

Application Number	15/0398/FUL	Agenda Item	
Date Received	27th February 2015	Officer	Mr Tony Collins
Target Date	29th May 2015		
Ward	Abbey		
Site	8, 10 And 10A Cheddars Lane And 351-355 Newmarket Road Cambridge Cambridgeshire CB5 8LD		
Proposal	Erection of student accommodation with 321 student rooms (following demolition of existing buildings), together with ancillary accommodation comprising common/study rooms, porters lodge, laundry room, plant room, bin and bike enclosures, landscaping and associated infrastructure including a sub-station.		
Applicant	Wrenbridge (Cheddars) Lane C/O Agent		

<p>SUMMARY</p>	<p>The development accords with the Development Plan for the following reasons:</p> <p>The loss of the existing uses on site, including some Class B2 uses, is in accordance with policy 7/3 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 and guidance in the Framework.</p> <p>The proposal would not have an unacceptable impact on the residential amenity of neighbouring occupiers.</p> <p>The proposal would create a high-quality living environment for future occupiers.</p> <p>The proposal not to provide car parking space on site is acceptable, and in accordance with policy 8/10 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 and</p>
-----------------------	---

	government guidance on sustainable transport in the Framework.
RECOMMENDATION	APPROVAL

1.0 SITE DESCRIPTION/AREA CONTEXT

- 1.1 The site (0.72 ha) is on the north-west side of Newmarket Road, immediately beyond its junction with Cheddars Lane. It is broadly L-shaped, extending approximately 130m north-west from Newmarket Road, and approximately 130 north-east from Cheddars Lane, partly encircling the retail site which accommodates the premises of Wickes and Staples.
- 1.2 The site faces the Tesco car park across Cheddars Lane and is surrounded by mixed uses, with terraced houses to the south-west on the corner of Cheddars Lane and to the north on Stanley Road, the Kingdom Hall to the north-east, and the City Church and small commercial and industrial units to the north-west on Cheddars Lane.
- 1.3 The site lies outside the Riverside section of City of Cambridge Conservation Area No.1 (Central), the nearest point of which is about 90m away to the NW, at the entrance to the Museum of Technology site. The site is not a protected industrial site. It lies outside the Controlled Parking Zone. A small portion of the Newmarket Road frontage of the site, along with the adjoining terraced houses at 1-7 Cheddars Lane, and the whole of the Wickes/Staples site (393-395 Newmarket Road) lie within Character Area 2 of the Newmarket Road Suburbs and Approaches Study 2011. The Wickes/Staples building is considered in the study to be one which detracts from the character of the area. There are no protected trees on or adjacent to the site.

2.0 THE PROPOSAL

- 2.1 The application proposed 321 student rooms, arranged in ten buildings spreading out from an entrance and porters' lodge at the western corner of the site where the two arms of the 'L' meet on the Cheddars Lane frontage.

- 2.2 Block J(two storeys) would occupy the relatively short (24m) frontage on Newmarket Road. This block, and Blocks A(2/3 storeys), H(3/4 storeys) and I(3 storeys) would surround two lawned courtyards in the south-eastern arm of the site. Block A would face on to Cheddars Lane, while Blocks H and I would back on to the Wickes and Staples site. Block A would include the porters' lodge on the ground floor, and Block H would include communal facilities including a laundry and a large common room facing into the 'first', paved, courtyard immediately behind the porters' lodge.
- 2.3 The northern arm of the site would be occupied by a long landscaped space, reaching from the entrance gates to the northern edge of the site. This would be flanked by Blocks B(three storeys), C(four storeys), D(four storeys) and E(three storeys) on the north-west side, and Blocks F(three storeys) and G(four storeys) on the south-east side. Single-storey cycle stores would fill the spaces between most of the blocks.
- 2.4 The student blocks would all be located on, or very close to, the site boundaries. They would face inwards to the courtyards, with the corridor elevations on the outward sides, so the buildings would screen the central spaces from the commercial and industrial uses and car parking which largely surround the site. All of the blocks would have pitched roofs, and the uppermost storey of all the blocks (except Block J) would be within the pitched roof, lighted either by dormer windows or rooflights.
- 2.5 The application is supported by the following documents.
- Design and Access Statement
 - Planning Statement
 - Transport assessment
 - Site analysis document
 - Flood risk assessment
 - Landscape strategy
 - Tree survey and arboricultural assessment
 - Sustainability checklist
 - Sustainability statement
 - Renewable energy report
 - Acoustic assessment
 - Daylight and sunlight assessment

- Historic environment assessment
- Public Art strategy
- Student Management Plan
- Environmental Phase One Desk Study
- Ground Investigation report
- Phase I and II Geo-environmental study
- Utility Services report
- Air quality assessment
- Ventilation and extract strategy
- Ecological appraisal
- Archaeology statement
- Lighting strategy

2.6 In June 2015, the applicants submitted amended drawings together with a revised section of the Design and Access Statement and additional documents. The principal amendment was to reduce the height of the northernmost elements of Blocks E and F. The submission also made amendments to the disabled room layouts, and the disabled car parking provision, and substituted hedge planting for tree planting at the northeast corner of the site. All these amendments were in response to comments made by objectors and consultees. These amendments, which reduce the total number of student rooms proposed from 321 to 318, have been notified to neighbouring residents.

3.0 SITE HISTORY

3.1 Site history since 2000 is shown below. The picture is complicated, because the parcel of land contains a number of curtilages. All of the applications below refer to only a part of the present application site.

	Description	Outcome
02/1188/FP	Change of use of 355 Newmarket Road to one 3-bedroomed house, including alterations to existing building	Refused
06/0975/FUL	Demolish existing building (355 Newmarket Road) and erect new 3 storey building with 6 dwellings and one office suite unit	Refused

07/0987/ADV	Illuminated and non-illuminated signage	Approved with conditions
08/1002/FUL	Provision of a new car showroom, internal sales area, car accessories and part sales, workshop, service bays and ancillary offices	Approved with conditions
11/0493/FUL	Change of use (of 351 Newmarket Road) from B1 (Business) to A2 (Financial and Professional Services - Estate Agency) or B1 (Business) in the alternative	Approved with conditions
13/1858/FUL	Existing building (John Banks) to be re-clad to create a new car showroom, with new mezzanine floor. Additional building link also to be constructed	Approved with conditions

4.0 PUBLICITY

- 4.1 Advertisement: Yes
 Adjoining Owners: Yes
 Site Notice Displayed: Yes
 Development Control Forum (Meeting of 8th July 2015). The minutes of the Forum are not yet published, but will be attached to the amendment sheet for Committee.

5.0 POLICY

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

PLAN	POLICY NUMBER
------	---------------

Cambridge Plan 2006	Local	3/1 3/4 3/7 3/8 3/11 3/12 3/14 4/4 7/3 7/10 8/2 8/3 8/5 8/6 8/9 8/10 10/1
---------------------	-------	---

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

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

	<p>Management Plan (2011)</p> <p>Cambridge City Council (2011) - Open Space and Recreation Strategy</p> <p>Cambridgeshire Design Guide For Streets and Public Realm (2007)</p> <p>Cycle Parking Guide for New Residential Developments (2010)</p>
	<p><u>Area Guidelines</u></p> <p>Cambridge City Council (2002)–Eastern Corridor Area Transport Plan:</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:

Policy 32 Flood risk

Policy 41 Protection of business space

Policy 46 Development of student housing

6.0 CONSULTATIONS

Cambridgeshire County Council (Highways Development Management)

First advice (18th March 2015)

- 6.1 Conditions required relating to: traffic management plan for construction; improvement of junction where cycle/pedestrian route to east of Tesco meets Riverside; provision of signage to direct cyclists away from Newmarket Road; management plan for student arrival and departure

Second advice (9th April 2015)

- 6.2 Objection: insufficient information regarding:

- Suitability of pedestrian and cycle links
- Student Management Plan
- Disabled car parking spaces
- Cycle parking
- Travel Plan
- Potential for 'existing use' trip generation

Third advice (16th June 2015)

- 6.3 Continued objection: deficiencies remain in the information submitted with respect to: bus stops, time to travel to rail station, accident data, Brunswick House traffic survey, Student Management plan, trip generation of existing uses, potential trip generation of proposal, and Travel Plan.

Fourth advice (13th July 2015)

- 6.4 Additional advice is acceptable. Application supported subject to legal agreement to secure contributions to Midsummer Common cycle improvements, Riverside/Tesco path improvement and bus stop on Newmarket Road, and conditions to require updated Travel and Student Management plans.

Head of Refuse and Environment

- 6.5 No objection subject to conditions to control: assessment and mitigation of contaminated land, construction hours, construction deliveries and collections, construction noise and vibration, dust, ventilation and plant noise. Informatives are also sought.

Urban Design and Conservation Team

- 6.6 Support the proposed arrangement of buildings which fronts on to and defines the routes and open spaces and backs onto and secures the hostile boundaries of the adjacent industrial and retail developments. The arrangement and hierarchy of routes, buildings and open spaces is supported and responds to the north-south and east-west axis of the site.

Scale and massing

- 6.7 Scheme proposes buildings up to 3.5 storeys in height (12.8m to the ridgeline) and is below the 13m trigger for the skyline guidance. Nonetheless the submitted D&A Statement (section 6.5 Massing and Form) includes 7 3D strategic viewpoints showing the proposed scheme in the wider context from the Elizabeth Way Bridge, Rowlinson Way, the Retail Park, the Newmarket Road Railway Bridge, Riverside and Stourbridge Common. Views of the proposed scheme from Elizabeth Way Bridge, Rowlinson Way and the Newmarket Road Railway Bridge are limited and only the very tops of the ridgeline and chimneys are visible. As a result the buildings appear to form part of the existing urban skyline and fit comfortably in their surroundings.
- 6.8 Proposed scale and massing of buildings is acceptable in design terms and relates well to the domestic scale of the neighbouring terraced houses on Cheddars Lane and Newmarket Road and the large warehouse and retail sheds to the north of the site.
- 6.9 ADF [Average Daylight Factor] and APSH [Average Probable Sunlight Hours] assessments indicate that BRE recommendations for daylight and sunlight are met. All of the rooms assessed meet the BRE recommended levels of internal daylight. The level of daylight to rooms is therefore acceptable. For the purposes of the assessment the amenity spaces have been divided up into 3 areas. The results of the APSH test show that all 3 areas meet the

BRE recommendations for sunlight. The level of sunlight to these spaces is therefore acceptable.

Elevations and materials

6.10 Elements supported

- Contemporary approach to materials and elevations.
- Proportions of buildings, pitched roofs and chimneys – they replicate to some extent the proportions of existing neighbouring terrace houses.
- Projecting bay windows on Newmarket Road – they help to articulate and add interest to this elevation.
- Stepped roof form, stepped building line, and slate-clad recess of Building A - they help break up the length of the block into three distant elements.
- Proposed palette of materials, which is of a high quality.
- Treatment of visible gable ends with active windows, ‘blind’ windows and recessed and projecting chimneys forming vertical breaks.
- Zinc-clad chimneys incorporating flue/extracts from kitchens and bathrooms and forming part of the heating strategy. These emulate the forms of nearby terrace houses and help articulate the roofline.
- Articulation to rear of Buildings C, E, F, G, H with large recessed brick panels
- Fritted glazing and high-level rooflights in Block I to reduce overlooking towards 1-7 Cheddars Lane.

6.11 Concerns

- Fritted glazing – full details not shown. Condition required.
- Steel ventilation panels alongside windows could cause staining – large scale details to show how rainwater is shed should be required by condition. Possibly bronze or copper would be preferable.

Amenity space, landscape and thresholds

6.12 Approach with large open green spaces extending along the north-south and east-west axis of the site is supported; buildings are arranged to enclose and front onto the open spaces providing opportunities for activity and surveillance. Planted thresholds in

front of all of the ground floor student rooms are particularly supported and improve the privacy of occupants from passers-by.

Boundary treatments

6.13

1.1m steel railings along Newmarket Road and Cheddars Lane frontages	Acceptable
Close boarded fences to the rear of Buildings D and E	Acceptable
Close boarded fencing to rear of No. 1-7 Cheddars Lane	Not sufficiently robust – brick wall should be secured by condition
Existing steel palisade fencing retained to rear of Buildings B and C	Not required – buildings should form boundary. Condition should require removal of this fence.
vehicular access gates	More detail needed

6.14 Cycle stores acceptable in location and arrangement. Plan showing capacity and allocation required.

Conclusion

6.15 Supported, subject to conditions on materials, fritted glazing, boundary treatments, entrance gates, and cycle parking

Senior Sustainability Officer (Design and Construction)

Sustainable design and construction

6.16 Application proposes the following. All are supported.

- Targeting a BREEAM score of ‘very good’;
- Hierarchical approach to reducing energy use and associated carbon emissions;
- Consideration given to the adaptability of buildings for future residential uses, although it is noted that consideration to other issues such as parking would need to be given should any future changes be anticipated;
- Use of permeable paving and geocellular storage to reduce surface water run-off rates, although it is noted that the Council’s sustainable drainage engineer has raised the issue of

consideration needing to be given to the long-term maintenance of pumps;

- Targeting of water consumption levels of 105 litres/person/day, which will be achieved through the use of low flow fittings and water efficient appliances.

6.17 Rainwater collection for irrigation of landscaping should be encouraged.

Renewable Energy Provision

6.18 Two technologies are proposed, namely gas fired Combined Heat and Power (CHP) and 290m² of photovoltaic panels. This is policy compliant. Renewable Energy Report shows that the use of these two technologies reduces carbon emissions at a level in excess of the minimum requirements set out in Policy 8/16.

6.19 No specification for the CHP engines given. Condition required to secure details including maintenance.

Conclusion

6.20 Approach being taken to sustainable design and renewable and low carbon energy is supported.

Access Officer

First advice (8th April 2015)

6.21 Concerns about lack of clarity on level changes in the landscape scheme, absence of outdoor seating for disabled occupiers, poor design and location of accessible rooms, number of accessible rooms and associated car parking spaces

Second advice (9th July 2015 – following amendments)

6.22 Support the application. Access to, and parking on the site is as requested. Access and provision to the communal areas is good. Now the accessible room toilets have been moved, these rooms could be good if proper shelving and wardrobes are fitted.

Head of Streets and Open Spaces (Landscape Team)

- 6.23 Landscape proposals generally acceptable, but a number of suggestions for changes to detail of planting. Conditions required to control landscape details, landscape management and boundary treatment.

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

- 6.24 Further details of cycle parking required. Sheffield stands for visitors required where double-decker cycle parking is used. Improvements to cycle path/Riverside junction should be secured by condition.

Head of Streets and Open Spaces (Sustainable Drainage Officer)

- 6.25 Offers a substantial reduction in flows compared to present situation. Surface and foul drainage proposals are both dependent on pumping, so it is essential pumps are maintained.

Environment Agency

- 6.26 Acceptable subject to conditions to control assessment and remediation of ground contamination and a scheme for surface water drainage.

Anglian Water

- 6.27 Surface water strategy and flood risk assessment are unacceptable. Reliance on pumps to handle surface water drainage not considered appropriate. Condition required to ensure appropriate surface water drainage solution.

Cambridgeshire Constabulary (Architectural Liaison Officer)

- 6.28 Suggestions made about remote monitoring of CCTV, and protocol for admitting visitors during unstaffed hours. Concerns expressed about implications of any future change to ungated residential accommodation.

Cambridgeshire County Council (Archaeology)

- 6.29 To NE of mediaeval monastic precinct of Barnwell Priory. Evidence of Iron Age, Roman and Saxon occupation in the vicinity. Archaeological investigation required.

Streets and Open Spaces (Trees)

- 6.30 No concerns about tree losses, but concerns about crown reductions to trees T2, T3 and T6. Continued crown reduction into the future to retain acceptable clearance is not normally appropriate. Notwithstanding this the loss to T2 and T3 will be mitigated by the line of trees continuing westerly. Relationship between development and T6 is more problematic. Tree can tolerate the building footprint, but even revised proposal allows insufficient space for crown development. Further reduction in upper storey of Block F is required.

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

- 6.31 The full minute of the Panel meeting is as follows:

Establishing a new urban pattern.

- 6.32 This is a challenging site set within a complex hinterland currently dominated by low-grade industrial uses. Within this context, the provision of new green spaces and the re-ordering of the built environment is broadly welcomed. Nevertheless, it is the Panel's view that this scheme has to be designed to establish a pattern of development that will help to shape a coherent new neighbourhood in the future.
- 6.33 Although policy may suggest that the surrounding uses may remain for some time, future-proofing this development for example in terms of the quality of its construction, potential overlooking and the provision of linkages is important, as this area will, at some point, be radically improved beyond its present run down state. This site straddles the block and will play an important role in setting the pattern for future development and the permeability of the neighbouring street network.

Permeability.

- 6.34 The Panel notes that the scheme is currently a single access site, largely for security reasons. Any future requirement for housing provision in this area however would result in this site becoming part of a closer urban network of streets, which it would need to link into. The design team is asked to include this among current considerations and retain the provision to ensure that openings for access points from adjacent streets are available.

Landscaping

- 6.35 Scale of internal spaces. The Panel were comfortable with the distribution of volumes and the heights of buildings across the site. However, the sections appeared to suggest that the central space will seem more like a broad street frontages of the scale, say, of Bateman Street. In this context, the Panel questioned the informal treatment of the landscaping in what would be likely to feel a quite urban setting. A greater degree of formality is encouraged therefore (including street furniture). The Panel would recommend further exploration into using tree species of greater scale that would work well within the urban fabric -such as at St Matthew's Gardens.
- 6.36 Outdoor recreation areas. The Panel felt there was currently insufficient provision across the site for outdoor gathering and recreation. The pattern of diagonal paths seems to follow desire lines to entrances, rather than creating coherent routes or spaces. The Panel felt that the landscaping design should be further developed to both define the street routes and the character of the various spaces.
- 6.37 Tree planting along Newmarket Road and Cheddar's Lane. The long-term management and the size of trees at maturity need to be considered. As the landscaping needs to have a presence from the start, the Panel would welcome a greater idea of what the trees will look like, particularly on the southern edge where the proposed tree planting is quite dense.
- 6.38 Edge treatments to site. This would benefit from further work as, at present, the boundary edge treatment consists predominantly of trees intended to obscure views of the industrial sheds. The efficacy of this proposal needs to be reviewed.

6.39 Elevational treatments.

Attention needs to be paid to the rear of the blocks where single aspect blank facades form the boundaries of the site. In future, these elevations may well be exposed and need to relate to adjacent schemes, so should be designed with care from the start. The Panel would recommend that some of the more pleasing features such as the dormer windows and careful attention to brick detailing are used within the internal site elevations and not reserved exclusively for the Newmarket Road frontage.

6.40 Internal communal spaces.

The Panel felt these spaces were small and might fail to meet the needs of the students. The Panel expressed some concern as to the quality of the north-facing living spaces as these would be permanently in shade.

6.41 Land contamination.

The Panel would like to see the degree of contamination verified in depth on this site which has a long history of industrial uses.

6.42 Future adaptability of student housing.

The Panel pointed out that the market for this type of student studio housing might change and the development would then need to be converted into a different type of housing. The potential for future adaptation of the student accommodation into apartment units should be considered at the outset, particularly in terms of their construction. Structural cross wall construction or CLT timber framing may well inhibit the future opening up of the narrow frontage spaces to form larger rooms.

6.43 Environmental credentials/use of renewables.

The Panel were less than impressed by the tick-box approach to the scheme's environmental credentials. The Panel would like to stress that there is an argument for looking at passive solutions first and an understood logic for heating control in this type of student rooms, before the installation of PV is considered. The Panel note that all rooms with the exception of those facing

Newmarket Road will be naturally ventilated but this and other features need to be presented with greater conviction as to how it is achieved.

6.44 Conclusion.

Should Cheddar's Lane one day have a life beyond the quasi-industrial, the establishing of future linkages to and from this long, sprawling site would make a significant difference to the quality of the wider area. As Cambridge has witnessed a phenomenal rise in the provision of student accommodation over a relatively short time period, it would not be unreasonable to question whether such a phenomenon could be sustained. This development could potentially establish a pattern of adaptability, both in terms of providing an urban landscape to set the agenda for the future of the area, through to creating a form of student housing that can ensure a robust future both in terms of the sustainability of its form and construction.

6.45 In broad terms, this is a commendable scheme, which will benefit from further work to develop the landscaping and the details. The basic layout does not present the Panel with any fundamental concerns.

6.46 **VERDICT – GREEN (unanimous)** subject to the key issues highlighted being taken forward for further development.

Disability Consultative Panel (Meeting of 31st March 2015)

6.47 The full minute of the Panel meeting is as follows.

6.48 Accessible unit. The bedroom and bathroom should be located next to each other in order to accommodate an overhead or manual hoist. The shower appears to have a level threshold but is not of the correct dimensions and does not include handrails. No room has been provided next to the pedestal for transfer and the basin is poorly located. Doorways also appear compromised (sliding doors are recommended if space is limited) and doubt was expressed as to the accessibility of the study room cooking facilities and suitability of the storage area, with also no indication that the desk height could be adjusted.

6.49 In the Panel's view this is one of the worst schemes ever submitted in terms of accessibility. The design team are advised to seek expert advice before a thorough re-examination of the scheme.

6.50 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 Representations have been received from the owners/occupiers of the following addresses:

4 Cheddars Lane
26 Cheddars Lane
38 Cheddars Lane
20 Earl Street
2 Grebe Road
45 Mill Road
477 Newmarket Road
35 Oyster Row
37 Oyster Row
82 Riverside
Riverside House, Riverside
5 Stanley Road
11 Stanley Road
50 Stanley Road*
61 Stanley Road
63 Stanley Road*
65A Stanley Road
69 Stanley Road
80 Stanley Road
85 Stanley Road*
106 Stanley Road
147 Stanley Road
152 Stanley Road
158 Stanley Road
8 St Bartholomew's Court
48 St Bartholomew's Court
12 Water View*
30 School Lane, Fulbourn

7.2 and also from

CHS Group (owners and managers of 25-31 Stanley Road)*
Cambridge Cycling Campaign
Riverside Area Residents Association*

Those marked with an asterisk above have also commented on the revised proposal.

7.3 The representations can be summarised as follows:

Principle

- Site could be used for affordable housing
- Contrary to 2006 and 2014 local plan policies regarding preservation of business uses
- Designated as light industrial
- Current mix of uses valuable to the local community
- Loss of jobs
- ARU does not support it – possible reversion to residential would be too intensive
- Precedent
- Site not unsightly at present
- No benefits to public

Design and context

- Scale and massing too great
- Impinges on the skyline
- Permission previously refused for two-storey building at Kingdom Hall

Neighbour amenity

- Noise
- Lack of on-site professional support
- Buildings D, E and F – overbearing
- Change in ground level will increase overbearing impact
- Overshadowing
- CCTV intrusive in neighbouring gardens
- Site lighting may impact on neighbour amenity at north end of site
- Impact of trees

Traffic and parking

- Would intensify high existing demand for on-street car parking space
- Impossible to police student use of cars
- Allowing occupiers two car ownership transgressions before sanction is too lenient
- Should be between 32 and 64 car parking spaces on site.
- Should fund residents' parking
- Insufficient car parking for disabled students
- Loss of residents' car parking spaces outside the present garage
- Impact elsewhere of vehicles waiting for drop-off slots at term ends
- Parking by construction workers

- Entrance via Kingdom Hall site unacceptable
- Increased traffic on Newmarket Road and Riverside
- Transport assessment underestimates impact of additional traffic through using potential rather than actual totals for the existing uses, and assuming future occupiers will generate only 4 movements per day rather than the ECATP figure of 8.5 movements.
- Risk to students from car-dominated nature of routes to places of study

- Double-stacker cycle parking not appropriate

Other issues

- Conflict of interest because of Council's ownership of the land

7.4 Riverside Area Residents Association submitted a further detailed objection to the application on 15th July 2015. In addition to providing images to support RARA's concerns about the amended plans, a review of the applicants' photomontages and detailed comments explaining RARA concerns about them, and an additional visual appraisal of the proposal, the representation lists the following key objections to the proposal (the RARA letter lists these under nine headings, but I have separated some of them out for clarity)

1. Principle of development is unsound because no independent evidence is provided of sufficient Class B2 land elsewhere
2. No affordable housing is provided
3. Buildings D, E and F cause unacceptable sense of visual domination for neighbours
4. Harm to nearby screening trees
5. Impact of noise from student social areas on neighbours
6. Impact of noise from adjacent industrial uses on future occupiers of the development
7. Blocking of key emergency access route
8. Inadequate car parking
9. Site not sustainable because of dangers on cycling and walking routes
10. Traffic impact
11. Demolition of existing buildings on Newmarket Road unacceptable

7.5 Representations have also been received from Anglia Ruskin University. The representations can be summarised as follows.

7.6 Anglia Ruskin is currently unable to offer first year students sufficient cluster accommodation in a hall-type setting. The main demand is for cluster accommodation, and it is the most appropriate type of accommodation to foster the development of community and successful independent living.

7.7 Anglia Ruskin is mentioned as a beneficiary of this scheme. The location is appropriate, the cluster accommodation is welcome and some of our students will find the scheme attractive. If the developers wish to provide accommodation for continuing students, a mix of cluster, shared houses and studios on the site would be much more beneficial and would cater for a wider range of students. The large number of studios proposed here is not supported. There is an increasing proportion of studios coming forward and the proportion of studio to cluster availability in Cambridge will be approaching 45% if this scheme proceeds as planned.

7.8 This scheme should be regarded as a speculative student housing scheme rather than for the specific benefit of Anglia Ruskin.

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. Trees
11. Third party representations
12. Planning Obligation Strategy

Principle of Development

8.2 Policy 7/10 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 permits the development of speculative student accommodation only if its occupation is limited to full-time students of the city's two universities, if it is appropriately sited for those two institutions, and if it makes appropriate provision to accommodate disabled students and to prevent the occupiers keeping cars in the city. I will deal with the issues of disabled occupiers and car parking under the relevant headings below. In my view, although not immediately adjacent to the main faculty buildings of either university, the site is located close enough to both to make cycle travel convenient, and is well sited for the main ARU campus. Subject to a legal agreement restricting occupancy, it is my view that the application satisfies the first two criteria of Policy 7/10.

8.3 Representations question whether the accommodation is required, and point to the comments from Anglia Ruskin University which suggest that the accommodation mix in the proposed development is not ideal and contains more studio-

type accommodation than the university would prefer. In response, the applicants have submitted an assessment carried out by Bidwells, which suggests that the proposal would satisfy only about 3% of the current 10,000-bed shortfall in purpose-built student accommodation in the city, and would be likely to be fully let immediately, as have recent student accommodation developments at the Brunswick and Rail Yard. In my view, this assessment needs to be treated with caution, although it may give some guidance to the current situation with respect to student accommodation. In any event, Policy 7/3 does not include any requirements for a particular mix of accommodation types, and in my view, the Council would have no basis to refuse the application on this basis.

8.4 Policy 7/3 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 seeks to protect existing industrial and storage space. The application site is not within a protected industrial site, but policy 7/3 places restrictions on the redevelopment of industrial sites wherever they lie in the city. Two parts of the application site are currently in Class B2 industrial use: the vehicle repair workshops at 8 and 10A Cheddars Lane. In my view the applicants are correct in their submission that the majority of the site is currently in sui generis car sales use. To satisfy local plan policy 7/3 on the protection of industrial and storage space, an application which involves the loss of the current Class B2 use on the site has to meet two tests. It must accord with subsection (a) of that policy, which requires a demonstration that either there is a sufficient supply of such floorspace in the city, or that vacancy rates are high. It must also meet one of the other four criteria in the policy, which are as follows:

b) the proposed development will generate the same number or more unskilled or semiskilled jobs than could be expected from the existing use; or

c) the continuation of industrial or storage uses will be harmful to the environment or amenity of the area; or

d) the loss of a small proportion of industrial or storage floorspace would facilitate the redevelopment and continuation of industrial or storage use on a greater part of the site; or

e) redevelopment for mixed use or residential development would be more appropriate

- 8.5 The applicants have submitted information about the availability of similar Class B2 accommodation elsewhere. I have submitted this information to the Planning Policy Manager, who has confirmed that she considers this information demonstrates that there is a sufficient supply of such accommodation and that the proposal therefore meets the test of part (a) of Policy 7/3. I concur with this view.
- 8.6 The applicants have suggested that the proposed development will create an equal number of semi-skilled or unskilled jobs as the present Class B2 uses on the site. They do not provide any information about current employment in these B2 uses, but suggest that the development would create employment for a site manager, an assistant site manager, a maintenance operative, community ambassadors, and contract cleaners. I do not consider that the site manager or assistant site manager posts can be considered as semi- or un-skilled. I do not consider that the community ambassadors, who will be students living on site, can be considered as employees, and I am aware that the contract cleaning work is likely to provide only part-time posts. Since I do not have any information on how many contract cleaners would be employed, or how many semi- or unskilled jobs exist in the B2 uses presently on site it is difficult to assess this issue. It may be that the maintenance and cleaning posts generated are approximately equal to the vehicle repair jobs currently existing, but I do not have conclusive evidence.
- 8.7 The applicants have also argued that the continuation of industrial use, in close proximity to the residential curtilages which face Cheddars Lane to the south-west of the site would be harmful to the amenity of those occupiers. I agree that industrial activity in close proximity to these dwellings may not be ideal, although I am not aware that the existing uses have a significant harmful impact.
- 8.8 The applicants further argue that the harmful neighbour impact of the continuation of industrial use, coupled with the benefits of providing additional student accommodation mean that the application meets test (e) of policy 7/3 because it would, for these reasons, be more appropriate than the present use.

8.9 In addition, the applicants have submitted additional information about the poor standard of the existing Class B2 accommodation on the site, citing its low ceiling height, subsidence problems, poor insulation and absence of an Energy Performance Certificate. The applicants suggest that these defects will shortly render the present buildings unlettable, and that upgrading them would not be viable.

8.10 In summary, I am of the view that the application clearly meets the test in subsection (a) of policy 7/3; there is sufficient supply of this type of floorspace in the city. I do not consider that the applicants have conclusively demonstrated that the application meets test (b) (by providing equivalent employment opportunities), test (c) (by eliminating industrial uses harmful to residential amenity, or test (d) (by ensuring a more appropriate overall use of the site). However, I am also of the view that it is difficult to demonstrate conclusively that the proposal does not meet these tests. In these circumstances, it is important to have regard to the National Planning Policy Framework. Paragraph 22 of the Framework states:

Planning policies should avoid the long-term protection of sites allocated for employment use where there is no reasonable prospect of a site being used for that purpose. ... Where there is no reasonable prospect of a site being used for the allocated employment use, applications for alternative uses of land or buildings should be treated on their merits, having regard to market signals and the relative need for different land uses to support sustainable local communities.

8.11 Given the low likelihood of the B2 premises on this site providing acceptable industrial or storage floorspace into even the medium term, the clear availability of such floorspace elsewhere in the city, the absence of a clear case that the application fails to satisfy any of tests (b), (c) or (e) of policy 7/3, and the clear advice above in the Framework, it is my view that the application must be regarded as being in accordance with policy 7/3 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 and with national planning guidance in the Framework.

8.12 Representations received argue strongly that the application should be refused, both because of the loss of the existing

industrial uses, and because it would act as a precedent for the loss of other industrial uses nearby. I have indicated above that I do not consider the loss of the existing B2 use to conflict with policy 7/3. I do not consider that approval of this application would create a precedent for further loss of B2 floorspace. Each application must be considered on its own merits, and in my view, nearby industrial units are not directly comparable to the two units considered here, either in their location or the nature of the premises.

8.13 Representations further argue that the existing John Banks part of the site should be regarded as being in use for vehicle repair within Class B2, and consequently that the overall loss of B2 floorspace is much greater than the application suggests. I do not accept this view; in my opinion the John Banks site is part of a car sales use which is sui generis, and any vehicle maintenance or repair which is taking place on that site is ancillary to the sui generis car sales use.

8.14 Representations have also strongly argued that the application site should be developed for housing. The site is not allocated for housing either in the 2006 local plan or in the 2014 Proposed Submission. Housing might be a very appropriate use for this site, but this application must be considered as it is, on its own merits. The desirability of the development of this site for housing could not be cited as a reason for refusal of the present application.

Context of site, design and external spaces

Scale and massing

8.15 The proposal uses blocks of different sizes, from two to four storeys, with the uppermost floor of the majority of the blocks contained within pitched roofs. I concur with the view of the conservation and urban design team that this scale, and its distribution across the site are appropriate. Representations argue that the prevailing character of the area is of two-storey house, and that the four-storey scale of much of the scheme is therefore inappropriate. I do not accept this view. The proposed development is in close proximity to two-storey houses in only two locations, to the rear of 1-7 Cheddar's Lane, and to the SW of Nos. 23-31 and 61-67 Stanley Road. In both these locations, the scale of the proposed buildings has been limited in a

manner which respects the context. The area around the site contains a mixture of buildings and spaces of different scales, and I do not consider that the scale of the proposed blocks would conflict with this heterogeneous character, stand out in an anomalous or jarring manner, or detract from the townscape.

- 8.16 One of the inconsistencies alleged in drawings by third parties would suggest that the height of Block D is greater than 13m, which would trigger a requirement for the submission of information in accordance with the Council's Tall Buildings and Skyline SPD. However, notwithstanding officers' view that the proposal did not trigger this requirement, the applicants have submitted relevant information to show the proposed buildings in context, and their likely impact on the skyline. The advice of the urban design team is that the proposal would not have a detrimental impact on the skyline, and I concur with this view.

Materials

- 8.17 In my view the palette of materials and the elevational details are appropriate. The broad approach, in which pitched roofs and chimneys are used to allude to the character of surrounding areas, the fenestration emphasises the vertical dimension of the accommodation blocks, giving them a 'terraced' quality, and a range of features are used to articulate and enliven the elevations, is a very positive one in my view, and all these features would contribute to the creation of an attractive living environment.

Amenity space and landscape

- 8.18 The landscape team are broadly satisfied with the proposal, but have a number of specific recommendations about planting. I concur with this view; in general I consider that the arrangement and extent of outdoor space on the site would create an attractive and convenient environment. The detail of planting and boundaries could be controlled by conditions.
- 8.19 In my opinion the proposal is compliant in design terms with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 3/4, 3/7, 3/11, 3/12.

Public Art

- 8.20 The applicants have submitted a Public Art Delivery Plan. Its aspiration is the delivery of an appropriate public art contribution on site at the threshold on Cheddars Lane. Artist's brief and proposals for engagement with local stakeholders are included. In my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 3/7 and 10/1 and the Public Art SPD 2010. Acceptable implementation of public art can be secured by condition.

Renewable energy and sustainability

- 8.21 The sustainable development officer is satisfied with the approach proposed to both sustainable development and renewable energy. The development will comfortably exceed the minimum level of carbon saving required by the Council's policy. In my opinion, subject to the condition recommended to secure details of the energy technology and its maintenance, 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

- 8.22 The initial proposal demonstrated some serious shortcomings in the design of supposedly accessible rooms, which were highlighted by the comments of the Access Officer and Disability Access Panel. The applicant has subsequently discussed this issue in detail with the Access Officer and made significant amendments to the design of accessible rooms. The Access Officer is now completely satisfied that the concerns originally raised have been satisfactorily resolved, and in my opinion the proposal is compliant, in respect of inclusive access, with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 3/7 and 3/12.

Residential Amenity

Impact on amenity of neighbouring occupiers

- 8.23 The site is largely bounded by industrial and commercial properties. I do not consider that the scheme raises any issues for the amenity of those working on or visiting these premises.

8.24 There are three locations where the site is in proximity to residential properties. Two are in the north-east corner, where the curtilages of the terrace of houses at 23-31 Stanley Road, and 61-67 Stanley Road, although they do not directly abut the site, are in close proximity to it. The closest point of Block E to No. 61 Stanley Road is at 35m. The closest point of Block F to No. 31 Stanley Road is at 15m. The third location is at the opposite end of the site, where blocks I and J lie behind Nos. 1-7 Cheddars Lane. Block J is 7m from No.1 Cheddars Lane. Block I is 19m from No.7 Cheddars Lane.

8.25 Blocks E and F are oriented at right angles to the potential lines of sight towards houses in Stanley Road. I do not consider that there are any issues of overlooking in this direction. Representations submitted have argued very strongly that the overshadowing and visual domination created for the occupiers of houses at 61-67 and 23-31 Stanley Road by the height and mass of Blocks E and F, even in the revised form now submitted, would be unacceptable, and that the applicants have overestimated the significance of the tree planting to the south-west of No.61 Stanley Road in screening views, and underestimated the effect of the fall in ground level immediately to the north-east of the application site boundary. The third parties concerned have submitted a visual assessment of the outlook from 63 Stanley Road, a review of the applicants' verified views and supporting documents, and also verified views of their own. I have considered this issue carefully. I have reviewed: the verified images submitted by the applicants; the review of these images submitted by objectors; the verified images submitted by the objectors themselves; and the daylight and sunlight assessment relative to BRE criteria submitted at my request by the applicants. I have also reconsulted the urban design and conservation team, following the most recent amendments to the scheme submitted by the applicants.

8.26 My conclusion, which is supported by that of the urban design team, is that Blocks E and F would not cause significant harm to the occupiers of houses in Stanley Road, either through overshadowing or through visual domination. As far as overshadowing is concerned, Nos. 61-67 are too far from the application buildings (35m or more) for this to be an issue. Information submitted by the applicants shows that daylight and sunlight levels at No.31 with the development in place would be

comfortably within BRE guidelines. Nos.23-29 are further from Block F and would therefore be affected less.

- 8.27 As far as visual domination and sense of enclosure are concerned, Buildings E and F would be clearly visible from neighbouring properties, with Building E particularly prominent from 61 and 63 Stanley Road, and Building F from 29 and 31 Stanley Road. Trees would provide a degree of screening, but I accept objector's assertions that these trees are not within the curtilage of the residential properties concerned, and therefore could subsequently be removed. I also acknowledge that in winter months, the tree belt would have little impact on the visibility of the proposed buildings from 61-67 Stanley Road. However, the full extent of Block E, including its whole north elevation (which would rapidly diminish in prominence as it runs west) would only occupy 20° of the 180° panorama from the rear of No.61 and only 23° from No. 63. The issue here is not whether the new building would be prominent within the outlook from No's 61-67, or whether it would alter the view significantly; I acknowledge that it would do both. The issue is whether it would result in an unacceptable degree of visual domination, or create an unreasonable sense of enclosure for these neighbouring occupiers.
- 8.28 The proposed buildings would be at least 35m distant from N^{os}. 61-67. They would not be wholly domestic in scale, but having four storeys, one of which is set within a pitched roof, they would in my view be only 'one-step-above' domestic. They would also occupy only a limited sector of the visual arc to the rear of these houses. In these circumstances, I do not consider that they would lead to unacceptable visual domination or an unreasonable sense of enclosure.
- 8.29 For occupiers of N^{os}. 23-31, the proposed Building F would be closer, but it would still occupy a limited sector of the outlook, and in this case the building would be at a more oblique angle, further towards the edge of the field of view, and not in the centre of the outlook from front windows at these houses. As with N^{os}. 61-67, I acknowledge that these buildings will change the view, but I do not consider that they will lead to significant visual domination or an unreasonable sense of enclosure.
- 8.30 I note that the objectors consultants have identified inconsistencies in drawings. These inconsistencies may

diminish the accuracy of the applicants' photomontages. At my request the applicants have checked the drawings, and they believe them, with one exception, to be correct. It is their view that the inconsistencies arise from the method the objectors' consultants have used to scale the drawings. The one error which the applicants acknowledge is that on drawing P107 the front elevation of the building is shown incorrectly at 0.45m higher than it is on drawings P108 and P109 (ie. the true situation is that the building is of a lesser scale than this drawing would suggest). I have not subjected the drawings to further checking. However, in my view, the inconsistencies are relatively small; the most serious alleged appears to be a 0.95m disparity in the ridge height of Block D between drawing PO31 and other drawings. Even if all the dimensions involved are taken as the maximum value, I do not consider that this would alter my assessment of the visual impact of the proposal.

8.31 Representations have asserted that the positioning of communal social areas (kitchen/living rooms) for students at the northern end of Block F, adjacent to No. 31 Stanley Road, would create unacceptable levels of noise for nearby occupiers. I do not consider that there is a significant risk of unacceptable noise levels at this point. The rooms concerned face into the site courtyard, away from the houses at 23-31 Stanley Road, and there are no windows on the northern or eastern elevations. The environmental health team have not raised concerns about this issue, and I do not consider that the risk of noise for neighbours creates any need to ensure on-site supervision of the occupiers at a higher level than is proposed.

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

Amenity for future occupiers of the site

8.33 I have indicated above that I consider the layout of the scheme to be well-considered, with windows oriented to allow occupiers an appropriate outlook, adequate space between buildings, clear routes, and appropriate threshold treatments to protect the privacy of ground floor occupiers.

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

Refuse Arrangements

8.35 The Head of Refuse and Environment has confirmed that the provision for storage and collection of waste and recycling is satisfactory. In my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policy 3/12.

Highway Safety

8.36 The highway authority has confirmed that because of the increase in cycle traffic which the development is expected to generate, it is essential that the applicant contributes to the improvement of the pedestrian and cycle route from Cheddars Lane to Riverside. This can be secured through a Section 106 agreement. The highway authority has raised no other concerns regarding highway safety

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

Car and Cycle Parking

8.38 The cycling officer is broadly satisfied with the cycle parking strategy, but required further details. These can be secured by condition.

8.39 Following amendments, the access officer is satisfied with the provision of disabled car parking spaces.

8.40 The scheme makes no provision for on-site car parking for students. The proposed operator of the student accommodation scheme intends to prohibit future occupiers from keeping a car. This would be enforced via the contractual agreement between the operator and individual student occupiers. This arrangement can be secured through a condition requiring a Student Management Plan. It would be reinforced by measures to encourage the use of non-car transport in the Travel Plan. In my view, this is acceptable.

- 8.41 Representations submitted repeatedly express the view that this is not a satisfactory arrangement, that the proposal would lead to an unacceptable increase in pressure on on-street car parking spaces, to the detriment of residents, and that it should therefore be refused. I do not agree with this view. I acknowledge that any scheme to prohibit car keeping by students is unlikely to be 100% successful, but in my view, the combination of the sanctions proposed by the applicants, the proximity of the site to Anglia Ruskin University, the convenience of cycle travel from this location, and the difficulty of parking a car at the other end of any journey within the city, is likely to result in very low levels of car use by student occupiers. The belief that student occupiers routinely flout regulations prohibiting the keeping of cars does not seem to be supported by any concrete evidence.
- 8.42 Furthermore, the unregulated on-street car parking spaces in Stanley Road and other nearby streets can only be protected from use by people not resident locally, be they commuters, tourists or students, through a residents-only parking scheme. While the streets remain outside the controlled parking zone, the pressure on on-street car parking space will continue to increase, whether this proposal is permitted or not.
- 8.43 Paragraph 30 of the Framework states that encouragement should be given to solutions which support greenhouse gas emissions and reduce congestion, and Paragraph 29 states that the transport system needs to be balanced in favour of sustainable transport modes. By making it impossible for occupiers to park a car on site, and by reinforcing this approach with appropriate sanctions, a Travel Plan which fosters non-car travel, and contributions to cycle and bus infrastructure on Riverside, Newmarket Road, and Midsummer Common, I consider that this proposal accords fully with the guidance in these two paragraphs. In my view the absence of on-site car parking for future occupiers is in accordance with the City Council's Car Parking Standards, and with government guidance in the Framework.
- 8.44 In my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 8/6 and 8/10.

Trees

- 8.45 The tree officer has indicated concerns about the impact of Block F on the London plane T6, which she regards as of significant amenity value. The applicants have indicated that they will amend the proposed design to allow more space for the crown development of this tree. Details of this amendment and the tree officer's advice on it will be reported on the amendment sheet for Committee. Subject to this amendment, I am of the view that the impact on trees will be acceptable and in accordance with policy 4/4 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006.

Third Party Representations

- 8.46 I have addressed the issues raised in representations listed below in the paragraphs indicated.

Site could be used for affordable housing	8.14
Contrary to 2006 and 2014 local plan policies regarding preservation of business uses	8.4-8.11
Designated as light industrial	8.4-8.11
Current mix of uses valuable to the local community	8.4-8.11
Loss of jobs	8.6 and 8.9/8.10
ARU does not support it – possible reversion to residential would be too intensive	8.3
Precedent	8.11
Site not unsightly at present	See below
No benefits to public	8.2-8.3
Scale and massing too great	8.15 and 8.16
Impinges on the skyline	8.16
Permission previously refused for two-storey building at Kingdom Hall	See below
Noise	8.31
Lack of on-site professional support	8.31
Buildings D, E and F – overbearing	8.27-8.29
Change in ground level will increase overbearing impact	8.27-8.30
Overshadowing	8.26
CCTV intrusive in neighbouring gardens	Addressed by condition
Site lighting may impact on neighbour	Addressed by

amenity at north end of site	condition
Impact of trees	8.27, 8.45
Would intensify high existing demand for on-street car parking space	8.40-8.44
Impossible to police student use of cars	8.41
Allowing occupiers two car ownership transgressions before sanction is too lenient	8.41
Should be between 32 and 64 car parking spaces on site.	8.40-8.44
Should fund residents' parking	8.40-8.44
Insufficient car parking for disabled students	6.22
Loss of residents' car parking spaces outside the present garage	8.40-8.44
Impact elsewhere of vehicles waiting for drop-off slots at term ends	Addressed by condition
Parking by construction workers	Addressed by condition
Entrance via Kingdom Hall site unacceptable	This is not suggested, and would require a fresh planning application if it were in the future
Increased traffic on Newmarket Road and Riverside	6.1-6.4
Transport assessment underestimates impact of additional traffic through using potential rather than actual totals for the existing uses, and assuming future occupiers will generate only 4 movements per day rather than the ECATP figure of 8.5 movements.	6.4
Risk to students from car-dominated nature of routes to places of study	6.4 and S106 agreement
Double-stacker cycle parking not appropriate	Addressed by condition
Conflict of interest because of Council's ownership of the land	See below

8.47 I have addressed the key issues raised in the final RARA submission in the paragraphs indicated.

Principle of development is unsound because no independent evidence is provided of sufficient Class B2 land elsewhere	8.4-8.11
No affordable housing is provided	8.14
Buildings D, E and F cause unacceptable sense of visual domination for neighbours	8.27-8.29
Harm to nearby screening trees	8.45
Impact of noise from student social areas on neighbours	8.31
Impact of noise from adjacent industrial uses on future occupiers of the development	Addressed by condition
Blocking of key emergency access route	See below
Inadequate car parking	8.40-8.44
Site not sustainable because of dangers on cycling and walking routes	6.4 and S106 agreement
Traffic impact	6.1-6.4
Demolition of existing buildings on Newmarket Road unacceptable	See below

8.48 The remaining issues raised in representations are addressed below.

8.49 I accept that the site is not especially unsightly at present, but an unsightly site is not necessary to justify development.

8.50 A previous planning decision on the Kingdom Hall site may not be of direct relevance to this application. The two sites are not comparable, and each application must be considered on its own merits.

8.51 Land ownership, whether it be by the Council or not, is not a planning issue. Planning Committee must determine planning applications on the basis of local and national planning policy. My recommendation is made on this basis, and is not subject to any view which the Council's Property Department may have about the site.

8.52 In my view, there is no requirement for an emergency access to the site across the site of the proposed Block D. Fire access and fire safety are matters for Building Control, and if the present scheme were to raise issues at that stage, a further

planning application would be required to amend the layout accordingly.

- 8.53 The existing buildings on Newmarket Road are not listed, and are not in a conservation area. Their demolition consequently has general permission. The Council cannot prevent such demolition, and can only control the details of the method of demolition.

Planning Obligation Strategy

- 8.54 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:

Open Space

- 8.55 The Planning Obligation Strategy requires that all new residential developments, including student accommodation, contribute to the provision or improvement of public open space, either through provision on site as part of the development or through the creation or improvement of relevant facilities likely to be used by the future occupiers. The proposed

development requires a contribution to be made towards open space, comprising outdoor sports facilities, indoor sports facilities, and informal open space.

Informal Open Space

8.56 The Streets and Open Spaces team have indicated that improvements will be required to one or more of the following areas of informal space in order to cope with the increased pressure on open space use generated by the development:

- St Matthew's Piece
- Coldham's Common
- Stourbridge Common
- Pye Pitch, Chesterton
- Chesterton Rec
- Riverside

8.57 The Council estimates the cost of new or improved open space to be J238 per person, and therefore, I expect the improvements required for 318 additional residents to cost approximately J76,956. If the Streets and Open Spaces Asset Manager is able to provide precise details of the works required at this stage, I will report them on the amendment sheet, or at Committee.

Sports Facilities

8.58 The future occupiers will also create an additional demand for indoor and outdoor sports facilities. Since the students are most likely to attend Anglia Ruskin University, where the existing provision of sports facilities is very limited, I expect the cost of the additional provision required to be approximately J75,684 for outdoor provision (J238 per occupier), and J85,542 for indoor provision (J269 per occupier). If the Sport and Recreation Manager is able to give precise details of the works required at this stage, I will report them on the amendment sheet or at Committee.

8.59 Subject to the completion of a S106 planning obligation to secure the requirements of the Planning Obligation Strategy (2010) and the Cambridge City Council Open Space Standards Guidance for Interpretation and Implementation (2010), I am satisfied that the proposal accords 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)

Transport

8.60 As indicated above, the Highway Authority has made an assessment of the proposal, and it requires contributions to be made to Midsummer Common cycle improvements, the Riverside/Tesco path and cycleway improvement and the bus stop on Newmarket Road. 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.

9.0 CONCLUSION

9.1 I acknowledge that there are very strongly-held objections to this proposal. However, in my view, it is well-designed, and would provide a genuinely high-quality living environment for future student occupiers. Neighbours have submitted very detailed concerns about the impact on neighbour amenity in Stanley Road. I have considered these thoroughly in conjunction with colleagues in the urban design team, and I do not consider that the impacts would be unacceptable.

10.0 RECOMMENDATION

APPROVE subject to completion of the s106 Agreement by 30th September 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 1990.

3. No development approved by this permission shall be commenced prior to a contaminated land assessment and associated remedial strategy, together with a timetable of works, being submitted to the LPA for approval.

- (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.

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

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

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

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

4. 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)

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

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

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

6. No development, including demolition, shall take place until a traffic management plan for the demolition and construction phase has been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority. The plan shall include the arrangements for parking associated with the construction process. Development shall proceed only in accordance with the agreed arrangements.

Reason: To ensure effective operation of the highway network and to protect highway safety. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 8/2)

7. No development shall commence until a programme of measures to minimise the spread of airborne dust from the site during the demolition / construction period has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be implemented in accordance with the approved scheme.

Reason: To protect the amenity of nearby properties Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy4/13

8. No construction work or demolition work shall be carried out or plant operated other than between the following hours: 0800 hours and 1800 hours on Monday to Friday, 0800 hours and 1300 hours on Saturday and at no time on Sundays, Bank or Public Holidays.

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

9. There should be no collection or deliveries to the site during the demolition and construction stages outside the hours of 0800 hours and 1800 hours on Monday to Friday, 0800 hours to 1300 hours on Saturday and at no time on Sundays, Bank or Public Holidays.

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

10. Details of the specification and position of fencing, or any other measures to be taken for the protection of any trees from damage during the course of development, shall be submitted to the local planning authority for its written approval, and implemented in accordance with that approval before any equipment, machinery or materials are brought onto the site for the purpose of development (including demolition). The agreed means of protection shall be retained on site until all equipment, and surplus materials have been removed from the site. Nothing shall be stored or placed in any area protected in accordance with this condition, and the ground levels within those areas shall not be altered nor shall any excavation be made without the prior written approval of the local planning authority.

Reason: To protect the visual amenity of the area and to ensure the retention of the trees on the site. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/4, 3/11, 3/12 and 4/4)

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

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

12. Prior to the commencement of development/construction, details of the ventilation scheme for the residential units on the western façades of Blocks A and B, the southern façade of Block F and the façade of Block J, fronting Newmarket Road, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The scheme shall be installed before the use hereby permitted is commenced and shall not be altered without prior approval.

Reason: To ensure proper protection for future occupiers from vehicle noise on Newmarket Road and Cheddars Lane and in the Wickes car park. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/4 and 4/13).

13. No development shall take place until a scheme for surface water drainage which includes a maintenance plan for any pumps included therein, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority.

Reason: To avoid the risk of flooding (Cambridge Local Plan policy 4/16)

14. 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)

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

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

16. No windows or frames shall be installed until full details of fritted glazing for all blocks in which such glazing is to be used have been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority.

Reason: To ensure satisfactory privacy for future occupiers and neighbours. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 3/4)

17. Installation of windows, frames and surrounds shall not commence until details of these elements at a scale of 1:20, showing in particular how water is to drain from them, have been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority.

Reason: To ensure the external appearance of the building is maintained. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/4 and 3/12).

18. 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)

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

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

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

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

21. The erection of buildings hereby proposed shall not commence until there has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority a scheme of boundary treatments, which shall include the removal of the existing steel palisade fence alongside the City Church site, alternative treatment of this boundary, and full details of the entrance gates at both points on Cheddars Lane. The boundary treatments approved shall be completed before the use hereby permitted is commenced and retained thereafter unless any variation is agreed in writing by the local planning authority.

Reason: To ensure an appropriate boundary treatment is implemented. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/4, 3/11 and 3/12)

22. No permanent external lighting shall be installed on the site until details of that lighting have been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority.

Reason: To protect the amenity of neighbouring occupiers. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 3/4.)

23. No development shall commence until details of facilities for the covered, secured parking of bicycles for use in connection with the development hereby permitted shall be submitted to and approved by the local planning authority in writing. The approved facilities shall be provided in accordance with the approved details before use of the development commences.

Reason: To ensure appropriate provision for the secure storage of bicycles. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 8/6)

24. CCTV shall not be operated on the site until details of the CCTV strategy, showing the reach of cameras to be used, has been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority.

Reason: To ensure the privacy of neighbouring occupiers. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 3/4)

25. The buildings hereby approved shall not be occupied until the equipment for the generation of renewable energy specified in the application documents has been installed and is fully operational, and a scheme for the maintenance of the equipment has been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority. The approved maintenance scheme shall be adhered to thereafter.

Reason: To ensure acceptable levels of carbon reduction. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 8/16)

26. The development hereby approved shall not be occupied until appropriate signage has been installed directing cycle users towards routes other than Newmarket Road:

Reason: To Facilitate safe and convenient cycle travel, and in the interests of highway safety. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 8/2 and 8/4.

27. No development shall take place until a scheme of public art on site has been agreed in writing by the local planning authority. The scheme as agreed shall be fully implemented within three months of first occupation of the site.

Reason: To ensure appropriate public art on site. ((Cambridge Local Plan policy 3/7)

28. 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, student management, control of student car use, 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)

29. The applicant is advised that to satisfy the plant noise insulation condition, the rating level (in accordance with BS4142:2014) from all plant, equipment and vents etc (collectively) associated with this application should be less than or equal to the existing background level (L90) at the boundary of the premises subject to this application and having regard to noise sensitive premises. Tonal/impulsive noise frequencies should be eliminated or at least considered in any assessment and should carry an additional correction in accordance with BS4142:2014. This is to prevent unreasonable noise disturbance to other premises. This requirement applies both during the day (0700 to 2300 hrs over any one hour period) and night time (2300 to 0700 hrs over any one 15 minute period).It is recommended that the agent/applicant submits a noise prediction survey/report in accordance with the principles of BS4142: 2014 Methods for rating and assessing industrial and commercial sound or similar, concerning the effects on amenity rather than likelihood for complaints. Noise levels shall be predicted at the boundary having regard to neighbouring premises.

It is important to note that a full BS4142:2014 assessment is not required, only certain aspects to be incorporated into a noise assessment as described within this informative. Such a survey / report should include: a large scale plan of the site in relation to neighbouring premises; noise sources and measurement / prediction points marked on plan; a list of noise sources; details of proposed noise sources / type of plant such as: number, location, sound power

levels, noise frequency spectrums, noise directionality of plant, noise levels from duct intake or discharge points; details of noise mitigation measures (attenuation details of any intended enclosures, silencers or barriers); description of full noise calculation procedures; noise levels at a representative sample of noise sensitive locations and hours of operation.

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

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

Councils Supplementary Planning Document Sustainable Design and Construction 2007:
<http://www.cambridge.gov.uk/public/docs/sustainable-design-and-construction-spd.pdf>

Guidance on the assessment of dust from demolition and construction http://iaqm.co.uk/wp-content/uploads/guidance/iaqm_guidance_report_draft1.4.pdf

Control of dust and emissions during construction and demolition supplementary planning guidance
https://www.london.gov.uk/sites/default/files/Dust%20and%20Emissions%20SPG%208%20July%202014_0.pdf

The applicant is advised that notification to the Environmental Growth and Quality team will be required under the Environmental Permitting Regulations if an on site concrete crusher will be used during the demolition stage.

The applicant is advised that asbestos containing materials (cement sheeting) may be present at the site. The agent/applicant should ensure that these materials are dismantled and disposed of in the appropriate manner to a licensed disposal site. Further information regarding safety issues can be obtained from the Health and Safety Executive (HSE). Additionally, Guidance from the HSE on the identification and management of asbestos in buildings can be found by following the link below:

<http://www.hse.gov.uk/pubns/indg223.pdf>

It is advised that an asbestos survey is carried out by a licensed and qualified asbestos surveyor prior to any demolition works being carried out.

The applicant is reminded that it is a requirement of the Clean Air Act 1993 that no furnace shall be installed in a building or in any fixed boiler or industrial plant unless notice of the proposal to install it has been given to the local authority. Details of any plant to be installed should be provided using the Chimney Height Calculation form (available here: <https://www.cambridge.gov.uk/chimney-height-approval>). Reason: to protect human health in line with policy 4/14 of the Local Plan

INFORMATIVE: The applicant is advised that 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.

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

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

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 30th September 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 public open space, transport mitigation measures, or public art, in accordance with Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/7, 3/8, 8/3 and 10/1, the Public Art Supplementary Planning Document 2010, or the Open Space Standards Guidance for Interpretation and Implementation 2010.

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