

Application Number	15/1200/FUL	Agenda Item	
Date Received	3rd July 2015	Officer	Mrs Angela Briggs
Target Date	2nd October 2015		
Ward	Trumpington		
Site	Gonville Hotel Gonville Place Cambridge Cambridgeshire CB1 1LY		
Proposal	Refurbishment of Gresham House to provide an additional 10 hotel bedrooms, extension to rear of Gresham House to provide an additional 21 hotel bedrooms, (subterranean) basement to Gresham House and provide a gym, dance studios and subterranean day spa facilities and a plant room, front extension to Gonville Hotel to provide a new dining area, and associated external works and landscaping.		
Applicant	c/o Agent United Kingdom		

SUMMARY	<p>The development accords with the Development Plan for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> The provision of additional short stay accommodation for visitors is supported by planning policy <input type="checkbox"/> The proposal would make a positive contribution to the area and would enhance the character of the Conservation Area; <input type="checkbox"/> The proposal would not have an adverse impact on nearby residential amenity.
RECOMMENDATION	APPROVAL

1.0 SITE DESCRIPTION/AREA CONTEXT

- 1.1 The application site is located on the southern side of Gonville Place. It is directly opposite Parkers' Piece, which is a substantial area of protected open space. The Gonville Hotel has views across Parkers' Piece. Gresham House forms part of the north eastern boundary of the site. Gresham House (No.2 Gresham Road) is a mid-19th Century, two-storey, double fronted house. The main frontage/elevation faces Gonville Place but it is set back considerably from the site frontage and is not readily visible from Parker's Piece and Gonville Place. The former house has been incrementally extended over the years. Gresham House is owned by the Gonville Hotel. There are meeting/conference rooms and offices on the ground floor. The first floor rooms have been converted into small residential use by the hotel. A short gravel vehicular driveway leads to a gated entrance onto Gresham Road. There are residential buildings on the opposite side of Gresham Road. Gresham Court (the former Owen Webb House) is a Grade II Listed Building. The properties on Drosier Road form the south eastern boundary of the site. There are residential properties adjacent to the south western boundary of the site on Gonville Place which are two to three storey Victorian terrace housing.
- 1.2 The Gonville Hotel is a three storey building which was originally built as a house. The wings either side were constructed in the late 1970s and forms the main part of the hotel. There have been various additions to the rear of the hotel. The area to the front of the hotel is used for hotel residents' parking. There is limited cycle parking provision currently on-site. The main access to the Hotel is from Gonville Place. However, there is a secondary access to the rear from Drosier Road, which is seldom used and remains locked, unless it is required. All service vehicles arrive and leave the hotel via the main entrance from Gonville Place.
- 1.3 The wider area comprises a typical mix of City Centre uses. To the north east of the site, along Gonville Place, is the Queen Anne Multi-storey car park, Cambridge Medical Centre, and the Kelsey Kerridge Sports Centre. To the south east, along Gresham Road, are residential properties, mainly of Victorian architecture, and Hughes Hall and Cambridge University Cricket Club; Fenners is a flat roof apartment block of three storeys. To the south west, along Hills Road, are a mix of commercial and

office buildings, including the premises at 1 Hills Road currently occupied by Cambridge Assessment. To the north-west, along Regent Street, there is a mix of commercial uses.

- 1.4 The application site falls within the Central Conservation Area and the New Town and Glisson Road Area Conservation Appraisal is relevant. The site also bounds the Cambridge Historic Core Conservation Area and therefore this appraisal is also relevant. The Roman Catholic Church on the junction of Lensfield Road and Hills Road is a Grade II listed Building, and is a dominant feature of this part of the Conservation Area. Other Listed buildings within the vicinity include Gresham Court (Owen Webb House) and 3 and 3a Gresham Road, all of which are Grade II Listed. There are no buildings designated as Buildings of Interest adjacent to or within close proximity of the application site. However, the original Gonville Hotel building (former Georgian house) is locally listed as a Building of Local Interest.
- 1.5 Another significant feature of the site and its surroundings are the trees, on the northern boundary of Gresham House. These consist of a dense and mature group of trees and other vegetation which screens Gresham House from views from Parkers' Piece. There are also trees along the boundary with Gresham Road, some of which are over-grown Leylandii. Most of these trees are covered by a Tree Preservation Order. Those which are not protected by an Order are protected by virtue of their location in the Conservation Area. There is a large London Plane Tree to the front of the Gonville Hotel, which is a significant and dominant tree in the Gonville Place/Parkers' Piece street scape. This is also covered by a Tree Preservation Order.
- 1.6 The site falls outside the Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) and within the Air Quality Management Area (AQMA).

2.0 THE PROPOSAL

- 2.1 The application seeks planning permission for the following works:
 - Retention and refurbishment of Gresham House to provide an additional 10 hotel bedrooms;

- Extension to the rear of Gresham House to provide an additional 21 hotel bedrooms;
- A subterranean basement to Gresham House providing a gym, dance studio and day spa facilities and a plant room;
- Front extension to the Gonville Hotel to provide a new and larger dining/restaurant area (40 extra covers);
- Associated external works and hard and soft landscaping improvements and enhancement to the Gonville Hotel and around Gresham House.

2.2 In terms of the site layout, the proposal would also include:

- reduction and relocation of car parking bays – total of 36 car parking spaces including 4 disabled spaces (reduction from 59 car parking spaces);
- new cycle parking areas – total of 76 cycle spaces (increase from 8 cycle parking spaces);
- relocation of existing site facilities workshop/office;
- new bin store;
- external lighting;
- Public art – architectural gates.

2.3 The application is accompanied by the following supporting documents:

- Planning Statement (Carter Jonas LLP)
- Design & Access Statement (Annand and Mustoe Architects)
- Sustainable Development Checklist (Carter Jonas LLP)
- Statement of Community Involvement (Carter Jonas LLP)
- Heritage Statement (Donald Insall Associates)
- Archaeological Desk Based Assessment (Cambridge Archaeological Unit)
- Ecological Assessment & Nocturnal Bat Roost Survey (MKA Ecology)
- Tree Survey & Arboricultural Impact Assessment (Haydens)
- Transport Assessment & Travel Plan (SLR)
- Landscape Strategy Report & Landscape Masterplan (Allen Pyke)
- Renewable Energy Report (Cunnington Clark)
- M&E Statement (Cunnington Clark)
- Utilities Report (Cunnington Clark)
- Ventilation / Extraction Statement (Cunnington Clark)
- External Lighting Plan (Cunnington Clark)
- Water Efficiency Statement (Cunnington Clark)

- Desktop Contamination Report (MLM)
- Foul & Surface Water Drainage Report (Peter Brett Associates)
- Site Waste Management Plan (MLM)
- Public Art Strategy (MB Arts Management)
- Noise Assessment (Cass Allen)
- Air Quality Report (MLM)

3.0 SITE HISTORY

3.1 There is extensive site history. However, the most relevant to note are as follows:

Gonville Hotel and Gresham House:

Reference	Description	Outcome
13/0646/FUL	Demolition of Gresham House, and refurbishment and extension of Gonville Hotel to provide an additional 43 bedrooms and new spa/treatment rooms, with internal and external remodelling of the existing hotel to create a new dining area and hotel entrance, and associated external works and landscaping	Refused
13/0647/CAC	Demolition of Gresham House, and refurbishment and extension of Gonville Hotel to provide an additional 43 bedrooms and new spa/treatment rooms, with internal and external remodelling of the existing hotel to create a new dining area and hotel entrance, and associated external works and landscaping	Refused
14/0994/FUL	Removal of existing dilapidated exterior timber entrance lobby. Replacement with new single storey, glazed entrance lobby and minor remodelling of external landscaping to provide	Approved

DDA compliant access.

Gresham House, 2 Gresham Road:

Reference	Description	Outcome
C/03/0346	Change of use of ground floor to conference/meeting rooms and conversion to the first floor to 3No. flats and demolition of garage/ store.	Approved
C/71/0218	Alterations to form dwelling units and conservatory on ground floor, plus two flats on first floor	Approved
C/81/0875	Erection of boundary wall	Approved

4.0 **PUBLICITY**

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

5.0 **POLICY**

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

5.2 Relevant Development Plan policies

PLAN	POLICY NUMBER
Cambridge Local Plan 2006	3/1 3/4 3/7 3/11 3/12 3/14 4/4 4/10 4/11 4/12 4/13 4/14

	5/4
	6/3
	8/2 8/6 8/10 8/16

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>
Material Considerations	<p><u>City Wide Guidance</u></p> <p>Arboricultural Strategy (2004)</p> <p>Biodiversity Checklist for Land Use Planners in Cambridgeshire and Peterborough (March 2001).</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>Buildings of Local Interest (2005)</p>
	<p><u>Area Guidelines</u></p> <p>Cambridge City Council (2002)–Southern Corridor Area Transport Plan:</p> <p>Cambridge Historic Core Conservation Area Appraisal (2006)</p> <p>New Town and Glisson Road Conservation Area Appraisal (2012)</p>

5.4 Status of Proposed Submission – Cambridge Local Plan

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

For the application considered in this report, there are no policies in the emerging Local Plan that are of relevance.

6.0 CONSULTATIONS

Cambridgeshire County Council (Highways Development Management)

- 6.1 No objection in principle. Full comments awaited and will be reported on the amendment sheet.

Cambridgeshire County Council (Flood and Water Management Team)

- 6.2 No objection, subject to a condition relating to submission of details of the implementation, maintenance and management of the surface water drainage scheme.

Head of Refuse and Environment

Comments as submitted:

- 6.3 Object on the grounds of air quality. The proposal would lead to a worsening of air quality within the Air Quality Management Area (AQMA).
- 6.4 No objections to all other environmental health matters, subject to conditions relating to land contamination, construction hours, collection during construction, construction/demolition, noise/vibration (including piling), dust, building noise insulation (BS8233), building noise insulation (noise breakout, dance studio), odour and fume extraction.

Comments as amended:

- 6.5 The air quality concerns have now been overcome and are acceptable, subject to conditions.

Urban Design and Conservation Team

Comments as submitted:

- 6.6 Proposed Extension & Gresham House refurbishment

Scale and Massing:

- 6.7 The proposed extension occupies the rear garden to the south of Gresham House and rises to a height of 2.5 storeys (7.5m to the eaves and 9.7m to the ridge), with the 2nd floor accommodation located within the pitched roof space. The ridge height of the extension is approximately 1.3m taller than the ridge line of Gresham House and 0.5m taller than the Gonville Hotel parapet but 1.2m lower than the ridge line of No. 4 Gresham Road (known as Cobwebs). The proposed 2.5-storey

scale of the extension is considered acceptable in design and conservation terms and relates appropriately to the nearby 2 and 3-storey scale dwellings.

- 6.8 The extension is setback from the Gresham Road street frontage between 5m and 7.5m and is approximately 2.8m setback behind the front elevation of Cobwebs. We support this arrangement as the stepped building line helps visually break up the length of built form fronting Gresham Road and reduce the perceived scale of development looking north along Gresham Road.
- 6.9 The proposed extension is connected to the rear elevation of Gresham House by a lightweight 2-storey glazed link which accommodates the stair/lift core providing vertical circulation to floors within both the extension and Gresham House. The glazed link sits below the eaves line of Gresham House and is setback between 2m-2.6m behind the front elevation of the extension and between 1.3m and 1.8m behind the rear elevation. We support this approach; the height of the link together within the proposed setbacks creates a subtle connection between the existing Gresham House and new hotel accommodation.

6.10 Elevations and materials

Proposed extension:

- 6.11 The proposed elevations have been revised following comments made at Design and Conservation Panel and later pre-application discussions with the Urban Design and Conservation Team. The scheme takes a traditional approach to the proposed elevations and includes three gable ends on the Gresham Road frontage, each with a projecting bay at ground and 1st floor levels. Chimneys have also been introduced at roof level. The gables, projecting bays and chimneys provide articulation and relate to the vertical proportions and rhythm of the existing adjacent traditional houses (Cobwebs and Nos. 5 & 6 Gresham Road) as well as the double gable side elevation of Gresham House.
- 6.12 Proposed materials are indicated on the submitted elevation (PL_(P-)08 Street Scene) and include slate tiled roofs, buff facing brick, stone projecting bay windows, lead dormers (2nd

floor level), lead panels (oriel windows), aluminium windows and curtain wall glazing (to the glazed link). The proposed materials are likely to be acceptable, however the facing brick needs further consideration. A dark buff/gault brick (e.g. the “All about Bricks Grey Handmade” as used for the Hobbs House scheme on Regents Terrace) may form a better relationship with the existing stained and weathered buff bricks on the houses opposite and Gresham House. The ultimate success of the scheme will depend on the quality and finish of materials. At this stage we are content that they should be conditioned and samples provided to the LPA for agreement in writing.

- 6.13 The proposed aluminium windows are generally acceptable and replicate the existing traditional sash windows on the front and rear elevations of Gresham House. Large scale drawings of the windows need to be provided showing the proposed reveal depth. The colour of the windows also need to be confirmed. A white window frame may be appropriate given the existing windows in Gresham House.
- 6.14 Rainwater downpipes and hoppers are shown between each of the three gables on the Gresham Road elevation, although the proposed treatment of these is not indicated. Cast iron or aluminium (e.g. Alumasc Heritage) rainwater goods should be specified to reinforce the traditional appearance of the elevations.
- 6.15 Large scale drawings of the junction detail between the glazed link and Gresham House and the proposed extension needs to be provided and should be conditioned should the application be approved.
- 6.16 A lift overrun is proposed on the northwest corner of the proposed extension and projects to the same height as the ridgeline. The overrun is faced in buff brick and setback approximately 10.5m from the Gresham Road elevation and 4m from the rear elevation and is set behind a chimney. The Urban Design and Conservation team support this arrangement, the lift overrun reads as part of the group of chimneys and will be concealed from street level views from Gresham Road and from its garden.
- 6.17 The proposed south elevation is approximately 18.1m in depth and setback between 1.5m and 1.8m from the southern site

boundary. As raised in our comments on the impacts on neighbour amenity, the south elevation has the potential to appear dominant when looking north from the rear garden of the adjacent Cobwebs dwelling. A greater degree of articulation is needed for the blank section of the elevation. 'Blind' windows should be introduced to break up and provide articulation (other methods of articulating this facade could also be explored). The submitted Landscape Strategy Report (page 6) also proposes 'climbers on architectural trellis'. The submitted elevation should be updated to show the proposed location and extent of the climbers.

6.18 Gresham House:

6.19 Submitted elevations indicate new windows will be introduced on the gable end walls of Gresham House at ground and 1st floor level in order to accommodate the proposed internal changes and arrangement of bedrooms. The proposals also involve blocking up existing windows on the southwest gable and the removal of the external stairs on the northeast gable. Details of the proposed new windows need to be provided and should match the proportions of the existing windows on the front elevation. Where brickwork is proposed to be removed (rear elevation to the glazed link) it should be salvaged and used to infill areas where windows are proposed to be blocked up.

6.20 Amenity Impacts

Drosier Road:

6.21 The proposed rear elevation adjacent to the garden of No.8 Drosier Road is 2.5 storeys high with a 7m high parapet. Windows at ground and 1st floor levels include oriel windows and direct views towards the rear elevation of the Gonville Hotel. Rooms at 2nd floor level are located within the pitched roof space and include dormer windows which are setback 1.4m behind the 1m high parapet walls. The Urban Design and Conservation team support this approach as the oriel windows direct views away from the adjacent rear gardens and the setback proposed at 2nd floor level together with the parapet prevents overlooking.

6.22 'Cobwebs' (4 Gresham Road):

6.23 The proposed extension is located to the north of Cobwebs approximately 8.4m from the northern gable and is separated by the 1.8m high brick boundary wall, pitched roof garage and summer house.

6.24 The southern elevation of the extension includes a limited number of windows which are for the hallway and stair core. Whilst we support this approach, these windows should be obscured to further reduce potential overlooking.

6.25 As noted already, the western section of the southern elevation has no windows. Whilst the Urban Design and Conservation team support this approach, we are concerned that the extension will appear dominant from the adjacent rear garden. A greater degree of articulation is needed for the blank section of the elevation. 'Blind' windows should be introduced to break up and provide articulation. The submitted Landscape Strategy Report (page 6) also proposes 'climbers on architectural trellis', the elevation should be updated to show the proposed location and extent of the climbers.

6.26 Landscape and boundary treatments:

6.27 The submitted ground floor plan shows patio doors in Gresham House (rooms 2, 3 and 4) opening out into the proposed planting beds. The plans need to reflect the proposed threshold treatment in front of the patio doors. If patio doors are to be incorporated within the scheme then these need to open onto small spaces set within deeper planting beds. The planting beds should be arranged so as to improve privacy for the occupants.

6.28 The Landscape Strategy (page 9) indicates the 2m high brick wall on the Gresham Road and Gonville Road street frontages will be retained, as will the 1.8m high southern boundary wall to Cobwebs and 2.5m high wall across the rear of the Drosier Road gardens. A new 2m high wall is proposed between the Gresham House site and existing Gonville Hotel. The proposal to retain the brick walls is supported as these form part of the character of the site particularly on the Gresham Road frontage.

6.29 Page 2 of the Landscape Strategy proposes 300mm high trellis panels on top of sections of the wall on the Gresham Road

frontage and 600mm high trellis on top of the wall adjacent to No. 8 Drosier Road. Whilst the Urban Design and Conservation team accept the need for the 600mm high trellis to provide additional screening and softening of the building to the Drosier Road properties, the proposal to increase the height of the Gresham Road boundary is not acceptable.

6.30 The existing Gresham Road boundary wall has a gate providing access to the flats at 1st floor level in Gresham House. It is not clear if this opening is to be retained (as shown on the Site Plan) or blocked up (as shown on the Landscape Masterplan). The means of securing the gateway needs to be confirmed.

6.31 Basement level spa, gym and dance studio:

6.32 The proposed subterranean location of the spa, gym and dance studio is supported in design and conservation terms and reduces potential impacts on Gresham House. However as raised at pre-application stages the proposed location of the spa could result in poor legibility given that the main entrance is concealed and accessed via steps in the front garden or lift on the east elevation of the hotel. The D&A Statement (para 41) states that *'all new visitors/residents will access the hotel from Gonville Place, checking in and out at the main hotel reception. It will also be encouraged that patrons and day members of the spa use this entrance. However the use of the existing Gresham House gates is still under consideration for use by local day members using the spa facilities'*. Whilst this approach is acceptable details of the means of securing the gates (e.g. a key fob) as well as signage for the spa need to be confirmed in order to improve way finding of these facilities.

6.33 The Landscape Strategy (page 5) proposes metal railings surrounding the boundary of the sunken spa courtyard. However the D&A statement (para 29) indicates this boundary will comprise of glass balustrading. Glass balustrades should be specified to reduce the impact to the garden area in front of Gresham House. The treatment of the internal elevations of the courtyard needs to be provided as part of the materials condition.

6.34 Changes to Gonville Hotel (restaurant extension, front elevation, rear entrance):

- 6.35 The proposed changes to the Gonville Hotel are similar to those proposed as part of the original refused scheme (13/0646/FUL) and include a single storey dining room/restaurant extension on the front elevation, improvements to the front elevation and a new entrance/lift core on the side elevation.
- 6.36 The dining room/restaurant extension is single storey, fully glazed with louvered panels. The Urban Design and Conservation team support this approach as the extension will form a contemporary addition and will help activate the frontage of the hotel. Details of the proposed materials including colour of the louvered panels, doors and roof need to be provided. We are content that these be agreed by condition.
- 6.37 The submitted scheme also proposes to render the recessed parts of the Gonville Place elevation that flank either side of the C19th house. The Urban Design and Conservation team do not support this approach as render is not a typical part of the character of this part of the Conservation Area. We suggest that an alternative would be to paint these areas which will still retain the texture of the brick. As with the proposed render, it would help to break down the Gonville Place elevation into three separate elements and frame the original Gonville House building.
- 6.38 A new entrance/lift core is proposed on the side elevation and provides lift access from the hotel to the basement spa/gym facilities. Whilst the Urban Design and Conservation team support this addition, the treatment of the entrance extension need to be confirmed and should be conditioned.
- 6.39 The submitted D&A statement (para 37) proposes a PV solar array to the roof of Gonville Hotel. The location and mounting height of the PV panels needs to be confirmed. The panels should be arranged to reduce their visibility and impact from street level views so that they do not impact on the character or appearance of the conservation area.
- 6.40 Cycle parking and site facilities workshop:
- 6.41 The submitted scheme proposes new areas of cycle parking adjacent to the east elevation of Gresham House and the west elevation of the Gonville Hotel. The design and treatment of the cycle stores needs to be provided and should be conditioned.

6.42 The D&A Statement (para 45) indicates *'the existing site facilities workshop/office will be demolished and a newly built facility will be located to the rear, south east corner of the site adjacent to the Drosier Road gateway'*. The location of the site facilities workshop needs to be shown on the site plan and elevations provided showing the proposed material treatment.

6.43 Conclusion:

The submitted application is generally supported in design and conservation terms. The retention of Gresham House together with the proposed 2.5 storey scale and traditional elevation treatment of the new hotel accommodation has the potential to work well with the existing Gresham House and adjacent Victorian villas.

The south elevation has the potential to appear prominent from the rear garden of Cobwebs given the predominant blank brick wall. Methods for articulating this facade (e.g. 'blind' windows) are needed. The climbing plants as shown on the Landscape Strategy Report need to be shown on the submitted elevations in respect of a short and longer term view of said climbers.

In addition the following amendments and further information are required:

- Clarify the threshold treatment in front of the patio doors (rooms 2, 3 and 4).
- Remove the 300mm high trellis panels proposed on top of the Gresham Road boundary wall.
- Confirm if the opening in the Gresham Road wall will be retained and how it will be secured.
- Confirm the location, and provide elevations for the site facilities workshop.
- Carry out the amendments to the elevation treatment of the extension, Gresham House and Gonville Hotel as noted on pages 3, 4 and 7.

Finally, the proposed elevation treatment of the new extension, subterranean courtyard, Gresham House and Gonville Hotel should be conditioned.

6.44 Comments as amended:

6.45 The Urban Design & Conservation Team have reviewed the submitted 'response to Urban Design and Conservation comments' letter uploaded to Public Access on 4th September 2015.

6.46 The amendments submitted in response to our comments on the original application submission are acceptable in design and conservation terms. The application is therefore supported by the Urban Design & Conservation Team.

Senior Sustainability Officer (Design and Construction)

6.47 No objection, subject to plan showing positions of solar panels on the roof and resolution of the drainage strategy for the site.

Head of Streets and Open Spaces (Tree Team)

Comments as submitted:

6.48 No objection to the principle of the development. The tree losses required to accommodate the development are accepted on the condition that the tree removals will be phased and replacement planting will be extensive and more appropriate to the character of the site and the contribution it makes to the amenity of the area.

6.49 Comments as amended:

6.50 Gresham Road Trees:

Need to ensure that replacement trees are of a suitably large type to make a significant visual impact. The proposed drainage in this area has the potential to conflict with tree roots as the trees grow. Not clear what the Root Protection Zone (Proposed Trees) is intended to indicate. A planting detailing is required to show that tree will have sufficient rooting volume to mature without causing damage to the water storage.

The New London Plane, Gonville Place frontage:

Again this tree should be allowed to grow to maturity with limited management. As the layout stand at the moment, as the

tree increases in size it will have a high potential to damage the light structures surrounding it. The tree needs more soft ground around it.

Pleached Limes:

Again, while it is acknowledged that these trees will be pleached, it is intended that they reach a sufficient size to make a material contribution to amenity. While the depth of planting is acceptable it is not clear what volume of soil will be available to the trees due to the restrictions of the boundary wall and basement. It is also not clear if the trees will be raised above ground level or not. If they are in raised planters, they will need to be watered. Further detail including cross sections of the planting area is required.

Head of Streets and Open Spaces (Landscape Team)

6.51 Object. While the principle of the development and the proposal are generally acceptable, there are two fundamental concerns that suggest a slight over-development of the site. These must be addressed prior to moving forward with the scheme. These concerns are:

- The proposed drainage scheme has not taken the existing or proposed landscape into consideration in the proposed design for placement of attenuation tanks. Trees cannot be planted or near to underground attenuation tanks. These tanks must be relocated away from the existing and proposed soft landscaping areas;
- Concern regarding the suitability and maintenance of the proposed pleached Lime trees. Insufficient information submitted. However a condition is recommended requesting further information.

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

6.52 No comments received to date. If comments are received they will be added to the Amendment Sheet.

Head of Streets and Open Spaces (Sustainable Drainage Officer)

Comments as submitted:

6.53 Although the proposal is acceptable in terms of the proposed discharge rates there are a number of issues that need to be addressed to make the proposal acceptable:

- The proposed geo-cellular tanks appear to be beneath existing and proposed trees. This indicates a lack of co-ordination between the landscape and drainage proposals. This will be detrimental to the trees and the landscape. The location of the tanks should be co-ordinated with the landscape proposals and moved to an alternative location.
- Water quality has not been addressed within the proposals, any new or replaced external parking areas should utilise permeable paving of one form or another.
- The prevention of silt and debris entering into the geo-cellular tanks should be addressed.
- A management and maintenance plan should be provided that will demonstrate that the drainage can be maintained and how it will be maintained for the lifetime of the development.

6.54 Comments as amended:

6.55 Although the proposal is acceptable in terms of drainage provision, there are still concerns about the provision of new trees and the location of the underground geo-cellular tanks. There appears to be a discrepancy in the drawings and one drawing still indicates a new tree in the location of the tanks.

A management and maintenance plan should be provided that will demonstrate that the drainage can be maintained and how it will be maintained for the lifetime of the development.

Head of Streets and Open Spaces (Nature Conservation Officer)

6.56 No objection subject to conditions for an ecological check of all hedgerows, trees and shrubs to be undertaken before removal, and details to be submitted indicating the number, specification, orientation and location of bird boxes as part of the proposal.

Sport England

6.57 No comment.

Environment Agency

6.58 No objection in principle.

Anglian Water

6.59 No objection subject to a condition ensuring that no hard standing areas to be constructed until works have been carried out in accordance with the surface water strategy so approved.

Cambridgeshire County Council (Archaeology)

6.60 No objection subject to a condition requiring a programme of archaeological work in accordance with a written scheme of investigation.

Design and Conservation Panel (Meeting of 9th September 2015)

6.61 The conclusions of the Panel meeting were as follows:

Massing:

Although the Panel strongly approve of the retention of Gresham House, there were renewed concerns from the Panel that the scale and massing of the new building detracts from Gresham House itself. However the proposed revision of the street frontage on Gresham Road to form three gable ends is considered an improvement. Minimising the size of the lift over-run and its impact on the skyline is encouraged.

Materials:

Ancaster stone or similar is to be used for the detailing of the extension to Gresham House. The Panel were reassured that the PV range would not be visible due to shielding from the mansard roof.

Spa design:

There was some concern that the spa design is still vague as a spa consultant has not yet been appointed. The footprint of this underground facility has a massive impact on the gardens

above and the setting of Gresham House. The Panel felt that it is essential to develop and define the internal layout of the spa and questioned whether the disabled facilities had been adequately considered.

The Panel were satisfied with the assurance that no trees would grow above ground level from the sunken spa gardens and thought that the new wrought iron balustrade barrier proposals are an improvement.

Hotel Frontage to Gonville Place

Landscaping:

The Panel had hoped to see a holistic treatment of the hotel frontage along Gonville Place facing Parker's Piece, one of the foremost public spaces of Cambridge. They wished to see a photo montage of the existing and proposed trees. The tree officers had expected a series of mature trees evenly spaced along the frontage, but this was not apparent in the proposals.

Transport:

The Panel questioned the basis for the reduction in car parking as it was stated that guests usually arrive the hotel by car or taxi. They felt the taxi drop off point should be at the front of the hotel. They could not comment further on the transport proposals as the revised transport plan is due to be submitted imminently.

Restaurant design:

The Panel felt that the design of the new restaurant could have been made more inviting to customers as it is very visible from Parker's Piece and will be lit up at night. They felt disappointed that the design proposals for this element had not been moved forward since the last panel discussion.

Main hotel:

The Panel felt that the brief given to the architects for consideration of the redesign of the main part of the hotel did not extend far enough. They would welcome any proposals to upgrade the street elevation and felt that this is a missed opportunity for the hotel to radically improve its image.

Banners:

The Panel discussed the proposals for banners and supported the idea in theory, dependant on the size and scale of the posts which are not part of the present application. If the existing street frontage of the main hotel had more presence this in itself may make the hotel more inviting to customers. However, the Panel repeated that a coordinated vision for the front of the building was required.

Conclusion:

The Panel felt that the application was composed of a number of disparate elements which did not work well together. Their main disappointment was the lack of coordinated development of the proposals for the frontage of the whole hotel. Their other concerns were the scale and massing of the extension to Gresham House and the lack of appointment of a spa consultant. The Panel renewed their support for the retention of Gresham House and because of this decided to give two separate votes on the verdict.

VERDICT –

Gresham House scheme as proposed - AMBER (2) and GREEN (4)

Whole site as proposed - RED (1) and AMBER (5)

Disability Consultative Panel (Meeting of 25th August 2015)

- 6.62 The WC provision in the gym and dance studio needs to be more accessible while out of the 21 bedrooms, guidance specifies that at least two should be designed to the highest accessible standard with the preference for a higher number as numbers of good quality accessible rooms in the city are low. The application specifies the use of guidance from 'Sports England'. Adherence to this guidance would require a gym changing room with a bench.
- 6.63 The above responses are a summary of the comments that have been received. Full details of the consultation responses can be inspected on the application file.

7.0 REPRESENTATIONS

7.1 The owners/occupiers of the following addresses have made representations:

1, 3, 4, 5, 8, 10, 11	Gresham Place
7	Drosier Road
On behalf of 4 (Cobwebs), 5 & 6 Gresham Road and 3 & 4 Drosier Road, plus various other properties on Harvey Road	Caius Court, Gonville and Caius College
47	Tenison Road
61	Highsett, Hills Road
72	Mawson Road

7.2 The representations can be summarised as follows:

Building Design and Context/Landscaping

- The scheme for the front garden must preserve the large trees and shrubs at its perimeter. Concern that the substantial excavation works would damage their roots and have an adverse impact on the visual amenity of the site, if trees are lost;
- The Gresham House extension is overpoweringly large, both in bulk and height and too close to the road frontage;
- The design of the proposed development would be out of character with the area;

Residential amenity (general)

- Impact of the extension to Gresham House on the residential amenity of occupiers of Drosier Road. In particular noise and disturbance from the public using the new terrace connecting the parking area at the back of the hotel with the new extension. Also light nuisance from the extension and overlooking from the new hotel rooms;
- Over-bearing impact from the extension on Cobwebs (4 Gresham Road) and overlooking from windows on the east elevation;

- Proposed condensers located close to the boundary with Cobwebs are likely to generate background noise and should be re-located to within the site;
- Potential noise disturbance from the gym/spa/dance studio on surrounding properties;
- The dance studio will cause noise, and the generators for the extension would cause noise pollution to this residential area (Gresham Road/Place);
- Construction traffic should be strictly controlled and not from Gresham Road;

Residential amenity (car parking impact)

- The Gresham Road gated access is onto a busy thoroughfare for both pedestrians and cyclists. This would be a serious risk if it were used even more by taxis dropping off and manoeuvring in a tight space. Gresham Road should not be used for any loading or unloading of any materials and works should not operate between 5.30pm – 8.30am;
- Reduction in customer parking on-site when the hotel will be increasing in size will exacerbate the local parking problems, particularly in the Gresham Road/Harvey Road area;

Highway safety

- Concern over the safety of pedestrians and cyclists. The Gresham House gated access should be restricted so that it is not used by all guests of the hotel;

Comment in support

- The proposed development is a vast improvement on the first application and the retention of Gresham House is welcome.

7.3 Cambridge Past, Present & Future object for the following reasons:

- The three-storey extension is too bulky and dominates Gresham House;
- Frontage onto Gresham Road is bland and disappointing;
- The Landscaping lacks adequate detail. Concern over loss of mature trees. The new landscaping strategy plans do not appear adequately integrated with the design of the new building;

- Concern over the sunken courtyard and its impact on the surrounding mature gardens and plant equipment. Its delivery and maintenance could be problematic;
- Concern about the underground construction and the impact on the mature trees;
- The design of the glazed link appears sketchy and unresolved.

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. Impact on the Conservation Area and Listed Buildings
4. Public Art
5. Renewable energy and sustainability
6. Residential amenity
7. Impact on Trees
8. Landscaping and drainage
9. Air Quality
10. Highway safety
11. Car and cycle parking
12. Third party representations
13. Planning Obligation Strategy

Principle of Development

8.2 The proposal to expand existing hotel accommodation is generally supported by Policy 6/3 of the Local Plan 2006. The Cambridge Hotel Futures Study 2012 was endorsed in June 2012 for use as an evidence base for the review of the Local Plan and as a material consideration in planning decisions. However the Hotel Study does not take precedent over the planning policies contained within the current Local Plan in determining planning applications and proposals must also be considered against all other planning material considerations.

- 8.3 The Study has identified a need for between 979 and 2013 new hotel bedrooms up to 2031. The Study also notes the limited number of 4 star and boutique style hotels within the City Centre and as such proposals to provide such accommodation would be supported by the Study.
- 8.4 The proposal, in my view, meets the first line of the Policy 6/3 in that it would be strengthening the range of short-stay accommodation in Cambridge, furthermore by assisting the viability of the rest of the Gonville Hotel, it would also be helping to maintain the range of short-stay accommodation in the City Centre.
- 8.5 Gresham House currently incorporates two self-contained flats at first floor level of the building (one of which was occupied at the time of my site visit on 6th August 2015) and which are accessed independently from the Gonville Hotel, and via an external metal staircase from Gresham Road. Loss of Housing is covered under Policy 5/4 of the Local Plan and is generally not supported. The criteria against which loss of housing must be considered is engaged and are as follows:
- a) The property is unfit for human habitation and cannot be rehabilitated
 - b) it is a subsidiary part of a non-residential property without any practical means of separate access being provided
 - c) it is a listed building which can best be preserved through change of use
 - d) it is necessary for the provision of community facilities for which there is a need in Cambridge
 - e) the lost accommodation is replaced by at least an equivalent amount of new residential floorspace.
- 8.6 In my view criterion (b) is relevant in this case. The flats are currently capable of being accessed independently but in the proposed scheme Gresham House will be more closely integrated with the rest of the hotel and in my view there is no practical way to continue to provide an appropriate separation of the flats from the rest of the hotel.
- 8.7 The second part of Policy 6/3 seeks to ensure that where there is existing residential use on the site (as there is in Gresham House); this should be retained as permanent residential accommodation. Paragraph 6.10 of the supporting text adds

some detail to this requirement. This paragraph states that there is an appropriate balance to be achieved between protecting residential properties and meeting the needs of visitors. The supporting text goes on to state that private residential accommodation to be occupied by the proprietor will be secured by planning conditions to ensure there is no loss of residential units. It is clear from the supporting text that this policy does not seek to re-provide residential units unconnected to the hotel use, but that re-provided residential accommodation is connected to the new/on-going hotel use. This would be more appropriate in small scale guest houses and Bed and Breakfasts, where on-site residential accommodation is required for the efficient running of the Guest House/B&B. In my view, it is unusual for hotels of this scale to provide an on-site residential accommodation, particularly as the Hotel does not close during the night and is managed by staff who rotate around the clock. The proposal does not intend to re-provide the residential units, and as such would not strictly accord with this part of the policy. However, I do not believe that the policy aims to achieve this requirement in order to make the scheme wholly acceptable. Furthermore, I believe that there are clear economic benefits of providing additional high quality hotel accommodation in this location, which in my view would outweigh the need to insist that residential accommodation should be incorporated within the re-development.

- 8.8 In my opinion, the principle of the development is acceptable and in accordance with policies 5/4 and 6/3.

Context of site, design and external spaces

- 8.9 The Gonville Hotel was recently upgraded from a 3 star hotel to a 4 star. The Hotel is subscribed to the Best Western brand. The upgrading has been achieved through the improvements made to the internal accommodation and accommodation within the hotel building. However, in order to retain the 4 star rating, the hotel is required to invest further to bring forward more bedrooms (of no less than 100 in total) and a leisure type of facility (the spa/gym).
- 8.10 There are three main elements to this proposal: 1) The refurbishment and extension to Gresham House (providing an additional 31 bedrooms), 2) The construction of a subterranean spa/gym and dance studio beneath Gresham House, and 3)

Remodeling of the ground floor of the existing hotel to include a small extension to create a new and improved dining room together with significant changes to the landscaping and layout of the existing hard standing area to the front of the hotel, and external façade of the building.

8.11 The site is within the Central Conservation Area and is appraised in the New Town and Glisson Road Conservation Area Appraisal.

8.12 The site is related to two distinct character areas; Gresham Road, and Gonville Place. These two areas are quite different in terms of the scale and bulk of the buildings. Gresham Road is characterised strongly by residential scale Victorian architecture within which there are large buildings fronting the road of mainly 3-4 storeys with gaps in between. The site is in close proximity to The Owen Webb building, and nos.3 and 3A Gresham Road, which are listed. The character is somewhat interrupted by the Fenners apartment block, which is a flat roof three storey building set back from the road. Gonville Place is characterised by larger scale buildings which bound the perimeter of Parkers' Piece, such as the Kelsey Kerridge Sports Centre, the Queen Anne multi-storey car park, Parkside Swimming Pool, and the YMCA building, all of relatively large proportions. There are the four remaining houses along Gonville Place (1-4a Gonville Place) that are of a similar scale and period to the dwellings along Gresham Road. The setting of Gresham House is softened by the mature trees and vegetation that bounds with Gonville Place and along the boundary with Gresham Road. Gresham House cannot be seen from Parkers' Piece and its main presence is on Gresham Road. The Gonville Hotel building, on the contrary, is part of the Gonville Place character. The original part of the hotel was formerly a dwelling and is 19th Century. The building has since been substantially extended either side of it and stands how we know it today. The Gonville Hotel is designated as a Building of Local Interest, but Gresham House is not. It is recognised as being a positive building in the Conservation Area Appraisal.

Refurbishment and Extension to Gresham House

8.13 Taking the first element of the proposal. Unlike the previous application, Gresham House would be retained, refurbished, and extended to the rear. The refurbishment works would result

in 10 additional hotel bedrooms being provided over two floors (ground and first). The extension to the rear would result in a brand new hotel wing, providing an additional 21 hotel bedrooms over two and a half floors.

- 8.14 The proposed extension would be set back from the Gresham Road frontage by 4m from the nearest point and 6.6m from the furthest point (as the front boundary wall is slanted). The tall boundary wall would be retained. The extension would be connected to Gresham House by a glazed link which would not be full height, and would rise up to just below the eaves level of Gresham House. This glazed link element would be set back from the building line and would accommodate a stairwell. I consider that the glazed link provides a good contrast between the two architectural styles of Gresham House and the new extension, and contributes positively to the street scene.
- 8.15 The design approach of the extension is different to the villa style of Gresham House, and reflects 'Cobwebs' (4 Gresham Road), the dwelling adjacent, and others along this part of Gresham Road. The height of the extension, to the tip of the pitch roof element would be 9.8m, lowering to 9.2m of the main roof, and lowering further at the rear to 6.8m. Gresham House is approximately 8m in height. The extension is not a dwelling, and therefore is not of the same scale of Gresham House. The extension would be for hotel use and therefore the proportions of the building, in order for it to function as a hotel, will be essentially different from that of a building designed as a dwelling. Having said that, I consider that the proportions of the building are successful against the domestic scale of Gresham House. I consider that the design approach of the extension is appropriate, including the scale of the building and design details. Chimneys are also included within the design, which is a common feature of Gresham Road, and are an appropriate addition to the design detailing. The extension would be larger in footprint and in scale than Gresham House. However, I do not consider that the building would be significantly larger to the extent where it subsumes Gresham House or compromises its integrity within the street scene. In my view, the extension respects the character of the area by reflecting the architectural styles of the dwellings adjacent, which are prominent in the street scene. The proposed materials mentioned within the Design & Access Statement indicate that traditional materials would be used in the construction, and this can be secured by a

planning condition, to ensure that the materials will be of high quality and complement the character of the area.

- 8.16 The rear elevation of the proposed extension is significantly different to the Gresham Road frontage. This elevation would face the rear gardens of Drosier Road properties and would be approximately 5.6m away from the boundary. The windows project out and are angled in their design (oriel windows), and their main outlook would be away from the Drosier Road properties. The oriel window approach exists on the original Gonville Hotel building, and as such I consider that this design approach is appropriate for this elevation and responds positively to the site constraints.
- 8.17 The side elevation facing 'Cobwebs', 4 Gresham Road, would be set away from the boundary by 2m. There are windows on this side which serve hallways and stairwells. These can be obscure glazing to reduce any over-looking. There are also 'blind' windows on this elevation which in my view helps to articulate this side elevation and to add interest, particularly as views of this side elevation can be seen from Gresham Road.

Subterranean Spa/gym/dance studio

- 8.18 Taking the second element of the proposal, a subterranean spa facility with gym and a dance studio is proposed. The day spa facility would be used by guests of the hotel and members of the public by exclusive membership. The site would be excavated to accommodate the spa facility etc. and would be beneath Gresham House, and under the proposed extension. The spa facility would also extend underneath the existing garden area, and a link corridor would connect one side of the spa facility to the other and would run underneath Gresham House. Guests of the hotel will access the spa through the main hotel and via the proposed lobby area between the existing hotel and Gresham House. The existing gated access onto Gresham Road (serving Gresham House), would be solely for pedestrians and those spa members wanting to access the facilities from that direction. This gate would be locked and members of the spa would have a key fob to allow them entry. This access would not be used by people other than members to access the spa. I consider a condition requesting further details of how this will be managed is reasonable and is therefore recommended.

- 8.19 In terms of design, the facility would be entirely underground, although there would be significant alterations to the existing mature garden area, in front of Gresham House to allow access from Gresham Road (by members only). The alterations would result in an external sunken courtyard with glazed panels to allow light to penetrate through to the spa area and a stairwell from the grounds of Gresham House down to the external courtyard and through the main entrance to the spa reception area. The Design & Access Statement states that the design of the perimeter of the sunken courtyard, at ground floor level (not basement level) would be marked by ornate metal railings upstand on a low wall. I consider that this approach works successfully and is acceptable. However, precise details of how this would be delivered and materials, would need to be secured by a condition to ensure consistency of materials across the site.
- 8.20 The subterranean spa facility would expand out underneath the existing garden area and extensive re-landscaping of this part of the site would be required. The spa would include a small pool area, a sauna area, changing rooms and showers, toilets, a lounge area, a lift, a number of treatment rooms and a plant room. The main reception would also be in this section. In terms of visual amenity, the sunken courtyard and its boundary treatment is the most significant feature that would alter the character of the existing garden area. This feature would be visible from Gresham Road, through the existing metal gates and I do not consider that this would be detrimental to the character of the area as it is set well within the site would not be obtrusive in the street scene.
- 8.21 The gym and dance studio would be at the other end of Gresham House, underneath the proposed extension. This is a smaller space and would be accessed via the same routes as already mentioned. Other than the gym and dance studio, there would be changing rooms with showers, a gym office, a lift and a plant room. There would also be two stairwells either end of this area, up to the hotel bedrooms within the extension. This part of the spa facility would not come up to the boundaries of the site and is situated about 2m away from the boundary with Cobwebs, at basement level. In my view, there would be no visual impact from this part of the facility as it is entirely underground, although this part is wholly dependent on the spa

area for access for hotel guests who may be staying in the original Gonville Hotel building. I consider the spa facility is acceptable.

Remodeling of the existing hotel and landscape improvements

- 8.22 Taking the third element of the proposal, the Gonville Hotel frontage would be extended to create a new dining area/restaurant on the front elevation for 40 additional covers. The proposed extension would be fully glazed, flat roofed, contemporary extension with external louvered screens that sit away from the glass façade. The extension would project out by 5.6m, 14m in length and 3m in height. Further to this, there would be some site layout improvements, mainly re-landscaping the hotel frontage with both hard and soft landscaping features, but still retaining a dual access for entrance and exit. I consider that the alterations to the forecourt would improve and enhance the appearance of the Gonville Hotel from Gonville Place and across Parker's Piece. In my view, the soft landscaping proposals would help to soften the visual approach to the hotel, whilst the hard landscaping features would help to formalise the forecourt and improve the site's aesthetics.
- 8.23 A proposed site facilities workshop would be erected in the far corner of the site, to the rear. This would be a timber shed-type building with a mono-pitch roof, at a height of 3m to the highest point (front). The height then decreases towards the rear to 2.2m. This building would be adjacent to car parking spaces. I consider that the location and appearance of the building is acceptable.
- 8.24 In my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 3/4, 3/7, 3/11, 3/12.

Impact on the Conservation Area and Listed Buildings

- 8.25 The application is supported by a Heritage Statement. The Urban Design and Conservation Team support the proposal and I concur with their comments. Gresham House is noted as a 'building important to the character' in the New Town and Glisson Road Conservation Area Appraisal and its retention is a welcome response to the comments made on the previous refused scheme. The original Gonville Hotel building is designated as a Building of Local Interest.

- 8.26 The proposal has been amended to address the original concerns of the Urban Design and Conservation Team. These amendments are listed above under the relevant consultee comments.
- 8.27 I consider that the design approach of the proposal respects the historic setting of the area and in my view would enhance the appearance of the character of the Conservation area and would not adversely affect the setting of the nearby listed buildings.
- 8.28 The extension to the original Gonville Hotel (dining area) was also proposed as part of the previous application. The Urban Design and Conservation team supported this part of the proposal. Furthermore, the Design and Conservation Panel also raise no objection to this part of the proposal.
- 8.29 I note that there are concerns raised from the Design and Conservation Panel with regard to the Gonville Hotel frontage proposals, subject of this application. However, this part of the proposal has not changed since the previous scheme, to which they did not object. As such, I consider that this element is acceptable and would enhance the character of the Conservation Area by improving the hotel forecourt appearance and adding a modern feature on the frontage which also helps to break up the façade.
- 8.30 In my opinion, the proposal is compliant with policies 4/10 and 4/11 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2006).

Public Art

- 8.31 A Public Art Strategy has been submitted. The area identified for public art would be the entrance gates to Gresham House, railings along the hotel frontage and the railings around the sunken courtyard area. I consider that these areas are acceptable locations for public art interventions and would be visible from the public domain. I consider that a condition requiring further details of how the public art would be delivered is reasonable in this case, and is therefore recommended one together with another condition to ensure that the public art is properly maintained.

8.32 In my opinion 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

8.33 The application is supported by a Renewable Energy Report. The policy requirements (policy 8/16) of the proposed development should come from renewable energy sources. Hotel development typically has a high energy use because of the heating requirements for hot water from the number of guest bathrooms, and in this case also the requirements of the day spa facility.

8.34 Photovoltaic (PV) panels and a combined heat and power (CHP) system are proposed to provide a proportion of the hotel's energy requirements from a renewable energy source and to meet the 10% renewable energy requirements. The PV panels would be located on the roof of the Gonville Hotel. The CHP system would be installed within the mechanical services plant room, and would be suitable to meet the hot water needs and some of the heating demand from the proposed development. A gas boiler would be provided to deal with peaks in energy use.

8.35 In my opinion the applicants have suitably addressed the issue of sustainability and renewable energy and the proposal is in accordance with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policy 8/16 and the Sustainable Design and Construction SPD 2007.

Residential Amenity

Impact on amenity of neighbouring occupiers

8.36 The proposal has raised a number of concerns from neighbours. The proposal, particularly the extension to Gresham House, would mainly affect those who live on Gresham Road and Gresham Place, and no.8 Drosier Road, to the rear. I consider that the proposed extension to the original Gonville Hotel building and associated works (including the site facilities workshop building) would have a minimal impact on neighbour amenity and is therefore acceptable in this respect.

8.37 The proposed extension to Gresham House would be, in my view, a prominent building within the street scene. However, the building is set back from the Gresham Road frontage and

this helps to reduce the prominence of the building on the street scene. The distance between the extension and 3 and 3A Gresham Road, opposite, would be approximately 17m. I consider that this is an acceptable distance between properties and would not appear over-bearing, in my view.

8.38 There is a closer relationship to no.8 Drosier Road, to the rear, where the extension is 5m away from the boundary with the garden area of the property. The extension would be visible from the rear garden areas of Drosier Road. This part of the extension, however, is stepped lower than the main height and bulk of the building and as such, I consider that it would not be significantly dominant. There are windows along the rear elevation at ground and first floor levels, plus dormer style windows within the roof of the main building. The windows at ground and first floor are all oriel windows which are angled away from Drosier Road properties and as such the occupants of the hotel would not have direct views from their hotel bedroom window into the Drosier Road properties. The dormer windows within the roof of the main extension building would be set back, behind a parapet wall by a further 2m. The parapet wall would rise up to 375mm which in my view, helps to further minimise over-looking into the Drosier Road properties and improve the relationship.

8.39 The extension would also come closer to 'Cobwebs', no.4 Gresham Road. 'Cobwebs' is a three storey Victorian dwelling to the south of the application site and has a larger garden area than those properties on Drosier Road. The dwelling is a large prominent building in the street scene and has been extended to the rear over the years. It has a strong gable form which is reflected in the design of the proposed hotel extension. To the north of the property there is a single storey garage which is up against the boundary wall with the application site, and is visible from the application site. The southern elevation of the proposed extension would have windows that serve hall ways and stairwells, and as such these windows can be obscurely glazed. There are also a number of 'blind' windows, which would not allow any views out. In my view, the distance between the properties and the design of the extension is acceptable and I do not consider that the impact on the residential amenity of 'Cobwebs', in terms of over-looking and dominance, would be so significant as to warrant refusal of the application on this basis.

8.40 Some neighbours have raised concern about noise from generators/air conditioning units, the spa/gym, and general noise from the hotel from guests. A noise report has been submitted as part of the application. The Environmental Health Officer has assessed plant noise in terms of the impact it would have on the residential properties surrounding the site and is satisfied that noise from the plant would not be significant. A condition requiring further details of plant noise insulation is recommended to deal with this and to ensure that British Standard levels can be met before the development is occupied. The noise from the spa/gym/dance studio was also assessed and I have been advised that a condition is recommended requiring further details of building noise insulation to be submitted. I therefore consider that a condition is reasonable in this case. In terms of general noise and disturbance from hotel/spa guests, the extension/spa would mean more people would be using the hotel. However, the hotel would have a duty of management of the hotel grounds to ensure all patrons are acting appropriately within a residential area. From a planning perspective, a hotel use would not, in my view, introduce a high level of noise and disturbance given the nature of the business. The spa/gym would be more active, although as this is underground, and subject to appropriate sound proofing, I do not consider that this would cause considerable noise and disturbance to nearby neighbours that would warrant refusal of the application on this basis.

8.41 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.

Impact on Trees

8.42 The site contains a large number of trees, some of which are protected. The majority of the existing mature and highest quality trees would be retained as part of the proposed development. The proposed development seeks to minimise the loss of tree cover at the site and re-introduce appropriate replacement trees where possible. In particular the large London Plane tree dominating the entrance drive to the front of the hotel is an important feature of the site and its connection to the surroundings and will be retained.

8.43 A Tree Survey and an arboricultural impact assessment has been undertaken and submitted as part of the application. Seven trees have been identified for removal on arboricultural grounds with a further 21 trees and one tree group proposed for removal to accommodate the proposal. Most of the trees to be removed are growing in tight overcrowded conditions in close proximity to buildings, boundary walls or other trees. The thinning of the existing tree vegetation will benefit the remaining trees in the long-term by providing more growing space for the better quality trees within the site. The trees to be retained would be protected during construction phase of the development (and this is secured by condition requiring further details of tree protection during construction). It is proposed to plant 24 new trees in strategic locations at the boundary of the site. These proposed trees would be planted along the Gonville Road boundary to enhance the existing screening, and along Gresham Road to filter views from the road. The submitted Landscape Strategy document explains the strategy for removal and retention of trees, and management of that process (page 7). The strategy identifies a phasing strategy for removal and re-planting of trees and other planting over a period of 10 years. This approach, in my view, would help the new trees to establish and assimilate with the existing trees. I therefore consider that the strategy seeks to retain the screening that currently exists and can be seen from Parker's Piece, whilst improving the existing landscaping challenges of the site, and to deliver a better arboricultural solution that can be maintained in the future.

8.44 The Council's Tree Officer considers that the tree losses and the strategy approach to re-plant new trees on the site are acceptable. However, she remains concerned about the space around the proposed pleached trees, the trees along the Gresham Road boundary and the new Plane tree along the Gonville Hotel frontage. The Tree Officer has referred the landscaping issues to the Landscape Architect to resolve.

8.45 I consider that the proposed arboricultural strategy is acceptable and complies with policy 4/4 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2006).

Landscaping and drainage

- 8.46 Further work is needed to ensure that mitigation measures to deal with surface water drainage are compatible with proposed landscaping, particularly tree planting. This matter remains unresolved at the time of writing this report and I will provide an update on the amendment sheet.

Air Quality

- 8.47 The Environmental Health Officer has raised air quality as a concern as a result of additional traffic associated with the proposal. An amended plan showing 3no. electric car charging points has been submitted responding to this concern. The amended plan has been accepted and now overcomes the air quality concerns, subject to conditions.

Highway Safety

- 8.48 The Local Highway Authority have raised no objection from a highway safety point of view.
- 8.49 In my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policy 8/2.

Car and Cycle Parking

- 8.50 A Transport Assessment has been submitted in support of the application. The proposed extension and refurbishment of the hotel would allow the existing car parking to be re-arranged on site and consolidated to the side and rear of the main hotel building. The site currently provides 59 car parking spaces, of which 4no are disabled spaces. The approach of rearranging the car parking would allow for a better organized vehicle drop-off area at the hotel entrance, new landscaping in front of the proposed dining room extension, and designated cycle parking spaces. The hotel would provide 36 car parking spaces and 76 cycle parking spaces. The amount of cycle parking represents a marked increase on the present situation where a single cycle rack provides space for only 8 cycles. A hotel travel plan has been prepared to encourage more travel to the hotel by non-car modes of transport. I consider that the reduction in car parking spaces is acceptable, given the sustainable location of the site, and its proximity to the station and public transport routes. The

increase in cycle parking provision and their location is also acceptable, in my view.

- 8.51 Application of the car and cycle parking standards suggests that for a 115 bed hotel with 66 members of staff 29 car parking spaces and 45 cycle parking spaces should be provided. This compares with 36 car parking spaces and 76 cycle parking spaces proposed. Cycle parking provision is above standard and this is welcomed. Although car parking provision is in excess of the standard it is lower than currently provided which is acceptable in my view given that the hotel is expanding.
- 8.52 In my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 8/6 and 8/10.

Third Party Representations

- 8.53 I have addressed the neighbours' concerns and comments made by Cambridge PPF in my Assessment above.

Planning Obligation Strategy

Planning Obligations

- 8.54 The Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Regulations 2010 have introduced the requirement for all local authorities to make an assessment of any planning obligation in relation to three tests. Each planning obligation needs to pass three statutory tests to make sure that it is

- (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.

- 8.55 In line with the CIL Regulations, councils can pool no more than five S106 contributions towards the same project. The new 'pooling' restrictions were introduced from 6 April 2015 and relate to new S106 agreements. This means that all

contributions now agreed by the city council must be for specific projects at particular locations, as opposed to generic infrastructure types within the city of Cambridge.

Transport

8.56 Comments are still awaited from the County Council's Growth and Economy Team. These will be reported on the Amendment Sheet or orally at the Committee meeting.

9.0 CONCLUSION

9.1 In conclusion I consider that the proposed development is acceptable and approval is recommended, subject to conditions.

10.0 RECOMMENDATION

APPROVE subject to completion of any necessary s106 Agreement 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. Submission of Preliminary Contamination Assessment:

Prior to the commencement of the development (or phase of) or investigations required to assess the contamination of the site, the following information shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority:

- (a) Desk study to include:

-Detailed history of the site uses and surrounding area (including any use of radioactive materials)

-General environmental setting.

-Site investigation strategy based on the information identified in the desk study.

(b) A report setting out what works/clearance of the site (if any) is required in order to effectively carry out site investigations.

Reason: To adequately categorise the site prior to the design of an appropriate investigation strategy in the interests of environmental and public safety in accordance with Cambridge Local Plan 2006 Policy 4/13.

4. Submission of site investigation report and remediation strategy:

Prior to the commencement of the development (or phase of) with the exception of works agreed under condition 3 and in accordance with the approved investigation strategy agreed under clause (b) of condition 3, the following shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority:

(a) A site investigation report detailing all works that have been undertaken to determine the nature and extent of any contamination, including the results of the soil, gas and/or water analysis and subsequent risk assessment to any receptors

(b) A proposed remediation strategy detailing the works required in order to render harmless the identified contamination given the proposed end use of the site and surrounding environment including any controlled waters. The strategy shall include a schedule of the proposed remedial works setting out a timetable for all remedial measures that will be implemented.

Reason: To ensure that any contamination of the site is identified and appropriate remediation measures agreed in the interest of environmental and public safety in accordance with Cambridge Local Plan 2006 Policy 4/13.

5. Implementation of remediation.

Prior to the first occupation of the development or (or each phase of the development where phased) the remediation strategy approved under clause (b) to condition 4 shall be fully implemented on site following the agreed schedule of works.

Reason: To ensure full mitigation through the agreed remediation measures in the interests of environmental and public safety in accordance with Cambridge Local Plan 2006 Policy 4/13.

6. Completion report:

Prior to the first occupation of the development (or phase of) hereby approved the following shall be submitted to, and approved by the local planning authority.

(a) A completion report demonstrating that the approved remediation scheme as required by condition 4 and implemented under condition 5 has been undertaken and that the land has been remediated to a standard appropriate for the end use.

(b) Details of any post-remedial sampling and analysis (as defined in the approved material management plan) shall be included in the completion report along with all information concerning materials brought onto, used, and removed from the development. The information provided must demonstrate that the site has met the required clean-up criteria.

Thereafter, no works shall take place within the site such as to prejudice the effectiveness of the approved scheme of remediation.

Reason: To demonstrate that the site is suitable for approved use in the interests of environmental and public safety in accordance with Cambridge Local Plan 2006 Policy 4/13

7. Material Management Plan:

Prior to importation or reuse of material for the development (or phase of) a Materials Management Plan (MMP) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The MMP shall:

a) Include details of the volumes and types of material proposed to be imported or reused on site

- b) Include details of the proposed source(s) of the imported or reused material
- c) Include details of the chemical testing for ALL material to be undertaken before placement onto the site.
- d) Include the results of the chemical testing which must show the material is suitable for use on the development
- e) Include confirmation of the chain of evidence to be kept during the materials movement, including material importation, reuse placement and removal from and to the development.

All works will be undertaken in accordance with the approved document.

Reason: To ensure that no unsuitable material is brought onto the site in the interest of environmental and public safety in accordance with Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 4/13.

8. Unexpected Contamination:

If unexpected contamination is encountered whilst undertaking the development which has not previously been identified, works shall immediately cease on site until the Local Planning Authority has been notified and/or the additional contamination has been fully assessed and remediation approved following steps (a) and (b) of condition 4 above. The approved remediation shall then be fully implemented under condition 5

Reason: To ensure that any unexpected contamination is rendered harmless in the interests of environmental and public safety in accordance with Cambridge Local Plan 2006 Policy 4/13.

9. 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)

10. 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)

11. 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)

12. 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

13. Prior to the commencement of development/construction, a noise insulation scheme detailing the acoustic noise insulation performance specification of the external building envelope of the residential units (having regard to the building fabric, glazing and ventilation) to reduce the level of noise experienced in the residential units as a result of the proximity of the habitable rooms to the high ambient noise levels in the area be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The scheme shall achieve internal noise levels recommended in British Standard 8233:2014 Guidance on sound insulation and noise reduction for buildings. The scheme as approved shall be fully implemented before the first occupation of the building and thereafter be retained as such.

Reason: To protect the amenity of future occupants of this property from the high ambient noise levels in the area (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/4, 3/7 and 4/13)

14. Before the development/use hereby permitted is occupied, a scheme for the insulation of the building in order to minimise the level of noise emanating from the said building shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The scheme as approved shall be fully implemented before the building hereby permitted is occupied and shall be thereafter retained as such.

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

15. Prior to the occupation/use of the development, details of equipment for the purpose of extraction and filtration of odours shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The approved extraction/filtration scheme shall be installed before the use hereby permitted is commenced and shall thereafter be retained as such..

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

16. Before the development hereby approved is occupied, a scheme for the insulation of the plant in order to minimise the level of noise emanating from the plant, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and the scheme as approved shall be fully implemented before the use hereby permitted is commenced.

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

17. The proposed on-site renewable and low carbon energy technologies shall be fully installed and operational prior to the occupation of any approved buildings and shall thereafter be maintained in accordance with a maintenance programme, which shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority prior to the commencement of development. The renewable and low carbon energy technologies shall remain fully operational in accordance with the approved maintenance programme, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the local planning authority.

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

18. Prior to the commencement of development, a plan showing the number, specification, orientation and location of the bird boxes shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The works shall be completed in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: In the interest of nature conservation (Cambridge Local Plan 2006, policy 3/14)

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. 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)

21. Prior to the commencement of development, with the exception of below ground works, full details of all non-masonry walling systems, cladding panels or other external screens including structural members, infill panels, edge, junction and coping details, colours, surface finishes/textures and relationships to glazing and roofing shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. This may consist of large-scale drawings and/or samples. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

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

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

Reason: In the interests of visual amenity and to enhance the character of the Conservation Area (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/4, 3/12 and 4/11).

23. Prior to the commencement of development, full details of all windows and doors, as identified on the approved drawings, including materials, colours, surface finishes/textures shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. This may consist of large-scale drawings and/or samples. Thereafter the development shall be undertaken in accordance with the agreed details unless the Local Planning Authority agrees to any variation in writing.

Reason: In the interest of visual amenity and to enhance the character of the Conservation Area (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/4, 3/12 and 4/11).

24. No development shall commence until details of the location and 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)

25. Where existing openings are to be bricked up, the method for doing so, including the materials to be used, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, prior to the commencement of development. Thereafter the development shall be undertaken in accordance with the agreed details unless the Local Planning Authority agrees to any variation in writing.

Reason: In the interest of visual amenity and to enhance the character of the Conservation Area (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/4, 3/12 and 4/11).

26. No hard standing areas shall be constructed until works have been carried out in accordance with the submitted surface water drainage strategy, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To prevent environmental and amenity problems arising from flooding (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/12 and 4/13)

27. 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)

28. All hard and soft landscape works shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details, and to a reasonable standard in accordance with the relevant recommendation of the appropriate British Standard or other recognised code of good practice. The works shall be carried out prior to the occupation of any part of the development or in accordance with the programme agreed by the local planning authority in writing. The maintenance shall be carried out in accordance with the approved schedule. Any trees or plants that, within a period of five years after planting, are removed, die or become in the opinion of the local planning authority, seriously damaged or defective, shall be replaced as soon as is reasonably practicable with others of species, size and number as originally approved, unless the local planning authority gives its written consent to any variation.

Reason: To ensure provision, establishment and maintenance of a reasonable standard of landscaping in accordance with the approved design. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/4, 3/11 and 3/12)

29. No development shall take place until there has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority a plan indicating the positions, design, materials and type of boundary treatments to be erected. The boundary treatment 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. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

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

30. Prior to commencement of development, full details of the capital construction costs of the development shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority in writing.

To expend not less than 1% of capital construction costs on the provision of the Public Art.

Prior to the commencement of development, or within a timescale that shall be submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority, with the exception of any works of demolition or below ground works, a Public Art Delivery Plan and Public Art Maintenance Plan shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

The Public Art Delivery Plan shall include:

Details of the Public Art and artist commission; Details of how the Public Art will be delivered, including a timetable for delivery; Details of the location of the proposed Public Art on the application site or within the development, including a location plan; A breakdown of costs and how one percent of the capital construction costs will be spent on the provision of Public Art;

The proposed consultation to be undertaken with the local community including ward councillors on the proposed Public Art; and the proposed engagement with the local community to promote the Public Art once completed.

The Public Art Maintenance Plan shall include:

Details of how the Public Art will be maintained for the life of the Public Art, including how often maintenance will be needed; The proposed insurance of the Public Art against loss or damage for the life of the Public Art; How any repairs would be carried out, including how and to where the Public Art would be moved, if that is necessary; and how the Public Art would be repaired/replaced in the event that it is damaged/destroyed completely;

The approved Public Art Delivery Plan shall be fully implemented in accordance with the approved timetable.

On completion of the Public Art it shall be maintained, repaired, insured and (if necessary) replaced in accordance with the approved Public Art Maintenance Plan, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Once in place, the Public Art shall not be moved or removed otherwise than in accordance with the approved Public Art Maintenance Plan.

Reason: To ensure the public art makes a positive and contribution to the site (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 3/7).

31. The spa/gym/dance studio, hereby approved, shall operate only between the following hours: 0700 - 2200hrs Monday to Sunday and at no other times, unless otherwise agree in writing by the Local Planning Authority on a separate application.

Reason: In the interest of neighbour amenity (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 4/13).

32. Prior to the commencement of development and with reference to BS 5837 2012, details of the specification and position of all protection measures and techniques to be adopted for the protection of any trees from damage during the course of any activity related to the development, shall be submitted to the local planning authority for its written approval in the form of an Arboricultural Method Statement (AMS) and Tree Protection Plan (TPP).

Reason: To protect the retained trees from construction (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 4/4)

33. Prior to commencement, a site visit will be arranged with the retained arboriculturalist, developer and Local Planning Authority Tree Officer to agree tree works and the location and specification of tree protection barriers and temporary ground protection.

Reason: In the interest of the retained trees (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 4/4)

34. The approved AMS and TPP will be implemented throughout the development and 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: In the interest of tree protection (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 4/4)

35. Prior to the commencement of development, details of how the top panes of the glazed link between Gresham House and the proposed extension, hereby approved, will be obscurely glazed, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The works shall be completed in accordance with the approved details, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In the interest of neighbour amenity (Cambridge Local Plan 2006, policy 3/14)

36. Prior to the commencement of development, a management plan shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The Management plan shall include details of the operation of the hotel and spa/gym/dance studio, hereby approved, and details of the gated access from Gresham Road. The Gresham House gates shall be locked at all times other than to allow access for members of the spa/gym/dance studio by special arrangement, as detailed within the management plan, hereby requested. The works shall be completed only in accordance with the approved details, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In the interest of neighbour amenity (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 3/7)

37. Prior to the commencement of development full details of a mitigation scheme to address the impacts on air quality arising from the development shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To protect human health in accordance with policy 4/14 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2006).

38. The Air Quality mitigation scheme approved under condition number 37 shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details before the first occupation of the development and shall thereafter be retained as such.

Reason: To protect human health in accordance with policy 4/14 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2006).

INFORMATIVE: The site investigation, including relevant soil, soil gas, surface and groundwater sampling should be carried out by a suitably qualified and accredited consultant/contractor in accordance with a quality assured sampling, analysis methodology and relevant guidance. The Council has produced a guidance document to provide information to developers on how to deal with contaminated land. The document, 'Contaminated Land in Cambridge- Developers Guide' can be downloaded from the City Council website on <https://www.cambridge.gov.uk/land-pollution>. Hard copies can also be provided upon request

INFORMATIVE: 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: Dust condition informative

To satisfy the condition requiring the submission of a program of measures to control airborne dust above, the applicant should have regard to:

-Council's 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

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).

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