

Application Number	15/1759/FUL	Agenda Item	
Date Received	12th November 2015	Officer	Sarah Dyer
Target Date	11th February 2016		
Ward	Trumpington		
Site	Murdoch House 40 - 44 Station Road And Remains Of Former Silo Associated With Fosters Mill Cambridge CB1 2JH		
Proposal	The demolition of Murdoch House and the remains of the former Silo and the construction of two new mixed use buildings comprising 767sqm office floorspace (Class B1), 419sqm retail/cafe/restaurant floorspace (Class A1/A3) and 65 residential units for Block I1 and 473sqm retail/cafe/restaurant floorspace (Class A1/A3) and 24 residential units for Block K1, including ancillary accommodation/facilities with a single basement and 71 car parking spaces, with associated plant, 218 internal and external cycle parking spaces, and hard and soft landscaping.		
Applicant	Brookgate CB1 Limited		

<p>SUMMARY</p>	<p>The development accords with the Development Plan for the following reasons:</p> <p>Together with other parts of the CB1 development this scheme will provide a sustainable form of development close to Cambridge Station in accordance with government policy (NPPF)</p> <p>Information has been submitted to demonstrate that the development is unviable and unable to provide any affordable housing. This recommendation of approval follows government guidance which is that:</p> <p><i>Where an applicant is able to demonstrate to the satisfaction of the local planning authority that the planning obligation would cause the development to be unviable, the</i></p>
----------------	---

	<p><i>local planning authority should be flexible in seeking planning obligations.</i></p> <p>The development would secure the removal of Murdoch House which has an adverse impact on the setting of the listed Station building, the Conservation Area and the Station Area as a gateway into the city for visitors.</p>
RECOMMENDATION	APPROVAL

1.0 SITE DESCRIPTION/AREA CONTEXT

- 1.1 The application site forms part of a larger area, which is the subject of the CB1 Station Area Redevelopment proposals for which outline planning permission was granted in April 2010. The site lies on the south side of Station Road and is currently occupied by a three storey office building known as Murdoch House, and the remains of the Silo, which was substantially destroyed by fire in 2010.
- 1.2 The northern boundary of the site is the pavement on the south side of Station Road. To the west is the site of 50-60 Station Road and to the east is the bus interchange. To the south/rear are residential flats (the Ceres development) and the converted Mill.
- 1.3 The site is within the Station Area Redevelopment Framework boundary and within the Central Conservation Area. The trees on the site are protected by virtue of their location in a Conservation Area. The site falls within the Controlled Parking Zone.

2.0 THE PROPOSAL

- 2.1 Full planning permission is sought for two buildings, which are identified as Blocks I1 and K1 on the approved parameter plans. The proposed buildings would replace Murdoch House and the remains of the Silo. Across the two blocks a total of 89 units would be accommodated, 46 one bedroom and 43 two bedroom.

Block I1

- 2.2 Block I1 would replace Murdoch House and would be eight storeys tall, with the top two storeys set back. The building would provide 419sqm of commercial space (Use Class A1/A3) on the ground floor, 767sqm of office space (Use Class B1) on the first floor and 65 residential units on the upper floors.

Block K1

- 2.3 Block K1 would replace the remains of the Silo and would be nine storeys tall, with the top two storeys set back. The building would provide 473sqm of commercial space (Use Class A1/A3) on the ground and first floors and 24 residential units on the upper floors.
- 2.4 A single level basement is proposed under both buildings, to accommodate 71 car parking spaces and 190 cycle parking spaces. A further 28 cycle parking spaces would be provided at the front of Block I1. The basement would be accessed by cars via two car lifts on the eastern side of Block I1. Cyclists and pedestrians would access the basement via a staircase and cycle wheel ramp on the eastern side of Block I1.
- 2.5 Full planning permission is required because the proposed buildings differ from the parameter plans in the following ways:
- Use – the parameter plans show the upper floors as in office use and it is now proposed that the upper floors are in residential use.
 - Altered footprint to Block I1.
 - Silo lost to fire – the parameter plans show the Silo converted. A replacement building (Block K1) is now proposed.

3.0 SITE HISTORY

Reference	Description	Outcome
05/1094/FUL	Conversion and change of use of the silo and construction of two modern wings to provide storage, reading rooms and administrative offices and staff facilities to form a Historical Resource and	Approved

08/0266/OUT Cultural Centre. The comprehensive redevelopment of the Station Road area, comprising up to 331 residential units (inclusive of 40% affordable homes), 1,250 student units; 53,294 sq m of Class B1a (Office) floorspace; 5,255 sq m of Classes A1 /A3/A4 and/or A5 (retail) floorspace; a 7,645 sq.m polyclinic; 86 sq.m of D1 (art workshop) floorspace; 46 sq m D1 (community room); 1,753 sq m of D1 and/or D2 (gym, nursery, student/community facilities) floorspace; use of block G2 (854 sq.m) as either residential student or doctors surgery, and a 6,479 sq.m hotel; along with a new transport interchange and station square, including 28 taxi bays and 9 bus stops (2 of which are double stops providing 11 bays in total), a new multi storey cycle and car park including accommodation for c. 2,812 cycle spaces, 52 motorcycle spaces and 632 car parking spaces; highway works including improvements to the existing Hills Road / Brooklands Avenue junction and the Hills Road / Station Road junction and other highway improvements, along with an improved pedestrian / cyclist connection with the Carter Bridge; and works to create new and improved private and public spaces.

Approved

4.0 PUBLICITY

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

5.0 POLICY

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

5.2 Relevant Development Plan policies

PLAN	POLICY NUMBER
Cambridge Local Plan 2006	3/1 3/4 3/7 3/11 3/12 3/13 4/4 4/7 4/11 4/12 4/13 4/14 4/15 5/5, 5/10 7/2 8/2 8/4 8/6 8/9 8/10 8/16 8/18 9/1 9/9 10/1

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

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

<p>Supplementary Planning Guidance</p>	<p>Sustainable Design and Construction (May 2007)</p> <p>Planning Obligation Strategy (March 2010)</p> <p>Public Art (January 2010)</p> <p>Affordable Housing SPD (January 2008)</p>
<p>Material Considerations</p>	<p><u>City Wide Guidance</u></p> <p>Biodiversity Checklist for Land Use Planners in Cambridgeshire and Peterborough (March 2001).</p> <p>Cambridge City Nature Conservation Strategy (2006)</p> <p>Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (November 2010)</p> <p>Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (2005)</p> <p>Cambridge and Milton Surface Water Management Plan (2011)</p> <p>Cambridgeshire Quality Charter for Growth (2008)</p> <p>Cambridge City Council - Guidance for the application of Policy 3/13 (Tall Buildings and the Skyline) of the Cambridge Local Plan (2006) (2012)</p> <p>Cambridge Walking and Cycling Strategy (2002)</p> <p>Protection and Funding of Routes for the Future Expansion of the City Cycle Network (2004)</p>

	<p>Cambridgeshire Design Guide For Streets and Public Realm (2007)</p> <p>Air Quality in Cambridge – Developers Guide (2008)</p>
	<p><u>Area Guidelines</u></p> <p>Cambridge City Council (2002)–Southern Corridor Area Transport Plan:</p> <p>Station Area Development Framework (2004) includes the Station Area Conservation Appraisal.</p>

5.4 Status of Proposed Submission – Cambridge Local Plan

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

For the application considered in this report, there are no policies in the emerging Local Plan that should be taken into account.

6.0 CONSULTATIONS

Cambridgeshire County Council (Highways Development Management)

Application as submitted

- 6.1 Consultation required with Growth and Economy team. Transport Assessment incomplete with regard to cycle parking impact on lift demands.

Comments from Growth and Economy team

- 6.2 All mitigation measures identified for this land parcel as part of the outline permission to be secured against this application.

Site Accessibility Audit - acceptable.

Highway Safety – further information regarding accident data required.

Existing Trip Generation - The existing trip generation has been based on a survey undertaken at Murdoch House in June 2015, which is acceptable.

Proposed Development

Overview - the current proposals will result in a net decrease in office and retail floor area and an increase in residential units compared to the permitted outline use.

Site Access - lift queue modelling needs to be updated to reflect use by cyclists and the stacking capacity between the car park access and the public highway should be stated.

Car parking - The car parking provision is below maximum car parking standards and the applicant should commit to the securing of car parking monitoring surveys on local streets in accordance with the outline permission.

Cycle Parking

The cycle parking provision is in accordance with the outline permission and complies with minimum cycle parking standards

for the residential and B1 office units. According to minimum standards the café/ restaurant would require 53 cycle parking spaces to be provided. A cycle accumulation analysis should be provided for the site to demonstrate that the level of cycle parking provision is adequate for expected demand.

The details of the visitor parking management should be detailed and secured as part of a cycle management strategy as part of the Travel Plan for the site.

Trip Generation - Residential Trips and Office Trips are consistent with those presented in the CB1 Revised Transport Assessment. Further justification should be provided concerning the proportion of linked or pass-by trips to the retail/restaurant/café.

Traffic Impact and Mitigation

Active Travel Mitigation Measures - The Transport Assessment demonstrates that the trip generation for the proposed development is less than what was previously approved for the outline application for the site. Therefore the development is demonstrated to have no worse impact on the network than what was approved previously through the outline permission. The outline permission was supported by a package of mitigation/ contributions therefore an appropriate mitigation package will need to be agreed with CCC for this revised application.

Queue Assessment - The applicant should confirm the stacking capacity within the site for those waiting to access the basement car park, in order for CCC to understand whether there is a potential impact on the public highway. Accumulation analysis is also required.

Travel Plan - The TA should be secured through S106 agreement. The Travel Plan should cover all users of the site not just residential. It is not clear when the final travel plan will be provided to and agreed with CCC. This needs to be revisited. A commitment should be included to provide to annual monitoring report to CCC for comment. The Travel Plan should be monitored for a minimum of 5 years.

Interim Target Mode Split - The target for Car Drivers is 20% however it is not clear how this relates to the car park provision on site, therefore further information is required.

Walking and cycling - Recommend that free cycle training (including maintenance training) is provided to achieve best possible cycling figures. Recommend provision of lockers for cyclists/runners/walkers and a drying room facility to allow all year cycling/walking. The measures need to be tailored for each of the different users groups of the site.

Servicing & Delivery trips - It is not made clear what the mechanism will be for coordinating services and deliveries, will the occupier be encouraged to do so and if so when?

Further comments regarding the Travel Plan Coordinator and Travel Surveys.

Conclusions - The above issues need to be addressed before the transport implications of the development can be fully assessed. Accordingly CCC submits a holding objection.

Comments following further information

6.3 Highway Safety – more recent data should be used.

Site Access - CCC remains concerned that cyclists will use the lifts and therefore requires that the lift queue modelling be updated to reflect this.

Car parking - It is noted that the car parking surveys will be secured as part of the S106 for the development.

Cycle Parking - The applicant has provided additional explanation concerning the level of non-staff cycle parking for the retail/restaurants use, however CCC remain to be convinced concerning the balance of cycle parking proposed for staff and non-staff of the retail/ restaurant uses.

Trip Generation

Retail Trips - CCC remains to be convinced by linked, pass by and diverted trips to the retail/ restaurant uses on site, therefore further justification should be provided.

Queue Assessment - although the stacking capacity was discussed at the pre-application stage it is for the application to demonstrate that the stacking capacity provided is satisfactory and whether cars from the site queue onto the public highway during the AM and PM peak periods.

CCC requires that the applicant provide details of the hourly capacity of the lift and how this compares to the arrivals and departures in the AM and PM peak periods. This is to understand how the lift capacity and the arrivals and departures associated with the development compare during the peak periods and how this impacts on the available stacking capacity.

Car Parking Accumulation - the car parking accumulation analysis is considered to be appropriate for the purpose of this application.

Travel Plan - The Travel Plan (TP) will need to be updated and agreed with CCC prior to occupation. The TA should be secured through S106 agreement.

The above issues need to be addressed before the transport implications of the development can be fully assessed. Accordingly CCC submits a holding objection.

Comments following further information

- 6.4 County Council consider the transfer trips to be reasonable. The lift analysis provides reassurance concerning the cycle times for the lift. In addition, the County Council considers that any potential queuing associated with cars and cyclists associated with the lift could be overcome with a cycle strategy which requires the applicant to control the number of cyclists using the lift.

Therefore the County Council are able to lift the holding objection subject to the follow being secured through S106:

- A cycle strategy to control the number of cycles using the lift and to monitor and manage use of the cycle parking along the frontage of the development.
- A contribution will need to be secured with the applicant for wider off-site mitigation measures.

- A Travel Plan for each of the uses on site prior to occupation
- A contribution towards the costs incurred in implementing a residential controlled parking scheme.

6.5 The Highway Engineer has no concerns about highway safety.

Environmental Health

6.6 No objection subject to conditions relating to construction/demolition hours, collections and deliveries during construction/demolition, construction/demolition noise, dust, noise insulation scheme, plant noise insulation, odour/fume filtration, contaminated land, opening hours for A1/A3, delivery hours for A1/A3, electric vehicle recharge bays and electric cycle recharge points.

Refuse and Recycling

6.7 The suggested refuse stores, for both residential and office are satisfactory – they will be brought to kerbside by building facility staff for collection. The very last page shows in poor detail the collection point, which does not seem very adequate, as it will block the pavement and be on a corner which is far from ideal for emptying. It is advised that in front of the substation/gas room would be a better position. (Access to these rooms being infrequent and unlikely at the time we/other companies collect waste).

6.8 The commercial refuse store – yet to be determined in size/type – is difficult to comment on although its ground level position seems adequate.

Urban Design and Conservation Team

6.9 In terms of the overall design and relationship to the listed station building and wider Conservation Area, both K1 and I1 are considered acceptable in conservation and urban design terms. K1 has the potential to create a striking and well composed 'replacement' for the lost Silo and the opportunities created through that loss will improve the composition and containment of Station Square and improve circulation routes between it and the 'ante chamber' located to the south west. I1 will help to complete and balance the composition of buildings around Station Square whilst effectively responding to the

adjacent approved development at 50 & 60 Station Road. Conditions are recommended relating to materials samples, glass types, brick/stone sample panel, solar panels, balustrades and railings, access to the car park, lighting, signage, and rooftop plant.

Additional detailed comments from the UDC team are embedded in my Assessment.

Senior Sustainability Officer (Design and Construction)

6.10 No objection subject to conditions relating to renewable energy and BREEAM

Access Officer

6.11 The entrance doors to K1 should be electrically assisted. Twelve flats should be built to lifetime homes standards.

Head of Streets and Open Spaces (Landscape Team)

6.12 No objection. The public realm proposals for the area around Blocks I1 and K1 will do much to add to the quality of the CB1 development and particularly Station Square and the culmination of Station Road. The hard paving materials match that already accepted for Station Square. The planting proposals for the area include eleven large species trees planted into the hard paving. No conditions are recommended.

Following submission of tree pit details

The assurances are that:

- the rooting space and volume will be adequate to allow the full number of trees to thrive and also to anchor themselves to resist wind loading.
- the structural strength of the development is adequate to withstand the wind loading on the trees and is adequate to accommodate the increasing weight of maturing large species trees.

With these assurances, the Landscape officer is happy to support the landscape proposals.

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

- 6.13 Evidence from blocks already occupied within the station area is that residents prefer to leave their cycles on street rather than negotiate steep ramps and use the two tier cycle parking. Access to the basement, therefore needs to be as easy as possible and a gradient of 1 in 4 is recommended, rather than the 1 in 3 proposed. The material used for the ramp must be non-slip – again, the metal used for the ramps within the existing blocks is slippery when wet and so is unsuitable. The doors into the basement must be automatic.

Two-tier racks are not suitable for residential use. For staff there should be a minimum of 20% which are Sheffield stands for non-standard bikes, those with child seats, large baskets etc.

There must be a minimum of 2.2m aisle width, 2.5m preferred, between rows of two-tier racks.

The doors to the middle cycle store at the northern end should open outwardly to avoid clashing with poorly parked cycles.

Following submission of further information

The applicant has made changes to the basement layout in order to provide additional Sheffield stands and this is welcomed although the use of double stacker stands is not recommended for residential use.

A condition is needed to ensure that the doors at the bottom of the ramped stairs and to the cycle parking areas themselves are automatic to improve ease of use.

The ramped stairs remain fairly steep at 1:3 rather than the recommended 1:4. Detail of the material of the ramp and steps should also be conditioned.

Additional visitor parking should be provided next to the residential entrance to block K1

It is not clear how retail staff for K1 exit the basement and access the retail unit. Use of the ramped steps is not

acceptable as this is not convenient and is likely to result in staff using the visitor stands at street level.

Cambridgeshire County Council (Flood and Water Management) and Head of Streets and Open Spaces (Sustainable Drainage Officer)

Application as submitted

- 6.14 Calculations and design details of the linear drainage channels are required to demonstrate that there will be no surface flooding for a 1 in 30 year event and that no water leaves the site for a 1 in 100 year plus climate change.

Following submission of further information

- 6.15 Details acceptable – no conditions required.

Historic England

- 6.16 Historic England does not object to this application, but strongly recommends that if the application is to be approved a condition is included to require the full recording of the Silo and its history, and for a copy of that record to be placed in the Cambridgeshire Historic Environment Record before the remains of the Silo can be removed. Conditions would also be required to control the installation of signage and advertising on the commercial units.

Following submission of further information

- 6.17 A recording report has been placed in the Cambridgeshire Historic Environment Record and Historic England has confirmed that the condition is no longer required.

Natural England

- 6.18 No objection. The application is not likely to result in significant impacts on statutory designated nature conservation sites or landscapes.

Environment Agency

- 6.19 No objection, subject to conditions relating to ground water and contaminated land.

Anglian Water

6.20 No objection, subject to conditions relating to foul sewage and surface water disposal.

Cambridgeshire Constabulary (Architectural Liaison Officer)

6.21 No objection.

CCTV Manager

6.22 No objection.

Network Rail

6.23 No objection.

Cambridgeshire County Council (Education and Strategic Waste Infrastructure)

6.24 The County Council does not require any developer contributions in regards to education, libraries and strategic waste infrastructure

Design and Conservation Panel (Meeting of 11 February 2015) (Pre App)

6.25 Block I1

- Residential use

In the Panel's view, the impact of a residential use in this corner site will be considerable. The building has a distinctly corporate character that does not anticipate the variety that accompanies residential occupancy and is residential architecture at its most suppressed.

- Car lifts

The Panel enquired as to the level of activity at peak times and the likelihood of queues impacting on Station Road traffic

movements. (The Panel were informed that the Highways Authority were comfortable with the proposals.)

- Basement cycle parking (staircase)

The Panel would urge that the access staircase is re-designed as a dog-leg staircase can make manoeuvring cycles around the corner very difficult.

- Arcading

As the height of the arcade reads the same as 1 The Square and has a generous 3m set back, careful consideration will need to be given to hanging signage and its impact on the sense of space.

- West elevation

Concern was expressed by the panel about the completely different nature of the west elevation with protruding balconies, which seemed to have very little architectural relationship with the rest of the block. Little appreciation could be gained of the quality of the balcony spaces and how residents would experience them. With no signs of life portrayed, the depiction was viewed by the Panel as entirely corporate.

- Fins to balconies.

The Panel were informed that bronze coloured fins would be added to the balconies to ensure privacy from the adjacent offices. The louvers were difficult to detect in the illustrations provided, but there was a sense that the building would not appear as 'seamless' as in the illustrations, especially when seen from Station Road. Further work on the detailing is therefore encouraged and should be brought back to the panel.

- Fritted glass

The Panel were not entirely comfortable with this predominantly corporate approach to controlling the fenestration. Greater nuance is needed in a residential development.

- Long views (from the hotel at the northern end of The Square)

In the Panel's view, as this building will appear higher than in the recommended parameter plan, the two storey block set back behind a parapet will appear ungainly. A more elegant solution for the penthouse block should be explored.

- Solar heat gain

The elevation facing due east towards the Station Building is likely to experience solar heat gain. It would therefore be important for this residential block to have openable windows.

Block K1

- Enclosing The Square

Although the Panel could see the benefits of this lozenge shaped building in terms of its effective relationship with the Mill, there was some discussion as to its impact on the southern side of the Square. It could be argued that the square has now lost its sense of enclosure due to a building that establishes a far looser boundary on this southern edge

- Referencing the proportions of the former Silo (Ground floor + 9 storeys)

As the silo has been lost, the Panel questioned the validity of using the previous scheme incorporating the silo as the basis for making decisions about the new buildings. As it is recorded only in record photographs and not in the built form, they feel that it is irrelevant to current discussions. Although the commercial argument is understood, the proposal for nine storeys + GF would not relate to any existing structures in this area. The design team are reminded of the need for an appropriate relationship of buildings for this part of Cambridge.

- Ground floor + 8 storeys

The Panel felt that this height was more appropriate as it related with the shoulder height of Block I1 and therefore to the wider family of buildings, providing a degree of continuity. The panel felt it created an elegant proportion without needing an additional storey height as the design team suggested.

- Overlooking between flats.

The building's close proximity to the Mill at the NW corner with only 3 metres of separation, raised concerns regarding the impact on the quality of the adjacent living spaces in both schemes in terms of natural light levels and problems of overlooking. More detailed studies of the issues around this adjacency are required.

- Ventilation grills

The Panel would welcome clarity on the materials used for the ventilation grilles and how they would appear as darker vertical stripes on the elevations.

- Amenity spaces

Block K1 with its lack of balconies etc. has much less amenity space than neighbouring I1. The design team are reminded of the need to provide high quality residential accommodation in this area that exceeds that of the student accommodation already provided nearby.

- Central lift lobby

There seems to be no daylighting to the central lift lobby within the block. This should aim to provide a high quality entrance space to the apartments

- Micro climate

The Panel expressed some concern regarding the potential 'wind tunnel' effect created within the narrow canyon between the Mill and K1 and at I1's NW corner.

Conclusion

Although the Panel were comfortable in principle with K1's 'lozenge' form, they would like to see the scheme developed in more detail. Both blocks seemed to deny rather than accommodate the residential users within an overall corporate expression. The elevations on both I1 and K1 as depicted seem light on actual detail that reveals a lack of embrace of the residential. The elevations need to be more convincingly

thought through and firmer about the quality of the detailing, if the scheme is to create a successful addition to the end of Station Square.

VERDICT (on Blocks I1 and K1) – AMBER (unanimous)

Design and Conservation Panel (Meeting of 13 July 2016)

6.26 Block I1

- Residential use. I1 was described as ‘corporate’ in character. The façade facing the Square has now been remodelled with a double storey colonnade for the ground and first floors. The use of more brick including in the columns, is intended to provide a more grounded, residential feel. Juliet balconies have been introduced, where appropriate, and a transom to windows to accommodate openable windows and separate the lower panels with obscured glazing for privacy from clear glazing above.
- Basement cycle parking. Access has now been reconfigured with a route from ground floor level at a gradient which has been established within CB1. The basement has also been separated into the different uses and parking areas. Bins will also be stored at basement level and managed.
- West elevation and balconies. Horizontal stone banding has been introduced to bind all four facades including the balconies so the block reads more as a single building. The fins on the western elevation have been removed.
- Fritted glazing and solar heat gain. This will be used to obscure some of the residential activity from street level. The brise soleil at the top level has been broken down for a more modular treatment. Windows on the south-facing façade are now narrower to mitigate solar gain.
- The top floor duplex units have been recessed.

Block K1

- Height of Building Now reduced to ground floor + 8 storeys. The building height has been reduced so that K1 and I1 can be read more as a pair but are still distinguished by the materials used. Horizontal bands have been added to counter the relentless verticality.
- Double-height crown. The building in general has a narrower and more slender proportion which reveals more of the northern

elevation of the Mill giving it a presence on the square. Particularly at the top level, the new transparency adds lightness to the massing.

- Overlooking between flats - proximity of K1 to the Mill. The building has been moved 1m north towards the Square in order to address the issue of privacy. Obscured glass has already been fitted to adjacent windows in the Mill building.
- Residential lobby area. This has been recessed into the façade to provide shelter.

Conclusions

The design team have responded well to the comments made at the last review and the provision of additional information on materials and detailing is welcomed. In terms of Block I1, the Panel still had some lingering concerns regarding bin storage and servicing arrangements and how these vehicular movements within such a public circulation space would work in practice. In general terms however, the new design appears to be better able to accommodate the façade variation that is an inevitable aspect of it becoming a residential, rather than a commercial block.

Block K1 has a more dynamic shape but more importantly reveals more of the gable of the Mill building. The Panel again considered the proximity issue but the opaque glazing applied to all three floors of the Mill provides some privacy for those flats. Decisions on whether curved or faceted glass is used will make a significant difference to the detailing of K1. The design team are also asked to carefully consider the detailing of the roof top plant as this will impact on views both from the Square and from adjacent buildings.

2. Public realm and landscaping.

The antechamber space is under construction. There is still the need to deliver the wholly pedestrian NE corner of Station Square where service points will be provided to facilitate weekend market stalls. Granite sets will continue the hard landscaping over the busway although crossing points will be made of a different material to provide a degree of formality for the benefit of the visually impaired, disabled or parents with buggies. The space around Block K1 is intended to be a quieter environment with benches inviting pedestrians to pause. This

area will however relate to the larger Square as a whole. Plane trees will be planted over basement spaces

Conclusion

The Panel note that the original 2010 Landscape Strategy is being adhered to in terms of the planting etc. The inclusion of benches that provide the additional function of ventilation for basement car parking is a welcome response to the Panel's comments from last time.

Issues have been highlighted regarding the trees at 22 Station Road. The Panel feel it is crucial that the trees are provided with the appropriate volume of soil and irrigation in order to flourish.

The Panel appreciate the opportunity to see these blocks again and for the substantial and significant progress made since last time.

VERDICT (on Blocks I1, K1 and the landscaping) – GREEN (unanimous)

Developer Contributions Monitoring Unit

6.27 Consultation response from Developer Contributions Monitoring Unit

Community facilities:

What are the additional needs to be mitigated?

Using the assumptions included in the council's Planning Obligations Strategy SPD 2010 about the numbers of residents per size of dwelling, this proposed development could lead to a population increase of more than 150 residents. Its proximity to the railway station would suggest that many residents from this development might commute to work by train, leading to a particular need for community facilities outside working hours, during the evenings and at weekends. At the same time, given that no affordable housing is proposed in the current planning application, it would be reasonable for this proposed development to promote wider community cohesion on the CB1 site. There are two main needs.

a. A community development resource (in the form of a part-time community developer worker) is vital to integrate these next phases of proposed development into what is a relatively new community on the CB1 site (within the last few years), which is still in its formative stages. The mix of residential accommodation (both private and social housing) with student accommodation brings together a wide variety of people and expectations. The role would help to develop better understanding and respect between neighbours (manifested in greater consideration and tolerance) and foster better relationships and a sense of being part of the same community.

b. The increase in the local population will place extra demands on four community facilities within the immediate vicinity of the proposed development. Three of these (Huxley House, the Signal Box and the community meeting space at Hanover Court and Princess Court are small venues which could not be expanded. However the council has plans to develop community facilities at The Junction, which is within five minutes' walk of the proposed development. Owned by the council, The Junction is already a popular local arts venue, for which there are plans for wider refurbishment and development.

How much would the council seek in S106 contributions in order to mitigate this proposed development?

In line with the funding formula set out in the council's Planning Obligations Strategy 2010, this scale of this proposed development would require S106 contributions of £111,784 (plus indexation).

This is in the context of an earlier S106 agreement since April 2010, relating to the outline application for the CB1 development (08/0266/OUT), which included 331 residential dwellings. As well as securing the on-site community facility provision (Huxley House), £32,706 was collected for a community development worker (now fully spent) and a further £97,947 has been collected for improvements to The Junction or another community facility.

Any suggestion that a £111,784 contribution request for 89 dwellings would be disproportionate with the earlier £130,653 contribution from 08/0266/OUT for 331 dwellings needs to be countered with a reminder that the costs of the on-site provision

of the Huxley House community facility also need to be taken into account. The current request for the proposed new development, which did not form part of the 08/0266/OUT outline application, is therefore fair and reasonable in scale and kind to the proposed development.

How would the requested developer contributions be used on specific projects?

Of the £111,784 (plus indexation),

a. £50,000 (plus indexation) would enable the council to employ a community development officer (pay band 5) for two days a week for three years (including support costs, such as pension and national insurance). Given the high proportion of commuters living on the CB1 site, this role would be recruited to work mainly in the evenings and at weekends, and would liaise closely with the council's Community Safety team.

b. The remaining £61,784 (plus indexation) would be put towards the provision of new multi-purpose, flexible community meeting space within the re-development plans for the Junction site (as part of a wider planned redevelopment of The Junction). This meeting space would provide an opportunity for hosting larger scale community events and activities, and could also be hired out to community groups for community activities.

These requests comply with the CIL regulations, including the pooling constraints which mean that no more than five specific S106 contributions can be collected for the same project. The only specific contributions similar to the projects outlined above, which have been collected since April 2010, relate to the CB1 Cambridge Station redevelopment (08/0266/OUT). The costs of the new multi-purpose, flexible community meeting space at The Junction would exceed the combined total of the £97,947 already collected from the 08/0266/FUL and the amount now requested from this proposed development. The other funding requested will be raised from other sources.

Indoor sports:

The proposed development is within half a mile of the Kelsey Kerridge Sports Centre facility, which is on the Council's 2016/17 target list of indoor sports facilities for which specific

S106 contributions may be sought in order to mitigate the impact of development. This target list was agreed by the City Council's Executive Councillor for Communities in June 2016.

Given the scale of the proposed development on this site, and in line with the funding formula set out in the Council's Planning Obligations Strategy 2010, a specific S106 contribution of £41,137 (plus indexation) is requested towards the provision of a multi-purpose studio at Kelsey Kerridge Sports Centre, Queen Anne Terrace, Cambridge, CB1 1NA.

Under the S106 pooling constraint regulations, no more than five specific S106 contributions can be agreed for the same project. So far, one specific contribution has been proposed for this project, namely the one associated with development at 64 Newmarket Road (14/1905/FUL).

Outdoor sports:

This proposed development is within half a mile of Coleridge Recreation Ground, which is on the Council's 2016/17 'target list' of outdoor sports facilities for which specific S106 contributions may be sought in order to mitigate the impact of development. This target list was agreed by the City Council's Executive Councillor for Communities in June 2016 and is based on evidence and recommendations from the Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Playing Pitches Strategy (2016).

Given the scale of the proposed development on this site, and in line with the funding formula set out in the Council's Planning Obligations Strategy 2010, a specific S106 contribution of £36,414 (plus indexation) is requested towards the provision and/or improvement of outdoor sports pitches and changing rooms at Coleridge Recreation Ground.

Under the S106 pooling constraint regulations, no more than five specific S106 contributions can be agreed for the same project. So far, the council has not agreed any other specific contributions for this project.

Informal open space:

1. This proposed development is within half a mile of Coleridge Recreation Ground, which is on the Council's 2016/17 'target

list' of informal open spaces for which specific S106 contributions may be sought. This target list was agreed by the City Council's Executive Councillor for City Centre and Public Places in March 2016 and is based on evidence the 2015/16 informal open spaces audit. Coleridge Recreation Ground was rated as 67% for being well-placed, but only 58% for the open space facilities on offer, denoting room for improvement in order to mitigate the impact of local development on the natural environment.

Given the scale of the proposed development on this site, and in line with the funding formula set out in the Council's Planning Obligations Strategy 2010, a specific S106 contribution of £22,026 (plus indexation) is requested for the improving facilities, equipment and access to the open spaces at Coleridge Recreation Ground. This could be used, for example, for the provision of new benches, bins, noticeboards, interpretation boards, footpath surface signs, tree planting and new boundary hedges.

Under the S106 pooling constraint regulations, no more than five specific S106 contributions can be agreed for the same project. So far, one specific contribution has been proposed for this project, namely the one associated with development at 60-80 Perne Road (16/0641/FUL).

2. This proposed development is within a mile of Coe Fen, which is on the Council's 2016/17 'target list' of informal open spaces for which specific S106 contributions may be sought. This target list was agreed by the City Council's Executive Councillor for City Centre and Public Places in March 2016 and is based on evidence the 2015/16 informal open spaces audit. Coe Fen was rated as 52% for being well-placed, but only 55% for the open space facilities on offer, denoting room for improvement in order to mitigate the impact of local development on the natural environment.

Given the scale of the proposed development on this site, and in line with the funding formula set out in the Council's Planning Obligations Strategy 2010, a specific S106 contribution of £15,000 (plus indexation) is requested for the improving facilities, equipment and access to the open spaces at Coe Fen. This could be used, for example, for the provision of and / or improvements to landscaping and habitat creation.

Under the S106 pooling constraint regulations, no more than five specific S106 contributions can be agreed for the same project. So far, no specific contributions have been proposed for this project.

Play provision for children and teenagers:

This proposed development is within half a mile of Coleridge Recreation Ground play area. The Outdoor Play Investment Strategy 2016-2021 rated this play area facility as 86% for its location.

Given the scale of the proposed development on this site, and in line with the funding formula set out in the Council's Planning Obligations Strategy 2010, a specific S106 contribution of £24,648 for the provision and/or improvement of the children's play area at Coleridge Recreation Ground play area.

Under the S106 pooling constraint regulations, no more than five specific S106 contributions can be agreed for the same project. So far, the council has not agreed any other specific contributions for this project.

- 6.28 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 following representation has been received:

Cambridge Cycling Campaign

- 7.2 The representations can be summarised as follows:

The proposed double stacker cycle parking discriminates against cycle users with mobility issues and prevents the secure parking of tandems, cargo bikes and all types of trike.

Prepared to accept the principle of basement parking if it is easily accessible by a shallow cycleable ramp. The current proposal is inaccessible.

Object to the use of double stackers, especially for residential provision.

- Object to the residential and commercial cycle parking being shared.

7.3 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. Environmental Impact Assessment
3. Housing mix
4. Development Viability and Affordable Housing
5. Context of site, design and external spaces (and impact on heritage assets)
6. Public Art
7. Renewable energy and sustainability
8. Disabled access
9. Residential amenity
10. Refuse arrangements
11. Highway safety
12. Car and cycle parking
13. Third party representations
14. Planning Obligations (s106 Agreement)

Principle of Development

8.2 The principle of a mixed use development in the Station Area was promoted by the Station Area Development Framework and realised by the approval of Outline planning permission in 2010 which included a number of approved Parameter Plans. The Parameter Plan established the location and mix of uses across the site and the development has begun to be built out. In most cases the location and use of each block has been brought forward in accordance with the parameter plans with the notable exception of Block A1/A2 which was proposed as a polyclinic and hotel but is currently under development as an office building.

- 8.3 Local Plan policy 9/9 identifies the key land uses for the Station Area of Major Change including housing and gives an indicative capacity of 650 dwellings. 331 dwellings have been approved as part of the CB1 development and there are 183 properties were approved in the Warren Close development which is within the Area of Major Change. This gives a total of 514 dwellings against the indicative capacity of 650 dwellings. The current proposals would increase the total number to 603. The principle of additional residential development is supported by policy 9/9 and in any event additional residential uses in highly accessible locations such as this are supported by other local plan policies and the NPPF.
- 8.4 The provision of commercial uses and office use are also compatible with policy 9/9. However policy 7/2 is also relevant and this requires the occupation of office space to be limited to 'local users'. This requirement can be secured via a s106 Agreement in common with other office uses on CB1.
- 8.5 In my opinion, the principle of the development is acceptable and in accordance with policies 3/1, 7/2 and 9/9.

Environmental Impact Assessment

- 8.6 Having regard to the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2011, my view is that the development, when looked at in the context of its surroundings, cumulatively with other uses/proposals, its existing use and the accompanying documentation to be submitted with an application, it is not likely to result in significant environmental effects. I am of the opinion that the documentation provided as part of a formal planning application is sufficient to enable officers to assess the sensitive impacts arising from this development. If viewed in isolation the development is also below the threshold where an ES would be required.

Housing Mix

- 8.7 The proposed development does not include any affordable housing and I have addressed this issue below. Notwithstanding this it is important to also look at the mix of size of housing units. The scheme would bring forward 46 one bed units and 43 two bed units (52%/48%).

8.8 This ratio can be compared with the anticipated housing mix when the CB1 proposals were first considered, (2008) the Ceres development (CB1 first residential phase) and the Vesta development (CB1 second residential phase). The following table sets this out.

Housing mix (type/percentage)

	Studios	1 bed	2 bed	3 bed
Current Scheme	0	52	48	0
CB1 mix	9	36	49	6
Ceres	6	30	59	5
Vesta	0	28	67	5

8.9 This analysis shows that there will be a larger proportion of 1 bed houses in the proposed scheme than in other schemes on CB1. Policy 5/10 requires that housing developments of this scale provide a mix of dwelling sizes and types. In my view the development achieves the aim of providing a mixed size of unit particularly when viewed against the wider CB1 development. In terms of a mix of tenure I have set out below my reasons for accepting a scheme that does not deliver any affordable housing in this case.

Development Viability and Affordable Housing

8.10 Policy 5/5 seeks to ensure that local housing needs are met through new development in the context of producing a mixed and balanced community. The proposed development does not include any affordable housing. In line with policy 5/5 the applicants have sought to justify this position on the grounds of development viability. Whilst policy 5/5 seeks to secure 40% of affordable housing (in this case 36 homes) it is clear that 'The precise amount of such housing to be provided on each site will be negotiated taking into account the viability of the development, any particular costs associated with the development and whether there are any other planning objectives which need to be given priority'.

8.11 Paragraph 173 of the NPPF (2012) requires local planning authorities (LPAs) to consider development viability, indicating that:

To ensure viability, the costs of any requirements likely to be applied to development, such as requirements for affordable housing, standards, infrastructure contributions or other requirements should, when taking account of the normal cost of development and mitigation, provide competitive returns to a willing land owner and willing developer to enable the development to be deliverable.

8.12 The National Planning Practice Guide (NPPG) also provides clear advice to local planning authorities on the consideration of viability in decision making:

Where an applicant is able to demonstrate to the satisfaction of the local planning authority that the planning obligation would cause the development to be unviable, the local planning authority should be flexible in seeking planning obligations.

This is particularly relevant for affordable housing contributions which are often the largest single item sought on housing developments. These contributions should not be sought without regard to individual scheme viability. The financial viability of the individual scheme should be carefully considered in line with the principles in this guidance. (Paragraph 19)

8.13 The Council is therefore in a position where it must consider the viability information that has been submitted and make a decision on the application in the light of that information. In my view the key issues to be considered are as follows:

- The viability assessment and supporting information submitted by the applicant
- The independent assessment carried out by consultants appointed to act for the Council
- The arguments in favour of the development (without affordable housing)
- The balance of all material planning considerations having regard to the viability argument

The viability assessment and supporting information submitted by the applicant

- 8.14 The viability assessment identifies that the key issue impacting viability is the value of the existing office building and the existing planning permission for office development on this site. RICS guidance on the assessment of viability, which has been accepted as a framework for consideration of such matters on appeal, acknowledges that the existing use or alternative consented value has an important role in determining whether re-development of a site results in an “uplift” above that value so that development comes forward. The commitments in the S106 concerning delivery of other infrastructure introduce a cost of approximately £0.5 million onto the development. Together, these two factors mean that when considered against the value of residential development, the “sales receipts etc.” cannot also cover the cost of delivering the affordable housing.

The independent assessment carried out by consultants appointed to act for the Council

- 8.15 The applicant’s claims regarding viability have been challenged by the Council. To test the claims the Council has appointed BPS Chartered Surveyors. BPS has recently assisted the Council with applications at 64 Newmarket Road and other sites in the city and they are acknowledged property valuation experts.
- 8.16 The BPS review of the viability information has also been considered by Housing Officers who confirm that in their view the analysis appears sound. The information provided by the applicants when the application was submitted was analysed and BPS requested additional information which they have also examined. Following receipt of further information a second report was produced. Redacted versions of the viability information have been published on the Council’s website
- 8.17 The conclusion by BPS is that the applicant’s claim that the proposed development would generate a lower land value than the alternative use office development is sound. However the scheme deficit identified by BPS is smaller than the applicant’s figure.

8.18 In accepting the conclusions reached by BPS, officers have acknowledged that the assessment is based upon forecast future values (of the units) and build costs. Given this can only ever be a forecast, in this case, and having regard to policy 5/5 and the development programme on CB1, officers consider that a review prior to construction of the viability appraisal (pre-implementation review) is justified. This would allow for any changes in the forecast values and costs to prompt a reassessment of the developments capacity to support affordable housing.

8.19 Officers have negotiated a combined approach of a pre-implementation review should the development not commence within 2 years of the grant of planning permission and a post-completion review (clawback clause) of the type accepted on other sites in the city.

The arguments in favour of the development (without affordable housing)

8.20 The applicants have made the following comments in bringing forward the scheme without the provision of any form of affordable housing:

- a. The economics of completing the CB1 development are challenging and this is compounded with regard to Blocks I1/K1 which will deliver the second phase of the Station Square.
- b. It is accepted that as a standalone application this scheme is not viable as the underpinning existing use value would not justify redevelopment. However we (the applicants) are committed to delivering the Masterplan and completing Station Square.
- c. We (the applicants) have 'promised' the Council that they will remove the 'unsightly' Murdoch House.
- d. The proposed development provides a 'better setting and environment for tenants of commercial floorspace on the wider CB1 Estate'.
- e. The movement of the Southern Access Road has changed the 'dynamic' of Block I1. Block I1 is the least

attractive block of the Masterplan and the floorplate does not meet current market requirements. This means that 30, 10 and 20 Station Road would be brought forward first and there is no guarantee that Murdoch House would be redeveloped or the Station Square completed.

- f. The principle of residential use within the CB1 development has been accepted and the scheme will contribute more housing to the city.
- g. 'A central tenet of a good Masterplan is flexibility and the Lord Rogers Plan has shown a robustness to accommodate these changes'.
- h. 'Development (will) not proceed if the financial burden is too great and that would be a missed opportunity to complete the Masterplan that will not be repeated.'

8.21 In my view the key issues for consideration of the acceptability of this scheme are how it fits into the strategic vision for the site and whether it represents sustainable development. There is a need to consider the balance between the strategic aim of providing a new transport interchange and the strategic aim of meeting local housing need through the provision of affordable housing in this location. These are material planning considerations.

8.22 The adopted Local Plan includes a Spatial Strategy. One of the main components is the 'regeneration of the Station Area as a mixed use City district built around an enhanced transport interchange'. The Station Area Development Framework (SADF) was produced to drive that vision forward and it remains a material consideration in the determination of planning applications. In 2004 when the SADF was adopted the Station Area was in need of regeneration and the vision of the document was about transformation including providing a greatly improved transport interchange and a mixed use but predominately residential neighbourhood.

8.23 The Station has undergone a period of rapid change and the developers are delivering on the vision of a greatly enhanced transport interchange. The bus interchange and access to it was provided at an early stage through collaboration with the County Council. The first stage of the Station Square has been

opened and the changes to the station buildings which will significantly enhance the experience of all users are about to be revealed.

8.24 The delivery of the second phase of Station Square is a complex exercise. Murdoch House needs to be removed in order to facilitate the completion of the Square and this application offers the opportunity for this to happen. Murdoch House is an unattractive building and there is merit in its removal and replacement with new buildings the design of which are supported by officers and the Design and Conservation Sub-Panel (CB1)

8.25 The viability assessment exercise has demonstrated that Murdoch House has a significant value as an office building and the applicants have indicated that if planning permission is not granted they may decide to refurbish and re-let Murdoch House. This could be regarded as a lost opportunity to complete the Station Square at this time.

8.26 Additional housing in a highly accessible location such as this is supported by national and local planning policies. Despite the lack of affordable housing the development will have a positive effect on meeting housing needs albeit only part of that need. Compliance with planning policy can be justified on the basis that the development contributes to a sustainable development in the CB1 area. The Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) identifies a need for all types of housing in Cambridge and aims to achieve mixed and balanced communities.

8.27 I have looked at the delivery of affordable housing in the area defined by the Station Area Development Framework and the CB1 Masterplan. The following table sets out the position in detail:

Site	Total dwellings	Total affordable dwellings	% affordable housing
CB1 Phase 1 (Ceres)	169	63	37%
CB1 Phase 2 (Vesta)	137	58	42

Total CB1 to date	306	121	39.5
Blocks I1/K1	89	0	0
Total CB1 with Blocks I1/K1	395	121	30%
Warren Close	183	43*	23%*
Total CB1 + Warren Close	489	164	33%
Total CB1 + Warren Close + Blocks I1/K1	578	164	25%

*Based on % of developable area (34%) against policy for 30% affordable housing

- 8.28 The analysis of affordable housing provision when Blocks I1 and K1 are included varies between 25% and 30% depending on whether or not the Warren Close development is included. The Warren Close development was permitted under the previous Local Plan and the policy for affordable housing provision has changed. This is why including it in the calculation has the effect of reducing the percentage.
- 8.29 In my view bringing forward about 27% of affordable housing on a complex, large scale development such as CB1 amounts to sustainable development which is the key strand of the NPPF and is supported by policy 3/1 of the Local Plan. The new community at CB1 already provides for a range of housing tenures and a mixed form of development including office/commercial/hotels is being delivered. These uses contribute towards CB1's sense of place and community infrastructure has been provided in the form of open space, public art and community facilities. Mitigation measures to deal

with the demands of the occupiers of 89 new homes have been negotiated and these will also benefit existing residents and users of CB1.

The balance of all material planning considerations having regard to the viability argument

- 8.30 The NPPF reflects planning legislation and requires that applications for planning permission be determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. In this case, in the light of the outcome of the viability assessment the development is accords with policy 5/5 of the Local Plan. The applicants have argued that the proposal delivers a range of benefits that amount to material planning considerations in favour of the proposals. I have considered all other planning policies in the remainder of my assessment and have concluded that the scheme is in accordance with the Local Plan for the area. This conclusion is predicated on the conclusion that the development is consistent with local plan policy 3/1 which states that development will be permitted if it meets the principles of sustainable development having regard to both the Local Plan and the more recent NPPF definitions. If the application is considered to comply with policy 3/1 then planning permission should be granted. If it does not then material considerations will come into play.
- 8.31 My view is that the proposed development, together with existing development on CB1, constitutes a sustainable form of development and should be supported. If the Committee does not agree with this conclusion then it would be appropriate to consider whether material considerations, including those cited in the report elsewhere and including those specifically cited by the applicant above, outweigh the conflict. The opportunity to complete the Station Square and deliver on the CB1 vision and the aspirations of the SPD is nevertheless considered to be a material planning consideration of significant weight in support of the scheme
- 8.32 In my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 3/1 and 5/5.

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

Impact on the Conservation Area

- 8.33 The visual impact of the whole scheme on the character of the Conservation Area has been addressed the outline permission in broad terms and the various amendments thereto as individual building designs have come forward. The buildings proposed, and partially built, along the southern side of Station Road and elsewhere nearby affect the approach to the Listed railway station, the terraced houses along the Eastern side of Hills Road and the 19th century villas on the Northern side of Station Road as well as more distant views from various vantage points of the Conservation Area. This proposal will have an impact but this will be largely as expected by the 'masterplan', outline permission and the subsequent amendments and these have been considered to be acceptable in the past. The design of the buildings K1 and I1, materials of construction and setting will be part of the coherent grouping of new buildings planned around the new Station Square and should not have an adverse impact on the Listed building or character of the Conservation Area.

Design & Conservation CB1 sub-panel comments

- 8.34 The emerging proposals for K1 and I1 were presented to the D&C sub-panel on the 11th February 2015. The panel were comfortable with the lozenge form of K1 but felt that further refinement of the scheme was needed and in particular resolving the challenges of the residential use fronting on to the Square. Accordingly the scheme received a unanimous 'amber' vote. Since the D&C CB1 sub-panel presentation, the elevations and details of the scheme have been further refined and in my view and that of the Urban Design and Conservation (UDC) team, results in a proposed scheme that reconciles the challenges of delivering residential use buildings fronting on to Station Square. The revised scheme was presented to the D & C sub-panel in July this year and it received a unanimous Green verdict.

Building K1

- 8.35 The K1 building has been conceived as the replacement for the silo which was destroyed following a fire in 2010. A previous planning permission had approved conversion and extension of the silo building to create office space with A1 (retail) or A3 (restaurant) use on the ground floor.
- 8.36 The proposals subject to this application are to construct a nine storey building on the site of the former silo. The building will be residential with an A1/A3 use at ground floor. The change in use from the Outline is considered acceptable in urban design and conservation terms and will improve activity and surveillance of the Station Square throughout the day. The non-rectilinear form is considered appropriate in the place of the lost silo.

Building K1 Context - Relationship to 'The Mill'

- 8.37 At pre-application discussions the opportunity to improve the relationship with the restored Mill building was explored and is well summarised in the submitted Design & Access Statement. The footprint of the building creates a more slender profile when viewed from the new Station Square. The form also compensates for the variation in the alignment of the Mill when compared to the completed M1 and M2 student blocks to the south and the alignments of 'One The Square' and I1 to the north.
- 8.38 The proposed building has been angled to allow the restored gable of the Mill to be visible from the Station entrance and so has improved the relationship between this heritage asset and the listed building. The lozenge shape also allows for the creation of an appropriate connection between Station Square and the 'ante chamber' located to the south west of K1 at ground floor level and vistas through the development.

Building K1 Scale and massing

- 8.39 The overall approach taken to the scale and massing of K1 is to create a simple and confident form that relates well to the retained Mill building and which creates a focal building to hold the southern edge of the new Station Square. The lozenge shaped footprint of the proposed building has been designed to present a slender elevation to Station Square and to catch the

'essence' of the former Silo which had a unique silhouette with a distinctive roof form.

- 8.40 The overall height of K1 at 9 storeys (30.2m) sits within the overall envelope of the former silo as identified in the approved Outline parameter plan of 31.2m and occupies a smaller footprint. In our view, the scale and massing and overall form of the building does not compete with the retained restored Mill building and creates a positive 'marker building' holding the southern edge of Station Square and is therefore considered to be acceptable in design terms.

Building K1 Elevations and Materials

- 8.41 The overall approach to the elevations creates a well ordered building that expresses a clear base, middle and top to the building. The columns and their spacing are reminiscent of the spacing and rhythm of the old silo elevations. The upper two floors of the building would be set back behind an openwork form that is an extension of the structural frame at lower floors to create further articulation and refinement of the overall form. The ground and first floors are also grouped to better express the base of the building and the window and entrance reveals are proposed to be lined in reconstituted stone to provide additional articulation and modelling. A series of reconstituted stone bands are proposed between floors to add further modelling to the elevations. A transom has been introduced to the proposed full height windows with the lower section being a 'frosted fixed glass panel'. This detail will help to resolve concerns about privacy of occupiers and the impact of 'clutter' within rooms on the external elevations.
- 8.42 The proposed main facing materials are a red coloured facing brick with reconstituted stone detailing. It is proposed that the brick forms a contrast to the prevailing buff tones of the Station and elsewhere at CB1. The use of the contrast brick on L1-L4 as part of the Ceres development was supported previously and a contrast could be considered an appropriate response for this site subject to careful selection of an appropriate tone. This element can be conditioned as part of the materials condition and considered in the context of the repainted Mill building and other existing development in the immediate vicinity.

Building I1

- 8.43 Building I1 is positioned to form the western edge of the new Station Square on much of the site of Murdoch House. In the approved Outline 08/0266/OUT), the eastern edge of the building did not align with One the Square (Block A1/A2) located to the north. This was in part due to the need to provide a pedestrian route between it and the Silo. With the loss of the silo and reconfiguration of the K1 block, the opportunity to revisit the alignments has been taken with the submitted application. Building I1 now follows the building line dictated by One the Square and creates a more consistent edge to the western side of the Station Square. These changes are supported in conservation and design terms.
- 8.44 One the Square has created several important design cues for Building I1. The colonnade setback and height at ground and first floor has been translated across to I1 and so has the setback 'shoulder height' at the fifth floor. As such there will be a clear relationship between these buildings with consistent ground floor uses maintaining activity and surveillance on the western edges of Station Square.

Building I1 Scale and massing

- 8.45 The building would be 8 storeys in height with a recessed and well set back plant enclosure. The overall scale and massing is similar to that agreed through the parameter plan approved as part of the Outline application. The Outline permission allows for an overall height of 23m plus 2m plant (total height 25m). The proposed building at 20.6m to the setback with additional 5.2m for the recessed upper two floors and a further setback of a 1.8m high plant enclosure will have a total height of 27.6m. This exceeds the parameter plan height but officers are convinced on the basis of material that has been submitted that this increase should be supported. The form of the bronze louvred upper level plant room creates a clean silhouette to the roofscape of the building.

Building I1 Elevations and materials

- 8.46 The east elevation creates a well ordered frontage to the square which returns round to the north facing Station Road frontage

and similarly to the south facing elevation on to the 'ante chamber'.

- 8.47 The west facing elevation is more articulated and is faceted to orientate balconies to take advantage of views across the park located to the south and mitigate overlooking into the adjacent development at 50 & 60 Station Road. A buff coloured brick is proposed for the elevations with bronze coloured panels and window frames. The overall palette is supported in principle but the brick in particular will need to be carefully chosen to compliment the listed station and the colour palette of One the Square located to the north. Materials can be covered by condition should the application be approved.

Buildings K1 and I1 Conclusion

- 8.48 In terms of the overall design and relationship to the listed station building and wider Conservation Area, both K1 and I1 are considered acceptable in conservation and urban design terms. K1 has the potential to create a striking and well composed replacement for the lost Silo and the opportunities created through that loss will improve the composition and containment of Station Square and improve circulation routes between it and the 'ante chamber' located to the south west. I1 will help to complete and balance the composition of buildings around Station Square whilst effectively responding to the adjacent approved development at 50 & 60 Station Road.

Public Art

- 8.49 The site falls within the Red Phase of the CB1 development and is covered by the CB1 Public Art Strategy. The S106 agreement for the Outline application requires that the detailed delivery of public art is agreed via Public Art Delivery Plans. The application is supported by the CB1 Red Phase Public Art Delivery Plan (PADP).

- 8.50 The PADP proposes the following:

- The Linear Park commission involving collaboration between the landscape architects, project architects and an artist to deliver a series of works within the landscape.

The Station Gateway commission which will be a sculptural commission focused on the point where the Station Road approach narrows and the linear park comes to an end.

The Lighting commission which aims to provide an interactive approach to lighting Station Road.

8.51 The Public Art Officer is satisfied with the PADP subject to additional information being submitted for approval. This can be secured and agreed under officer delegated powers through the S106 agreement.

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

Renewable energy and sustainability

8.53 Policy 8/16 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2006) requires all developments over a threshold of 1,000 square metres to provide at least 10% of the developments predicted energy requirements from on-site renewable energy. The proposed development can also be viewed against the context of the plans for the redevelopment of the CB1 area as a whole, albeit this is a full planning application that is not bounded by the conditions attached to the outline application. The masterplan for the site contains the ambition for the development to exceed Part L of the Building Regulations by 10% and to achieve a 15% abatement of carbon emissions from renewable energy systems. It should be noted that since the outline permission was granted, changes to Part L of the Building Regulations have included more stringent carbon reduction targets for both residential and non-residential development, with a focus on encouraging a hierarchical approach to reducing carbon emissions.

8.54 The submitted Energy Strategy, prepared by Hilson Moran, sets out that by taking a hierarchical approach (passive design measures, fabric improvements, energy efficiency, and the use of renewable and low carbon technology) carbon reduction of 15% compared to a Part L 2013 compliant baseline for regulated emissions is predicted to be achieved. This approach is supported. In terms of renewable energy provision, two technologies are proposed; gas fired Combined Heat and

Power (CHP) and 50 m² of photovoltaic panels, to be located above a brown roof on the I1 block. Together, these two technologies are predicted to reduce emissions by 23,300 Kg/CO₂/annum, which equates to a 14% reduction, with the gas fired CHP reducing emissions by 20,400 Kg/CO₂/annum and the photovoltaic panels reducing emissions by 2,900 Kg/CO₂/annum. This approach is supported.

- 8.55 Further details are required on the technical specification of the proposed CHP system. While the use of this technology is supported, it will be important to ensure that it does not contribute to a reduction in air quality in this area, particularly as the site is located within the AQMA. This information can be secured by condition.
- 8.56 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

- 8.57 The scheme has been considered by the Access Officer. The Design and Access Statement emphasises that level changes are reduced to a minimum, all dwellings are compliant with Lifetime Homes Standards, 5% of the dwellings can be adapted to wheelchair standards, all floors are served by lifts, level access from the dwellings to all balconies and terraces is provided, and 10% of the parking spaces are designed to wheelchair standards. The Access Officer has recommended internal changes and I have included these in my recommendation as an informative.
- 8.58 In my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 3/7 and 3/12.

Residential Amenity

Impact on amenity of neighbouring occupiers

- 8.59 There are no residential properties to the north, east and west and therefore the only residents who will be affected by the development are to the south in the Warren Close and Ceres

developments. The residents of these flats could be affected by the development in a number of ways which I consider below.

Relationship with adjacent dwellings

- 8.60 Block I1 will sit to the north of Meade House which is part of the Ceres housing development. Block K1 will screen Block I1 from the converted Spillers Mill. The separation distance between Block I1 and Meade House will be about 30 metres. The separation distance between Block I1 and the nearest block on the Warren Close development will be in excess of 50 metres.
- 8.61 Block K1 will sit to the north of the converted Mill and to the northeast of Meade House. At its closest point Block K1 will be approximately 3 metres from the Mill and 12 metres from Meade House.

Overshadowing/loss of light

- 8.62 As a result of the orientation there will be no overshadowing or loss of light to Meade House arising from the development of Block I1. The shadow studies submitted with the application also demonstrate that Block K1 will not cast a shadow on Meade House or the Mill.

Overlooking/loss of privacy

- 8.63 In my view the separation distance between Block I1 and Meade House will reduce any potential overlooking/interlooking to a reasonable level. The relationship between Block K1 and Meade House is much closer; however the relationship between windows means that the opportunity for direct overlooking is limited. The intervening space between the two residential blocks is the access road Mill Park. In my view given the context and limited opportunity for interlooking this arrangement is acceptable.
- 8.64 Block K1 and the Mill are only 3 metres apart; therefore the potential for overlooking/loss of privacy is heightened. The ground and first floor of the northern end of the Mill is given over to commercial space whilst the upper floors accommodate flats. There are rows of four windows in the gable end of the Mill. The central pair serve bathrooms therefore overlooking/loss of privacy will not arise. However the windows on the outer

corners serve bedrooms although the room itself has dual outlooks also to the east or west respectfully.

8.65 In 2006 planning permission was granted for the addition of two wings to the Silo building and conversion to office use. These wings ran parallel the Mill Building in a very close relationship of less than 3 metres separation. Similarly the approved parameter plans, which assumed retention of the Silo allowed a very close relationship between the Mill and the Silo.

8.66 When planning permission was granted for the conversion of the Mill to flats the following observations were made in the Committee Report:

Block K2 sits to the north of the new student residential blocks that are currently under construction. The buildings are on the same alignment, which prevents any overlooking from the principle elevations to the front and back. Windows are proposed in the south (side) elevation which face the student blocks and there will be windows in this elevation of the student accommodation. A similar inter-relationship would result if the extant approval for the (Silo) conversion were implemented. Although there will be potential for inter-looking, given the high-density urban nature of the scheme it is my view that this is acceptable.

8.67 As a result of the lozenge shape of Block K1 a greater part of the north end of the converted Mill will be exposed in comparison with the 2006 Silo scheme or the approved parameter plans. The applicants have undertaken a 'proximity study' which highlights that three windows on the second, third and fourth level of the new building are particularly affected. These windows will be obscure glazed and I have recommended a planning condition to control this.

Enclosure/loss of outlook

8.68 The buildings that have been brought forward for Blocks I1 and K1 are comparable with the scale and massing that has been approved in principle via the Outline consent/parameter plans. The relationship between Block I1 and Meade House is acceptable in my view and the shape of Block K1 represents a reduction in the enclosure and loss of view to the Mill in comparison with the parameter plan arrangements.

Noise and disturbance

- 8.69 Although residential use will result in a different pattern of use of the buildings I do not think that against the context of a mixed use area, there will be a significant level of noise and disturbance arising from the development. I have recommended conditions suggested by the EHO team regarding control of noise from plant and opening and delivery hours of the A1/A3 units which will control impacts both for nearby residents and residents of the new buildings.

Overspill car parking

- 8.70 71 car parking spaces are provided, with 65 spaces for use by residents and 6 spaces to serve the commercial uses. I have assessed this against the parking standards below but the limited amount of car parking could have a consequence in terms of overspill parking. This issue has arisen on other sites within the CB1 development and has been addressed via a parking survey and potential mitigation measures being secured in the s106 Agreement. The County Council has recommended this provision and I have included it in my recommendations regarding the s106 Agreement. In my view this will satisfactorily address the issue of overspill parking impact.

Construction activities

- 8.71 I have recommended the conditions suggested by the EHO team regarding contaminated land, construction hours and construction activities and recommended an informative in relation to the Considerate Contractors Scheme.
- 8.72 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

- 8.73 The floorspace of the residential units varies between 46 sq m and 108 sq m. All units have lift access and usable external balcony spaces. Due to the proximity of the two blocks to each other there will be overshadowing of Block I1 by block K1. Also

there will be a degree of overshadowing on the West side of block I1 and the outlook from windows in the elevation will be affected by the close proximity of 50/60 Station Road when it is constructed. 50/60 Station Road will be on the opposite side of Mill Park and 12 metres from Block I1 at its closest point. The balconies serving units on the west side of Block I1 have been angled to direct views to the public space to the south and also to provide a sense of privacy and enclosure for the flats.

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

Refuse Arrangements

- 8.75 An area for the storage of refuse bins is located within the basement. The car lifts will be used to move the bins to street level. Refuse and Environment officers have confirmed that the refuse arrangements are appropriate and acceptable, but have sought a redesign of the bin collection point. This can be secured by condition.
- 8.76 In my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policy 3/12.

Highway Safety

- 8.77 Following the receipt of further information the Highway Engineer has confirmed that he does not have any concerns regarding highway safety. In my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policy 8/2.

Car and Cycle Parking

- 8.78 Conditions 26 and 27 of the outline planning permission are of relevance to the consideration of car parking. They read as follows:

'26 5% of short-term car parking spaces and 5% of long-term car parking spaces within the multi storey car park and 5% of all other parking spaces within the rest of the development shall be suitable for, and reserved for, people with disabilities.

Reason: To ensure an appropriate level of car parking provision for people with disabilities (Cambridge Local Plan policy 8/10 and appendix C).

27 Car parking provision shall not exceed a maximum of 425 car parking spaces to serve the office accommodation (B1a use class) and 232 car parking spaces to serve the residential accommodation (C3 use class).

Reason: To ensure an appropriate level of car parking provision in the interests of sustainable development and impact on air quality. (Cambridge Local Plan policies 4/14 and 8/10 and appendix C).'

8.79 The plans show that seven of the car parking spaces proposed are designed for use by disabled people; this represents 5% of the total number of spaces (71 spaces) and accords with condition 26 of the outline consent and adopted Car Parking Standards.

8.80 In the controlled parking zone, the adopted Car Parking Standards allow a maximum of one car parking space for each 100 sqm of office floorspace, one car parking space for each residential unit and disabled car parking only for retail uses. For the proposal this equates to a maximum of 96 spaces. 71 car parking spaces are proposed, 6 spaces for the office space (1 space per 128 sqm) and 65 spaces for the residential units (0.75 units per space)

8.81 The following table sets out the comparative numbers and ratio of car parking in the CB1 development to date.

SITE ADDRESS	NUMBER OF SPACES	CAR PARKING RATIO
Office development		
50/60 Station Road (first scheme)	60	1 space per 274 sqm
50/60 Station Road (second scheme)	76	1 space per 209 sqm

50/60 Station Road (third scheme)	83	1 space per 198 sq m
50/60 Station Road (scheme to be implemented)	124	1 space per 137 sq m
Microsoft (excluding temporary car park)	35	1 space per 280 sqm
Block J1 (30 Station Road)	40	1 space per 186 sqm
Block J2 (22 Station Road)	40	1 space per 186 sqm
Block J3 (20 Station Road)	40	1 space per 186 sqm
Block J4 (10 Station Road)	37	1 space per 153 sqm
Block A1/A2 (One the Square)	92	1 space per 156 sqm
Residential development		
Ceres development	104	0.62 spaces per dwelling
Vesta development	48	0.36 spaces per dwelling

8.82 71 car parking spaces are proposed to serve 89 flats which is a ratio of 0.8 spaces per dwelling. This development is not bound by the conditions attached to the Outline planning consent however the total amount of car parking provision associated with residential uses (223) remains below the level set out in condition 27 of the Outline consent.

Cycle Parking

8.83 A total of 218 cycle parking spaces are provided to serve the development. 190 are in the basement and 28 at ground floor level. The proportion of Sheffield stands to double stackers has been revised since the submission of the application.

- o The Sheffield stands / double stackers split for residential use in the basement has been revised from 100% double stackers to 52/48% Sheffield stands / double stackers. This arrangement ensures that every residential storage area has a maximum of 50/50% Sheffield stand / double stackers, and consequently, a maximum of 25% of cycle parking spaces are on the upper rack.
- o In addition, the office and retail cycle storage split has been revised from 100% double stackers to 34/66% Sheffield stands / double stackers, with a maximum of 34% of cycle parking spaces on the upper rack.
- o The overall split of Sheffield stands and double stackers results in 53/47%, taking into account the cycle parking spaces provided on street.

8.84 I share the concerns of the Walking and Cycling Officer about the use of double stackers in connection with residential development. Hi-capacity stands have been permitted as part of the Vesta housing development but the ratio of Sheffield stands to hi-capacity stands is 81% to 19%. The Cycle Parking Guide for New Residential Developments which is a material planning consideration advises that the use of high-low stands and two-tier stands is generally not acceptable for new residential developments but may be considered on a case-by-case basis. In this case the Cycling and Walking Officer has welcomed the increased numbers of Sheffield stands but remains of the view that use of double stackers is not recommended. In my opinion this does not form a strong enough basis for a refusal on the grounds of the inadequacy of cycle parking provision.

8.85 I have recommended planning conditions to address the detailed design matters raised by the Cycling and Walking Officer.

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

Third Party Representations

8.87 The Cambridge Cycling Campaign has raised similar issues to the Cycling and Walking Officer and I have dealt with these above. The amended basement plan shows a segregated area for cycle parking for the office and retail uses.

Planning Obligations (s106 Agreement)

8.88 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.

8.89 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.

City Council Infrastructure (Open spaces and Community facilities)

8.90 The Developer Contribution Monitoring team has recommended that contributions be made to the following projects:

Community Facilities

Community Development Officer (2 days per week) (£50,000)
The Junction (meeting space) (£61,784)

Indoor Sports

Kelsey Kerridge Sports Centre (Multi-purpose studio) (£41,137)

Outdoor Sports

Coleridge Recreation Ground (Improvement of pitches and changing facilities) (£36,414)

Informal Open Space

Coleridge Recreation Ground (Improvement of facilities, equipment and access) (£22,026)

Coe Fen ((Improvement of facilities, equipment and access)
(£15,000)

Play provision for children and teenagers

Coleridge Recreation Ground (Provision/improvement of play area) (£24,648)

8.91 I agree with the reasoning set out in paragraph 6.27 above that contributions towards these projects meet the requirements of the CIL regulations. 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 3/8, 5/14 and 10/1 and the Planning Obligation Strategy 2010.

County Council infrastructure (Education/Libraries/Strategic Waste)

8.92 The County Council does not require any developer contributions in regards to education, libraries and strategic waste infrastructure

Transport Infrastructure

8.93 County Council officers have confirmed that mitigation measures are needed to address the demands imposed on the transport network as a result of the development. In common with recent phases of CB1 transport contributions have been reviewed to ensure that they meet the CIL tests and are reasonably related to the development. Officers at the County Council have assessed the transport information submitted by the applicants and reached the view that the following contributions are appropriate:

- o £383,539 for Station Road improvements
- o £110,000 for Wayfinding in the CB1 area

Travel Plan Co-coordinator and Travel Plan

8.94 The outline s106 Agreement secures the submission and approval of a Travel Plan and provision of a Travel Plan Co-coordinator for each block in the Masterplan. These provisions need to be secured for Blocks I1/K1.

Residents Parking Scheme

8.95 Overspill parking from the development has the potential to have an adverse impact on the amenity of residents in the vicinity of the site. A pre-construction and post occupation parking survey is necessary to assess the impact of the development the outcome of which may be the establishment of a Residents Parking Scheme. The costs of carrying out the survey and setting up the Scheme are to be borne by the applicant.

8.96 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

Affordable Housing (Pre-implementation review and Clawback clause)

8.97 As set out in paragraph above the s106 Agreement should include clauses to secure a pre-implementation review and a claw-back clause. These will ensure that any uplift in actual value of the scheme compared to actual costs will initiate a review of the potential to provide affordable housing in some form. This would normally be a matter for detailed negotiation by officers as part of the detail of the s106 Agreement.

Triggers for implementation of Station Square (Phase 2)

8.98 The s106 Agreement for the CB1 development links the occupation of Block I1 with the completion of Station Square. The developers have also emphasised the strong link between the development of the site and the delivery of Station Square. The new s106 Agreement will need to secure this trigger with the detailed wording being the subject of negotiation by officers.

Restrictions on occupation of office accommodation

8.99 Policy 7/2 requires the occupation of office space to be limited to 'local users'. This requirement can be secured via a s106 Agreement in common with other office uses on CB1.

Public Art

8.100 In common with other phases of CB1 the s106 Agreement needs to tie the development of this site into the Public Art Delivery Plan for this part of CB1.

Public Realm

8.101 In common with other parts of CB1 clauses are needed in the s106 Agreement to control the public realm within the site to ensure that public access is provided.

Planning Obligations Conclusion

8.102 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.

9.0 CONCLUSION

- 9.1 In my view this scheme is consistent with the vision of CB1 in that it supports the delivery of a high quality transport interchange within a mixed use development. The implementation of a regeneration scheme is complex but this scheme offers the opportunity to deliver a key piece of transport interchange, the completed Station Square. The viability of the development has been robustly scrutinised and in accordance with local and national policy it has been demonstrated that the scheme is unable to provide any affordable housing. This is complaint with planning policy because the policies require that consideration be given to development viability. In my view there is a strong argument in favour of the principle of this development because of the particular circumstances of the case. If a contrary view is adopted my opinion is that this can only be based on an argument that the scheme does not amount to sustainable development which I do not support.

10.0 RECOMMENDATION

APPROVE subject to completion of the s106 Agreement and the following conditions:

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

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

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

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

3. Submission of Preliminary Contamination Assessment:

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

(a) Desk study to include:

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

-General environmental setting.

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

(b) A report setting set 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. Construction/Demolition works shall be carried out between 0800 hours to 1800 hours Monday to Friday, and 0800 hours to 1300 hours on Saturday and at no time on Sundays, Bank or Public Holidays, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the local planning authority in advance.

Variations to the permitted construction/demolition hours and/or permitted delivery/collection hours during construction/demolition will require a submission to the local authority for consideration at least 10 working days before the event. Neighbouring properties are required to be notified by the applicant of the variation within 5 working days in advance of the works

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

10. There should be no collections from 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, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the local planning authority in advance.

Variations to the permitted construction/demolition hours and/or permitted delivery/collection hours during construction/demolition will require a submission to the local authority for consideration at least 10 working days before the event. Neighbouring properties are required to be notified by the applicant of the variation within 5 working days in advance of the works

Reason: To protect the amenity of occupiers 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 the building in order to minimise the level of noise emanating from the said building shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The scheme as approved shall be fully implemented before the building hereby permitted is occupied and shall be thereafter retained as such.

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

14. Prior to the commencement of development/construction, a noise assessment of external and internal noise levels and a noise insulation / attenuation scheme as appropriate, detailing the acoustic / noise insulation performance specification of the external building envelope of the residential units (having regard to the building fabric, glazing and ventilation) and other mitigation to reduce the level of noise experienced externally and internally at the residential units as a result of high ambient noise levels in the area shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The scheme shall have regard to the external and internal noise levels recommended in British Standard 8233:2014 "Guidance on sound insulation and noise reduction for buildings".

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

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

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

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

16. Before the development hereby permitted is commenced, details of the location of associated duct work, for the purpose of extraction and/or filtration of fumes and or odours shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The approved ductwork shall be installed before the use hereby permitted is commenced.

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

17. The commercial units in A1 and A3 use hereby approved shall not be open outside the hours of 07:00 and 23:00 hrs

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

18. Commercial deliveries to the A1, A3 and B1 uses hereby approved shall not be made outside the hours of 0700-2300hrs on Monday to Friday, 0800-1300hrs on Saturday or at any time on Sundays or public holidays.

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

19. A minimum of five (5) electric vehicle recharge bays shall be installed and maintained within the car parking area for I1/K1.

Reason: to promote the use of low emission electric vehicles in Cambridge in the interests of air quality (Policy 4/14 of the Local Plan 2006).

20. A minimum of ten (10) electric cycle recharge points shall be installed and maintained within the bicycle parking area for I1/K1.

Reason: to promote the use of alternative modes of transport to and from the site in the interests of air quality (4/14 of the Local Plan 2006).

21. Development shall not begin until a scheme for surface water disposal has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Infiltration systems shall only be used where it can be demonstrated that they will not pose a risk to groundwater quality. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To protect and prevent the pollution of controlled waters from potential pollutants associated with current and previous land uses in line with National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), paragraphs 109, 120, 121 and Environment Agency Groundwater Protection: Principles and Practice (GP3).

22. No drainage works shall commence until a surface water management strategy has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. No hard-standing areas to be constructed until the works have been carried out in accordance with the surface water strategy so approved unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To prevent environmental and amenity problems arising from flooding. National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), paragraphs 109, 120, 121

23. Piling or any other foundation designs and investigation boreholes using penetrative methods shall not be permitted other than with the express written consent of the Local Planning Authority, which may be given for those parts of the site where it has been demonstrated that there is no resultant unacceptable risk to groundwater. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To protect and prevent the pollution of controlled waters from potential pollutants associated with current and previous land uses in line with National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), paragraphs 109, 120, 121 and Environment Agency Groundwater Protection: Principles and Practice (GP3).

24. An assessment of potential impacts on groundwater flow and down-gradient water environment receptors shall be undertaken. The assessment shall include dewatering, excavation of the aquifer and construction of a basement. Should significant impacts be identified, appropriate mitigation measures shall be agreed and implemented.

Reason: To protect the available water resource for sensitive water features / protected water users. National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), paragraphs 109, 120, 121

25. No development shall commence until a foul water strategy has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. No dwellings shall be occupied until the works have been carried out in accordance with the foul water strategy so approved unless otherwise approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To prevent environmental and amenity problems arising from flooding. National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), paragraphs 109, 120, 121

26. Prior to the commencement of the development hereby approved, with the exception of below ground works, full details including samples of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure that the appearance of the external surfaces is appropriate. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/4, 3/12 and 4/11)

27. Prior to the commencement of the development hereby approved, with the exception of below ground works, full details of glass type(s) to be used in curtain walling/windows/doors or other glazed features shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure that the appearance of the external surfaces is appropriate. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/4, 3/12 and 4/11)

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

Reason: In the interests of visual amenity and to ensure that the quality and colour of the detailing of the brickwork/stonework and jointing is acceptable and maintained throughout the development. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/4, 3/12 and 4/11)

29. Prior to the commencement of installation of any roof mounted equipment, full details of all solar panels [water pre-heat, etc.] and/or photovoltaic cells, including type, dimensions, materials, location, fixing, etc. shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. In bringing forward such details the applicant is reminded of the restrictions imposed on the height of buildings under the outline planning approval and encouraged to site such features so as not to be visible from ground level. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: In the interests of the visual amenity of the streetscene. (Cambridge Local Plan policies 3/4, 3/12 and 4/11).

30. Prior to the commencement of the development hereby approved, with the exception of below ground works, full details of all balustrades & railings [for decorative or safety purposes] for balconies, flat roofs and other accessible locations including materials, fixings, colours and finishes shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Thereafter the development shall be undertaken in accordance with the agreed details.

Reason: In the interests of visual amenity and to ensure that the quality and colour of the balustrades and railings is acceptable and maintained throughout the development. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/4, 3/12 and 4/11)

31. Prior to commencement of occupation full details of the access arrangements to car lifts, entry control lights and intercom bollard shall be submitted to and approved by the local planning authority in writing. The approved provisions for car lifts shall be provided prior to the first occupation and shall be retained thereafter.

Reason: To provide ensure that the entrance to the car lifts does not detract from the overall design of the building. (Cambridge Local Plan policy 3/12).

32. Prior to the commencement of occupation, a lighting plan including details of the height, type, position and angle of any external or colonnade/soffit lighting shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The development shall be implemented and maintained in accordance with the approved plan.

Reason: To protect the amenities of nearby residents/occupiers and in the interests of visual amenity. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 4/13)

33. Full details of designed locations for signage systems for the building [including fascias, hanging signs, lighting systems, etc.] to be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Thereafter the development shall be undertaken in accordance with the agreed details unless the local planning authority agrees to any variation in writing.

Reason: In the interests of visual amenity and to ensure that the quality of the signage, fascias, hanging signs, lighting systems, etc. is acceptable and maintained throughout the development. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/4, 3/12 and 4/11)

34. No rooftop plant shall be constructed on the building hereby approved until such time as full details, to a large scale, of any rooftop plant screening systems to be installed, where relevant, have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. This may include the submission of samples of mesh/louvre types and the colour(s) of the components. Colour samples should be identified by the RAL or BS systems. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure that the details of development are acceptable. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/4, 3/12 and 4/11)

35. The proposed on-site renewable and low carbon technologies shall be fully installed and operational prior to the occupation of any approved buildings and shall thereafter be maintained in accordance with a maintenance programme, which shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority prior to the commencement of development. Further information shall also be submitted and agreed in writing by the local planning authority in relation to the technical specification of the proposed gas fired Combined Heat and Power System, including emissions standards. The renewable and low carbon energy technologies shall remain fully operational in accordance with the approved maintenance programme, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the local planning authority.

Reason: In the interests of reducing carbon dioxide emissions (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 8/16) and to protect human health in accordance with policy 4/14 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2006).

36. The office space shall be constructed to meet the applicable approved BREEAM 'excellent' rating. Prior to the occupation of the building, or within six months of occupation, a certificate following a post-construction review, shall be issued by an approved BREEAM Assessor to the Local Planning Authority, indicating that the relevant BREEAM rating has been met. In the event that such a rating is replaced by a comparable national measure of sustainability for building design, the equivalent level of measure shall be applicable to the proposed development unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In the interests of reducing carbon dioxide emissions and promoting principles of sustainable construction and efficient use of buildings (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 8/16 and Supplementary Planning Document 'Sustainable Design & Construction' 2007).

37. Automatic doors shall be installed in all areas used to access cycle parking spaces.

Reason: To facilitate access by cyclists (Cambridge Local Plan policy 8/6)

38. Prior to the commencement of installation of ramp and steps serving the cycle parking area, full details of the external finish of the ramp and steps shall be submitted to and approved by the local planning authority in writing. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans.

Reason: To facilitate access by cyclists (Cambridge Local Plan policy 8/6)

39. Prior to occupation of the development a Cycle Parking Access and Management Plan shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The Plan shall include a strategy to control the number of cyclists using the car lift and to monitor and manage the use of all cycle parking adjacent to the buildings.

Reason: To ensure satisfactory arrangements are in place to secure management of cycle parking. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 8/2 and 8/6)

40. The windows identified as having obscured glass on drawing numbers 6343 D3121 REV 10, 6343 D3720 REV 05 and 6343 D3721 REV 05 at second, third and fourth floor level) shall be obscure glazed to a minimum level of obscurity to conform to Pilkington Glass level 3 or equivalent prior to commencement of use (of the extension) and shall have restrictors to ensure that the window cannot be opened more than 45 degrees beyond the plane of the adjacent wall and shall be retained as such thereafter.

Reason: In the interests of residential amenity (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/4 and 3/12).

41. Prior to the commencement of development, full details of the on-site storage facilities for commercial waste, including waste for recycling shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Such details shall identify the specific positions of where wheeled bins, or any other means of storage will be stationed and the specific arrangements to enable collection from within 10m of the kerbside of the adopted highway/ refuse collection vehicle access point and the arrangements for the disposal of waste shall be provided and shall include provision for a minimum of 50% recycling/organic capacity. The approved facilities shall be provided prior to the commencement of the use hereby permitted and shall be retained thereafter.

Reason: To protect the amenities of nearby residents/occupiers and in the interests of visual amenity. Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/12 and 4/13

42. Prior to the commencement of the development, full details and plans for the on-site storage facilities for waste and recycling shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Such details shall identify the specific positions of where wheeled bins, or any other means of storage will be stationed to enable collection from within 10m of the kerbside of the adopted highway/ refuse collection vehicle access point. Details should include the on-site storage facilities for waste, including waste for recycling and the arrangements for the disposal of waste detailed; these arrangements shall subsequently be provided and shall include provision for a minimum of 50% recycling/organic capacity. The approved arrangements shall be retained thereafter.

Reason: To protect the amenities of nearby residents/occupiers and in the interests of visual amenity. Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/12 and 4/13

43. Prior to the commencement of occupation, full details of the storage facilities for the separation of waste for recycling and composting within the individual flats shall be provided. The approved arrangements shall be retained thereafter.

Reason: To protect the amenities of nearby residents/occupiers and in the interests of visual amenity. Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/12 and 4/13

INFORMATIVE: To satisfy the plant sound 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 sound 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 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 an acoustic 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 an acoustic assessment as described within this informative.

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

- Air Quality Monitoring in the Vicinity of Demolition and Construction Sites 2012

http://www.iaqm.co.uk/wp-content/uploads/guidance/monitoring_construction_sites_2012.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: To satisfy the odour/fume filtration/extraction condition, details should be provided in accordance with Annex B and C of the "Guidance on the Control of Odour and Noise from Commercial Kitchen Exhaust Systems," prepared by Netcen on behalf of the Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (DEFRA) dated January 2005 available at: https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/69280/pb10527-kitchen-exhaust-0105.pdf

INFORMATIVE: As the premises is intended to be run as a food business the applicant is reminded that under the Food Safety Act 1990 (as amended) the premises will need to be registered with Cambridge City Council. In order to avoid additional costs it is recommended that the applicant ensure that the kitchen, food preparation and food storage areas comply with food hygiene legislation, before construction starts. Contact the Commercial Team at Cambridge City Council on telephone number (01223) 457890 for further information.

INFORMATIVE: A premises licence may be required for this development in addition to any planning permission. A premises licence under the Licensing Act 2003 may be required to authorise:

- The supply of alcohol
- Regulated entertainment e.g.
- Music (Including bands, DJ's and juke boxes)
- Dancing
- The performing of plays
- Boxing or wrestling
- The showing of films
- Late Night Refreshment (The supply of hot food or drink between 23:00-05:00)

A separate licence may be required for activities involving gambling including poker and gaming machines.

The applicant is advised to contact The Licensing Team of Environmental Health at Cambridge City Council on telephone number (01223) 457899 or email Licensing@cambridge.gov.uk for further information.

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: To satisfy the backup generator condition the noise level from the generator associated with this application should not raise the existing background level (L90) by more than 5 dB(A) at the boundary of the premises subject to this application and having regard to noise sensitive premises.

Note: Only in exceptional circumstances where the applicant has shown that the above cannot be achieved and the need is for real emergencies (e.g. hospital operating theatre or emergency services) the following standard may be used

To satisfy the emergency generator condition the noise level from the emergency generator associated with this application should not raise the existing background level (L90) by more than 10 dB(A) at the boundary of the premises subject to this application and having regard to noise sensitive premises.

INFORMATIVE: Furnace chimney height 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 furnaces, boilers or plant to be installed should be provided using the Chimney Height Calculation form (available here: <https://www.cambridge.gov.uk/chimney-height-approval>), prior to installation

INFORMATIVE: The entrance doors to K1 should be electrically assisted to aid access for people with mobility issues.

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