

| | | | |
|---------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------|-----------|
| Application Number | 15/2316/FUL | Agenda Item | |
| Date Received | 17th December 2015 | Officer | Lisa Lamb |
| Target Date | 17th March 2016 | | |
| Ward | Abbey | | |
| Site | West's Garage Ltd Cambridge CB5 8HD | 217 Newmarket Road | |
| Proposal | Erection of student accommodation with 195 student rooms (following the demolition of existing buildings), together with ancillary accommodation comprising common/study rooms, laundry room, management office, plant room, bin and bicycle enclosures, landscaping and associated infrastructure including a sub-station. | | |
| Applicant | Unicity XXI Cambridge SARL | | |

| | |
|----------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| SUMMARY | <p>The development accords with the Development Plan for the following reasons:</p> <p>The scale and amended massing of the development respond appropriately to the context, including the conservation area.</p> <p>The building would not cause unacceptable impacts on daylight or sunlight to neighbouring residential properties, and the proposal would not have any other unacceptable impacts on the residential amenity of neighbours.</p> <p>The building provides an acceptable level of residential amenity for future occupiers.</p> <p>The appeal against the previous refusal 14/1154/FUL has been allowed (see Appendix 1) which establishes the principle of student accommodation at the site.</p> |
| RECOMMENDATION | APPROVAL |

1.0 SITE DESCRIPTION/AREA CONTEXT

- 1.1 The site is a roughly rectangular site of 0.36 ha at the corner of Newmarket Road and River Lane. It has been occupied since the 1950's by a motor vehicle business. Vehicle repair operations on this site have gradually diminished in favour of vehicle sales. The desire to create additional vehicle sales space lies behind the present site owners' wish to relocate
- 1.2 The site is not allocated in the Cambridge Local Plan (2006), nor in the Cambridge Development Plan 2014 Draft Submission. It lies within the area of the Eastern Gate SPD, and within the Eastern Gate Opportunity Area in the Draft Submission.
- 1.3 The site falls outside any conservation area, but the boundary of the Riverside section of City of Cambridge Conservation Area No.1 (Central) runs along the western and northern boundaries of the site. There are three rowan trees just outside the northeast boundary of the site (within land owned by the City Council) which are protected by their position within the conservation area.
- 1.4 The site falls within the controlled parking zone.

2.0 THE PROPOSAL

- 2.1 The proposal seeks full planning permission for: Erection of student accommodation with 195 student rooms (following the demolition of existing buildings), together with ancillary accommodation comprising common/study rooms, laundry room, management office, plant room, bin and bicycle enclosures, landscaping and associated infrastructure including a sub-station.
- 2.2 The proposed development is arranged in 3 'cores' with two amenity spaces (courtyards) and circulation spaces incorporated in between. The blocks are visually and physically separated along River Lane and in views from Godesdone Road. The main pedestrian access would be from Newmarket Road opposite the junction with Coldhams Lane and this main entrance is double height. The communal and office/management facilities are housed in the block fronting Newmarket Road with student accommodation above.

2.3 The main block fronting Newmarket Road would be 3 storeys with additional accommodation in the roof (3+1 storeys when viewed from Newmarket Road) with a lower ground floor element providing additional student rooms and access to the courtyard areas. The block has a flat roofed central element accentuating the main entrance and a pitched roof with dormer windows serving the upper level student rooms. To the east of the block there is a gable feature adjacent to the Corner House, Public House, which is on the opposite side of River Lane.

2.4 The other two blocks would be sited to the north of this frontage block. They would be 3 storey and 2+1 storeys respectively (12m and 9m) and would front onto River Lane.

2.5 The application as originally submitted was accompanied by the following information:

- Design and Access Statement
- Planning Statement
- Flood Risk Assessment
- Drainage Statement
- Utilities
- Landscape Statement
- External Lighting Layout
- Air Quality
- Archaeology written scheme of investigation
- Heritage Statement
- Land Contamination Assessment
- Statement of Community Involvement
- Sustainability Statement Checklist
- Noise Report
- Energy Statement
- Transport Statement
- Travel Plan
- Ventilation Strategy
- Daylight/Sunlight report
- Student Management Plan
- Verified Views
- Public Art Delivery Plan
- Tree Survey & Arboricultural Method Statement
- Letter of support/interest from ARU (appendix A to Planning Statement)

2.6 Since the original submission of the application the scheme has been amended as follows:

- The ridge on Newmarket Road is reduced by 829mm through an alteration in roof form.
- The ridged roofs onto the rear gardens of Godesdone Road and to the north towards Rowlinson Way have also been reduced in height as shown on drawings 1513_PL_203A and 1513_PL_204A respectively.
- The planters onto River Lane (five planters) have been removed and replaced with three tree pits. The updated landscape information also shows the removal of synthetic turf.

2.7 The following additional information has also been submitted:

- Technical Highways note
- Revised drainage information
- An addendum to the Design and Access statement to address the Walking and Cycling Officer comments.
- Revised waste information

3.0 SITE HISTORY

There is extensive history on this site in connection with the garage use, stretching back from 2006 to the 1960's, but the only relevant previous applications are shown below.

| Reference | Description | Outcome |
|-------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------|
| 14/1154/FUL | The erection of new student housing (202 study bedrooms) and associated communal facilities, cycle parking, and external landscaping following demolition of the existing buildings. | Refused. Appeal allowed 18.03.16 |
| 13/1780/FUL | The erection of new student housing (257 study bedrooms) and associated communal facilities, cycle parking, and | Withdrawn |

external landscaping following demolition of the existing buildings.

A copy of the Inspector's Decision letter in relation to the appeal is attached as Appendix 1.

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 3/8 3/11 3/12 3/13 4/4 4/11 4/13 4/14 7/10 8/2 8/3 8/6 8/9 8/10 10/1 |

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

| | |
|-----------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Central Government Guidance | National Planning Policy Framework March 2012 National Planning Policy Framework – Planning Practice Guidance March 2014 Circular 11/95 |
|-----------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

| | |
|----------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <p>Supplementary Planning Guidance</p> | <p>Sustainable Design and Construction (May 2007)</p> <p>Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Waste Partnership (RECAP): Waste Management Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (February 2012)</p> <p>Planning Obligation Strategy (March 2010)</p> <p>Public Art (January 2010)</p> <p>Eastern Gate Supplementary Planning Document (October 2011)</p> |
| <p>Material Considerations</p> | <p><u>Area Guidelines</u></p> <p>Cambridge City Council (2002)–Eastern Corridor Area Transport Plan</p> <p>Riverside and Stourbridge Common Conservation Area Appraisal (2012)</p> <p>Newmarket Road Suburbs and Approaches Study (October 2011)</p> |

5.4 Status of Proposed Submission – Cambridge Local Plan

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

For the application considered in this report, the following policies in the emerging Local Plan are of relevance:

22 Eastern Gate Opportunity Area

6.0 CONSULTATIONS

Cambridgeshire County Council (Highways Development Management and Growth and Economy)

First Comments dated 27 January 2016 (Transport Assessment)

- 6.1 It is important to note that the Transport Strategy for Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire should not be prejudiced by the West Garage development proposals. This document has not been referred to as part of this section and should be included.

Existing Transport Network

- 6.2 The existing pedestrian, cycle and public transport sections are agreed.

Accident Data

- 6.3 The accident data analysis provided dates from 2010 to 2014. The County Council require the accident data provided to be the most recent 60 months of data, and therefore request that a more recent analysis be undertaken.

Trip Generation and Distribution

Existing Trip Generation

- 6.4 The September 2013 survey results indicate that the site was used as a through route for pedestrians and cyclists. The County Council have calculated that 117 trips are associated with trips travelling through the Wests Garage site, which will continue to operate along River Lane and Newmarket Road after the development is built out and therefore should be treated as such and not included in the existing development trip calculation.
- 6.5 The applicant has undertaken a separate survey of the site when it was no longer operational to identify the number of trips travelling through the site not associated with the development. This indicates that the site is used as a cut through currently

now that Wests Garage is no longer in operation. As already stated above the number of trips associated with pass-through trips has already been identified by the County Council are part of the previous application submission.

Future Trip Generation

- 6.6 The use of the Tripos Survey data is acceptable on this occasion. The Transport Statement identifies that the only vehicles captured during the survey period were taxis' and therefore servicing was not captured as part of the survey. The servicing is to be undertaken via River Lane and therefore details of the number vehicles servicing the site and staff numbers including how they are expected to travel to the site, should be provided as part of the Transport Statement.

Transport Impact

- 6.7 The development is expected to have fewer motorised vehicular movements associated with it compared to the existing use, although details of staffing number have not been disclosed at this stage. However, overall person trips particularly those travelling by cycle or foot are expected to increase.

Transport Contributions

- 6.8 The development is expected to reduce motorised vehicular traffic on the highway network although pedestrian and cyclist movements are expected to increase. The County Council considers that the contributions towards local cycle and pedestrian infrastructure improvements will help to improve facilities for vulnerable road users travelling to and from the site. The County Council will comment on this further once the outstanding issues concerning accident analysis and trip generation have been addressed.

Car Parking

- 6.9 The Transport Statement identifies that occupants of the accommodation will be under the control of the appropriate student parking control policies and will not be permitted to own and run a car whilst resident in Cambridge at The University of Cambridge and Anglia Ruskin.

Cycle Parking

- 6.10 The Transport Statement identifies that the development will provide 112 secure cycle parking within a designated cycle store located within the building and accessed from River Lane. In addition there will be 57 spaces located adjacent to the main cycle store for use by visitors. The total number of cycle parking spaces is in keeping with Cambridge City Cycle Parking Standards.

Travel Plans

- 6.11 The full Travel Plan should be submitted and agreed prior to occupation. The Travel Plan should demonstrate how students will be encouraged to travel by sustainable travel and how safer routes will be promoted to students. The Travel Pack should include advised pedestrian and cycle routes to key destinations. The Travel Packs listed in the Transport Statement should also be supplied to staff to encourage them to use sustainable modes of transport to get to and from work. The contents of the Travel Packs should be submitted and agreed with the County Council prior to occupation.

Conclusions

- 6.12 Having reviewed the supporting information associated with the application there are a number of outstanding issues which need to be addressed by the applicant in order for the development impacts to be considered and assessed in full. Therefore the County Council recommend a **holding objection** at this stage.

Second comments dated 24 February 2016

- 6.13 The application continues to seek two disabled spaces to be provided on-street. This proposal must be withdrawn. Blue badge holders can park in residents' bays and pay and display bays without charge. It is not necessary to amend on-street bays unless there are exceptional circumstances requiring this.
- 6.14 There are still no details provided of where it is intended for servicing vehicles to stop: further information has been provided as to frequency of servicing, which will inform the process when the location has been identified.

- 6.15 The removal of the segregated footway on the corner of Newmarket Road/River lane is accepted.
- 6.16 The encouragement of cyclists to use the footway on the corner of Newmarket Road/Coldhams Lane is still of concern. Cyclists will be encouraged to rejoin the carriageway immediately south of a give way where drivers will be concentrating on vehicles approaching from the left. This proposal must be removed.
- 6.17 Cyclists will already have crossed to the south side of Newmarket road and can use the existing left turn and give way junction. This is a simpler arrangement than that proposed and avoids the potential conflict of cyclists joining the carriageway unexpectedly south of the existing junction without a full merge facility.
- 6.18 The Highway Authority recommends that the proposal be **REFUSED** planning permission.

Third Comments dated 4 March 2016

- 6.19 The latest additional information does not overcome the issues previously raised by the Highway Authority.

Fourth Comments dated 22 March 2016

- 6.20 The application has removed the proposal to seek two disabled spaces to be provided on-street. The applicant has provided details of anticipated levels of servicing and how this will take place.
- 6.21 I consider that, given the level of servicing, the arrangements will not cause significant detriment to the operation of the public highway. The proposal encouraging cyclists to use the footway on the corner of Newmarket Road/Coldhams Lane has been removed, overcoming the Highway Authority's previous concerns.
- 6.22 The Highway Authority is therefore satisfied that our previous concerns have been addressed and we are able to withdraw our holding objection.

- 6.23 It is important to note that the Transport Strategy for Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire should not be prejudiced by the West Garage development proposals. This document has not been referred to as part of this section and should be included. This has not been addressed in the Technical Note.

Accident Data

- 6.24 The accident data analysis provided dates from 2010 to 2015, this is considered acceptable to the County Council. The Newmarket Road/ Coldhams Lane/ River Lane junction and Elizabeth Way roundabout are accident cluster sites identified by the County Council. Both the Technical Note and Transport Statement identifies that each of the incidents can be attributed to a combination of driver error, volume of traffic and/ or poor road safety awareness.
- 6.25 The development is expected to reduce motorised vehicular traffic on the highway network although pedestrian and cyclist movements are expected to increase. The County Council considers that the contributions towards a crossing facility detailed below will help to improve facilities for vulnerable road users travelling to and from the site.
- 6.26 In addition it is advised that residents of the development be offered cycle training classes through the Travel Plan initiatives to ensure they are made of road safety.

Future Trip Generation

- 6.27 Further details concerning the servicing numbers have been provided as part of the additional information submitted. However, there are expected to be a limited number to the site although it is not clear where they will stop. A service management plan should be secured in the event planning permission is granted.

Transport Impact

- 6.28 The development is expected to have fewer motorised vehicular movements associated with it compared to the existing use, although details of staffing number were requested in our previous response this information has not been provided.

Transport Contributions

- 6.29 The development is expected to reduce motorised vehicular traffic on the highway network although pedestrian and cyclist movements are expected to increase. The County Council considers that the contributions towards local cycle and pedestrian infrastructure improvements will help to improve facilities for vulnerable road users travelling to and from the site. For those travelling from the development to the Beehive Centre and Anglia Ruskin Newmarket Road poses a barrier. Therefore the County Council require the applicant to contribute £120,000 to the County Council for the installation and maintenance of a crossing facility on Newmarket Road to be located between Abbey Walk and Cheddars Lane to facilitate movements to and from the development to the south side of Newmarket Road including the retail park and Anglia Ruskin.

Car Parking

- 6.30 It is recommended that suitable measures be included in the Travel Plan to ensure that students are prevented from owning and having a car in Cambridge whilst living at the student residents. This should be monitored through the Travel Plan. A student management plan should be secured which identifies how drop offs and pick up will work at the beginning and end of term, including where parents will park, how they will be informed of their time slot and what they should do in the event they are early or late to site.

Travel Plans

- 6.31 The full Travel Plan should be submitted and agreed prior to occupation and be updated in accordance with the comments provided in our previous response. The Travel Plan should include a commitment to provide cycle training for all students attending the site to ensure they are made aware of road safety and advice for those travelling to and from the site via cycle.

Conclusions

6.32 Should the Local Planning Authority be mindful to grant planning permission the County Council require the following to be secured through S106/ Planning condition:

- A Travel Plan, Service Management Plan and Student Management Plan should be provided prior to occupation.
- A contribution £120,000 to the County Council for the installation and maintenance of a crossing facility on Newmarket Road to be located between Abbey Walk and Cheddars Lane to facilitate movements to and from the development to the south side of Newmarket Road including the retail park and Anglia Ruskin.

Environmental Health

6.33 Raise no objection to the scheme subject to the imposition of conditions and informatives and provide the following detailed comments:

Construction/demolition pollution

6.34 Pollution from the demolition and construction phases has the potential to affect the amenity of surrounding properties if not controlled. In the interests of amenity, the standard construction/demolition/delivery noise/hours and dust conditions are recommended.

Traffic noise

6.35 Section 6.0 advises on the double glazing and mechanical ventilation systems to serve particular blocks. Whilst I agree that purge ventilation can be utilised during short periods of time via an open window (in the case of painting, burnt toast etc), a suitable alternate to opening a window for thermal comfort is required for block A due to the elevated noise levels. This has been discussed in detail within the ventilation section below.

6.36 It is required that living rooms achieve the BS8233:2014 standard of 35 dB L_{Aeq} during the day. It is required that

bedrooms achieve the standard of 35 dB L_{Aeq} during the day and 30 dB L_{Aeq} at night.

- 6.37 Where windows are required to be kept closed to achieve acceptable noise levels inside, a ventilation system is required to provide sufficient comfort ventilation to enable occupant's adequate ventilation rates without the need to open windows due to external noise. During warmer weather the ventilation system needs to be able to cope with the need for increased ventilation. This necessitates an increase control for the occupier which may result in elevated noise levels. Acoustic treatment of the extract system needs to be taken into consideration in these cases.
- 6.38 Ventilation strategy reports that have been assessed in previous planning applications to appease amenity requirements recommend 4 air changes per hour within living rooms and at least 2 within bedrooms (with windows closed) to achieve comfort ventilation during warmer weather.

Plant noise

- 6.39 Page 25 of the noise study recommends design targets for plant. Whilst I agree with the night time target rational, I do not agree with the daytime. It is required that 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 (L_{90}) during the day and night, at the **boundary of the premises** subject to this application and having regard to noise sensitive premises.
- 6.40 The exact plant specifications to be installed will be required and calculations to ensure the site boundary limits above are complied with prior to occupation of the proposed development.

The Corner House PH

- 6.41 The conclusion that music breakout from the pub does not adversely affect the development is reasonable, based on the submitted data and comparisons.

Substation noise

- 6.42 A new substation is proposed within the site. Electrical substations can produce very low frequency tonal humming which has the potential to cause noise disturbance to neighbouring properties.
- 6.43 It is recommended that the applicant carries out post installation testing of the components in order to satisfy the local planning authority that the emissions fall within required standards.

Noise conclusions

- 6.44 A noise compliance condition to ensure the recommendations concerning glazing specification are implemented as per the Red Acoustic recommendations.
- 6.45 A plant condition (and associated informative) is recommended to provide information in accordance with the above plant and substation information.
- 6.46 A ventilation condition is recommended due to concerns regarding the suggested mechanical systems to achieve the requirements of the noise, ventilation and air quality sections to ensure health and quality of life are protected.

Ventilation

- 6.47 Calford Seaden have submitted a ventilation strategy dated 13th November 2015. The stated ventilation systems may not provide adequate ventilation for amenity. Large sections of the site are subjected to elevated noise levels, as discussed above and will require a suitable alternative to opening windows to achieve comfort/summer ventilation.
- 6.48 Section 8.4.5.4 of BS8233:2014 states that windows may remain openable for rapid or purge ventilation or at the occupants choice. However, in noisy environments where closed windows are the only option to achieve internal noise levels (as stated above and within note 4 of section 7.7.2), a suitable alternative ventilation system other than opening windows needs to be available.

- 6.49 Within sites subjected to noisy traffic sources, utilising an open window will not achieve the internal noise requirements of BS8233:2014. Therefore the windows may remain closed if the user wants to protect themselves from noise. The user will then require a suitable ventilation system which replaces the need to open the window and to achieve the ventilation rate that an open window will. Previous acceptable assessments have achieved 2-4 ACH.
- 6.50 National Planning Policy Framework, Planning Practice Guidance on Noise states that factors which can influence whether noise could be a concern includes “whether adverse internal effects can be completely removed by closing windows and, in the case of new residential development, if the proposed mitigation relies on windows being kept closed most of the time. In both cases a suitable alternative means of ventilation is likely to be necessary. Further information on ventilation can be found in the Building Regulations.”
- 6.51 It is also important to be aware of noise production from any installed mechanical ventilation. Sections 4.34 – 4.36 of Approved Document F discuss this. Full details of the ventilation system to achieve the requirements detailed above will be required as part of the ventilation condition.

Artificial Light

- 6.52 Artificial light associated with the development can have adverse impact on the amenity of the area. A full lighting prediction assessment will be required to protect amenity in accordance with the ILP guidance notes for the reduction of obtrusive light GN01:2011 including vertical illuminance light intrusion. A bespoke lighting condition is recommended.

Contaminated Land

- 6.53 The desktop study identified potential contamination issues on the site; intrusive investigation will be undertaken in order to assess the extent of any contamination. All these issues can be covered by the contaminated land conditions which should be attached to this application if permission is granted.

Air Quality

6.54 Consideration should be given to the protection of health of the future residents and people working on the busy and frequently congested Newmarket Road. To a certain extent, the design of the building has considered this – there are no windows on the front lower ground floor Newmarket Road façade in the habitable rooms. There are no habitable rooms on the ground floor front façade, where the administrative and utility rooms are located. I recommend consideration of protection from noise and traffic fumes for the administrative block. System 4 type mechanical ventilation is proposed for the front façade. Purge ventilation using opening windows is required for System 4. Providing that the mechanical ventilation system proposed is adequate for the requirements of the building, occasional purge ventilation should be acceptable, if not ideal. Plans showing intake and extract details have not been provided; this can be covered by planning conditions.

House in Multiple Occupation (HMO) Management

6.55 The Student Management Plan should more particularly but not exclusively include the following information:

- Management arrangements for on-site security and CCTV provision.
- Arrangements for daytime on-site management.
- Arrangements for out of office hours and weekend management.
- Details of the procedure of dealing with complaints of noise nuisance.

Walking and Cycling Officer

First comment dated 08 February 2016

Access

6.56 The applicant has tried to provide a by-pass to the signals for cyclists but this is to the detriment of pedestrians with a narrow footway and inconvenient crossing point over River Lane. It

also requires cyclists to exit onto the carriageway right on the corner where a conflict may occur with traffic turning left. A solution would be to provide an approach cycle lane of 1.5m (which could be advisory) on the carriageway to an advanced stop lane so that cyclists can by-pass queuing traffic. The traffic lanes could be reduced in width or the existing kerb line brought back to provide the space for the approach lane.

Cycle Parking

6.57 This appears generally acceptable although some clarification is needed:

- Entrance to the cycle stores – it is not clear whether there is a door or it has open access – given this is a secure site the latter would be preferable
- The area marked for bin collection would appear to block the main entrance to the cycle parking area, this would not be acceptable if this is the case

6.58 Some on-street visitor parking is needed. This could be located either under the canopy near the main entrance – the gate could be set back to allow for this, or at an angle outside the common room. 2 or 3 racks should also be provided at the other end of the development at the corner with Rowlinson Way for short term/ visitor use.

Amended comment dated 09 February 2016

Access

6.59 The applicant has ignored the fact that there is a large retail centre across the road from this site, including a supermarket, which will be very attractive to students living at this site. The problem is that there is no pedestrian phase at the junction to allow them to cross safely. The applicant suggests that students can use the crossing which is situated 100m away but this is unlikely to be attractive and most will try to cross at the junction. I am concerned that this development will encourage pedestrians and cyclists to try and cross from this site to Coldham's Lane and that this not safe.

6.60 The applicant has tried to provide a by-pass to the signals for cyclists but this is to the detriment of pedestrians with a narrow footway and inconvenient crossing point over River Lane. It

also requires cyclists to exit onto the carriageway right on the corner where a conflict may occur with traffic turning left. A solution would be to provide an approach cycle lane of 1.5m (which could be advisory) on the carriageway to an advanced stop lane so that cyclists can by-pass queuing traffic. The traffic lanes could be reduced in width or the existing kerb line brought back to provide the space for the approach lane.

Cycle Parking

- 6.61 This appears generally acceptable although some clarification is needed:
- o Entrance to the cycle stores – it is not clear whether there is a door or it has open access – given this is a secure site the latter would be preferable
 - o The area marked for bin collection would appear to block the main entrance to the cycle parking area, this would not be acceptable if this is the case
- 6.62 Some on-street visitor parking is needed. This could be located either under the canopy near the main entrance – the gate could be set back to allow for this, or at an angle outside the common room. 2 or 3 racks should also be provided at the other end of the development at the corner with Rowlinson Way for short term/ visitor use.

Refuse and Recycling

First comment 07 March 2016

- 6.63 Food waste is the heaviest of all separated material streams and as such cannot be collected in containers larger than 240lt with 140lt being preferred. Ensuring non-contamination of this stream is also critical to guarantee scheduled collection. In shared accommodation like this examples of successful food waste separation are unknown and not recommended.
- 6.64 The access/egress to and from both bin stores to the road are difficult with corners due to low planters and possible slopes (looking at the existing site) – furthermore neither store appears to have doors and is therefore not providing secure storage of waste as is required by the Waste Regulations (England and Wales) 2012. As it stands both bin stores are liable to be subject to illicit dumping and miss-use.

- 6.65 The proposed Refuse Collection Vehicle stopping/collection point appears dangerously close to the corner with Newmarket Road and too far away from the smaller of the bin stores. 10m being the maximum drag distance for large 1,100lt bins. A plan with marked distances on would be of use.
- 6.66 Bin stores should be ventilated, well lit and secure, ideally covered from the elements. Any doors between them and the road should open fully, folding back out of the way of collectors and staying open so as not to hinder the movement of bins.
- 6.67 Any staff employed by the development should ensure they have removed contamination from recycling bins and have all bins roadside by 7am on the agreed morning of collection.

Second comments dated 11 March 2016 (following revisions)

- 6.68 No objection subject to the imposition conditions relating to waste management.

Urban Design and Conservation Team (UDC Team)

First comments dated 5 January 2016

Eastern Gate Development Framework

- 6.69 In March 2011, a Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) was adopted for the 'Eastern Gate Area'. The SPD provides clear guidance on the City Council's aspirations for the area by providing a framework that co-ordinates redevelopment. The document went through significant public consultation with local residents and stakeholders to shape the content and aspirations contained within it. With regards to the West's Site, this is identified within the framework which provides guidance on the overall heights likely to be acceptable and appropriate. The SPD also identifies significant views looking north and north-east across the Riverside Area and views looking north-west towards the Museum of Technology Chimney. The SPD makes a brief assessment on some of the key characteristics of the study area including the remnants of the Newmarket Road 'high street' and finer grained buildings that characterise the Riverside Conservation Area.

Heritage Statement

- 6.70 The Heritage Statement gives an assessment of the proposals and their impact on the Conservation Area as it abuts the site. It is agreed that the existing buildings on the site detract from the setting of the adjacent Conservation Area.
- 6.71 The reference to the site being 'transitional' between the larger scale buildings on the south side of Newmarket Road and the domestic scale of the north side is accepted. The articulation of the roofs, the scale of the blocks and the stepping down of the heights along River Lane help the scheme to work with the character of the setting of the Conservation Area and the adjacent buildings which are close to the proposed development. The stepping back of the building line, and the breaking up of the block along River Lane, when compared to the previous scheme, help the proposed development to mitigate its impact on the adjacent properties.
- 6.72 Of great importance to the success, or otherwise, of the scheme will be the pallet of materials and the workmanship in construction. These will help any scheme that may be approved to sit comfortably alongside the existing buildings and to make a positive impact on the setting of the Conservation Area.

Scale and massing

- 6.73 The SPD identifies in Figure 39: Built Form, Scale and Massing Strategy (page 45) that the Wests site could allow buildings up to 3+1 storeys (the +1 either being accommodation in the roofspace or a setback upper floor) along the frontage and stepping down from 3+1 to 2 storeys along River Lane. These heights were informed by the sensitivity of views across the Riverside Conservation Area and other recently approved and/or constructed schemes along Newmarket Road.
- 6.74 The buildings on River Lane are angled to reduce the impact on properties opposite. The proposals range from 2-3 storeys with accommodation set within a pitched roof on the Newmarket Road frontage and in part on the River Lane frontage. The overall approach to the scale and massing creates an articulated roofscape and breaks the scheme into a series of blocks that respond to the changing characters of Newmarket Road, River Lane and Rowlinson Way.

Newmarket Road

- 6.75 Drawing 1513_PL_200 shows the proposed elevation fronting on to Newmarket Road. Measured to the parapet it is 10m and to the top of the ridge 14m to the section closest to the River Lane junction. The section above the parapet is configured as a pitched roof with dormer windows consistent with the wording in the SPD of 'accommodation in the roofspace'.
- 6.76 The section of the building that does not accord with the SPD height is at the point furthest away from the Conservation Area. Given the diminishing plane of the roof the difference in height between 13m and 14m will not be significant and on balance the height is considered to be acceptable.

River Lane

- 6.77 The SPD identifies a range of heights along River Lane of 2-3+1 equating to a range in heights of 6m and 12m.
- 6.78 Drawing 1513_PL_201 shows the proposed elevations fronting River Lane. It shows how the scheme is broken into 3 distinct elements which step down in scale towards the Conservation Area.
- 6.79 The overall height of the block at the Newmarket Road end has been discussed above. It presents a gable to the River Lane and has a projecting bay to provide articulation.
- 6.80 The middle block is 12m to the ridge and 7.8m to the eaves. The height is consistent with the SPD guidance and considered to be acceptable.
- 6.81 The block adjacent to the existing terraced houses is 9m to the ridge and 5.2m to the eaves. This block has accommodation set within the roofspace. The approach taken is consistent with the SPD guidelines and acceptable in design terms.

Rowlinson Way

- 6.82 The SPD does not provide specific guidance for the Rowlinson Way frontage but it is assumed that 2 storeys is appropriate as this is at the lower end of the range and given the interface with the Conservation Area.
- 6.83 Drawing 1513_PL204 shows that the maximum ridge height for the building is 10.6m. The section closest to River Lane is

9.6m. The height difference of 1m is caused by level change on Rowlinson Way. The scale and massing is considered acceptable.

6.84 Other scale and massing relationships are considered below in our assessment of the submitted verified views.

Verified views

6.85 Verified views of the key approaches to the site, the view from Elizabeth Way Bridge, local views from surrounding streets and from back gardens of existing properties have been produced to demonstrate how the scheme will sit within the surrounding context. The images show a current situation and then the view with the development proposals. The methodology for creating the images is clearly explained in the document and we have no reason to doubt the accuracy of the images presented.

Elizabeth Way Bridge (View 10)

6.86 When considering the impact of the scheme on the Conservation Area, the view from Elizabeth Way Bridge, that affords an elevated view across the Conservation Area, has long been a key vantage point to assess the impact of schemes on Newmarket Road. The view submitted in support of the application demonstrates that the impact of the scheme from this point will be minor due to the broken form of the proposals, pitched roofs and dark roofing colour.

Newmarket Road (View 1 West and View 3a & 3b East)

6.87 The views are consistent with the scale and massing shown in the submitted elevations and demonstrate how the proposals scale down towards the Coopers Furniture shop.

Coldham's Lane (View 2)

6.88 This shows how proposed development will fit in with the changing character of the Coldham's Lane and Newmarket Road junction.

River Lane (View 7a)

6.89 This view shows how the massing of the building creates a more varied and articulated form, when compared to the refused scheme (14/1154/FUL).

Godesdone Road (View 4 and View 5)

- 6.90 These views and the consideration of the impact of the scheme on the amenity of residents has been a key concern throughout progression of the various applications for development on the site.
- 6.91 The existing views show the large scale 'sheds' on the garage site which present blank gables to the gardens safeguarding privacy of residents. The pitched roof forms create a degree of articulation and variation.
- 6.92 The proposed view demonstrates how the overall form of the buildings on the site creates articulation and variation although does demonstrate that the view will undeniably change. Projecting privacy screens are proposed (Drawing 1513_PL_202) on windows closest to the Godesdone Road properties will ensure that privacy between developments is not compromised. The detailed design of the scheme and the accompanying daylighting assessment demonstrate that neighbour amenity will not be compromised as a result of the redevelopment.

Beche Road (View 6)

- 6.93 The existing view shows how the roof of the largest shed is visible along with a section of the Premier Inn beyond. The proposed view demonstrates that development on the site will be more visible from this viewpoint but the scale and detailing is not considered to be harmful to the character of the conservation area.

Rowlinson Way (9a)

- 6.94 This area is in use a garage block and parking area and therefore of low significance to the conservation area. The proposals are more visually prominent than the existing sheds but have been designed to prevent overlooking of existing properties and are well articulated.

Daylight and sunlight (overshadowing) assessment

- 6.95 Daylight has been assessed using three methods; Vertical Sky Component (VSC), No-Sky Line Contour (NSC) and Average Daylight Factor (ADF). For sunlight the Annual Probable Sunlight Hours (APSH) has been used.

6.96 The potential impact of the scheme on surrounding properties at 2-22D Godesdone Road, 231 Newmarket Road, 6-24 River Lane and 33-47 River Lane have all been assessed as well as the internal daylighting of rooms. The results for the daylight assessment show that the scheme is fully compliant with the BRE criteria.

6.97 The internal daylighting of all study bedrooms meets or exceeds the thresholds identified in the BRE guidelines. The submitted D&A Statement (page 44) shows how the scheme was adjusted to ensure that all study bedrooms received adequate daylighting. The report indicates that one of the common rooms falls marginally below the threshold but this is considered acceptable in the wider context of the development.

Sunlight (overshadowing) surroundings

6.98 This assessment demonstrates that there is 'no material change to the shading levels of any of the neighbouring gardens' (EB7 report paragraph 6.36). Consequently the scheme fully meets the assessment targets identified by the BRE.

Sunlight (overshadowing) with the proposed scheme

Northern courtyard

6.99 This space has been assessed and will receive 2 hours or more of sunlight on the 21st March and is therefore fully compliant with the BRE guidelines.

Southern courtyard

6.100 The assessment reveals that 30% of the space will receive 2 hours or more of sunlight on the 21st March. This is below the threshold identified by the BRE but the report concludes that it is acceptable. Our view is that it is unfortunate the space falls below the 2 hour threshold but the courtyard has been designed to place seating in the sunniest part and with suitable materials and plant species will be a successful space.

Elevations and Materials

6.101 The Eastern Gate SPD provides an analysis of the prevailing character of Newmarket Road in Figure 40. It highlights how the buildings along this road are characterised by an '*orderly composition and grouping of elements which creates a strong vertical rhythm*'. It also highlights the variation in rooflines and local variations in the scale of adjacent buildings.

6.102 The submitted D&A Statement (page 29) identifies how the scheme has attempted to respond to this context and character to break down the overall massing. The elevations allow a further refinement of the massing with the Newmarket Road frontage broken into 2 elements with a linking entrance section between them. The section to the west has a more set back top floor which creates variation in the roofscape. A series of 100mm recesses help to break the elevation down further and respond to the plot widths of existing development on the north side of the road.

6.103 An overall grid is created by horizontal and vertical brickwork with large windows set into it. We have suggested the introduction of a spandrel panel or fretted section to the lower part of these windows on the Newmarket Road and River Lane frontages to improve the privacy of occupiers and to ensure that the elevations are not cluttered by belongings being piled up against the windows. The applicant is proposing a film on the inside face of the glazed unit to resolve this issue (Drawing 1513_PL_111). This has the potential to work although we would need to see a sample prior to confirming its acceptability. A more robust method would be to introduce a transom that would further break down the scale of the window openings, and the provision of a solid panel. This element should be conditioned if the application is approved.

Materials

6.104 The proposed materials have been chosen to respond to materials prevalent in the local area. The use of a buff brick is acceptable although will need to be carefully selected to work with the existing buildings surrounding the site. Standing seam zinc roofing is acceptable and so are the proposed aluminium windows. A sample panel on site will be required and details will be covered by condition should the application obtain approval.

Second comments dated 18.03.16

6.105 Amendments have been received to the above application. With regards to Urban Design & Conservation issues, the amendments relate to:

1. Revisions to the roof details (lowering of ridge height)
2. Verified views and CGIs

3. Tree pit details

6.106 The overall height of the building fronting on to Newmarket Road exceeded the overall heights identified in the Eastern Gate SPD by 1m. This exceedance was considered acceptable given the diminishing plane of the roof and particularly so when viewed from street level and as demonstrated in Views 1, 2, 3a and 3b contained within the Verified Visual Assessment photomontages report produced by Robert Watson Studio.

6.107 Notwithstanding that we considered the overall height to be acceptable, the applicant and their design team have reviewed the overall height of the proposals and through redesigning the roof form have managed to reduce the eastern section by 829mm and the western section by 255mm. As such the eastern section of the proposed building is now 171mm taller than the maximum height in the SPD at 13.171m. The western section is reduced to 12.8m.

6.108 The same split roof treatment has been introduced across each of the roof forms on the scheme with a consequential reduction in overall ridge heights across the rest of the scheme.

6.109 The revised roof forms are acceptable in design terms and the reduction in the ridge heights across the scheme considered acceptable.

Verified views

6.110 The Verified Visual Assessment prepared by Robert Watson Studio has been amended to incorporate the amended roof profiles and show the reduction in the ridge height when compared to the originally submitted images.

Tree pit details

6.111 The approach to planting trees along River Lane has been amended to remove the planters. The changes reduce the number of trees from 5 to 4, but will ensure that they more likely to establish and survive long term. Landscape colleagues will provide detailed comments on the proposed specification.

Planning Policy Manager

6.112 Policy 7/10 Speculative Student Hostel Accommodation of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 should be applied to this site, which

is not allocated for any particular form of development in either the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 or the Cambridge Local Plan 2014: Proposed Submission. In order to ensure that this scheme is occupied by Anglia Ruskin University or University of Cambridge full time students (see criterion A of Policy 7/10), this matter should be dealt with as part of the legal agreement for the site. It should not be occupied by other institutions during term-time, given the ongoing growth of both Anglia Ruskin University and the University of Cambridge and their established need for student accommodation. This application can only be considered to be compliant with the Cambridge Local Plan 2006, if a legal agreement is entered into in order to secure the use of the student accommodation units by full time students of Anglia Ruskin University and/or the University of Cambridge.

6.113 It is noted that of the 195 student accommodation units proposed, 186 are study bedrooms within cluster flats of between 4 and 6 bedrooms, whilst 9 units are studio units. Whilst the council is largely supportive of the scheme in terms of the predominance of cluster flats, the council has no certainty that studio accommodation is acceptable to Anglia Ruskin University or the University of Cambridge. Studio accommodation can be more expensive and less appealing to some students as it is entirely self-contained and reduces social contact with other students, unlike less expensive cluster flats. The council would not wish to see student accommodation developed, which cannot be let due to its design and layout. It would be helpful if either or both universities could confirm in writing their interest in occupying the studio element of the development. Appendix A of the applicant's Planning Statement does not supply confirmation that Anglia Ruskin University would be willing to take on nomination rights for the studio units.

6.114 It is noted that the applicant's Planning Statement makes reference to Policy 46: Development of Student Housing in the Cambridge Local Plan 2014: Proposed Submission. This policy cannot be given considerable weight, as although the plan has been submitted to the Secretary of State for examination, Policy 46 is subject to a number of objections.

Senior Sustainability Officer (Design and Construction)

6.115 In accordance with the requirements of policy 3/1 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006, the applicant has submitted a Sustainability Statement, outlining the applications approach to achieving sustainable development through the application of the principles of sustainable design and construction. A variety of measures are proposed including:

- The hierarchical approach to reducing energy use and carbon emissions;
- The provision of travel packs for students, and I would suggest that a useful addition to these packs might be information about car clubs operating in the area for those students who might need occasional access to a car;
- The use of LED lighting;
- The use of water efficient appliances and sanitary ware to target potable water consumption of no greater than 105 litres/person/day;
- The targeting of A rated materials where possible.

All of these measures are supported.

6.116 The Sustainability Statement makes reference to the solar shading strategy including careful consideration of solar control glazing and external shading, and indeed the slight glazing setbacks on east and west elevations included in the scheme and the projecting privacy screens will provide some shading, which is welcomed. I do, however, have some concerns about overheating in the student rooms located along the Newmarket Road frontage, which due to noise concerns, quite understandably are to be ventilated using mechanical ventilation with heat recovery. In order to ensure that the MVHR does not lead to inadvertent internal heat gains in the summer, it will be important to ensure that the model selected has a summer bypass function. I would also strongly recommend that the glazing on this elevation be specified as solar control glazing, and it would be helpful if the applicant were able to confirm the g value of the glazing to be used on this elevation so that we can be confident that overheating has been designed out of the scheme as much as possible so as to avoid the use of mechanical cooling.

6.117 With regards to renewable energy provision and the schemes approach to meeting the requirements of Policy 8/16 of the

Cambridge Local Plan 2006, the applicant is proposing to use both renewable and low carbon energy technologies. A 124m² photovoltaic array is to be utilised, along with gas fired CHP to provide for the accommodations hot water demand and to provide low carbon electricity for the landlord supply. When set against baseline emissions of 403,147 Kg/CO₂/annum, this approach reduces carbon emissions by 65,687 Kg/CO₂/annum, which represents a 16% reduction in emissions. This approach, which exceeds the requirements of Policy 8/16 is supported.

6.118 While the use of CHP is supported, it will be important to ensure that it does not contribute to a reduction in air quality in this area, particularly as the site is located within the AQMA. With this in mind, it is recommended that the CHP system chosen meets one of the following emissions standards:

- Spark ignition engine: less than 150 mgNO_x/m³
- Compression ignition engine: less than 40 mgNO_x/m³
- Gas turbine: less than 50mgNO_x/m³

Head of Streets and Open Spaces (Landscape Team)

First Comments dated 11 January 2016

6.119 Trees in planters on the street are not acceptable. All street trees must be planted in bespoke pits in the ground utilising root cell treatments where required to avoid conflicts with services.

6.120 Synthetic turf is not an acceptable treatment in this context. A combination of hard paving and soft landscape is recommended. We note that the area where this is suggested is a shady, north-facing area.

Second comments dated 17 March 2016

6.121 We support the current proposals which replace trees in planters with trees in hard paving. We are comfortable with the level of underground support the trees are receiving. Please note that a note on drawing 101 – Landscape Layout still says ‘Trees in Planters.’ Please update.

6.122 The planting provided to the area formerly proposed to be artificial turf is acceptable.

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

First comments dated 08 February 2016

6.123 The applicant has tried to provide a by-pass to the signals for cyclists but this is to the detriment of pedestrians with a narrow footway and inconvenient crossing point over River Lane. It also requires cyclists to exit onto the carriageway right on the corner where a conflict may occur with traffic turning left. A solution would be to provide an approach cycle lane of 1.5m (which could be advisory) on the carriageway to an advanced stop lane so that cyclists can by-pass queuing traffic. The traffic lanes could be reduced in width or the existing kerb line brought back to provide the space for the approach lane.

Cycle Parking

6.124 This appears generally acceptable although some clarification is needed:

- o Entrance to the cycle stores – it is not clear whether there is a door or it has open access – given this is a secure site the latter would be preferable
- o The area marked for bin collection would appear to block the main entrance to the cycle parking area, this would not be acceptable if this is the case

6.125 Some on-street visitor parking is needed. This could be located either under the canopy near the main entrance – the gate could be set back to allow for this, or at an angle outside the common room. 2 or 3 racks should also be provided at the other end of the development at the corner with Rowlinson Way for short term/ visitor use.

Second comments dated 09 February 2016

Access

6.126 The applicant has ignored the fact that there is a large retail centre across the road from this site, including a supermarket, which will be very attractive to students living at this site. The problem is that there is no pedestrian phase at the junction to allow them to cross safely. The applicant suggests that students

can use the crossing which is situated 100m away but this is unlikely to be attractive and most will try to cross at the junction. I am concerned that this development will encourage pedestrians and cyclists to try and cross from this site to Coldham's Lane and that this not safe.

6.127 The applicant has tried to provide a by-pass to the signals for cyclists but this is to the detriment of pedestrians with a narrow footway and inconvenient crossing point over River Lane. It also requires cyclists to exit onto the carriageway right on the corner where a conflict may occur with traffic turning left. A solution would be to provide an approach cycle lane of 1.5m (which could be advisory) on the carriageway to an advanced stop lane so that cyclists can by-pass queuing traffic. The traffic lanes could be reduced in width or the existing kerb line brought back to provide the space for the approach lane.

Cycle Parking

6.128 This appears generally acceptable although some clarification is needed:

- o Entrance to the cycle stores – it is not clear whether there is a door or it has open access – given this is a secure site the latter would be preferable
- o The area marked for bin collection would appear to block the main entrance to the cycle parking area, this would not be acceptable if this is the case

6.129 Some on-street visitor parking is needed. This could be located either under the canopy near the main entrance – the gate could be set back to allow for this, or at an angle outside the common room. 2 or 3 racks should also be provided at the other end of the development at the corner with Rowlinson Way for short term/ visitor use.

Third Comments dated 05 April 2016

6.130 There is no pedestrian phase at the Coldham's Lane junction to allow students to cross safely. The large retail park which is accessed from Coldham's Lane will be a strong attractor to the resident students and the provision of a crossing, as requested by the Highway Authority, at a distance from the junction is unlikely to be used. I am concerned that this development will

encourage pedestrians and cyclists to try and cross from this site to Coldham's Lane and that this not safe.

6.131 The applicant has tried to provide a by-pass to the signals for cyclists but this is to the detriment of pedestrians with a narrow footway and inconvenient crossing point over River Lane. It also requires cyclists to exit onto the carriageway right on the corner where a conflict may occur with traffic turning left. A solution would be to provide an approach cycle lane of 1.5m (which could be advisory) on the carriageway to an advanced stop lane so that cyclists can by-pass queuing traffic. The traffic lanes could be reduced in width or the existing kerb line brought back to provide the space for the approach lane.

Cycle Parking

6.132 This appears acceptable.

Cambridgeshire County Council (Flood and Water Management)

First comments Dated 26 January 2016

6.133 In the absence of an acceptable surface water drainage strategy within the Flood Risk Statement (M1716 / Nov 2015) we **object** to the grant of planning permission and **recommend refusal** on this basis for the following reasons:

- The applicant has not demonstrated that the storage volume required to attenuate surface water run-off from the critical 1 in 100 chance in any year storm event, with an appropriate allowance for climate change, can be provided on site.
- The applicant has not demonstrated that sustainable drainage systems (SuDS) will be used on site to provide storage for surface water generated on site, in line with the Planning Practice Guidance to the National Planning Policy Framework and the Non-statutory Technical Standards for Sustainable Drainage Systems, which requires development to give priority to the use of SuDS
- The applicant has not demonstrated that the peak discharge rate for all events up to and including the 1 in 100 chance in any year critical storm event, including

an appropriate allowance for climate change, will not exceed that of the existing site. This may increase the flood risk on site and in surrounding areas.

Second Comments dated 12 February 2016

- 6.134 I have reviewed the materials and I agree with Simon Bunn (Drainage Engineer), the information provided is not adequate enough to overcome the objection.
- 6.135 Although the applicant has demonstrated where the attenuation tank is likely to be located, without detailing the proposed discharge rates/storage volume calculations it's unclear from our perspective as whether the proposed scheme will be able to accommodate for all rainfall events up to and including the 1 in 100 year rainfall event (+ 30% cc).
- 6.136 The applicant details that the groundwater level is too high, I would greatly appreciate it if the applicant is able to submit the evidence to demonstrate it. If, the use of infiltration SuDS is not feasible due to the high groundwater level etc we would advise the applicant to use non infiltrating SuDS (reference should be made to CIRA (C753) The SuDS Manual). We are content with the use of an attenuation tank.

Third comments dated 22 February 2016

- 6.137 We are in agreement with the Drainage Consultant (Simon Bunn) and request that the issues raised by him are addressed.
- 6.138 In addition we would strongly advise that adequate water quality treatment is provided on site e.g. by using catchpits and additional SuDS

Fourth comments dated 16 March 2016

- 6.139 The applicant has proposed to manage surface water on site by using attenuation tanks and limiting run off to 5l/s, which outfalls into the surface water sewers located on River Lane and Newmarket Road sewer.
- 6.140 The applicant has therefore met the minimum requirements of the NPPF. We recommend a condition requiring further details to be submitted.

Fifth comments dated 21 March 2016 (corrected run off rate quoted)

- 6.141 The applicant has proposed to manage surface water on site by using attenuation tanks and limiting run off to 35l/s, which outfalls into the surface water sewers located on River Lane and Newmarket Road sewer.
- 6.142 The applicant has therefore met the minimum requirements of the NPPF. We recommend a condition requiring further details to be submitted.

Head of Streets and Open Spaces (Sustainable Drainage Engineer)

First Comments dated 19 January 2016

- 6.143 The proposals are unacceptable for the following reasons:
- The proposals are to match the existing surface water drainage flow rates without an understanding of what they are. The Cambridge and Milton Surface water drainage strategy requires a minimum of 20% reduction in post development flow based on actual discharge from the site.
 - Formalising the drainage without an adequate assessment or consideration of where any attenuation will be provided could potential increase flood risk to downstream properties.

Second comments dated 19 February 2016

- 6.144 The application in my opinion as it stands will increase flood risk and does not offer any betterment. I am also discussing this issue with colleagues at Anglian Water.

Third comments dated 11 March 2016

- 6.145 No objection: The proposals are to match the existing runoff rates from the site and the City Council would ideally prefer a greater reduction in the runoff rates from the site.

6.146 The City Council would support any reduction in flows required by Anglian Water. There is no management and maintenance plan associated with the application.

Environment Agency

6.147 No Objection

Anglian Water

6.148 No response received.

Cambridge International Airport

6.149 No objection.

Cambridgeshire Constabulary (Architectural Liaison Officer)

6.150 No objections, recommendations, or further observations.

Cambridge Fire and Rescue Service

6.151 No response received

Disability Consultative Panel (Meeting of 26 January 2016) & Access Officer Comments

6.152 Room layouts. The designers are advised to look again at the internal door arrangements as the plans show a clash between the bathroom door and front door.

6.153 Access and adaptability. The Panel welcome the reasonable level of provision proposed but would still recommend the inclusion of grab rails in every shower unit.

6.154 Kitchens. These appear to be remote from the accessible rooms. Greater consideration should therefore be given to the location of communal facilities in relation to the students with access needs. The Panel were however comfortable with the accessibility of the surfaces and facilities within the kitchens.

6.155 Refuse arrangements. The Panel regarded the refuse arrangements as sensible, particularly the inclusion of a waste collection service from the accessible rooms.

6.156 Conclusion: This latest submission reflects the past comments made by the Panel and City Council officers. The improvements made as a result are welcomed.

Design and Conservation Panel (Meeting of 7 October 2015)

6.157 The conclusions of the Panel meeting(s) were as follows:

Scale and massing.

6.158 Located at the prominent junction with Coldham's Lane on one of the important arteries into the city; the Panel were pleased to see a fundamental reassessment of this proposal. In terms of scale and massing, the scheme was presented as a transition between the neighbouring domestic scale Victorian buildings and the taller hotels opposite. Newmarket Road is currently undergoing considerable change and the role of this development in that sequence was not explored. The coherence of the elevation to Newmarket Road was seen as critical. More key views down Newmarket Road illustrating how the scheme relates to these larger scale buildings would have been helpful.

Entrance from Newmarket Road.

6.159 The Panel felt the architectural expression of the entrance needs further design development as it fails to unite the two halves of the building and provide a readable opening. Further consideration should be given to framing and signaling the entrance. At ground level, entrance doors might be needed to control the ingress of air pollution from Newmarket Road.

Alignment of entrance with Coldham's Lane.

6.160 Views across this junction are one of the critical viewing points of the new development. The Panel were informed that the internal layouts prohibited exact alignment with Coldham's Lane. This was regarded as unfortunate, but perhaps not absolutely critical to the success of the scheme.

6.161 *River Lane frontage.*

Defining the River Lane frontage is important as the existing development along the street is quite fragmented. It was felt

that a scheme that followed the street line would be more successful, even if set back to allow a zone for planting. Whether this frontage would receive sufficient sunlight for a planted amenity space to flourish needs to be further explored.

Bin store.

- 6.162 The location of refuse stores right on the entrance from River Lane seemed to be unfortunate in such a public area.

Public art.

- 6.163 The Panel would encourage the proposal for an imaginative commission for public art at the corner 'gateway' to River Lane, possibly incorporating some subtle lighting.

Courtyards.

- 6.164 The permeability and double courtyard arrangement was welcomed by the Panel. It was pointed out that these spaces would still be largely in shadow however, making conditions difficult for grass to grow well. Such an environment would need a robust landscaping approach and should try to mitigate the limited light levels.

Verified views.

- 6.165 The Panel understands that residents on Godesdone Road in particular had expressed concerns in terms of massing and the scheme had been pushed back in response to this. The provision of views from these western residential buildings (both existing and proposed) was regarded as crucial in understanding what these residents would experience. Looking eastwards, the impact on the River Lane dwellings needs to be informed by shadow studies while the extent of potential overlooking for Rowlinson Way residents also needs to be fully understood.

Trees along Newmarket Road frontage.

- 6.166 Concern was expressed as to the success of any trees along this narrow 3m wide pavement. As there are no expectations to transform this busy artery into a formal boulevard, the designers are advised against creating hostages to fortune.

Room layouts.

- 6.167 The newly developed room layouts were generally welcomed by Panel. There were some detailed questions; over the ventilation particularly to Ground floor rooms, the fenestration to the north facing rooms especially along Rowlinson Way and

whether the head heights in the dormer rooms would enable them to work as reasonable habitable spaces.

Cluster arrangements and corridors.

6.168 The Panel questioned the linear cluster arrangement of rooms along paired non-day lit corridors. This is unusually restrictive for student accommodation in Cambridge; layouts of rooms clustered around the common room are felt to offer a more sociable grouping of rooms. There was also concern that the long narrow corridors could not be navigated easily by disabled residents.

Future adaptability.

6.169 With the market for student accommodation in Cambridge likely to eventually reach saturation point, the designers are advised to consider whether these plans, particularly with the long corridors, would be sufficiently robust to accommodate a change of use to flats in the future.

Conclusion.

6.170 This scheme has improved significantly from its previous iterations. The three-block arrangement with improved permeability and level changes are all welcomed, as are the gable ends facing Godesdone Road. The Panel felt that the process of design development needs to be continued to ensure that this is a really strong scheme for this important site.

6.171 The Panel note the drop in storey height on the western block in recognition of the smaller scale Cooper Furniture buildings. Although this and other changes were made following strong feedback from residents, the architects are reminded of the importance of the elevation to Newmarket Road and how future change may bring with it different demands.

6.172 The inclusion of the 3D 'walk through' graphics presentation was appreciated.

VERDICT – AMBER (6), GREEN (2)

6.173 I have consulted the following Service Managers regarding potential mitigation measures to address demands for Informal Open Space and Indoor/Outdoor Sports Facilities:

6.174 Development Manager (Streets and Open Spaces)

6.175 Recreation Services Manager

6.176 Their comments are summarised in the section on Planning Obligations (s106 Agreement) below.

6.177 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:

52 Abbey Road

86 Beche Road

10 Godesdone Road

11 Godesdone Road (2 Letters)

12 Godesdone Road

14 Godesdone Road

18 Godesdone Road

20 Godesdone Road (2 letters)

45 River Lane (2 letters)

30 Riverside (2 letters)

7.2 Representations have also been received from:

CHS Group 6 – 24 River Lane, the housing association responsible for houses in River Lane, Rowlinson Way and Stevenson Court.

Riverside Area Residents' Association (4 letters)

7.3 The representations can be summarised as follows:

Principle

- The scheme is not significantly different to the previously refused scheme. There is only a reduction of 7 students.
- Intensity of use
- The previous reasons for refusal have not been addressed.
- The scheme does nothing to address the fundamental housing supply issue close to the city
- Introduces transient population

Context and design

- Scheme does not respond to Conservation Area
- Scheme violates SPD height and form guidelines
- 60% of the frontage will 'read' as four storeys.
- Scale of building, height and massing
- Dominant structure
- Transition to a lower height at the western end is inadequate
- No attempt has been made to satisfy the SPD aspiration to green Newmarket Road
- Tree planting shown on River Lane cannot be achieved
- Block B is higher than the refused scheme when viewed from Godesdone Road properties
- Overdevelopment of the site.
- The Design and Conservation Panel recorded only two 'green' verdicts all of the remaining were amber (in need of significant improvements to make it acceptable)
- The development is pushed to the boundary of the site on all sides
- Materials are inappropriate - masonry and glass

Neighbour amenity

- The rear block is even more visually dominant for Godesdone Road houses.
- Overlooking to surrounding houses
- The Rowlinson Way wing will dominate and overbear properties on Godesdone Road.
- Overbearing to properties on River Lane
- Loss of light to properties in River Lane
- Security concerns relating to boundary wall to rear of Block B
- Overspill of students into the surrounding residential streets
- Antisocial behaviour
- Management plan only addresses issues within the site and does not seek to control behaviour outside of the site.

Amenity for future occupiers

- Sunken courtyards will lack sunlight and will be dominated by tall buildings.
- Study rooms in general are small and overlooked. The ones in the roof of block C will have poor amenity – sloping ceilings, lack of light and lack of floor space.
- Lack of outdoor amenity space
- The common room does not provide enough space for 195 students, it is north facing, adjacent to Newmarket Road and fully glazed

- Lack of toilet facilities near the common room and management office

Highway issues

- Cycle entrance/exit point is dangerously located.
- There will be cyclist/pedestrian conflicts
- Travel plans must reflect likely behaviour and is unacceptable
- No realistic attempt has been made to block taxi visits to the site.
- Drop off/pick up arrangements will cause problems at the start/end of each term.
- Increase in trip generation will be harmful to amenity
- The visibility onto Newmarket road from River Lane should be improved
- There should be an additional pedestrian/cycle crossing point of Newmarket Road

Car parking

- No credible response to ensure that occupants do not keep cars
- No parking provided for disabled students
- No provision is made for servicing and deliveries
- The three parking spaces on River Lane close to the junction with Newmarket Road is dangerous

Other issues

- Images are misleading
- Proposals do not accord with planning policies or the NPPF
 - This is a wholly new application which should be considered anew without preconception.
- The building heights set out in the SPD are mandatory and maximum.
- Description of the existing buildings on site is misleading and is not of bulky warehouses. The comparison of the existing buildings on site is not justified as there is no similarity whatsoever
- The applicants should not be allowed to 'buy' their way out of providing outdoor space via a S106 agreement.
- The planning statement refers to buildings on the opposite side of Newmarket Road that have now been removed and replaced with the Travelodge.
- Bin collection
- Long term maintenance/survival of proposed trees
- Concern about site management
- Lack of reception facility out of hours and at weekends

- No council tax will be paid by residents
- There will be no wider benefit to the local economy
- Newmarket Road will become a 'wind tunnel'
- The refused scheme is at appeal and this application should not be determined until the outcome of this is known.

7.4 The additional representations received following revisions to the scheme can be summarised as follows:

- The amendments do not provide sufficient information for the proposals to be assessed by either the public or officers.
- A full three weeks should be given for re-consultation
- The images are produced using a wide angle lens and are misleading
- The developer should be asked to provide further views and the re-consultation should start from when these are provided so that residents are not handicapped.

7.5 Following the appeal decision in respect of 14/1154/FUL (appeal allowed) the Riverside Area Residents Association have confirmed their previous objections to the scheme is now withdrawn.

7.6 Councillor Johnson made the following comments:

- I note that several amendments to application 15/2316/FUL have been submitted by the developer.
- I am concerned that residents will not have had enough time to properly formulate a considered and appropriate response to the amendments, which are significant in nature and in scope. In addition, the developer have not provided a number of important images - images which will help highlight any impact on residential amenity, etc, of the amended application.
- I would be grateful if the following requests can be actioned:
 - An extension for making representations on the amendments from 14 to 21 days
 - A formal appeal to the developer to provide the missing images previously requested by residents

- In both cases the 'clock' for responses to be submitted really should be 21 days from the date uploaded onto the planning portal.
- Request that the application is determined at committee rather than at delegated level.

7.7 Councillor Ashton agreed with and seconded the comments made by Councillor Johnson as outlined above.

7.8 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 (and impact on heritage assets)
3. Public Art
4. Renewable energy and sustainability
5. Disabled access
6. Residential amenity
7. Refuse arrangements
8. Highway safety
9. Car and cycle parking
10. Other Environmental Impacts
11. Third party representations
12. Planning Obligations (s106 Agreement)

Principle of Development

8.2 The appeal decision for the previously refused scheme at the site (14/1154) was issued on 18 March 2016 and the inspector allowed the appeal. Where appropriate I have referred to the appeal decision letter in my assessment. The key issues that the Inspector identified in his consideration of the appeal (paragraph 4) were:

- The effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the Conservation Area including the setting of the adjacent City of Cambridge Conservation Area.
- Whether the future occupiers would be likely to experience acceptable living condition, particularly in respect of the proposed communal space;
- Whether it has been demonstrated that there is a need for student accommodation in this location having regard to the principles of sustainable development and;
- Whether the proposal makes adequate provision for infrastructure comprising open space and sport facilities, waste facilities and public art.

8.3 This is not an allocated site. The principle of development for student accommodation would be in accordance with development plan policy provided that clauses in a Section 106 agreement were in place to restrict occupancy to full-time students of the city's two universities and to prevent such occupiers from keeping cars in the city. The applicants are prepared to enter into such an agreement, although it has not yet been completed. The appeal decision supports the principle of student accommodation on the site.

8.4 In my opinion, subject to an appropriate legal agreement to restrict occupancy, the principle of the development is acceptable and in accordance with policy 7/10 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006.

Context of site, design and external spaces (and impact on heritage assets)

Response to context

Scale and massing

8.5 The proposed buildings would be split onto 3 'cores' or 'blocks' the highest of which would front onto Newmarket Road. The blocks are arranged running from west/east and are set to the north of the main block fronting onto Newmarket Road in a parallel alignment.

8.6 The main block fronting Newmarket Road increases in height from west to east. At the far western end immediately adjacent to the existing commercial units it would be two storey. This then

rises to 2+1 storey moving towards the main entrance of the building and beyond the central access it would be 3+1 storey.

- 8.7 The latest re-design of the roof form of the Newmarket Road block has reduced the eastern section by 0.829m and the western section by 0.255m. As such the eastern section of the proposed building is now 0.171m taller than the maximum height in the SPD at 13.171m. The western section is reduced to 12.8m. The same split roof treatment has been introduced across each of the roof forms on the scheme with a consequential reduction in overall ridge heights across the rest of the scheme.
- 8.8 I have assessed the scale and massing of the proposal against the existing built form which surrounds the site and against the guidance given in the Eastern Gate SPD. I have also considered the advice given by the Urban Design and Conservation team. I also note the concerns very strongly expressed in representations that the storey heights of the proposal do not correspond to the guidance in the SPD and that the proposal does not adhere to the maximum storey heights set out in Figure 39 of the SPD.
- 8.9 It is accepted that the maximum heights have been marginally exceeded by the Newmarket Road block. However, the SPD makes it clear in Section 3.4 that the heights are recommendations, that the creation of varied heights is important, and that proposals seeking to exceed the recommended storey heights must be tested in a robust way. In my view, the verified images submitted provide this robust testing, and when coupled with the very small scale of the exceedance I am of the view that the Newmarket Road block does produce a form of development in line with the spirit of the aspirations of the SPD in relation to building heights. The SPD very clearly recommend an increase from the present heights in any future development. The appeal Inspector also noted at paragraph 12 of the decision that verified images were sufficient to 'robustly test' an exceedance in the heights in the SPD.
- 8.10 The remaining two blocks to the north of the Newmarket Road block would front onto River Lane and would be 3 storey and 2+1 storeys respectively (12m and 9m). These two blocks would also be prominent in views from properties on Godesdone Road and Rowlinson Way.

8.11 The existing commercial buildings to the north of the site are single-storey, but they have high gabled roofs, and in my view, notwithstanding neighbour representations, the heights proposed for two blocks to the north of the Newmarket Road block fronting onto River Lane would be appropriate in terms of scale. The pitched roofs are in my view an appropriate allusion to the forms of the commercial roofs currently in place, and relate well to the character of the conservation area. Paragraph 3.4.14 of the Eastern Gate SPD states: '[policy]... is intended to avoid long unvaried rooflines of large new buildings forming dominant and intrusive horizontal bands on the skyline, which would detract from the roofscape of the conservation area and the skyline of the city...]. It is my view that the two rear blocks are well-articulated, and their form would not have a harmful impact on the character of the conservation area in line with the above paragraph from the SPD. The importance of achieving varied roof heights is also noted by the appeal Inspector and is set out at paragraph 8 of the appeal decision.

8.12 The verified images submitted comply with the requirements of Paragraph 3.4.9 of the Eastern Gate SPD, and confirm my view that the design is compliant with that guidance and acceptable. I am satisfied that the proposal would not have a harmful impact on the conservation area, and is appropriate in its context on the north side of Newmarket Road. I concur with the advice of the UDC team that the scale and massing is acceptable in design terms.

Architectural detail and Materials

8.13 There are a number of elements which break up that mass of the blocks and emphasize verticality. On the Newmarket Road block the main entrance is articulated by a full height void with brise solei detailing to the stairwell. The windows have a vertical emphasis and there is recessed brickwork to create the visual appearance of 'bays' within the overall frontage. The corner detailing to the eastern end of the block also relates well to the Corner House PH and in my view successfully turns the corner onto River Lane. The two rear block have pitched roofs and again, vertically proportioned window emphasis with timber privacy screens and projecting brick edge detailing to the window openings.

- 8.14 It is my view these features would diminish the perceived mass of the building and create a more comfortable relationship with the conservation area to the north and west.
- 8.15 The proposed materials have been chosen to respond to materials prevalent in the local area. The building would be clad in buff brick with pale mortar, standing seam zinc roofing is proposed with aluminium windows. In my view these materials would respond well to the local context. Appropriate quality could be secured by condition.
- 8.16 In my view, the detailing and materials of the proposal are appropriate for the context and in accordance with policies 3/4 and 3/12 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006, and the guidance in paragraphs 3.4.18 to 3.4.20 of the Eastern Gate SPD.

Landscaping

- 8.17 The application proposes two sunken courtyards separating the three blocks. A detailed landscaping proposal has been submitted which indicates that the courtyards would have formal seating and dining furniture as well as less formal seating (around retaining walls etc). Some ornamental and screening planting is proposed. The species have been selected so that they can flourish in more shady conditions that will be afforded by the Courtyards. The landscape team have confirmed that they are content with the proposals and I share this view.
- 8.18 It is also proposed to provide planting along the River Lane frontage and details of the services and tree pits have been provided for consideration. Although in the latest review of the plans the number of trees is reduced from 5 to 4, the landscape team are confident that these trees can be provided and would have good survival prospects so long as the tree pit detail is adhered to. This can be controlled by a suitably worded condition.
- 8.19 In my opinion, the landscaping proposals, both in the courtyard and the street, are acceptable. In this respect, the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 3/4, 3/7, 3/11, 4/4 and 4/11.

Design and Conservation Panel comments

8.20 The Key points raised by D&C Panel meeting of 7 October 2015 are identified in the table below. It should be noted that issues relating to the internal configuration of the building are not a planning matter.

| | D&C Panel comment | Resolution/evidence |
|-------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Scale and massing | Panel were pleased to see a fundamental reassessment of this proposal. Further views along NMR to see the relationship to the larger scale buildings would have been helpful. | We have provided our own assessment of the scale and massing in relation to guidance in the Eastern Gate SPD and based on an assessment of the verified views and submitted plans, elevations and sections. |
| Entrance from Newmarket Road | Panel felt the entrance needed further design development to provide a readable opening and unite the two parts of the building. | Revisions undertaken after the panel meeting resulted in a more recessed entrance and refined detailing to make it more legible. |
| Alignment of entrance with Coldham's Lane | Panel felt that the failure of the scheme to align the main entrance with the centre line of Coldham's Lane was unfortunate but not critical to the success of the scheme. | Page 35 of the D&A Statement indicates how a strong visual connection is created between the alignment of Coldham's Lane and the proposed entrance. |
| River Lane frontage | It was felt that a scheme that followed the street line would be more successful particularly given the fragmented character of this end of River Lane. | The previous refused scheme (14/1154/FUL) had a continuous alignment and less broken form. The impact on properties opposite in terms of daylighting was greater as a result, although considered acceptable by an independent assessment of the scheme, given the urban nature of the |

| | | |
|------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| | | location. These proposals have no impact on daylighting levels beyond what is considered acceptable by the BRE guidelines. Accordingly the more broken frontage is considered to be acceptable in design terms. |
| Bin store | The bin store location on the River Lane entrance was considered unfortunate. | This entrance is not the main route into the building and we are confident that through good design and detailing its impact has been successfully mitigated. |
| Courtyards | The likelihood of the courtyards being heavily shaded was identified by panel although was felt to be resolvable through robust landscaping. | A BRE assessment has been undertaken which demonstrates that the northern courtyard satisfies the assessment criteria. The southern courtyard does not meet the minimum levels identified by the BRE but has been designed to ensure seating is positioned in the sunniest places. Landscape colleagues have suggested amendments to the landscape scheme to resolve concerns about the landscape specification of the courtyards. |

| | | |
|------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Verified views | Views from Godesdone Road were considered to be particularly important in the assessment of the acceptability of the proposals. | Verified visual assessment montages showing existing and proposed views have been prepared to accepted industry standards. We have assessed these images along with the Daylighting and Sunlighting (Shadow) study. |
| Trees along Newmarket Road | Concern was expressed as to the success of any trees along this narrow 3m wide pavement. As there are no expectations to transform this busy artery into a formal boulevard, the designers are advised against creating hostages to fortune. | Planting along Newmarket Road was investigated but discounted. |
| Room layouts | The approach to room layouts was welcomed with detailed questions about head heights in the dormer rooms and ventilation strategies. | Page 27 of the D&A Statement shows how the study bedrooms can be configured. Ventilation louvres are proposed and well integrated into the elevations. Head heights in the attic rooms appear to be adequate given the floor to floor heights. |
| Cluster arrangements and corridors | The Panel questioned the linear cluster arrangement of rooms along paired non-day lit corridors. This is unusually restrictive for student accommodation in Cambridge; layouts of rooms clustered around the common room are felt to offer a more sociable grouping of rooms. There was also | A number of the corridors are not day lit and ideally we would like to see some natural daylighting of these circulation spaces. There will be a degree of deferred light given the positioning of common rooms at the end of these circulation spaces. Issues relating to disabled access will be covered by the Access Officer. |

| | | |
|---------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| | concern that the long narrow corridors could not be navigated easily by disabled residents | |
| Future adaptability | The designers were advised to consider whether these plans, particularly with the long corridors, would be sufficiently robust to accommodate a change of use to flats in the future. | Page 50 of the submitted D&A Statement demonstrates how the study bedrooms could be converted to create additional 'accessible rooms'. Page 52 of the submitted D&A Statement shows how the scheme could be adapted to create private residential accommodation. |

8.21 In my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 3/4, 3/7, 3/11, 3/12.

Public Art

8.22 The applicants' have agreed to the principle of providing public art on site, and the public art delivery plan submitted with the application sets out the broad principles for the provision of public art within the site. I am satisfied that the detail of the public art can be adequately controlled by the imposition of suitably worded conditions.

8.23 Subject to conditions to secure the provision of on-site public art, the proposal is in accordance with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 3/7 and 10/1 and the Public Art SPD 2010.

Renewable energy and sustainability

8.24 The application proposes the use of photovoltaics, combined heat and power and the provision of some small areas of sedum roofing. The Sustainability officer is content that the carbon savings generated by the scheme would exceed the 10% required by policy. The noise implications of air source heat pumps would need to be controlled by condition.

8.25 In my opinion the applicants have suitably addressed the issue of sustainability and renewable energy and the proposal is in

accordance with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policy 8/16 and the Sustainable Design and Construction SPD 2007.

Disabled access

- 8.26 The Council's access officer has not raised any objection to the proposals and concurs with the Disability Panel comments. Whilst I acknowledge that the Disability Panel have raised concerns relating to the clash between doors within the units, this is outside of the planning remit and is a requirement of Building Regulations. The applicants agent has responded to this and advised that power assisted doors can be provided within the accessible units and I consider that this is a reasonable solution. Overall there are not considered to be any issues relating to accessibility.
- 8.27 In my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 3/7 and 3/12.

Residential Amenity

Impact on amenity of neighbouring occupiers

Sunlight and daylight

- 8.28 The potential impact of the scheme on surrounding properties at 2-22D Godesdone Road, 231 Newmarket Road, 6-24 River Lane and 33-47 River Lane have all been assessed as well as the internal daylighting of rooms. The results for the daylight assessment show that the scheme is fully compliant with the BRE criteria.

Privacy

Godesdone Road.

- 8.29 Numbers 2 – 20 Godesdone Road back directly onto the application site, which is currently vacant and so are not currently overlooked by residential properties. Properties further along Godesdone Road to the north (numbers 22a onwards) do have some sense of existing mutual overlooking from the rear of properties on River Lane. With regard to the windows on the Newmarket Road block, the westernmost windows which could give an oblique view across the gardens

towards the rear of numbers 2 – 20 Godesdone Road are treated with angled screens so that views are directed back into the site, across the courtyard. I consider that this will protect against overlooking from these windows. The central block is sited to the far east of the site and would be a total of 50m from the rear of the properties on Godesdone Road. There is planting proposed on the western boundary to provide some visual screening, but even if it were possible to achieve a view across I am of the opinion that the distances are so great, that there would be no undue loss of privacy. There are no windows giving any outlook directly to the west (eg across the gardens to numbers 2 – 20 Godesdone Rd) on the northernmost Block. There are windows which give outlook on the north elevation and these are angled windows directing views obliquely to the north east. Oblique views could be possible to the rear properties north of 22a at a distance of approximately 26m. That said, there are the Rowlinson Way Garages in between the two sets of buildings and windows giving this outlook are only present on level 2. At level 3, there are three dormer windows that give outlook to the north. As such I consider that there would be an acceptable relationship between the proposals and the surrounding properties on Godesdone Road in terms of privacy.

Beche Road

- 8.30 Given that the rear of the Newmarket Road block would be approximately 75m from the properties on Beche Road there will be no significant overlooking impacts.

River Lane

- 8.31 The south side of the curtilage of No.33 is currently not overlooked, and the arrangement of angled windows on the northern elevation of the northern most block at level 1 would effectively eliminate such overlooking from the scheme. At level 3 the windows are reduced to 3 dormer windows. It is my view that this would also reduce overlooking to gardens further north on River Lane, and given the mutual overlooking which already exists, no significant loss of privacy would occur in this direction.
- 8.32 The northernmost and central blocks are set back from the edge of the footway on River Lane and as such the distances

between the front elevations of these blocks and the front of the houses on the eastern side of River Lane is a minimum of 18m. I consider these separation distances to be acceptable in terms of maintaining an acceptable level of amenity for the existing residents on River Lane. I am also mindful that the proposed tree planting and landscaping will to some extent shield direct views across the street and more oblique views from Rowlinson Way. The appeal Inspector drew similar conclusions in relation to the refused scheme at paragraph 24 of the appeal decision.

Visual domination

- 8.33 The present scheme has pulled the whole of the River Lane blocks back from the highway, and provides a separation distance between No.6 River Lane and the closest part of the development to approximately 19m. The current scheme has also reduced the massing of building at the west end of the Newmarket Road block. Having studied the verified views now provided, I am of the view that the buildings proposed would not cause an unacceptable degree of visual domination in either of these locations. I do not consider that the relatively modest heights at the west end of the northernmost block would lead to unacceptable visual domination of houses in Godesdone Road, which would be at a distance of approximately 18m. Issues of visual dominance do not arise elsewhere around the site. The appeal Inspector concluded at paragraph 17, that the previous scheme for an unbroken and higher block on this elevation would not visually dominate the properties opposite. Given these conclusions, and coupled with the fact that the current scheme is for blocks which allow views/light through to the west and that the blocks are lower, I am of the opinion that there are no grounds to resist the scheme in relation to visual dominance.

Noise and disturbance

- 8.34 I note neighbour concerns on this issue. However, Newmarket Road is a very busy road, there is also a substantial distance of the building from its neighbours. In addition to this, the student accommodation is not likely to lead to a large number of motor vehicle movements, the positioning of the main entrance on Newmarket Road and a relatively low proportion of the student rooms face outwards towards nearby houses. On this basis, I do not consider that the impacts of noise, movement and light from the building on neighbouring occupiers would be

unacceptable. I am also mindful of the fact that the premises could revert to vehicle repair activity, which generates considerable noise, without requiring planning permission. I am of the view that the particular issues associated with pick-up and drop-off at the beginnings and ends of university terms could be addressed by a condition requiring a management plan. I do not consider that the impact of increased pedestrian traffic to Tesco, or additional rubbish collections would cause significant harm to neighbouring occupiers. The Inspector concluded that noise issues could be controlled via a condition (paragraph 25) and I am satisfied that this approach will also be appropriate for the current scheme.

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

Amenity for future occupiers of the site

- 8.36 I consider that the external courtyards, including planting and outdoor seating/socialising areas together with a part double-height internal common room leading into the southernmost courtyard would provide a high-quality space and give a high amenity value to future occupiers. The daylight/sunlight assessment has confirmed that the levels of daylight and sunlight available to the courtyard, and to rooms looking on to it are acceptable. There are adequate cycle storage and bin arrangements all rooms have outlook, and privacy screens and planting are in use (in relation to courtyard facing rooms) to protect overlooking into the student rooms (as well as protecting against overlooking towards the existing residential properties) and I have no other concerns in relation to the quality of the space for the future occupiers.
- 8.37 I acknowledge that the two courtyard spaces are relatively small. However, a single courtyard was proposed in the appeal scheme and the Inspector found (para 12 of the decision) that a courtyard would not be a 'poor environment' notwithstanding the height of the surrounding buildings and the size of the space. The buildings in the current scheme are lower than previously proposed and the courtyard areas are (in total) a similar size to that previously proposed. Given the conclusions of the appeal

Inspector, I do not consider that there would be any grounds to resist the proposals on the basis of amenity space or living conditions for the future occupiers.

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

Refuse Arrangements

- 8.39 I am of the view that adequate space is provided for the storage of waste and recycling on site. A management plan would be necessary to ensure satisfactory arrangements for collection and retrieval of bins, but this could be addressed by condition.
- 8.40 In my opinion, subject to such a condition, the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policy 3/12 and the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Waste Partnership (RECAP): Waste Management Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (February 2012).

Highway safety

- 8.41 The Highway Authority initially raised concerns in relation to the level of servicing required and car parking spaces for disabled users being specified. Following amendments to the scheme the highway concerns have been addressed and these objections have been removed. The Highway Authority is now of the opinion that the level of servicing, and proposed arrangements will not cause significant detriment to the operation of the public highway. The proposal encouraging cyclists to use the footway on the corner of Newmarket Road/Coldhams Lane has been removed.
- 8.42 I note the comments of the Walking and Cycling Officer in the latest comments dated 05 April 2016 and I am satisfied that the financial contribution of £120,000 as set out at paragraph 8.55 to improve crossing facilities to the south of the site, including access to the retail park will overcome these concerns. I am also content that as the works fall outside of the application site (and outside of the applicant's control), that a S106 agreement is the appropriate mechanism to address this issue.

8.43 In the light of the revised comments from the Highway Authority, I am content that there would be no detriment to highway safety and that the proposals would be compliant with Policies 8/2 and 8/10.

Car and Cycle Parking

8.44 The proposal provides no car parking space on site. Student use of cars can be precluded by a Section 106 agreement, and I do not consider that the application would increase pressure on car parking in the area, which is controlled. Pick-up and drop-off of students at term ends can also be controlled, by a management plan, secured by condition. The disabled parking originally proposed has been removed through amendments, but as the highway officer has pointed out, disabled badge holders can park in the surrounding streets in any case. I consider this arrangement to be acceptable. The cycling officer has indicated that the cycle parking proposed is adequate.

8.45 In my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 8/6 and 8/10.

Other Environmental Impacts

8.46 It is inevitable that a scheme of this size will have some impacts during the construction phase of the development. Notwithstanding the fairly noisy location of the site adjacent to Newmarket Road, I still consider that a construction hours condition is appropriate, as is a condition controlling piling and delivery hours. A traffic management plan for construction vehicles has also been conditioned and I am satisfied that with these conditions in place that the impacts on the surrounding neighbours will be adequately controlled.

Refuse Arrangements

8.47 I am of the view that adequate space is provided for the storage of waste and recycling on site. A management plan would be necessary to ensure satisfactory arrangements for collection and retrieval of bins, but this could be addressed by condition. I also note that the Waste Officer has confirmed that there are no objections to the scheme, I agree with this advice.

8.48 In my opinion, subject to such a condition, the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policy 3/12.

Archaeology

8.49 This was raised as an issue by third parties in respect of the previous scheme. The Inspector allowed the appeal (see Appendix 1) and in so doing he imposed a condition (number 16) in relation to archaeology. Given that this is a recent decision and a material consideration I consider it reasonable to impose a condition in this regard in relation to this application.

Other Matters

Third Party Representations

| Issue | Response or paragraph where addressed |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------|
| Principle | |
| The scheme is not significantly different to the previously refused scheme. There is only a reduction of 7 students. | 8.2, 8.3 |
| Intensity of use | 8.3 |
| The previous reasons for refusal have not been addressed. | 8.2 |
| The scheme does nothing to address the fundamental housing supply issue close to the city | 8.3 |
| Introduces transient population | 8.3 |
| Context and design | |
| Scheme does not respond to Conservation Area | 8.11, 8.12 |
| Scheme violates SPD height and form guidelines | 8.8, 8.9 |
| 60% of the frontage will 'read' as four storeys. | 8.5 – 8.12 |
| Scale of building, height and massing | 8.5 – 8.12 |
| Dominant structure | 8.33 |
| Transition to a lower height at the western end is inadequate | 8.7, 8.11 |

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| No attempt has been made to satisfy the SPD aspiration to green Newmarket Road | No policy basis to require this |
| Tree planting shown on River Lane cannot be achieved | Amendments to scheme to secure tree pits to ensure planting can be delivered/maintained |
| Block B is higher than the refused scheme when viewed from Godesdone Road properties | The refused scheme has been allowed at appeal. The current proposals have been assessed on their own merits although the allowed appeal for a larger scheme overall is a material consideration. |
| Overdevelopment of the site. | 8.3 |
| The Design and Conservation Panel recorded only two 'green' verdicts all of the remaining were amber (in need of significant improvements to make it acceptable) | 8.20 and subsequent table analysis. |
| The development is pushed to the boundary of the site on all sides | 8.5 – 8.12 |
| Materials are inappropriate - masonry and glass | 8.15 |
| Neighbour amenity | |
| Loss of light to properties in River Lane | 8.26 – 8.28 |
| Overlooking to surrounding houses | 8.29 – 8.32 |
| Management plan only addresses issues within the site and does not seek to control behaviour outside of the site. | A management plan will be required by a condition and will control use of the site as far as possible, but it may not be possible to control behavior away from the site. |
| Overbearing to properties on River Lane | 8.31, 8.33 |
| Antisocial behaviour | 8.34 |
| Overspill of students into the surrounding residential streets | This is not something that can be controlled via the planning remit |

| | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Security concerns relating to boundary wall to rear of Block B | I have no reason to believe that this would be an issue. |
| Amenities for future occupants | |
| Sunken courtyards will lack sunlight and will be dominated by tall buildings. | 8.36 |
| Study rooms in general are small and overlooked. The ones in the roof of block C will have poor amenity – sloping ceilings, lack of light and lack of floor space. | 8.36 |
| Lack of outdoor amenity space | 8.36 |
| The common room does not provide enough space for 195 students, it is north facing, adjacent to Newmarket Road and fully glazed | 8.36 |
| Lack of toilet facilities near the common room and management office | The internal arrangements such as these cannot be controlled via planning. |
| Car and cycle parking | |
| No credible response to ensure that occupants do not keep cars | This can be controlled via a S106 agreement. |
| No parking provided for disabled students | 8.41 and no objection from the Access Officer |
| No provision is made for servicing and deliveries | controlled by condition |
| The three parking spaces on River Lane close to the junction with Newmarket Road is dangerous | No highway objection received |
| Highway safety | |
| Cycle entrance/exit point is dangerously located. | No objection received from the Highway Authority. |
| There will be cyclist/pedestrian conflicts | 8.41 |
| Travel plans must reflect likely behaviour and is unacceptable | Controlled by condition/S106 |
| No realistic attempt has been made to block taxi visits to the site. | This is not possible within the planning remit. |

| | |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Drop off/pick up arrangements will cause problems at the start/end of each term. | This will be addressed by the management plan |
| Increase in trip generation will be harmful to amenity | 8.34 |
| The visibility onto Newmarket road from River Lane should be improved | There is no objection to the proposals from the Highway Authority in relation to the vehicular access. Given this there are no grounds on which to resist the application on this basis. |
| There should be an additional pedestrian/cycle crossing point of Newmarket Road | There is no objection to the proposals from the Highway Authority and there is a financial contribution secured via a S106 agreement to improve crossings outside of the site for wider safety. |
| Cycle entrance/exit point is dangerously located. | There is no objection to the proposals from the Highway Authority and there is a financial contribution secured via a S106 agreement to improve crossings outside of the site for wider safety. |
| Other issues | |
| Images are misleading | There is no reason to doubt the accuracy of the images. Inspector has accepted the accuracy of CGI's and given them weight in the determination of the associated appeal against 14/1154/FUL. |
| Proposals do not accord with planning policies or the NPPF | 9.6 |
| This is a wholly new application which should be considered anew without preconception. | 8.2 |
| The building heights set out in the SPD are mandatory and maximum. | 8.7 – 8.9 |

| | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Description of the existing buildings on site is misleading and is not of bulky warehouses. The comparison of the existing buildings on site is not justified as there is no similarity whatsoever | The existing buildings on site are a material consideration and the supporting documentation has described them accurately in my opinion. |
| The applicants should not be allowed to 'buy' their way out of providing outdoor space via a S106 agreement. | There is no Policy requirement for minimum levels provision of outdoor space within the site. |
| The planning statement refers to buildings on the opposite side of Newmarket Road that have now been removed and replaced with the Travelodge. | This does not undermine the planning statement as the Newmarket Road area is changing rapidly. |
| Bin collection | Controlled by condition |
| Long term maintenance/survival of proposed trees | Controlled by condition |
| Concern about site management | Controlled by condition |
| Lack of reception facility out of hours and at weekends | Controlled by condition |
| No council tax will be paid by residents | This is not a material planning consideration |
| There will be no wider benefit to the local economy | There is no policy basis to require any wider benefits |
| Newmarket Road will become a 'wind tunnel' | There is no evidence to suggest this would be the case. |
| The refused scheme is at appeal and this application should not be determined until the outcome of this is known. | There is no conflict in determining an application whilst an alternative scheme is at appeal. Since the submission of the application the appeal for the previously refused scheme has been issued (18.03.16). para 3.0 |

Planning Obligations (s106 Agreement)

8.50 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.

8.51 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.

8.52 I have consulted the service managers who are responsible for the delivery of projects to offset the impact of development and have summarised their consultation responses in the following tables:

Table 1 Open Space

| | | |
|---|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1 | Is any on-site facility proposed to mitigate the development? | No |
| 2 | Could the extra demands created by the new development be mitigated by the existing capacity of nearby facilities? | <p>It is likely that there will be an Increased demand for informal games and recreation including basketball, 5 aside football. The current nearby facilities operate as follows:</p> <p>AGS 04 Ditton Fields 53% Quality P&G 22 Coldhams Common 59% Quality P&G 20 St Matthew’s Piece 59% Quality CEM 13 Abbey Church 53%</p> |

| | | |
|---|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 3 | Is a mitigation project is proposed at a specific nearby location? | <p>Coldham's Common demonstrates a well-placed site 81% but with a low offer of 49%. Any collected S106 would be used to enhance the sites offer.</p> <p>Access improvements to include new benches, bins, noticeboards, interpretation boards, footpath surfaces signs.</p> <p>Tree planting and new boundary treatments ie hedges</p> <p>Fencing to segregate cattle to create new areas for recreation.</p> |
| 4 | How much S106 funding is requested from the developer? | £47,190 Calculated as 195 no 1 person rooms @ £242 per unit = £47,190. |
| 5 | Have any contributions for this specific project been agreed since 6 April 2015? | TBC |

Table 2 Indoor Sports Facilities

| | | |
|---|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1 | Is any on-site facility proposed to mitigate the development? | No |
| 2 | Could the extra demands created by the new development be mitigated by the existing capacity of nearby facilities? | It is anticipated that students would be attending more activities at Abbey Sports Centre & Gym, Cambridge Parkside Pools and Kelsey Kerridge. Therefore the demand on the centres will be growing especially for sports hall team games at Kelsey Kerridge, along with gym and exercise class based activities at all three sites. |

| | | |
|---|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 3 | Is a mitigation project is proposed at a specific nearby location? | Kelsey Kerridge – all prices currently estimated <input type="checkbox"/> Studio conversion & more gym equipment - £55,000 <input type="checkbox"/> Contribution towards Projectile room conversion - £120,000 |
| 4 | How much S106 funding is requested from the developer? | £52,455 Calculated as 195 no 1 person units @ 269 per person = 52,455. |
| 5 | Have any contributions for this specific project been agreed since 6 April 2015? | TBC |

Table 3 Outdoor Sports Facilities

| | | |
|---|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1 | Is any on-site facility proposed to mitigate the development? | No |
| 2 | Could the extra demands created by the new development be mitigated by the existing capacity of nearby facilities? | The dominant sporting demand from this new set of accommodations will be for use of the adult football pitches for games, training and recreational use, along with tennis and cycling which are also sporting preferences in these groups Logans Meadow As a site this is very near to the development accessed by the new foot and cycle bridge. The pitch is currently designated as a colts pitch but it is highly likely the playing area would be used by students from the accommodations as a local training ground for any teams, and for recreational games which could impact on the wear |

| | | |
|---|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| | | and tear and reduce the quality of the playing surface for junior games, therefore better pitch drainage and works to improve the pitch even an artificial surface could be considered. There is limited space to add any pavilion facilities on the meadow which may be prohibitive as it is on a flood plain, but the contribution could be used to create changing facilities in the nearby Scouting building. |
| 3 | Is a mitigation project is proposed at a specific nearby location? | Logans Meadow - contribution towards: <input type="checkbox"/> Artificial Training pitch - £50,000 <input type="checkbox"/> Training pitch improvements and drainage - £35,000 <input type="checkbox"/> Changing rooms at Scout facility - £80,000 |
| 4 | How much S106 funding is requested from the developer? | £46,410 Calculated as 195 no I person units @ £238 per person = £46,410. |
| 5 | Have any contributions for this specific project been agreed since 6 April 2015? | TBC |

6.53 In the event that the identified specific projects, for which S106 contributions are agreed and received, are not delivered the Council will be required to re-pay the commuted sum payments.

6.54 The following table is a summary of the s106 contributions that will be requested in relation to this development:

Table 6 Summary

| | |
|----------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Open Space | £47,190 |
| Play Space | N/A – cannot seek contributions for schemes providing student accommodation |
| Indoor Sports | £52,455 |
| Outdoor Sports | £46,410 |
| Community Facilities | N/A – cannot seek contributions for schemes providing student accommodation |

8.55 Subject to the completion of a S106 planning obligation I am satisfied that the proposal accords with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 3/8, 5/14 and 10/1 and the Planning Obligation Strategy 2010 and the Cambridge City Council Open Space Standards Guidance for Interpretation and Implementation (2010)

Transport

8.56 £120,000 to the County Council for the installation and maintenance of a crossing facility on Newmarket Road to be located between Abbey Walk and Cheddars Lane to facilitate movements to and from the development to the south side of Newmarket Road including the retail park and Anglia Ruskin.

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

Other Planning Obligations

8.58 The following will also need to be secured via a S106 agreement as set out in the report and consultee responses:

- Travel Plan
- Student Management Plan
- Management/monitoring of student car ownership
- Occupancy restriction

Planning Obligations Conclusion

8.59 It is my view that the planning obligation is necessary, directly related to the development and fairly and reasonably in scale and kind to the development and therefore the Planning Obligation passes the tests set by the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010. The appeal Inspector also accepted the S106 requirements in relation to the refused scheme (14/1154/FUL) which were very similar to those requested for this application and as such the nature of the requests are considered appropriate.

9.0 CONCLUSION

9.1 It is my view that the principle of student accommodation on is site is acceptable.

9.2 Having assessed the proposed scheme and reviewed the consultee comments I am of the view that the proposed design and visual impact of the scheme is acceptable, as is the impact on the Conservation Area, subject to the imposition of conditions to control materials.

9.3 I am also of the view having reviewed the conclusions of the daylight/sunlight report and looked at the CGI images of the proposed buildings, that the impacts on the surrounding residents will, on balance be acceptable.

9.4 I am of the opinion that the proposals will provide a high quality living environment for the future occupiers of the scheme.

9.5 In the light of the recent appeal in relation to the previously refused scheme at the site (ref 14/1154/FUL) which was for a higher number of student rooms and for buildings which were larger and un-broken in their mass, I am of the opinion that the current scheme represents a significant improvement and reduction of impacts. As such, it is my view that this scheme is acceptable and there are no planning grounds on which it could reasonably be refused.

9.6 I am satisfied therefore, that the proposals would comply with the provisions of the relevant Development Plan Policies cited within the main body of the report and to the NPPF.

10.0 RECOMMENDATION

1) APPROVE subject to completion of the s106 Agreement by 1 August 2016 and the imposition of 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 assessing 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. The external building envelope glazing element sound reduction performance / index (Rw) specifications to mitigate against traffic noise from Newmarket Road as detailed / stated within the Red Acoustics, UNICITY XXI CAMBRIDGE SARL, C/O THREESIXTY DEVELOPMENT LTD, Environmental Noise Study (R1135-REP01-PB) dated 03 December 2015 shall be fully implemented prior to occupation and shall be maintained and retained thereafter. The sound reduction performance of the external building glazing elements shall be for the glazing window unit / package as a whole in their installed condition inclusive of the glazing, the frames, casing spandrel panels or mullions, all seals on any openable part of the system and any openings.

Reason: In the interests of the amenities of the future occupants of the new units Cambridge Local Plan Policy 4/13.

14. Before the development/use hereby permitted is occupied, a scheme for the insulation of plant and equipment 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 and shall be retained thereafter.

Reason: In the interest of residential amenity - Cambridge Local Plan Policy 4/13.

15. Prior to the installation of any lighting an external artificial lighting assessment and scheme shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The scheme shall include details of any artificial lighting of the site and an artificial lighting impact assessment with predicted lighting levels at proposed and existing residential properties shall be undertaken (horizontal / vertical isolux contour light levels and calculated glare levels) . Artificial lighting on and off site shall meet the Obtrusive Light Limitations for Exterior Lighting Installations contained within the Institute of Lighting Professionals - Guidance Notes for the Reduction of Obtrusive Light - GN01:2011 (or as superseded).

The artificial lighting scheme as approved shall be fully implemented before the use hereby permitted is commenced and shall be retained thereafter.

Reason: In the interest of residential amenity and to ensure that the development has a satisfactory visual appearance - Cambridge Local Plan Policies 3/4, 3/7, 4/13 and 4/15

16. Prior to occupation/use of the development hereby permitted, details of CHP boilers to be installed in any building shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Any gas-fired CHP must meet an emissions standard of:

Spark ignition engine: less than 150 mgNO_x/Nm³
Compression ignition engine: less than 40 mgNO_x/Nm³
Gas turbine: less than 50 mgNO_x/Nm³

The CHP boiler(s) shall be installed 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).

17. Prior to the commencement of construction on Block A, as part of a noise insulation scheme to protect future occupiers from the impact of traffic noise and air quality from Newmarket Road full details of the ventilation scheme / system for the units within block A on the Newmarket Road and River Lane façade as detailed in the Red Acoustics, UNICITY XXI CAMBRIDGE SARL, C/O THREESIXTY DEVELOPMENT LTD, Environmental Noise Study (R1135-REP01-PB) dated 03 December 2015 shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. If the internal noise limits can only be achieved with closed windows then alternative means of both background and purge ventilation should be provided to allow residents to occupy the properties at all times with windows closed. Air intake shall be from the roof and/or rear of the building, away from Newmarket Road. The scheme as approved shall be fully implemented before the use hereby permitted is commenced prior to the occupation and shall thereafter be retained thereafter as such.

Reason: To protect human health in accordance with policy 4/13 and 4/14 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2006).

18. Before starting any brick work, a sample panel (minimum 1x1m) of the facing materials to be used shall be erected on site to establish the detail of bonding, coursing and colour, type of jointing shall be agreed in writing with the local planning authority. The quality of finish and materials incorporated in any approved sample panel(s), which shall not be demolished prior to completion of development, shall be maintained throughout the development.

Reason: In the interests of the visual amenity 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 policy 3/12).

19. Prior to the installation of any walling systems, 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 are to be submitted to and approved in writing by the LPA. This may consist of large-scale drawings and/or samples. Thereafter the development shall be undertaken in accordance with the agreed details and retained as such thereafter.

Reason: To accord with Policy 3/4 and 3/12 of the 2006 Cambridge Local Plan.

20. Full details of all windows and doors, including the obscure glazed sections on Newmarket Road and River Lane frontage, as identified on the approved drawings, including materials, colours, surface finishes/textures are to be submitted to and approved in writing by the LPA. This may consist of large-scale drawings and/or samples. The development shall be undertaken in accordance with the agreed and shall be retained as such thereafter.

Reason: To accord with Policy 3/4 and 3/12 of the 2006 Cambridge Local Plan.

21. No development other than demolition and below ground enabling works shall take place until full details of both hard and soft landscape works (including green roofs and associated details) 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 (e.g. furniture, play equipment, refuse or other storage units, signs, lighting); proposed and existing functional services above and below ground (e.g. 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)

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

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

23. Boundary treatment: No development shall take place other than demolition and below ground enabling works 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)

24. The development hereby approved shall not be occupied until an operational management plan for the site, which provides details of site management, security, delivery handling, waste collection management, litter control and term end pick-up and drop-off arrangements has been submitted to and approved in writing by, the local planning authority. Occupation of the site shall take place only in accordance with the approved management plan.

Reason: To protect the amenity of neighbouring occupiers and highway users, and to ensure efficient operation of the highway network and protect highway safety. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/4, 3/7, 3/12 and 8/2)

25. Within six months of the commencement of development, a Public Art Delivery Plan shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority and shall include the following:

- 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;
- The proposed consultation to be undertaken with the local community;

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

Reason: To accord with the provisions of Cambridge City Council Public Art SPD (2010) and policies 3/4 and 3/7 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006.

26. Prior to the occupation of the development, a Public Art Maintenance Plan shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority and shall include the following:

- Details of how the Public Art will be maintained;
- How the Public Art would be decommissioned if not permanent;
- How repairs would be carried out;
- How the Public Art would be replaced in the event that it is destroyed;

The approved Public Art Maintenance Plan shall be fully implemented in accordance with the approved details. 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 accord with the provisions of Cambridge City Council Public Art SPD (2010) and policies 3/4 and 3/7 of the Cambridge

27. The existing access to the adopted public highway shall be permanently closed off and returned to a full face kerbed footway within 21 days of the opening of the new access hereby approved.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety in accordance with Policy 8/2 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006.

28. No demolition or construction works shall commence on site until a traffic management plan has been agreed with the Planning Authority.

Reason: in the interests of highway safety Policy 8/2 of the Cambridge Local Plan.

29. No demolition/development shall take place until a Written Scheme of Archaeological Investigation has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. No demolition/development shall take place other than in accordance with the Written Scheme of Archaeological Investigation.

Reason: To protect potential features of archaeological importance, Cambridge Local Plan Policy 4/9.

30. The four street trees shall be provided, prior to the first occupation of the development approved and shall be planted in accordance with the tree pit details shown on drawing number 301.

Reason: To ensure that the trees are suitably planted and retained in the interests of visual amenity, Cambridge Local Plan policies 3/4, 4/4.

31. The development shall not be occupied until a plan for the future management of the proposed street trees has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The approved plan shall be adhered to thereafter.

Reason: To ensure that the trees are retained in the long term in the interests of visual amenity (Cambridge Local Plan Policies 3/4, 3/7 and 4/4)

32. 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)

33. The development hereby approved shall not be occupied until an operational management plan for the site, which provides details of site management, security, delivery handling, waste collection management, litter control and term end pick-up and drop-off arrangements has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Occupation of the site shall take place only in accordance with the approved management plan.

Reason: to ensure the effective management of the site in the interests of residential amenity, Cambridge Local Plan Policies 4/13, 3/7

34. No building hereby permitted shall be occupied until surface water drainage works have been implemented in accordance with details that have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Before these details are submitted an assessment shall be carried out of the potential for disposing of surface water by means of a sustainable drainage system in accordance with the principles set out in The National Planning Policy Framework and associated Guidance, and the results of the assessment provided to the local planning authority. The system should be designed such that there is no surcharging for a 1 in 30 year event and no internal property flooding for a 1 in 100 year event + 40% an allowance for climate change. The submitted details shall:
- i. provide information about the design storm period and intensity, the method employed to delay and control the surface water discharged from the site to achieve a 20% reduction in peak flows and the measures taken to prevent pollution of the receiving groundwater and/or surface waters; and
 - ii. provide a management and maintenance plan for the lifetime of the development.
 - iii. The surface water drainage scheme shall be managed and maintained thereafter in accordance with the agreed management and maintenance plan.

Reason: To ensure that adequate provision is made within the site for suitable drainage, Cambridge Local Plan Policy 3/12

INFORMATIVE: It is a requirement of the Clean Air Act 1993 that no furnace shall be installed in a building or in any fixed boiler or industrial plant unless notice of the proposal to install it has been given to the local authority. Details of any plant to be installed should be provided using the Chimney Height Calculation form (available here: <https://www.cambridge.gov.uk/chimney-height-approval>)

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: Demolition/Construction noise/vibration report

The noise and vibration report should include:

a) An assessment of the significance of the noise impact due to the demolition/construction works and suitable methods for this are to be found in BS 5228:2009 Part 1 Annex E - Significance of noise effects. It is recommended that the ABC method detailed in E.3.2 be used unless works are likely to continue longer than a month then the 2-5 dB (A) change method should be used.

b) An assessment of the significance of the vibration impact due to the demolition/construction works and suitable methods for this are to be found in BS 5228:2009 Part 2 Annex B - Significance of vibration effects.

If piling is to be undertaken then full details of the proposed method to be used is required and this should be included in the noise and vibration reports detailed above.

Following the production of the above reports a monitoring protocol should be proposed for agreement with the Local Planning Authority. It will be expected that as a minimum spot checks to be undertaken on a regular basis at site boundaries nearest noise sensitive premises and longer term monitoring to be undertaken when:-

- Agreed target levels are likely to exceeded
- Upon the receipt of substantiated complaints
- At the request of the Local Planning Authority / Environmental Health following any justified complaints.

Guidance on noise monitoring is given in BS 5228:2009 Part 1 Section 8.4 - Noise Control Targets and in Annex G - noise monitoring.

A procedure for seeking approval from the Local Planning Authority (LPA) in circumstances when demolition/construction works need to be carried out at time outside the permitted hours. This should incorporate a minimum notice period of 10 working days to the Local Planning Authority and 5 working days to neighbours to allow the Local Planning Authority to consider the application as necessary. For emergencies the Local Planning Authority should be notified but where this is not possible the Council's Out of Hours Noise service should be notified on 0300 303 3839.

Contact details for monitoring personnel, site manager including out of hours emergency telephone number should be provided.

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: Notification to the Environmental Growth and Quality team will be required under the Environmental Permitting Regulations if an on site concrete crusher will be used during the demolition stage.

INFORMATIVE: Electricity substations are known to emit electromagnetic fields. The Radiation Protection Agency has set standards for the release of such fields in relation to the nearest premises. The applicant should contact The National Grid EMF unit on 0845 702 3270 for advice regarding the electric/magnetic fields that are associated with electric substations.

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

INFORMATIVE: Any material imported into the site shall be tested for a full suite of contaminants including metals and petroleum hydrocarbons prior to importation. Material imported for landscaping should be tested at a frequency of 1 sample every 20m³ or one per lorry load, whichever is greater. Material imported for other purposes can be tested at a lower frequency (justification and prior approval for the adopted rate is required by the Local Authority). If the material originates from a clean source the developer should contact the Environmental Quality Growth Team for further advice.

INFORMATIVE: The Council's document 'Developers Guide to Contaminated Land in Cambridge' provides further details on the responsibilities of the developers and the information required to assess potentially contaminated sites. It can be found at the City Council's website on <http://www.cambridge.gov.uk/ccm/content/environment-and-recycling/pollution-noise-and-nuisance/land-pollution.en>. Hard copies can also be provided upon request.

INFORMATIVE: The Housing Act 2004 introduces the Housing Health & Safety Rating System as a way to ensure that all residential premises provide a safe and healthy environment to any future occupiers or visitors.

Each of the dwellings must be built to ensure that there are no unacceptable hazards for example ensuring adequate fire precautions are installed; all habitable rooms have adequate lighting and floor area etc.

The applicant/agent is advised to contact housing standards at Mandela House, 4 Regent Street, Cambridge and Building Control concerning fire precautions, means of escape and the HHSRS

INFORMATIVE: The residents of the site will not qualify for Residents Permits (other than visitor permits) within the existing Residents Parking Schemes operating on surrounding streets.

The proposal will require alteration of the existing Traffic Regulation Order controlling on-street parking.

The amendment of the Order to remove the existing on-street parking space must be a pre-commencement Condition of any permission that the Planning Authority is minded to grant in regard to this application.

The alteration of the Traffic Regulation Order is subject to a consultation process, the outcome of which cannot be prejudged and that the applicant will be required by the Highway Authority to bear the full costs of this.

The principal areas of concern that should be addressed are when submitted details in respect of condition number 28 are

1. Movements and control of muck away lorries (wherever possible all loading and unloading should be undertaken off the adopted public highway)
2. Contractor parking, for both phases (wherever possible all such parking should be within the curtilage of the site and not on street).
3. Movements and control of all deliveries (wherever possible all loading and unloading should be undertaken off the adopted public highway)
4. Control of dust, mud and debris, please note it is an offence under the Highways Act 1980 to deposit mud or debris onto the adopted public highway.

INFORMATIVE: The applicant is encouraged to ensure all future tenants/occupiers of the flats are aware of the existing local car club service and location of the nearest space.

2) 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