

Application Number	17/0172/FUL	Agenda Item	
Date Received	13th February 2017	Officer	Lorna Gilbert
Target Date	15th May 2017		
Ward	Castle		
Site	34-36 Madingley Road Cambridge CB3 0EX		
Proposal	Erection of a residential apartment development to be arranged within two blocks comprising of ten 2 x bed units and 6 x 1 bed units along with car and cycle parking, hard and soft landscaping following the demolition of the existing buildings on the site.		
Applicant	Madingley Developments Ltd C/O Agent		

SUMMARY	<p>The development accords with the Development Plan for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- In my view, the proposal is acceptable in terms of its scale and appearance and would preserve the appearance and character of the conservation area and would not harm the setting of nearby listed buildings.- I consider it would not adversely harm residential amenities, biodiversity or highway safety.
RECOMMENDATION	APPROVAL

1.0 SITE DESCRIPTION/AREA CONTEXT

- 1.1 The properties of No.34 and No.36 Madingley Road are large detached properties located on the northern side of Madingley Road. To the north-east lies the Conduit Head Bird Sanctuary which is a City Wildlife Site and is designated protected open space. To the east of the application site lies the Whitehouse No.1 Conduit Head Road, which is a grade II listed building. The north-east corner of the application site borders Salix, Conduit

Head Road which is a Grade II listed building. To the west of the application site are properties No.2, 4 and 6 Lansdowne Road which are detached properties.

- 1.2 The application site falls within the Conduit Head Road Conservation Area. There is a group Tree Preservation Order along the north-western boundary within the site of No.36 Madingley Road and there are individual Tree Preservation Order trees through the centre of the site and towards the north-western boundary. There are also group Tree Preservation Order trees within neighbouring sites to the north-east and east of the site.

2.0 THE PROPOSAL

- 2.1 The application proposes demolishing the two properties on site known as No.34 and 36 Madingley Road. It proposes the construction of two residential apartment blocks comprising of ten x two bed units and six x one bed units along with car and cycle parking and refuse provisions.
- 2.2 The blocks stand a maximum of 9.5m high and comprise of lower ground floor basements which include car parking, two apartments (one in Block A and one in Block B) and bin storage. Block A extends a maximum of 18.9m in width and 21.85m in length (including the terraced area) and Block B extends up to 24.2m in length and 17.6m in width.
- 2.3 Some of the apartments are split over two floors. Block A contains seven apartments (three x one bedroom apartments and four x two bedroom apartments). Block B has nine apartments (three x one bedroom apartments and six x two bedroom apartments).
- 2.4 Details of the proposed materials are included on the application form. The walls will be white render, concrete and dark brick and the roof will be zinc. The windows and doors are to be powder coated composite
- 2.5 The basement contains seventeen car parking spaces and there are two additional car parking spaces at ground floor level. These are accessible from Madingley Road. The entrance/exit to the basement car park will be controlled by a traffic light system.

- 2.6 Bin and bike storage is located towards the front of the site.
- 2.7 Nineteen trees are to be removed from the site which includes trees covered by Tree Preservation Orders and within a Conservation Area. Tree works are proposed to some remaining trees. Enhanced planting is also proposed. Details can be found in the latest Tree Drawing and Tree Survey revision E.
- 2.8 Amendments have been made to the current planning application. These include a revision to the access arrangement for vehicles exiting the site (as shown on drawing number SK04 Rev.A). Vehicles exiting the site will give way to pedestrians and cyclists using the path along Madingley Road. A Transport technical note was also received 28th March 2017. A revised Tree Survey, Arboricultural Impact Assessment Preliminary Arboricultural Method Statement and Tree Protection Plan Rev.E and updated tree drawing reference 4809-D Rev.E were submitted in response to the revised access arrangement. An email from the agent dated 24th April 2017 responded to the Urban Design and Conservation team's comments. In response to the Sustainable Drainage Engineer comments a revised Drainage Strategy Rev.B and email dated 26th May 2017 from G.H. Bullard and Associates LLP were received.

3.0 SITE HISTORY

Relevant planning history:

Reference	Description	Outcome
16/0531/FUL	Erection of a residential apartment development to be arranged within two blocks comprising ten 2xbed units and six 1xbed units along with car and cycle parking and hard and soft landscaping following the demolition of the existing buildings on the site.	Withdrawn

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 3/2 3/3 3/4 3/6 3/7 3/8 3/9 3/10 3/11 3/12 3/13
		4/2 4/3 4/4 4/6 4/8 4/9 4/10 4/11 4/13 4/14 4/15
		5/1 5/4 5/5 5/9 5/10 5/14
		8/1 8/2 8/3 8/4 8/5 8/6 8/9 8/10 8/11
		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)

	<p>Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Waste Partnership (RECAP): Waste Management Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (February 2012)</p> <p>Planning Obligation Strategy (March 2010)</p> <p>Public Art (January 2010)</p>
Material Considerations	<p><u>City Wide Guidance</u></p> <p>Arboricultural Strategy (2004)</p> <p>Biodiversity Checklist for Land Use Planners in Cambridgeshire and Peterborough (March 2001).</p> <p>Cambridge Landscape and Character Assessment (2003)</p> <p>Cambridge City Nature Conservation Strategy (2006)</p> <p>Criteria for the Designation of Wildlife Sites (2005)</p> <p>Cambridge City Wildlife Sites Register (2005)</p> <p>Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (November 2010)</p> <p>Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (2005)</p> <p>Cambridge and Milton Surface Water Management Plan (2011)</p> <p>Cambridge City Council (2011) - Open Space and Recreation Strategy</p> <p>Balanced and Mixed Communities – A Good Practice Guide (2006)</p>

	<p>Cambridgeshire Quality Charter for Growth (2008)</p> <p>Cambridge Walking and Cycling Strategy (2002)</p> <p>Protection and Funding of Routes for the Future Expansion of the City Cycle Network (2004)</p> <p>Cambridgeshire Design Guide For Streets and Public Realm (2007)</p> <p>Cycle Parking Guide for New Residential Developments (2010)</p> <p>Air Quality in Cambridge – Developers Guide (2008)</p>
	<p><u>Area Guidelines</u></p> <p>Cambridge City Council (2003)–Western Corridor Area Transport Plan:</p> <p>Conduit Head Road Conservation Area Appraisal (2009)</p> <p>Madingley Road Suburbs and Approaches Study (March 2009)</p>

5.4 Status of Proposed Submission – Cambridge Local Plan

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

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

6.0 CONSULTATIONS

Cambridgeshire County Council (Highways Development Management)

Comments dated 24th February 2017:

- 6.1 The proposal may have implications for the Cambourne to Madingley Road proposals currently under consideration within City Deal. The developer is advised to contact Adrian Shepherd to discuss these proposals. This can be addressed with an informative.
- 6.2 The layout of the access gives priority for the private access over the public highway cycleway footway. The access should be redesigned to reverse this so that users of the private drive give way to users of the public highway. To this end the footway cycleway should be slewed north to provide a 5 metre reservoir for a car to stop off the main carriageway. 2.4 metre by 33 metre visibility splays must be provided to the back of the footway/cycleway for vehicles egressing the site. The kerbed access should be replaced with a vehicle crossover of the footway.
- 6.3 Includes details of conditions and informatives if Highways are satisfied with amended drawings.

Comments received 10th May 2017:

- 6.4 The Madingley Road cycle route is a busy cycle route.
- 6.5 Unlike Milton Road, where a similar junction to the one proposed was used, this street is of a more rural nature, without continuous cycling facilities throughout and so the Highway Authority seeks to encourage the use of the northern shared use facility as the principle cycling provision on this stretch, providing a route avoiding the complex M11 junction.

- 6.6 The design proposed by the developer is for a private access upon which the residents may well seek to impose car dominance over the cyclists already upon the public highway.
- 6.7 Cyclists seeking to exercise this right, and with the constraints on cycling provision on carriageway on that route, I consider that more higher speed cyclists would be encountered on this shared surface route than that on Milton Road, those cyclists would be at risk.

Comments received 19th June 2017 in response to amended drawings received:

- 6.8 Yes, drawings are acceptable.

Environmental Health

- 6.9 The development proposed is acceptable subject to the imposition of the conditions/informatives outlined below:

- Conditions
 - construction hours
 - collection during construction
 - construction/demolition noise/vibration & piling
 - dust condition
 - noise insulation scheme
 - ventilation scheme
- Standard Informative:
 - dust condition informative

Urban Design and Conservation Team

- 6.10 The development proposed is acceptable subject to the imposition of the condition outlined.
- 6.11 It is considered that there will be some impact on the designated heritage assets, but that this can be offset by the use of mitigation methods. There is some public benefit to be gained by providing additional homes in the city and therefore, subject to the applicant clarifying the visualisation methodology and maturity of proposed trees shown on the photomontages, in

addition to the applicant giving further consideration to the usability of the undercroft parking area, the application, on balance, can be supported,. It is considered that the application addresses the relevant paragraphs in the NPPF.

- 6.12 The agent responded to the Urban Design and Conservation team's comments by email on 24th April 2017 with a short addendum. It clarified the vegetation shown in the CGI's are shown as per the planting proposals with specimens planted at varying sizes with some up to 6m in height. It also detailed the computer modelling method. An updated basement drawing PL2(21)10 Rev.B includes details of how the ramp will operate and the Transport Statement received 2nd February 2017 demonstrates tracking for vehicles using the car parking spaces.

Comments received 11th May 2017:

- 6.13 The development is acceptable.
- 6.14 The additional information received regarding the comments made by Urban Design and Conservation on the visuals that were submitted with the proposal documents have added clarity to the application. These comments are noted and accepted.

Senior Sustainability Officer (Design and Construction)

- 6.15 The development proposed is acceptable subject to the imposition of the condition requested.

Additional comments:

- 6.16 I have some concerns, given the orientation of the main Madingley Road façade and the amount of unshaded glazing, that some of the principle living spaces could be prone to overheating in the summer months, although this is something that can be minimised. The Design and Access Statement makes reference to the larger flats benefitting from a south facing room to encourage solar gain, and while this is beneficial in winter months, in summer months this could lead to overheating. While it is noted the trees fronting Madingley Road may provide some shading, I would recommend that solar control glazing be specified. The specification and installation of the MVHR and role of thermal mass will also require careful

consideration to ensure that this does not lead to unintended internal heat gains in summer months.

6.17 Renewable energy provision - With regards to energy use and reduction in carbon emissions, the hierarchical approach to reducing carbon emissions is supported. The use of MVHR is also supported in terms of the role that it has to play in maintaining healthy indoor air quality, bearing in mind concerns raised above regarding specification and correct installation. The approach to utilising photovoltaic panels is also supported. However, I have a query regarding the approach to the Council's 10% renewable energy requirement. It would appear from the letter from Green Heat containing carbon calculations that the carbon reduction associated with both the photovoltaic panels and the MVHR has been included. MVHR is not a recognised renewable energy technology and as such its contribution to carbon reduction, while welcomed and supported, should not count towards the 10% carbon reduction calculations to meet the requirements of policy 8/16.

6.18 As the general approach to renewable energy and the use of photovoltaic panels is supported, it is considered that these issues could be addressed through the use of a planning condition.

Access Officer

6.19 Comments to previous application reference 16/0531/FUL still stand.

6.20 The landscaping of this project should not create any routes that have steps without a sloped/ramped alternative route.

6.21 The above ground floor flats being served by individual staircases does not help access that could be gained by communal lifts servicing all above ground flats.

6.22 The stepped parts of the landscaping without alternative ramped routes is unacceptable.

Comments received 7th June 2017:

6.23 I am not happy with the (platform) lift, I feel landscaping could make pathways with suitable gradients. A lift may stop certain

disabled people using it without assistance, it will need to be maintained, it will need vandal proof security, it will be of less use in inclement weather, it will be restrictive to visitors (who may not have key, etc.).

- 6.24 This has been responded to under paragraph 8.43 of the assessment.

Head of Streets and Open Spaces (Tree Team)

- 6.25 No objection. Conditions requested.

Head of Streets and Open Spaces (Landscape Team)

Comments received 13th March 2017:

- 6.26 The development proposed is unacceptable and should be refused.
- 6.27 The landscape team feels that the proposals put protected trees and tree belts under pressure for future removal. Functionally, the site is complex and the parking is difficult to access and negotiate which may lead to problems with parking in surface level visitor spaces or elsewhere on the surface to avoid the basement. In the same vein, the cycle parking stores, pushed to the peripheries of the site and distant from the front doors may lead to convenience parking elsewhere on the site. We feel that all of this complexity and difficulty in accommodating basic elements of residential needs is a direct result of overdevelopment.
- 6.28 In response to Landscaping's comments; I have recommend the inclusion of the Arboricultural Method Statement and Tree Protection Plan conditions which I consider will help mitigate the impact on trees to be retained. Tracking diagrams have been provided to demonstrate the car parking spaces are workable. Two cycle parking stores are proposed which are located near to each of the blocks. I consider their position to be acceptable.

Cambridgeshire County Council (Flood and Water Management)

- 6.29 As Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) we have no objection in principle to the proposed development.
- 6.30 The applicant has demonstrated that surface water can be dealt with on site by using permeable paving and a swale, proposing to reduce the discharge rate, to be more reflective of greenfield rates (2l/s).
- 6.31 We recommend the conditions requested are imposed.

Cambridgeshire County Council (Growth and Economy)

- 6.32 No contributions required or can be sought.

Head of Streets and Open Spaces (Sustainable Drainage Officer)

Comments dated 20th June 2017:

- 6.33 The development proposed is acceptable subject to the imposition of the condition outlined.
- 6.34 Additional information: All new or altered external surfaces within the site boundary should be of permeable construction.

Head of Streets and Open Spaces (Nature Conservation Officer)

- 6.35 The Applied Ecology report has identified low numbers (3) of pipistrelle bats roosting in the building proposed for demolition. The destruction of this roost is likely to be granted through a low impact Natural England licence if suitable mitigation is in place.
- 6.36 The site adjoins a City Wildlife Sites, known to support Great Crested Newts. The applicant's ecologist has recommended protective fencing during demolition and construction. I would support this.
- 6.37 I would also seek reassurance that the boundary to the City Wildlife Site is not subject to external lighting.

6.38 Conditions and informatives are recommended.

Growth Projects Officer, Cambridge City Council

6.39 The site is not applicable for affordable housing (net increase of fourteen dwellings).

Environment Agency

6.40 Whilst the Agency has no objection in principle to the proposed development we wish to offer recommendations and informatives.

6.41 For your information this application falls within Flood Risk Standing Advice, being within floodzone 1 and less than 1 ha in area. In line with current government guidance on Standing Advice, it will be necessary, in this instance, for your Council to respond on behalf of the Environment Agency in respect of flood risk and/or surface water drainage issues. Please refer to the relevant standing advice, which can be found at: <https://www.gov.uk/flood-risk-assessment-standing-advice>

6.42 Notwithstanding the above, infiltration drainage, including soakaways, will only be acceptable where the site is uncontaminated.

Anglian Water

6.43 Our records show that there are no assets owned by Anglian Water or those subject to an adoption agreement within the development site boundary.

6.44 The foul drainage from this development is in the catchment of Cambridge Water Recycling Centre that will have available capacity for these flows.

6.45 The sewerage system at present has available capacity for these flows. If the developer wishes to connect to our sewerage network they should serve notice under Section 106 of the Water Industry Act 1991. We will then advise them of the most suitable point of connection.

- 6.46 The preferred method of surface water disposal would be to a sustainable drainage system (SuDS) with connection to sewer seen as the last option.
- 6.47 The surface water strategy/flood risk assessment submitted with the planning application relevant to Anglian Water is unacceptable. We would therefore recommend that the applicant needs to consult with Anglian Water and the Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA). We request a condition requiring a drainage strategy covering the issue(s) to be agreed.
- 6.48 Request a planning condition.

Cambridgeshire Constabulary (Designing Out Crime Officer)

- 6.49 I have viewed the documents in relation to community safety, crime and disorder and completed a crime and incident analysis for the area covering the last 12 months, I would consider this to be an area of low risk to crime.
- 6.50 There is no mention of crime prevention within the Design and Access statement. This office would be happy to discuss Secured by Design and measures to mitigate against crime and disorder as the application progresses.

Cambridgeshire County Council (Archaeology)

- 6.51 Our records indicate that the site is located in a landscape of high archaeological potential set within the hinterland of the Roman town at Cambridge. Archaeological investigations to the south east have identified evidence for extensive Roman settlement and an associated cremation cemetery (HER ECB1015). Further evidence for high status Roman settlement has also been recorded to the west in connection with the Cambridge North West development (HER MCB19118). It is likely that important archaeological remains will survive in the area and that these would be severely damaged or destroyed by the proposed development.
- 6.52 We have provided advice with regard to the previous development proposal for this site (16/0531/FUL) and we would confirm that we still consider this advice to be appropriate.

- 6.53 We would not object to the proposed development, but would recommend that the site should be subject to a programme of archaeological investigation and recommend that this work should be commissioned and undertaken at the expense of the developer. This programme of work can be secured through the inclusion of a negative condition such as the model condition 'number 55' contained in DoE Planning Circular 11/95.

Cambridge Airport

- 6.54 No objection.
- 6.55 However, we would ask that the Airport be informed of any construction plan for the use of cranes so that they can be assessed to ensure they do not penetrate our safeguarded surfaces.

Disability Consultative Panel (Meeting of 28th February 2017)

- 6.56 The upper storeys have now been designed to be visitable as a result of the Panel's comments made at a previous meeting. Further improvements could be made however as there are still some stepped areas in the grounds with no ramps. There should also be a WC at the entrance level of the maisonettes. The designers are recommended to explore the option of a through-floor or stairlift for the maisonettes to improve their accessibility. Sliding doors between the living room spaces and the bathrooms would also remove potential conflict.
- 6.57 *Conclusion:* This is a much improved scheme and although may not be suitable for disabled residents, certain adaptations could be made for those who acquire a disability.

Developer Contributions Monitoring Unit

- £4,998 – Towards the provision of and/or improvement of the outdoor artificial pitches at Wilberforce Road, Cambridge CB3 0EQ
- £3,792 – Provision and/or improvement of the children's play area at Storeys Field Play Area.

- £5,082 – Provision of and/or improvement of and/or access to Informal Open Space facilities at Storeys Field.
- £16,332 – Towards the provision of and/or improvement of the facilities and/or equipment at Storey's Field Centre, Newmarket Road, Cambridge.
- No suitable projects were applicable for Indoor Sports contributions.

6.58 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:

Objections:

- 4, 6, 8, 10 Lansdowne Road
- Daylesford, Conduit Head Road
- Orchard House, Conduit Head Road
- Salix, Conduit Head Road
- Willow House, Conduit Head Road
- 44 Conduit Head Road
- 7a Adams Road
- Cambridge Past, Present and Future

Support:

- 2 Lansdowne Road

7.2 There have been a large variety of objections received. These are summarised in Appendix A.

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. Affordable Housing

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

Principle of Development

- 8.2 According to the National Planning Policy Framework 2012 housing applications should be considered in the context of the presumption in favour of sustainable development. I would argue that this application provides the opportunity to increase housing numbers on a site which is in an accessible location.
- 8.3 The proposal involves the loss of two large family houses and the creation of sixteen one and two bedroom residential apartments located within two blocks. Policy 5/1 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2006) states that proposals for housing development on windfall sites will be permitted subject to the existing land use and compatibility with adjoining uses.
- 8.4 Policy 5/10 states that on housing developments of 0.5 hectares or more, or capable of accommodating 15 or more dwellings, a mix of dwelling sizes will be required. The site is under 0.5 hectares but the proposal provides sixteen units on site but this equates to a net increase of 14 units. The proposal does contain a mix of units which comprise of one and two bedroom apartments. I consider this acceptable for a site of this size and the nature of the development which proposes only apartments.
- 8.5 Policy 3/10 of the Local Plan 2006 is not directly relevant to the proposal as the proposal involves the loss of the existing properties on site and their replacement with two blocks of flats, therefore the proposal does not involve residential development within the garden area or curtilage of existing properties. However, many of the parts of the criteria of this policy are covered by other relevant policies.

- 8.6 In my opinion, the principle of the development is acceptable and in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework 2012 and policies 5/1 and 5/10 of the Local Plan 2006.

Affordable Housing

- 8.7 I agree with the Growth Projects Officer's assessment of the site and that a provision of affordable housing is not required in this instance.
- 8.8 In my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 5/5 and 10/1 and the Affordable Housing SPD (2008)

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

- 8.9 The Design and Access Statement explains the design evolution of the scheme since the previous application 16/0531/FUL was submitted and subsequently withdrawn. It also explains pre-application discussions have taken place. In summary, the most notable revisions include a greater separation between the two blocks, greater articulation to the principal facades, Block A has been rotated and stairwells relocated. The flank elevations of the blocks have been stepped down from three storeys to two storeys and better quality materials are proposed. Block A has a reduced footprint and Block B has been increased. External landscaping has been altered to improve disabled access. A Heritage Report has been provided.

Response to context, scale and massing and heritage assets

- 8.10 The site falls within the Conduit Head Road Conservation Area and contains trees which are the subject of TPOs (Tree Preservation Order). The neighbouring properties to the north and east of the application site known as Whitehouse and Salix on Conduit Head Road are both Grade II listed buildings. No.34 Madingley Road is identified as a positive building in the Madingley Road Suburbs and Approaches Study.
- 8.11 At Chapter 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), Conserving and Enhancing the Historic Environment,

the irreplaceability of heritage assets is discussed. Under paragraph 128, applicants are required to describe the significance of any heritage assets affected including their setting, Paragraph 129 talks of the local planning authority identifying the significance of a heritage asset that may be affected by a proposal and taking that into account when considering the impact of a proposal. The desirability of new development making a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness is discussed under paragraph 131, and 132 addresses the issue of great weight being given to the conservation of a heritage asset. Paragraph 134 is concerned with development that leads to less than substantial harm and the need for this to be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal. With regard to non-designated heritage assets the effect of an application on their significance should also be taken into consideration when determining an application.

- 8.12 The Urban Design and Conservation team raised concerns with the previous scheme (16/0531/FUL) and in particular the loss of No.34 Madingley Road. A Heritage Statement has been submitted as part of the current application that identifies that it was in the 1980s that the site was divided into two plots, and that the building has been heavily altered with its many extensions. From the evidence provided in the Heritage Statement the Urban Design and Conservation team considers that the building is considered neutral within the conservation area and they accept the loss can be agreed providing the replacement buildings preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the conservation area. I agree with this view given the information provided.
- 8.13 The Conduit Head Road Conservation Area Appraisal refers to the character of the area is of large detached properties in sizeable, mature gardens. It discusses two distinct character areas, the area along the west of Conduit Head Road and the area of Bradrushe Fields, to the east of the road. I agree with the Urban Design and Conservation teams comments that the Madingley Road properties are more in common with the west of Conduit Head Road character area where the area has more piecemeal development.
- 8.14 It is acknowledged that the proposed buildings will stand higher than nearby residential properties at three storeys high, with a basement below. The blocks step down to just over two storeys

high with a flat roof by the boundaries. Towards the boundaries the buildings stand a similar height to neighbouring residential properties. As noted by the Urban Design and Conservation team, the Landscape Visual Appraisal shows there will be no clear views of the additional massing from the vantage points shown. Along Madingley Road, the entrance to the site will provide the clearest view of the site. Block A is set back between 9m and 11m from the front site boundary along Madingley Road and angled Block B is located between 17.7m and 24m from the front boundary. The setback of Block B helps to reduce the bulk of the buildings when viewed from Madingley Road. The proposed additional planting along the boundaries helps provide screening and will soften views. I recommend the inclusion of a boundary treatment and soft landscaping condition.

- 8.15 The angled nature of Block B follows the boundary line and orientation of the neighbouring Whitehouse, whereas Block A is set back a similar distance from Madingley Road as No.2 Lansdowne Road. The staggered nature of the position of the two blocks on site helps to soften the bulk and massing of the buildings and provides a 7m separation between the two buildings. The two storey elements include green roofs which add soft landscaping to the site.
- 8.16 The two blocks are larger than the existing dwellings on site but there is space provided around the buildings which avoids them looking cramped on site. The design of the buildings seeks to draw inspiration from nearby listed buildings and the buildings have a Modern Movement style with the flat roofs and ribbon windows.
- 8.17 The Whitehouse is a grade II listed building located to the east of the application site. This building is set back 20m from the shared boundary with the application site. The shared boundary separating the two sites contains mature vegetation which acts as screening from the proposed development. I do not consider the proposal would harm the setting of this nearby listed building.
- 8.18 The rear boundary abuts the Wilderness area and garden of Salix a grade II listed property. Salix the house on this site is located 38m from the shared site boundary but the Wilderness area abuts the site boundary. There is less dense vegetation

along this boundary and there is a low mesh boundary fence separating the two sites. Block B is set back closer to this rear boundary than the current house on the site. At its closest Block B is located 19m from this boundary (17m if including the basement terrace area). The proposal includes new planting of vegetation between Block B and the Wilderness area. The property of Salix is located to the north-east of the application site and much of it will be obscured from view from the proposed blocks by vegetation on the application site and by the boundary with Whitehouse and vegetation within the Salix site. I do not consider the setting of Salix will be adversely affected by the proposal because of the combination of its position in relation to the proposed development and vegetation that will provide some screening of the site.

- 8.19 A third party requested that a third view from Urban Design is requested as they felt that the application differs very little from the last planning application on the site, but the response from Conservation and Urban Design gives an opposing response to those provided for the previous scheme. Both Urban Design and the Conservation team provided joint comments on the current planning application and they find the scheme to be acceptable. I consider that because the comments came from both the Urban Design and Conservation team further comments are not needed from the Urban Design team. I agree with the consultee comments provided. I consider the proposal will preserve the character and appearance of the conservation area and will not harm the setting of nearby listed buildings. It has also been considered that the loss of No.34 Madingley Road which is a positive building in the Madingley Road Suburbs and Approaches Study is considered now to be acceptable. Identification of a building as a positive building in the Conservation Area does raise its profile as a designated heritage asset but does not mean it cannot be demolished.
- 8.20 Third parties comments requested the properties of 34 and 36 Madingley Road be considered for listing. The Conservation team has considered the Heritage Statement and information relating to these properties and has not recommended they be put forward to be listed.

Movement and Access

- 8.21 The site is not level and drops down from street level. The proposal provides pedestrian access to the both blocks via a ramp and stairs from the front of the site. There are steps and paths that lead to the rear garden area. The car parking is accessible via a ramp that is accessed from Madingley Road. The site is adjacent to a footpath and cycle route which encourages these uses. Two areas of cycle parking are located towards the front of the site. Surveillance from the flats will provide natural surveillance of these areas. Bin storage is located towards the front of the site and within the basement.
- 8.22 The Landscaping team has raised some concerns over distances between the flats and external areas, parking areas and bin and bike stores. I consider the distance from the flats to the external areas to be reasonable as the stairwell and lift serve each block and are located by the central core area of the site. The basement parking is reached by the stairwell and lift located within each block which I consider to be acceptable. I consider the bin and bike stores are acceptable. Table 5.4 of the Design and Access Statement demonstrates the distance to the refuse storage areas from each flat and the distances comply with the requirements of the RECAP Design Guide (SPD). The Council's Arboricultural Officer has considered the position of the bin and bike stores and considers them acceptable in terms of their proximity to trees on site.

Open Space and Landscape

- 8.23 The two lower ground floor flats include terraces that are below ground level. The Landscaping team have highlighted potential overlooking concerns from users of the communal green space but note this can be dealt with by condition. I consider the hard and soft landscaping condition proposed will mitigate any privacy concerns for these terraced areas.
- 8.24 The Landscaping team questioned the usability of the upper floor triangular shaped terrace areas. The proposal is for one and two bedroom flats and therefore I consider the proposed amenity spaces are adequate for small households. There is also a communal garden area that provides additional amenity space for the residents.

8.25 Table 4.11.1 of the Tree Survey, Arboricultural Impact Assessment Preliminary Arboricultural Method Statement and Tree Protection Plan highlights which trees and hedge are to be removed from site (19 trees/hedge). It also highlights the tree works proposed to some remaining trees. The site contains Tree Preservation Order trees and is within a Conservation Area. The proposal does involve the loss of some Tree Preservation Order trees. The report explains that with the exception of T044 tree removals will have little or no impact on the visual amenity or character of the area due to limited stature or low visibility due to location. T044 is a large specimen prominently located close to the frontage on Madingley Road and it notes its loss will have some impact on the publicly visible character of the site. However, it has some defects including severe bark inclusion at stem unions and is not regarded as a long term asset for the site. It also notes that the removal of this tree will provide space for the future development of T038 and T042 which are specimens of higher quality that have the potential to contribute significantly to the character of the site and the local area in the future.

8.26 Drawing number 1747 A2 02 E (Landscape Strategy) identifies new planting proposed. Additional trees are proposed near the front boundary and in particular along the north-western boundary bordering properties along Lansdowne Road to enhance existing boundary planting. Additional tree planting is also proposed to enhance the rear boundary that borders the Wilderness and Salix with the tree line enhanced. Trees are also proposed throughout the site and between the two blocks that will help soften the appearance of hardstanding and buildings on site. The landscaping scheme also includes the addition of shrubs, lawn, rough grass and ornamental planting. I consider the new planting will satisfactory mitigate the loss of trees from the site.

Biodiversity

8.27 The Applied Ecology Report identifies the nearest statutorily designated wildlife site as Madingley Wood Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) which occurs over 2km to the west.

8.28 The Applied Ecology Report identified low numbers of pipistrelle bats roosting in the building proposed for demolition. The

Council's Biodiversity Officer notes that the loss of the roost is likely to be granted through a low impact Natural England licence if suitable mitigation is in place. He also requests the inclusion of a condition, which I support.

- 8.29 The site is adjacent to a City Wildlife Site that contains Great Crested Newts. The Applied Ecology Report and Council's Biodiversity Officer recommend that protective fencing is installed during the demolition and construction and I agree with the inclusion of the condition suggested.
- 8.30 The Biodiversity Officer has asked if a condition can be included so the adjoining boundary to the City Wildlife Site shall not be externally lit unless otherwise agreed in writing by the local planning authority. I consider this appropriate and reasonable and recommend it be included.
- 8.31 I also support the inclusion of the informatives recommended.

Elevations and Materials

- 8.32 The proposed materials will be similar to other nearby listed building. The materials and detailing take inspiration from the listed buildings of Salix, Willow House and Whitehouse along Conduit Head Road. I consider the proposed materials and elevation treatment will compliment the surrounding properties.
- 8.33 In my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 3/4, 3/7, 3/11, 3/12, 4/10 and 4/11.

Public Art

- 8.34 The Design and Access Statement explains that the site historically housed a public house called 'Man Loaded With Mischief' until its closure in 1921. The pub sign had the quote: "A Monkey, A Magpie and Wife; Is the true Emblem of Strife". The application proposes public art on the side elevation of Block A in the form of silver lettering that states the name of the pub that previously occupied the site and the pub sign quote underneath.
- 8.35 In my view, the proposed on site public art provision is acceptable as it recognises the past history of the site.

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

Renewable energy and sustainability

- 8.37 The application is supported by an Energy Improvement Statement, Sustainability Statement and Design and Access Statement. It explains the general approach given to sustainable design and construction, which incorporates thermal mass, Mechanical Ventilation with Heat Recovery (MVHR), to help maintain a healthy indoor environment, use of water efficient appliances and sanitary ware and photovoltaic panels. The Council's Senior Sustainability Officer finds the proposal acceptable. Further information is required on some aspects but she considers this can be dealt with by way of a planning condition, which I support.
- 8.38 In my opinion the applicants have suitably addressed the issue of sustainability and renewable energy and the proposal is in accordance with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policy 8/16 and the Sustainable Design and Construction SPD 2007.

Disabled access

- 8.39 The Design and Access Statement confirms disabled access will be compliant with Part M of the Building Regulations. External surfaces and parking areas will be paved in a smooth hard material suitable for use by wheelchair users. All doors are to have level thresholds. WC within each apartment have been designed for use for the disabled. Light switches, electrical socket outlets and intercom door entry system are to be located at a suitable height. Consideration is to be given to the interior colour scheme to provide a contrast between elements such as skirtings and signage. A charging point for disabled buggies is to be provided in the downstairs lobby and hearing loops provided in communal areas.
- 8.40 The proposal includes duplex units that are located over two floors. A disabled lift has been included which serves all floors bar the top floor of each of the two residential blocks, however all of the top floor apartments are duplex so can be reached by

the lift. The lifts also link the basement parking area with the flats.

- 8.41 The Disability Panel commented on the proposal. They noted it *'is a much improved scheme and although may not be suitable for disabled residents, certain adaptations could be made for those who acquire a disability.'* They did highlight there are some stepped areas in the grounds with no ramps. The applicant has responded and proposes a platform lift for access to the rear garden. The Access Officer would prefer a ramp as he is concerned some people would be unable to use it without assistance and there are potential maintenance and weather issues. I note the Access Officer's comments however I consider the provision of a platform lift would provide acceptable disabled access to the rear garden. Visitors are likely to be able to use the lift as they would be meeting residents. I do not consider maintenance or weather conditions are reasons for not allowing a platform lift. I understand that some people may require assistance to use the lift but I consider this acceptable as residents would understand this when deciding whether they wish to reside in an apartment.
- 8.42 The Disability Panel requested WC at entrance level of the duplex apartments and consideration of stairlift or through-floor to aid access and the use of sliding doors within the apartments. I recommend an informative is included if Planning Committee are minded to approve the scheme to highlight these options to the applicant.
- 8.43 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

Lansdowne Road

- 8.44 Even numbered properties No.2 to 6 Lansdowne Road border the site to the north and west. The closest property is No.2 Lansdowne Road which is located 12.4m from the boundary and its rear elevation faces towards Block A. This property is located 16m from Block A. Block A is set in a minimum of 1.9m from this shared boundary.

- 8.45 Block A stands at three storeys high but drops down to around two storeys high (6.7m high) with a flat roof by the Lansdowne Road boundary. Only the floor labelled as the second floor on the drawings has flank windows facing towards Lansdowne Road properties. This top floor is set in 5.3m from the main side elevation of Block A. Terraces are proposed at the front and rear of Block A. There is vegetation along this shared boundary including mature trees, which will be enhanced by additional proposed planting. This will provide some screening to properties along Lansdowne Road, although it is acknowledged that during the winter months it will provide less screening. Block A's rear windows and terraces will face in the direction of gardens and properties at No.4 and 6 Lansdowne Road, these properties are located at least 16.8m from the rear of Block A. I consider the combination of the distance between the windows and terraces and the vegetation along the boundary will avoid an unreasonable level of overlooking to these properties.
- 8.46 In my view, the combination of vegetation screening and Block A stepping down in height towards the boundary, avoids the proposal being overbearing or causing an unreasonable sense of enclosure to properties along Lansdowne Road.
- 8.47 The proposed blocks both have flat roofs which helps to reduce their bulk and I consider the proposal that extends to around two storeys high above ground level towards the boundary will not lead to an unreasonable loss of light to neighbours' due to its position and scale. The trees also act as natural separation between the application site and its neighbours'.

Whitehouse, Conduit Head Road

- 8.48 This neighbouring property to the east is located 25m from Block B. There is thick vegetation along the boundary between the site and this neighbour. The proposal steps down to around two storeys high (6.6m high) with a flat roof towards the shared boundary.
- 8.49 In my view, I do not consider the proposal would result in an unreasonable loss of light, outlook, sense of enclosure or loss of privacy to this neighbour due to the distance between Block B and the Whitehouse and the scale of the proposal towards

the boundary and vegetation present that separates the two sites.

Salix, Conduit Head Road

8.50 This property is located to the north-east of the application site and the property would be positioned 50m from Block B. The Wilderness part of this property's rear garden would be located 17m from the lower terrace at Block B and 19m from the main building. The property of Salix is angled to the north-east which helps reduce direct views of this property from the proposed blocks. There is a mesh fence along the rear boundary that separates the application site from the Wilderness part of this neighbours' garden. The rear elevation of Block B would directly face the Wilderness. Block A is angled to not directly face this area but would still have views towards this area. The application does propose introducing further vegetation towards the rear boundary. It is noted that Block B sits further back in the site than the house it is to replace. However, it is considered that the distance between Block B and the garden of Salix is sufficient to avoid unreasonable overlooking from the development. A solid fence could be introduced along the boundary to reduce overlooking in particular from users of the communal garden and provide additional privacy between the sites. The existing vegetation and proposed enhanced vegetation will help to reduce overlooking.

8.51 I consider the distance between Salix and the proposed blocks avoids the proposal from being overbearing, creating a sense of enclosure, harming outlook or resulting in a loss of light.

Light and noise pollution

8.52 The proposal will intensify the use of the site with sixteen units on site instead of the existing two large houses. It is accepted there is likely to be greater light and noise pollution caused by the proposed development than existing due to the additional units on site and the set back of the blocks on the site. However, I do not consider this will be so detrimental as to justify refusal of the planning application.

Overspill Car Park

- 8.53 Seventeen basement car parking spaces are provided and two at ground level which can be used by visitors. I consider this amount of car parking provision helps avoid residents and visitors needing to park along nearby streets.

Construction activities

- 8.54 I recommend the inclusion of the conditions requested by Environmental Health. These relate to construction hours, construction/demolition noise/vibration & piling, dust, noise insulation scheme and ventilation scheme. These are in the interests of residential amenities.
- 8.55 In my opinion the proposal adequately respects the residential amenity of its neighbours and the constraints of the site and I consider that it is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 3/4 and 3/7.

Amenity for future occupiers of the site

- 8.56 In my view, the proposed units are all of an acceptable size for one and two bedroom units. The smallest one bedroom units have a floor area of 74.57m² and the two bedroom units each have a floor area of 106.89m².
- 8.57 The majority of units have terraced areas with the exception of one bedroom units F15 and F16. The proposal also includes a communal rear garden area for the flats which is between 5m and 28.5m away from each of the apartments. I consider the combination of terraces for all two bedroom units and some one bedroom apartments and the communal area which is accessible for all apartments provides an acceptable provision of amenity space for all apartments.
- 8.58 Environmental Health are supportive of the proposal and I consider the proposed noise insulation and ventilation conditions will ensure an acceptable standard of living accommodation.
- 8.59 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

- 8.60 A covered bin storage area has been provided towards the front of the site close to the entrance. The refuse stores provide communal coloured wheeled containers (for green waste, dry recyclables and residual waste). Gate widths will be a minimum of 2m. The bin storage area towards the front of the site is located within 10m of the highway. Another refuse store has been provided in the basement solely for use by Block B. On bin collection day, the bins will be moved to the storage area in close proximity to the site access by a Management Company and once serviced and once serviced by refuse Officers, they will be returned to the basement. Kitchens are to be provided with integral separate waste containers to encourage recycling.
- 8.61 The apartments are located between 3.5m and 27.5m from their respective bin storage areas. The RECAP Waste Management Design Guide explains that residents should not have to take their waste and recycling more than 30 metres to a bin storage area. The proposal therefore meets the RECAP Supplementary Planning Guidance. I recommend the inclusion of a refuse condition so further information is provided about the bin storage arrangements and in particular how the bins in the basement are managed and how refuse vehicles will collect waste from the site.
- 8.62 In my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policy 3/12.

Highway Safety

- 8.63 The Highways Authority originally raised concerns with the access arrangement that gives priority for the private access over the public highway cycleway footway. The Highways Authority requested that this be redesigned so users of the driveway give way to users of the public highway. Visibility splays and vehicle crossover were also requested.
- 8.64 The site is not level and Madingley Road is higher than the application site and slopes down towards the site. Drawings reference SK04 Rev.A (Proposed access arrangements and

visibility) and an updated Site Plan were submitted which showed revisions to the access arrangements which the Highways Authority found to be acceptable. The Highways Authority does not object to the amended drawings. Drawing number PL2(90)01 Rev.D (site plan) has been received since but the details of the access arrangement remain unchanged from the previous drawing with the exception of tree works. The agent explained that it is not possible to provide priority for cycles when vehicles access the site as this would require the whole cycleway to be shifted into the application site and would result in the loss of a number of substantial trees from the Madingley Road frontage.

- 8.65 Although the Highways Authority finds the proposal to be acceptable, in my view, the site plan does not clearly show that the vehicles leaving the site need to give way to pedestrians and cyclists. I therefore recommend an additional condition to ensure it is made clear that the access arrangement needs to be constructed in accordance with the Proposed Access Arrangement and Visibility drawing. I also recommend the inclusion of the conditions requested by the Highways Authority.
- 8.66 I consider the use of a traffic light system to access the ramp to and from the basement car park to be an acceptable form of traffic management. This will ensure no cars pass on the ramp. This will be linked to an automated up/over door that will be introduced at the site. I recommend the inclusion of a condition for more detailed information on these arrangements.
- 8.67 Tracking analysis has been provided to demonstrate that manoeuvring into and out of the car parking spaces in the basement is workable. The car parking spaces labelled F14 are located in front of one another. I consider this is acceptable as they are allocated for the same apartment.
- 8.68 In my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policy 8/2.

Car and Cycle Parking

- 8.69 In total nineteen car parking spaces are provided. Each apartment will have at least one car parking space. Two of seventeen basement car parking spaces are disabled spaces. Two car parking spaces are located at ground floor level and

one of these is a disabled car parking space. I consider the provision of disabled car parking spaces and on-site car parking provision is acceptable for the proposed development.

- 8.70 The Design and Access Statement explains that 26 cycle spaces will be provided. These are to be located within communal covered and secure cycle stores located by the south and east boundaries. The stores will be fitted with Sheffield cycle stands. The cycle stores roof overhang will be a maximum of 1m and will have sedum (green) roofs.
- 8.71 The proposal provides sufficient cycle parking provision for the occupants of the apartments in accordance with the Cycle Parking Standards within the Local Plan 2006. No visitor cycle parking is proposed. The standards recommend some level of visitor cycle parking, in particular for large housing developments. I consider this could be dealt with by way of condition.
- 8.72 In my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 8/6 and 8/10.

Drainage and Flooding

- 8.73 The Environment Agency has no objection in principle and provided recommendations and requested informatives. The application site falls within floodzone 1. The Environment Agency requested the Council respond on behalf of the Environment Agency in respect of flood risk and/or surface water drainage issues.
- 8.74 Anglia Water finds the surface water strategy/flood risk assessment to be unacceptable and recommend the applicant consult with Anglia Water and the Lead Local Flood Authority. They request a condition requiring a drainage strategy to cover the issue. I recommend the inclusion of the condition they have requested.
- 8.75 Cambridgeshire County Council's Flood and Water team (Lead Local Flood Authority) have no objection in principle. They request the inclusion of the safeguarding conditions, which I consider to be acceptable.
- 8.76 The Council's Sustainable Drainage Engineer originally found the proposal to be unacceptable as insufficient information was

submitted. Following receipt of a revised Drainage Strategy and then email dated 26th May 2017 from G.H. Bullard and Associates LLP, the Sustainable Drainage Engineer responded on the 20th June 2017 and found the scheme to be acceptable providing the inclusion of a condition requested to address the remaining outstanding issues. I consider this condition to be necessary and recommend its inclusion.

8.77 I consider the mitigation conditions recommended will satisfactory address the concerns over potential flooding of the site and neighbouring sites including the Wilderness area to the rear of the site.

8.78 Providing the safeguarding conditions are included I consider the proposal would meet the requirements of policy 8/18 and the National Planning Policy Framework 2012.

Other issues

8.79 I recommend the inclusion of the conditions requested by Archaeology and Cambridge Airport as requested by the consultees.

Third parties

Response to representations:

Character	See paragraphs 8.9 – 8.33 of the assessment.
Residential amenities	See paragraphs 8.44 – 8.59 in the assessment above.
Oversight	The Landscape Strategy drawing provides a plan view of the proposed planting. Residential amenity has been considered in paragraphs 8.44 -8.59.
Transport and Car Parking	See paragraphs 8.53 and 8.63 – 8.72. A third party questions the reliability of the transport information supplied. The Highways Authority has considered the information and finds it acceptable.

Ecology	See paragraphs 8.27 – 8.31. An objector quoted the Conduit Head Conservation Area Appraisal which refers to The Wilderness as a SSSI. However, this is incorrect and this has been confirmed by the Council's Nature Conservation Projects Officer.
Runoff	See paragraphs 8.73 – 8.78 of the assessment.
Archaeology	I have recommended the archaeology condition requested by the Cambridgeshire County Council Archaeology team.
Trees	See paragraphs 8.25 – 8.26 of the assessment.
Other	See paragraphs 8.2 – 8.6 above.

Planning Obligations (s106 Agreement)

8.80 The Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Regulations 2010 have introduced the requirement for all local authorities to make an assessment of any planning obligation in relation to three tests. Each planning obligation needs to pass three statutory tests to make sure that it is

- (a) necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms;
- (b) directly related to the development; and
- (c) fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development.

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

8.81 In line with the CIL Regulations, councils can pool no more than five S106 contributions towards the same project. The new 'pooling' restrictions were introduced from 6 April 2015 and relate to new S106 agreements. This means that all

contributions now agreed by the city council must be for specific projects at particular locations, as opposed to generic infrastructure types within the city of Cambridge.

City Council Infrastructure (Open spaces and Community facilities)

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

£4,998 – Towards the provision of and/or improvement of the outdoor artificial pitches at Wilberforce Road, Cambridge CB3 0EQ

£3,792 – Provision and/or improvement of the children's play area at Storeys Field Play Area.

£5,082 – Provision of and/or improvement of and/or access to Informal Open Space facilities at Storeys Field.

£16,332 – Towards the provision of and/or improvement of the facilities and/or equipment at Storey's Field Centre, Newmarket Road, Cambridge.

- 8.83 I agree with the reasoning set out in paragraph 6.57 (DCMU comments paragraph) above that contributions towards these projects meet the requirements of the CIL regulations. Subject to the completion of a S106 planning obligation to secure this infrastructure provision, I am satisfied that the proposal accords with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 3/8, 5/14 and 10/1 and the Planning Obligation Strategy 2010.

Planning Obligations Conclusion

- 8.84 It is my view that the planning obligation is necessary, directly related to the development and fairly and reasonably in scale and kind to the development and therefore the Planning Obligation passes the tests set by the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010.

9.0 CONCLUSION

- 9.1 In my view the proposal is acceptable in terms of its scale and appearance and would preserve the appearance and character of the conservation area and would not harm the setting of nearby listed buildings. I consider it would not adversely harm residential amenities, biodiversity or highway safety. I therefore recommend approval of the scheme.

10.0 RECOMMENDATION

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

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

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

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

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

3. 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)

4. 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)

5. 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)

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

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

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

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

Reason: In the interests of residential amenity and to comply with policy 4/13 of the Local Plan 2006.

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

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

Reason: In the interest of residential amenity and to comply with policy 4/13 of the Local Plan 2006.

9. 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)

10. 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 (egg furniture, play equipment, refuse or other storage units, signs, lighting); proposed and existing functional services above and below ground (egg 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)

11. No development shall take place until there has been submitted to and approved by the local planning authority in writing a plan indicating the positions, design, materials and type of boundary treatment to be erected. The boundary treatment shall be completed in accordance with a timetable agreed in writing with the local planning authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure an appropriate boundary treatment is implemented. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/4, 3/11 and 3/12)

12. No development shall commence until details of visitor cycle parking are submitted to and approved by the local planning authority in writing. The approved facilities shall be provided in accordance with the approved details before use of the development commences.

Reason: To ensure appropriate provision for the secure storage of bicycles. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 8/6)

13. Prior to the commencement of the use hereby permitted, the arrangements for the disposal of waste detailed on the approved plans shall be provided and information shall be provided on the management arrangements for the receptacles to facilitate their collection from a kerbside collection point. The approved arrangements shall be retained thereafter.

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

14. No development shall take place within the area indicated until the applicant 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.

The model condition also indicates:

Developers will wish to ensure that in drawing up their scheme, the timetable for the investigation is included within the details of the agreed scheme.

A brief for the archaeological work can be obtained from the Historic Environment Team, Cambridgeshire County Council upon request.

Reason: Due to the location of the site and in accordance with policy 4/9 of the Local Plan 2006.

15. No development hereby permitted shall be commenced until surface water drainage works have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Before these details are submitted, an assessment shall be carried out of the potential for disposing of surface water by means of a sustainable drainage system and identify where surface water is currently discharged for the existing site. The proposed surface water drainage system should be designed such that there is no surcharging for a 1 in 30 year event and no internal property flooding for a 1 in 100 year event + 40% an allowance for climate change. The submitted details shall:
 - a. provide information about the design storm period and intensity, the method employed to delay and control the surface water discharged from the site and the measures taken to prevent pollution of the receiving groundwater and/or surface waters;
 - b. identify the proposed attenuation feature has been designed to incorporate a 300mm freeboard for the 1 in 100 year + 40% allowance for climate change event and exceedance routes should this overtop;
 - c. provide details of mitigation to the risk of blockage to the outfall control and conveyance features between the swales, and
 - d. provide a management and maintenance plan for the lifetime of the development which shall include the arrangements for adoption by any public authority or statutory undertaker and any other arrangements to secure the operation of the scheme throughout its lifetime.
2. The surface water drainage scheme shall be managed and maintained thereafter in accordance with the agreed details and management and maintenance plan.
3. No development hereby permitted shall be commenced until any alterations within third party land have prior approval from the owner and their acceptance submitted to the local planning authority.

Reason: In the interests of drainage and flooding and residential amenity and to comply with policy 8/18 of the Local Plan 2006 and the National Planning Policy Framework 2012.

16. Where soakaways are proposed for the disposal of uncontaminated surface water, percolation tests should be undertaken, and soakaways designed and constructed in accordance with BRE Digest 365 (or CIRIA Report 156), and shall be submitted and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The maximum acceptable depth for soakaways is 2 metres below existing ground level. Soakaways will not be permitted to be located in contaminated areas. If, after tests, it is found that soakaways do not work satisfactorily, alternative proposals must be submitted.

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

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

Reason: In order to comply with policy 8/18 of the Local Plan 2006 and the National Planning Policy Framework 2012.

17. If during development, contamination not previously identified is found to be present at the site then no further development (unless otherwise agreed in writing with the local planning authority) shall be carried out until the developer has submitted and had approved in writing a remediation strategy to the local planning authority detailing how this unsuspected contamination shall be dealt with and obtained written approval from the local planning authority. The remediation strategy shall be implemented as approved.

Reason: in the interests of residential amenity and to comply with policies 4/13 and 8/18 of the Local Plan 2006 and the National Planning Policy Framework 2012.

18. No unbound material shall be used in the surface finish of the driveway 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 and to comply with policy 8/2 of the Local Plan 2006.

19. Notwithstanding the provision of Class A of Schedule 2, Part 2 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015, (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 and to comply with policy 8/2 of the Local Plan 2006.

20. 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 and to comply with policy 8/2 of the Local Plan 2006.

21. Details of how the basement car park will operate to allow vehicles to enter and exit shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety and to comply with policy 8/2 of the Local Plan 2006.

22. The visibility splays and vehicular access arrangements shall be constructed in accordance with drawing number SK04 Rev.A (Proposed access arrangement and visibility)

Reason: In the interests of highway safety and to comply with policies 8/2 of the Local Plan 2006.

23. The manoeuvring area shall be provided as shown on the drawings and retained free of obstruction.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety and to comply with policy 8/2 of the Local Plan 2006.

24. Any redundant vehicle crossover of the footway must be returned to normal footway and kerb at no cost to the Highway Authority.

Reason: for the safe and efficient operation of the public highway and to comply with policy 8/2 of the Local Plan 2006.

25. The access shall be provided as shown on the approved drawings and a width of access of 15 metres provided for a minimum distance of ten metres from the highway boundary and retained free of obstruction.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety and to comply with policy 8/2 of the Local Plan 2006.

26. 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 and to comply with policy 8/2 of the Local Plan 2006.

27. Prior to the occupation of the development, a renewable energy statement, which demonstrates that at least 10% of the development's total predicted energy requirements will be from on-site renewable energy 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/CO₂/annum; and
 - b) A schedule of proposed on-site renewable energy technologies, their respective carbon reduction contributions, location, design and a maintenance programme.

The proposed renewable energy technologies shall be fully installed and operational prior to the occupation of any approved buildings and shall thereafter be maintained in accordance with a maintenance programme, which shall be submitted to and 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 (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 8/16).

28. Development shall not begin until a surface water drainage scheme for the site, based on sustainable drainage principles, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The scheme shall subsequently be implemented in accordance with the approved details before development is completed.

The scheme shall be based upon the principles within the agreed Drainage Strategy (GHB Reference: 055/2016/FRA Rev A, dated January 2017) prepared by GH Bullard & Associates LLP and shall also include:

- a) Full calculations detailing the existing surface water runoff rates for the QBAR, 33% Annual Exceedance Probability (AEP) (1 in 30) and 1% AEP (1 in 100) storm events
- b) Full results of the proposed drainage system modelling in the above-referenced storm events (as well as 1% AEP plus climate change) , inclusive of all collection, conveyance, storage, flow control and disposal elements and including an allowance for urban creep, together with an assessment of system performance;
- c) Detailed drawings of the entire proposed surface water drainage system, including levels, gradients, dimensions and pipe reference numbers
- d) Full details of the proposed attenuation and flow control measures
- e) Details of overland flood flow routes in the event of system exceedance, with demonstration that such flows can be appropriately managed on site without increasing flood risk to occupants;
- f) Measures taken to prevent pollution of the receiving groundwater and/or surface water;

The drainage scheme must adhere to the hierarchy of drainage options as outlined in the NPPF PPG

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 and to comply with the National Planning Policy Framework 2012.

29. Details for the long term maintenance arrangements for the surface water drainage system (including all SuDS features) to be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to the first occupation of any of the dwellings hereby permitted. The submitted details should identify runoff sub-catchments, SuDS components, control structures, flow routes and outfalls. 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 2012.

30. Details of any cranes to be used in the construction of the development shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure they do not penetrate Cambridge Airport's safeguarding surfaces and to comply with policies 8/12 and 8/13 of the Local Plan 2006.

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

Reason: To prevent environmental and amenity problems arising from flooding and to comply with policy 8/18 of the Local Plan 2006 and National Planning Policy Framework 2012.

32. No development shall take place (including any demolition, ground works, site clearance) until a method statement for additional surveys, method statements for demolition and proposed mitigation has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The content of the method statement shall include the:

- a) purpose and objectives for the proposed works;
- b) detailed design(s) and/or working method(s) necessary to achieve stated objectives (including, where relevant, type and source of materials to be used);
- c) extent and location of proposed works shown on appropriate scale maps and plans;
- d) timetable for implementation, demonstrating that works are aligned with the proposed phasing of construction;
- e) persons responsible for implementing the works;
- f) initial aftercare and long-term maintenance (where relevant);
- g) disposal of any wastes arising from works.

The works shall be carried out strictly in accordance with the approved details and shall be retained in that manner thereafter.

Reason: To comply with policy 4/6 of the Local Plan 2006 and the National Planning Policy Framework 2012.

33. No development, demolition or earth moving shall take place or material or machinery brought onto the site until a method statement for protective fencing and warning signs has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. All protective fencing and warning signs must be erected on site and maintained during the construction period in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To comply with policy 4/6 of the Local Plan 2006 and the National Planning Policy Framework 2012.

34. The adjoining boundary to the City Wildlife Site (the Wilderness) shall not be externally lit unless otherwise agreed in writing by the local planning authority.

Reason: To comply with policy 4/6 of the Local Plan 2006 and the National Planning Policy Framework 2012.

35. Prior to commencement and in accordance with BS5837 2012, a phased Arboricultural Method Statement (AMS) and Tree Protection Plan (TPP) shall be submitted to the local planning authority for its written approval, before any equipment, machinery or materials are brought onto the site for the purpose of development (including demolition). In a logical sequence the AMS and TPP will consider all phases of construction in relation to the potential impact on trees and detail the specification and position of protection barriers and ground protection and all measures to be taken for the protection of any trees from damage during the course of any activity related to the development, including demolition, foundation design, storage of materials, ground works, installation of services, erection of scaffolding and landscaping.

Reason: To comply with policies 4/4 and 4/11 of the Local Plan 2006.

36. Prior to the commencement of site clearance a pre-commencement site meeting shall be held and attended by the site manager, the arboricultural consultant and Local Planning Authority Tree Officer to discuss details of the approved AMS.

Reason: To comply with policies 4/4 and 4/11 of the Local Plan 2006.

37. The approved AMS and TPP will be implemented throughout the development and 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 comply with policies 4/4 and 4/11 of the Local Plan 2006.

INFORMATIVE: Dust condition informative

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

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

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

-Guidance on the assessment of dust from demolition and construction

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

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

http://www.iaqm.co.uk/wp-content/uploads/guidance/monitoring_construction_sites_2012.pdf

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

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

INFORMATIVE: The applicant is reminded that, under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981, as amended (section 1), it is an offence to remove, damage or destroy the nest of any wild bird while that nest is in use or being built. Planning consent for a development does not provide a defence against prosecution under this act.

Trees and scrub are likely to contain nesting birds between 1st March and 31st August inclusive. Trees and scrub are present on the application site and are to be assumed to contain nesting birds between the above dates, unless a recent survey has been undertaken by a competent ecologist to assess the nesting bird activity on site during this period and has shown it is absolutely certain that nesting birds are not present.

INFORMATIVE: The applicant has detailed within the Drainage Strategy that the "swale can be subtly incorporated within the landscaping". The Lead Local Flood Authority would require a detailed plan of this proposal as we would need to ensure that the proposed storage can be provided, amongst the proposed/existing trees.

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: Informative: 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: 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.

INFORMATIVE: The Highway Authority would accept dedication of any additional land within the visibility splays.

INFORMATIVE: Informative: Prior to the commencement of the first use the vehicular access where it crosses the public highway shall be laid out and constructed in accordance with the Cambridgeshire County Council construction specification.

INFORMATIVE: The developer is advised to contact Adrian Shepherd, Project manager, Public transport projects.
Email Address - Adrian.J.Shepherd@cambridgeshire.gov.uk
Phone number - 01223 728110
To discuss potential implications regarding the City Deal Schemes on Madingley Road.

INFORMATIVE: Notwithstanding the provision of the Town and Country Planning General Permitted Development Order 2015 (or any order revoking or re-enacting that Order), any oil storage tank shall be sited on an impervious base and surrounded by oil tight bunded walls with a capacity of 110% of the storage tank, to enclose all filling, drawing and overflow pipes. The installation must comply with Control of Pollution Regulations 2001 and Control of Pollution (Oil Storage) Regulations 2001.

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

INFORMATIVE: The Cambridgeshire Constabulary Crime Prevention Design Team at Huntingdon would be happy to discuss Secured by Design and measures to mitigate against crime and disorder as the application progresses. They can be contacted at cpdt@cambs.pnn.police.uk

INFORMATIVE: Traffic Management Plan:

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: The Disability Panel explained that further improvements could be made however as there are still some stepped areas in the grounds with no ramps. There should also be a WC at the entrance level of the maisonettes. The designers are recommended to explore the option of a through-floor or stairlift for the maisonettes to improve their accessibility. Sliding doors between the living room spaces and the bathrooms would also remove potential conflict.

APPENDIX A

Third party representations

The owners/occupiers of the following addresses have made representations:

Objections:

- 4, 6, 8, 10 Lansdowne Road
- Daylesford, Conduit Head Road
- Orchard House, Conduit Head Road
- Salix, Conduit Head Road
- Willow House, Conduit Head Road
- 44 Conduit Head Road
- 7a Adams Road
- Cambridge Past, Present and Future

Support:

- Lansdowne Road

The representations can be summarised as follows:

Objections:

Character

- The appearance of the very large blocks is out of keeping with the area.
- The proposal would damage the amenity of the Conduit Head Road Conservation Area as it neither maintains nor enhances the appearance of the Conservation Area when viewed from the South.
- The size of the proposal is completely unsuitable for the area. That there are other flats in this conservation area, or, that there will be flats and high-rise buildings on the near North West Cambridge Development (NWCD), should not be viewed as a precedence that has been set - but as a warning not to further erode this conservation area.
- The existing flats in Conduit Head Road are set lower and further back from other properties and are well screened by mature trees. The flats are owned by St John's College and house students.
- Flats are forced into an area too small to accommodate them.
- An attempt has been made to blend the proposed development in the style of some of the existing properties - the attempt fails

due to the height and density proposed. Thereby rendering the proposed development out of character and style and size with existing properties.

- It is understood that Conservation Areas are designed to keep intact the general overall physical appearance of structures to maintain the character of that area.
- This proposal not only intends to demolish both existing domestic independent units, but proposes to replace them with taller, united, modern structures. They are considered detrimental to the character and appearance of the Conduit Head Conservation Area and seems out of scale and inappropriate. They also appear contrary to the Cambridge Local Plan 3/4.
- West Cambridge is already seeing considerable development by the Universities and it must be desirable to retain a proportion of domestic architecture to maintain a suitable balance. The Conservation principles of the area should be strong enough to refuse the proposed development.
- We encourage listing of the two properties for preservation in the future.
- The density in height, width and number of units within the Conservation Area is disproportionate for the plot, therefore not in keeping with the Conservation Area. The heritage of the Conservation Area has predominantly large domestic dwellings on proportionate plots. The only two that don't have single domestic dwellings are set geographically lower in height on their plots and behind mature evergreen screening and cannot be seen from any of the approaching roads or neighbouring properties. They are also much smaller in relation to the surface area of the plots they occupy.
- The scale and massing of the buildings in this location is badly out of context with other dwellings within the conservation area and have a poor relationship to the rest of the site.
- The proposal is at least one full storey higher than other domestic dwellings in the approximate vicinity. No.36 Madingley Road is less than 30 years old. Why demolish either house?
- Huge increase in artificial light from the development will impact neighbours' gardens within the Conservation area and the Wildlife in the Conservation Area which is currently almost exclusively pitch black from dusk until dawn.
- Moving the development back has had a negative impact on surrounding neighbours and conservation area as it forces the

high density development much further back into the conservation area.

- The site is within the Conduit Head Conservation Area, adjacent to several listed buildings, several TPO trees and part of a wildlife area and is included in the Cambridge Suburbs and Approaches, Madingley Road document, which states: *'Madingley Road is a principal route into the City, and retains its green and open quality closer to the City Centre to a larger extent than other approaches'* Whilst the applicant does not appear to consider the significance of the road, it is clear that as one of the primary routes into the city, its setting and character are vital to the heritage and history of Cambridge.
- If one was to separate out the two components of the scheme, then the principle of demolition is the first to review. The existing dwellings have modest architectural or historic interest, they are:
 - both substantial family homes that are perfectly viable
 - in a desirable location
 - sit comfortably in the street scene
 - echo the other dwellings along Madingley Road in scale and form
 - sit within large attractive mature gardens at the front and rear
- The proposal is significant over-development of the site, but it also raised major concerns related to design, scale, mass, materials, transport/highways issues, impact to the conservation area and adjacent heritage assets and impact to ecology and trees.
- The NPPF requires any proposal to be assessed as the balance between harm and public benefit. Whilst the current proposal may increase the occupancy of the site, there is a question of need of this type of housing in this particular location. Does the proposal preserve and enhance the setting and character of the conservation area? Does it sit comfortably in the setting adjacent to the heritage assets?
- The architectural design of the proposed new buildings is alleged to respond to the several listed early 20th Century Modernist houses, but fails to replicate their quality and style in a meaningful way.
- The spatial qualities of the existing buildings include generous gardens, open skyline, space around the buildings and distance

from adjacent properties. The proposal lacks these qualities and would neither preserve nor enhance the site and its surroundings.

- Whilst the West and NW Cambridge sites are to include a dense development, the existing development on the north side of Madingley Road retains its more modest growth and is part of what adds character to the conservation area.
- From a planning point of view, trees and vegetation cannot be relied upon and are therefore not material considerations for mitigation of through views.
- The plans want to demolish no. 36 Madingley Road which, on the contrary, is an attractive house completely in keeping with its surroundings. This is a Conservation Area, with small, domestic dwellings and a large number of trees. The proposed development would cut down many of the trees, which will badly affect the attractive and tranquil character of the area.
- The two houses 34-36 Madingley Road represent well the period in which they were built and although not listed, merit preservation in the area setting.
- The Conservation Area Appraisal from 2009 is talking about the continuity of the gardens of both houses into The Wilderness as an important element in the natural character of the whole area.
- The idea that a large block of flats with car parking for the occupiers and their guests is not detrimental to the natural features and the whole character of The Conduit Head Road Conservation area is clearly false.
- To maintain Cambridge as a relatively green city is not an easy task. The City Council has the opportunity to do so here.
- I request; with support of the local residents, that a third opinion is sought from the Urban Design team for this proposal. This application differs very little from the first and has inexplicably received a totally opposing response, which reads more like personal opinion than any appraisal based on planning policy
 - Firstly *“Conservation issues raised in the previous scheme with regard to no. 34 Madingley Road have been addressed within the Heritage Statement for this application. This shows that the site was only relatively recently, in the 1980s, divided into two plots. Until that point it was a single site. Therefore the proposal to combine the two plots has been justified as a return to the previous layout. This is supported”*
 - The site was originally one large house and a well removed detached double garage. I know this because it was my home until 1982. It was divided into two large

individual plots and the detached garage was replaced with a single large house. Both houses still stood - as they do today - on significant sized plots. Combining the two plots does nothing to "return it to the previous layout".

- If that is the urban design departments concern, then the second house should be converted back into a garage. To build two blocks of flats 3 storeys high, taking up a significantly larger footprint and sitting much more obtrusively on a single plot is by no means returning it to the previous low built density site of the 1980's.

- *"The depiction of no. 34 Madingley Road as being a non-designated heritage asset has also been investigated. The Heritage Statement shows that the building has been heavily altered with its many extensions, and that it is not a good example of its building type."*

- The previous conservation area officer was calling for the listing of the building – how can two officers have such conflicting views?
- *"Therefore it can be agreed that the building is neutral within the conservation area and its loss can be agreed provided that any replacement buildings preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the conservation area."*
- As previously mentioned these dominating 3 storey flats do not enhance the character or appearance of the conservation area especially not for those living around it. This second proposal similar in nature to the first, pushes the buildings much further back on the site – so whilst this camouflages their appearance somewhat from the 40mph road users - for the stationary neighbours looking up at it from their gardens, or being looked down upon in their gardens - it does not.
- Nor does any amount of additional planting take away from the fact that from October – May neighbours are significantly overlooked and would suffer huge losses of privacy. I refer back to photographic submissions by ourselves and Salix and your visit Lorna, which showed this clearly to be the case. All pictures were taken on a bright day either at ground level or 1.8m above.
- With regards to the size, the officer reports *"This increase in height will change the character and appearance of the conservation area, but the photomontages show that*

there will be no disruptively negative, clear views of the additional massing from the vantage points shown in the visualisations.”

- Why has the officer/s not visited the site in person? Photomontages and site plans can be extremely misleading. We discovered that on your last visit Lorna, when you saw the significance of the exposure and impact to surrounding neighbours' gardens - which is not clear from the visualisations if you don't visit the site. In fact, views toward Salix and no. 4 & 6 Lansdowne Road from the development were noticeably absent.
- In addition, *“When viewed from the air, the overall roof scape is lessened by the use of green roofs over the two storey elements of the blocks.”* How lovely that helicopter users and the passing abseiling community won't be subject to dominating views of this development.
- Furthermore, in drainage strategy appendix G the map provided shows a water channel from the pond in Salix garden leading right up to the boundary line with the proposed development and suggests this is where the SUD's would be situated and overflow into if needed. This channel does not exist. If the development causes flooding onto Salix's land and subsequent damage to this listed building - as a heritage asset - I would ask the planning department to make evident who would be responsible.
- Finally, in the much later submission of additional transport information, two examples have been provided as a comparison to this application in terms of the exit and entry points onto a main highway. Neither compare in relation to this site as they exit onto flat, level ground in a 30mph zone. Not from a steep incline crossing a pedestrian and cycle path into a 40mph zone.
- The Conduit Head Conservation Area Appraisal carried out by the Council states:
 - “Trees and vegetative cover have a major impact on the character of the area, which is reflected through the designation of many individual and group TPOs. The vegetation acts to enclose the area, screening views into the surrounding landscape it also reduces views through to the private garden spaces and buildings, emphasising the privacy of these areas.”
 - The Conduit Head Conservation Area Appraisal found and names the Conservation Area as “The

Wilderness, a SSSI, to the rear of properties on Conduit Head Road and numbers 34 and 36 Madingley Road, forms an important integrated shared private space. Private gardens and the shared private space of the Wilderness are important to the character of the area. The large plot size compliments that of the houses.”

- “Over the last few decades, a number of the large building plots have been subdivided. This has been to the detriment of the setting of some structures, which now feel oversized and cramped within their building plot. This practice has also eroded the leafy, high quality character of the area.”

- “Subdivision of plots should be actively discouraged in order to maintain the original setting of the buildings”. And “Any development should be set back from the road within a green and leafy setting, in order to maintain the enclosed and secluded character of the area”. Also, that “the relationship between the Wilderness and the houses that back on to it should be preserved.”

- The appraisal was sought for the following purpose “This document has appraised the character of all elements of the Conservation Area. It’s content and the policies should be used to inform the future management of the area.”

Residential amenities

- Adjoining properties will be considerably overshadowed: the proposed development will loom over the inhabitants of Lansdowne Road and Conduit Head Road. This will lead to a significant number of properties adjoining the proposed development, and a significant number of properties around the nature reserve, being overlooked. Any sense of privacy will vanish.
- Noise and disturbance.
- Light pollution.
- The developer chose not to show views into the development from our garden (Salix) or that of 6 Lansdowne as shown in drawing number 1747A202E (which shows view point locations into the site from other properties). This is clearly because these views would not be favourable to the planning application.
- Drawing (number 1747A202E) falsely shows that trees appear to screen 34/36 Madingley Road from our garden. As our photographs show, this is far from the truth.

- The proposed development will move from being 32 metres away from our boundary (Salix), to 17 metres away. And be substantially bigger. This will hugely impact our privacy and that of our family as we play and walk about in our garden.
- The proposed development's height will dwarf that of our house, Salix. This means that our house and other adjoining properties will be overshadowed, overlooked and suffer a significant loss of privacy and light in varying degrees. This extends to ownership of Willow House and beyond, as the first and second floors would have open views over "the nature reserve" - private gardens to our house and Willow House and houses beyond.
- "The nature reserve" as it is referred to in DPA's Design & Access statement is, in fact, our (Salix) private garden (and also the private gardens of other houses as it works its way alongside Conduit Head Road).
- Outlook.
- Overbearing sense of enclosure compared to the current massing and spacing of the in keeping properties on the site.
- Overshadowing and loss of light
- Overlooking and loss of privacy
- No.6 Lansdowne Road would go from having the first floor of one large single occupancy domestic property at No.34 (approximately 30-40 metres from the boundary) having an open view into our house and garden from October – May. To having flats of multi-occupancy having a direct view from October to May every year. Concerned with privacy and impacts on light to both our home and garden.
- The density will increase the occupancy four-fold from the existing two-storey domestic houses and create more opportunities to overlook properties in Lansdowne Road. Proposal is for four storeys high and vegetation will only obscure views partially.

Oversight

- The oversight of the neighbouring properties will be substantial (and increased relative to the previous proposal. The developers do not show the prospect from this direction presumably since it would be detrimental to the acceptance of their proposal.

Transport and Car Parking

- The high and increased density development (increased from c. 6 occupants to as many as 35 occupants) will funnel traffic up an incline across an important pedestrian and cycling route onto a 40 mph road, blinded by vegetational screening to block visibility of the development from the highway. It is inappropriate, as shown on the plans, to overrule the pedestrian and cycle path right of way.
- The number of car parking spaces will encourage car ownership at a time when the City desperately needs a massive reduction in the number of cars on City Roads.
- Concerned with access for bin collections and grocery delivery vans and they could potentially block the flow of traffic and ease of access to and from site by waiting on the 40mph Madingley Road.
- Access to the proposed development is not at all safe for road users and pedestrians.
- Access to the proposed flats as you enter/exit Madingley Road is unsafe. With the opening of the North West Cambridge site - and the new supermarket, the footpath/cycle path will be even busier. The family-oriented bicycles where the children sit in the front will be particularly vulnerable to the dangerous exit/entrance. And as the cars wait to get onto Madingley Road, the cycle path will be blocked.
- Any car looking to leave the drive will effectively block the cycle path and footpath. This is an unsafe volume of traffic exiting and entering for its access and location. Make the cycle path more dangerous. Highway Code 206 should not be altered. Vehicles should remain giving way to pedestrians and cyclists on the pavement.
- Nineteen parking spaces will increase movement into and out of the site by up to 5 x current movement. The trip predictions in the transport statement are most likely inaccurate given it is possible to produce trip rates to fit predetermined preferred figure using the TRICS system. Multi-modal surveys provide the most limited data especially when sample sizes are small. They have been used over only six days in a period of 9 years up to 2014. TRICS is updated on a quarterly basis I would have expected to see recent data being used. All of this considered, it could render the proposed trip rates unreliable.
- The original Design and Access Statement highlighted a severe accident directly opposite the application site which involved a car and cyclist, there has been a further accident. It is our

opinion that the development will exacerbate the likelihood of this pattern of behaviour. Compounded by the increased impact of the North-West Cambridge development which is predicted an increase of over 800 cars using Madingley Road.

- There is insufficient car turning space on site and awkward visibility splays onto the road raising concerns about traffic and highway safety.
- There are concerns about the existing ground levels, as the street is higher than from within the site- a feature of the approach into Cambridge along Madingley Road.
- There is no dedicated off site space along Madingley Road for bin Lorries to stop and service the development and due to the increased number of residents this will take longer to do.
- There are concerns about any underground parking due to the potential of flooding.
- Additional vehicles will aggravate congestion already experienced on Madingley Road.
- What concerns us most is the narrow, steep and unsafe exit from the residential apartment blocks, which runs across the joint pedestrian and cycle path alongside Madingley Road. This will endanger the users of the footpath, whose numbers will be considerably increased once the North West
- Cambridge Development is up and running. Nor should cyclists or pedestrians have to give way to cars from private dwellings.

Ecology

- A recent university dissertation (including camera traps and counting) has identified the valuable biodiversity of this rare green, tree rich and watered space. Some of the species are outlined in other objections.
- The wildlife in this area is bound to be drastically disrupted - or possibly, destroyed.
- We object on the basis of the deterioration it will cause to the adjoining city wildlife site. The wider surrounding area is subject to significant development which makes the Conduit Head Road Conservation Area and the enclosed City Wildlife Site even more of an essential haven for the local wildlife. The deterioration will be threefold.
- Extra light, noise, and human activity adjacent to the boundary will reduce the safe area available for wildlife. As others have commented, the current diversity is welcome and enjoys little intervention from a low density of human habitation set well back from the ponds and woodland.

- The increased run-off from the proposed larger buildings will increase the water level in the City Wildlife Site. Recent experience has been that there are already unacceptably high water levels which have facilitated uprooting or simply drowning of a substantial number of trees. Any visit to the site leaves the impression of multiple losses, most recently added to with three more trees lost to storm Doris in February. The run off from the City Wildlife Site is through shallow channels that regularly block with twigs and leaves. In our view it does not form a viable route to increase drainage from the development site.
- The proposed increase in vehicular traffic with 16 rather than 2 units on site, seems likely to increase contamination in the run-off water from chemicals associated with those extra vehicles. The need to pump run-off up from the basement to get above the water table would suggest concentration of those chemicals could be occurring. Clearly water quality is of great significance to the wildlife, not least to the breeding colony of great crested newts.
- Light pollution will have a detrimental and adverse effect on existing wildlife corridors – specifically bat and bird populations and other wildlife (geese, ducks, kingfisher, owl colony, 2 known native woodpecker species, peacocks and great crested newts etc.) within the Conservation Area. Examples of common pipistrelle, commuting common pipistrelle and brown long eared bats have all been documented as active on site in the most recent ecology report.
- Absent from the ecology assessment are the facts from the Natural England documents, where activities that are stated to have a harmful effect on bats and their habitats are “the removal of commuting habitats like hedgerows, watercourses or woodland and changing or removing bats foraging areas and cutting down or removing branches from a mature tree”. The existing tree and shrub habitat on the proposed development site whilst may not be a place of roosting, support a bat colony and its existence.
- Planning policy also recommends that to lessen impact on biodiversity and geodiversity it should "promote preservation, restoration and re-creation of priority habitats and ecological networks." It should also aim to prohibit "the loss or deterioration of irreplaceable habitats, including ancient woodland and the loss of aged or veteran trees found outside ancient woodland"
- There is no mitigation to the ecology and wildlife in the immediate area to address the harm from the development.

- *Runoff*

- The increased roof and hard surface cover will cause increased run-off into the adjoining ponds which have already suffered from flooding.
- We are strongly objecting to the proposed development discharging water into our land (Salix). This was a shocking discovery for us. We have neither been consulted nor given consent for drainage to come into our garden from the proposed flats. Matt Tandy (the responding sustainable drainage engineer) has highlighted that the proposed surface water management strategy is insufficiently designed for purpose. We currently have many soak-aways in our garden to manage waterlogging issues. Notably, our garden sits lower than the houses at 34 and 36 Madingley Road.
- Objection to the significant increase in surface water run off/drainage and its management. The basement car park with predominant clay site will force surface water run off further into the conservation area and wilderness/woodland section behind.
- Proposed surface water management strategy, shows surface water being channeled into a Swale/attenuation pond, which has been highlighted by Matt Tandy (Drainage Engineer) as being insufficiently designed for purpose. It could impact on tree roots and could overflow into private garden of Salix and Will House. The remaining trees can't cope with increased periods of high water levels which have seen recent unprecedented highs.

Archaeology

- The development is placed along a major arterial road dating back to the Iron Age, and it is inappropriate to disturb this resource without proper reason.

- *Trees*

- There are 5 TPO trees on the development site. Three of these trees are planned to be felled amongst a total of 18 planned for felling, with significant crowning work and removal of other hedging also proposed. What then is the purpose of a TPO?
- Concerned about root damage during building works to two TPO trees that are proposed to remain.

- *Other*
- The proposal for one and two bedroom flats does not address the main requirement for the City for an increase in the number of family homes.
- Conflicts with policy 3/10 of the Local Plan 2006.
- Support:
- We believe that this proposal represents an improvement on the previous proposal.
- Our property (No.2 Lansdowne Road) is the one that is impacted the most by the new development. We consider that the impact of overlooking, loss of light or amenity will be little different from that we already experience.
- This development provides much-needed high-quality accommodation that gives a fresh look to one of the key entries into the city and that complements and enhances the modernist style of the conservation area. A modest number of units of a generous size are proposed and they are of a similar massing and grain of development to the neighbouring blocks of flats (Whitehouse).
- The footprint of the proposed buildings does not take away excessively from the attractive existing gardens, and a high-quality environment will be provided for future residents. This development of the land is more appropriate to the conservation area than alternatives such as multiple single units or multi-occupancy accommodation.
- The level of car-parking within the development is appropriate for its size, and the undercroft residents' parking will be largely out of sight. Given the significant increase in traffic on Madingley Road that will come from the North-West Cambridge development, it is helpful that the transport study for this proposal shows no more than one or two extra vehicle movements in the morning and evening rush-hour.
- It is good that the proposal calls for the removal of only one of the three trees remaining with a TPO, and that this is a low-quality tree.

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.