

<b>Application Number</b>	16/0673/FUL	<b>Agenda Item</b>	
<b>Date Received</b>	22nd April 2016	<b>Officer</b>	Michael Hammond
<b>Target Date</b>	22nd July 2016		
<b>Ward</b>	Market		
<b>Site</b>	Cambridge Union Society 9A Bridge Street Cambridge Cambridgeshire CB2 1UB		
<b>Proposal</b>	Demolition of ancillary buildings and removal of 1930's facade at the grade II listed Cambridge Union Society. Construction of replacement facade, reinstatement and refurbishment of historic features and internal and external access and refurbishment works including enlargement of existing cafe (use class A3) and re-opening of 'footlight's' entertainment space (sui generis). Demolition of squash courts and un-listed 3-5 Round Church Street in the conservation area. Construction of new link building for access and ancillary uses for the Union Society. Construction of adjacent new building with ground floor restaurant (use class A3) with 38 room post-graduate student accommodation above (use class C2) together with basement storage and services.		
<b>Applicant</b>	See Company. C/o Agent United Kingdom		

SUMMARY	<p>The development accords with the Development Plan for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- In my view the proposal would cause less than substantial harm to the heritage assets and this would be outweighed by the public benefits that would accrue from the development.</li> <li>- The proposed restaurant and entertainment uses would not give rise to unacceptable environmental problems or nuisance to the occupiers</li> </ul>
---------	---

	<p>and users of the area.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The proposed student accommodation would provide a high quality living environment for its future occupants.</li> <li>- In comparison with the submitted plans, the reduction in scale and mass of the proposed restaurant/ accommodation building is considered to reduce the level of harm considerably.</li> </ul>
RECOMMENDATION	APPROVAL

## 1.0 SITE DESCRIPTION/AREA CONTEXT

1.1 The Cambridge Union Society is located in the historic core of the City Centre. It occupies a large site on the south-west corner of Park Street and Round Church Street. The majority of the site is occupied by the main Grade II Listed Building of the Cambridge Union Society. The building is three-storeys in height with a half level below. It was completed in 1866 by Sir Alfred Waterhouse, most famously known for his design for the National History Museum in London. Since its construction, the building has been the subject of later extensions and additions, notably the 1930's extension to the Round Church Street elevation and the squash court. The half level below was formerly used by the Cambridge University Footlights Drama Club. The debating chamber is situated in the heart of the building and occupies a large proportion of the main building and hosts the oldest debating society in the world. This aspect of the building has retained its appearance for over 140 years and has hosted a variety of well-known speakers including former prime ministers and major international figures. There is also the Cambridge Union Society coffee shop/ bar at ground-floor level which is open to members of the public. The upper floors and remainder of the building are predominantly office/ educational space, in addition to the large library and snooker room. In the north-east corner of the site is a row of three terraced properties (3-5 Round Church Street) used as student accommodation which are under the ownership of Trinity College.

- 1.2 To the west of the site is the Holy Sepulchre Church, commonly referred to as the Round Church, which is a Grade I Listed Building. To the north of the site is the Park Street multi-storey car park. There is a row of terraced properties to the east along Park Street, the southern half being Grade II Listed Building and the northern half being designated as Buildings of Local Interest. To the south-east of the site is the Grade I Listed 'Little Trinity' building. The ADC theatre is situated to the south of the site.
- 1.3 The site is situated in a sensitive location in terms of conservation and heritage assets. As stated there are the Grade I Listed Buildings of the Round Church and Little Trinity in close proximity. The main building on site is Grade II Listed. The row of terraced properties to the east along Park Street are Grade II Listed/ Buildings of Local Interest. The site is situated in the Central Conservation Area.
- 1.4 There are three tree preservation orders which cover the north-east and eastern sections of the site. The site also falls within the City Centre (as defined by the Cambridge Local Plan 2006), within the Controlled Parking Zone and in the Air Quality Management Area.

## **2.0 THE PROPOSAL**

2.1 Full planning permission and listed building consent are sought for the following works:

### **2.2 Demolition:**

- Removal of the 1933 elements of the Round Church Street façade of the Grade II Listed Cambridge Union Society buildings;
- Demolition of the 1883 dilapidated toilet block of the Grade II Listed Cambridge Union Society buildings;
- Demolition of the 1933 former Squash Courts of the Grade II Listed Cambridge Union Society buildings;
- Internal and external demolitions and removals of fabric from various periods to allow for the improved access to, and usage of spaces within, the Grade II Listed Union Society buildings;
- Demolition of the unlisted 3-5 Round Church Street in the Conservation Area

### 2.3 Development (as revised):

- Construction of a new Round Church Street façade of the Grade II Listed Cambridge Union Society building based upon an adaptation of the original 1883 design to tie-in with surviving original elements;
- Recreation of four dormer windows to the 1866 element of the Grade II Listed Cambridge Union Society buildings to re-instate those lost through bomb damage in the second world war;
- Creation of a new doorway to the Park Street elevation of the original 1883 building known as Round Church House of the Grade II Listed Cambridge Union Society buildings;
- Recreation of doorway from Snooker Room to the stairs of the Grade II Listed Cambridge Union Society buildings to re-instate the later change to remove the door;
- Creation of a new doorway between Round Church House and the Debating Chamber of the Grade II Listed Cambridge Union Society building;
- Re-location of the doorway from the café and members bar into the courtyard through enlargement of an existing window and creation of a ramp to create a level access entrance and subsequent closure of existing café entrance through reinstatement of former window detail of the Grade II Listed Cambridge Union Society building;
- General refurbishments to the interior of the Grade II Listed Cambridge Union Society building including to enlarge and refurbish the ground floor café and members bar (Use Class A3) and to enlarge and refurbish the basement 'footlights' entertainment space (Sui Generis);
- Construction of new three storey 'link' building connecting the Debating chamber entrance to a new building entrance onto Round Church Street including internal circulation space, stairs and lift and
- toilet facilities and ancillary spaces;
- Construction of new ground floor restaurant venue (Use Class A3) with frontage onto Round Church Street and Park Street with 38no. room post-graduate accommodation above and basement for associated plant, refuse and cycle parking and storage;
- Associated landscape works to front, rear and side including creation of level access entrances.

- 2.4 The applications are considered together in this report for planning permission as they are intrinsically related. There is however a separate agenda item which relates specifically to the application for listed building consent and sets out the relevant conditions.
- 2.5 In response to a number of concerns raised by consultees relating to heritage issues, the applicants have amended the scheme, specifically the proposed Trinity College post graduate accommodation and restaurant building. The amendments consist of alterations to the scale, massing and design of this element of the proposed works. These amendments are discussed in greater detail in the assessment section of this report.
- 2.6 The proposals have been the subject of extensive pre-application discussions between the Local Planning Authority and the applicants/ agent.
- 2.7 The application is accompanied by the following supporting information:
1. Design and Access Statement
  2. Heritage and Conservation Area Appraisal
  3. Planning Statement
  4. Building Surveys
  5. Transport Statement and Travel Plan
  6. Archaeological Appraisal
  7. Geo-technical and Contamination Appraisal
  8. Ecology and Arboricultural Assessment
  9. Surface Water & Foul Water Drainage
  10. Utilities Assessment
  11. Noise and Air Quality Assessment
  12. Ventilation and Extraction Statement
  13. Sustainability and Renewable Energy Appraisal
  14. A full drawings package

### **3.0 SITE HISTORY**

- 3.1 The site has an extensive planning history. The most recent applications on this site are listed below:

<b>Reference</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Outcome</b>
16/0674/LBC	Demolition of ancillary buildings	Pending

	<p>and removal of 1930's facade at the grade II listed Cambridge Union Society. Construction of replacement facade, reinstatement and refurbishment of historic features and internal and external access and refurbishment works including enlargement of existing cafe (use class A3) and re-opening of 'footlight's' entertainment space (sui generis). Demolition of squash courts and un-listed 3-5 Round Church Street in the conservation area.</p> <p>Construction of new link building for access and ancillary uses for the Union Society. Construction of adjacent new building with ground floor restaurant (use class A3) with 38 room post-graduate student accommodation above (use class C2) together with basement storage and services.</p>	Consideration.
12/0829/LBC	To increase the height of the chamber balustrade to minimise the risk to people using the chamber balcony.	Permitted.
06/0576/LBC	Removal of 2 No. existing metal escapes (external) and installation of a new hand rail (internal) to Grade II Listed Building.	Permitted.
C/03/0914	Re-opening of original blocked up doorways, formation of new doorways and other alterations.	Permitted.

4.0 **PUBLICITY**

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

5.0 **POLICY**

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

5.2 Relevant Development Plan policies

PLAN		POLICY NUMBER
Cambridge Plan 2006	Local	3/1 3/4 3/7 3/10 3/11 3/12 3/13 3/14 3/15 4/4 4/9 4/10 4/11 4/12 4/13 4/14 4/15 6/10 7/7 8/1 8/2, 8/3, 8/6, 8/9, 8/10, 8/16, 8/18 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
Supplementary Planning Guidance	Sustainable Design and Construction (May 2007) Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Waste

	<p>Partnership (RECAP): Waste Management Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (February 2012)</p> <p>Planning Obligation Strategy (March 2010)</p> <p>Public Art (January 2010)</p>
<p>Material Considerations</p>	<p><u>City Wide Guidance</u></p> <p>Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (November 2010)</p> <p>Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (2005)</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>Cambridgeshire Design Guide For Streets and Public Realm (2007)</p> <p>Cycle Parking Guide for New Residential Developments (2010)</p> <p>Air Quality in Cambridge – Developers Guide (2008)</p> <p>The Cambridge Shopfront Design Guide (1997)</p> <p>Roof Extensions Design Guide (2003)</p> <p>Buildings of Local Interest (2005)</p>
	<p><u>Area Guidelines</u></p> <p>Cambridge Historic Core Conservation Area Appraisal (2006)</p> <p>Park Street Car Park Planning Guidance Note (2016)</p>



Other	Draft Historic Core Conservation Area Appraisal (2016)

#### 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)**

#### Original Comments (20/05/2016)

- 6.1 No objection on Highway Safety Grounds. Further information and alterations are required to the Transport Statement.

#### Comments on Additional Information (11/11/2016)

- 6.2 Having reviewed the information provided the County Council consider that the development does not result in a severe cumulative impact on the highway network and therefore are able to remove our holding objection subject to the following planning conditions and informatives:

- Service Management Plan
- Travel Plan (including Student Management Plan detailing how drop off and pick up of students will occur.)

- No unbound material
- No gates erected
- Highways drainage
- Visibility splays
- Manoeuvring area as shown
- Approval in principle documents
- Access as shown
- Traffic management plan
- Traffic Management Plan informative
- Highways informative
- Public Utility informative

### **Environmental Health**

6.3 No objection subject to the following conditions/ informatives:

- Construction Hours
- Collection during construction
- Construction/ demolition noise/ vibration & piling
- Dust
- Odour filtration
- Contaminated Land
- Building noise insulation
- Noise insulation scheme
- Plant noise insulation
- Lighting
- Hours of deliveries/ collections
- Hours of use
- Air quality ventilation scheme 1
- Air Quality ventilation scheme 2
- Combined heat and power
- Plant noise insulation informative
- Dust condition informative
- DEFRA odour informative
- Housing informative
- Permitted process informative
- Clean air act informative

### **Refuse and Recycling**

6.4 No comments received.

## **Urban Design and Conservation Team**

### **Original Comments (22/07/2016)**

#### 6.5 Objection. Reasons for refusal:

- The height, scale massing and elevational treatment of the proposed student accommodation block would have an adverse impact on the setting of listed buildings within the Union Society site.
- The internal changes to the main stair area would have a significantly harmful effect on the fabric of the listed building.
- The height, scale massing and elevational treatment of the proposed student accommodation block and would not preserve or enhance the character of this part of the Historic Core/Conservation Area.
- The height, scale massing and elevational treatment of the proposed student accommodation block and would have an adverse impact on the setting of the Listed Park Street terrace.
- The demolition of 3-5 Round Church Street is not acceptable given the contribution which these buildings currently make to the character of this part of the Conservation Area.
- The proposed development will lead to ‘less than substantial harm’ to the settings of listed buildings and the Conservation Area as designated heritage assets and this harm is not outweighed by the public benefits of the development.

#### **Proposed Trinity College Accommodation Block & Restaurant.**

- The accommodation block would be of greater scale and bulk than the existing Northern Waterhouse wing on the same street elevation. It would also be of the same scale as and would thus compete with, the debating chamber building – the latter being the most significant element of the buildings and currently signalling this in its relationship with the existing lower wings. In these respects, the scale and bulk of the new building is considered excessive and to fail to respond sympathetically to the existing listed buildings and therefore to harm their character.
- It also does not help form a notional townscape intermediary between the more commercial & institutional city centre and the more modest scale of the residential inner suburbs. The mass of the building is not convincingly broken down by the notional

'double-pile' form or the two gable ends with projecting bays. It still seems to present an overwhelming visual intervention into the townscape, especially when viewed from the Northern end of Park Street. The mass seems more oppressive when viewed across the 'back yard' because of the solid brick mass of the student block and the heavy metal-clad parapet at eaves level.

### Impacts on the settings of Listed Buildings – (planning application)

#### *The Setting of the Terrace on Park Street:*

- There is clearly scope for improvement of the current prospect and the proposals potentially improve the service yard and boundary treatment. However, the accommodation block's scale, design and bulk in view across service yard would make it very dominating. Round Church House (the admin office) is set back from the Eastern boundary and is 2 – 3 storeys towards this boundary and the gable of 5, Round Church Street is of comparable scale to Round Church House. In contrast, the accommodation block would be much taller and much wider (14metres) than the main front to back depth of the existing cottages (7 metres). That it would be much closer to the boundary and occupying the corner as it would, its scale would be emphasised. The scale, bulk and design of the new building would result in it being unduly dominant in the setting of the terrace and a major adverse impact on the setting of the Listed terrace. There same can be said of the locally listed element.

#### *The Setting of the Holy Sepulchre Church (Round Church)*

- In the passage way along the Southern side a new gate is proposed in a position where there is none presently. Subject to the agreement of the details of this gate, there is judged to be no material adverse impact on the setting of the Church.

#### *The Setting of the Union Buildings*

- The setting of the Union buildings is currently marred by several elements. The scheme would improve the appearance of the building's setting at the service yard including by the removal of the toilet block.
- As an adjoining building, the Round Church St wing would be of significantly greater scale and bulk than the Northern wing and would be of the same scale as the debating chamber building – the latter being the most significant element of the buildings and currently the tallest. In terms of the immediate setting of the

listed building then, the new wing/building would appear the largest part of the group and this is considered to detract from the latter's setting.

- The proposed accommodation block would be apparent from Bridge Street in longer views down Round Church Street towards the Union buildings where it would appear above and beyond the existing Northern wings of the Union buildings.
- The dominance of the proposed accommodation block is therefore considered to harm the immediate setting of the older buildings.

#### Impacts on the conservation area – (planning application)

##### *Demolition of 3 – 5 Round Church Street*

- 3-5 Round Church Street are considered to contribute positively to the character or appearance of the conservation area and their demolition is considered to cause harm to the heritage asset.
- Returning to NPPF paragraphs 133 or 134, In either case, harm caused by the proposal must be weighed against the public benefits which in the case of para 133 must be substantial. Weighing against these are harm to the conservation area and Listed buildings settings that would arise from the design of the building proposed and the demolition of the cottages.

##### *Improvement of yard facing Park Street*

- This is currently a visually poor service yard viewed from the street. There is clearly potential for improvement and for mitigating views of the gable of No.5 Round Church Street

##### *The scale, bulk and design of the new building.*

- The substantial length, width and height of the building allied with the rigid repetition of elements (windows, dormers, banding, gables, and chimneys), result in it being likely to appear very dominant – especially seen from across the rear yard or on Park Street from opposite the car park corner. Its height, position on the site boundary and form would effectively project the building out into the street scene when viewed from the Park Street / Jesus Lane junction. In addition, the architectural treatment of the end elevation consists of very demonstrative elements with only shallow recessions and would be alien in the context of smaller scale buildings on Park Street and Lower Park Street. The combination of these factors would produce an overly dominant building on Park Street.

## Alterations to the Listed Buildings – (Listed building application)

### *Removal of the 1930s extensions.*

- The removal of the 1930s extensions is acceptable.

### *Demolition of Toilet Block*

- If the demolition were properly recorded and the better fittings salvaged for reuse elsewhere (or in the listed building), then it is probably acceptable to demolish the block, on balance.

### *Additional bay to the Waterhouse Northern elevation and reconstruction of the lower façade of the range.*

- A part of the proposals for the existing 19th Century northern block is the construction of an additional bay in brickwork to the Waterhouse Northern elevation. This is not a reinstatement as it was never part of the Waterhouse design. A straight vertical line on the Northern elevation drawing indicates the join between the two and the bay is confirmed by the floor plans to be at an angle to the existing main wall. How the brickwork at this junction was to work would need to be detailed. This bay would require brick and stonework of precisely matching materials.

## Interior changes to Listed Building

### *Basement*

- The works to basement are acceptable, subject to conditions.

### *Ground Floor*

- The proposed link building (atrium area) affects early layout in the existing stair area by removing the short adjoining wall of the 1866 build. This area currently has some enclosure which reflects the character of this part of the building. The drawing 745 183 P1 Indicative Central Atrium Circulation indicates the contrasting character of space that is envisaged. To retain the character of the early phase, the existing stair configuration should be retained and the new space start only beyond (north of) the short adjoining wall.
- The proposed additional number/position of further large openings in the main spine wall between the Members Bar and Blue Room is undesirable in terms of the character of these rooms – this will impact on the shape & scale of the proposed ‘forward kitchen’ and the bar.

### *First Floor*

- Here the main concerns remain in the area of the link block between the reconstructed end of the Waterhouse Northern block and the new student block. How much is demolished, how much is reconstructed, how much retained and so on.

### *Second Floor*

- Acceptable subject to condition.

### *New Link Building*

- To Round Church Street a link block provides both visual and literal separation between the listed building and the accommodation block and the recessed threshold should help visitors 'read' the buildings and how they are meant to be approached & used. However, it is important that the transparency of the façade of the foyer allows the two ends of the two separated blocks to be seen and understood as separate buildings but also that the link block itself has a real architectural presence on the street.

## **Comments on Amendments (09/11/2016)**

### Accommodation Block.

- Noting the reduction in height of the proposed Round Church Street elevation of the accommodation block, and reduced height and bulk of the proposed Park Street elevation, these revisions are considered to substantially address the height, scale, and massing issues previously objected to.
- In addition to the height and bulk reduction, the fenestration changes to the Park Street elevation also contribute to avoiding the overbearing effect of the gables of the previous version.

### 3-5 Round Church Street.

The harm to the conservation area caused by the proposed demolition of 3-5 Round Church Street remains as per the comments on the original proposal.

### Cambridge Union Society Buildings.

A part of the proposals for the existing 19th Century Round Church Street block is the entrance link and construction of an additional gabled bay in brickwork to the Waterhouse Northern elevation. The latter is not a reinstatement as it was never part of the Waterhouse design and replaces the existing roof hip. However, the applicants have declined to respond to the

Victorian Society's criticism of this element of the proposals and have submitted a justification of the design approach they have taken.

### Conclusion.

The harm versus the benefits of the scheme are discussed in the Conservation response to the original proposal. The issue remains one of the loss of 3-5 Round Church Street, and the inclusion of arguably undesirable alterations to the Listed CUS buildings (link and staircases) compared with benefits of reinstating the lower part of the Waterhouse, Round Church Street elevation; sustaining the historic Cambridge Union Society buildings; and any other perceived benefits.

The proposed development will lead to 'less than substantial harm' to the settings of listed buildings and the Conservation Area as designated heritage assets and this harm is not outweighed by the public benefits of the development.

## **Historic England**

### **Original Comments (10/06/2016)**

- 6.6 The application is not supported.
- 6.7 Historic England appreciate the Union Society's aims to develop the overall site to safeguard its long-term future. However, the submitted proposals in their current form would cause severe harm to the significance of the Cambridge Historic Core Conservation Area, as a result of the impact on their setting. We do not consider that a clear and convincing case for the demolition of 3-5 Round Church Street has been made in accordance with the requirements in Paragraph 132 of the NPPF. The repair of nos 3-5 should be central to any scheme for this site if it is to be consistent with the Framework's objective of conserving significance and the weight accorded to the conservation of significance reflects the statutory duties laid upon decision-makers by the 1990 Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act. Even were the Council to conclude that a case could be made for demolition, the scale of the new build element should be significantly reduced in line with the advice above.



## **Comments on amendments (01/11/2016)**

- 6.8 The revised proposals showing a reduction in height of one storey, together with amendments to the detailed design of the gable end of the student accommodation facing Park Street, would have a lesser impact on the streetscene than the previous proposals. However, our stance remains that demolition of 3-5 Round Church Street would cause severe harm to the significance of the Cambridge Historic Core Conservation Area, as a result of the impact on their setting, particularly in relation to the listed Park Street terrace. The repair of nos 3-5 and their integration into the wider development should be central to any scheme for this site if it is to be consistent with the NPPF's objective of conserving significance, and the weight accorded to the conservation of significance reflects the statutory duties laid upon decision-makers by the 1990 Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act. In accordance with guidance in the NPPF, the level of harm that would be incurred to the significance of the conservation area through the loss of 3-5 Round Church Street should, therefore, be carefully balanced against the perceived public benefits of the revised proposals.

### **The Victorian Society**

- 6.9 Object to the application (as submitted).

#### **Demolition of 3 -5 Round Church Street**

- 6.10 The most damaging aspect of the scheme is the proposed demolition of the attractive terrace of later nineteenth-century houses at 3-5 Round Church Street which would cause substantial harm.

#### **Proposed accommodation block**

- 6.11 The proposed accommodation block excessively and damagingly tall and bulky, seemingly on quite a different scale from the Union building that it would dominate and overshadow, not to mention the smaller scale domestic properties nearby. We object also to the crude, heavy treatment of the proposed link block proposed to abut the north end of the reworked North Wing.

## Works to the listed building

- 6.12 While we raise no objection to the loss of the twentieth-century fabric (and defer to the Twentieth Century Society on its significance), we object to an approach that would see an approximation of the Waterhouse's northern ground-floor elevation recreated. If the twentieth-century remodelling is to be unpicked, it makes sense to reinstate Waterhouse's design and reintegrate what survives of his work on Cross Church Street with its original setting.

### **Design and Conservation Panel (Meeting of 10<sup>th</sup> August 2016)**

The minutes of the Panel meeting were as follows:

- 6.13 **The impact on the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.**

Although the Panel did see the benefits of removing the existing discordant 1930s elements, concern was expressed as to the quantum of development on this site, and the impact of such a dominant development on the Conservation Area. The Panel regard Round Church Street as transitional space; moving from the busy, commercial character of Bridge Street to the quieter and predominantly residential character of Park Street. It was therefore felt that this development should respond to this changing character, but instead of stepping down in scale and massing it steps up, with the taller elements likely to create a canyon effect along Round Church Street and result in a significant increase in overshadowing of the public realm. The Panel was also not convinced that the height of the existing debating chamber element of the Waterhouse building should be seen as the precedent for the height of the new-build element on the back of the pavement along Round Church Street. The debating chamber is sited in the heart of the site, well away from the adjacent streets, in much the same way as Trinity College's taller Wolfson building is encircled by lower buildings lining the adjacent streets.

- 6.14 **Treatment of New Entrance (Round Church Street).**

The Panel noted the examination of options for the new entrance off Round Church Street, but questioned the decision

to treat this as a negative 'void' between the new Trinity Building and the restored and extended Waterhouse wing. The Panel was not convinced by the justification that this formed a third element in the street-scene. The Panel would encourage a greater celebration of the entrance, but one which is also architecturally incorporated as part of the Trinity Building, for a more successful result. The Panel would also have welcomed the opportunity to learn more about the architectural treatment for the new circulation space and stairwell within the Waterhouse building, but lack of time forced the debate to focus on more pressing matters.

#### **6.15 New Trinity Building.**

In addition to their concerns over the building's impact on the character and appearance of the Conservation Area, the Panel felt that this building would be more successful if it could be seen to have its own identity, rather than attempt to be seen as part of the 'family' of Waterhouse structures on the site. Particular concerns were expressed regarding the end double-gable that appears over-dominant and muscular, in particular when compared to the scale of the listed cottages along Park Street. The Panel was not convinced that the lower elements facing on to Park Street helped address this issue of scale, while the large areas of glass would afford views into the communal kitchen facilities; the experience of the student housing at CB1 suggests this might be unfortunate, and particularly inappropriate when viewed in the context of the listed cottages on the opposite side of Park Street.

#### **6.16 Treatment of the retained Courtyard space (including provision of disabled ramp).**

The Panel noted that the current treatment of the Courtyard is to retain the existing paths and to introduce a new dog-legged path to provide a ramped access to a new disabled entrance on the side wing. At the same time a triangular area of grass abutting the rear of the Round Church would be replaced with paving. The Panel felt that this important external space would benefit from a more holistic consideration, including how disabled access might be provided to the main entrance (as opposed to a side entrance), and where it might be best to provide hard landscaping for external seating (including

consideration of the impact on the setting of the Grade I listed Round Church).

#### **6.17 Listed cottages (Park Street).**

The presentation made no reference to the impact of the proposal on the setting of the listed cottages on the east side of Park Street. The Panel felt that further clarity was needed regarding the development's impact. Based on the information provided, the reference to the stepped end gable 'addressing' the cottages was viewed as tokenistic and unconvincing. The Panel also had a concern that the new Trinity Building appeared to mask more of the cottages in the proposed image looking down Round Church Street from Bridge Street.

#### **6.18 Conclusion**

At the last presentation in September, the Panel stated that they could accept the demolition of 3-5 Round Church Street providing the quality of redevelopment was of a sufficiently high standard.

The design of the scheme as currently proposed has not met this requirement, and the Panel considered the case had not been made to justify the quantum of new development on the site. The Panel recognises that this is an opportunity to restore the Waterhouse Building and put the future finances of the Cambridge Union Society onto a sound footing but, in the Panel's view, this scheme would be harmful both to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area and the setting of the adjacent Grade II listed cottages on Park Street. While there would be some undoubted enhancements to the Waterhouse Building, on balance, the Panel felt these benefits did not outweigh the harm.

VERTICT – AMBER (2), RED (3) with 1 abstention.

#### **Officer's note**

6.19 The programme for determination of the application did not allow for the revised application to be considered by the Design and Conservation Panel.

## **Twentieth Century Society**

6.20 No comments received.

### **Senior Sustainability Officer (Design and Construction)**

6.21 The proposal is acceptable subject to the following conditions:

- Renewable and low carbon energy
- Combined Heat and Power

### **Head of Streets and Open Spaces (Tree Team)**

6.22 There are no formal objections to the proposal including tree removals proposed in the Tree Survey. It may be necessary to carry out tree work to T6 and T7 to facilitate alterations. Works of this nature would need to be detailed and approved by the LPA before they can commence.

### **Head of Streets and Open Spaces (Landscape Team)**

6.23 No objection subject to landscaping conditions.

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

6.24 The improvement to the public realm in the area, particularly the widening of the footway is very much welcomed. However, this application will not improve the pinch point at the corner of Park Street and Round Church Street which will remain at 1.4m. The building should be set back to provide a recommended minimum footway of 1.8m.

6.25 Whilst it is appreciated that space is at a premium at this location the proposal does not include any cycle parking for the new restaurants which is unacceptable. By setting back the new building by approximately 800mm it would be possible to install cycle racks at 45° in front of the building. The need to use a lift to access the basement cycle parking is not ideal. It should be widened to 2m to allow two people with cycles to use it at the same time.

**Cambridgeshire County Council (Flood and Water Management)**

6.26 No objection subject to drainage conditions.

**Head of Streets and Open Spaces (Sustainable Drainage Officer)**

6.27 No objection subject to surface water drainage scheme condition.

**Environment Agency**

6.28 No objection subject to contaminated land condition and informatives.

**Anglian Water**

6.29 No objection, subject to surface water drainage condition and informative.

**Cambridgeshire Constabulary (Architectural Liaison Officer)**

6.30 No objection.

**Public Art Officer**

6.31 No comments received.

**Cambridge Water**

6.32 No comments received.

**Cambridgeshire County Council (Archaeology)**

6.33 No objection subject to condition.

**Access Officer**

6.34 No comments received.

## **Fire and Rescue Service**

6.35 No comment received.

## **City Service Managers**

6.36 No comments received.

## **Disability Consultative Panel (Meeting of 28<sup>th</sup> June 2016)**

6.37 The Panel very much appreciated this second presentation on what must be a challenging site. The practical interventions proposed will significantly improve access for disabled people while consideration is also being shown to restoring some of the site's original Victorian features. A good scheme.

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

## **7.0 REPRESENTATIONS**

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

- Cambridge Past, Present and Future
- 8 Park Parade

7.2 The representations can be summarised as follows:

- The proposal will enhance the neighbourhood.
- Proposals to radically alter a listed building should respect that building as it stands with any extension or alteration being on a subservient scale. The proposed refurbishment of the Cambridge Union involved a loose restoration along the lines of how the building was prior to the 1930s Tomlinson alterations, but with the re-development of the eastern half of the site with a building that is substantially larger than the listed building that is to be retained. Although this breaches the general principle, it is the opinion of Cambridge PPF that the circumstances justify this reversal provided the quality of the architectural design and finish materials is not allowed to become compromised during the development process.

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

### **Principle of Development**

#### Principle of demolition of heritage assets and works/ additions to the listed building

8.2 The principle of demolition of the heritage assets has been assessed in the 'Context of site, design and external spaces (and impact on heritage assets)' section of this report.

#### Principle of expansion of café/bar (use class A3) and re-opening 'footlight's' venue (use class sui generis)

8.3 Policy 6/10 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2006) states that development for use classes A3 (food and drink) will only be permitted:

a) Where the proposal will not give rise to unacceptable environmental problems or nuisance and the individual and



cumulative impact of the development is considered acceptable;  
and

b) Where it is in an existing centre.

- 8.4 The proposals for the Union Society include expansion of the existing 1815 Café and Members Bar and the re-opening of the former 'Footlight's' entertainment venue.
- 8.5 The Environmental Health Team is satisfied that the proposed expansion of the existing café/ bar and proposed re-opening of the 'Footlight's' venue would not give rise to unacceptable environmental problems or nuisance, subject to conditions. In my opinion the principle of the expansion of the existing restaurant use and re-opening of the 'Footlight's' entertainment venue is acceptable.

#### Principle of new Restaurant venue (Use Class A3)

- 8.6 Policy 6/10 is also relevant to the proposed new restaurant venue beneath the proposed post-graduate accommodation. In respect of the two criterion of this policy, the policy is considered to be met as the restaurant would be located within an existing mixed use area at the centre of Cambridge and would also be in the immediate vicinity of Portugal Place, Bridge Street and Jesus Lane, which contain a high volume of existing restaurant and public house establishments. The area is already highly frequented for food and drink purposes and it is considered that there is no likelihood that the use would lead to unacceptable environmental impacts or nuisance or contribute in such a way that would lead to an unacceptable cumulative impact, subject to conditions.
- 8.7 The design of the new building utilises separate entrances for the student accommodation above to that of the restaurant guest and servicing entrances as well as separate servicing spaces. The presence of the restaurant use with student accommodation above is therefore also deemed to be an acceptable relationship, subject to the conditions recommended by the Environmental Health Team.

## Principle of Student Accommodation (Use Class C2)

- 8.8 Policy 7/7 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2006) states that planning permission will be granted for windfall and student hostel sites subject to:
- a) Amenity considerations;
  - b) Their proximity to the institutions they serve;
  - c) Supervision, if necessary, is provided as appropriate to their size, location and the nature of the occupants; and
  - d) They do not result in a loss of family residential accommodation.
- 8.9 In terms of criterion A, it is established that the site and surrounding area already includes a quantity of student accommodation and student based uses, including student accommodation within the houses fronting Park Street and the presence of the Union Society. As described in paragraphs 8.5 and 8.7 of this report, the proposed expansion and development of the entertainment and restaurant based uses are not anticipated to give rise to any unacceptable environmental or noise problems, subject to conditions. The proposed student accommodation is deemed to be compatible with the proposed and existing uses from an amenity perspective.
- 8.10 The site is within close proximity to the main campus of Trinity College and I am confident that criterion B has been met. With respect to criterion C, it is understood that Trinity College already has procedures for the management and supervision of its students. I have recommended a condition for a management plan to be provided prior to occupation to confirm the precise details of this supervision procedure. Subject to meeting this condition, I consider this criterion has also been met.
- 8.11 The existing properties of nos.3-5 Round Church Street are within the ownership of Trinity College and are currently occupied as shared student accommodation. These properties are not deemed to be family residential accommodation. Consequently the proposal does not result in the loss of family residential accommodation and meets criterion D.
- 8.12 In my opinion, subject to condition, the principle of the proposed student accommodation is acceptable.

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

8.13 This section of the report will address the two key elements of the application. The first section will assess the principle of the proposed works from a heritage perspective, specifically, the principle of demolition to the Grade II listed building, principle of demolition of nos.3-5 Round Church Street in the Conservation Area, and the principle of works to the listed building. The second section will assess the impact of the proposed works, notably the restaurant and accommodation block, on the character and appearance of the Conservation Area, and the setting of heritage assets. In the concluding paragraph of this latter section I shall summarise the balance between the harm to heritage assets against the public benefits of the development.

### Policy Position

8.14 Policy 4/10 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2006) states that works for the demolition of Listed Buildings will not be permitted unless:

- a) The building is structurally unsound for reasons other than deliberate damage or neglect; or
- b) It cannot continue in its current use and there are no viable alternative uses; and
- c) Wider public benefits will accrue from redevelopment.

8.15 Paragraph 133 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2012) states that:

*“Where a proposed development will lead to substantial harm to or total loss of significance of a designated heritage asset, local planning authorities should refuse consent, unless it can be demonstrated that the substantial harm or loss is necessary to achieve substantial public benefits that outweigh that harm or loss, or all of the following apply:*

- The nature of the heritage asset prevents all reasonable uses of the site; and*
- No viable use of the heritage asset itself can be found in the medium term through appropriate marketing that will enable its conservation; and*

- *Conservation by grant-funding or some form of charitable or public ownership is demonstrably not possible; and*
- *The harm or loss is outweighed by the benefit of bringing the site back into use.”*

8.16 There is an inconsistency between the criteria within Policy 4/10 of the Local Plan and that of the NPPF. The NPPF makes clear that the demonstration of public benefits can in of itself provide justification for substantial harm to or total loss of significance of designated heritage asset. The justification for demolition does not necessarily need to establish both a public benefit argument and compliance with the criteria within policy 4/10 of the Local Plan.

8.17 In light of the above, in the event that the proposed demolition and works are deemed to cause substantial harm to or total loss of significance of a designated heritage, the harm caused would be weighed against the public benefits.

8.18 The public benefits that have been demonstrated by the agent are as follows:

*Improvement to the Public Realm*

- Opportunity to repair the harm of the 1960’s Park Street road widening and truncation of Round Church Street terrace.
- Uneven pavement to be replaced along Round Church and Park Street.
- Increase in width of narrow pavement at the pinch point on the corner of Park Street.
- Activity created at street level along Round Church Street, benefiting the future Park Street Car Park redevelopment.
- Visual improvement to service yard at rear of Union, tidying up and unsightly area of Cambridge.

*Improvement to Building Conditions*

- Replaces deteriorating housing that is financially and physically unviable to refurbish to modern living standards.
- Replaces the ‘eyesore’ of the 1930’s intervention to the Round Church Street elevation of the CUS building.
- Enables the repair and maintenance of the CUS building which in areas has become heavily dilapidated.

### *Improvement to Public Housing*

- Releases housing currently owned by Trinity College back into the housing stock (39 Victoria Park, 12 Glisson Road, 20 Victoria Street and 53 + 66 Searle Street).
- Replaces low quality student housing with an increased number of high quality units.

### *Improvements to the Cambridge Union Society (CUS)*

- Funds the development of the CUS which otherwise would not be financially possible.
- Allows the CUS to develop a source of income for the long term sustainability of the Union.
- Returns the building to an appearance in keeping with its Victorian origins, removing the failed 1930's intervention.
- Reinstates lost heritage features of the Victorian building including the dormers above the Snooker Room.
- Repairs and replaces elements of the Union that have reached the end of their life cycle, securing the buildings future.
- Ensures the future of the longest running and world renowned debating society.
- Opens the CUS building to the public via the enabling of the development works.
- Enables the CUS to reopen and reuse the original home of the Footlight's.
- Enables the Union to provide much needed accessibility to the majority of key areas within the building.
- Provides the CUS with a public face and an unprecedented level of much needed public access.

## **Principle of Proposed Demolition and Works**

### Principle of demolitions to the Grade II listed Cambridge Union Society Building

8.19 The following demolitions to the Grade II Listed Building are proposed:

- Removal of the 1933 elements of the Round Church Street façade of the Grade II Listed Cambridge Union Society buildings;
- Demolition of the 1883 dilapidated toilet block of the Grade II Listed Cambridge Union Society buildings;
- Demolition of the 1933 former Squash Courts of the Grade II Listed Cambridge Union Society buildings;

- Internal and external demolitions and removals of fabric from various periods to allow for the improved access to, and usage of spaces within, the Grade II Listed Union Society buildings;
- 8.20 The agent has prepared a heritage assessment which highlights the significance of each element of the Listed Building. The assessment confirms that the areas of highest significance are the Debating Chamber, front entrance and faces and interior of the 1886 extensions of the parallel ranges. The 1930's Round Church Street façade, 1883 toilet lock and 1930's former squash courts are identified as being of low significance.
- 8.21 The Urban Design and Conservation Team, Historic England and Victorian Society have raised no objection to the removal of the 1930's Round Church Street façade, demolition of the 1883 toilet block or the former squash courts. The vast majority of the demolition works to the interior of the Listed Building are also supported by consultees, subject to conditions. As such, I do not consider any harm to the significance of the Listed Building would occur from these proposed demolitions.
- 8.22 The main point of contention in terms of demolition affecting the Listed Building is the proposed removal of the main staircase in the atrium. The Urban Design and Conservation Team and Historic England both object to this element of the scheme and consider that in order for the demolition to be acceptable. The consultees have stated that the existing stair configuration should be retained and the new interior space should start only beyond (north of) the short adjoin wall.
- 8.23 The heritage assessment provided with the application defines this staircase as clearly being of some heritage significance as an aspect of the 1930's alterations. In their view it is of no higher than moderate heritage significance. I am inclined to further the view of the applicant.
- 8.24 In my opinion, the removal of the staircase would lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of the Listed Building. In accordance with paragraph 134 of the NPPF I have weighed this harm against the public benefits of the proposal, including securing its optimum viable use.

8.25 Conservation and Planning Officers, together with the agent, have explored ways of trying to overcome this issue. No solution to this matter was agreed upon but it was clear that trying to retain or mimic the existing staircase would have significant impacts on the circulation and functionality of the scheme. At present, the Cambridge Union Society effectively turns its back onto Round Church Street and the existing entrances are relatively discreet and out of the public view. The proposed entrance onto Round Church Street would counteract this by providing an inviting and legible entrance into the site from the public realm. The new entrance would also drastically enhance the levels of active frontage along the street. In addition to this, accessibility and circulation would be improved substantially as the existing corridors and routes through the building are narrow and extremely difficult for people with impaired mobility to access. The Disability Consultative Panel recognise this in their support of the scheme (see paragraph 6.37).

8.26 In my opinion, the public benefits of the increased public exposure of the building and its uses, and the significant improvements to accessibility, would outweigh the less than substantial harm to the Listed Building.

#### Principle of Demolition of 3 -5 Round Church Street

8.27 Policy 4/11 of the Local Plan requires the same test as policy 4/10 to be applied when considering proposals to demolish any buildings in the Conservation Area. As explained in paragraphs 8.14 – 8.18 of this report, the tests applied would mirror those of the NPPF whereby to justify demolition it must be demonstrated that a building is either structurally unsound or obsolete or that wider benefits would accrue. The buildings in question are not listed and are not identified as Buildings of Local Interest. The buildings form part of a positive view in the Historic Core Conservation Area Appraisal (2006) and the space to the east of no.5 is described as poor floorspace. The draft Historic Core Conservation Area Appraisal (2016) identifies the buildings as being positive and no.5 being a focal feature in the street scene. However, as there are objections to this document and it is only at consultation stage I am of the view that this document holds only limited weight.

- 8.28 The heritage assessment submitted considers the row of properties to make at best little more than a neutral contribution to the area. It states that the positive elements of the buildings are their materials of construction and general form, which gives some affinity with nearby residential properties and some of the minor details such as the shop window to No.5. Negative aspects are the unsightly gable end and now visible rear elevations and boundaries together with the hard-to-maintain front lightwells which are prone to damp and collect rubbish making it hard to prevent them looking unsightly. The assessment describes how the relationship with the Park Street Listed Buildings to the east is relatively recent as there would have been no visual link between the cottages on the east side and the cottages to the west prior to the demolition works on the west side in the 1960's. The assessment concedes that the demolition of these properties will entail some loss of heritage significance to the Conservation Area, but that the loss would be less than substantial given the generic appearance of the residential dwellings and limited heritage value compared to numerous longer rows and groups of house in the area.
- 8.29 The Urban Design and Conservation Team, Historic England and the Victorian Society all agree that the buildings to contribute positive to the character or appearance of the Conservation Area. The buildings are identified as a 'positive' feature in the published Conservation Area Appraisal 2006. However, there is some ambiguity over the level of harm each consultee considers would arise. The wording of Historic England ("severe harm") and the Victorian Society's ("high level of harm") comments implies that they consider the demolition would lead to substantial harm to the heritage asset, in accordance with paragraph 133 of the NPPF. In contrast, the Urban Design and Conservation Team in summarising their reasons for refusal explain that the proposed development will lead to 'less than substantial harm' to the setting of listed building and the Conservation Area as designated heritage assets and this harm is not outweighed by the public benefits of the development. Notwithstanding the Urban Design and Conservation Team's opinion on the weight of the public benefits, the identification of the harm caused matches that of paragraph 134 of the NPPF.
- 8.30 In justifying the significance of the buildings, Historic England makes reference to the group value they have when viewed in



conjunction with the Park Street town houses and the positive contribution they make. The Victorian Society also cites this group value as being the key factor in their significance, as well as the positive contribution they make to the setting of the Union Society building. The Urban Design and Conservation Team also emphasises the group value aspect but goes into greater detail about the materials of the scheme and the impact this has in cohesion with the Cambridge Union buildings:

*“Following their decline in popularity and the demise of the city’s brickworks, nineteenth century gault brick buildings are very much representative of a limited period and are integral to the character and appearance of the central core conservation area. By c1890 gault bricks were out of fashion for city centre houses and suburban villas as advances in manufacturing and transport meant that the much more desirable red bricks were readily available. On the application site, they contrast with and help to highlight the materiality of the “high status”, red brick, Waterhouse Cambridge Union Buildings.”*

- 8.31 I agree with the view of the Urban Design and Conservation Team that the demolition of the properties would result in less than substantial harm to the significance of the heritage asset. As a result, the harm caused must be weighed against the public benefits that the demolition would provide, including securing its optimum viable use.
- 8.32 The demolition of this element of the site would allow for the development of the new restaurant and student accommodation block that would be built in its place. This would result in improvements to the public realm, notably the increase in width of the narrow pavement at the pinch point on the corner of Park Street and creation of activity at street level along Round Church Street. The existing poor condition of student housing would be replaced with a higher quality of accommodation. A structural engineers report and valuation report of the existing properties states that the repairs and renovations needed to bring the properties back into domestic use would involve significant work. The report concludes that given the need to raise sufficient funds to safeguard the Listed Building, such work is not viable. The subsequent development over this space would develop a source of income for the long term sustainability of the Union and secures the future of the building. The financial security of the Union would help to

ensure that the legacy of the Listed Building is preserved and allow them to repair and maintain the building accordingly. I consider this latter benefit to be a significant public benefit as without this there is a real risk that the setting and historic fabric of the Listed Building could be irreversibly harmed.

8.33 Overall, in weighing the less than substantial harm to the heritage asset caused by the demolition of nos.3 – 5 Round Church Street against the public benefits (including securing its optimum viable use) that would accrue, I am of the opinion that the public benefits would outweigh the harm and secure the long-term future of the Listed Building.

#### Principle of works and additions to the Grade II Listed Building

8.34 The application proposes the following works and additions to the Listed Building:

- Reinstatement of lost dormer windows
- Reinstatement of a Waterhouse derived façade
- Access improvements
- Internal changes to improve circulation and usage of spaces
- Creation of ancillary spaces

8.35 The relevant consultees have raised no objection to the proposed reinstatement of the lost dormer windows, creation of ancillary spaces and most of the access improvements and internal changes. In the absence of objections to these elements from the expert consultees, I am minded to support these aspects of the proposal, subject to conditions.

8.36 One exception is the lack of support for the proposed removal and replacement of the staircase. The impact of this element has been assessed in paragraphs 8.22 – 8.25 of this report and is deemed to be acceptable.

8.37 I also acknowledge that concerns have been raised from the Victorian Society regarding the proposed reinstatement of the Waterhouse derived façade. The Victorian Society considers that if the twentieth-century remodeling is to be unpicked, it makes sense to reinstate Waterhouse's design and reintegrate what survives of his work on Round Church Street with its original setting. In contrast, Historic England state that no harm would be caused to the building's significance by the proposed

restoration of the lower section of the Waterhouse elevation on Round Church Street. The Urban Design and Conservation Team recommend conditions relating to the junction of brickwork and material samples and do not object to the this element of the scheme.

- 8.38 In my opinion, the proposed Waterhouse façade would improve the appearance of the building and would not amount to substantial harm to the heritage asset. The current Round Church Street 1930's façade is of poor quality and in a dilapidated condition. The proposed façade would take inspiration from the architectural attributes of the existing Waterhouse building and would rejuvenate the appearance of the building in the street scene. The works will enhance the character and appearance of the Conservation Area and make a positive contribution to the setting of the Listed Building.

### **Response to Context**

#### Proposed restaurant/ accommodation building and link building – Original proposal

- 8.39 The proposed building would occupy a highly prominent location in the street scene by virtue of its position occupying the corner of the site between Round Church Street and Park Street. As explained in paragraphs 1.2 and 1.3 of this report, the site is in a sensitive location in terms of heritage assets both on-site and off-site.
- 8.40 The application originally proposed a four-and-a-half storey building with the ridge line over 3.1m above the adjacent Round Church Street element and sought to use the ridge line of the large debating chamber roof to inform its scale and mass. The gable end featured a set of double gothic style bays and the Round Church Street façade had a high frequency of dormer windows with rows of horizontal stone coursing demarcating each floor of the building.
- 8.41 The original scheme came under strong criticism from the Design and Conservation Panel. The Panel felt that the development should respond to this changing character, but instead of stepping down in scale and massing it steps up, with the taller elements likely to create a canyon effect along Round Church Street and result in a significant increase in

overshadowing of the public realm. The Panel was also not convinced that the height of the existing debating chamber element of the Waterhouse building should act as a precedent for the proposed height. The Panel wanted to see the glazed linking element portrayed as a greater celebration of the entrance. Furthermore it was recommended that the new building should have its own identity and that the end double-gable appears over-dominant and muscular in appearance when compared to the listed cottages opposite.

8.42 Continuing this theme, concerns were raised by design-based consultees. The Urban Design and Conservation Team encapsulated their criticism by describing the scale and bulk of the new building to be too excessive and failing to respond sympathetically to the existing listed buildings, thus harming their character. Historic England shared this view, explaining that the new building would constitute an extremely prominent intervention in the street scene. This was also reiterated by the Victorian Society, who added that the crude, heavy treatment of the proposed link block appears highly incongruous, working against, not with, the form and manner of the listed building.

8.43 In assessing the original proposal, I agreed with the concerns raised regarding the proposed new building as the proposal would have adversely impacted on the setting and historic interest of the nearby Listed Buildings and would have failed to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Conservation Area.

Proposed restaurant/accommodation building and link building  
– Revised proposal

8.44 In response to the unanimous criticism of the original scheme the applicant elected to revise the proposal to try and address the concerns raised. The main changes are as follows.

8.45 The building has been reduced in scale down to three-and-a-half storeys with the ridge line being lowered by 2.75m, approximately 400m above that of its neighbouring building. The number of dormers has been decreased down from 5 to 3 with the dormers now slightly wider and sitting lower in the roof plane. The central stone coursing between the first and second floor has been removed and replaced with recessed brickwork and the window detail simplified to read as single vertical planes

breaking up the horizontal nature of the buildings along Round Church Street. There was originally an overhang above first-floor level and this has since been removed so that the building line is flush at all levels. The eaves line has also been lowered and reads level with that of the Waterhouse element adjacent along Round Church Street. The set of double gables has been replaced with two regular gable ends and the window fenestration has been altered in terms of a significant reduction in the level of glazing and introduction of ornamental arrangements, notably oriel windows. There are also other more detailed changes to minor elements of the scheme.

8.46 Since the amendments were made comments have been received from the Urban Design and Conservation Team and Historic England. The Urban Design and Conservation Team has stated that the revisions are considered to substantially address the height, scale and massing issue previously objected to and that the fenestration changes to the Park Street elevation also contribute to overcoming the overbearing effects of the gables of the previous version. Historic England explain that the amendments would reduce the level of harm caused to the setting of the Listed Buildings and that this would have a lesser impact on the street scene. No comments have been received from the Victorian Society on the amended scheme.

8.47 The original scheme was criticised by the relevant consultees due to its excessive scale and mass, treatment of the end gable and dominance compared to the Listed Buildings both on and off-site. The responses received after the amendments suggest that the level of harm caused by this element has been reduced significantly. There were concerns raised by the Design and Conservation Panel and the Victorian Society regarding the proposed link building/ entrance from Round Church Street which do not appear to have been resolved. However, these were not shared by the Urban Design and Conservation Team or Historic England.

8.48 In my opinion, the proposed amendments have overcome the main issues regarding the treatment of the gable end, excessive scale and mass and the dominating impact it would have on the relevant heritage assets. The treatment of the Round Church Street elevation and reduction in mass has resulted in a scheme which appears much simpler in its form and appearance. This combined with the significant reduction in

scale means that the development would not harmfully compete or draw attention away from the prized debating chamber building. Furthermore the revision to the gable end means that it will appear far less pronounced and dominant in the street scene when viewed from key public viewpoints in the Conservation Area.

8.49 I do not share the views of the Victorian Society and the Design and Conservation Panel in respect of the concerns relating to the link building and entrance. In my view, the glazed link would act as a sensitive mediator between the reinstatement of the Waterhouse façade and the new building, providing a key delineation between the ends and beginnings of these two elements. The recessing of this aspect behind the building frontages of these two buildings and glazed fenestration also ensures that it does not clutter or confuse the successfully contrasting treatment along Round Church Street of the two buildings. My opinion is that celebrating this entrance any further, by way of widening, bringing forward or changing materials, would appear awkward in the juxtaposition it finds itself. In addition to this, the scheme needs to be taken in its current context, whereby there is no meaningful active frontage along this elevation, and the proposed glazed link would be a considerable enhancement to improving the levels of active frontage along this street.

8.50 In my assessment of the revised scheme and interpreting the consultee responses received before and after the revisions, I am of the view that the proposed building, as amended, would cause less than substantial harm to the nearby heritage assets. In accordance with paragraph 134 of the NPPF I have weighed this harm against the public benefits of the proposal, including securing its optimum viable use.

#### Assessment of Public Benefits

8.51 The applicant has presented what they consider to be a number of public benefits that would arise from the development of the proposed building. The full list of these public benefits is detailed in paragraph 8.18 of this report. I have assessed the public benefits put forward and the level of weight they should be afforded in decision making.

- 8.52 Firstly, with respect to the improvements to the public realm, the opportunity to repair the harm of the Park Street road widening, replacement of pavement and visual improvements to the service yard would be site-specific and are relatively minor when compared to the other public benefits put forward. Nevertheless, these would represent a benefit to the area. The increase in width of the pavement on the corner of Park Street and creation of an active frontage along Round Church Street would substantially improve the pedestrian environment in terms of safety and active surveillance and I believe these are moderate in terms of their significance.
- 8.53 Secondly, in considering the improvements to the building conditions, the replacement of deteriorating housing is very much exclusive to Trinity College and I am not convinced that this is a notable public benefit. The replacement of the 1930's Round Church Street façade would inevitably improve the appearance of the street scene and would benefit the character of the area as a whole. The repair and maintenance work of the Cambridge Union Society building would be a significant public benefit and this is explored in greater detail in paragraph 8.55.
- 8.54 Thirdly, the replacement of low quality student housing with higher quality units would be, in my view, a private benefit to Trinity College as it would only be readily experienced by their students. In contrast, the release of housing currently owned by Trinity College would be a substantial public benefit. The properties in question are all in sustainable locations and ideal for use as dwellinghouses. The release of this housing would contribute to easing the holistic housing issues that the city is currently experiencing, notably increasing the supply of houses available to help meet the growing demand.
- 8.55 Fourthly, there would also be public benefits arising from the improvements to the Cambridge Union Society. I consider the reinstatement of the dormers above the snooker room not to be a public benefit. The opening up of the building and its associated functions would improve opportunities for members of the public to experience the uses offered, which, at present, are almost invisible to people using the public realm adjacent. The reopening of the Footlight's entertainment venue would also offer new cultural experiences for those living and visiting Cambridge. The new entrance and internal works to the building would dramatically improve the accessibility of the building

which is currently extremely difficult and challenging for anyone with impaired mobility to navigate. The overall sustainability and carbon footprint of the building would be improved as a result of replacing outdated forms of heating and energy usage with modern-day technology.

- 8.56 Finally, and most significantly, the works would ensure that the long term future of the Listed Building is secured and that the world's longest running debating society is able to continue operating in the heart of Cambridge. The existing building is in a poor state structurally which is encapsulated by the fact that existing leaks are managed by catching water in buckets. In addition to this, the heating of the building uses extremely old forms of boilers which are inefficient in both their energy use and the financial cost of running. The consequence of this is that the historic fabric of the Listed Building is at a serious risk of deteriorating without these necessary internal works. The Cambridge Union Society has, and continues to host, a variety of world renowned public speakers and guests and plays a critical role in forming the global presence of the University of Cambridge. The ability to attract high profile speakers and host high quality debates on economic, social and environmental issues adds significant weight in the overall city branding of Cambridge as a forward thinking and progressive city.

### Summary

- 8.57 The proposed internal works to the Listed Building would cause some harm to its special architectural interest due to the removal of the main staircase. The properties at nos.3 – 5 Round Church Street are considered to have a neutral contribution to forming the character and appearance of the Conservation Area and the loss of these would result in a degree of harm. The proposed link building and entrance from Round Church Street would harm nearby heritage assets according to the Victorian Society and the Design and Conservation Panel. The revised scheme for the post-graduate accommodation/ restaurant block is considered to cause low harm to heritage assets. Overall, I am of the opinion that the proposed demolitions and additions amount to less than substantial harm to the relevant heritage assets.
- 8.58 There would be dramatic public benefits to the pedestrian environment and accessibility of the area both internally within



the site and externally outside the site, such as the widening of the pinch point between Park Street and Round Church Street. The internal improvements and long term structural and financial benefits for the Cambridge Union Society that the proposal would create would take important steps to securing the legacy of the world renowned Cambridge Union Society and help preserve the historic integrity of the Listed Building. The replacement of the 1930's extensions and additions, which are considered to detract from the Listed Building's significance, would contribute positive to the area. The proposal would also involve the release of five properties currently owned by Trinity College to the open market which would be beneficial in the City meeting its overall housing need.

- 8.59 In my opinion, in weighing the less than substantial harm to the heritage assets caused by the demolition of nos.3 – 5 Round Church Street against the public benefits (including securing its optimum viable use) that would accrue, I am of the opinion that the public benefits would outweigh the harm and the scheme is acceptable, in accordance with paragraph 134 of the NPPF.

#### Landscaping and Trees

- 8.60 The proposal would involve the removal of the two trees close to the north-east corner of the site. The tree survey identifies these trees as being of Category C and Category U value respectively. The large protected tree in the south-east corner, that which is most visible from views north-west between Jesus Lane and Park Street, would not be removed. The Tree Officer has raised no objection to the proposed works subject to a condition ensuring that the root protection area of this tree and the adjacent tree will not be affected.
- 8.61 The landscape design seeks to enhance the existing front and rear courtyards to the Union Society buildings as well as repair surrounding public realm where appropriate. The front entrance courtyard includes installation of a ramp to allow provision of a permanent level access to the café and wider building. The main lawn is proposed to be replaced by Yorkstone paving to create a terrace for the café and Society events. The scheme proposes new planting around the courtyard and refreshing the existing shrub beds with new plants. The Landscape Team is supportive of the proposals, subject to landscaping conditions.

8.62 In my opinion, subject to conditions, the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 3/4, 3/7, 3/11, 3/12, 3/13, 3/14, 4/4, 4/10, 4/11 and 4/12.

### **Renewable energy and sustainability**

8.63 The application proposes a combined approach in terms of renewable energy for the proposed Trinity building for both the new restaurant and student accommodation consisting of a roof mounted photovoltaic array of approximately 30m<sup>2</sup> and a combined heat and power system within the basement. The upgrades to the existing building fabric and plant/ boiler rooms in the basement will also represent an improvement in terms of the buildings sustainability. The Sustainability Officer is supportive of the proposals, subject to conditions and I agree with this advice.

8.64 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, subject to conditions.

### **Disabled access**

8.65 As described in paragraph 8.24 of this report, the proposal would significantly improve the accessibility of the building and is supported by the Disability Consultative Panel.

8.66 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**

8.67 Whilst the proposed new building is of a considerable scale, it is situated a comfortable separation distance from any nearby residential properties. The building would not adversely overshadow or visually enclose any neighbouring occupiers. The views out would face onto the street and would not compromise the privacy of any nearby occupiers. The works to the listed building would not introduce any new forms of overlooking or loss of privacy.

- 8.68 Conditions have been recommended by the Environmental Health Team to control the noise and environmental matters associated with the proposed accommodation, restaurant and entertainment uses. In my opinion, subject to these conditions, the proposal would not give rise to unacceptable levels of noise and disturbance.
- 8.69 The Environmental Health Team and Highway Authority have recommended conditions to control the demolition/ construction process and these have been recommended accordingly.
- 8.70 In my opinion, subject to conditions, 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

- 8.71 The proposal would provide 38 post-graduate student accommodation rooms, all with communal living areas and acceptable outlooks. The Environmental Health Team has recommended conditions regarding building insulation and noise to protect future occupiers and these have been recommended accordingly. The site is within walking distance of the main Trinity College campus and is in a highly sustainable location, close to local shops, facilities and outdoor spaces.
- 8.72 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**

- 8.73 Bin storage would be provided in the basement. There would be a designated store for the existing Union Society functions and the proposed post-graduate accommodation underneath the central atrium area. The proposed restaurant would have a basement refuse store. There would be service lifts adjacent to both of these stores and there would be logical routes out from each of these stores to the designated collection point adjacent

to Park Street. The bin collection area would not block the path along Park Street. With the exception of collection days, bins would not be visible from public viewpoints which would be a significant improvement compared to the existing situation where they are stored informally on the Park Street service yard area.

- 8.74 In my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policy 3/12.

### **Drainage**

- 8.75 A drainage report has been submitted by the agent and this has been reviewed by the Lead Local Flood Authority, City Council Drainage Engineer, Anglian Water and Environment Agency who are all supportive of the proposal, subject to conditions and informatives.

- 8.76 In my opinion, subject to conditions, the proposal is compliant with paragraph 103 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2012).

### **Archaeology**

- 8.77 The County Council Archaeology Team has raised no objection to the proposed works, subject to an archaeology condition.

- 8.78 In my opinion, subject to condition, the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policy 4/9.

### **Public Art**

- 8.79 I do not find any conflict with policy 3/7 in respect of public art.

### **Highway Safety**

- 8.80 The Highway Authority has raised no objection to the proposal on highway safety grounds subject to conditions and I agree with this advice.

- 8.81 In my opinion, subject to conditions, the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policy 8/2.

## **Car and Cycle Parking**

- 8.82 The proposal does not include any car parking provision for students. Students are not permitted to bring cars to the site. The central location of the site means that students would have access to a wide range of shops and services including public transport links. I therefore do not consider car parking to be a necessary requirement for this proposal. However, the Highway Authority has recommended a travel plan (including student management plan) condition which requires details of how drop-offs and pick-ups will be managed so as to avoid any traffic overspill issues. The S106 agreement would ensure that future occupants do not own/ keep cars in Cambridge.
- 8.83 There is no dedicated car parking for the proposed restaurant use. The City Council has maximum parking standards and there is no obligation for this to be provided. The vast majority of restaurants in the City Centre also do not benefit from dedicated car parking and the site is easily accessible by alternative forms of travel. The Park Street multi-storey car park is also opposite the site which would provide car parking if needed. In addition to this, the agent has prepared detailed surveys and calculations of the parking capacity of the Park Street car park. The results of this indicate that the net effect of the likely trip numbers created by the restaurant would not be significant and that there would still be spare capacity.
- 8.84 The existing 11 car parking space to the rear courtyard of the Union Society would be reduced down to four spaces. Again, the City Council has maximum parking standards and there is no obligation for all of the existing parking to be retained. The site is in a highly sustainable location and is not dependent on car parking. The car parking area is only likely to be used by office staff or any V.I.P guests speaking at the Union.
- 8.85 The cycle parking standards require 1 space per 2 bedspaces within the Historic Core area and 1 visitor space per 5 bedspaces. Based on this calculation 27 cycle parking spaces are needed for the student use. There appears to be some uncertainty regarding the level of cycle parking proposed. The Design and Access Statement and Planning Statement make reference to 65 spaces being provided in the basement but the plans only show 42 spaces being provided. Reference is also made on landscaping plans to the retention of seven existing

cycle parking hoops in the front courtyard area which would bring on-site cycle parking up to 56 spaces. Notwithstanding this discrepancy, the level of cycle parking for the proposed student accommodation well exceeds the minimum standards required and is acceptable.

8.86 No dedicated cycle parking is proposed for the restaurant use which in the strictest application of the minimum standards is contrary to the Cambridge Local Plan (2006). 1 space for every 10m<sup>2</sup> of dining area is needed for this use. Approximately 258.5m<sup>2</sup> of dining area is proposed and so 26 spaces are required in accordance with the minimum standards. It is also acknowledged that the Cycling and Walking Officer has recommended that the building is set back to allow for cycle racks to be installed in front of the building. There is however public cycle parking nearby in the form of 20 hoops (40 spaces) on the south-west corner of Park Street and Jesus Lane, as well as over 100 hoops in the Park Street multi-storey car park. The agent has prepared detailed surveys and calculations of the cycle parking capacity of the Park Street car park. The results of the likely trip numbers generated demonstrated that at peak times the proposal would result in a loss of 4% of this cycle parking being taken up and there would still be over 38% capacity remaining. The Highway Authority has assessed the calculations and findings submitted and consider the proposal to be acceptable in this respect. In my opinion, I do not consider it would be reasonable to refuse the application due to a lack of cycle parking for this component as there is evidence of a surplus of public spaces in the surrounding area. Trying to accommodate cycle parking along the front of the building would result in a significant reduction in usable floor space or would likely interfere with the public highway.

8.87 In my opinion, subject to condition, the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 8/6 and 8/10.

### **Third Party Representations**

8.88 The only third party representations are in support and have been addressed in the main body of this report.

## **Planning Obligations (s106 Agreement)**

8.89 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.

8.90 In bringing forward my recommendations in relation to the Planning Obligation for this development I have considered these requirements.

8.91 In line with the CIL Regulations, councils can pool no more than five S106 contributions towards the same project. The new 'pooling' restrictions were introduced from 6 April 2015 and relate to new S106 agreements. This means that all contributions now agreed by the city council must be for specific projects at particular locations, as opposed to generic infrastructure types within the city of Cambridge.

8.92 The student accommodation would be occupied by post-graduate students of Trinity College. The applicant has provided evidence to show that the College has open space and sport facilities available to the future occupants in close proximity to the site:

- Gym & Sports Fields/Courts off Grange Road = 14min walk / 6min cycle
- Practice Pitches off Cranmer Road = 21min walk / 7min cycle
- Boat Clubs off Kimberley Road = 13min walk / 4min cycle
- Recreational Open Space off the Backs = 8min walk / 3 min cycle
- Fellow's Garden off Queen's Road = 8min walk / 3min cycle

8.93 Having reviewed the proposals I am mindful that the proposals are within walking distance of the facilities at Trinity College,

and also the public open space at Jesus Green. It is also pertinent to point out that there would only be a net increase in four student rooms occupied by Trinity College as a result of this proposed development. The combination of the release of the properties listed in the succeeding paragraph (22 student rooms), in addition to the 13 rooms provided within 3 – 5 Round Church Street that would be demolished, means that the College would be gaining four additional rooms. Given the scale of the development (39 units of student accommodation/ net increase of 4 units), I am of the opinion that there is no justification in seeking a contribution in this instance.

- 8.94 A Section 106 agreement would be entered into to restrict occupancy to full-time students of Trinity College and to prevent the students from keeping/owning cars. The S106 agreement will also ensure that the houses currently owned by Trinity College and put forward for release as a public benefit are released into the open market. These properties are 39 Victoria Park, 12 Glisson Road, 20 Victoria Street, 53 Searle Street and 66 Searle Street.

## **9.0 CONCLUSION**

- 9.1 The key deliberation that has been made when considering the application has been weighing the harm caused by the proposed development against the public benefits that would occur. In my assessment of this the public benefits are deemed to outweigh the harm that would be caused to relevant heritage assets. The demolition/ works to the listed building, the demolition of nos.3 – 5 Round Church Street and the proposed restaurant/ student accommodation building would cause less than substantial harm to the setting and importance of the Grade II Listed Building, nearby Listed Buildings and the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. The amendments to the proposed building are considered to take significant steps to overcoming the concerns originally raised by the design-based consultees and the Design and Conservation Panel. There would be a significant amount of public benefits, in terms of public realm improvements, preservation of the Listed building and housing need, arising from the scheme which, in my view, would outweigh the less than substantial harm that would be caused by the proposed works.



9.2 The proposal would provide drastic improvements to disabled accessibility and would open up to the public what is currently a very introverted and secluded part of Cambridge's unique history.

9.3 The application should be approved subject to conditions.

## **10.0 RECOMMENDATION**

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

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

6. Completion report:

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

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

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

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

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

#### 7. Material Management Plan:

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

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

b) Include details of the proposed source(s) of the imported or reused material

c) Include details of the chemical testing for ALL material to be undertaken before placement onto the site.

d) Include the results of the chemical testing which must show the material is suitable for use on the development

e) Include confirmation of the chain of evidence to be kept during the materials movement, including material importation, reuse placement and removal from and to the development.

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

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

8. Unexpected Contamination:

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

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

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

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

10. There should be no 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.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

15. Prior to the commencement of development/construction, a noise assessment of 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 accommodation units (having regard to the building fabric, glazing and ventilation) and other mitigation to reduce the level of noise experienced internally at the accommodation 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 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 future occupants (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/12, 4/13 and 7/7)

16. 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 and retained thereafter.

Reason: To protect the amenity of nearby properties (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 4/13 and 6/10)

17. Prior to the installation of any artificial lighting, an artificial lighting scheme shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The scheme shall include details of any artificial lighting of the site and an artificial lighting impact assessment with predicted lighting levels at proposed and existing residential properties shall be undertaken. Artificial lighting on and off site must meet the Obtrusive Light Limitations for Exterior Lighting Installations contained within the Institute of Lighting Professionals Guidance Notes for the Reduction of Obtrusive Light - GN01:2011 (or as superseded). The approved lighting scheme shall be installed, maintained and operated in accordance with the approved details / measures.

Reason: To protect the amenity of nearby properties (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 4/13 and 4/15)

18. Deliveries and collections to site are prohibited outside of the following hours:
- Monday to Saturday = 07:00 - 23:00hrs
  - Sundays and bank/public holidays = 08:00 - 18:00hrs

Reason: To protect the amenity of nearby properties (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 4/13 and 6/10)

19. The Cambridge Union Society 1815 bar and cafe shall not be open outside the following hours:
- 10:00 and 23:00 - Monday - Wednesday
  - 10:00 and 01:00 - Thursday
  - 10:00 and 02:00 - Friday - Saturday
  - 10:00 and 23:00 - Sunday

Reason: To protect the amenity of nearby properties (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 4/13 and 6/10)

20. The Footlight's entertainment venue shall not be open outside the following hours:
- 10:00 and 23:00 - Monday - Wednesday
  - 10:00 and 01:00 - Thursday
  - 10:00 and 02:00 - Friday - Saturday
  - 10:00 and 23:00 - Sunday

Reason: To protect the amenity of nearby properties (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 4/13 and 6/10)

21. The new restaurant A3 use hereby permitted 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 policies 4/13 and 6/10)

22. Prior to the commencement of construction on the residential units/works to convert the property to residential use, full details of the ventilation scheme for the residential units on the façade fronting Park Street and Round Church Street shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Air intake shall be from the roof and/or rear of the building, away from Park Street and Round Church Street. The ventilation scheme shall achieve at least 2 air changes per hour. The scheme as approved shall be fully implemented before the use hereby permitted is commenced and shall thereafter be retained as such.

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

23. The scheme of ventilation approved under condition number 22 shall be installed in accordance with the approved details before the first occupation of the development and shall thereafter be retained as such.

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

24. 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. The approved ductwork shall be retained thereafter.

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



25. Prior to occupation, further information shall 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. Any gas fired CHP shall meet an emissions standard of:

Spark ignition engine: less than 150 mgNO<sub>x</sub>/Nm<sup>3</sup>

Compression ignition engine: less than 400 mgNO<sub>x</sub>/Nm<sup>3</sup>

Gas turbine: less than 50 mgNO<sub>x</sub>/Nm<sup>3</sup>

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).

26. Prior to occupation, an energy statement, which demonstrates that at least 10% of the development's total predicted energy requirements will be from on-site renewable and low carbon sources, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The statement shall include the following details:

a) The total predicted energy requirements of the development, set out in Kg/CO<sub>2</sub>/annum; and

b) A schedule of proposed on-site renewable and low carbon technologies, their respective carbon reduction contributions, location, design and a maintenance programme.

The renewable and low carbon technologies shall remain fully operational in accordance with the approved maintenance programme, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the local planning authority.

No review of this requirement on the basis of grid capacity issues can take place unless written evidence from the District Network Operator confirming the detail of grid capacity and its implications has been submitted to, and accepted in writing by, the local planning authority. Any subsequent amendment to the level of renewable/low carbon technologies provided on the site shall be in accordance with a revised scheme submitted to and approved in writing by, the local planning authority.

Reason: In the interests of reducing carbon dioxide emissions and to ensure that the development does not give rise to unacceptable pollution. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 8/16).

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

Reason: to ensure the buildings are appropriately serviced, managed and controlled (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/7 and 8/9)

28. No occupation of the development shall commence until a Travel Plan has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The Travel Plan shall comprise immediate, continuing and long-term measures to promote arrangements to encourage the use of public transport, cycling and walking and in particular measures to encourage the use of alternative means of transport to the private car by staff, students and visitors. The travel plan shall also include details of a student management plan to control the pick-up and drop-off of students at the site. The student management plan element shall set out measures as to how the student accommodation will be managed on a day-to-day basis, how it would be managed when let during holiday periods, and how any issues arising from its operation in terms of impact on adjacent neighbours will be handled. It shall include the contact name and number of a College representative, made available to local residents and placed as information near to the entrance of the building in a prominent and publicly visible location. Details of the cycle parking on site and where additional cycle parking will be located if there is obvious demand with details of how the demand will be monitored shall also be provided. The Travel Plan shall thereafter be implemented in accordance with the approved document.

Reason: In order to deliver sustainable transport objectives and to ensure the occupation of the buildings is appropriately managed and controlled (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/4, 3/7, 3/12, 8/2, 8/3 and 8/4)

29. No unbound material shall be used in the surface finish of the access within 6 metres of the highway boundary of the site.

Reason: To avoid displacement of loose material onto the highway in the interests of highway safety (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 Policy 8/2)

30. Notwithstanding the provision of Class A of Schedule 2, Part 2 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995, (or any order revoking, amending or re-enacting that order) no gates shall be erected across the approved vehicular access unless details have first been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 Policy 8/2).

31. The access shall be constructed with adequate drainage measures to prevent surface water run-off onto the adjacent public highway, in accordance with a scheme submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, in consultation with the Highway Authority.

Reason: To prevent surface water discharging to the highway (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 Policy 8/2).

32. Two 2.0 x 2.0 metres visibility splays shall be provided as shown on the drawings. The splays are to be included within the curtilage of the new dwelling. One visibility splay is required on each side of the access, measured to either side of the access, with a set-back of two metres from the highway boundary along each side of the access. This area shall be kept clear of all planting, fencing, walls and the like exceeding 600mm high.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 Policy 8/2).

33. The developer is advised that part of the proposed structure supports the public highway. Prior to commencement the developer must contact the Highway Authority to provide an Approval In Principle document in accordance with BD2 Volume 1 Highway Structures: Approval Procedures and General Design, Section 1 Approval Procedures of the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 Policy 8/2).

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

Reason: in the interests of highway safety (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 Policy 8/2).

35. No roofs shall be constructed until full details of the type and source of roof covering materials and the ridge, eaves and hip details, if appropriate, have been submitted to the local planning authority as samples and approved in writing. Roofs shall thereafter be constructed only in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To avoid harm to the special interest of the Conservation Area. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006, policy 4/11)

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

Reason: In the interests of the visual amenity of the Conservation Area 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 3/12 and 4/11)

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

Reason: To avoid harm to the special interest of the Conservation Area. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006, policy 4/11)

38. Full details of all solar panels (water pre-heat, etc) and/or photovoltaic cells, including type, dimensions, materials, location and fixing shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the LPA. Thereafter the development shall be undertaken in accordance with the agreed details unless the LPA agrees to any variation in writing.

Reason: To avoid harm to the special interest of the Conservation Area. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006, policy 4/11)

39. No demolition shall take place until an appropriately detailed historic buildings record has been submitted to (The specification to be agreed in advance based upon "A Guide to Good Recording Practice", Historic England, May 2016) and approved by the LPA. Thereafter the applicants shall also deposit a copy with each of the following organisations: the Cambridgeshire Collection of the Central Library, Lion Yard, Cambridge; the County Archive, Shire Hall, Castle Hill, Cambridge.

Reason: To record and advance understanding of the buildings to be demolished in accordance with NPPF (2012) paragraph 141.

40. No development shall take place until full details of both hard and soft landscape works have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority and these works shall be carried out as approved. These details shall include proposed finished levels or contours; means of enclosure; car parking layouts, other vehicle and pedestrian access and circulation areas; hard surfacing materials; minor artefacts and structures (e.g. furniture, play equipment, refuse or other storage units, signs, lighting); proposed and existing functional services above and below ground (e.g. drainage, power, communications cables, pipelines indicating lines, manholes, supports); retained historic landscape features and proposals for restoration, where relevant. Soft Landscape works shall include planting plans; written specifications (including cultivation and other operations associated with plant and grass establishment); schedules of plants, noting species, plant sizes and proposed numbers/densities where appropriate and an implementation programme.

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

41. A landscape maintenance and management plan, including long term design objectives, management responsibilities and maintenance schedules for all landscape areas shall be submitted to and approved by the local planning authority in writing prior to occupation of the development or any phase of the development whichever is the sooner, for its permitted use. The landscape plan shall be carried out as approved. Any trees or plants that, within a period of five years after planting, are removed, die or become in the opinion of the local planning authority, seriously damaged or defective, shall be replaced as soon as is reasonably practicable with others of species, size and number as originally approved, unless the local planning authority gives its written consent to any variation.

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

42. Prior to commencement of development, details of the specification and position of fencing, or any other measures to be taken for the protection of any trees from damage during the course of development, shall be submitted to the local planning authority for its written approval, and implemented in accordance with that approval before any equipment, machinery or materials are brought onto the site for the purpose of development (including demolition). The agreed means of protection shall be retained on site until all equipment, and surplus materials have been removed from the site. Nothing shall be stored or placed in any area protected in accordance with this condition, and the ground levels within those areas shall not be altered nor shall any excavation be made without the prior written approval of the local planning authority.

Reason: To protect the visual amenity of the area and to ensure the retention of the trees on the site. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/4, 3/11, 3/12 and 4/4)

43. No development shall take place within the area indicated until the applicant, or their agents or successors in title, has secured the implementation of a programme of archaeological work in accordance with a written scheme of investigation which has been submitted by the applicant and approved in writing by the local planning authority.

Reason: To secure the preservation of the archaeological interest of the area either by record or in situ as appropriate (Local Plan 2006 policy 4/9).

44. Details for the long term maintenance arrangements for any parts of the surface water drainage system which will not be adopted (including all SuDS features) to be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to the first occupation of any building. The submitted details should identify runoff sub-catchments, SuDS components, control structures, flow routes and outfalls. The submitted details should also identify where the manhole covers are, how to lift them, what to look for, how to inspect for silt in the attenuation tank and if found, how to remove it. In addition, the plan must clarify the access that is required to each surface water management component for maintenance purposes. The maintenance plan shall be carried out in full thereafter.

Reason: To ensure the satisfactory maintenance of unadopted drainage systems in accordance with the requirements of paragraphs 103 and 109 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

45. Prior to commencement of works, infiltration testing should be undertaken on site in accordance with BRE365 guidance shall be submitted to and agreed in writing by the local planning authority.

Reason: To ensure that the proposed development can be adequately drained and to ensure that there is no flood risk on or off site resulting from the proposed development in accordance with National Planning Policy Framework 2012 paragraph 103.

**INFORMATIVE:** Traffic Management Plan informative: The principle areas of concern that should be addressed are:

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

**INFORMATIVE:** This development involves work to the public highway that will require the approval of the County Council as Highway Authority. It is an OFFENCE to carry out any works within the public highway, which includes a public right of way, without the permission of the Highway Authority. Please note that it is the applicant's responsibility to ensure that, in addition to planning permission, any necessary consents or approvals under the Highways Act 1980 and the New Roads and Street Works Act 1991 are also obtained from the County Council. No part of any structure may overhang or encroach under or upon the public highway unless licensed by the Highway Authority and no gate / door / ground floor window shall open outwards over the public highway



**INFORMATIVE:** Public Utility apparatus may be affected by this proposal. Contact the appropriate utility service to reach agreement on any necessary alterations, the cost of which must be borne by the applicant.

**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](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](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](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](https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/69280/pb10527-kitchen-exhaust-0105.pdf)

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

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

Further information may be found here:

<https://www.cambridge.gov.uk/housing-health-and-safety-rating-system>

**INFORMATIVE:** The Medium Combustion Plant Directive (MCPD) is part of The EU Clean Air Package published in December 2013. It will introduce a system of registration/permitting for 1-50MW plant, emission limits for nitrogen oxides, sulphur dioxide and particulate matter and monitoring of emissions by operators. Medium combustion plant include boilers, engines, turbines and backup generators and can run on natural gas, solid and liquid fuels, including biomass and biogas. New plant will need to be registered and meet emission limits in late 2018 and existing plants by 2025 and 2030 depending on size.

The proposed planning application involves the installation of plant that is likely to require regulation. The applicant is advised to ensure that the design and installation of any relevant plant takes into account the requirements of this Directive. Further advice can be obtained from the Environmental Quality and Growth team.

**INFORMATIVE:** It is a requirement of the Clean Air Act 1993 that no furnace shall be installed in a building or in any fixed boiler or industrial plant unless notice of the proposal to install it has been given to the local authority. Details of any 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>).

**INFORMATIVE:** No consent is granted for any advertisement, for which a separate application may be necessary.

**INFORMATIVE:** Drainage.

Drainage systems must not be situated in contaminated land.

All surface water from roofs shall be piped direct to an approved surface water system using sealed downpipes. Open gullies should not be used.

Only clean, uncontaminated surface water should be discharged to any soakaway, watercourse or surface water sewer.

All foul sewage or trade effluent, including cooling water containing chemical additives, or vehicle washing water, including steam cleaning effluent shall be discharged to the public foul sewer.

**INFORMATIVE: Pollution Prevention.**

Where dewatering is required during demolition/construction works, the resultant water should not be disposed of via any ground surface, drain or watercourse without prior approval from the relevant regulatory body (including the Environment Agency, local authority or water company) as this activity may require a discharge consent. Any facilities, above ground, for the storage of oils, fuels or chemicals shall be provided with adequate, durable secondary containment to prevent the escape of pollutants. The bunded area shall be designed, constructed and maintained in order that it can contain a capacity not less than 110% of the total volume of all tanks or drums contained therein. All filling points, vents, gauges and sight glasses should be bunded. Any tank overflow pipe outlets shall be directed into the bund. Associated pipework should be located above ground and protected from accidental damage. There shall be no gravity or automatic discharge arrangement for bund contents. Contaminated bund contents shall not be discharged to any watercourse, land or soakaway.

Surface water from roads and impermeable vehicle parking areas shall be discharged via trapped gullies.

Prior to being discharged into any watercourse, surface water sewer or soakaway system, all surface water drainage from lorry parks and/or parking areas for fifty car park spaces or more and hardstandings should be passed through an oil interceptor designed compatible with the site being drained. Roof water shall not pass through the interceptor.

Site operators should ensure that there is no possibility of contaminated water entering and polluting surface or underground waters.

**INFORMATIVE: Waste Management.**

If any controlled waste is to be removed off site, the site operator must ensure a registered waste carrier is used to convey the waste material off site to a suitably authorised facility.

The Duty of Care regulations for dealing with waste materials are applicable for any off-site movements of wastes. The developer, as a waste producer, has a duty of care to ensure all materials removed from the site go to an appropriate licensed disposal site and all relevant documentation is completed and kept in line with the regulations.

If any waste is to be used on site, the applicant will be required to obtain the appropriate exemption licence or authorisation from the Environment Agency. We are unable to specify what exactly would be required, if anything, due to the limited amount of information provided

**INFORMATIVE:** Condition number 39 only applies to 3-5 Round Church Street, the toilet block to the rear of the Union Society buildings, and the 1930 extensions to the Union Society buildings.