



To: Executive Councillor for Planning Policy and Transport: Councillor Kevin Blencowe  
Report by: Director of Environment  
Relevant scrutiny committee: Development Plan Scrutiny Sub Committee 14 March 2016  
Wards affected: All wards

## **NEW MUSEUMS SITE DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK - SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING DOCUMENT**

---

### **Not a Key Decision**

---

#### **1. Executive summary**

- 1.1 The New Museum Site is a key University of Cambridge site, on the north side of Downing Street. It is allocated in the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 as Site 7.08 for redevelopment/refurbishment for predominantly University uses, with some mixed use to enhance the attractiveness of the public realm. Policy 43 University Faculty Development and Appendix B: Proposals Schedule in the submission Cambridge Local Plan (2014) identifies the New Museum Site as Site U2 for mixed-use redevelopment for university related uses.
- 1.2 The council and the University of Cambridge are working in partnership on the preparation of a New Museum Site Development Framework Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) to ensure that any future development on the New Museums Site safeguards the architectural, historic, cultural and archaeological importance of the site while providing an opportunity for positive qualitative change. The site development brief provides greater certainty and detail to support the delivery of this allocation in the coming years.
- 1.3 The emerging Local Plan is still at the examination stage, which means that the Council is unable to adopt the New Museums Site Development Framework as an SPD until the Local Plan has been found sound and adopted. In the interim period, prior to adoption of the SPD, the New Museums Site Development Framework provides context and guidance as material consideration in the planning process.

- 1.4 In accordance with the process of preparing an SPD, consultation on the draft Development Framework was carried out over a 6 week period between 13 July and 7 September 2016.
- 1.5 Appendix A provides a brief summary of the key issues raised during public consultation. Appendix B provides summaries of the representations received to the draft SPD and sets out the proposed responses. Appendix C provides a track-changed version of the SPD, whilst Appendix D incorporates the Statement of Consultation.
- 1.6 No significant changes are proposed as a result of the consultation. However some minor amendments to the SPD are proposed and are set out in Appendix C, reflecting the comments received during the public consultation set out in Appendix B.

## **2. Recommendations**

- 2.1 This report is being submitted to the Development Plan Scrutiny Sub-Committee for prior consideration and comment before decision by the Executive Councillor for Planning Policy and Transport.
- 2.2 The Executive Councillor is recommended:
  - To agree the responses to the representations received to the New Museums Site Development Framework (Appendix B) and the consequential amendments to the New Museums Site Development Framework(Appendix C);
  - To approve the New Museum Site Development Framework (Appendix C) in anticipation of the adoption of the Local Plan, and to agree that it should be carried forward for adoption as a Supplementary Planning Document at the same time as the Local Plan.

## **3. Background**

### New Museum Site SPD

- 3.1 The aim of the New Museums Site Development Framework SPD is to set out the joint aspirations of the council and the University of Cambridge regarding future changes to the site. These should improve the urban form with changes to the public realm, provide

better access for all and adopt more sustainable forms of development while respecting the site's heritage and surroundings. Future development on the site offers an opportunity to create an improved, more coherent development and especially to improve the public realm on the site.

3.2 The key issues and opportunities on the site have been identified as follows:

- Enhancement of the Historic Core Conservation Area and the careful management of existing built heritage assets on and around the site;
- Integration of the site into the wider city centre;
- Improvement of the external spaces within the site and creation of an appropriate public realm with improved permeability and public access especially to University museums and the heritage of the site;
- Improvement of University facilities in support of its continuing academic success and its importance to the life of the city;
- Increased environmental sustainability including better energy use, increased ecology and biodiversity and settings supporting the health and wellbeing of the site users and visitors;
- Reduced car parking and improved facilities for pedestrians and cyclists.

3.3 The New Museum Site Development Framework SPD has been written to support the new Cambridge Local Plan (2014). This SPD will be adopted at the same time as the Local Plan is adopted.

### Public Consultation

3.4 After being approved for public consultation at Development Plan Scrutiny Sub Committee (DPSSC) on 16 June 2015, the draft New Museums Site Development Framework SPD was the subject of consultation for 6 weeks between 13 July and 7 September 2016.

3.5 In line with the consultation standards set out in the council's Statement of Community Involvement and in accordance with the Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) Regulations 2004 (as amended), the consultation documents were sent to the statutory and other consultees. All of the consultation material was made available on the council's website and an online consultation system was utilised to allow people to submit their comments via the internet (hard copies of the response forms were made available to those who do not have access to the internet). A

notice was placed in the Cambridge Evening News on Monday 13 July 2015 containing information about the consultation and how people could get involved.

- 3.6 The draft SPD and its supporting documents remain available on the council's website at <https://www.cambridge.gov.uk/new-museums-site-development-framework-spd>

### Results of consultation

- 3.7 At the end of the consultation period, a total of 63 separate representations were received, made by 38 respondents, of which 4 (6%) were supportive, 23 (37%) were comments and the remainder, 36 (57%) were objections. The majority of responses came from the academic community however responses also came from a variety of other sources including local residents, businesses, planning consultants, the James Clerk Maxwell Foundation along with a number of other Clerk Maxwell enthusiasts, and Historic England.

- 3.8 In summary, the key issues raised (see Appendix A) include:

- The treatment of the site's permeability (approximately 30% of all the representations received);
- Concern over the treatment of and alterations to the Old Cavendish Laboratory and Mond buildings;
- Clarification and strengthening of particular paragraphs of the draft SPD;
- Historic England requested that minor changes be made to the text to clarify points of reference.
- Neighbouring organisations requested early consultation on proposals that may affect operational access and parking capacity/access.

- 3.9 Officers have worked through all representations and have drafted responses. Summaries of all representations and proposed responses with recommended changes to the SPD have been attached as Appendix B to this report.

### Next Steps

- 3.10 Subject to approval by the Executive Councillor, the public consultation responses will be published and loaded on the council's public consultation website.

3.11 In terms of status, the emerging Local Plan is still at the examination stage, which means that the council is unable to adopt the New Museums Site Development Framework as an SPD until the Local Plan has been found sound and adopted. In the interim period, prior to adoption of the SPD, the New Museums Site Development Framework provides context and guidance as material consideration in the planning process.

## **4. Implications**

### **Financial Implications**

4.1 There are no significant direct staffing or procurement issues arising from this report. Staffing resources are already committed through the budget and service plan process.

### **Staffing Implications**

4.2 There are no direct staffing implications arising from this report. The development of the SPD is already included in existing work plans.

### **Equal Opportunities Implications**

4.3 The SPD, once adopted, will have a positive impact by ensuring the site is better integrated into the wider city centre. New development within the site should improve access for people with limited mobility.

### **Environmental Implications**

4.4 The guidance contained within the SPD follows the principles of sustainable development as set out in the NPPF.

### **Consultation**

4.5 The consultation and communication arrangements for the SPD were carried as outlined in paragraphs 3.4 and 3.5.

### **Community Safety**

4.6 There are no direct community safety implications arising from this report.

## **5. Background papers**

5.1 These background papers were used in the preparation of this report:

- Cambridge Local Plan 2014: Proposed Submission (as amended)  
<https://www.cambridge.gov.uk/local-plan-review-proposed-submission-consultation>
- The New Museums Site Historic Environment Analysis (Beacon Planning Ltd., 2015)  
<http://democracy.cambridge.gov.uk/documents/s28744/CityCentreAccessStudy.pdf>
- Cambridge City Council Historic Core Area Appraisal (Cambridge City Council, 2006)  
<https://www.cambridge.gov.uk/historic-core-appraisal>

## 6. Appendices

- Appendix A: Brief summary of the key issues raised during public consultation
- Appendix B: Schedule of Consultation Representations
- Appendix C: New Museums Site Development Framework Supplementary Planning Document with tracked changes
- Appendix D: Statement of Consultation

## 7. Inspection of papers

To inspect the background papers or if you have a query about the report, please contact:

Author's name:	Glen Richardson
Author's phone number:	01223 457374
Author's email:	<a href="mailto:glen.richardson@cambridge.gov.uk">glen.richardson@cambridge.gov.uk</a>

## Appendix A: Brief summary of the key issues raised during public consultation

<b>Chapter 1 – Introduction</b>			
Respondents	Support (incl. qualified)	Object	Comment
5	2	3	0
(Support)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support 1st sentence in para 1.1.1 however the historical significance of the site is not being approached appropriately hence objection to para 1.4.1 and the lack of proper implementation</li> </ul>		
(Object)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Failure to recognise and protect the old Cavendish Laboratory; contradictory to SPD's statement of intent.</li> <li>The old Cavendish Laboratory is a key piece of scientific history, the external view and style should be retained in line with 1.4.1b,c,d,e,f.</li> <li>The Mond and Cavendish laboratories should not be demolished;</li> <li>The Cavendish laboratory should become a museum.</li> </ul>		
Draft response and consequential changes to SPD	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It is not considered appropriate to single out individual buildings in the key issues section. There are many other significant buildings of heritage significance that would then need to be listed out herein, this is done later in the document at a more appropriate level of detail.</li> <li>Careful consideration and attention has and will continue to be given towards any alteration or restoration of the site's built heritage.</li> <li>Works to the Cavendish Laboratory as part of the Student Services Centre project, which also impacted the Arts School, were carefully assessed by the City Council and Historic England as part of application 15/0779/LBC and were approved in 2015.</li> </ul>		

<b>Chapter 2 – Planning Context</b>			
Respondents	Support (incl. qualified)	Object	Comment
2	0	1	1
(Object)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Loses important connection with the Cavendish Lab history. It is important to preserve the Lab, designed by James Clerk Maxwell.</li> <li>The proposal ignores the historical significance of the Cavendish lab.</li> <li>Need to preserve history as an inspiration and challenge for future generations.</li> </ul>		
(Comment)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>When making reference to the fact that English Heritage has engaged with the preparation of the Masterplan, it would be helpful to note in brackets that English Heritage is now known as Historic England (so as to avoid confusion with the English Heritage Trust).</li> </ul>		
Draft response and consequential changes to SPD	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Careful consideration and attention has been given towards the restoration of the site's built heritage. Works to the Cavendish Laboratory as part of the Student Services Centre project, which also impacted the Arts School, were carefully assessed by the City Council and Historic England as part of application 15/0779/LBC and were approved in 2015.</li> <li>Delete all references to "English Heritage" and replace with "Historic England".</li> </ul>		

<b>Chapter 3 – Vision and Objectives</b>			
Vision			
Respondents	Support (incl. qualified)	Object	Comment
1	0	0	1
(Comment)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Specific detail needed for different retained buildings;</li> <li>• Only the Goldsmith Laboratory should be demolished;</li> <li>• Careful consideration needed for entrances through Arts School and Pembroke Street; and</li> <li>• Holistic approach needed to house the entire Science Library Collection in a purpose built building and, or relocated to West Cambridge.</li> </ul>		
Draft response and consequential changes to SPD	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Careful consideration and attention has been given towards the restoration of the site's built heritage. Only the Mond annexe is scheduled for demolition, as agreed via application 15/0777/FUL &amp; 15/0779/LBC (the second application which consented to the new entrance through the Arts School);</li> <li>• Plans to house the entire Science Library Collection altogether are under consideration.</li> </ul>		
Objectives			
Respondents	Support (incl. qualified)	Object	Comment
7	1	4	2
(Support)	<p>Objective 3:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Retention of Arts School supported although more detail needed including the new entrance from Bene'ts Yard and how it will relate to the renovated wing of the Arts School.</li> </ul>		
(Object)	<p>Objective 1:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The entire Science Library Collection should be housed in a purpose built building; and</li> <li>• Buildings of significant historical and scientific importance should not be altered thereby retaining their historical connections</li> </ul> <p>Objective 4</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is an internationally recognised context to Cambridge. That context is largely provided by the buildings. Without the buildings and connection to the past, there is no particular reason for the current and future university to be there at all. There are other rivers, other opportunities to create a 'new town' for the university if that is what is sought.</li> </ul>		
(Comment)	<p>Objective 3:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Add a final sentence to read along the lines "Some of the core buildings are of significance and those of greatest significance will be retained". This will acknowledge that the Mond building is listed and will be kept but allow the Mond Annex (a Building of Local Interest) to be removed.</li> </ul>		
Draft response and consequential changes to SPD	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Plans to house the entire Science Library Collection altogether are under consideration.</li> <li>• Careful consideration and attention has been given towards the restoration of the site's built heritage. Detailed consultation is undertaken with the Council, Historic England and others before</li> </ul>		

	<p>any proposals are put forward which could impact on assets of heritage significance, either via their use or design.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Works to the Cavendish Laboratory as part of the Student Services Centre project, which also impacted the Arts School, were carefully assessed by the City Council and Historic England as part of application 15/0779/LBC and were approved in 2015. Only the Mond annexe is scheduled for demolition.</li> <li>• Agree to amend Objective 3 by adding an additional sentence at the end of this paragraph to read: “Some core buildings are of significance and those of greatest significance will be retained”.</li> </ul>
--	---

**Chapter 4 – The Existing Site**

Respondents	Support (incl. qualified)	Object	Comment
10	0	6	4
(Object)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The development of the Cavendish Laboratory, or rather their partial demolition, would destroy the space in which much important science was carried out</li> <li>• The Cavendish Building is of international significance and its Grade II listing understates its intrinsic importance. That it was the first of its kind and that it was largely designed by James Clerk Maxwell put it into a category deserving of far greater respect than the scant regard paid to it by this scheme.</li> <li>• The Cavendish should be maintained in its entirety. This is a significant part of Cambridge's contribution to the history of Science. Piecemeal tinkering is not acceptable.</li> <li>• The need to demolish the Examination Hall should not be hurried. The Examination Building is connected with the Arts School building and the separation of them by means of demolition would be a serious operation which should be very carefully planned beforehand.</li> <li>• In this plan only part of the original Cavendish Laboratory is designated as being of Very High heritage significance, and no grounds are given for distinguishing the front of the building from the side wing, which held many significant teaching and research laboratories but is here designated as being only of High significance.</li> <li>• The proposal to create a new entry to the site through the side wing does not reflect the considerable value of retaining the integrity of the original laboratory building. The purpose built combination of teaching and research spaces was novel, and central to the success of the laboratory.</li> <li>• The Mond building should be reassigned to high importance.</li> </ul>		
(Comment)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For the sake of clarity (and to avoid confusion with the current Botanic Gardens) it is suggested that the final part of the sentence reads 'a good deal of the former Botanic Garden remained undeveloped.'</li> <li>• Suggest adding 'and Augustinian Friary' after King's Ditch at the end of paragraph 4.3.13.</li> <li>• Paragraph 4.6.1 states that access to the site is currently very poor. However, I question this and would suggest that what is very poor is the permeability of the site. If you compare plan 10, which</li> </ul>		

	<p>illustrates the current access points, with map 13, which shows the proposed access points, there is no change. Suggest that the opening sentence of paragraph 4.6.1 reads: 'Access into the site is currently poor and permeability through the site is very poor, as highlight by Plan 10.'</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Mond and Cavendish buildings are both of too great a historical significance to be partly destroyed.</li> </ul>
Draft response and consequential changes to SPD	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Careful consideration and attention has been given to the restoration of the site's built heritage. Works to the Cavendish Laboratory as part of the Student Services Centre project, which also impacted the Arts School, were carefully assessed by the City Council and Historic England as part of application 15/0779/LBC and were approved in 2015.</li> <li>• Only the Mond annexe (a Building of Local Interest) is scheduled for demolition as agreed under application 15/0997/LBC. The removal of which will enhance the setting of both the Mond Building and the Cavendish Laboratory.</li> <li>• The demolition of the Examination Hall has been approved via approval of application 15/0777/FUL.</li> <li>• The significance of the Cavendish Laboratory has been carefully considered together with Historic England and the City Council and is considered appropriate.</li> <li>• Agree to amend paragraph 4.2.6 to add the word "former" after the words "...of the..." in the final sentence.</li> <li>• Agree to amend paragraph 4.3.13 to add the words "and Augustinian Friary" after the words "King's Ditch".</li> <li>• For many users, especially cyclists and pedestrians, access is very poor and often the subject of conflict with vehicles, construction traffic, etc. Permeability is very poor too, however this is fully recognised and the parameters for change address this in a significant fashion. No change proposed to Paragraph 4.6.1.</li> </ul>

<b>Chapter 5 – Parameters for Change</b>			
5.1 – Connectivity and Movement			
Respondents	Support (incl. qualified)	Object	Comment
5	0	4	1
(Object)	<p>a. The Urban Block</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agree congestion in the area is undesirable however the solution is not to open retail outlets in along Pembroke Street will diminish the non-commercial, academic character.</li> </ul> <p>b. Urban Connectivity</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Conditional support for enhanced connectivity if there are no future impacts or restrictions for the car parks / Grand Arcade and that access is not restricted as a result of the changes</li> <li>• Oppose restriction on car parking that may impact upon operational requirements;</li> <li>• Consultation requested to discuss public realm improvements and highway alterations in light of the site's proximity with the Grand Arcade and existing of car parks.</li> </ul>		
(Comment)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support pedestrians having priority, cyclists should also be given priority. Need to reduce vehicular traffic.</li> </ul>		

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Implications for signage and advertising need to be considered when testing the appropriateness of introducing small specialist retail outlets into Pembroke Street frontage.</li> </ul>
Draft response and consequential changes to SPD	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The introduction of some specialist retail units at ground level along Pembroke Street is only an option as noted in paragraph 5.1.12. In any event permission for change of use would likely be necessary and would enable detailed assessment of whether such uses were appropriate.</li> <li>• Early consultation with neighbouring and, or potentially concerned site users, to be consulted prior to formal planning application submission to overcome cited concerns.</li> <li>• Works to the east side of the site on Corn Exchange Street are nearing completion, however early consultation with neighbouring and, or potentially concerned site users, to be consulted prior to any future formal planning application submission to overcome cited concerns.</li> <li>• Section 5.1 of the SPD sets out strategies to address issues of access and traffic management. Equally section 5.2 sets out improvements to the public realm to create significant new areas of open space will be achieved.</li> <li>• The implication for signage and advertising for small retail outlets would be given due consideration at the planning application stage.</li> </ul>

## Chapter 5 – Parameters for Change

### 5.1 – Connectivity and Movement c. Site permeability

Respondents	Support (incl. qualified)	Object	Comment
18	1	16	1
(Support)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• So long as "existing window openings [are] sensitively adapted and possibly enlarged" this is an appropriate compromise between past and present.</li> </ul>		
(Object)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Cavendish Laboratory - one of the most scientifically significant buildings in the world - should be preserved as a monument to its achievements and systems of scientific learning;</li> <li>• Heritage value of the Cavendish Laboratory wing in understated;</li> <li>• The iconic laboratory should become a museum;</li> <li>• Proposed development will impact the front façade and the original design and layout of what was the first purpose built academic laboratories in the world. The new entrance will destroy the internal arrangement of the building, e.g. Rutherford's personal laboratory;</li> <li>• "Plain" exterior should celebrate the Laboratory's history while the other side is one of the most iconic scientific building in the world;</li> <li>• Proposals to destroy its core fabric are contradictory to the proposed Policies 60 and 61 in the emerging Cambridge Local Plan 2014 document;</li> <li>• More sympathetic development of the Cavendish that those submitted should be possible and investigated. See University of Coimbra for very good examples of sympathetic restoration and re-purposing of historic laboratories;</li> <li>• More clarity needed regarding the future treatment of the nearby buildings.</li> <li>• Alternatives should be considered rather than new entrances on</li> </ul>		

	Pembroke Street and Free School Lane.
(Comment)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Do not support new entrances on Pembroke Street and Free School Lane. The current entrances are adequate for pedestrians and cyclists. Both streets are part of the few visually appealing streets left in the city centre. The proposal that new entrances would be sensitive to historical surroundings is vague and easily ignored in today's planning environment. The Bene't Street and Corn Exchange entrances could be widened and made the main public entrances. There are more pedestrians in that area anyway. The Whipple Museum main entrance could be in the new courtyard which is proposed.</li> </ul>
Draft response and consequential changes to SPD	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Careful consideration and attention has been given towards the restoration of the site's built heritage. Works to the Cavendish Laboratory as part of the Student Services Centre project, which also impacted the Arts School, were carefully assessed by the City Council and Historic England as part of application 15/0779/LBC and were approved in 2015. Only the Mond annexe is scheduled for demolition.</li> <li>Section 5.1 explains the objectives and constraints to the Pembroke Street access. It is made clear that the entrances are not adequate nor do they support the creation of a better connected, more legible environment for both public and university use. The other entrances are equally part of the wider site access arrangements that either have been, or will be, considered in detail. Careful consideration of the impact on building fabric and heritage assets will be undertaken before any works requiring planning permission are granted.</li> </ul>

5.2 – Open Space and Public Realm			
Respondents	Support (incl. qualified)	Object	Comment
9	0	3	6
(Object)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It is not clear from this description what exactly will be done to the Mond Building, but it is an important historical site, both in its own right as a pioneering laboratory and as part of the Cavendish Laboratory complex.</li> <li>The Mond annexe was designed and built to be part of a suite which includes the Mond Laboratory. As such it cannot be considered as a separate and subordinate building. Photographs in the architectural press dating from the opening of the Mond Lab give just as much prominence to the annexe as to the tower and crocodile. There is no evidence that the architect H.C. Hughes or his contemporaries thought of the annexe as anything other than *part* of the suite of Mond buildings. It must be kept for the same reasons that the Mond Lab is being preserved.</li> <li>Oppose the destruction of these historic parts of the Old Cavendish laboratory and the Mond Laboratory for the sake of 'the public realm' for the following reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Unsure that the lack of "clarity, cohesion, and spatial identity" is a bad thing, A tasteful, spacious solution to the cluttered feel of the New Museums Site can be found without demolishing the spaces where such incredible discoveries and scientific advances were</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		

	<p>made.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The conservation of these precious, culturally significant laboratories is more important to the public than the 'realm' their destruction might create.</li> </ul>
(Comment)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• When it comes to the buildings in the centre of the square area, the central area would be enhanced by more pedestrianisation and trees in the centre which would justify the demolition of the centrally placed Rolls Royce Laboratory.</li> <li>• The adequate space provided within the central area (between the Austin Building and the Attenborough Building) will not require any demolition or removal of any part of the Austin Building.</li> <li>• The retained Mond Building fits with the increased pedestrianised space although the purpose of the reduced Mond Building is not indicated.</li> <li>• To the south of the area it is envisaged demolishing the Shell Building and the Goldsmiths' Laboratory to enable 'greening of the area around a new entranceway from Pembroke Street. Again this would contribute to the increased space between the Attenborough Building and the Old Metallurgy Building which it is intended to retain.</li> <li>• The necessity of demolishing both the Shell Building and Goldsmiths Laboratory to attain such a space is not clear. If the size of the Attenborough Building annexe is only as is almost completed at the moment then adequate pedestrian space by the removal of the Goldsmiths' Laboratory only and not the Shell Building as well would be a better and more realistic plan.</li> <li>• The making of a new entrance through the Heycock Wing into the central area should be very carefully considered as this frontage onto Pembroke Street is also of listed nature and the engineering difficult. Could not the existing entrance from Pembroke Street be slightly altered to serve as the entrance?</li> <li>• Recommend that signage is added to the list of items needing a consistent treatment in the design of opens spaces.</li> </ul>
Draft response and consequential changes to SPD	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demolition of the Shell Building or the Goldsmiths' Laboratory are required to achieve public realm as anticipated in the university master plan and which the SPD supports; and</li> <li>• Comments regarding careful treatment of the Pembroke Street façade are noted and any changes to this elevation will be considered as part of any works to the 1907 building. Note these buildings are not however statutorily listed.</li> <li>• Sufficient space has been catered for space across three new squares for a variety of uses.</li> <li>• Agree to add the words "signage" in paragraph 5.3.5 after the word "materials".</li> <li>• The Mond Building will be retained, only the Mond annexe is scheduled for demolition as approved under 15/0779/LBC.</li> <li>• Careful consideration and attention has been given towards the restoration of the site's built heritage. Works to the Cavendish Laboratory as part of the Student Services Centre project, which also impacted the Arts School, were carefully assessed by the City Council and Historic England as part of application 15/0779/LBC and were approved in 2015. Only the Mond annexe is scheduled</li> </ul>

	for demolition.
--	-----------------

<b>5.3 – Built Form</b>			
Respondents	Support (incl. qualified)	Object	Comment
3	0	0	3
(Comment)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The exact nature of the new Student Services Building on the site of the Examination Hall is not completely specified although it seems to be envisaged as 3 storey and of ultramodern construction and style. Therefore the retention and care of the Arts School building should be seriously considered and planned for in detail from the beginning of work on the Examination Hall.</li> <li>When considering the impact of new buildings on the quality of external spaces through daylight and sun path modelling, both spaces within the New Museums Site and the adjacent public realm should be considered.</li> <li>Existing build creates operational difficulties for the Cambridge Corn Exchange.</li> </ul>		
Draft response and consequential changes to SPD	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Arts School building is to be retained and incorporated into the new approved proposal for the Student Services Centre approved under 15/0777/FUL.</li> <li>Paragraph 5.3.5 does note the word “site” in reference to the public realm, hence no change to the text is considered necessary.</li> <li>Concerns duly noted however it is not for this SPD to seek to address existing operational difficulties with existing conditions. Co-ordination between the City Council and the University will be necessary as part of any new development and during construction and later operations phases.</li> </ul>		

<b>5.4 – Sustainability</b>			
Respondents	Support (incl. qualified)	Object	Comment
1	0	1	0
(Object)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The conservation of historical assets is last on the list of sustainability considerations. Truly good plans would find a better balance of sustainability objectives.</li> <li>Struggle to see a substantial difference. Cambridge believes their rationale for destruction is simply even more righteous, but the end result in both cases is unnecessary and undesirable destruction.</li> </ul>		
Draft response and consequential changes to SPD	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Careful consideration and attention has been and will be given to the alteration of the site’s built heritage. Detailed consultation is undertaken with the council, Historic England and others before any proposals are put forward which could impact on assets of heritage significance, either via their use of design.</li> </ul>		

<b>5.5 – Phasing and Implementation</b>			
Respondents	Support (incl. qualified)	Object	Comment
1	0	0	1
(Comment)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Careful joined-up planning of large vehicular access will be required in dialogue with the Cambridge Corn Exchange and Cambridge Arts Theatre to ensure that both arts venues can continue to ensure access for shows.</li> </ul>		

Draft response and consequential changes to SPD	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Early consultation with neighbouring and/or potentially concerned site users would be necessary.</li> </ul>
---	--

<b>Chapter 6 – Planning Obligation</b>			
Respondents	Support (incl. qualified)	Object	Comment
1	0	0	1
(Comment)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Cambridge Corn Exchange (CCE) adjoins the New Museums Site and plays a vital function for both University and city. Suggest either a 'Planning Obligation' to ensure a contribution towards its capital development costs (in order to better serve both town and gown) or, preferably, an active partnership between the New Museums Site project team and the Cambridge Live team responsible for CCE to plan an ambitious programme of shared facilities and activities.</li> </ul>		
Draft response and consequential changes to SPD	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Such a planning obligation would require detailed consultation and agreement, which would be outside the remit of this framework, or at the very least via a shared building or public realm project between the University and the council. The planning obligations set out in this SPD are considered appropriate and proportionate to the impact of the development on its surrounding, notably the need for future improvements in and around the main entrance to the site off Downing Street.</li> </ul>		