

Application Number	16/1030/FUL	Agenda Item	
Date Received	6th June 2016	Officer	Mr Sav Patel
Target Date	5th September 2016		
Ward	Abbey		
Site	West's Garage 217 Newmarket Road Cambridge Cambridgeshire CB5 8HD		
Proposal	Erection of student accommodation with 219 student rooms (following 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	N/A c/o Threesixty Developments Ltd c/o Agent		

<p>SUMMARY</p>	<p>The development accords with the Development Plan for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The design, scale and massing of the development respond appropriately to the context, including to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. - 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. - The building provides an appropriate level of residential amenity for future occupiers. - 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 and the extant planning permission represents a significant material consideration.
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. The site is currently vacant. The vehicle repair operations on this site gradually diminished in favour of vehicle sales. West's Garage has relocated to a site on Mercers Row, which is off Swans Lane approximately half a mile north-east of the application site. To the north of the site is Rowlinson Way, which is a small cul-de-sac consisting of a block of single-storey garages which are owned by the City Council. Beyond Rowlinson Way is a terrace of two-storey dwellings which front onto River Lane. To the east of the site is River Lane which consists of two-storey terraced housing set back from the road. To the south of the site is Newmarket Road which is an arterial route into and out of Cambridge and is characterised by a mix of commercial and residential development. Newmarket Road is currently experiencing significant regeneration with the development of hotels, apartments and student housing. The western boundary of the site abuts the rear gardens of the properties in Godesdone Road, which are between 18 and 22 metres in depth, and the furniture store which fronts onto Newmarket Road.
- 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 219 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+1 storey and 2+1 storeys respectively and would front onto River Lane. The 2 storey pavilion building adjacent to the western boundary which featured in the previous HUB scheme has been eliminated in the present proposal as a consequence of the three-block layout.

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 In response to third party representations and comments from the Landscape Team, comparison plans with the HUB scheme and tree pit details have been submitted. The plans consist of the following:

- Comparative Area Plan;
- North-west boundary clarification plan;
- Comparative Elevations;
- Landscape Layout plan;
- Planting Plan;

2.7 These plans have been consulted on.

2.8 More recently, concerns have been raised regarding the detail of the north western boundary and comparative building heights

from the rear gardens of Godesdone Road. With regards to the north-west boundary issue, concerns have been raised regarding the accuracy of the boundary wall between 20 and 20a Godesdone Road, and the existing historic school wall and garage block. The applicant's topographical survey lacks detail in this location. Whilst this issue does not prevent me from assessing the proposed development and its impact on the surrounding environment, I have made the applicant aware of this issue. They have advised me that they will be carrying out a survey of this specific boundary and will submit an updated topographical survey for clarification. To date, I have not received this, so I will either update the amendment sheet or present the survey plan in my introduction to Committee.

Background

- 2.9 Planning permission already exists for a student accommodation development on this site. The HUB scheme (14/1154/FUL) is for student accommodation consisting of 202 study units with associated cycle, bin and amenity space provisions. The scheme comprises two main components grouped round a central courtyard at basement level (one storey below Newmarket Road street level). On the west side is a two-storey building (termed the 'pavilion' building) while ranges along Newmarket Road, River Lane and Rowlinson Way form a single main building enclosing the other three sides of the courtyard.
- 2.10 The planning application was presented to Planning Committee on 1 April 2015 with an officer recommendation for approval. Members resolved not to accept the officer's recommendation. Following the use of the Council's Adjourned Decision Protocol, the application was brought back to Committee on 29th April 2015, and refused. The application was refused for six reasons; 1. Height and massing; 2. Visually dominant and sense of enclosure on properties in River Lane; 3. Pavilion building would appear overbearing and out of character; 4. Courtyard would appear cramped and be overwhelmed by the height buildings surrounding it; 5. No occupancy restriction or management arrangement; and 6. No provision for open space, sports facilities, waste facilities or public art. Subsequently the applicant appealed the decision. The appeal was lodged on 20 November 2015 and dealt with by written representations. The

Inspector allowed the appeal subject to conditions and S106 agreement.

- 2.11 The current proposal is a hybrid scheme. It retains a Newmarket Road elevation which resembles the HUB scheme with relatively minor changes but proposes an entirely different layout and design for the rest of the site.
- 2.12 Running alongside this planning application is a Section 73 application (16/1088/S73) which proposes to vary condition 2 (Approved Plans) of application 14/1154/FUL: the approved HUB scheme. The proposal seeks minor material amendments to the HUB scheme. Both applications will be presented to Planning Committee.

3.0 SITE HISTORY

Reference	Description	Outcome
13/1780/FUL	The erection of new student housing (257 study bedrooms) and associated communal facilities, cycle parking, and external landscaping following demolition of the existing buildings.	Withdrawn
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
15/2316/FUL	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.	Withdrawn
16/1088/S73	Section 73 application to vary	Pending

condition 2 (approved plans) of permission 14/1154/FUL, allowed under appeal APP/Q0505/W/15/3137454, to permit a minor material amendment to the approved scheme to include the reconfiguration of the internal layout to create 7 additional study bedrooms (209 study bedrooms in total), reduction in the buildings footprint and cluster sizes, alterations to the substation enclosure and cycle parking arrangement, together with minor external alterations.

*A copy of the Inspector’s Decision letter in relation to the appeal is attached.

4.0 PUBLICITY

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

5.0 POLICY

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

5.2 Relevant Development Plan policies

PLAN		POLICY NUMBER
Cambridge Plan 2006	Local	3/1 3/4 3/7 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

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

Central Government Guidance	<p>National Planning Policy Framework March 2012</p> <p>National Planning Policy Framework – Planning Practice Guidance March 2014</p> <p>Circular 11/95</p> <p>CIL</p>
Supplementary Planning Guidance	<p>Sustainable Design and Construction (May 2007)</p> <p>Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Waste Partnership (RECAP): Waste Management Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (February 2012)</p> <p>Planning Obligation Strategy (March 2010)</p> <p>Public Art (January 2010)</p> <p>Eastern Gate Supplementary Planning Document (October 2011)</p>
Material Considerations	<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)

First comments:

- 6.1 Having reviewed the Transport Statement associated with the application the County Council require additional information in order to comment on the application in full. Therefore the County Council recommend a holding objection at this stage.
- 6.2 The County Council require:
- Servicing numbers and frequency to be provided.
 - A plan showing the pedestrian and cycle improvements proposed for River Lane and Newmarket Road.
- 6.3 Should the Local Planning Authority be minded to grant planning permission then the County Council require that the following are secured through planning condition or S106.

- A Travel Plan, Site 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 Street 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.

Second comments:

- 6.4 A plan showing proposed works on Newmarket Road has now been provided and this addresses the concerns of the Highway Authority in that regard.

Environmental Health

- 6.5 Raise no objection to the scheme subject to the imposition of conditions and informatives:
- 6.6 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 following standard construction/demolition/delivery noise/hours and dust conditions are recommended:
- o Construction hours
 - o Collection during construction
 - o Construction/demolition noise/vibration & piling
 - o Dust condition
 - o Contaminated land (x6)
 - o Glazing specification
 - o Ventilation
 - o Plant noise insulation
 - o Artificial lighting
 - o CHP boiler
 - o Demolition/construction noise/vibration informative
 - o Plant noise insulation informative
 - o Dust condition informative
 - o Concrete crusher
 - o Substation informative
 - o Site Investigation Informative
 - o Remediation Works Informative

- o Materials Chemical Testing Informative
- o Contaminated Land Guide Informative
- o Housing informative
- o Furnace/boiler informative

Refuse and Recycling

- 6.7 No comments received to date. I shall either update the amendment sheet or report the comments orally at the committee meeting.

Urban Design and Conservation Team

- 6.8 The proposed development is acceptable subject to the following conditions:
- o Brick work sample panel;
 - o Non-masonry materials;
 - o Full details of all windows and doors including obscure glazed sections

- 6.9 Permission 14/1154/FUL was allowed under appeal APP/Q0505/W/15/3137454. As such the use and an overall scale and massing envelope have been established through this application. The proposals which form the subject of application 16/1030/FUL have a number of variations from the approved scheme and will be discussed in further detail below.

Eastern Gate Development Framework

- 6.10 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.

- 6.11 An assessment of the scale and massing of the scheme in response to the guidance in the Eastern Gate SPD is provided elsewhere in these comments under 'scale and massing'.

Response to context

- 6.12 The Wests Garage site is located to the northern side of Newmarket Road at the junction with River Lane. The site is currently occupied by a garage showroom and ancillary workshops and car and van storage areas. These vary in height from the 1 storey showroom along Newmarket Road to 1.5-2 storey commercial buildings/sheds towards the middle and western boundary of the site. These latter buildings are significantly greater in massing terms than the finer grain buildings within the adjacent conservation area.

Verified Visual Assessment Photomontages

- 6.13 A series of Verified Visual Assessment Photomontages have been prepared to show the scheme set within the existing surrounding context. The verified views show the key approaches to the site, the view from Elizabeth Way Bridge, local views from surrounding streets and from back gardens of existing properties. 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.

Scale and massing

- 6.14 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 roof space 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.

- 6.15 The proposals create a continuous building line along Newmarket Road with a recessed main entrance. The approach breaks the overall form up to read as 2 similarly proportioned blocks. The accommodation at upper floor is well recessed for the entire length of this frontage with a series of dormer windows providing articulation of the roofscape. Along River Lane, the scheme is broken into a series of 3 buildings with gaps between to create a more broken street frontage.
- 6.16 Drawing 1513_PL_201 Rev B 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. The buildings on River Lane are angled to reduce the impact on properties opposite.
- 6.17 The overall height of the proposed buildings does exceed that of the approved scheme and this is illustrated in the D&A Statement at pages 32-33. However the upper floor treatment on the proposals is very different to the flat roof form of the approved scheme. The pitched roofs on the proposed scheme will read as a diminishing plane and consequently the overall increase in height, when compared to the approved scheme, is considered to be acceptable in design terms.
- 6.18 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. A comparison against the Eastern Gate SPD heights is made below.

Newmarket Road

- 6.19 The SPD identifies heights of up to 3+1 storeys for the Wests site on Newmarket Road frontage. Assuming 3m floor to floor heights this equates to a maximum height of 12m or 13m with an increased 'commercial floor' height at ground floor.
- 6.20 Drawing 1513_PL_200 shows the proposed elevation fronting on to Newmarket Road. Measured to the parapet it is 9.8m and to the top of the ridge 13.4m 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'. Given the diminishing plane of the roof the difference in height between

13m and 13.4m will not be significant and on balance the height is considered to be acceptable.

River Lane

- 6.21 The SPD identifies a range of heights along River Lane of 2-3+1 equating to a range in heights of 6m and 12m. Drawing 1513_PL_201 Rev B 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.
- 6.22 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.
- 6.23 The middle block is 11.8m to the ridge and 8m to the eaves. The height is consistent with the SPD guidance and considered to be acceptable.
- 6.24 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

- 6.25 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.
- 6.26 Drawing 1513_PL204 shows that the maximum ridge height for the building is 10.4m. The section closest to River Lane is 9.4m. The height difference of 1m is caused by level change on Rowlinson Way. The scale and massing is considered acceptable.

Elevations and Materials

- 6.27 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.

- 6.28 The submitted D&A Statement (pages 29-30) identifies how the scheme has responded to the surrounding context and character to break down the overall massing. The massing is further refined on the Newmarket Road frontage by being broken into 2 elements with a linking entrance section between them. Recesses of 100mm create shadow lines and help to break the elevation down further and respond to the plot widths of existing development on the north side of the road.
- 6.29 An overall grid is created by horizontal and vertical brickwork with large windows set into it. The applicant is proposing a film on the inside face of the glazed unit to resolve this issue (Drawing 1513_PL_205 Rev B and D&A Statement page 37). This has the potential to work although we would need to see a sample prior to confirming its acceptability. This element should be conditioned if the application is approved.

Materials

- 6.30 The proposed materials are identified on the submitted planning elevations and illustrated in the submitted D&A Statement (page 36) 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.

Senior Sustainability Officer (Design and Construction)

First comments:

- 6.31 A variety of measures are proposed including:
- o Adoption of the hierarchical approach to reducing energy use and associated carbon emissions;
 - o The provision of travel packs for students, and I would suggest that a useful addition to these packs would be information about car clubs operating in the area for those students who might need occasional access to a car;

- o The use of water efficient appliances and sanitary ware to target potable water consumption of no greater than 105 litres/person/day;
- o The targeting of A rated materials where possible.

These measures are supported.

While most aspects of the scheme are acceptable subject to the imposition of the condition(s), further information is required before the scheme can be supported in full.

6.32 Recommended condition and informative:

- o Renewable and low carbon energy condition;
- o Permitted Process – medium sized combustion plant directive informative

6.33 Additional information requested:

6.34 A revised roof plan showing the full extent of the proposed photovoltaic panels, or clarification that the current roof plan is correct.

Second comments:

6.35 On the basis of the information contained in the email from the agent and the new roof plan (SK106) which now shows the full extent of the photovoltaic panels in line with the recommendations of the Renewable Energy Report. The proposal can now be supported in full. The new roof plan should be referenced under the approved plans in the decision notice.

Access Officer

6.36 Comments on previous application (15/2316/FUL) apply.

Previous comments:

6.37 No objections. 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.

Head of Streets and Open Spaces (Landscape Team)

- 6.38 The landscape team is pleased with the design and feel the scheme provides a positive response to the site and its context. The proposal is supported subject to the following conditions:
- o Hard and Soft Landscaping;
 - o Landscape Maintenance and Management Plan;
 - o Boundary treatment;
 - o Tree pit details

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

- 6.39 No comments received to date. I shall either update the amendment sheet or report the comments orally at the committee meeting

Cambridgeshire County Council (Flood and Water Management)

First comments:

- 6.40 In the absence of an acceptable surface water drainage strategy within the Drainage Statement (ref: M1716 - Rev 1 dated May 2016) we object to the grant of planning permission and recommend refusal on this basis for the following reason:
- o Surface Water Storage Volume – The applicant has not demonstrated that the storage volume required to attenuate surface water run-off from the critical 1 in 100 annual probability storm event, with an appropriate allowance for climate change, can be provided on site. The current storage estimates are based on a 35l/s discharge rate and will need updating to accommodate the new climate change allowances and the 28l/s discharge rate as specified;
 - o Climate Change Allowances - The applicant has not used the updated climate change allowances (published 19 February 2016) to inform the surface water drainage

strategy. The LLFA request that the upper end of 40% is incorporated into the drainage calculations.

Second comments:

- 6.41 Following further correspondence with the applicant and the submission of further details to clarify the drainage proposals; the applicant has demonstrated that surface water can be dealt with on site by using underground attenuation and runoff rates will be limited to 28 l/s to the public surface water sewer. Surface water drainage comment recommended.

Head of Streets and Open Spaces (Sustainable Drainage Officer)

- 6.42 The proposed development is acceptable subject to a surface water drainage condition.

Growth Project Officer (Affordable Housing)

- 6.43 No objections to the proposal.

Environment Agency

- 6.44 The Environment Agency has no objection in principle to the proposed development we wish to offer the following informatives.

- o Surface Water Drainage;
- o Foul Water Drainage;
- o To consult Anglian Water Services Ltd;
- o Pollution Prevention;

Anglian Water

- 6.45 No objections subject to condition on surface water management strategy.

Cambridgeshire Constabulary (Architectural Liaison Officer)

- 6.46 The Officer has reviewed the application in regards to the community safety and crime aspects of it's design. The Officer has also reviewed crimes in this immediate area over last year

and have noted 299 cycle thefts within the CB5 post code area of which 44 relate to Newmarket Road. In view of the large amount of cycle parking within the site this office is happy to work with developers to discuss security. The Officer has noted on the Design and Access Statement the comments about BREEAM Standards in regards to security.

- 6.47 The Officer has no further comments, recommendations or suggestions.

Developer Contributions Monitoring Unit

- 6.48 A S106 agreement including specific contributions for this site has already been agreed (14/1154/FUL), with this new application representing alternative proposals for its development. The projects for which specific contributions are requested for this new application include those listed in the earlier agreement. Contributions are sought towards projects relating to improvements to Indoor Sports (J58,911) and Outdoor Sports (J52,122) facilities at Abbey Sports Centre and Gym facility. A contribution towards Informal Open Space (J52,998) has also been requested relating to improving facilities, equipment and access to open space at Coldhams Common.

Cambridgeshire County Council (Archaeology)

- 6.49 No objection subject to condition to secure a programme of archaeological investigation prior to development.

Sport England

- 6.50 The proposed development is not considered to fall either within our statutory remit (Statutory Instrument 2015/595), or non-statutory remit (National Planning Policy Guidance Par. 003 Ref. ID: 37-003-20140306) upon which we would wish to comment, therefore Sport England has not provided a detailed response.

Cambridge Airport

- 6.51 Cambridge Airport has no objection to the proposal.

Defence Infrastructure Organisation

6.52 The MOD has no safeguarding objections to this proposal.

6.53 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:

- o 52 Abbey Road (Support)
- o 70 Beche Road
- o 86 Beche Road
- o 10 Godesdone Road
- o 12 Godesdone Road
- o 14 Godesdone Road
- o 18 Godesdone Road
- o 20 Godesdone Road
- o Newlands, Dashwood Close (owner of 22a Godesdone Road);
- o Riverside Area Residents Association (RARA)

7.2 The representations can be summarised as follows:

Support:

- o The new application appears to be much more attractive alternative and should be supported to avoid the visually appalling and over dominant appeal scheme being implemented;
- o The River Lane frontage is an improvement and is welcomed by residents;

Objections:

Context and design

- o Scheme does not respond to Conservation Area
- o Scheme violates SPD height and form guidelines
- o Scale of building, height and massing
- o Out of keeping with the local residential area;

- o Too dominant and significantly higher than those buildings it replaces;
- o Overdevelopment of the site such that it does not fit in the site boundaries;
- o The increased height on the western elevation up to 1.6 metres would significantly worsen the impact on Godesdone Road residents;
- o The elevation heights should be kept to the limits established by the consented scheme;
- o The development should take reference from buildings immediately adjacent to the site which are two-storey properties within the Conservation Area;

Neighbour amenity

- o Loss of privacy from overlooking to the properties in Beche Road and River Lane;
- o Privacy already affected by Travelodge Hotel on Newmarket Road;
- o The rear block is even more visually dominant for Godesdone Road houses;
- o The increase in storey height over the consented scheme is a violation of the storey guidelines given in the SPD;
- o The mullion screens at the rear of the Newmarket road section is inadequate;
- o Overlooking of surrounding houses
- o The flat roof area at the northern end which appears to be accessible is likely to become a communally accessed roof terrace. This would result in Godesdone Road properties being overlooked and significant noise risk;
- o The location of the communal areas are directly adjacent to the boundaries on the north side and there is a risk of noise from these areas;
- o The communal areas should be located closer to the centre to reduce risk of noise impacting surrounding properties;
- o The various iterations have steadily got worse over time and the latest scheme being 2.5 metre higher than the appeal scheme with extra student rooms;
- o The western elevation of the proposal will appear overbearing and block light into the gardens of the properties on Godesdone Road.
- o Inadequate proposals for noise control;
- o Concerned with the potential impact of so many students on this quiet residential area;

- The proposal will greatly increase the local population and potential noise impact particularly late at night

Amenity for future occupiers

- courtyards will lack sunlight and will be dominated by tall buildings.
- Lack of green outdoor amenity space

Highway issues

- No crossing facility for large number of students negotiating the River Lane/Newmarket Road junction to enable safe crossing;
- The location of the Newmarket Road section up to the boundary line and corner of River Lane would reduce visibility for motorists turning into River Lane;
- During term time drop off and pick up the proposal is likely to represent a significant disruption to traffic movement at an already restricted junction;

Car parking

- No evidence of further parking has been considered by the developer for disabled students;

Other issues

- Failure to provide images of the scheme;
- Doubts over the accuracy of the drawings and buildings which compared to the previous schemes;
- The height measurements should be provided in the plans
- Proposals do not accord with planning policies or the NPPF
- The developer is motivated by maximising income with little consideration for the surrounding area;
- The demolition work would involve part of a private garden wall;
- The Western Boundary plan shows structure that does not exist on site and inaccurately represents the boundary line;
- The plans are incorrect and the Planning Committee cannot be asked to approve an application;
- The topographical survey does not contain sufficient detail of the north western boundary;
- Concerns with the amount of planning documents to review for this oversized development;

- o Impact on health from the stress caused by these proposals

7.3 Councillor Johnson made the following comments:

- o I note that the occupier of 18 Godesdone Road has been in correspondence with you regarding the above application, including the height figures supplied by the developer. I support the residents' request for you, if possible, to check the accuracy of the data provided. There are quite legitimate concerns here which need to be addressed in my view.

7.4 The above representations are a summary of the comments that have been received. Full details of the representations can be inspected on the application file.

8.0 ASSESSMENT

8.1 From the consultation responses and representations received and from my inspection of the site and the surroundings, I consider that the main issues are:

1. Principle of development
2. Context of site, design and external spaces (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/FUL) 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

8.5 The proposed development is a hybrid, retaining a Newmarket Road block similar to the HUB scheme, but bringing forward a new proposal for the remainder of the site. The HUB scheme was essentially one building extending from Newmarket Road, turning into River Lane and then turning into the part of Rowlinson Way which consists of the single storey garage block. The HUB scheme also included a pavilion building which faced the rear gardens of the properties in Godesdone Road. The scheme has been broken into three separate blocks which

are varied in scale and massing but have continuity in terms of design and materials and elevational treatment. The blocks also form a transition from the four storey Newmarket Road block to two and half storey which would be particularly noticeable from River Lane. In my view the revised design and layout responds better to the site context than the approved scheme, particularly where it interfaces with the residential context of Godesdone Road and River Lane. In terms of the Newmarket Road, the Newmarket Road block makes a bold statement which reflects the appearance and character of this important corridor into and out of the city which is undergoing rapid change. The proposed block would be read in context with the new multi-storey buildings opposite consisting of hotels, student accommodation and residential apartments.

- 8.6 In my view, the proposal responds appropriately to the site context and is in accordance with policies 3/4, 3/7, 3/12 and 4/11 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006, and the guidance of the Eastern Gate SPD.

Scale and massing

- 8.7 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 with gaps between to create a more broken street frontage to River Lane and to mitigate against the potential for a wall of development visible from the rear gardens of Godesdone Road. The proposed development also contains a lower ground floor element the same as the HUB scheme, which is only accessible from the sunken internal courtyard.
- 8.8 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 three storey (excluding the lower ground floor element) with a flat roof rising to a fourth storey which is set back (3+1 storey) with a mono-pitch roof linked to a flat roof section behind. The set back would be defined by five pairs of flat roof dormers in a dark finish to match the roof and contrast with the facing brickwork. The roof and dormers would be set behind a small parapet wall. The main entrance would be located in the middle of the Newmarket Road block. It would be defined by a full height

recessed section which helps to break up the mass so that it reads as two similar proportioned blocks either side of the main entrance. This articulation of the block also gives the entrance prominence and legibility from Newmarket Road.

- 8.9 Whilst the proposed scheme is considered on its own merits, the applicant has produced a set of comparative elevation plans and floor plans comparing the HUB scheme with the proposed scheme. The plan shows that the Newmarket Road frontage would be slightly wider than the HUB scheme and have a different main entrance. The fourth storey of this scheme is also entirely set back within a designed roof form as opposed to the HUB scheme in which it is partly contained within a full four storey elevation. The revised roof profile reduces the mass of the Newmarket Road elevation and gives it a subservient appearance when compared to the HUB scheme. The chamfered edge of the HUB scheme has also been replaced with a traditional corner with extensive glazing to create an active frontage onto Newmarket Road. The redesign relates better to the corner and with the roof set back reduces its massing when viewed from Newmarket Road. This is evident when comparing the verified views for each (these views are also shown on drawing titled Comparative Elevations- Newmarket Road dwg no.513_PI_208).
- 8.10 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 expressed in third party representations that the storey heights of the proposal do not adhere to the maximum storey heights set out in Figure 39 of the SPD.
- 8.11 I accept 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 (1.1m on the ridge of set back of the mono-pitched roof), I am of the view that the Newmarket Road block produces

a form of development in line with the aspirations of the SPD in relation to building heights. The SPD very clearly recommends an increase from the present heights in any future development. The appeal Inspector also noted at paragraph 12 of the appeal decision that verified images were sufficient to 'robustly test' an exceedance in the heights in the SPD. Furthermore, given the diminishing plane of the roof, the difference in height between 12.2m and 13.3m will not be significant and in my view the proposed height is acceptable. This is a view shared by the Urban Design and Conservation team.

8.12 The remaining two blocks to the north of the Newmarket Road block would front onto River Lane and would be 3+1 storey and 2+1 storeys respectively. These two blocks would also be prominent in views from properties on Godesdone Road and Rowlinson Way. However, there is no specific guidance for the Rowlinson Way frontage in the SPD. I feel that a two and half storey form would be appropriate here, particularly adjacent to existing houses and the Conservation Area boundary.

8.13 The existing commercial buildings to the west of the site are single-storey, but they have high pitch-gabled roofs, and in my view, notwithstanding neighbour representations (which I have dealt with in detail below at paras 8.29, 8.30, 8.32a, 8.33 and 8.46), 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. Whilst the proposed scheme does marginally exceed the height of the HUB scheme in certain areas, the exceedance is not considered to be significant or such that it would result in making the development appear dominant or out of scale. The variation in roof line and shape is

considered to create architectural interest and an allusion to the commercial use of the site.

- 8.14 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.
- 8.15 In my view, the scale and massing of the proposal is appropriate for the context and in accordance with policies 3/4, 3/7, 3/12 and 4/11 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006, and the guidance of the Eastern Gate SPD. In reaching this view I have carefully considered the impact of the development on the setting of the Conservation Area which is a heritage asset.

Architectural detail and Materials

- 8.16 There are a number of elements which break up that mass of the blocks and emphasise verticality. On the Newmarket Road block the main entrance is articulated by a full height recessed section dressed in a standing seam zinc surround (to match the roof) with *brise solei* detailing to the stairwell which also controls excessive solar gain. 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 has been carefully articulated so it relates well to the Corner House PH and in my view successfully turns the corner onto River Lane by creating a continuous active frontage from Newmarket Road onto River Lane through the use of large recessed bay windows. The two rear blocks have pitched roofs and mono-pitch roof features and again, vertically proportioned window emphasis with timber privacy screens and projecting brick edge detailing to the window openings. These blocks would continue the use of zinc clad dormer windows in the roof which would also be clad in standing seam zinc.
- 8.17 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. The transition in

scale from the main four storey Newmarket Road block to the two and a half storey block is also considered to help assimilate the development with the more domestic scale to the north, east and west.

- 8.18 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 and former use of the site. Appropriate quality could be secured by condition.
- 8.19 In my view, the detailing and materials of the proposal are appropriate for the context and in accordance with policies 3/4, 3/7, 3/12 and 4/11 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006, and the guidance in paragraphs 3.4.18 to 3.4.20 of the Eastern Gate SPD.

Landscaping

- 8.20 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 proposed scheme would provide more circulation space between and around the buildings compared with the HUB scheme. This has resulted in a marginal increase in the height of the development, which, in my view, is an acceptable compromise. The landscape team have confirmed that they are content with the proposals and I share this view.
- 8.21 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. The landscape team are satisfied with the proposed development overall but have requested clarification on the tree cell details. However, they are confident that 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.

8.22 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.

Public Art

8.23 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.

8.24 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

8.25 The application proposes the use of photovoltaics, and combined heat and power. The sustainability officer is content that the carbon savings generated by the scheme would exceed the 10% required by policy. Along with these renewable energy provisions the proposal also includes a variety of other sustainable measures such as adopting a hierarchical approach to reducing energy use and carbon emissions, student travel packs to encourage sustainable transport including car club, use of water efficient appliances and sanitary ware, and targeting A rated materials where possible. All these measures are supported by the sustainability officer.

8.26 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

8.27 The Council's Access Officer has not raised any objection. The proposal includes 11 accessible rooms which is 5% of the student accommodation. Of the 11 rooms, 5 are identified as being suitable for wheelchair use from the outset and 6 rooms are identified as being designed for easy adaption.

8.28 In my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 3/7, 3/12 and 7/10.

Residential Amenity

Impact on amenity of neighbouring occupiers

Sunlight and daylight

8.29 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.

8.30 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 50 metres from the rear of the properties on Godesdone Road. The cores that project off the central block and north block would extend closer to the western boundary. 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 (e.g across the gardens to numbers 2 – 20 Godesdone Rd) on the northernmost Block. There are windows which give outlook in the north elevation. In order to mitigate

this they are angled windows directing views obliquely to the north east. Oblique views could be possible to the rear of the properties at 22a, 22b, 22c and 22d Godesdone road but at distances of no less than 28 metres. At this distance it would be difficult to argue there would be any undue loss of privacy. 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.

- 8.31 The two north blocks would each have a gable end adjacent to the garden boundaries of the properties in Godesdone Road. This would result in a material change to the outlook compared to the HUB scheme. The HUB scheme consisted of a two-storey pavilion building with a series of pitched roofs located adjacent to the boundary and extending along rear gardens of nos.4 to 16 Godesdone Road. The closest points of the central core and north core of the scheme would be located between 18 metres and 25.7 metres from the rear of the properties in Godesdone Road. This level of separation is considered to be acceptable in this urban context. Therefore the proposed scheme would, in my view, present a much better visual relationship to properties in Godesdone Road than the HUB scheme.

Beche Road

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

River Lane

- 8.33 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.

- 8.33a 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 are a minimum of 18 metres. 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 14/1154/FUL scheme at paragraph 24 of the appeal decision.

Visual domination

8.34 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 of approximately 19 metres. The current scheme has also reduced the massing of building at the west end of the Newmarket Road block. Having studied the verified views, 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 18 metres minimum (22a Godesdone Road) and 25.7 metres at the furthest (8 Godesdone Road). 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. Whilst I accept there are elements of the roof in the Newmarket Road and middle block that project above the height of the HUB scheme, I do not consider they would be excessive such that they would have a materially adverse impact on the houses in Godesdone Road. Furthermore, the applicant has produced verified images from the gardens of two of the properties in Godesdone Road to show how the proposed development would appear. The proposed development would not appear unduly dominant or overbearing particularly due to the level of separation. Given these conclusions, and coupled with the fact that the current scheme is for blocks which allow views/light through to the east and west and that the blocks are have been designed to with a

better layout and roof form, I am of the opinion that there are no grounds to resist the scheme in relation to visual dominance.

Noise and disturbance

8.35 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 is not close to neighbours, 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.

8.36 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

8.37 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, 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.

8.38 I acknowledge that the two courtyard spaces are relatively small. However, a single courtyard was proposed in the HUB 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 proposal would provide 690m² of usable amenity space whereas the HUB scheme provided 695². Therefore whilst the proposed scheme is to create two separate spaces, the total floor space would be comparable with the HUB scheme. The proposed scheme would also provide a significant amount of circulation and open space within and around the building compared to the HUB scheme. The proposed scheme would provide 757m² of circulation/open space compared to the 105m² in the HUB scheme. 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.

8.39 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

8.40 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.

8.41 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

- 8.42 The Highway Authority is of the opinion that the level of servicing, and proposed arrangements will not cause significant detriment to the operation of the public highway subject to conditions and S106. The County Council have also requested a financial contribution of £120,000 towards installation and maintenance of a crossing facility on Newmarket Road to be located between Abbey Street 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.
- 8.43 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 and monitored by a Travel Plan which would be secured via a S106. In terms of cycle parking provision, the proposal would provide 192 spaces; 148 for residents and 44 for visitors. The cycling officer has not commented on the application. The cycle parking would be located close to the Newmarket Road and River Lane corner. I am recommending a cycle parking condition to allow appropriate consideration of the cycle parking arrangements to ensure it is provided in accordance with the cycle parking standards.
- 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.

Third Party Representations

8.47 I have addressed most of the representation received through the neighbour notification process in the above section of the report. I set out below the representations that I have not addressed.

Representations	Response
<i>Context and design</i>	
Scheme does not respond to Conservation Area	See paragraphs 8.12 to 8.15
Scheme violates SPD height and form guidelines	See paragraphs 8.11 to 8.13
Scale of building, height and massing	See paragraphs 8.7 to 8.10
Out of keeping with the local residential area;	See paragraph 8.5
Too dominant and significantly higher than those buildings it replaces;	See paragraphs 8.6 to 8.12
Overdevelopment of the site such that it does not fit in the site boundaries;	The proposed development makes better use of the site than the HUB scheme.
The increased height on the western elevation up to 1.6 metres would significantly worsen the impact on Godesdone Road residents;	The refused (HUB) scheme has been allowed at appeal. The current proposals have been assessed on their own merits although the allowed appeal is a material consideration.
The elevation heights should be kept to the limits established by the consented scheme;	The refused (HUB) scheme has been allowed at appeal. The current proposals have been assessed on their own merits although the allowed appeal is a material consideration.
The development should take reference from buildings	See paragraph 8.11 and 8.15 and 8.17

immediately adjacent to the site which area two storey properties within the Conservation Area;	
<i>Neighbour amenity</i>	
Loss of privacy from overlooking to the properties in Beche Road and River Lane;	8.29 and 8.31
Privacy already affected by Travelodge Hotel on Newmarket Road;	Unreasonable to argue the Travelodge has any impact on privacy due to the level of separation.
The rear block is even more visually dominant for Godesdone Road houses;	See paragraphs 8.30 and 8.33
The increase in storey height over the consented scheme is a violation of the storey guidelines given in the SPD;	The current proposals have been assessed on their own merits although the allowed appeal is a material consideration.
The mullion screens at the rear of the Newmarket road section is inadequate;	See paragraph 8.29 and 8.32
Overlooking of surrounding houses	The proposal has been designed to mitigate against any unreasonable levels of overlooking. Any new windows that do directly face towards the surrounding properties are considered to be at a significant distance not to cause undue loss of privacy.
The flat roof area at the northern end which appears to be accessible is likely to become a communally accessed roof terrace. This would result in Godesdone Road properties being overlooked and significant noise risk;	The flat roof areas are not proposed to be used as general communal space.
The location of the communal areas are directly adjacent to the boundaries on the north side and there is a risk of noise from these areas;	The proposed development is set off the north, east and west boundaries. The space between the boundaries would be used as circulation space. The western

	boundary is proposed to be landscaped to mitigate any adverse levels of noise overspill.
The communal areas should be located closer to the centre to reduce risk of noise impacting surrounding properties;	The communal spaces are located in a similar location of the HUB scheme albeit in two separate areas. The communal space would also be located on a lower ground level and therefore along with boundary treatment and landscaping the impact from noise is likely to be mitigated.
The various iterations have steadily got worse over time and the latest scheme being 2.5 metre higher than the appeal scheme with extra student rooms;	The proposed scheme is considered to be an improvement on the HUB scheme.
The western elevation of the proposal will appear overbearing and block light into the gardens of the properties on Godesdone Road.	See paragraph 8.33
Inadequate proposals for noise control;	Controlled by condition.
Concerned with the potential impact of so many students on this quiet residential area;	The principle of a 202 students accommodation building has been established. Whilst the proposed scheme is for 17 more student rooms, I do not consider the additional rooms would cause significant increase in noise levels such that it warrant refusal of this application.
<i>Amenity of future occupiers</i>	
Sunken courtyards will lack sunlight and will be dominated by tall buildings.	See paragraph 8.36
Lack of green outdoor amenity space	See paragraph 8.37 – I have recommended a hard and soft landscaping
<i>Highway issues</i>	
No crossing facility for large number of students negotiating	This has not been raised as a highway safety issue by the

the River Lane/Newmarket Road junction.	Highway Authority.
The location of the Newmarket Road section up to the boundary line and corner of River Lane would reduce visibility for motorists turning into River Lane;	This has not been raised as a highway safety issue by the Highway Authority.
During term time drop off and pick up the proposal is likely to represent a significant disruption to traffic movement at an already restricted junction;	This will be addressed by the management plan
<i>Car parking</i>	
No evidence of further parking has been considered by the developer for disabled students;	Measure to restrict students from car ownership will be controlled by a Travel Plan secured in a S106. A management plan which will also be secured in a S106 will controlled drops offs and pick ups. The Access Officer has not raised any objections in this regard.
<i>Other issues</i>	
Failure to provide images of the scheme;	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.
Doubts over the accuracy of the drawings and buildings which compared to the previous schemes;	There is no reason to doubt the accuracy of the submitted plans. They are to scale.
The height measurements should be provided in the plans	This has been provided on drawing no. 1513_PL_203 rev A and 1513_PL_206 rev A.
Proposals do not accord with planning policies or the NPPF	The proposal is in accordance with the NPPF. The proposed scheme is considered to be a better overall scheme to the HUB scheme which the Inspector confirmed was compliant with the

	NPPF. Therefore, there is nothing to suggest as part of the current proposal that would materially change my view on this.
The developer is motivated by maximising income with little consideration for the surrounding area;	This is not a material planning consideration
The demolition work would involve part of a private garden wall;	The applicant will be seeking to update the topographical survey to provide clarity on the north western boundary. However, this does not prevent me from assessing the proposed development overall.
The Western Boundary plan shows structure that does not exist on site and inaccurately represents the boundary line;	The applicant will be submitting an updated topographical survey.
The plans are incorrect and the Planning Committee cannot be asked to approve an application;	The plans are to scale and whilst comparisons have been made with the HUB scheme I have also assessed the proposal on its own merits.
The topographical survey does not contain sufficient detail of the north western boundary;	The applicant is aware of this and is seeking to update the topographical survey.
Concerns with the amount of planning documents to review for this oversized development;	This is unfortunate but it is not a material planning consideration.
Impact on health from the stress caused by these proposals	This is unfortunate but it is not a material planning consideration.

Planning Obligations (s106 Agreement)

8.48 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.

8.49 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.

8.50 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:

8.51 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?	Coldham's Common demonstrates a well-placed site 81% but with a low offer of

		<p>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?	J52,998 Calculated as 219 no 1 person rooms @ J242 per unit = J52,998.
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.
3	Is a mitigation project proposed at a specific nearby location?	<p>Abbey Sports Centre and Gym Facility is within half a mile of the site</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Studio fit out/conversion & more gym equipment</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/></p>
4	How much S106 funding	J58,911

	is requested from the developer?	Calculated as 219 no 1 person units @ 269 per person = J58,911.
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?	<p>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</p> <p>This proposed development is within half a mile of the outdoor sports facilities at Abbey Sports Centre, which is on the council's 2016/17 target list of outdoor sports facilities for which specific S106 contributions may be sought. This target list was agreed by the City Councils Executive Councillor for Communities in June 2016 and is based on evidence and recommendations from the Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Playing Pitches Strategy.</p>
3	Is a mitigation project is proposed at a specific nearby location?	<p>Abbey Sports Centre - contribution towards:</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Artificial Training pitch and/or</p>

		<input type="checkbox"/> Training pitch improvements and drainage and/or <input type="checkbox"/> Floodlit training area on the grass pitches at Abbey Sports Centre and Gym <input type="checkbox"/>
4	How much S106 funding is requested from the developer?	J52,122 Calculated as 219 no I person units @ J238 per person = J52,122.
5	Have any contributions for this specific project been agreed since 6 April 2015?	TBC

6.52 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.

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

Table 6 Summary

Open Space	J52,998
Play Space	N/A – cannot seek contributions for schemes providing student accommodation
Indoor Sports	J58,911
Outdoor Sports	J52,122
Community Facilities	N/A – cannot seek contributions for schemes providing student accommodation

8.54 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

- 8.55 J120,000 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.
- 8.56 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

- 8.57 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

- 8.58 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), I am of the opinion that the current scheme, whilst it contains more units and is higher in places, represents a significant improvement and a better overall scheme. 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 December 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 to assess the contamination of the site, the following information shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority:

(a) Desk study to include:

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

-General environmental setting.

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

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

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

4. Submission of site investigation report and remediation strategy:

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

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

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

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

5. Implementation of remediation.

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

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

6. Completion report:

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

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

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

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

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

7. Material Management Plan:

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

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

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

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

8. Unexpected Contamination:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

13. 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.

14. 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

15. 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).

16. The external building envelope glazing element sound reduction performance / index (R_w) 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 20 May 2016 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.

17. Prior to the commencement of development/construction, details of an alternate ventilation scheme to open windows for the student accommodation shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The ventilation scheme shall source air from the rear of the development away from the road. The ventilation scheme shall achieve at least 2 air changes per hour.

The scheme shall be installed before the use hereby permitted is commenced and shall not be altered.

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 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.

20. 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.

21. Full details of all windows and doors, including the obscure glazed and translucent sections facing Godesdone Road, Newmarket Road, Rowlinson Way and River Lane, 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.

22. 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)

23. 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)

24. 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)

25. No development shall take place until there has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority a plan illustrating tree pit design for all new tree planting. These details shall include all root cell designs in section and plan so that the full extents of the area of root volume provided can be assessed. The details shall also include all other features such as irrigation methods, guying/staking, soil type and quality/quantity, drainage (where needed), tree protection methods, tree furniture, and any other features needed to ensure establishment and continued thriving of the proposed tree. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

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)

26. 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)

27. 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)

28. 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.

29. 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.

30. 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.

31. 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)

32. 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.

33. 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

34. 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

35. 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 a peak flow of 28 l/s 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 which shall include the arrangements for adoption by any public authority or statutory undertaker and any other arrangements to secure the operation of the scheme throughout its lifetime.
- iii. The surface water drainage scheme shall be managed and maintained thereafter in accordance with the agreed management and maintenance plan.

Reason: To ensure appropriate surface water drainage.
(Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 4/16)

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: To satisfy the plant noise insulation condition, the rating level (in accordance with BS4142:2014) from all plant, equipment and vents etc (collectively) associated with this application should be less than or equal to the existing background level (L90) at the boundary of the premises subject to this application and having regard to noise sensitive premises.

Tonal/impulsive noise frequencies should be eliminated or at least considered in any assessment and should carry an additional correction in accordance with BS4142:2014. This is to prevent unreasonable noise disturbance to other premises. This requirement applies both during the day (0700 to 2300 hrs over any one hour period) and night time (2300 to 0700 hrs over any one 15 minute period).

It is recommended that the agent/applicant submits a noise prediction survey/report in accordance with the principles of BS4142: 2014 "Methods for rating and assessing industrial and commercial sound" or similar, concerning the effects on amenity rather than likelihood for complaints. Noise levels shall be predicted at the boundary having regard to neighbouring premises.

It is important to note that a full BS4142:2014 assessment is not required, only certain aspects to be incorporated into a noise assessment as described within this informative.

Such a survey / report should include: a large scale plan of the site in relation to neighbouring premises; noise sources and measurement / prediction points marked on plan; a list of noise sources; details of proposed noise sources / type of plant such as: number, location, sound power levels, noise frequency spectrums, noise directionality of plant, noise levels from duct intake or discharge points; details of noise mitigation measures (attenuation details of any intended enclosures, silencers or barriers); description of full noise calculation procedures; noise levels at a representative sample of noise sensitive locations and hours of operation.

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

INFORMATIVE: Dust condition informative

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

-Council's Supplementary Planning Document - "Sustainable Design and Construction 2007":

<http://www.cambridge.gov.uk/public/docs/sustainable-design-and-construction-spd.pdf>

-Guidance on the assessment of dust from demolition and construction

http://iaqm.co.uk/wp-content/uploads/guidance/iaqm_guidance_report_draft1.4.pdf

-Control of dust and emissions during construction and demolition - supplementary planning guidance

https://www.london.gov.uk/sites/default/files/Dust%20and%20Emissions%20SPG%208%20July%202014_0.pdf

INFORMATIVE: 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: 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>)

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.