

### **6.9 *Application as submitted***

It is disappointing that for such a significant development, advice has not been sought for the inclusion of public art within it at a much earlier stage of the design process and that a Public Art Delivery Plan (PADP) has not been developed to outline how this will be done and by whom. It is crucial that the developer seeks expert advice about how to develop the arts proposals and that the Council's Public Art Officer is contacted as soon as possible to also provide advice. It is crucial that the PADP has details of the budget submitted. Any proposals developed to integrate work within the fabric of the building will require the LA's approval prior to commencement of development.

### ***Application as amended***

Officer note: The applicants have appointed a public art consultancy 'InSite Arts'. A draft PADP has been submitted and I am awaiting further advice from the Public Art Officer

regarding this. I will report any further comments on the amendment sheet or orally at the meeting.

### **English Heritage**

- 6.10 No Objection: English Heritage consider the existing nurses hostel buildings on Tennis Court Road make a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the Central Cambridge Conservation Area and are satisfied that the scale, massing, design and materials of the proposed replacement building, together with the proposed internal and external alterations to the grade II listed Old Addenbrooke's Hospital (now the Judge Business School) building and the proposed link building to Keynes House would not cause harm to the conservation area and are therefore contextually appropriate for this sensitive site. We would have no objection should your authority be minded to approve the application.

### **Environment Agency**

- 6.11 No Objection. Recommend a condition that if, during development, contamination not previously identified is found to be present at the site then no further development shall be carried out until the developer has submitted a remediation strategy to the local planning authority. Informatives regarding surface water drainage, foul water and pollution prevention are recommended.

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

- 6.12 No Objection: In terms of crime, the JBS has seen 7 x crimes recorded in 3 years. These are broken down as 4 x theft related, 2 x stolen cycles and 1 x burglary. The security of the new building has been thoroughly considered. The lecture theatre windows in relation to the footpath on Tennis Court Road should be glazed with laminated glass to minimise the risk of damage. The lecture theatres will be air conditioned, these windows will be non-opening. No further comments are made and there is no objection on crime and disorder grounds.

## **Cambridgeshire County Council (Archaeology)**

- 6.13 The development area was evaluated in 2013 to determine the significance of archaeological remains. The evaluation demonstrated the presence of a cemetery of 14th century or earlier date, most probably associated with the medieval proprietary chapel of St. Edmund. Evidence of Medieval occupation of unknown extent and duration was also found. This archaeological evidence was found to be truncated in the later 18th century due to quarrying ahead of the construction of Addenbrooke's Hospital (now the Judge Business School). In addition, later cemetery evidence is also at the Judge Business School relating to the infirmary cemetery of Old Addenbrooke's Hospital. The archaeological evidence present in the development area is of great significance in terms of the understanding more of the lost parish of St Edmund's and requires excavation in advance of construction.

We do not object to development from proceeding in this location but consider that the site should be subject to a programme of archaeological investigation. A written scheme of investigation has been agreed and a condition to ensure that investigative works are carried out in accordance with it is recommended.

### **Design and Conservation Panel (Meeting of 11 June 2014)**

#### **6.14 1. Presentation - Cambridge Judge Business School – Phase 1**

The Panel's comments are as follows:

- Long and short distant views. Following comments made at the December 2013 site visit, the provision of these views is very much welcomed. The extent of the tree cover in the Downing College/Tennis Court Road as demonstrated in these views is compelling.
- Heritage value of hostel buildings. The Panel were informed by officers that as the original Historic Core Appraisal document did not include buildings that made a positive contribution to the Conservation Area, the value of these hostel buildings was yet to be determined. This is regarded as a crucial issue by the Panel and one that needs urgent clarification. As described in the presentation, these buildings are a part of the character of

Tennis Court Road, but should they be confirmed as heritage assets, a specific case for their demolition or how their loss would be mitigated would need to be made.

- Views facing south along Tennis Court Road
- Courtyard set-back. The Panel would welcome further development of the proposed overhanging planting seen only very faintly in the images provided. This would provide some relief and enhancement to what would otherwise be a stark façade.
- Set-back element (materials). Very little information was provided as to the quality of this element. Further articulation is therefore needed. The Panel note the difficulties in needing to provide glazing appropriate for a social space, versus the impact of additional solar gain for a passively ventilated building.
- Views facing north. The Panel were informed that a screen wall would be used to obscure refuse bins etc. This would make for a very stark/negative experience at street level. The inclusion of additional trees behind this wall is recommended in order to break up this long masonry frontage on Tennis Court Road.
- Rear service yard. The Panel would like to see views maintained of the rear elements of the Outram Building, as this provides some delight for the passer-by at street level.
- Treatment of the Roofscape/roof profile. This was not presented in great detail to the Panel, although all agreed that the inclusion of a 'box' as the highest element would be more appropriate than a pitched roof in this context.
- Materials and detailing. All agreed these would be crucial to the success of the scheme.
- War Memorial. As referred to at the December site visit, there is some evidence to suggest that a historic WW1 war memorial is located on this site, whether within Keynes House or elsewhere. The Panel will look forward to a definitive outcome regarding this matter.
- Cycle parking. The Panel would stress the need for appropriate cycle parking provision to accommodate the additional staff and pupils using the site.

Conclusion:

The design team are praised for their excellent site analysis and clear presentation.

Some reservations were expressed in general terms as to the appropriateness of such a clear break in the façade above 1st floor level and more specifically as to the nature of the set-back element. Greater articulation is needed here.

This proposal relies on the demolition of the existing Nightingale and Bridget hostels however, and some feeling persisted among Panel members that this building's ability to enhance the character and appearance of the Conservation Area was yet to be proven.

VERDICT – GREEN (6), AMBER (1)'

### **Disability Consultative Panel (Meeting of 28 October 2014)**

6.15 Some of the accessible features were commented upon as follows:

The accessible courtyard parking will be retained.

Entrance: The existing heavy double doors will be replaced by power-assisted doors and more glazing. The flush threshold will be retained. A secondary door will be activated by an adjustable sensor. The Panel would welcome some form of tactile directional indicators to aid those approaching the entrance from the street that may be visually impaired.

Atrium - Reception desk: This will be at desk height in the centre of the space.

The Panel would request that the architects consider the distances that ambulant disabled student, lecturers or visitors may need to cross. The Panel would for example welcome benches and other seating in the atrium space in a variety of styles and heights. A walking stick/crutch holder at the reception desk is also recommended. The Panel expressed some concern regarding the potentially hazardous marble flooring, although some assurance was provided in the form of absorbent mats at the entrance and various staff members that would be available to help manage the atrium space.

New signage strategy: With various lift cores, staircases and walkways within the new and existing building, the need for a 2 year signage project has been identified. The Panel note that

interim measures will be in place in anticipation of this main project.

Accessible lecture theatres: The Panel welcomes the inclusion of hearing induction loops in all teaching and meeting room spaces as well as the exploration into wider door widths and movable lecture theatre furniture. However, consideration also needs to be shown towards disabled lecturers who may need a ramp or handrail to reach the stage and a table instead of a lectern.

Tennis Court Road pavement: The Panel welcomed the proposal to widen the footpath, as this is currently a narrow road where high speed vehicular movements can make this a hostile environment for pedestrians and wheelchair users.

### Conclusion

The Panel welcome the variety of accessible features included in this proposal and the fact that disabled students had been approached to provide comments at an early stage.

6.16 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 I have not received any representations from third parties.

## **8.0 ASSESSMENT**

8.1 From the consultation responses 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. Amenity of adjacent occupiers
7. Refuse arrangements
8. Highway safety

- 9. Car and cycle parking
- 10. Planning Obligation Strategy

## **Principle of Development**

- 8.2 The issues of principle can be placed into two main categories. Firstly, there is the question of the loss of the student accommodation use which has to be balanced against the public benefits of strengthening the Judge Business School's (JBS) educational provision. Secondly, there is the proposed physical loss of the two hostel buildings which has to be balanced against whether the replacement building is an acceptable alternative in terms of its design and contribution to the character and setting of the Conservation Area and adjacent listed buildings.

### *Loss of Student Use*

- 8.3 Policy 5/4 states that in cases of redevelopment and change of use that the loss of residential accommodation will not be permitted unless it can be demonstrated that:
- a) the property is unfit for human habitation and cannot be rehabilitated;
  - b) it is a subsidiary part of a non-residential property;
  - c) it is a Listed Building which can be best preserved through a change of use;
  - d) it is necessary for the provision of community facilities for which there is a need in Cambridge; or
  - e) the lost accommodation is replaced by at least an equivalent amount of new residential floorspace. Such provision will be made on site unless otherwise agreed.
- 8.4 The hostels have been occupied by Anglia Ruskin University students since 1990 on a leasehold arrangement which came to an end in 2014. They are currently vacant but did accommodate approximately 121 students.
- 8.5 In relation to criteria a), the application is accompanied by a Condition Survey report which concludes that whilst the hostel buildings are not unfit for human habitation, they could not be viably converted into modern student accommodation. The application does not accord with criteria a.

- 8.6 Criteria b and c are not relevant.
- 8.7 With reference to criteria d, policy 5/11 excludes University teaching accommodation from the definition of a community facility. It could not therefore be argued that the loss of the housing is necessary for the provision of a community facility. The terms of this criterion are not met.
- 8.8 With reference to criteria e, the applicants state that the Old Press/Mill Lane site will be likely to make provision for 200 student units and that the University is planning an additional 280 student units for phase 1 at North West Cambridge. I am not aware of a causal relationship between the loss of ARU student accommodation from the application site and the provision of additional University of Cambridge student accommodation. Neither is there a direct relationship with the site and the provision of additional accommodation for Anglia Ruskin University students at CB1 where ultimately 1,250 units could be occupied by ARU students and for whom progress has been made in provision at the former Brunswick site under policy 7/9 of the Local Plan. This accommodation was not put forward and approved as full or partial replacement for lost accommodation for ARU from the hostels.
- 8.9 In my view, criteria e of policy 5/4 is not satisfied. In my opinion, however, evidence of student completions and commitments (3,133 units) since the start of the plan period for the emerging Local Plan, demonstrates that the loss of the site for housing either ARU or University of Cambridge students would not significantly prejudice their respective student housing need. On this basis, I see no harm arising from the loss of the student units against the provisions of policy 5/4 even though none of the criteria are met. This loss must, in any case, be balanced against the needs of the JBS which are supported under policy 7/5, and discussed below.

*The needs and economic impact of the Judge Business School*

- 8.10 Policy 7/5 promotes the development or redevelopment of University sites in the City Centre. It states that such proposals will be permitted if they allow improved facilities, a reduction in parking, improvement to external environment and amenity space and better use of land. In my view, the proposal accords with all of these criteria, particularly in making better use of land.

8.11 The JBS is a provider of education and research. It has been located on the old Addenbrookes site in the city centre for 15 years and has grown substantially in that time, both in size and reputation.

8.12 The application is accompanied by a report on the impact of the JBS on the City of Cambridge and its economy, which goes some way to demonstrating a wider public economic benefit from allowing the proposal.

8.13 The impact can be summarised as follows:

1. Practical involvement of students with local companies.
2. Start-up Assistance: 'Accelerate Cambridge' nurturing new Cambridge start-ups
3. Entrepreneurship: Providing education for entrepreneurs
4. Education in Business and Management.
5. Research: Work done by the Centre for Business Research on the region's economic activity and how the presence of the University affects it.
6. Executive Education.
7. Employment and Expenditure: 200 staff, 550 students and other visiting participants such as Executive Education delegates, represents around 4% of the University of Cambridge overall as measured in terms of expenditure

8.14 In particular, the JBS state:

'...we are severely constrained in our ambitions by the shortcomings in our physical space. Our facilities are neither extensive enough nor good enough to support growth and compare poorly with our direct competitors, many of whom are in the process of improving their facilities even further e.g. Oxford Said Business School, who last year completed phase two of a four phase expansion programme and London Business School, who are refurbishing the old Marylebone Town Hall for educational purposes. Recognising this threat we have initiated plans to expand our footprint on our city centre site with the support of the university and with significant philanthropic donations. If these plans can be realised then we can move forward with confidence, building on the successful progress of the past ten years.

We believe that the future success of this business school and the prosperity of the city are aligned and we trust that readers of this report will share that view and determine that we find ways to work together to achieve our ambitions.'

- 8.15 In my view, the proposed JBS extensions will have a positive economic impact on the local economy. The JBS has put forward a robust case for a need to remain on the existing site. The difficulties with the current JBS accommodation will be rectified through the new building. The need to maintain a competitive edge with other business schools and improve existing facilities in this location is justified. With regard to policy 5/4 and lost student accommodation as weighed against the benefits of improving the JBS's accommodation under policy 7/5, there is, in my opinion, a justifiable and strong argument for accepting the proposal in principle.

#### *Loss of the Hostel Buildings*

- 8.16 The proposal would involve the demolition of the two hostel buildings and their replacement with a purpose designed building for the JBS.
- 8.17 Notwithstanding that officers agree that the buildings are not worthy of being locally listed as non-designated heritage assets, the hostel buildings do have a limited positive impact on the character and appearance of the Conservation Area by virtue of their following qualities:
- Scale and height: being relative to nearby buildings
  - Materials: traditional Gault brick and slate
  - Fenestration: multi-pane, characteristic of the surrounding streets
  - Discrete block form and spacing: in particular in context with Kings Hostel but also Downing College.
  - Embellishment: particularly the southernmost (Bridget's) hostel having attractive red brick detailing.
  - Glimpse views: through to the Addenbrooke's building.
  - Break in building form.

8.18 An additional report was submitted by the applicants in order to establish whether the current hostel buildings are capable of adaptation by the JBS. This concludes that:

- The retention and reuse of the hostel buildings would reduce the available area by approximately 1,000m<sup>2</sup>. The spaces that could be provided would be compromised in their scale which would further reduce the extent of the elements from the brief that could be achieved within the existing hostel buildings.
- To enable the large scale spaces to be located within the existing buildings there would need to be significant and costly structural alteration, which would be likely to result in a scheme where the majority of the internal structure is removed - a facade retention proposal.
- There would need to be significant amendments to the building services, beyond the replacement of the all the listing services, this would include the replacement and upgrading of all the windows and major thermal improvements to walls and the roof to bring the existing buildings in line with the current Building Regulations.

8.19 I accept that it would not possible to accommodate the needs of the JBS within the current buildings on site. I place little merit on the potential for a façade retention scheme only and this has not been specifically sought by either the Council's Urban Design and Conservation team or English Heritage. However, the buildings are not structurally unsound and could probably continue in student use subject to the necessary investment. As such, the proposed demolition is in conflict with policies 4/10 and 4/11 of the Local Plan but, in my view, and that of Conservation Officers and English Heritage, this should not be an outright obstacle if a suitable replacement building is proposed.

8.20 With reference to NPPF paragraph 134, the "less than substantial harm" of the demolition needs to be outweighed by the public benefits of the proposal. One part of these public benefits is the wider economic impact of strengthening the JBS education offer that would be brought about. The second is the contribution the new building would make to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area and setting of the adjacent listed buildings compared to that existing.

- 8.21 In my opinion, whilst there is conflict with policies 4/10 and 4/11, in light of NPPF guidance, this should not necessarily be an outright obstacle to accepting demolition of the hostel buildings. Subject to a suitable replacement building being proposed, the principle of the development is acceptable and in accordance with Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies, 5/4, 7/9, 4/10 and 4/11.

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

- 8.22 The overall concept of providing additional facilities for the JBS to remain on the site is accepted by Conservation Officers, the Design & Conservation Panel and English Heritage. The way in which these additional facilities are provided affects the listed building, its setting and the townscape of some of the most prominent streets in the conservation area.

#### *Scale and Massing*

- 8.23 The proposed building rises to 4 storeys and is approximately 0.5m higher than the existing roofline of Bridget's Hostel and 0.75m higher than Nightingale Hostel. At 3rd floor level it is set-back 4m on the east and north elevations and 1m on the south elevation. The scale of the building, in comparison to that existing, is acceptable.
- 8.24 Previously there were concerns regarding the massing and unbroken length of the building with particular reference to the loss of the glimpse view between the hostels from Tennis Court Road to the back of the old Addenbrooke's building. Officers have accepted that long-distance views from Downing College between the hostel buildings do not appear to be readily apparent because of the extent of tree cover (both deciduous and coniferous) and the limited angle of view from Downing. The Design & Access Statement provides a number of studies which demonstrates this. In my opinion, the gap between the buildings does not form an important view from within the Conservation Area and is not crucial to the setting of the old Addenbrooke's building either from Tennis Court Road or Downing.
- 8.25 Oblique views of the scheme up and down Tennis Court Road are important. The Design & Access Statement demonstrates through a series of CGI's that the proposed set-back in the

middle of the building is of sufficient depth (4.5m) to suggest a break in building form and help preserve the existing sense of rhythm and spacing of buildings. This is accepted by the Urban Design and Conservation team and addresses issues raised by the Design and Conservation Panel.

### *Southern Façade*

- 8.26 The southern façade of the new build would be prominent along Tennis Court Road. The existing view of Bridget's hostel presents a fine grain of detailing and a strong composition of windows and balance of solid and void terminating at ground level.
- 8.27 The proposal has been amended to strengthen the southern façade with the introduction of larger windows and a rebalancing of the proportions and positions of openings. The Urban Design and Conservation team are now satisfied with how this elevation would appear. I agree with their assessment.

### *Eastern Facade*

- 8.28 The existing hostel buildings incorporate a number of windows at basement and ground floor level, the majority of which are at head height with few at waist level. Most of these windows are barred and have obscured glazing for privacy.
- 8.29 The proposed façade has been revised to lower the windows onto Tennis Court Road which, whilst preserving the privacy of associated lecture rooms, provides more animation at street level. The Design & Access Statement compares the existing extent of openings from the hostel building with those proposed. The proposal compares favourably and would provide a greater degree of animation at street level to improve the pedestrian experience. The pre-cast concrete fins to the windows would give deep reveals to the openings and would work well in giving modulation to the façade.

### *Listed Building Interventions*

- 8.30 There has been concern whether the joins between the proposal and the more recent Ark building by Outram have been successfully delivered to minimise the loss of listed fabric.

8.31 Four key issues were highlighted by Conservation Officers. I outline how these issues have been addressed by the applicants below:

*1: Front Door*

8.32 The applicants originally proposed the removal of the external front door to the old Addenbrooke's building. This is part & parcel of what appears to be Outram's conversion and visually signifies the vibrancy of the architecture contained behind it. The proposal would have removed an important visual component of the building in favour of a glazed entrance door. The applicants have removed this element of their proposal from the scheme.

*2: Eastern Elevation of the Ark*

8.33 This elevation currently exhibits multi-coloured brickwork columns. The columns were originally proposed as being over-clad. Officers considered the brickwork, by Outram, was of importance and required being revealed rather than hidden. The applicants have responded by revealing the brick columns of the Ark building and providing a light-weight glazing system above. I have recommended condition 4 on the associated application for listed building consent to ensure that agreement is reached regarding the extent of loss of the window frames between the brick columns.

*3: Northern and Western Elevations of the Ark*

8.34 The applicants also propose the brickwork in this location to be partially clad. The plans have been amended to lessen the extent of cladding and officers have met with the applicants to clarify the structural constraints of new columns having to be placed in front of existing columns. A further structural report has been provided which justifies the positioning of the new structural columns and I am confident that the interface is satisfactory.

*4: Outram Doors on the Canted Elevation*

8.35 The proposal includes the removal of the original Outram doors in the canted north entrance screen. This removal remains a concern to officers and does not appear necessary. Plain

glazed replacements are proposed which would open up internal views of the new foyer area. The removal of these doors is not agreed at this stage. Condition 3 is recommended on the associated application for listed building consent to enable an acceptable replacement.

### *Overall*

- 8.36 There is no question that the proposal is a well thought-out extension to the old Addenbrooke's hospital building. The scale is acceptable and the means of linking the old to the new via a landscaped podium will make efficient use of otherwise underused spaces. The relatively plain architectural design of the proposal gives more of a clinical impression than the old hospital building to which it adjoins. That said, the design and modular detailing with deep reveals and use of high quality materials is impressive and has the support of the Urban Design and Conservation team, English Heritage and the Design and Conservation Panel. To my mind, the replacement building would improve the character and appearance of the Conservation Area and the setting of adjacent listed buildings. It is therefore compliant with policies 3/12, 3/14 and 4/11 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006. Whilst the demolition of the hostels is in conflict with policy 4/10, the quality of the replacement building and the improvement to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area is a significant public benefit and together with the economic benefits the strengthening of the JBS education offer would bring, the proposal accords with paragraph 134 of the NPPF (2012).

---

### **Public Art**

- 8.37 The application did not originally include a public art delivery plan (PADP). This has now been submitted from public art consultants InSite Arts. The PADP includes two strands.
- 8.38 The first is to create a permanent work for the new building. The PADP states:

‘The general public will not have access into this new building. Therefore it is most appropriate that a permanent artwork is developed for the school on the exterior of the building along Tennis Court Road and/ or

on its South Elevation to give public access to this artwork...A permanent artwork could be integrated within the Southern Elevation of the new building to Tennis Court Road. This work may form part of the elevation or be applied to the elevation. The appointed artist and Stanton Williams will work together to agree the best and most appropriate location for the proposed artwork'

8.39 The PADP includes an indicative programme and a suggested budget of £132,200 for this.

8.40 The second strand is to provide a temporary work with the aim of sharing the story of the old Addenbrookes building, its arts programme and the future of the JBS. The PADP states that it would include:

- '1. Specially commissioned temporary events from local artists and art organisations from the city.
2. Partnerships with existing arts events and programmes linked to wider city initiatives.
3. Dialogue with the Fitzwilliam Museum, to explore the possibility of the Forecourt becoming an extended venue to the Museums Outdoor Gallery or explore possibilities for a relationship between the two buildings.
4. Working with art institutions, potentially Anglia Ruskin School of Art, with work from this relationship being exhibited.'

8.41 The PADP includes an indicative programme for the temporary work and a suggested budget of £45,000 for this.

8.42 The PADP also includes a proposed management structure and artist selection process. It recommends close involvement with the chosen artists and the architects Stanton Williams.

8.43 I am awaiting feedback from the Council's Public Art Officer on the submitted PADP and will report this on the amendment sheet or orally at Committee.

### **Renewable energy and sustainability**

8.44 The building would be targeted to be built to BREEAM excellent. The design of the building includes: shallow floor plans and high ceilings to maximise daylighting and natural

ventilation; exposed thermal mass, with passive cooling technology; and the integration of shading devices to help prevent excessive solar gain. The building is predicted to achieve a 25% reduction in CO2 emissions compared to Part L of the 2010 Building Regulations. The Council's Sustainability Officer supports these measures.

- 8.45 The applicant has submitted an Energy Statement setting out carbon calculations to satisfy the 10% renewables requirement under policy 8/16. This proposes solar photovoltaic and solar thermal panels which are predicted to represent a 10.3% reduction in carbon emissions. This approach is supported.
- 8.46 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**

- 8.47 The application includes a comprehensive Access Statement demonstrating that an inclusive environment will be created. Both the Council's Access Officer and the Disability Consultative Panel have commented on and support the proposal. The Access Statement confirms flush thresholds between new and old; tactile directional indicators; a low desk height reception; accessible lecture theatres; hearing induction loops in all reception, teaching and meeting room spaces; the retention of 4 disabled car parking spaces; and a signage strategy
- 8.48 In my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 3/7 and 3/12.

### **Amenity of Adjacent Occupiers**

Impact on amenity of neighbouring occupiers

- 8.49 Neighbours include the grounds and buildings of Downing College to the east, Kings Hostel to the north and laboratory buildings to the south. There are no dwellings affected by the proposal. Because the scale of building is very similar to that existing, I do not consider that the visual impact of the proposed building from any of these neighbouring buildings would be

harmful. The application includes shadow plans, which demonstrates a negligible impact in terms of overshadowing to Kings Hostel compared to the existing situation.

8.50 I note that the Environmental Health Officer has recommended conditions regarding construction and delivery hours, dust and piling. The Highways Officer has recommended a Traffic Management Plan condition for construction traffic. I propose conditions 3, 4, 5 and 15 accordingly.

8.51 In my opinion the proposal adequately respects the amenity of its neighbours and the constraints of the site and I consider that it is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 3/4 and 3/7.

### **Refuse Arrangements**

8.52 The proposal would utilise the existing service yard off Tennis Court Road for deliveries and refuse collection. An internal storage area for bins is proposed within the internal layout. This is satisfactorily located and is of adequate size to serve the building.

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

### **Highway Safety**

8.54 The Highways Officer has not raised any concern with regard to the impact of the scheme on highway safety. I recommend condition 14 to ensure that the additional pavement width is provided onto Tennis Court Road.

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

### **Car and Cycle Parking**

#### *Car Parking*

8.56 Existing car parking is provided across three main areas of the site; in front of Keynes House, to the rear of Keynes House and behind Nightingale Hostel. The total number of spaces is to be reduced from 41 to 26, mainly because of the loss of those

spaces to the rear of Nightingale Hostel for the new build. The approach to the reduction in car parking is acceptable and together with the implementation of a Travel Plan, this will ensure that sustainable travel to and from the site is promoted. There is already a car club space on site and the applicants have confirmed that it will remain.

### *Cycle Parking*

- 8.57 The site currently has 292 cycle parking spaces. A further 80 spaces were proposed as part of the original application. This has been subsequently increased by 24 spaces, meaning 396 cycle spaces in total are proposed.
- 8.58 The cycle parking standards require that 1 cycle space be provided for every 2 members of staff. 270 staff are forecast at the JBS, requiring 135 cycle parking spaces for staff.
- 8.59 The cycle parking standards require that cycle parking be provided for all students using the site. The total maximum number of students using the site in any given hour is estimated at 404.
- 8.60 The standards therefore require a total of 539 cycle spaces to be provided and the application is 143 spaces short (539-396).
- 8.61 Paragraph 1.2 of the standards, states that some flexibility for the historic core area of the city where land constraints may make application of the standards difficult for change of use or refurbishment will be applied. In my view, the applicants have sought to meaningfully increase their cycle parking provision and some flexibility should be applied in this case. The cycle stands would all be a mixture of Sheffield hoops and Falco racking. Internally within the Ark building, shower and changing facilities would be provided together with locker space.
- 8.62 In my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 8/6 and 8/10.

## **Planning Obligation Strategy**

## Planning Obligations

8.63 The Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010 have introduced the requirement for all local authorities to make an assessment of any planning obligation in relation to three tests. If the planning obligation does not pass the tests then it is unlawful. The tests are that the planning obligation must be:

- (a) necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms;
- (b) directly related to the development; and
- (c) fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development.

In bringing forward my recommendations in relation to the Planning Obligation for this development I have considered these requirements. The Planning Obligation Strategy (2010) provides a framework for expenditure of financial contributions collected through planning obligations. The 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:

### Transport

8.64 Contributions towards catering for additional trips generated by proposed development are sought where 50 or more (all mode) trips on a daily basis are likely to be generated. The site lies within the Southern Corridor Area Transport Plan where the contribution sought per trip is £369.

8.65 The applicants have submitted a transport assessment on which the following assessment of additional trips and contributions is based.

-226 additional trips x £369 = £83,394.

8.66 However, the applicants state that they do not believe it reasonable or justifiable to continue collecting contributions at a

rate of £369 per trip given that 6 schemes totalling £5,150,000 have now been implemented within the Southern Corridor. They state that the contribution per generated trip should be reduced to £143 resulting in a revised SCATP contribution of £32,207 (bearing in mind the scheme would result in a 27% reduction in car trips).

8.67 The County Council Transport team has not responded to the latest addendum to the TA. I am mindful that a revised contribution rate may be unacceptable to the County. I will report any further comments from the Transport team on the amendment sheet or orally at the meeting.

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

#### Public Art

8.69 The development is required to make provision for public art and officers have recommended as set out in paragraphs 8.36 to 8.42 above that in this case provision for public art should be made on site. This needs to be secured by the S106 planning obligation.

8.70 Subject to the completion of a S106 planning obligation to secure this infrastructure provision, I am satisfied that the proposal accords with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 3/7 and 10/1 and the Public Art SPD 2010.

#### Travel Plan

8.71 The application includes a Travel Plan which has been revised to address a number of issues raised by the County Council. It includes measures such as:

- The retention of a Car Club space on site
- Modal shift targets
- Travel Information Packs for staff and students
- The appointment of a Travel Plan Co-ordinator
- A basic bicycle repair kit available on site
- 'Doctor Bike' visits and bike security marking.
- Promotion of the existing UoC cycle-to-work salary sacrifice scheme.

- Promotion of the UoC-wide subsidised fares for travel via the Uni4 bus service
- Promotion of Train season ticket discounts through membership of the Cambridge Travel for Work (TfW) Partnership, providing a 10% discount for season tickets,
- Car share promotion

8.72 The provisions of the Travel Plan can be safeguarded through the S106.

### Planning Obligations Conclusion

8.73 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 The principle of development is acceptable. The scale of the proposal would be in keeping with existing buildings. The design of the new build would improve the character and appearance of the Conservation Area and setting of adjacent listed buildings. Subject to conditions, specific works to the listed fabric of the Ark building would be acceptable. Overall the proposal would provide much needed space for the Judge Business School in a well-designed building.

## **10.0 RECOMMENDATION**

**APPROVE** subject to completion of the s106 Agreement, in accordance with advice from Cambridgeshire County Council Transport Team regarding SCATP payments and/or other contributions towards specified highway infrastructure works, by 1 June 2015 and the following conditions:

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

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

2. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans as listed on this decision notice.

Reason: In the interests of good planning, for the avoidance of doubt and to facilitate any future application to the Local Planning Authority under Section 73 of the Town and Country Planning Act 19.

3. Except with the prior written agreement of the local planning authority in writing no construction work or demolition shall be carried out or plant operated other than between the following hours: 0800 hours to 1800 hours Monday to Friday, 0800 hours to 1300 hours on Saturday and at no time on Sundays, Bank or Public Holidays.

Reason: In order to safeguard the amenity of adjacent occupiers (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 4/13).

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

Reason: In order to safeguard the amenity of adjacent occupiers (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 4/13).

5. Prior to any piling taking place the applicant shall provide the local authority with a report / method statement for approval detailing the type of piling and mitigation measures to be taken to protect local residents noise and or vibration. Potential noise and vibration levels at the nearest noise sensitive locations shall be predicted in accordance with the provisions of BS 5228-1&2:2009 Code of Practice for noise and vibration control on construction and open sites. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: In order to safeguard the amenity of adjacent occupiers (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 4/13).

6. The roof top plant shall be installed and shall work within the operational parameters as set out in the "Roof Plant - Environmental Noise Assessment" report dated 3rd October 2014, prepared by Applied Acoustic Design.

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

7. The demolition of the buildings and the control over dust shall be carried out in accordance with the submitted Demolition Method Statement of 23rd October 2014.

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

8. All ventilation and extraction equipment shall be installed in accordance with the "Ventilation and Extraction Report", prepared by ARUP, dated 3rd October 2014.

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

9. With the exception of any demolition and underground enabling works, no development shall commence until details of the surface water drainage for the site have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The drainage works shall be constructed in accordance with the approved details prior to the occupation of any part of the development hereby approved.

Reason: In order to ensure adequate means of surface water drainage NPPF 2012

10. No demolition of the Bridget's or Nightingale Hostels shall be commenced until evidence of the full funding and the indicative programme for the construction of the replacement building hereby approved has been first submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In the interests of safeguarding the character and appearance of the Conservation Area (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 4/11).

11. Prior to the removal of any existing foundations and prior to any excavation or construction of new foundations/piles, a system of monitoring the nearby listed buildings/structures for movement shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The submission shall include details of acceptable parameters, frequency and accuracy of measurements, location of monitoring points, etc. Should movement outside the agreed parameters be detected, work on site will cease and the Local Planning Authority and structural engineers will be notified immediately. Thereafter the monitoring shall be undertaken in accordance with the agreed details.

Reason: To protect the adjacent buildings from harm (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 4/10).

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

Reason: In the interests of the visual amenity of the Conservation Area and to ensure that the quality and colour of the detailing of the brickwork/stonework and jointing is acceptable and maintained throughout the development (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/12 and 4/11).

13. Prior to their installation, the details of the following shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority:

A: Window design, including sills, lintels, jambs, transoms, mullions, thresholds and reveal depths.

B: All non-masonry walling systems, cladding panels or other external screens including structural members, infill panels, edge, junction details, colours, surface finishes/textures and relationships to glazing and roofing.

C: All masonry (stone, artificial stone, terracotta, brick, faience, etc.) wall or parapet copings including cross-sections and drips.

D: Full details of the means of re-siting of any commemorative plaque(s) salvaged from the demolished buildings.

The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: In the interests of the visual amenity of the Conservation Area (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 4/11).

14. Prior to the occupation of the new building, the additional footway on the Tennis Court Road frontage of the site shall be constructed and provided to an adoptable standard and thereafter remain publicly accessible as if it were part of the public highway for the purposes of its use.

In the interests of improving the public realm and pavement width (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/4, 3/7, 8/2).

15. No demolition or construction works shall commence until a traffic management plan has been agreed in writing by the Planning Authority. It shall include the following:
  - i. Movements and control of muck away lorries (all loading and unloading should be undertaken off the adopted public highway).
  - ii. Contractor parking, all such parking should be within the curtilage of the site and not on street.
  - iii. Movements and control of all deliveries (all loading and unloading should be undertaken off the adopted public highway).
  - iv. Control of dust, mud and debris.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 8/2).

16. If the buildings are scheduled for demolition during the bird breeding season, a check shall be carried out for nesting birds. If any active bird nests are identified, they should be left undisturbed until the chicks have fledged.

Reason: In order to protect existing wildlife (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 4/3).

17. The Archaeological works shall be carried out in accordance with the submitted 'Specification for Archaeological Monitoring at The Judge Institute' prepared by the Cambridge Archaeological Unit, dated 10 March 2015.

Reason: In order to protect historic features of the site (Cambridge Local Plan policies 3/4 and 4/10).

18. The proposed on-site renewable energy technologies shall be fully installed and operational prior to the occupation of the approved building and shall thereafter be maintained and remain fully operational.

Reason: In the interests of reducing carbon dioxide emissions (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 8/16).

19. The cycle parking as shown on the approved plans shall be provided in full prior to the occupation of the building.

Reason: In order to ensure timely provision and promote cycling to and from the site (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 8/2)

## **INFORMATIVES**

### S106

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

### Works to the Highway

This development involves work to the public highway that will require the approval of the County Council as Highway Authority. It is an OFFENCE to carry out any works within the public highway, which includes a public right of way, without the permission of the Highway Authority. Please note that it is the applicant's responsibility to ensure that, in addition to planning permission, any necessary consents or approvals under the Highways Act 1980 and the New Roads and Street Works Act 1991 are also obtained from the County Council.

No part of any structure may overhang or encroach under or upon the public highway unless licensed by the Highway Authority and no gate / door / ground floor window shall open outwards over the public highway. Public Utility apparatus may be affected by this proposal. Contact the appropriate utility service to reach agreement on any necessary alterations, the cost of which must be borne by the applicant.

#### Contaminated Land

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

#### Considerate Contractors

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

**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 and public art in accordance with Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/7, 3/12, 8/3 and 10/1 as detailed in the Planning Obligation Strategy 2010, the Public Art Supplementary Planning Document 2010 and the Southern 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, delegated authority is sought to allow officers to negotiate and complete the Planning Obligation required in connection with this development**