

<b>Application Number</b>	15/0777/FUL	<b>Agenda Item</b>	
<b>Date Received</b>	27th April 2015	<b>Officer</b>	Mr Tony Collins
<b>Target Date</b>	27th July 2015		
<b>Ward</b>	Market		
<b>Site</b>	North Range Of Buildings New Museums Site Free School Lane Cambridge Cambridgeshire		
<b>Proposal</b>	Creation of new student services centre, including demolition of existing examinations hall, north end of the Austin Building, Mond Building annexe and creation of a cut through the Old Cavendish Laboratory. Refurbishment of Old Cavendish, Rayleigh wing Arts School and Lecture Theatre creation of the landscape areas and associated works		
<b>Applicant</b>	University Of Cambridge C/o Agent		

<p>SUMMARY</p>	<p>The development accords with the Development Plan for the following reasons:</p> <p>The development would enhance the quality of the site and the conservation area, and provide a strong functional and visual link between this University site and the city centre</p> <p>The proposals as amended address the significant design concerns raised by Design Panel and the Urban Design and Conservation team</p> <p>The harm arising from the loss of the Mond Annexe and the Examination Halls is outweighed by the overall benefits of the scheme</p>
<p>RECOMMENDATION</p>	<p>APPROVAL</p>

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

- 1.1 The New Museums Site (NMS) is one of the most prominent faculty sites of the University of Cambridge, lying in the heart of the city. It fills almost the whole of the irregular quadrilateral bounded to the north by Bene't Street and Wheeler Street, to the east by Corn Exchange Street, to the south by Downing Street and Pembroke Street, and to the west by Free School Lane. It has been in the ownership of the University since the eighteenth century, and was originally its Botanic Gardens. From the mid-nineteenth century, the site was developed with buildings for the study of the natural sciences.
- 1.2 The Corn Exchange, and retail premises, including several bars and restaurants fill the small part of this block which is not within the NMS. To the north are the Guildhall, and further retail premises on the north side of Bene't Street. To the east is the Grand Arcade. To the south, across Downing Street and Pembroke Street are the University's Downing site, and Pembroke College. To the west, across Free School Lane, is Corpus Christi College.
- 1.3 This application relates to the North Range of this site, the buildings which run across the northern edge of the NMS, from Free School Lane to the point where the site meets the tiny cul-de-sac of Parson's Court, on the west side of the Corn Exchange. There are three linked buildings in this range, the Old Cavendish Laboratory and its Rayleigh Wing, stretching alongside, and east from, Free School Lane, the Arts School, fronting on to Bene't Yard, a small turning off Bene't Street, and the Examination Halls, in the north-east corner, backing on to Parson's Court. The application also relates to two other buildings which lie immediately to the south of this group, the Mond Annexe, and the Austin Building.
- 1.4 The whole of this site lies within City of Cambridge Conservation Area No.1 (Central). The Old Cavendish Building, the Rayleigh Wing, the Arts School and the Mond Building to the south of the site are all listed Grade II. The Examination Halls, the Austin Building, and the Mond Annexe are unlisted, but the Mond Annexe is a Building of Local Interest.

## 2.0 THE PROPOSAL

- 2.1 The application proposes extensive works to the northern part of the New Museums site, involving the demolition of some buildings, the alteration of others and the construction of a new Student Services Centre on the site of the present Exam Halls.
- 2.2 The principal purposes of the development are:
- to provide new space for Student Services, enabling several different student support functions to be brought together in appropriate accommodation,
  - to create replacement examination halls which are sufficiently flexible to provide space for other uses outside exam seasons
  - to begin the process of creating new, coherent and less overdeveloped urban courtyards, enhancing the quality of the wider site for both regular users and visitors
  - to create a more legible entrance to the New Museums site from the city centre, strengthening the link between this part of the university and the neighbouring streets and spaces.
- 2.3 The proposal forms the second phase of a Masterplan for the new Museums site, which seeks to ensure a coherent and sensitive redevelopment of the site. It aims to achieve:
- A more appealing site, contributing positively to the city's economy and culture
  - The creation of a more sustainable environment
  - Adaptable and flexible space for University use
  - Improved entrances and accessibility
  - Greater restrictions on access by motor vehicles
  - Retention and enhancement of heritage buildings which contribute positively to the site and its surroundings
  - The demolition of buildings of lower quality
  - The creation of clear routes
  - The improvement of the existing complex service networks
- 2.4 This application seeks approval for the construction of the proposed Student Services Centre. The development also involves alterations to three listed buildings, the Old Cavendish Building, the Rayleigh Wing, and the Arts School. Many of these alterations require listed building consent but not planning permission. However, changes are proposed to the exterior of

these buildings, including the insertion of new windows in the Arts School, and most importantly, the creation of a double archway from Bene't Yard through the present ground floor of the Cavendish Building to the interior of the site, and these changes also need planning permission. Internal links at ground, first and second floor levels would be created between the east end of the Arts School and the new Student Service Centre, and the two buildings would be sealed together by a glazed element filling the narrow space between them.

- 2.5 Permission is also sought for the demolition of three buildings: the Exam Halls, the Mond Building Annexe, and the northernmost section of the Austin building. None of these buildings is listed. Two sections of the Exam Halls would be retained: the distinctive ventilation tower which sits in the angle between the building and No.4 Parson's Court would remain in situ and be used in the ventilation strategy of the new Student Service Centre, while the doorway of the Exams Hall would be re-sited to form an entrance to the new examination space. The removal of the northern section of the Austin Building and the Mond Annexe would permit the relevant parts of the new courtyard spaces envisaged in the Masterplan to be created.

### 3.0 SITE HISTORY

- 3.1 There is extensive planning history on the New Museums site, both within the present application site, and beyond it, but the only applications of relevance to this application are those listed below.

<b>Reference</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Outcome</b>
13/1093/FUL	Change of use of Arup Building (now David Attenborough Building) from D1 to B1/D1, with alterations and refurbishment	Approved with conditions
15/0772/FUL	Demolition of Rolls Royce Building	Approved with conditions
15/0779/LBC	Alterations to Arts School and Old Cavendish Building	Under consideration

#### 4.0 PUBLICITY

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

#### 5.0 POLICY

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

5.2 Relevant Development Plan policies

PLAN		POLICY NUMBER
Cambridge Plan 2006	Local	3/1 3/4 3/6 3/7 3/11 3/12 3/13 4/10 4/11 4/12 4/13 4/16 7/5 8/2 8/6 8/9 8/10 10/1

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

Central Government Guidance	National Planning Policy Framework March 2012 National Planning Policy Framework – Planning Practice Guidance March 2014 Circular 11/95
Supplementary Planning Guidance	Sustainable Design and Construction (May 2007) Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Waste Partnership (RECAP): Waste Management Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (February 2012)

	<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 Management Plan (2011)</p> <p>Cambridge Walking and Cycling Strategy (2002)</p> <p>Air Quality in Cambridge – Developers Guide (2008)</p>
	<p><u>Area Guidelines</u></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, the following policies in the emerging Local Plan are of relevance:

Policy 43: University faculty development

## 6.0 CONSULTATIONS

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

First Comments (5<sup>th</sup> June 2015)

#### 6.1 Deficiencies in transport submission regarding:

- Reference to NPPG and Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Transport Strategy,
- Evidence for existing staff, student and visitor numbers in Table 2.1 of the Transport Assessment
- Details of 2012 surveys, absolute numbers involved, and modal splits shown therein,
- Size of proposed buildings compared to existing,
- Proportion of total New Museums site cycle parking to be contained within the North Range
- Usual amounts of staff and students on site at any one time
- Access to basement cycle parking
- Predicted trip generation
- Future use of Lecture Theatre A and types of student attending
- Uses in the Mond Annexe and the north end of the Austin Building
- TRICS outputs
- Peak trips
- Modal split amongst staff to be relocated to New Museums from other sites

#### 6.2 Unable to fully assess transport impact. Refusal recommended unless these issues resolved.

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

#### 6.3 Unable to comment on waste provision. Otherwise no objection, subject to conditions on construction hours, construction deliveries, construction noise, vibration and piling, dust, plant

noise insulation and contaminated land. Informatives also recommended.

### **Waste Strategy Manager**

6.4 Insufficient information.

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

First advice (30<sup>th</sup> June 2015)

#### Proposed Student Services Building

- 6.5 English Heritage confirmed in 2014 that the Exams Hall was not listed. Nevertheless the building and its façade have heritage value and both the City Council and Historic England were keen to pursue options which involved its integration into a new building approximately in the same location/orientation.
- 6.6 Notwithstanding the extensive pre-application discussions on the new SSC building, we are of the view that further detailed amendments to the proposal are still necessary, especially in regards to the plant overrun/tank box. Our comments and suggested further work and/or amendments are as follows.
- 6.7 The roof-mounted lift plant /water tank“box” is prominent especially in verified views provided with the application. This plant box was not discussed in any level of detail at the pre-application stage. Our concern is that the resulting square, aluminium box is too prominent in views from both Peas Hill but also from surrounding elevated positions including the verified view taken from the Grand Arcade car park. This feature is considered to have an adverse impact on the conservation area. The applicant has offered now to review the scale of this box and to change the colour to a much more muted grey colour and tone so it is less intrusive in the surrounding roof scape and we look forward to seeing this further work. The most successful finish to the plant box would be zinc. However, anodized aluminium might also be an option.
- 6.8 We feel that the re-integration of the original door entrance to the Exams Hall is generally successful. Having seen both options now we are satisfied that a solid, pre-cast panel rather than glazing above the door is acceptable. It needs to be

confirmed that the original door, not only the stone door surround and arch, are re-used.

- 6.9 The use of hardwood timber on the new SSC façade is questionable. In our understanding timber does not feature widely as panelling within the New Museums site and it is our view that alternate materials should be considered for windows and ventilation panels. Equally timber is a far less durable product than masonry or metal hence will require maintenance at regular intervals. We are however supportive of the use of brick work (such as a TBS Mystique) and reconstituted stone is supported, subject to condition and erection/approval of a sample panel.
- 6.10 The building parapet in our view is not well finished. The building takes on a somewhat stunted appearance with no clear “top”, the second and third floors are identical in proportion, and thus the contemporary composition of the building appear more at odds to its neighbours.
- 6.11 The glazed link between the Arts School and the new part of the SSC will allow the gable elevation of the Arts School to be exposed, and create, a “light touch” in this location. While we have no fundamental concerns with this arrangement, the success of the link will be depend on installation, drainage and maintenance. More details are required.
- 6.12 Measures to control of staining and weathering of the façade, particularly window cills, have now been provided, including aluminium capping of pre-cast cills. It is imperative that sills in particular are safeguarded against weathering as much as possible.
- 6.13 There is a need for appropriate surfacing and lighting at the Parson’s Court approach and in the alleyway into the site as part of the works planned with this application – especially given the taller new building proposed.

#### Creation/enhancement of spaces

- 6.14 Three main spaces are affected: landscaping to Bene’t Street Yard; re-forming of the area between the Mond and Cavendish buildings (Court 3); and partial forming of the northern edge of Court 2 (between the David Attenborough and Austin buildings).

Besides creating a better working and pedestrian environment within the site, it is notable that the opening-up of spaces will lead to greater visibility of buildings within the site and improved spatial relationships between them. This represents an enhancement of this part of the conservation area.

#### Demolition of the Examination Schools.

- 6.15 The building is not listed, but Para 138 of the Framework states that the loss of a building that makes a positive contribution to the significance of the Conservation Area should be treated as harm.
- 6.16 The building relates by date, architect and function to other buildings on the site. It has however, less visible presence from outside the site and internally is compromised. The building is of moderate significance to the conservation area and its loss detracts from the conservation area. The main entrance doorway is proposed to be retained in the replacement building, which is positive.

#### Demolition of the Mond Annexe.

- 6.17 The Mond Annexe, which is almost contemporary with the Grade III listed Mond Building (1932), is a BLI. It is considered to be of moderate significance and its loss detracts from the conservation area.

#### Cavendish Labs

- 6.18 The proposed internal alterations are considered under the listed building application. In terms of external appearance, the application proposes the creation of a functional link between Benet's Yard and a new "third court" through the Grade II Listed Cavendish East Wing involving the removal of outer wall with two windows on each elevation. This is a major intervention. The applicant's justification for it is for permeability within the site. The opening would initially be a large one to enable movement for demolition and construction materials. The cut-through would subsequently be reduced to two arches on either side as shown on submitted drawings.
- 6.19 More information is needed on how this large opening in the listed building is intended to be used. It would not be acceptable

for the first floor structure to have to be removed. It is important that central piers are reinstated when the materials moving stages have been carried out. To reflect the different existing width of walling between windows on either elevation, the piers should not be of the same width. Window arch brickwork must be retained. The treatment of the currently internal walls and ceiling exposed by the through link is also important.

#### The Arts School.

- 6.20 The principle of new openings in the upper blank elevation to provide windows is acceptable.
- 6.21 The new SSC building will be a more imposing backdrop for the Arts School due to its greater scale. Bene't Yard is currently a detractor from the setting of the Arts School. The improvements will enhance the setting of the west façade of the Arts School significantly. The setting of the Arts School will be opened up by the removal of the north end of the Austin Building. The Arts School and SSC would be in close juxtaposition here but relieved to some extent by the glazed connection between them.

#### Setting of the Corn Exchange.

- 6.22 At Parsons Court the existing Exams Schools blends in terms of materials with the Corn Exchange and 4 Parsons Court. At present, the new SSC building could be an unsympathetic contrast. However, we have suggested modifications and amendments to the scheme to make it more acceptable in design terms.

#### Conclusions

- 6.23 In our view, the adverse impacts of the loss of the Mond Annexe and the Exams Hall on the settings of the Listed Arts School, Mond Lab, and Cavendish buildings may be said to be offset by enhancements of the settings of the Listed buildings resulting from the new and improved spaces around them, and the weight given to the adverse impacts of the same demolitions on the conservation area must take into account the limited significance of these buildings and the improvement of the interior of the.

6.24 However, the contribution of the proposed SSC building to the appearance of the conservation area remains problematic for reasons referred to above. Therefore on balance, it cannot yet be concluded that the proposed SSC preserves or enhances the conservation area – issues noted above need to be mitigated first

6.25 In our view, for the reasons above, we do not consider that the application currently complies with policies 3/4, 4/10, 4/11 or 4/12. We would however hope that with further work and consideration of the issues identified, we may be in a position to fully support the application.

Second advice (13<sup>th</sup> August 2015), following the revised plans and submissions of 31/07/15.

6.26 Assessment is now as follows:

- SSC plant /water tank roof “box”: reduction in size and material finish change - satisfactory.
- Original Exam Halls door entrance: solid, pre-cast panel above the door is acceptable.
- SSC windows: condition sought to ensure vertical slat option.
- SSC parapet: parapet design as submitted now considered acceptable; avoiding further height to the building is considered to outweigh the parapet depth concern.
- Glazed link: acceptable.
- Measures to control of staining and weathering of the façade: acceptable.
- Parson’s Court alleyway. surfacing requires condition. Security lighting is part of the wider master plan.

6.27 With all these amendments and subject to conditions, we are satisfied that the proposal represents an appropriate design in this context and the design has responded positively to the various comments made by consultees, including ourselves, Historic England and the Design and Conservation Panel. The scheme now complies to the relevant policies cited earlier in our

comments dated 30<sup>th</sup> June, 2015, and we support the application in design and conservation terms.

**Design and Conservation Panel (Meetings of 10<sup>th</sup> December 2014, 11<sup>th</sup> February 2015 and 10<sup>th</sup> June 2015)**

6.28 The conclusions of the Panel meetings were as follows.

10<sup>th</sup> December 2014

6.29 The Panel were provided with the consultants' evaluation of the existing Exams Hall façade, which stated that this heavily altered building was regarded as a heritage asset of only minimal significance. It was argued that the Conservation Area would achieve a net gain by its demolition. This proposal was viewed as inadequate both in its justification and appreciation of its potential.

6.30 The current proposal for façade retention does not impact on the proposed new building and it acts as 'wallpaper' only. The Panel would feel unable to justify demolition for this scheme. Instead it would encourage further work into the impact of a more meaningful retention scheme, which reinstated the central doorway and an informal lobby space. Then it could be assessed whether this would make sense and enrich the place. In the Panel's view, this is not a straightforward issue as matters of integrity and impact are combined with the quality of the response to the public realm.

6.31 The Panel felt that the team had failed to address the complex nature of the site with its many retained buildings. More thorough information was needed to communicate the historic mix of the surrounding buildings and to define the context for the proposed new moves. The issue seems wider than the current single focus on the retained façade.

6.32 Inserting a new building into this mix will remain a complex task, but needs a compelling design logic to enable it to hold its own, yet remain in conversation with its neighbours. The Panel looks forward to seeing fresh thinking around this proposal.

6.33 **VERDICT: RED (unanimous)** The design team are requested to provide more information and greater detail on proposals for integration and conservation, in parallel to enhanced proposals

for a new building that relates more positively to its context.

11<sup>th</sup> February 2015

- 6.34 Exams Hall façade: At this point, the Panel maintains its support for retention of the Exams Hall façade as a memory of the building, but would like to see further work undertaken to create a convincing scenario for this. Although architecturally it includes some pleasing elements, it could be argued that the facade holds greater value in its associations. Should only the doorway be retained, a witty relationship would need to be found between this and the modern building. It could become a focal point for the landscaping of the new south-facing courtyard. The exploration into the relationship between the Arts School and the new building is appreciated.
- 6.35 Wheeler Street: The Panel expressed some concern regarding the considerable impact of the new building on the more domestically-scaled buildings, specifically regarding the overshadowing of the rear spaces. The Panel would like to see evidence that the impact on light levels has been considered.
- 6.36 Mond Annexe: A re-defined Mond Annex within the new public realm could be interesting and should not be dismissed at this stage. The Panel will look forward to further dialogue and to further evolution of the process.
- 6.37 **VERDICT**: (on both the Exams Halls façade and Mond Annex options) **AMBER (unanimous)**

10<sup>th</sup> June 2015

- 6.38 The Panel felt this was a satisfactory conclusion to the first of many chapters in the transformation of the New Museums Site. The architects have brought a degree of sophistication and elegance to upgrading the existing Arts School building and inserting a new development. Providing the landscaping is of a sufficiently high standard, the changes proposed will improve the environment.
- 6.39 **VERDICT: GREEN (6) AMBER (1)**
- 6.40 The relevant sections of the minutes of the panel meetings are attached to this report as Appendices A(December 2014),

B(February 2015), and C(Jun 2015).

### **Historic England**

- 6.41 On balance, no objections to the demolition of the Mond Annexe. Consider any adverse impacts on the setting of the Mond Building would be offset by the enhancement to the settings of nearby listed buildings by the creation of improved public spaces.
- 6.42 No objection to the demolition of the majority of the Examinations Hall. Disappointed that the proposal does not retain the full façade of that building, but welcome the retention and integration of the original doorway.
- 6.43 Advise that the overall impact of the proposal on the conservation area would be neutral, except for the lift and stair overrun on the new Student Services building. It should be reduced in scale and its finish materials made less prominent.
- 6.44 Lack of parapet on Student Services building together with identical dimensions to second and third floors results in 'unfinished' appearance. Urge stronger parapet to complement the elevational character of adjacent buildings.
- 6.45 Satisfied that harm to the significance of the Grade II Cavendish Laboratory caused by creation of ground-level cut-through is outweighed by the benefit of increased permeability of the site. Satisfied that the significance of the Arts School would not be harmed by alterations proposed, and that overall scheme is in accordance with NPPG.
- 6.46 Provided the scheme is amended to include reinstatement of window arch brickwork on the internal side of the cut-through (facing the Mond Building), no objections.

### **Victorian Society**

- 6.47 Object to the substantial demolition and replacement of the Examination Halls. The frontage pavilion is an aesthetically pleasing structure, and the building's most significant external element. The loss of this element would cause harm to the setting of a number of listed buildings and would fail to preserve or enhance the Conservation Area to which it contributes

positively.

- 6.48 The character and appearance, particularly of the interior, of the Examination Halls has been much compromised in the latter part of the twentieth century. It may be therefore that the loss of the majority of the building could be acceptable. However the handsome front pavilion should be retained and incorporated into any new building on the site. Given its structural and visual discreteness, this should not prove too challenging for a skilled and imaginative architect. Should the application be amended in order to retain the pavilion on the front of the Examinations Hall then we would be prepared to withdraw our objection.
- 6.49 No objection to improving access to the site by creating an opening through the New Cavendish Building, or to the alterations proposed to the Arts School building.

### **20<sup>th</sup> Century Society**

- 6.50 Object to the demolition of the Mond Annexe. This would be detrimental to the setting of the listed Mond Building, and would cause harm to the character of the conservation area. The wish to open up the interior space of the site is acknowledged, but the limited mass of the Mond Annexe would not prevent this if retained. An appropriate use for the building could easily be found.

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

- 6.51 Support in principle, but concerned about the omission of significant detail on the following matters from the proposal.
- Litter and recycling bins
  - Investigation of underground services
  - Tree planting
  - Roof-top pond
- 6.52 Certain elements of the scheme are not supported, namely:
- Absence of permeable paving
  - Tree species proposed
  - Aquatic planting area in Bene't Street Yard
  - Sliding gate/secure screen

## Senior Sustainable Development Officer

- 6.53 The bespoke approach to sustainable construction for the New Museums Site is fully supported, and the level of detail within the Sustainable Assessment Matrix (SAM) for this wider site is welcomed. Such an approach will ensure that site specific opportunities can be fully taken into account. The SAM includes targets to reduce onsite CO<sub>2</sub> emissions and on-site water use, to reduce construction waste, to reduce emissions from commuting and to increase use of local labour and apprenticeships. It also includes proposals to achieve acceptable comfort conditions in the future without the need for major air-conditioning plant, to increase soft landscaping and enhance the public realm.
- 6.54 Specific measures being incorporated into the proposals for the North Range of Buildings include:
- Proposals for the majority of the new building to be naturally ventilated, with the examination halls ventilation tower to be retained and re-used as a ventilation inlet for the air handling plant associated with the new examination halls, which will need mechanical ventilation for periods of high occupancy usage;
  - The use of exposed thermal mass coupled with night time purge to help regulate internal temperatures, allowing the building to remain cooler in summer months;
  - The use of a green roof in combination with proposed photovoltaic panels. This approach is fully supported as not only will the proposals for the green roof assist with surface water attenuation and help enhance the biodiversity potential of the site, but it will also help to reduce internal cooling loads and will help to maintain a more stable microclimate around the photovoltaic panels;
  - Thermal modelling of the building to future climate scenarios to ensure that buildings will remain comfortable even in a warmer climate;
  - The use of deep window reveals, opaque ventilation panels and shading blades on relevant elevations to provide solar protection;
  - Reference to the use of rainwater recycling to serve central toilet stacks in the new build;
  - Building performance/fabric improvements including roof insulation and ground floor insulation above basements in

existing buildings, sensitive to their heritage status.

- 6.55 All of these measures are supported.
- 6.56 The Sustainability and Energy Statement submitted as part of the planning application outlines the hierarchical approach to reducing emissions across both the new build element and refurbishment of existing buildings within the North Range of buildings, an approach that is fully supported. This approach is predicted to reduce carbon emissions by 59,884 Kg/CO<sub>2</sub>/annum, of which 18,900 Kg/CO<sub>2</sub>/annum would be achieved through the use of photovoltaic panels and air source heat (an 11.3% reduction). This approach is fully supported.
- 6.57 Also as part of this phase, pipe runs and space are to be provided to enable a Combined Heat and Power-led district heating network to be developed as part of phase 3 of the redevelopment of the New Museums Site. This should help to lead to further emissions reductions. This approach, futureproofing this stage of the development for connection to the heat network, is also supported.
- 6.58 Proposal supported overall, subject to a condition to ensure installation of the proposed renewable energy technologies.

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

First advice (20<sup>th</sup> May 2015)

- 6.59 The use of green and brown roofs is fully supported. However, the application as a whole, as it stands, is not supported for the following reasons.
- 6.60 Although the foul and surface water has been separated internally the original connection to the foul/combined sewer remains. The applicant has not sufficiently demonstrated that this arrangement will not increase the risk of flooding. Assessments of existing flows into the existing network have been based on an impermeable area method. This can substantially overestimate existing flows due to the fact that the existing infrastructure may not be in place to accommodate these flows and new infrastructure will be much more efficient and can lead to greater amounts of surface water entering the

network than previously. An assessment of existing flows should be based on the capacity of the existing infrastructure, which will give a more realistic view of the existing surface water discharges from the site. The proposal, as it stands, could potentially increase flood risk in an area that has suffered numerous flooding incidents in recent years.

- 6.61 There should be a greater emphasis on making a surface water connection to the surface water network in Bene't Street. Opportunities in the historic core of Cambridge to separate foul and surface water do not arise on a regular basis and should be taken when presented.
- 6.62 The rationale for not using permeable paving is not accepted. There are numerous engineering techniques to ensure that basements will not be impacted by this approach.

Second advice (22<sup>nd</sup> June 2015)

- 6.63 Addendum report does provide further information regarding the discharge from the site, but I still have strong concerns about the proposals as there still appears to be a greater amount of surface water being discharged into the foul network in Bene't Street, where there have been flooding incidents in the past. The foul pipe is a 225mm diameter and from Anglian Water's records, only has a minimal fall from manhole 8304 to 8303 (30mm) and even if it is assumed that this pipe is new and in perfect condition, the discharge proposals (74.49 l/s) considerably exceed the capacity of the pipe which is around 15 l/s. There has also been no consideration that foul will also be discharged from the site in this location. A greater effort should also be made to separate as much surface water from foul water as possible. There has been no effort to achieve this in the proposals.
- 6.64 The proposals could therefore potentially increase flood risk in the area and still cannot be supported.

Third Advice, following amendments (7<sup>th</sup> August 2015)

- 6.65 The revised surface water drainage strategy is acceptable and demonstrates that flood risk will not be increased as a result of the proposals. It has also been demonstrated that there is betterment in terms of peak surface water runoff from the site.

## **Cambridgeshire County Council (Lead Drainage Authority)**

First advice (27<sup>th</sup> May 2015)

- 6.66 Object: surface water drainage strategy not acceptable. The applicant has not demonstrated what the existing surface water runoff rates currently are for the site and therefore the proposed decrease in discharge rates cannot be identified as acceptable. This may increase the flood risk on site and in surrounding areas.

Second advice (22<sup>nd</sup> June 2015)

- 6.67 Agree fully with second advice from the Council's Sustainable Drainage Officer.

Third advice (18<sup>th</sup> August 2015)

- 6.68 Drainage strategy is acceptable.

### **Environment Agency**

- 6.69 No objection in principle, but conditions sought relating to surface and foul water details, open gullies and a percolation test.

### **Anglian Water**

- 6.70 No advice provided at present.

### **Disability Access Panel (Meeting of 26<sup>th</sup> May 2015)**

- 6.71 Stressed need for a hearing induction loop system within the lecture theatre and for consideration to be given to disabled lecturers as well as students.

### **Access Officer**

- 6.72 University provision is generally good. Design and Access Statement is comprehensive. Disability Panel were happy with the proposal. No further comment required.

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

- 6.73 Improved permeability through the site for cyclists and pedestrians is very much welcomed.
- 6.74 Inadequate information about cycle parking. Transport Statement does not make clear how the cycle parking level relates to the proposed student and staff levels.
- 6.75 Inadequate information with regard to the number of cycle racks at ground level. Transport Statement refers to semi-vertical and two-tier racks but there is no further detail of these racks. Semi vertical racks of any kind are not acceptable. More detail needed on double-decker racks and access to basement

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

- 6.76 At present, the County Archaeological team has not provided advice on this application. Given the position of the site very close to the historic core of the city, it appears to me that there may be a likelihood of archaeological remains existing in this area. I anticipate that the County Council will seek a condition to require an archaeological investigation. I recommend such a condition, and I will report any comments of the archaeological service on the amendment sheet or at Committee.

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

- 6.77 Recommend basement cycle parking areas be secured with fob access and covered by CCTV. No objections.

### **Ministry of Defence (Air Safeguarding)**

- 6.78 No safeguarding objections.
- 6.79 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 Cambridge Past Present and Future.

7.2 The representations can be summarised as follows.

7.3 Broadly supported, but concerned about the following elements:

- Proposal to demolish only limited section of the Austin Building could jeopardise successful implementation of the landscaping.
- Brick cladding and precast concrete is unacceptable for new Student Services building. It should be replaced by Clipsham or Stamford limestone, which would be more consistent with the retained Exams Hall entrance and the street elevations of buildings on Free School Lane and Downing and Pembroke Streets.

7.4 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. Sustainable drainage
6. Disabled access
7. Refuse arrangements
8. Highway safety
9. Car and cycle parking
10. Third party representations

### **Principle of Development**

8.2 In my opinion, the principle of the development, which seeks the improvement of facilities, a reduction in car parking, and improvements to external amenity spaces is acceptable and in fully in accordance with policies 3/1, 3/4, 3/7, 3/12, and 7/5 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006. I deal with the demolitions involved, and their significance with respect to policies 4/11 and 4/12 below.

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

- 8.3 The proposal is made up broadly of four elements: the demolition of some buildings, the alteration of some of the retained buildings, the erection of a new building - the Student Services Centre, and the creation of new spaces.

### Demolitions

- 8.4 I note the objection of the Twentieth Century Society to the demolition of the Mond Annexe, which is a BLI. I also note the advice of the Urban Design and Conservation team that the loss of this building would detract from the conservation area. However, I agree with Historic England that the impact of the loss of the Mond Annexe is outweighed by the benefits created by opening up the space within the site, creating a better setting for other surrounding buildings, and allowing views from the Free School Lane archway towards the east side of the New Museums Site. I do not accept the view of the Twentieth Century Society that the limited mass of the Mond Annexe would not limit the quality of the new space created. In my opinion, because of the very clear and substantial public benefit arising from its removal, the demolition of the Mond Annexe is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 3/4, 3/7, 3/11, 4/11 and 4/12.
- 8.5 I note the objection of the Victorian Society to the demolition of the Examinations Hall, and the rider in the Society's advice that whilst the loss of the Hall itself could be countenanced, the frontage pavilion should be retained in its entirety. Disappointment that the scheme does not retain the whole of the frontage pavilion here is shared by Historic England. I also note the Urban Design and Conservation team's view that the building is of moderate significance and that its loss detracts from the conservation area.
- 8.6 I also note, however, that the applicant has fully explored a number of alternative proposals to retain the whole of the frontage pavilion of the Exam Hall building. In my view, all of these proposals were unsatisfactory; even the most coherent alternative scheme would not have allowed the use of the original doorway as a functional entrance, and would have caused the building to read very confusingly to users and

detracted from the proper functioning of the new space outside. It would also have compromised the aims of the Student Services Centre element of the project by reducing the space available to the University for examinations, created an uneasy visual relationship between the ground floor of the SSC and the rest of the building, and perpetuated the awkwardness of the juxtaposition between the Exams Hall frontage and the corner of the David Attenborough Building. I am convinced by this exercise that if any part of the Exam Halls is to be retained and integrated into the SSC, the use of the main doorway as proposed here, serving as a functional entrance, is the appropriate solution.

- 8.7 I also note the concerns of Cambridge Past Present and Future that the demolition of the Austin Building in phases could jeopardize the satisfactory completion of the landscaping proposals for the new spaces within the New Museums site. I do not share this concern. In my view, the implementation of appropriate landscaping can be guaranteed by future permissions on the site and conditions attached to them. It would not be reasonable to require the whole of the Austin Building to be demolished at one time.

#### Alterations to the Arts School and the Old Cavendish Building

- 8.8 The majority of the alterations proposed are internal, and do not require planning permission. They are addressed in the report on the associated listed building consent application. The exceptions are the additional windows proposed in the Arts School, and the cut-through in the ground floor of the Cavendish Building to form a link between the internal courtyard and Bene't Yard and Bene't Street.
- 8.9 The City Council's conservation officers, Historic England and the Victorian Society all support the insertion of additional windows in the Arts School, and I accept this advice. These three consultees are also all persuaded that in principle, any harm to the significance of the Old Cavendish building caused by the creation of a cut-through could be outweighed by the benefits of greater permeability. I concur with this view, but I also note the concerns expressed about how the wider form of this opening, needed for construction purposes, will be created, and how the piers, archway brickwork and 'internal' surfaces of

the finished opening will be handled. In my view, these issues can be satisfactorily controlled by appropriate conditions.

### New Student Services Centre building

- 8.10 In my view, the proposed SSC is of appropriate scale and proportions to fill this awkward section of the New Museums site in a successful manner. Its height would closely match that of the Arts School and the Old Cavendish building, and I do not consider that it would unduly dominate or overpower them. Rather, I am of the view that its south elevation would relate well to both the newly refurbished mid-twentieth-century David Attenborough Building to the east, and its historic neighbours to the west. The relationship between the entrance to the SSC and the space in front of it, and between the entrance and the David Attenborough Building would both be considerable improvements over the present situation.
- 8.11 The applicants have submitted amendments to the proposed plant 'box' at roof level, significantly reducing its footprint and its height, and proposing metal cladding of a grey colour, either zinc or aluminium. The proposed changes would greatly reduce its visibility in Peas Hill, to the point where I do not consider it would have any significant impact. In my view this change addresses the concerns about this feature of the building which have been raised in several quarters. The additional submissions also include amended details of the use of timber on the windows, additional cill details to prevent staining from water runoff, and additional details of the glazed link between the SSC and the Arts School. I am satisfied that all these additional details are acceptable and resolve the concerns raised on the respective issues.
- 8.12 The additional submission also includes confirmation that the existing timber doors of the Examinations Hall would be used as the entrance to the SSC from the south, as well as the doorway surrounding them. The submission also indicates that the applicants wish to adhere to the proposed stone panel above the retained doorway, rather than using a glazed panel in this position. I am of the view that the stone panel proposed is more successful in integrating the doorway into the new building, and in my opinion, this solution is acceptable. The additional submission also explores a series of different approaches to the parapet of the building, in response to issues raised by Panel,

the urban design team, and Historic England, but concludes that the design as originally submitted, without additional parapet detail, is the most appropriate solution. I agree with this conclusion. In my opinion, the simplicity of the proposed elevation, and the precise repetition of storey detailing at first, second and third floor level, are two of the strengths of the proposed building; I do not consider that additional parapet detail would add merit to the building, and in my opinion, the design originally submitted for the upper edge of the building is balanced and fully respectful of its context.

### New external spaces

- 8.13 The application proposes, in accordance with the Masterplan for the NMS, the landscaping of Bene't Yard, including a greater limiting of its use by cars, the creation of a new space (Courtyard 3) between the Cavendish Laboratory and the Mond Building, and the formation of the first part of a larger space (Courtyard 2), south of the new SSC and west of the David Attenborough Building, where the Rolls Royce building, whose demolition has already been approved, now stands. All of these changes would enhance the quality of the NMS as a whole. I accept the advice of the landscape team that some aspects of the detailed landscaping proposals need amendment and I recommend conditions accordingly.

### Conclusion

- 8.14 In my view, the overall plan for the North Range, as now amended, would enhance the character of the conservation area, provide a more stimulating and convenient place to study, and protect the setting of the listed buildings on the site, in accordance with policies 3/4, 3/7, 3/11, 3/12, 4/10 and 4/11 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006.

### **Public Art**

- 8.15 The applicant has submitted a Public Art Strategy in association with this application. The Strategy is set in the context of a Public Art Programme for the whole New Museums site, and includes details of overall vision, site-wide projects, commissioning, public engagement, scheduling, budget, delivery, maintenance and reporting. In my opinion, subject to a condition requiring adherence to the strategy submitted, the

proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 3/7 and 10/1 and the Public Art SPD 2010

### **Renewable energy and sustainability**

- 8.16 Detailed proposals to improve sustainability over the site, reduce carbon emissions, and enable further sustainable improvements in the future through Combined Heat and Power are fully supported by the Sustainable Development Officer. I accept her advice; in my view, the applicants have suitably addressed the issues 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.

### **Sustainable drainage**

- 8.17 Drainage officers at both City and County Councils strongly opposed the application as originally submitted because of the risk that new infrastructure would release surface water into sewers in Bene't Street too rapidly, causing flooding. Following a redesign of the surface water strategy, the City Council's sustainable drainage officer, the County Council's drainage officer, and the Environment Agency are all now content with the scheme. I accept their advice, and in my view, subject to a condition to ensure implementation of the amended surface water drainage proposal, the scheme is acceptable in terms of flood risk, and in accordance with policy 4/16 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006. The Water Authority has not yet provided advice, but I anticipate it will agree with the other relevant consultees. I will report any comments on the Amendment Sheet or at Committee

### **Disabled access**

- 8.18 The application has given thorough consideration to disabled users. Disability Access Panel and the Access officer are content with the proposal, and I concur with their view. The relatively minor issues raised by Panel can be addressed by an informative. In my opinion the proposal is compliant, with respect to inclusive access, with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 3/7 and 3/12.

## **Refuse Arrangements**

- 8.19 The Waste Strategy Manager has indicated a lack of necessary information. I accept this advice, but I do not consider that the application should be refused on this basis. I consider it likely that the Waste Strategy team's concerns can be addressed by the provision of additional information which can be secured by condition.
- 8.20 In my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policy 3/12.

## **Highway Safety and transport issues**

- 8.21 The highway authority has raised issues about the impact of the construction process. That impact will be significant, but I concur with the highway authority that it can be addressed by condition.
- 8.22 Issues relating to the Transport Statement remain unresolved; the County Council is not content with several aspects of the information provided. I expect these issues to be resolved by the submission of the necessary information. I will report any such information, and the County Council's response, on the amendment sheet or at Committee.
- 8.23 In my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policy 8/2.

## **Car and Cycle Parking**

- 8.24 Car parking on site will be reduced. This is in accordance with local plan policy which seeks to secure reductions in on-site non-residential car parking.
- 8.25 The cycling officer has indicated concerns about the information on cycle parking provided and the types of cycle storage suggested. In my view these issues can be addressed by condition, which I recommend.
- 8.26 In my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 8/6 and 8/10.

## **Third Party Representations**

8.27 I have addressed the two issues raised.

## **9.0 CONCLUSION**

9.1 Overall the proposals would enhance the site, the conservation area, and the setting of the listed buildings. The loss of the Mond Annexe and the Examination Halls is justified on this basis

## **10.0 RECOMMENDATION**

**APPROVE** subject to the following conditions:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Reason: To avoid pollution and to protect the health of future users of the site. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/4, 3/7 and 4/13).

4. 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)

5. 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)

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

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

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

7. 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 development (including demolition), or site preparation, including excavation, delivery of plant or materials, or erection of site fencing or contractors' facilities, shall take place until a traffic management plan (TMP) for the demolition and construction phases has been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority. The approved TMP shall be adhered to throughout the implementation of the approved development.

Reason: To protect the amenity of the users of nearby premises, to protect highway safety, and to ensure the efficient operation of the highway network. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/4, 4/13 and 8/2)

9. 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)

10. 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)

11. 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)

12. The proposed Student Services Centre building shall not be brought into use until full details of the repaving of the Parsons Court alleyway have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Implementation shall be in accordance with the approved details, and shall take place within three months of the opening of the SSC.

Reason: To ensure appropriate routes through the site. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 3/7)

13. No windows, surrounds, or associated joinery shall be installed in the proposed Student Services Centre until full details confirming a vertical slatted format for the timber panels has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority.

Reason: To ensure the finished elevation responds to its context appropriately (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/4 and 3/12)

14. The renewable energy technologies set out in the Renewable Energy Statement submitted in association with the application shall be fully installed and operational prior to the first occupation of the development and shall thereafter be retained as approved and remain fully operational in accordance with the approved maintenance programme.

Reason: In the interests of reducing carbon dioxide emissions and to ensure that the development does not give rise to unacceptable pollution. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 4/13, 4/14 and 8/16).

15. If any soakaways are proposed as part of any drainage strategy for the application site, no construction shall take place until a percolation test has been undertaken and has demonstrated that soakaways will work adequately in adverse conditions. If, after tests, it is found that soakaways do not work satisfactorily, alternative proposals should be submitted. Soakaways will not be permitted to be located in contaminated areas.

Reason: To avoid flooding and pollution (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 4/13 and 4/16)

16. 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)

17. The proposed Student Services Centre building shall not be brought into use until full details of the arrangements for the storage and collection of waste and recycling on this part of the site, both during subsequent phases of the New Museums site, and after its conclusion, have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority.

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

18. No work connected with the provision of cycle storage shall commence until further details with respect to cycle storage have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The arrangements thus approved shall be implemented in full prior to the first use of the proposed Student Services Centre. The additional details shall cover:

How cycle parking provision relates to total expected numbers of staff and students on site

Exact specifications and locations of cycle racks to be used at ground level and in the basement

Access to the basement cycle parking spaces, including ramp details

The applicant is advised that semi-vertical cycle racks will not be an acceptable component of this submission.

Reason: To ensure appropriate cycle parking (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 8/6).

19. 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)

20. The development hereby approved shall not be occupied until full details of the public art associated with the development, including a timetable for implementation, have been agreed with the local planning authority. Public art shall be provided in accordance with the agreed scheme and the agreed timetable.

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

**INFORMATIVE:** The applicant is advised of the following guidance from the Environment Agency regarding drainage.

All surface water from roofs shall be piped direct to an approved surface water system using sealed downpipes. Open gullies should not be used. The sewerage undertaker should be consulted regarding the availability of capacity in the surface water sewer. Only clean, uncontaminated surface water should be discharged to any soakaway, watercourse or surface water sewer. Surface water from roads and impermeable vehicle parking areas shall be discharged via trapped gullies.

All foul sewage or trade effluent, including cooling water containing chemical additives, or vehicle washing water, including steam cleaning effluent shall be discharged to the public foul sewer. It is an offence under Section 118 of the Water Industry Act 1991 to discharge trade effluent to a sewer without the prior consent of the statutory undertaker.

Anglian Water Services Ltd. should be consulted by the Local Planning Authority and be requested to demonstrate that the sewerage and sewage disposal systems serving the development have sufficient capacity to accommodate the additional flows, generated as a result of the development, without causing pollution or flooding. If there is not capacity in either of the sewers, the Agency must be reconsulted with alternative methods of disposal.

**INFORMATIVE:** The applicant is advised that in order to satisfy the landscape condition attached to this permission, more precise details of the following features must be supplied: litter and recycling provision, investigation of existing underground services, tree planting, roof-top pond.

The applicant is further advised that the following elements of the original landscaping proposal are regarded as unacceptable, and that any submission to discharge the landscape condition should demonstrate alternative solutions: aquatic planting area in Bene't Yard, sliding gate, tree species proposed, absence of permeable paving.

## **APPENDIX A**

### **Cambridge City Council Design & Conservation Panel**

#### **Notes of item 3 of the meeting Wednesday 10th December 2014**

The proposal to provide a new student building incorporating informal engagement spaces, administrative functions and exam halls following demolition. This forms the basis of a series of proposals for this site initially presented to the Panel as part of the 8<sup>th</sup> September site visit. The Panel are invited to examine two key options for the new building. Both are fundamentally the same but one option will illustrate the retention of the existing single storey façade of the Exams School and the other does not.

The Panel's comments are as follows:

#### **The Monde Annexe (BLI).**

The Panel were informed that its removal would assist the development of the 3<sup>rd</sup> courtyard but as a building of some quality, the Panel felt its value was yet to be determined. While its context has undoubtedly changed over time, the Panel would nevertheless welcome a thorough study of the Annexe in order to be able to evaluate its worth.

This architectural evaluation might be provided within the context of the wider site, as a plan indicating the historical significance of all the existing buildings would be helpful when considering issues of integrity and impact of the new moves.

#### **Refurbishment of the retained Arts School.**

The Panel congratulated the team on their approach to revitalising the old Arts School and retaining key spaces. It seemed less clear exactly how the new proposed building would mesh with the original building and how that interface could be made explicit. In the Panel's view, there is a certain 'completeness' to the Arts School building which should be respected, although enhancements could be made in the refurbishment of its interiors.

#### **Retention of the façade of The Exams School.**

The Panel were not in a position to decide whether or not the façade has significance or whether there might be an overall loss of historic fabric. They were primarily interested in the assessment of what the

integration of this historic element might involve and what the impact of this might be on the new accommodation. The overall benefits and costs can then be looked at.

The Panel felt that this exercise has not yet been undertaken convincingly. Retention of the façade would also probably mean integration of its central doorway and completion of the entrance hallway behind, for it to make sense. The scheme presented made little effort to integrate the façade in a meaningful way. As the façade is currently tucked into the north east corner only visible from Parson's Court, the 'liberation' of the frontage could help the building recover some of its presence on the site.

### **Elevation of Student Services Centre without façade retention.**

The Panel questioned the success of the proposed elevations to the proposed new student services building. Given that this is a south facing elevation, the level of shading required for this highly glazed façade seemed perverse and produced a very closed frontage to the new centre. The glazed link with the front entrance doorway appeared weak, located between two strong elements, and would benefit from further work.

### **Relationship with the Arup tower.**

The Panel questioned whether sufficient consideration had been given to the new building's relationship with the adjacent Arup tower and queried the approach taken. The Arup tower is a vertebrate structure and provides a strong context for the new building, being within very close proximity.

### **Site studies.**

The Panel would have welcomed the provision of site sections to explore the context of the new building relative to its neighbours and the courtyard. They might also be used to highlight to the appropriate architectural language and materials of the proposed new insertions into this very complex site.

### **Landscaping.**

In such a predominantly hard-surfaced area, the Panel would encourage sufficient provision of landscaped spaces. The courtyard landscaping could be used to help define entrances and desire lines – whether to reinforce the existing central doorway or to highlight a new alignment. The possibility of using water within the vertical elements in order to reflect light and further enhance the public realm is to be explored.

### **Route through the site from Benet Street.**

The Panel would encourage greater permeability and public access of the site, so it is supportive of establishing a route from Benet Street. However, the detailing and size of the opening through the Old Cavendish East Wing needs to be further defined and justified.

### **Conclusion**

The Panel were provided with the consultants' evaluation of the existing Exams Hall façade, which stated that this heavily altered building was regarded as a heritage asset of only minimal significance. It was argued that the Conservation Area would achieve a net gain by its demolition. This proposal was viewed as inadequate both in its justification and appreciation of its potential.

The current proposal for façade retention does not impact on the proposed new building and it acts as 'wallpaper' only. The Panel would feel unable to justify demolition for this scheme. Instead it would encourage further work into the impact of a more meaningful retention scheme, which reinstated the central doorway and an informal lobby space. Then it could be assessed whether this would make sense and enrich the place. In the Panel's view, this is not a straightforward issue as matters of integrity and impact are combined with the quality of the response to the public realm.

The Panel felt that the team had failed to address the complex nature of the site with its many retained buildings. More thorough information was needed to communicate the historic mix of the surrounding buildings and to define the context for the proposed new moves. The issue seems wider than the current single focus on the retained façade.

Inserting a new building into this mix will remain a complex task, but needs a compelling design logic to enable it to hold its own, yet remain in conversation with its neighbours. The Panel looks forward to seeing fresh thinking around this proposal.

### **VERDICT – RED (unanimous)**

**The design team are requested to provide more information and greater detail on proposals for integration and conservation, in parallel to enhanced proposals for a new building that relates more positively to its context.**

**Cambridge City Council  
Design & Conservation Panel**

**Notes of item 2 of the meeting Wednesday 11<sup>th</sup> February 2015**

Since the proposals were last presented to the Panel in December (unanimous verdict RED), the University has reviewed the comments raised with their design team and with officers from both the City Council and English Heritage. Following that review, the Panel are invited to comment on an advanced design for the scheme.

The Panel's comments were as follows:

**Retention/removal of the Exam Hall façade.**

The Panel were shown options developed in greater detail since last time. Although the University's preferred option is still the removal of the façade in favour of an entirely new building, the work undertaken to explore alternative options is much appreciated.

**Retention of complete facade**

A scheme was shown for the re-erection of the entire façade on the face of the new building behind the new colonnade. If it is to be retained then there was the general feeling among Panel members that it should be celebrated rather than treated as wallpaper pasted on the elevation of the new building. It was also felt the new entrance would have to work harder located alongside the original doorway.

**Retention of doorway element of facade.**

The retention and relocation of the doorway element of the original façade was discussed. As its significance could be seen to lie in its symbolic association as the University's historic exam hall rather than its architectural merits, the Panel would support an exploration of the central doorway only being retained and re-erected. This could bring additional advantages in reshaping the landscaping proposals for the south-facing courtyard and defining the pedestrians entrance. Perhaps the ground floor exam hall might open into the courtyard through generous doors to provide a more dynamic relationship with the space. It is suggested that the

University develop this proposal to see whether it has further potential.

### **Relocation of facade.**

There was discussion of the entire façade being demolished and relocated to another part of the site. The cost implication of this option is understood and no obvious alternative location was offered.

### **Conclusion.**

At this point, the Panel maintains its support for retention of the Exams Hall façade as a memory of the building, but would like to see further work undertaken to create a convincing scenario for this.

Although architecturally it includes some pleasing elements, it could be argued that the facade holds greater value in its associations.

Should only the doorway be retained, a witty relationship would need to be found between this and the modern building. It could become a focal point for the landscaping of the new south-facing courtyard.

The exploration into the relationship between the Arts School and the new building is appreciated.

Wheeler Street (southern edge of the development) – the Panel expressed some concern regarding the considerable impact of the new building on the more domestically-scaled buildings, specifically regarding the overshadowing of the rear spaces. The Panel would like to see evidence that the impact on light levels has been considered.

### **The Mond Annex.**

- Removal. The Panel are aware that the removal of the Annex was always a part of the masterplan. However, although the Annex may be of a different quality to the Mond Building itself and its removal would free up the area of public realm, the impact of its removal has not yet been explored in depth. Clear and authoritative information is still needed on whether its removal would leave a greater collective quality of architecture.
- Retention. The Panel considered whether the Annex could take on an alternative role within the new public realm, possibly as a visitor centre. In the Panel's view the onus is still on the design team to develop the 'story' of what happens at ground level. The Panel will look forward to further development regarding the Mond Annex and to a thoroughly set-out argument at submission stage.

**Conclusion.**

A re-defined Mond Annex within the new public realm could be interesting and should not be dismissed at this stage. The Panel will look forward to further dialogue and to further evolution of the process.

**VERDICT:** on both the Arts School façade and Mond Annex options – **AMBER** (unanimous)

**Opening through Old Cavendish Building**

Proposals were shown for both making a pair of narrower openings on both sides of the building or a single broader entrance. The Panel felt that the narrower openings would be more appropriate for the existing building, although a more spacious central lobby within would create a space for pedestrians to pause. The brick pier between openings might provide the location for new artwork or a carved plaque.

**Cambridge City Council  
Design & Conservation Panel**

**Notes of item 2 of the meeting Wednesday 10th June 2015**

Creation of new student services centre, including demolition of existing examinations hall, north end of the Austin Building, Mond Building annexe and creation of a cut through the Old Cavendish Laboratory. Refurbishment of Old Cavendish, Rayleigh wing Arts School and Lecture Theatre creation of the landscape areas and associated works. This follows previous presentations to the Panel in December 2014 (unanimous verdict RED) and in February this year (unanimous verdict AMBER on the Arts School façade and Mond Annex options.)

The Panel were informed that since last time, further studies had been undertaken in relation to the Mond Annex but that the option to retain was incompatible with the University's objectives for the site. Further daylight modelling had revealed the impact to be negligible.

The Panel's comments were as follows:

**New Exam Hall façade (with relocated portal entrance).**

The Panel welcome the re-use of the historic doors within the modern surround that effectively ties in with the wider site while embedding some memory into the building. The blank panel above gives the portal a scale it doesn't currently have, although an inscription here could give the new building a pleasing focal point.

**Landscaping foreground.**

High quality landscaping is needed to lead directly to this new entrance. With its generous south-facing doors, the area beyond needs to be able to properly accommodate student spill-out during the warmer months as well as conference delegates.

**Arts School**

- o Visible plant room. The Panel expressed some concern regarding the lift over-run visible above the skyline from Peas Hill. This was regarded as an intrusion in this part of the city

and should be minimised as far as possible. If its height cannot be lowered, the Panel would suggest a lighter grey finish is used for the cladding instead of the proposed bronze colour.

- Window sills and skirting. The Panel would urge that appropriate measures are taken to minimise weathering and rainwater staining.
- Palette of interior colours. There is potential here to find an appropriate palette of colours to bring the interior spaces to life and distinguish between the older building and its refurbished elements.
- The point where the corridors reach the atrium space is not only a source of light but an arrival point that could be celebrated.

#### □ **Mond Annex.**

The Panel appreciates the need to have views through to the David Attenborough Building. They were informed that its removal would also be needed for construction access. The space would be transformed by landscaping as part of the longer term strategy. The Panel felt that views revealing the Mond rotunda would be beneficial.

#### □ **Double archway through the Cavendish Laboratory.**

The Panel were comfortable with this double arched access, although the relationship between the lintels and the brickwork on the inner elevation was regarded as curious.

### **Conclusion**

**The Panel felt this was a satisfactory conclusion to the first of many chapters in the transformation of the New Museums Site. The architects have brought a degree of sophistication and elegance to upgrading the existing Arts School building and inserting a new development. Providing the landscaping is of a sufficiently high standard, the changes proposed will improve the environment.**

**VERDICT – GREEN (6) AMBER (1)**