

Application Number	17/0928/FUL	Agenda Item	
Date Received	25th May 2017	Officer	Toby Williams
Target Date	24th August 2017		
Ward	Castle		
Site	Mount Pleasant House Mount Pleasant Cambridge Cambridgeshire CB3 0RN		
Proposal	Demolition of the existing office building and removal of the 145 associated car parking spaces (use class B1a) and construction of college accommodation, landscaping and access arrangements (use class sui generis).		
Applicant	N/A C/O Agent		

SUMMARY	<p>The development accords with the Development Plan for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -The principle of developing the site for student accommodation is acceptable. -The design and scale of the buildings is acceptable. -Providing appropriate S106 provisions are secured regarding the academic staffing element, the application is acceptable. -Appropriate mitigation for improvement to local cycling and walking provision to the site has been agreed to be secured through a S106.
RECOMMENDATION	APPROVAL

0.0 Introduction

- 0.1 This application is a resubmission of a recent approval (16/1389/FUL) for an almost identical scheme granted on 31 March 2017 for the Mount Pleasant House site. That application was for college accommodation and mainly for students but also for a limited amount of academic staff, totalling 277 units for all occupants. The need for the application has arisen because of two issues.
- 0.2 The first is that the S106 for 16/1389/FUL has an obligation within it limiting the percentage of units capable of being occupied by academic staff to 5%. During the course of that application, the applicants were insufficiently precise in their definition of 'college' accommodation. Following the committee meeting of 1 February 2017, the officer position, without a further report back to Committee, was that a maximum academic staffing cap of 5% was appropriate. The applicants now wish to raise the academic cap to 25%, which equates to 68 of a total of 273 units.
- 0.3 The second issue is that a number of relatively minor design changes have been made which amount to material amendments and collectively require a new application. The applicants have produced a Design Statement which summarises the changes to the consented scheme (16/1389/FUL) as follows:

Building B1:

- ☐ Substation incorporated at ground floor within a reorganised bin store
- ☐ External first floor deck/walkway has been omitted
- ☐ North elevation remodelled to reflect above changes

Building B2:

- ☐ Re-designed layout, replacing 44no. en-suite rooms with 40no. self-contained studio apartments
- ☐ New fenestration pattern draws on precedent of Building B3 north elevation

Building A

- ☐ External cycle ramp between ground floor and lower ground floor on the Mount Pleasant elevation reduced in length and increased in width to 2m.
- ☐ Entrance door to the cycle store relocated and changes to the distribution of cycle parking within the store.
- ☐ Removal of floor gratings over the external well and increases to the soft landscape area between the building and Mount Pleasant.
- ☐ Minor internal changes to layout of studios. This does not affect the number of studios in Building A nor the external appearance of the building.

0.4 This assessment focuses on the merits of an increase in the academic staff ratio as a matter of principle. The second part of the assessment then turns to the design changes and the impact of these on the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

0.5 By way of guidance for members, almost all the original consultation responses – except planning policy - mirror those received originally and for the sake of brevity they are not repeated as part of this assessment. Those conditions as originally requested by consultees have been carried over as part of a new recommendation save where submissions have been made already and the conditions discharged. In those circumstances, the previous conditions requesting information for discharge have been altered so as to request compliance with approval documents.

0.6 As an appendix, the original report for 16/1389/FUL has been attached as appendix A to this report.

PUBLICITY

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

0.8 POLICY

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

0.10 Relevant Development Plan policies

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

0.11 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) Planning Obligation Strategy (March 2010) Public Art (January 2010)
Material Considerations	<u>City Wide Guidance</u> Arboricultural Strategy (2004)

	<p>Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (November 2010)</p> <p>Cambridge City Council (2011) - Open Space and Recreation Strategy</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 Historic Core Conservation Area Appraisal (2006)</p> <p>Castle and Victoria Road Conservation Area Appraisal (2012)</p> <p>Huntingdon Road Suburbs and Approaches Study (March 2009)</p>

0.12 Status of Proposed Submission – Cambridge Local Plan

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

For the application considered in this report, the following policies in the emerging Local Plan are of relevance: 1, 3 and 46. The site is proposed to be allocated (as a modification) for

student accommodation for 270 student bedrooms in the emerging local plan as R17.

CONSULTATIONS

Planning Policy

- 0.13 Comments focus specifically on the request to amend the cap on academic staff that was imposed via the section 106 agreement through the previously approved application 16/1389/FUL.
- 0.14 The current signed section 106 agreement (schedule 7) for application 16/1389/FUL allows for the provision of 5% of units to be occupied by academic staff of the University of Cambridge or visiting academics associated with the University of Cambridge. This amounts to approximately 14 units, yet it specifies that the remaining units are for the purpose of full-time undergraduate or post-graduate students enrolled on a course of at least one academic year or more. As such the occupancy of the site has been agreed as predominantly student accommodation.

Previous Comments to the Existing Planning Application and the emerging Local Plan

- 0.15 Previous comments with regard to the Assessment of Student Housing Demand and Supply for Cambridge City Council¹ study, its relationship with national guidance and policy and the status of the Local Plan, made in relation to application 16/1389/FUL are considered to still be relevant to this application.
- 0.16 As previously stated in the policy comments to application 16/1389/FUL the Council acknowledged that St Edmund's College currently operates considerably below accepted college norms in housing its students in its own accommodation. As the largest growth in student numbers will be in graduate students, it is the colleges that take graduate students (of which St Edmund's College is one of only six) which are under the greatest pressure. The pressure on St Edmund's is

¹ Cambridge Centre for Housing and Planning Research, January 2017.

exacerbated by the fact that it is one of three “accept all” Colleges².

0.17 Recognising this and the findings of the student accommodation study and in order to address the growth of the University of Cambridge, the Council proposed a modification relating to Site R17 Mount Pleasant House to replace the indicative capacity of 50 dwelling units with 270 student bedrooms. This modification was approved by Development Plan Scrutiny Sub Committee on 25 January 2017 and presented to the Planning Inspectors as part of Matter CC6A. Page 7 of matter CC6A (page 7) states that:

0.18 “These main modifications are proposed as a result of discussions with the landowners to bring forward development on the Mount Pleasant House site (Site R17) and Old Press/Mill Lane site (Site U1). Both landowners have confirmed that mainstream residential accommodation will not be deliverable on these sites and that student accommodation is being pursued.”

0.19 Policy 46 of the emerging Local Plan and allocation R17 is the subject of objections that have yet to be resolved through the Local Plan examination process. As such, and in accordance with the NPPF, the emerging Local Plan can attract only limited weight at this stage.

Policy 7/7 College and University of Cambridge Staff and Student Housing

0.20 Policy 7/7 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 deals specifically with the issue of College and University of Cambridge Staff and Student Housing. The policy states that:

0.21 “Sites suitable for the development of student hostels or affordable or special needs housing for the Colleges and University staff are identified in the Proposals Schedule and the Proposals Map.”

² This means that when graduate students apply to Cambridge University they select their preferred College. The older, more well-known Colleges tend to be oversubscribed and so students are allocated to St Edmund’s as an Accept All College.

- 0.22 This is further justified through paragraph 7.41 of the policy. The Mount Pleasant House site is not identified within the plan for the provision of staff/key worker housing.
- 0.23 In addition, paragraph 7.39 of the policy identifies the University of Cambridge as becoming “directly involved in providing affordable key worker housing for staff.” This is currently being undertaken through implementation of the North West Cambridge Area Action Plan and associated planning applications. Outline application 11/1114/OUT allows provision for 1,500 key worker homes of which a substantial number are currently under construction.
- 0.24 It is understood that the College believes that it has a need for further key worker housing however, it is of concern that the application’s (17/0928/FUL) proposed additional 41 key worker units could cause harm to the successful implementation of North West Cambridge and the College’s own aforementioned need for student accommodation. It is requested that further evidence be provided to justify that this would not be the case and that the occupation of such units on the site would not reduce the uptake of key worker housing at North West Cambridge.
- 0.25 Paragraph 7.41 of policy 7/7 further notes that policies concerning key worker housing are dealt with in the Cambridge Local Plan’s Living in Cambridge Chapter. This is discussed in more detail below.

Policy 5/5 Meeting Housing Needs

- 0.26 Policy 5/5 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 deals with the matter of affordable housing. Footnote 3 of the policy notes that affordable housing types are social rented, intermediate rented, low cost home ownership and include supported housing and housing for key workers. This is expanded upon in paragraph 5.10 of the policy which states that key worker housing will be available to successive occupiers unless there are no eligible nominees in which case units will be offered to others in housing need.
- 0.27 The accommodation being offered via this application is the same as that on offer at North West Cambridge and would therefore meet the policy’s definition of key worker housing.

- 0.28 If the demand for key worker housing is not met at Mount Pleasant House due to the uptake of key worker housing at North West Cambridge, concern would be raised as to the occupation of these units by others in housing need. It would not be considered appropriate to house people in housing need within the restrictive setting of a student accommodation complex where the required amenities and services may be limited, in this case policies 4/13 Pollution and Amenity and 5/1 Housing Provision would also have to be considered and justified.
- 0.29 If the provision of further key worker units on the site were evidenced as justified after the submission of further information it would be prudent to consider the controls that would need to be implemented in the event of such circumstances. For example, who would reside in these properties if demand were not met (for example, full-time students) and who would take on the management of these units. It would be recommended that these measures are agreed through an approved Section 106 agreement.
- 0.30 Examples of justification could include figures on existing need for key worker housing, availability of units at North West Cambridge and timings of the completion of these units in comparison to the completion of units at Mount Pleasant amongst other relevant information.

Concluding Remarks

- 0.31 Paragraph 7.39 of Policy 7/7 identifies the University of Cambridge as becoming “directly involved in providing affordable key worker housing for staff.” This is currently being undertaken through the North West Cambridge Area Action Plan and associated planning applications. Outline application 11/1114/OUT allows provision for 1,500 key worker homes of which a substantial number are already under construction. It is of concern that the application’s (17/0928/FUL) proposed additional 41 key worker units could cause harm to the successful implementation of North West Cambridge and the College’s own aforementioned need for student accommodation. It is requested that further evidence be provided to justify that this would not be the case and that the

occupation of such units on the site would not reduce the uptake of key worker housing at North West Cambridge.

- 0.32 If considered justified it would be useful to have further information suggesting the controls that would need to be implemented in the event that the key worker housing is not occupied. For example, who would reside in these properties if demand were not met and who would take on the management of these units.

REPRESENTATIONS

- 0.33 No third party representations have been received from third parties in relation to the revised application

1.0 ASSESSMENT

Principle

Background: Counsel Advice

- 1.1 The basic principles and application of policy as set out in paragraphs 8.2 – 8.17 of the committee report for 16/1389/FUL at appendix 1 remain largely applicable. The Council has, however, received some recent legal advice in respect of application 16/0821/FUL for the Romsey Labour Club which has a bearing on the interpretation of policy 7/10 and the weight to be afforded to the Student Study with a particular reference to studio apartments. This advice concludes the following:
- ☐ Criteria a) of policy 7/10 in seeking to restrict speculative student hostel accommodation to full time students attending Anglia Ruskin University or the University of Cambridge is out of date and cannot be relied upon as a reason for refusal. 7/10 is discriminatory and is inconsistent with the NPPF and emerging policy in this respect.
 - ☐ Policy 7/10 should not be applied to studio units, only hostel accommodation i.e. those with shared communal facilities. The policy does not reflect more recent trends in student accommodation provision for studios and is out of date in this respect.

- The Student Study as an evidence base suggests that there is a need for studio accommodation. Weight can be given to the objective assessment of student studio need but no weight can be attributed to the policy proposal contained therein as they have not been subject to public consultation. Studio accommodation for students cannot be resisted on the basis of the Study.
- Criteria b), c) and d) in relation to management arrangements regarding the keeping of cars, the proximity of the accommodation to the educational institution and appropriate provision for students who are disabled remain relevant for decision making when 7/10 is engaged.
- For decision making purposes, emerging policy 46 can only be given limited weight.

1.2 The following assessment at paragraph 1.3 deals firstly with whether 7/10 is engaged. Paragraph 1.12 deals with the issue of the proposed studios.

Relevant Policies

Policy 7/10

1.3 Following the receipt of the legal advice, the first question is whether 7/10 is engaged. The Council's policy team advice does not reference this policy. Subsequent to the issuing of permission 16/1389/FUL, St Edmunds College has formally committed to the scheme and has signed a 47 year lease for the buildings at the end of which they will retain the freehold. As such, my view is that the proposal could no longer be described as speculative and 7/10 is not engaged.

Policy 7/7

1.4 The site is not allocated for a proposed use in the 2006 Local Plan. For the University of Cambridge, policy 7/7 supports windfall student accommodation subject to meeting certain criteria. A windfall site is defined in the local plan as a site which

becomes unexpectedly available for development (usually for housing) during the Plan period and which the Local Plan has not already defined as a potential development site. As such, my view is that 7/7 is engaged.

- 1.5 Paragraph 7.39 of policy 7.7 identifies the University of Cambridge as becoming “directly involved in providing affordable key worker housing for staff.” Paragraph 7.41 of policy 7/7 further notes that policies concerning key worker housing are dealt with in the Cambridge Local Plan’s Living in Cambridge Chapter.

Policy 5/5

- 1.6 Policy 5/5 deals with the matter of affordable housing. The policy is contained within the Local Plan’s Living in Cambridge Chapter. The first part of the policy states that ‘Housing developments on sites of 0.5 Hectares or more and all developments including an element of housing which have 15 or more dwellings will only be permitted if they provide an agreed mix of affordable housing types to meet housing needs’.
- 1.7 Footnote 3 of the policy notes that affordable housing types are social rented, intermediate rented, low cost home ownership and include supported housing and housing for key workers.
- 1.8 The academic accommodation being offered by the College via this application is narrower to that on offer at North West Cambridge (which is for all staff) but in my view would still meet the definition of key worker housing vis-a-vis policy 7/7 and supporting para. 7.39. The site is 0.57 Ha in size, which is above the size threshold specified by 5/5. 74 units within the scheme would also be studio flats (C3 use class) and capable of independent accommodation separate from the HMO clusters and therefore the requirements of the second threshold set by policy 5/5 of 15 or more dwellings would be met.
- 1.9 The level of accommodation sought for academic staff is 25% which equates to 68 units. I note that the applicant states that the academic staff would be mixed within the accommodation as a whole and that the studio units are not intended to be solely or primarily for academic staff. However, they are not seeking a specific exclusion of academic staff from the studio

units. The applicant also puts forward an argument that the sui-generis nature of the combined uses (which is different to NW Cambridge: 1, 2 and 3 bed flats/houses for all University/College staff) means that 5/5 is not engaged and that there is no policy justification for a cap on academic staff either through this policy or as set out under 7/7. That notwithstanding, the applicant is willing to enter into a S106 agreement with respect to the academic staff.

- 1.10 I disagree with the applicant's interpretation of policy. I note there is no explicit exclusion of *staff* accommodation from triggering the affordable housing policy unlike *student* accommodation as set out in the Council's Affordable Housing SPD 2008 (paras 29, 49 and 5.12). The terms of 5/5 are broad, but to my mind *housing*, whether it be in the form of cluster HMO's, studio flats or a combination of both (as a sui-generis use) is still housing. 5/5 does not exclude sui-generis housing proposals and no specific reference is made to the C3 use class. The effect of granting permission without some form of control over the academic staff housing element of the proposal is that potentially 68 units, which could include almost all of the studio flats, are sold off to the open market and occupied independently from the student accommodation. The question is not whether 5/5 is engaged, it is whether the Council can be satisfied that adequate controls can be put in place to ensure the proposed academic staff accommodation remains key worker housing. If no cap was imposed on the proposal, theoretically all of the accommodation on the site could be utilised by academic staff as college accommodation. Whilst there is no express provision for a cap in policy, it stands to reason that a cap is required to ensure the benefits of the student accommodation in meeting student need are realised.

Student Accommodation

- 1.11 Paragraphs 8.2 – 8.17 at appendix A deal with the principle of student accommodation on the site. The acceptability of the new proposal in relation to the student element remains unaltered. The existing and projected need for purpose built student accommodation is significant and weighs in favour of the proposal, although less so now because 58 student units are 'lost' from this scheme. The proposed modification to the

proposed allocation in the emerging local plan for 270 student units indicates that the use of the site for this purpose is acceptable. The proposed student use accords with adopted policy 7/7 and would help meet identified student need in accordance with the findings of the Student Study and NPPG guidance. Notwithstanding that the number of student units as part of this proposal has reduced, the proposed allocation cannot be used as an obstacle to resist a lesser number; the need is still being met through the provision of a significant number of student units and little weight can be afforded to the emerging allocation at this point in time. See the table below for a comparison of the previous scheme against that now proposed.

Application	En-suite	Studios	Total	% Acad	Academic	Student
16/1389/FUL	243	34	277	5%	14	263
17/0928/FUL	199	74	273	25%	68	205

- 1.12 In line with the Counsel advice in relation to the Romsey Labour Club, the Student Study provides an evidence base to suggest that there is a need for studio style accommodation to meet, mainly, post-graduate needs. The application is accompanied by a letter from St Edmund's College of 22 March 2017 which states that they are better served with more studio apartments as they will provide a more varied mix of college accommodation for its members who require more independent living. Whilst 7/7 refers to windfall student *hostel* sites, the same inference that the reference to *hostel* accommodation is out of date as per policy 7/10, can be applied to 7/7.

Staff Accommodation and Need

- 1.13 The policy response focusses specifically on the request to amend the cap on academic staff that was imposed via the

section 106 agreement through the previously approved application 16/1389/FUL.

1.14 In the applicant's planning statement, an argument of the need for academic staff accommodation is put forward. This is supplemented by a letter from St Edmund's College of 22 May 2017 attached at appendix 3. The main points drawn out from this letter are that:

- 1 The College intends for the site to be occupied by members of the College (whether academic staff or students), together with potentially sub-letting arrangements for other Colleges and University students.
- 2 St Edmund's already provides a mixture of types of accommodation for its members on its current site.
- 3 MPH will become an extension to the current site as it is contiguous, and, once fully developed, the current MPH site will feel as if it is part of St Edmund's.
- 4 A key purpose of being a Cambridge College, is to develop a community of academics as well as students. Historically the College has not faced explicit planning restrictions on the use of its accommodation for its members.
- 5 The number of its members who are drawn from the post-doctoral community has increased in recent years. These are typically individuals who have recently completed postgraduate study, and are often on short-term research contracts with the University or associated institutions (comprising Junior Research Fellows, Research Associates and Associate Members). They are expected to participate in college life. Their age is closer socially to student members (who are predominantly postgraduates) than to the College Fellows.
- 6 The major expansion in research activities means that the Colleges are in competition with other universities around the world to attract post-docs. In order to compete, the Colleges are seeking to ensure that post-docs are able to benefit in full from participation in collegiate life (aiding integration). Many post-docs are from overseas. They

often lack social/community networks and find it very difficult to access housing within the City, often driving up demand for space in the private rented section, especially HMOs. The provision of affordable accommodation for post-docs is therefore critical to the future research performance of the University.

1.15 In addition to appendix 3, the applicant's agent states:

'The NW Cambridge Outline Planning Permission included 1,500 key worker units. Assuming an equal split between 1, 2 and 3 bed flats/houses this equates to 3,000 rooms. The application proposal would therefore represent 2.3% of this total. Given this small percentage the application proposal cannot be considered to have a material impact on the deliverability of NW Cambridge.

Moreover, as made clear in the Key Worker Housing Statement approved as part of the Outline Planning Permission (11/1114/OUT) "the University's need for key worker housing to meet its staff needs will exceed the number of key worker housing units in the Proposed Development" (paragraph 3.17). This is precisely why the s106 accompanying that Planning Permission set out a detailed process for prioritising the allocation of key worker housing (3.17-3.18). The Officer report considering the Outline Planning Permission repeated this reasoning: "The proposed development provides for 3000 dwellings, 1500 (50%) of which will be key worker housing in line with the above policy. Despite this new housing, the University will not be able to meet its full need for key worker housing through the proposed development and, therefore, further work has been undertaken to determine how to prioritise the housing that will become available as a result of this development." (paragraph 8.167). In light of this significant need that it is acknowledged will not be met by NW Cambridge the application proposal cannot be considered to have a material impact on the deliverability of NW Cambridge.'

1.16 There is no dispute with the need for the academic staff accommodation or the cited benefits of co-locating post-docs with post-grads – who have similar age profiles and needs - as part of an academic community belonging to the University of Cambridge and of the College that has to compete on a world stage. I note the expansive reference to the Inspector's report

on the NW Cambridge AAP contained within the planning statement which sets out the increasing demand for staff accommodation based upon the University's Housing Needs Study (2008). This is a material consideration which lends weight to the academic staff element albeit that report forms part of a separate policy framework. As a contiguous site with St Edmund's, the site provides an ideal opportunity to extend the existing college provision and it is inherently sustainable to co-locate staff and students on site and ease the pressure on staff seeking independent accommodation off-site which could be more remotely located. My view is that 68 units for academic staff is unlikely to prejudice the uptake of the key worker housing on NW Cambridge. No harm therefore arises from the academic staffing element of the scheme, subject to appropriate S106 controls.

S106: Academic Housing

- 1.17 I agree with the conclusions of the policy team that it would not be appropriate to house people in housing need (other than academic staff) within the restrictive setting of a student accommodation complex where the required amenities and services may be limited.
- 1.18 The policy team recommend a number of measures to ensure the key worker housing is managed in accordance with the need set out by the college. Whilst a more substantial obligation, some of the measures set out in the NW Cambridge S106 are applicable to this application and I have reviewed this document with my policy colleagues.
- 1.19 The S106 controls would extend to include: a cap of 25% of academic staff; minimum terms of employment with the University or College; definitions of academic staff/visitors; fall-back accommodation provisions should the 25% cap not be met; management and maintenance arrangements; an allocations policy (to be agreed); minimum and maximum occupation periods; and reporting responsibilities/information provisions regarding academic staff/visitor occupation.
- 1.20 The academic staff housing obligations are to be agreed through a S106. In my view, subject to the detailed terms of the S106 being acceptable and delegated to officers, the scheme

would be compatible with the aims and objectives of policies 7/7 and by extension 5/5 and permission should be granted.

Other S106 requirements

- 1.21 Paragraph 1.82 of the original application sets out in tabularised form (italicised below) the S106 provisions regarding occupation restrictions, highways mitigation, sports (outdoor/indoor) and informal open space contributions previously sought. I set out my response below the italicised elements to each obligation in relation to the revised application.

Heads of Obligation Term	
Occupation Restriction	<p><i>A specific obligation to limit the occupation of the buildings to full time students of the University of Cambridge or Anglia Ruskin University only, including provisions relating to restriction on car ownership by students, as per policy 7/10.</i></p> <p>This is no longer a speculative application and 7/10 is not applicable. However, ARU students were previously considered as an acceptable occupant. As such, I see no reason to exclude such occupation however unlikely that may now be because of the terms of lease signed by St Edmunds.</p>
Highways	<p><i>-Pavement widening on Mount Pleasant to 2m.</i></p> <p><i>-Cycling facilities contribution of £57,000.00 towards improvements to cycling facilities between Mount Pleasant House and Cambridge City Centre;</i></p> <p><i>-Adoption of additional width of footpath as public highway maintainable at the public expense.</i></p> <p><i>Crossing Facility Improvements between Shelly Garden and Mount Pleasant to remove the stagger</i></p> <p><i>The highways improvements are necessary to</i></p>

	<p><i>ensure additional cycling impact arising from the development is adequately mitigated as per policies 8/2, 8/3 and 8/4.</i></p> <p>All of the required highway mitigation still applies to the revised proposal.</p>
Indoor sports	<p><i>Indoor sports provision for University of Cambridge students is provided at the West Cambridge site and is satisfactory to meet the needs of these students from this site.</i></p> <p><i>A specific S106 contribution if Anglia Ruskin University (ARU) students occupy of £74,513 (plus indexation) towards the provision of improvements to and enhancements of indoor sports and leisure facilities at Chesterton Community College, as per policy 3/8 is sought. This is because these students do not benefit from bespoke ARU indoor sports facilities and are likely to place additional demand upon the Community College facilities.</i></p> <p>My view is that this mitigation is still required and the mitigation justified. The academic staff, being University of Cambridge employees, are likely to make use of the University facilities (with associated preferential rates as employees of the University) similar to the students and I see no clear justification for seeking an amendment to the obligation based upon the increased cap. As ARU continue to be an acceptable occupier, the contribution in the event that they occupy is necessary.</p>
Outdoor sports:	<p><i>Outdoor sports provision for University of Cambridge students is provided at the West Cambridge site and as part of individual college provision in and around the City to which St Edmunds College students have sole or shared access arrangements to, including for cricket, football, rugby and boat house provision. This</i></p>

	<p><i>level of outdoor provision is satisfactory to meet the needs of these students from this site.</i></p> <p><i>A specific S106 contribution if ARU occupy of £65,926 (plus indexation) towards the improvements to and enhancements of the outdoor pitches (for example better pitch drainage, ground levelling and enhancing the athletics provision on site) at Chesterton Community College, as per policy 3/8 is sought. This is because ARU students only benefit from very limited outdoor sports facilities and would be likely to access the publicly accessible outdoor facilities provided at the Community College site.</i></p> <p>My view is that this obligation is still required and the mitigation justified. The academic staff, being University of Cambridge employees, are likely to make use of the University facilities similar or jointly with resident students of the scheme and I see no clear justification for seeking an amendment to the obligation based upon the increased cap. As ARU continue to be an acceptable occupier, the contribution in the event that they occupy is necessary.</p>
Informal open space:	<p><i>Very limited open space, other than landscaped courtyards, is provided on-site. The site does however adjoin St Edmunds College, which has extensive landscaped grounds and is the likely main occupier of the buildings. A specific S106 contribution if anyone other than St Edmund's College students occupies as the main occupier of £67,034 (plus indexation) is sought towards the provision and/or improvement of and/or access to informal open space at Alexandra Gardens as per policy 3/8. Alexandra Gardens is the closest area of informal open space to the site and is likely to be impacted upon by students other than those from St Edmund's College.</i></p> <p>This obligation is still required. Academic staff associated with the College would also benefit</p>

	from the adjacent grounds of St Edmund's College as much as its students and therefore no change to this obligation is required.
--	--

1.22 In my view, the S106 requirements being sought are compliant with the CIL Regulations, particularly in relation to the academic staff housing.

1.23 Subject to the completion of a S106 planning obligation, I am satisfied that the proposal accords with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 3/8, 5/5, 7/7, 8/2, 8/3 and 10/1 and the Planning Obligation Strategy 2010 and the Cambridge City Council Open Space Standards Guidance for Interpretation and Implementation (2010).

2.0 Design Changes

Building B1

2.2 The changes to this building are fourfold and include: a substation within a reorganised bin store; the omission of an external first floor walkway; cladding with vertical timber boarding; and remodelling of the North elevation.

2.3 This block is adjacent to White Cottage and is two storeys in height. The reorganised ground floor incorporates a substation and a more logical arrangement for the bins within a deeper timber clad structure facing onto the internal courtyard. Options for the location of the substation are limited and this part of the site is by necessity functional. Its main front and entrance from the south is largely unchanged. Overall I conclude the changes are acceptable.

Building B2

2.4 This block incorporates the greatest number of changes including replacing 44 no. en-suite rooms with 40 no. self-contained studio apartments and a new fenestration pattern similar to building B3. The height is the same as the approved scheme and the footprint similar.

- 2.5 This block is adjacent to Blackfriars Priory and faces the entrance to the site from Mount Pleasant. The design changes are driven by the reconfigured internal arrangement which has altered from en-suites to studios. The previous proposal included 44 no. 17m² study bedrooms and 4 no. shared kitchens. The revised proposal includes 40 no. studio apartments of approximately 25m² each.
- 2.6 The western elevation incorporates double the number of windows, from 24 to 43 (including stair cores). The proposed five studios on each floor facing west each have two windows rather than one each for the five en-suites per floor as previously proposed. Having visited the Priory, I do not have any concerns regarding the increase in windows facing west given the intervening retained landscape, distances from building-to-building (see appendix A, paragraph 8.44) which remain unchanged and the same number of west facing rooms. Overall, the revised window arrangement on the western elevation and elsewhere on the building is neutral in terms of its impact.
- 2.7 The eastern elevation of this block has also been reconfigured to introduce greater articulation on its south eastern corner. Here, a pre-cast concrete design with vertical fins frames a vertical core of studio rooms. The framing is set within a 'square' of contrasting buff brick finished with a lime wash mortar, which is 'cut-out' from the main building and which will provide a contrasting foil to the proposed red-brick finish of the block in general. The main entrance is also now from the east side of the building below the concrete framing and this helps anchor the proposal more effectively and provide a better front to the Mews Court within which it sits. The changes to the building and those outside are all acceptable.

Building A

- 2.8 The changes to this building are minor and focus on the external cycle ramp on the Huntingdon Road elevation. This has been reduced in length and increased in width to 2m. The entrance door to the cycle store has been repositioned. Floor gratings over the external well on the Mount Pleasant side have been removed and soft landscaping increased. The overall cycle parking number remains the same but the distribution has been changed within the cycle store.

- 2.9 This is the main building for the scheme. From my observations, the cycle access arrangements have improved, with a greater refuge/turning area at the bottom of the steps now proposed. The revised internal configuration of cycle parking is very minor and the loss of the grates on the eastern side of the block is a welcome improvement to the scheme as it will provide additional landscaping space.

Summary of Design Changes

- 2.10 All of the proposed design changes are acceptable. The proposal would comply with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 3/4, 3/7, 3/12, 4/10, 4/11 and 4/12 and NPPG guidance at paragraphs 126-136.

3.0 Other Considerations – Previous Planning Applications and Appeal Decisions

- 3.1 The applicant's agent has made a number of points in relation to the relevance of the Mill Road student appeal and an approved student scheme at 100 Histon Road. These comments do not affect my recommendation but nevertheless require response.
- 3.2 My view is that the Mill Road appeal (14/1496) is not relevant to the submitted application because that was for student accommodation on an existing and proposed housing allocation. This application proposes to reduce the number of student units on a site that has no adopted allocation and has a proposed student allocation. These two scenarios differ significantly and are therefore not comparable.
- 3.3 Planning permission at The Ranch, 100 Histon Road - notwithstanding the terms of the S106 - was for student accommodation, not college accommodation and is not relevant to the application, differing significantly in scope and size and approved at a different point in time.

4.0 CONCLUSION

- 4.1 The principle of the proposed development is acceptable and accords with policies 5/5 and 7/7. The proposal would help

meet identified purpose built student housing need and would meet the needs of the academic staff of the University of Cambridge. Co-locating academic staff and students within an academic community on a site which is contiguous with St Edmund's College is an inherently sustainable form of development. The design, scale and visual impact of the scheme as revised is acceptable. I recommend approval.

10.0 RECOMMENDATION

APPROVE subject to completion of a S106 Agreement (the detailed terms of which are delegated to officers) and conditions to be agreed following further negotiation with the applicants following the discharge of conditions relating to 16/1389/FUL.

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. Preliminary Contamination Assessment:

The submission of information in relation to the discharge of conditions 4 - 8 shall have regard to the following approved documents which have been submitted and approved for the discharge of condition 3 of planning permission 16/1389/FUL:

- Site Investigation Strategy (Campbell Reith, 13th April 2017)
- Review of Contaminated Land Desk Study Report (Ramboll, 18th July 2016)
- Preliminary Environmental Risk Assessment, WSP, May 2015)
- Email from Mr Jaime Brown of Campbell Reith (20th March 2017 at 14.27)

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

4. The approved contamination remediation for phase 1 works shall be fully carried out in accordance with the approved documents 'Land Quality Statement' (Campbell Reith, May 2017) and 'Remediation Specification, Revision B' (Campbell Reith, June 2017) that have been submitted and approved for the part discharge of condition 4 of planning permission 16/1389/FUL.

Prior to the commencement of the development of phase 2 works (the area of the former fuel tanks) with the exception of works agreed under condition 3 and in accordance with the approved site investigation strategy agreed under condition 3 and in accordance with the documents approved for phase 1, the following shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority:

(a) A site investigation report for phase 2 detailing all works that have been undertaken to determine the nature and extent of any contamination, including the results of the soil, gas and/or water analysis and subsequent risk assessment to any receptors

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

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

5. Implementation of remediation.

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

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

6. Completion report:

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

(a) A completion report demonstrating that the approved remediation strategy as required by clause (b) of condition 4 of this permission and clause (b) of condition 4 of application 16/1389/FUL and implemented under condition 5 has been undertaken and that the land has been remediated to a standard appropriate for the end use.

(b) Details of any post-remedial sampling and analysis (as defined in the approved material management plan as required by condition 7) shall be included in the completion report along with all information concerning materials brought onto, used, and removed from the development. The information provided must demonstrate that the site has met the required clean-up criteria.

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

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

7. Material Management Plan:

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

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

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

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

8. Unexpected Contamination:

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

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

9. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved document 'Assessment of Noise and Vibration from Demolition and Construction' (Ian Sharland Ltd, 24th May 2017) submitted and approved for discharge of condition 9 of planning permission 16/1389/FUL.

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

10. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved document 'Dust management Plan' (Osborne, 27/06/17 Rev1) submitted and approved for discharge of condition 10 of planning permission 16/1389/FUL.

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

11. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved document 'Traffic Management Plan dated 05/05/17, Rev 1' submitted and approved for discharge of condition 11 of planning permission 16/1389/FUL.

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

12. The development shall be carried out in accordance with Tree Protection Plan: 1396a-05 Rev C.

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

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

Reason: To ensure that an appropriate archaeological investigation of the site has been implemented before development commences. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 4/9)

14. Prior to the commencement of development above ground level, excluding below ground enabling works and foundations and with the exception of the demolition of the existing building on the site, 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 (predominantly traffic noise from Mount Pleasant, Castle Street and Huntingdon, Histon and Victoria Road) 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".

If the internal noise limits can only be achieved with closed windows then alternative means of both whole dwelling and or passive background / purge ventilation should be provided to allow residents to occupy the properties at all times with windows closed.

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

Reason: To protect the amenity of future occupants from the high ambient noise levels in the area. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006, policy 4/13)

15. Prior to the commencement of development above ground level, excluding below ground enabling works and foundations and with the exception of the demolition of the existing building on the site, as part of a noise insulation scheme to protect future residents from road traffic noise (from Mount Pleasant, Castle Street and Huntingdon, Histon and Victoria Road) details of a mechanical ventilation / alternative ventilation scheme, that provides an alternative option to opening windows within the accommodation units / habitable rooms shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Any mechanical ventilation scheme shall source air from the rear of the development away from the road. The ventilation scheme shall achieve at least 2 air changes per hour. The scheme shall be installed before the use hereby permitted is commenced and shall be retained thereafter.

Reason: To protect the amenity of future occupants from air pollution. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 4/13)

16. Prior to the commencement of development above ground level, excluding below ground enabling works and foundations and with the exception of the demolition of the existing building on the site, the following material samples and details of materials shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority:

- (a) 1m x 1m sample panel of the brickwork proposed showing the detail of bonding, coursing and colour and type of jointing.
- (b) non-masonry walling systems, cladding panels or other external screens including structural members, infill panels, edge, colours, surface finishes/textures and relationships to glazing and roofing including recesses back from the brickwork.
- (c) Roofing materials and coping details.
- (d) Window frame types, including details of the recess back from the outer edge of the brickwork.
- (e) Rainwater goods.

The approved sample panel(s) shall be kept on site throughout the course of the development. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

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

17. Prior to the commencement of development above ground level, excluding below ground enabling works and foundations and with the exception of demolition of the existing building, full details of both hard and soft landscape works shall be 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 (including a plan indicating the positions, design, materials and type of boundary treatments to be erected); car parking layouts, other vehicle and pedestrian access and circulation areas; hard surfacing materials; minor artefacts and structures (e.g. furniture, play equipment, refuse or other storage units, signs, lighting); proposed and existing functional services above and below ground (e.g. drainage, power, communications cables, pipelines indicating lines, manholes, supports); retained historic landscape features and proposals for restoration, where relevant. Soft Landscape works shall include planting plans; written specifications (including cultivation and other operations associated with plant and grass establishment); schedules of plants, noting species, plant sizes and proposed numbers/densities where appropriate; full details of all tree pits, including any in planters, hard paving and soft landscaped areas; 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).

18. Prior to the commencement of development above ground level, excluding below ground enabling works and foundations and with the exception of the demolition of the existing building on the site, a renewable energy statement, which demonstrates that at least 10% of the development's total predicted energy requirements will be from on-site renewable/low carbon 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.
- b) A schedule of proposed on-site renewable/low carbon energy technologies, their respective carbon reduction contributions, location, design and a maintenance programme.

The proposed renewable/low carbon 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.

In the event that the approved renewable/low carbon energy technologies cannot be installed due to grid capacity issues then the requirements of this condition will be relaxed. In such a case, written evidence in the form of correspondence with the District Network Operator confirming that connection is not possible will need to be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority.

Reason: In the interests of reducing carbon dioxide emissions (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 8/16).

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

The approved lighting scheme shall be installed, maintained and operated in accordance with the approved details / measures.

Reason: In order to avoid light pollution and in the interests of residential amenity (Cambridge Local Plan 2006, policies 3/7 and 4/13).

20. Prior to the occupation of the development (or in accordance with an alternative timetable otherwise agreed in writing by the local planning authority) a Public Art Delivery Plan (PADP) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority and shall include the following:

- a) Details of the public art and artist commission;
- b) Details of how the public art will be delivered, including a timetable for delivery;
- c) Details of the location of the proposed public art on the application site;
- d) The proposed consultation to be undertaken;
- e) Details of how the public art will be maintained;
- f) How the public art would be decommissioned if not permanent;
- g) How repairs would be carried out;
- h) How the public art would be replaced in the event that it is destroyed;

The approved PADP shall be fully implemented in accordance with the approved details and timetabling. Once in place, the public art shall not be moved or removed otherwise than in accordance with the approved maintenance arrangements.

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

21. Prior to occupation, further information shall be submitted and agreed in writing by the local planning authority in relation to the technical specification of the proposed gas fired Combined Heat and Power System, including emissions standards. Any gas fired CHP shall meet an emissions standard of:

- Spark ignition engine: less than 150 mgNO_x/Nm³
- Compression ignition engine: less than 400 mgNO_x/Nm³
- Gas turbine: less than 50 mgNO_x/Nm³

Reason: To protect local air quality and human health by ensuring that the production of air pollutants such as nitrogen dioxide and particulate matter are kept to a minimum during the lifetime of the development, to contribute toward National Air Quality Objectives and accords with the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and policies 4/13 and 4/14 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2006).

22. Prior to occupation, a scheme for the insulation of the plant in order to minimise the level of noise emanating from the plant shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority and the scheme as approved shall be fully implemented before the use hereby permitted is commenced and retained thereafter.

Reason: In order to safeguard the amenity of future and existing occupants of buildings (Cambridge Local Plan 2006, policy 4/13).

23. No building hereby permitted shall be occupied until surface water drainage works have been implemented in accordance with details that have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Before these details are submitted an assessment shall be carried out of the potential for disposing of surface water by means of a sustainable drainage system in accordance with the principles set out in the National Planning Policy Framework and associated Guidance, and the results of the assessment provided to the local planning authority. The system should be designed such that there is no surcharging for a 1 in 30 year event and no internal property flooding for a 1 in 100 year event + 40% an allowance for climate change. The submitted details shall:

- i. provide information about the design storm period and intensity, the method employed to delay and control the surface water discharged from the site and the measures taken to prevent pollution of the receiving groundwater and/or surface waters; and
- ii. provide a management and maintenance plan for the lifetime of the development.
- iii. The surface water drainage scheme shall be managed and maintained thereafter in accordance with the agreed details and management and maintenance plan.

Reason: To prevent environmental and amenity problems arising from flooding, to comply with National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and to accord with the requirements of policies 3/4, 3/11, 3/12 and Policy 8/18 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006.

24. No building hereby permitted shall be occupied until full details of facilities for the secure parking of bicycles for use in connection with the development hereby permitted have been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority in writing. The agreed facilities shall be provided in accordance with the approved details before use of the development commences and shall include power assisted doors into the internal cycle store together with secure access arrangements.

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

25. Prior to the occupation of the development, a student management plan shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The management plan shall include provisions relating to travel advice; specific stipulations prohibiting the keeping of a car in Cambridge (excluding disabled students); check-in time slots in order to stage the impact of the check-in process; the organization of the move-in day; site security; the management of deliveries; responsibilities expected of students both inside and outside the site; the management of move-out times; maintenance cover; tenancy checks; waste management; and the external display of contact information for on-site management and emergencies. The scheme shall be managed in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: In order to ensure the occupation of the site is well managed and does not give rise to significant amenity issues for nearby residents (Cambridge Local Plan, policies 4/13 and 7/10).

26. 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)

27. There should be no collections from or deliveries to the site during the demolition and construction stages outside the hours of 0800 hours and 1800 hours on Monday to Friday, 0800 hours to 1300 hours on Saturday and at no time on Sundays, Bank or Public Holidays unless on specific occasions and subject to the prior written notification being given to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

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

28. 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 (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 2006).

29. The access shall be constructed with adequate drainage measures to prevent surface water run-off onto the adjacent public highway.

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

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

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

31. Notwithstanding the provisions of Schedule 2, Part 2, Class A of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 (or any Order revoking and re-enacting that order with or without modification), no fences, gates, walls or other means of enclosure forward of the elevations facing Castle Street/Huntingdon Road and Mount Pleasant, other than those shown on the drawings approved as part of this planning permission or a subsequent discharge of condition shall be erected within the curtilage of the buildings without the granting of specific planning permission.

Reason: In the interests of visual amenity (Cambridge Local Plan policies 3/7, 3/12 and 4/11)

32. Any trees or plants provided as part of any landscaping scheme which, within a period of 5 years from the planting date, die, are removed or become seriously damaged or diseased, shall be replaced in the next planting season with others of similar size and species as those originally planted, unless the local planning authority gives written consent to any variation.

Reason: In the interests of the amenity of future residents of the student scheme and to ensure a suitable relationship and integration of the built development with its surroundings (Cambridge Local Plan 2006, policies 3/7, 3/11, 3/12, 4/2, 4/3, 4/4).

33. The proposed development shall be carried out in accordance with the recommendations of the Phase 1 Habitat Survey by Development Ecology.

Reason: To ensure that the development of the site conserves and enhances ecology (Cambridge Local Plan 2006, policies 4/3, 4/6, 4/7 and 4/8).

34. The landscaping shall be managed in accordance with the 'Landscape Management Manual for Mount Pleasant House Rev C.' dated 22/07/16.

Reason: In the interests of visual amenity (Cambridge Local Plan 2006, policy 3/10).

35. The 'Mount Pleasant Travel Plan, Rev 1' dated July 2016 shall be carried out and become effective in accordance with its provisions within three months of first occupation of the college accommodation and shall be implemented and monitored for a period of at least five years from first occupation.

Reason: In the interests of encouraging sustainable travel to and from the site (Cambridge Local Plan 2006, policies 8/2, 8/3 and 8/4).

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 site investigation, including relevant soil, soil gas, surface and groundwater sampling should be carried out by a suitably qualified and accredited consultant/contractor in accordance with a quality assured sampling, analysis methodology and relevant guidance. The Council has produced a guidance document to provide information to developers on how to deal with contaminated land. The document, 'Contaminated Land in Cambridge- Developers Guide' can be downloaded from the City Council website on <https://www.cambridge.gov.uk/land-pollution>.

Hard copies can also be provided upon request

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

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

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

Further information may be found here:

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

INFORMATIVE: To satisfy the noise insulation condition for the building envelope as required above, the Council expects the scheme to achieve the internal and external noise standards recommended in BS8233:2014 "Sound Insulation and noise reduction for buildings-Code of Practice".

Internal noise standard shall be achieved in habitable rooms with external windows / doors open and closed. Where sound insulation requirements preclude the opening of windows for rapid ventilation and summer comfort acoustically treated mechanical and or passive free area ventilation may also need to be considered within the context of this internal design noise criteria.

For traditional external areas that are used for amenity space, such as gardens and patios, it is desirable that the external noise level does not exceed 50 dB LAeq,T with an upper guideline value of 55 dB LAeq,T which would be acceptable in noisier environments. If these levels cannot be achieved then an acoustic barrier may be required around this amenity area.

INFORMATIVE: Demolition/Construction noise/vibration report

The noise and vibration report should include:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

INFORMATIVE: Demolition/Construction noise/vibration report

The noise and vibration report should include:

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

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

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

- Agreed target levels are likely to exceeded
- Upon the receipt of substantiated complaints

-At the request of the Local Planning Authority / Environmental Health following any justified complaints.

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

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

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

INFORMATIVE: 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.

This development involves work to the public highway that will require the approval of the County Council as Highway Authority. It is an OFFENCE to carry out any works within the public highway, which includes a public right of way, without the permission of the Highway Authority. Please note that it is the applicant's responsibility to ensure that, in addition to planning permission, any necessary consents or approvals under the Highways Act 1980 and the New Roads and Street Works Act 1991 are also obtained from the County Council.

No part of any structure may overhang or encroach under or upon the public highway unless licensed by the Highway Authority and no gate / door / ground floor window shall open outwards over the public highway.

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.

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

INFORMATIVE: Accessible Rooms

The applicant's attention is drawn to the comments of the Council's Access Officer with regard to the provision of accessible rooms and rooms suitable for students with sensory impairment. SENDA (2001) for educational buildings and the 'Code of Practice (revised) for providers of post-16 education and related services' give further advice on such provision.

APPENDIX A: OFFICER ASSESSMENT FOR 16/1389/FUL

SUMMARY	<p>The development accords with the Development Plan for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">-The principle of developing the site for student accommodation is acceptable.-The design and scale of buildings is acceptable.-Appropriate mitigation for improvement to local cycling and walking provision to the site has been agreed to be secured through a S106.
RECOMMENDATION	APPROVAL

1.0 SITE DESCRIPTION/AREA CONTEXT

- 1.1 The site is Mount Pleasant House, an office building and car park of 0.57Ha dating from 1979 which sits on the corner of Castle Street to the north and Mount Pleasant to the east. The building is arranged over four main floors of office space, below which is an undercroft car parking area which extends out into a rear landscaped car parking court for approximately for 145 cars. There is plant located on the roof. The building is constructed out of brown brick and its form is arranged around three octagonal shaped tower elements positioned at its ends and on the corner, with strong horizontal brick banding and glazing between.
- 1.2 The site is within the extreme north eastern corner of the West Cambridge Conservation Area. It is located just outside the boundary of the Castle and Victoria Conservation Area. The building is not listed or a building of local interest and is noted as a negative building in the West Cambridge Conservation Appraisal. It is within the controlled parking zone and on the edge of the air quality management area.
- 1.3 To north of the site, Chestnut House, a recent student housing development and Babbage House, an office block, face the site from across Huntingdon Road and Castle Street. To the east is

Shelly Garden, a linear modern housing development fronting onto Castle Street. Diagonally opposite and to the south east are the Storey's Almshouses, arranged in a 'T' shaped footprint fronting both Shelly Road and Mount Pleasant via a landscaped verge rising from the carriageway. These are grade II listed buildings.

- 1.4 To the south of the site is White Cottage, a Building of Local Interest. St Edmund's College lies to the south west of the site and forms part of a substantial area of landscape protected open space. The Chapel to St Edmund's is grade II listed. To the immediate west is Blackfriars Priory on Buckingham Road and to the north of this No.3 the Rectory, both Buildings of Local Interest. Between these buildings are Buckingham House, a more modern conference centre and student accommodation block and 1 Huntingdon Road, a Doctor's Surgery that has been extended to the rear. Further northwest, along Huntingdon Road is Murray Edwards College, a grade II* listed building and further still Fitzwilliam College.
- 1.5 The site is cut in from Castle Street pavement level where there is pedestrian access, with a drop down 2.5m to the undercroft car parking below. Vehicular access is from Mount Pleasant and consists of a wide bell mouth which drops down into the car parking area. There are a substantial number of trees on and adjacent to the site - particularly in the south west corner - and several tree preservation orders cover them. A former medieval stone cross, the 'Ashwickstone', is recorded on the front of the site and at the top of Castle Street but does not have any heritage status apart from its evidential value.
- 1.6 The building is very prominent from surrounding roads and from long distant views along Histon Road and Victoria Road in particular.
- 1.7 The site is not currently allocated in the Cambridge Local Plan (2006) but is designated in the emerging local plan as R17 for residential development, with an indicative capacity of 50 dwellings. The Planning Policy Manager comments on the weight to be attributed to this proposed designation in the consultation response.

2.0 THE PROPOSAL

- 2.1 Planning permission is sought for the demolition of Mount Pleasant House (4,793sqm) and the erection of college accommodation comprising 243 en-suite rooms and 24 studios, with landscaping and access.
- 2.2 It is intended that the buildings would be for students with a limited number (the studios) for academic staff or postgraduate students. The application has been designed in partnership with St Edmund's College, to the south of the site, albeit planning permission is not being sought for a specific occupier due to funding restrictions.
- 2.3 The student rooms vary in size, with en-suites from 17-20sqm and studios from 23-39sqm. The en-suite rooms are typically arranged in clusters of eight with shared kitchen and dining facilities positioned on the corners and gables of the buildings. The studio apartments are self-contained and include shower rooms, kitchens and living room spaces.
- 2.4 The footprint of the main proposed buildings form a 'U' shaped block (referred to as A blocks 1-4 although all one building) on the front of the site facing Castle Street. This forms a south facing courtyard area (Court A) which is terminated by a smaller detached intermediate end block (B3). A secondary court (Court B) consists of hard and soft landscaping and is formed by this intermediate block (B3) and two other detached blocks (together referred to as B blocks 1-3). The bigger of these blocks (B2) runs along the west of the site and the smaller of the blocks (B1) is positioned to the south of the site adjacent to White Cottage.
- 2.5 The main 'U' shaped A blocks onto Castle street and Mount Pleasant are 4+1 storeys (5+1 storeys from the inner Court A due to the change in level). The B blocks towards the rear of the site are 4 storeys, stepping down to 3 storeys and 2 storeys adjacent to White Cottage.
- 2.6 The building line on Castle Street is angled away from the corner into the site, rather than being parallel with the road. This reflects the alignment of Murray Edwards and Fitzwilliam Colleges to the northwest and allows for tree planting onto the Castle Street frontage.

- 2.7 A north-south main pedestrian route is proposed from Castle Street along the eastern side of the block of buildings that form the western boundary, through the two courts and eventually linking to the St Edmund's College site, providing a direct line of view to St Edmund's Tower. The main entrance from Castle Street is proposed as an area for public art through a creative cladding arrangement. All existing 145 car parking spaces are removed and replaced with 4 disabled spaces. The access and parking court allows for refuse and service vehicle access and turning. Cycle storage for 306 cycles is provided. They are mostly located within the easterly footprint of block A alongside Mount Pleasant, which can be accessed from either its north or south sides. External cycle parking is arranged around the outside of the other B blocks as appropriate.
- 2.8 The landscaping around White Cottage is retained and enhanced. Lots of trees within the site are removed and replaced with alternative specimens. Some of the trees along the Castle Street frontage are removed, but others retained. Buildings are set 7-8m off the western boundary to allow for tree root protection.
- 2.9 The buildings would be mainly constructed from a multi-red facing brickwork with a natural mortar in stretcher bond. The gable towers of the A block would be finished in a pre-cast concrete framework with a white brick façade. The roofing elements would be finished in two tone cladding panels with an overhanging roof. Windows would be metal, have full brick depth reveals and be finished in grey.
- 2.10 The application is accompanied by the following supporting documents.

- Planning Statement
- Design and Access Statement
- Plans
- Air Quality Assessment
- Arboricultural Survey and Impact Assessment
- Daylight and Sunlight Report
- Drainage Strategy
- Energy Statement
- Flooding Sequential Test
- Noise Assessment
- Heritage and Archaeological Assessment

- Landscape Plans and Management Plan
- Habitat Survey
- Environmental Risk Assessment
- Statement of Community Involvement
- Sustainability Statement
- Transport Statement
- Travel Plan

2.11 The application has been subject to alteration/ design development and submission of additional documentation as follows:

- Revised plans and elevations including treatment of corner element onto Mount Pleasant and Castle Street
- Revised landscaping plans and updated arboricultural assessment
- Revised court B plans, improved overlooking and relocation of bins
- Revised daylight and sunlight report
- Additional air quality assessment information
- Additional noise and ventilation information
- Amended tracking drawings
- Revised supporting 3D images of the scheme

2.12 This has been subject to further consultation.

3.0 RELEVANT SITE HISTORY

Reference	Description	Outcome
07/0059/FUL	The installation of a telecommunications base station.	A/C
06/0134/FUL	The installation of 2no. antennas, 2 no. 300mm dishes, radio equipment housing and ancillary development.	A/C
C/04/0184	Erection of telecommunications base station including antenna and equipment cabin.	PG
C/03/0033	Installation of 3No. dual polar antennae and 4No. dishes including radio equipment cabinets on the roof.	PG
C/77/0681	Erection of office building, residential flats and provision of	A/C

	car parking facilities, Cambridge.	
--	------------------------------------	--

4.0 PUBLICITY

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

5.0 POLICY

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

5.2 Relevant Development Plan policies

PLAN		POLICY NUMBER
Cambridge Plan 2006	Local	3/1, 3/4, 3/7, 3/8, 3/11, 3/12
		4/3, 4/4, 4/10, 4/11, 4/13, 4/14, 4/15
		5/1, 5/5
		7/7, 7/9, 7/10
		8/2, 8/3, 8/4, 8/6, 8/9, 8/10, 8/16
		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>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>Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (November 2010)</p> <p>Cambridge City Council (2011) - Open Space and Recreation Strategy</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 Historic Core Conservation Area Appraisal (2006)</p> <p>Castle and Victoria Road Conservation Area Appraisal (2012)</p> <p>Huntingdon 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, the following policies in the emerging Local Plan are of relevance: 1, 3 and 46. The site is proposed to be allocated for housing in the emerging local plan as R17 and is indicated as having a capacity for 50 dwellings (see Planning Policy comment).

6.0 CONSULTATIONS

Cambridgeshire County Council (Highways Development Management)

6.1 First Comment

Holding Objection: The trip generation in the Transport Assessment is accepted. There will be a beneficial reduction in car trips from the site. There will be a significant increase in pedestrian and cyclist movements. Mitigation in the form of cycle improvements need to be made in the locality of the site, including improvements to pedestrian and cycling crossing points. Mount Pleasant footway widths need to be increased to 2m.

On-site cycle parking provision in terms of quantum is acceptable and accords with the City Council's adopted standards. Suggests amendments to the internal configuration of the cycle parking to improve isle widths and the access arrangements to the cycle parking at the rear of the site.

Management arrangements for pick-up and drop-off need to be outlined.

6.2 Second Comment

Suggested mitigation in the form of a dedicated cycle link on the north side of Castle Street is proposed. The applicants are advised to work up a detailed scheme to assess its workability.

Environmental Health

6.3 First Comment

Objection: The proposed development adjoins the City's Air Quality Management Area. Raises concerns with regard to the air quality assessment and associated methodology. Seeks clarification and/or revision to the submission. Air quality will determine the potential need for mechanical ventilation with sealed window units. With the uncertainty over the results of the air quality assessment, we are unable to determine what mitigation will be required.

In the event of approval, recommends conditions in respect of: contamination; Demolition / construction hours; collections/deliveries during demolition/construction; demolition/construction noise & vibration (including piling); dust; noise assessment/insulation; ventilation; CHP plant; lighting; and various informatives.

Second Comment

- 6.4 No Objection: A revised air quality assessment has been submitted which addresses the concerns previously raised and is acceptable. Where mechanical ventilation is required, air intake for the units shall be from the roof-top level or from the rear of the block.

Refuse and Recycling

- 6.5 No objection: refuse vehicles can enter and turn to come out forward in the courtyard. Bin capacities: there should be 31 x 1100 bins in total, but there are only 14 x 1100 bins. The college will be paying for additional collections, to have a weekly or twice weekly collection. The development is acceptable in terms of waste and recycling.

Urban Design, Conservation and Landscape

6.6 First Comment

No Objection: The site layout is and collegiate typology is acceptable. White Cottage is adequately respected. Mature trees located at the boundary of the site are retained and a

landscaped buffer provided. One tree is retained along the Castle Street frontage and elsewhere new tree planting is proposed along street frontages and within the new courts. Overall the plan provides a simple, connected network of buildings and spaces designed to work with the topography of the site. The Mews Court requires amendment.

Scale and massing

The scale and massing of buildings has been revised following pre-application discussions. Building heights across the site have been reduced and all of the proposed buildings sit below the roof level of the existing Mount Pleasant House office block, staggering down adjacent to White Cottage. The scale and massing of all blocks is acceptable.

Elevations and materials

The submitted scheme includes narrow setbacks in brickwork to break up street frontages. The setbacks break the two street frontages into a series of 6 vertical “bays”. The northeast corner of House A fronting the Huntingdon Road/Mount Pleasant junction is too blank and requires amendment. The building fenestration forms a simple grid with a variety of infill panels (glass, metal, louvers). 200mm deep reveal depths are supported in design terms and helps articulate the façades.

Proposed cladding materials include multi-red facing brickwork with natural coloured mortar laid to stretcher bond. Panels of vertical stack bond brickwork are proposed for key infill panels, and timber effect fibre-cement panels and soffits are proposed for the setback upper floor levels facing surrounding streets. The proposed materials are acceptable subject to condition.

Amenity spaces

The main “green” amenity space (Court A) to be used by the occupants of the development fails to achieve the recommended levels of sunlight and is contrary to BRE guidance. It should be redesigned together with court B to improve overall amenity in terms of landscape, light and use.

6.7 Second Comment

Mews Court and Court A

The amendments remove the refuse storage previously proposed on the south elevation of the studio block, reduce the size of the driveway area and reduce the number of disabled parking spaces from 5 to 4. A new amenity space (Mews Court) has been introduced to the south of the studio block.

The sunlight assessment combines the results of both Court A and the Mews Court to conclude that together the amenity spaces meet the BRE requirements.

Court A should be a primarily a hard landscaped space with trees set within it, which would be more suitable given the shading of this space throughout the day.

The introduction of the Mews Court is welcomed and has the potential to create a successful and attractive amenity space. Recommends a landscaping condition to agree the extent of landscaping and to ensure its protection.

Building A - Corner façade to Huntingdon Road and Mount Pleasant

The amendments introduce 2 slot windows and a ventilation grill on the upper ground level and a concrete frame with three openings has been introduced on the first, second and third floor levels with kitchen/gyp room windows behind. This approach is supported, which helps articulate and add interest to this prominent corner of the building.

Senior Sustainability Officer (Design and Construction)

- 6.8 No Objection: The approach to minimising internal summer heat gains through solar glazing, the design of windows and overhangs is supported. Further information in relation to carbon calculations, brown roofs and the nature of the BREEAM pre-assessment has been provided. The officer confirms full support for the approach to sustainable design and construction and renewable/low carbon energy provision. A condition is recommended relating to renewables/low carbon energy.

Access Officer

- 6.9 No Objection: The applicants have confirmed that 14 rooms would be accessible and that this equates to 5%. The accessible rooms are distributed throughout the building and would be a mix of Part M compliant and Lifetime Homes accessible rooms. Car parking is limited to 4 disabled parking bays in the mews court with level access. Lift access is provided to all accessible rooms on the upper floors. All central spaces are fully accessible via wheelchair. Ramps would be part M compliant. The Access Officer finds the provision acceptable and has asked to have further dialogue with the architects to make some of the 'Lifetime Homes Standard' rooms suitable for students with sensory impairments. An informative has been suggested to address these issues.

Head of Streets and Open Spaces (Tree Team)

6.10 First Comment

Objection: The redevelopment provides opportunity for significant visual improvement through landscaping. The nine pollarded Poplar along the frontage are acceptable replacements and will enhance the site from Castle Street, Huntingdon Road and Victoria Road. Raises concerns about the loss of trees at the vehicular entrance on Mount Pleasant and from the garden, car park and west boundary. Revisions to the landscaping scheme, particularly in terms of the setting and impact on White Cottage, are sought. Objects to the loss of T29, a category A tree, within the car park. The level changes across the site make retention of trees difficult and replacement is a reasonable solution, however, more space needs to be given over to adequate replacement planting. Currently unable to support the proposal.

6.11 Second Comment

Following review of further correspondence with the applicants, the tree officer maintains their objection in relation to the impact on the character and appearance of Mount Pleasant. It is the trees required to be removed to accommodate the two rear blocks that will have the most negative impact on the site.

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

6.12 First Comment

Mount Pleasant footways need to be increased to 2m. The vehicular entrance to the site needs to be narrowed and redesigned to give greater priority to pedestrians by continuing the footway over the access. Pedestrian crossing points need to be improved within the vicinity of the site. To get to the site by foot from certain directions, long detours are necessary. Cyclists approaching the site from Huntingdon Road will find it difficult to access the site. Seeks clarification regarding access to the site for cyclists and cycle shelter design.

6.13 Second Comment

The Walking and Cycling officer has explored various options for improvement to access the site for cyclists with the applicants and the County Council Transport Team. This has resulted in the suggested provision of a dedicated cycle lane on Castle Street to be secured.

Cambridgeshire County Council (Flood and Water Management)

- 6.14 No Objection: Following the submission of further details in respect of the drainage proposals, the scheme is considered acceptable. Surface water can be dealt with by means of permeable paving, attenuation tanks and possibly green roofs. Surface water will be restricted to 15 l/s. Recommends surface water drainage and management conditions.

Head of Streets and Open Spaces (Sustainable Drainage Officer)

- 6.15 No Objection: Recommends a sustainable drainage condition.

Anglian Water

- 6.16 No objection: There is sufficient foul water capacity within the sewerage network for the development. Anglian Water recommend a condition limiting the construction of hard-

standing areas until the works for the surface water strategy have been carried out.

Cambridgeshire Constabulary (Architectural Liaison Officer)

- 6.17 No Objection: Pre-application discussions were given on this scheme and no further comments are necessary

Defense Infrastructure Organisation (MOD)

- 6.18 No Objection

Cambridge International Airport

- 6.19 No Objection: The proposed building heights do not give rise to concern. Asks to be informed of the construction plan for the use of cranes to ensure they do not penetrate safeguarded surfaces

Historic England

- 6.20 No Objection: The application should be determined in accordance with national and local policy guidance.

Design and Conservation Panel Meeting of 8 June 2016

- 6.21 The redevelopment of Mount Pleasant House was presented to the Panel in November 2015 (unanimous verdict RED). The proposals have been fundamentally reconsidered in response to feedback and public consultation. The brief and schedule of accommodation has been re-thought with the Colleges leading to a substantial reduction in floor area, and an increase in the variety of rooms and studios and the addition of shared communal study rooms.

Amendments since last time include a smaller footprint pulled further back from the street as well as a reduction in height. The number of bedroom spaces has been reduced from 292 to 277, with 34 studio units. The revised approach to massing, elevation treatment and landscaping, reflects the changes in brief and aims to create a more appropriate response to context.

Presentation by David Emond of RH Partnership with Nicholas Hare of Nicholas Hare Architects.

The Panel's comments were as follows:

Response to Previous Comments

The Panel were most appreciative of the fundamental rethink of the design of the scheme by the client and design team and felt that good progress has been made.

Urban Opportunity

The Panel welcome the recognition of the site's collegiate form with the aspiration that it could become part of the series of post-1950 college buildings along Huntingdon Road. Further work is needed to define exactly what the presence of this new collegiate court will be. In addition, the new court completes the street frontage of St Edmund's College along Mount Pleasant and defines the end of the larger landscaped space in front of the college. An additional study of the urban forecourt of the existing college property is being undertaken concurrently, which should tie in with this design.

Corner block

The nature of the block on the corner of Huntingdon Road and Mount Pleasant and whether there was an opportunity to create a more positive gesture at this major junction was discussed. The clear definition of the corner block as proposed, includes a second entrance point which is also inflected in the landscaping to this street edge. The materials and detailing need to be particularly carefully realised to define this crucial street corner.

Materials

The language of the materials is clearly work in progress. Although the architects favour the specification of a single brick to be used throughout as in the neighbouring college buildings, the Panel suggested that there could be further exploration into the use of different brick colours textures and reflectivity in different areas of the site. Further discussions regarding the external choice of materials relate both to the site's relationship with the buildings on Huntingdon Road as well as to St

Edmunds College and buildings along Mount Pleasant. The architects should look carefully at the use of light or dark coloured materials when considering the internal courtyard elevations as seen in different light conditions.

Elevations

Overall, the treatment of the elevations is also under development. Of the internal courtyard elevations shown, the proposal for a lower level loggia with recessed glazing seemed a potentially attractive solution. The suggested special gable ends need to avoid a potentially corporate office feel in developing proposals for an elaborate louvre system.

Courtyards

The south-facing aspect of these two spaces and reduction in height of the surrounding blocks is a significant improvement in the block massing. The two internal studio blocks are important defining elements within the taller surrounding ranges and need to be carefully considered either as contrasting elements or completion of the larger forms. The Panel suggested the opportunity for a roof garden on the S block facing the College. It could not only provide a functional space for those living on the site but would provide added interest looking down from neighbouring blocks.

Relationship with White Cottage

The landscape setting for White Cottage has been much improved. The proximity and scale of the blocks adjacent to this small building appears more comfortable. The definition of the setting for this building in the overall landscape plan is welcomed.

Tenure issues

The issues of policy and principle regarding the provision of market housing with no affordable units are for Council officers to resolve and not the Panel. The Panel were keen to be assured that the current proposals are tied to designated College use and not seen as student units for letting on the open market.

Conclusion

The Panel very much appreciated the response to their previous comments. Although it is not yet fully resolved, they support the direction being taken with this scheme. Development of the materials language, for example, is only currently at a baseline level so their quality and detailed application will be key. The Panel would welcome the opportunity to evaluate some of the materials choices before final decisions are made.

VERDICT – GREEN (6), AMBER (1)

Consultations with Service Managers

- 6.22 I have consulted the following Service Managers regarding potential mitigation measures to address demands for Informal Open Space, Indoor and Outdoor Sports Facilities.

Development Manager (Streets and Open Spaces)

Informal open space: A specific S106 contribution if ARU occupy of £67,034 (plus indexation) towards the provision and/or improvement of and/or access to Informal Open Space at Alexandra Gardens is required.

Recreation Services Manager

Indoor sports: A specific S106 contribution if ARU occupy of £74,513 (plus indexation) towards the provision of improvements to and enhancements of indoor sports and leisure facilities at Chesterton Community College is required.

Outdoor sports: A specific S106 contribution if ARU occupy of £65,926 (plus indexation) towards the improvements to and enhancements of the outdoor pitches (for example better pitch drainage, ground levelling and enhancing the athletics provision on site) at Chesterton Community College is required.

Planning Policy Manager

(Officer Note: This is a significant land use issue for the site and I have copied the response in full).

6.23 'The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) sets out the Government's planning policy approach to achieving sustainable development. Whilst no specific reference is made to student accommodation within the NPPF, key policy principles set out in the document are relevant to informing any Local Plan policy approach. Paragraph 17 of the NPPF makes reference to every effort being made objectively to identify and then meet the housing, business and other development needs of an area, and respond positively to wider opportunities for growth. In particular, local planning authorities should 'plan for a mix of housing based on current and future demographic trends, market trends and the needs of different groups in the community' (paragraph 50).

The NPPF confirms that local authorities should plan positively for the knowledge industries and the development of a strong and competitive economy. Supporting higher and further education organisations is compatible with national policy aims and the proposed economic vision for the city as a centre of excellence and world leader in higher education. In supporting to ongoing success of higher and further education in Cambridge, consideration needs to be given to the provision of sufficient student accommodation to meet the ongoing needs of a range of institutions, whilst addressing the potential for distortions in the local housing market as a result of the attractiveness to developers of providing student housing.

National Planning Practice Guidance

In terms of the Government's National Planning Policy Guidance (NPPG), which was published in March 2014 immediately prior to the Council submitting its Local Plan to the Secretary of State for examination on 28 March 2014, there are two references to the provision of student accommodation.

Paragraph 3-038-20140306 of the NPPG allows for student accommodation to be counted towards the housing requirement for a district, based upon the amount of accommodation it releases from the housing market:

All student accommodation, whether it consists of communal halls of residence or self-contained dwellings, and whether or not it is on campus, can be included towards the housing requirement, based on the amount of accommodation it releases in the housing market. Notwithstanding, local authorities should take steps to avoid double-counting.

Notwithstanding this advice within the NPPG, Cambridge City Council does not currently count new student accommodation towards the Council's housing requirement as there has been little evidential basis for a robust assumption that new purpose built student accommodation will result in existing shared accommodation being released into the housing market, given the large number of higher and further education institutions in Cambridge and the overall demand for student accommodation.

Additionally, the final bullet point of paragraph 2a-021-20160401 of the NPPG states that:

Local planning authorities should plan for sufficient student accommodation whether it consists of communal halls of residence or self-contained dwellings, and whether or not it is on campus. Student housing provided by private landlords is often a lower-cost form of housing. Encouraging more dedicated student accommodation may provide low cost housing that takes pressure off the private rented sector and increases the overall housing stock. Plan makers are encouraged to consider options which would support both the needs of the student population as well as local residents before imposing caps or restrictions on students living outside of university-provided accommodation. Plan makers should engage with universities and other higher educational establishments to better understand their student accommodation requirements.

The Council's recently commissioned and completed 'Assessment of Student Housing Demand and Supply for Cambridge City Council'³ provides information on the student accommodation requirements of a range of educational institutions in Cambridge and assists the Council in addressing

³ Cambridge Centre for Housing and Planning Research, January 2017.

this element of the NPPG. The findings of this study are discussed later in this response in relation to the emerging Local Plan.

Cambridge Local Plan 2006

The current Development Plan for Cambridge includes the following:

- Cambridge Local Plan (2006) and Proposals Map (2009);
- Cambridge East Area Action Plan (2008);
- North West Cambridge Area Action Plan (2009);
- Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Core Strategy, Minerals and Waste Site Specific Proposals Plan and Proposals Maps (2011/2012)

The relevant part of the Development Plan for this site is the adopted Cambridge Local Plan (July 2006). The North West Cambridge Area Action Plan (October 2009) is not relevant to this site as it addresses an area of the city to the north-west of this site further up Huntingdon Road. Though referred to in the applicant's Planning Statement, the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003 is also not relevant to this site as the remaining saved policies of the structure plan fell away at the point that the Regional Spatial Strategy for the East of England (the East of England Plan) was revoked in 2013.

The Cambridge Local Plan 2006 contains a number of policies addressing the need to deliver student accommodation. Policy 7/7 deals with staff and student housing for the University of Cambridge and sets out criteria for assessing proposals. This policy identifies sites for student accommodation; explains that additional student accommodation within existing college sites will be permitted; and supports windfall student accommodation subject to meeting certain criteria. Policy 7/9 of the adopted Local Plan 2006 addresses the student accommodation needs for Anglia Ruskin University, through sites allocated for this purpose in the proposals schedule. Policy 7/10 of the adopted Local Plan 2006 supports the provision of speculative student hostels on sites that have not been allocated in the Local Plan,

but have become available during the plan period. Policy 7/10 restricts such speculative development by way of a Section 106 agreement to housing full-time students attending Anglia Ruskin University or the University of Cambridge.

The application site is not allocated for development in the adopted Local Plan. This means that the site is considered to be a windfall site in the terms of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006. While the applicant's Planning Statement confirms that the development has been designed in partnership with St Edmund's College and that the proposed lease agreement will mean that the occupier ultimately ends up owning the freehold of the site, it is understood that the accommodation may also be made available to other Colleges and Anglia Ruskin University. As such, this would indicate both Policy 7/7 and Policy 7/10 Speculative Student Hostel Accommodation of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 should be applied as the development may accommodate University of Cambridge and Anglia Ruskin University students and university/college staff. In order to ensure that this scheme is occupied by Anglia Ruskin University or University of Cambridge full time students (see criterion a of Policy 7/10), this matter should be dealt with as part of the legal agreement for the site. It should not be occupied by other institutions during term-time, given the ongoing growth of both Anglia Ruskin University and the University of Cambridge and their established need for student accommodation. Outside term time, the units may be made available to conference delegates and/or language school students to make effective and sustainable use of the accommodation provided.

The Emerging Cambridge Local Plan

The emerging Local Plan is a material consideration in decision-making as it has been published and submitted for examination by the Secretary of State. The NPPF explains that the weight that can be given to emerging Development Plan policies depending on the stage of preparation of the plan, the extent to which there are unresolved objections and the degree of consistency with the NPPF (paragraph 216).

In relation to this site and this proposal for development, emerging Policy 3: Spatial strategy for the location of residential development addresses the level of housing required to meet the objectively assessed need for housing in the city, and emerging Policy 46: Development of student housing is positively worded and sets out criteria against which proposals for the development of student accommodation can be assessed. The emerging Local Plan identifies the allocation of the site in the emerging Local Plan as a potential residential site with capacity for 50 dwellings (reference site R17). The policies regarding the provision of housing and student accommodation and the allocation itself are subject to objections. The weight that can be accorded to the emerging Local Plan is therefore limited.

Having said this, the Council has recently commissioned the Cambridge Centre for Housing and Planning Research to undertake an *Assessment of Student Housing Demand and Supply for Cambridge City Council*. The study was identified as necessary by Cambridge City Council for the following reasons:

- Since the emerging Local Plan was submitted for examination in March 2014, a new element of the National Planning Practice Guidance was introduced in 2015 in respect of student accommodation;
- The Council has dealt with a significant appeal for student accommodation on an existing housing allocation (App/Q0505/W/15/303586) at 315 – 349 Mill Road; and
- An increasing number of applications have come forward for student accommodation, with a particular emphasis on the provision of studio units as part of sui generis student accommodation.

The study was undertaken between September and December 2016 and makes a number of recommendations. The study includes a baseline analysis of the current structure of the student population, the current accommodation used by

students, and the future plans of the different educational institutions. It analyses what the level of purpose built student accommodation (PBSA) could be if all current and potential future students were to be accommodated in PBSA, rather than, for example, in shared housing in the private rented market. In addressing the issues raised in the study, this report proposes modifications to policies and site allocations in the emerging Local Plan, including site R17: Mount Pleasant House.

The student accommodation study has identified current student numbers and projections of future student numbers (full-time) for the universities, and a large number of specialist colleges and language schools in Cambridge, and the types of courses that they are attending. This has included data collection from:

- University of Cambridge, including all 31 colleges;
- Anglia Ruskin University;
- Colleges of further education, specialist colleges and language schools, and affiliated organisations such as the colleges which form the Cambridge Theological Federation.

The data used in the analysis comes from two main sources:

- The first source is data extracted from the Higher Education Statistics Agency (HESA) returns made by the University of Cambridge and Anglia Ruskin University;
- The second source of data is an online survey that was used to collect data from individual institutions about their student profile, current accommodation provision, and future planned provision. The University of Cambridge Colleges and wider University of Cambridge were included in the study, as was Anglia Ruskin University. The non-university institutions excluded the standard school sector but included the Further Education (FE) colleges e.g. Cambridge Regional College, language schools e.g. Bell Educational Services Ltd, performing arts colleges e.g. Cambridge School of Visual and Performing Arts, theological colleges e.g. Wesley House, independent sixth forms e.g. Mander Portman Woodward and summer schools e.g. Reach Cambridge.

The student accommodation study shows that the number of students at educational institutions in Cambridge with a need for some form of accommodation is estimated at 46,132 in 2015/16. Some 91% of undergraduates, and 55% of postgraduates at the University of Cambridge are in University or College maintained accommodation, compared to 11% of undergraduates and 15% of postgraduates at Anglia Ruskin University. Excluding mature students who are less likely to be living in shared accommodation, there is an estimated current potential for 6,085 bed spaces in PBSA.

Although Anglia Ruskin University has confirmed as part of the study that it is planning to remain at the same student numbers in Cambridge for the next five to ten years, the University of Cambridge's current planning framework envisages an expansion in undergraduate numbers of 0.5% each year for the next ten years, and in postgraduate numbers of 2% per annum to 2026, with some individual Colleges having higher expansion rates than others. These growth plans lead to an estimated future potential 2,874 student bed spaces to 2026. The other institutions have an anticipated growth rate of 230 students in total to 2026. This suggests that a total of 9,189 student rooms could be built in PBSA by 2026 to address both the current and the potential future levels of student numbers. As at 31 March 2016, there were 1,281 student bed spaces in the planning pipeline. Once completed, and provided they are occupied by students, this will reduce the current level of students outside PBSA from 6,085 to 4,804, and reduces the future potential level of students outside PBSA from 9,189 student bed spaces to 7,908.

The study reports that if all current and potential future students were to be accommodated in purpose built student accommodation, there would need to be provision of 7,908 bed spaces, having taken into account student accommodation units already in the pipeline. Whilst the NPPF confirms at paragraph 17 that local authorities should consider development needs other than simply housing and employment, it should be noted

that there is no part of national planning policy that says that all students are required to be provided for in purpose built student accommodation. The student accommodation study recognises that students have different needs and that purpose built student accommodation will not be suitable for all students.

The study confirms that more than 25% of undergraduates are not housed in University/College maintained accommodation at Homerton, St Edmund's, Girton, Queens', Jesus, and Gonville and Caius Colleges. More than 30% of postgraduates are not housed in University/College maintained accommodation at Homerton, Hughes Hall, Darwin, St Edmund's, Queens', and Wolfson Colleges.

St Edmund's College currently operates considerably below accepted college norms in housing its students in its own accommodation. As the largest growth in student numbers will be in graduate students, it is the colleges that take graduate students, of which St Edmund's College is one of only six, which are under the greatest pressure. The pressure on St Edmund's is exacerbated by the fact that it is one of three 'accept all' Colleges (this means that when graduate students apply to Cambridge University they select their preferred College. The older, more well-known Colleges tend to be oversubscribed and so students are allocated to St Edmund's as an Accept All College).

In the absence of a national policy requirement to provide purpose built student accommodation, the ongoing uncertainty about needs beyond the next ten years, and the provision of student accommodation which continues to be made through both allocations and windfall sites, it is considered there is no justification to conclude that the Council's current strategy to address student accommodation in the emerging Local Plan is not reasonable.

However, the emerging Local Plan acknowledges the competing development pressures in Cambridge including student accommodation and it has always considered it

important that a balanced approach is taken within the remit of sustainable development in order to support the economic and social needs as well as quality of life and place.

Recognising the findings of the student accommodation study and in order to address the growth of the University of Cambridge, the Council has proposed a modification relating to Site R17 Mount Pleasant House to replace the indicative capacity of 50 dwelling units with 270 student bedrooms. This modification is being considered by Development Plan Scrutiny Sub Committee on 25 January 2017.'

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:

- 7 Cranwell Court
- 15 Mount Pleasant
- 72 Huntingdon Road

7.2 The representations can be summarised as follows:

-Object to the demolition of the building. It is a good example of its type (a late modernist building) and has character and presence. It is unsustainable to demolish it and a waste of raw material.

-The façade could be retained.

-The building should be converted to student accommodation, like the Study Inn.

-The proposed building is anodyne and unremarkable.

-Proctorial rules on car ownership should apply to the site.

-Not notified of the public consultation.

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

8.0 ASSESSMENT

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

1. Renewable energy and sustainability
2. Principle of development
3. Context of site, design and external spaces
4. Heritage impact
5. Public Art
6. Disabled access
7. Amenity of nearby occupiers
8. Refuse arrangements
9. Highway safety and transport impact
10. Car and cycle parking
11. Environmental impact
12. Third party representations
13. Planning Obligations (s106 Agreement)

Principle of Development

- 8.2 The site is not allocated for a proposed use in the 2006 Local Plan. For the University of Cambridge, policy 7/7 supports windfall student accommodation subject to meeting certain criteria. Policy 7/10 supports the provision of speculative student hostels on sites that have not been allocated in the Local Plan, but have become available. 7/10 seeks to restrict speculative student development by way of a Section 106 agreement to housing full-time students attending Anglia Ruskin University or the University of Cambridge. As such, the site can be considered a windfall site.
- 8.3 As a windfall site for a University of Cambridge College, the amenity of adjacent residents and future occupants would not be compromised by the development. The site is adjacent to the intended main occupier, St Edmund's College. A student

management plan would ensure the accommodation is adequately supervised. Adequate provision is made on-site for students who are disabled. The proposal meets the requirements of policy 7/7. Supporting paragraph 7.41 to this policy emphasises that a positive attitude will be taken towards additional windfall student hostel sites that may come forward.

8.4 As a windfall site for Anglian Ruskin University (ARU), the site location is slightly less favourable in relation to the ARU campus on East Road. Nonetheless, it is located in a central location, just north of the City Centre, and is within cycling and walking distance for students and is in close proximity to shops and services. Bus services run along Castle Street and if ARU students were to occupy, use could be made of public transport. The amenity impact of ARU students would be similar to those of a College, with a likelihood of more undergraduates. Proposed condition 25 (student management plan) would apply to either university.

8.5 The applicants are willing to enter into a S106 agreement to ensure occupancy restrictions to these two educational institutions and restrict car ownership of students living on site. The proposal meets the criteria set out by policies 7/7 and 7/10.

Emerging Plan

8.6 Emerging policies 3 (Spatial Strategy) and 46 (Student Housing) are relevant. The emerging Local Plan identifies the site for residential use with a capacity for 50 dwellings. The policies regarding the provision of housing and student accommodation and the allocation itself are subject to objections. The weight that can be accorded to these policies and allocation in the emerging Local Plan is therefore limited.

Need

8.7 Following new National Planning Policy Guidance, the outcome of the Mill Road appeal (App/Q0505/W/15/303586) and an

increasing number of student accommodation applications, the Council has recently commissioned a student study which assesses student housing demand and supply. The assessment proposes modifications to policies and site allocations in the emerging Local Plan, including site R17: Mount Pleasant House.

- 8.8 The findings of the study are that across Cambridge's educational institutions, an estimated current need for 6,085 purpose built student rooms exists. Taking into account the growth of the student population, it estimates that by 2026 the need for additional purpose built student accommodation is likely to have risen to 9,189 student rooms. Even taking into account existing planning permissions in the pipeline, the number of purpose built bed spaces required to 2026 is estimated at 7,908.
- 8.9 In broad terms, not all students will want to be accommodated within purpose built accommodation and there is little evidence to suggest that such housing would free up housing stock for Cambridge residents. Nonetheless, the outcomes of the study suggest that the demand for purpose built student accommodation is substantial and is no less so for St Edmund's College who currently operates considerably below accepted college norms in housing its students in its own accommodation.

Conclusion

- 8.10 Adopted policy indicates the site is acceptable as a windfall site for student accommodation. The proposed allocation has limited weight in the consideration of the use of the site for general market housing. The existing and projected need for purpose built student accommodation is significant and weighs in favour of the proposal. The proposed modification to the proposed allocation in the emerging local plan indicates that an alternative use of the site for student use could be equally acceptable. The proposed land use is acceptable in principle, accords with

adopted policies 7/7 and 7/10 and would help meet identified student need in accordance with the findings of the student study and NPPG guidance.

Context of site, design and external spaces

Layout and Landscaping

- 8.11 The site layout includes a series of student buildings with two accompanying courtyards of different size and function. The first set of buildings provides a street-facing frontage onto both Castle Street and Huntington Road and continues the existing built frontage along Mount Pleasant. This creates a small, green court - Court A - separate from adjacent streets much like other collegiate courts. The Design and Conservation Panel welcome the recognition of the proposed collegiate form with the aspiration that it could become part of the series of post-1950 college buildings along Huntingdon Road.
- 8.12 The second group of buildings provide a smaller scale of development around Court B than the main/larger grouping of buildings. This second grouping is scaled down to better address the existing BLI White Cottage and provides the functional, service-based court for both parking and loading/unloading.
- 8.13 One tree is retained along the Castle Street frontage and elsewhere new tree planting is proposed along it including nine pollard semi-mature Plane trees. Landscaping is provided within the new courts. Existing tree planting around the vehicular entrance to Mount Pleasant has been retained. The Tree Officer supports the majority of the loss and replanting around the edges of the site but maintains an objection to the loss of trees within the centre of the site adjacent to White Cottage and in particular a young Dawn Redwood, a category A tree (T29) currently at 15m in height. The applicants have advised that this tree has the potential to grow up to in excess of 30m and that it would have a considerable rooting environment. They do not

consider its retention within the court as desirable. My view is that the loss of the tree is acceptable. It does not form part of a recognised vista within the Conservation Area and the loss of the redwood is acceptable given that replacement trees will be provided and that in the longer term it could cast considerable shade and impact upon the southerly courtyard space. To design a revised scheme around this tree would be to attribute too much weight to its current visual impact and contribution to the Conservation Area.

8.14 A direct footpath route from Castle Street to St. Edmund's College is provided in a south-east to north-west direction from Huntingdon Road. Cycle parking is well distributed through the site and each 'house' is provided an allocation of cycle parking spaces.

8.15 Overall the layout provides a simple, connected network of buildings and spaces designed to work with the topography of the site and is acceptable.

Scale and massing

8.16 All of the proposed buildings sit below the roof level of the existing Mount Pleasant House.

8.17 Block A is relatively long and in some areas unbroken, but with defined breaks and 'bays' created along façade lengths. It rises to 4+1 storeys on the Castle Street/Huntingdon Road and Mount Pleasant street frontages (appearing as 5+1 storeys from Court A) and forms a similar height to the parapet level to the existing Mount Pleasant House. The building steps down to 4 storeys on the east and west sides of the site adjacent to No. 1 Huntingdon Road and Mount Pleasant.

8.18 Buildings towards the rear of the site are 4 storeys (B2) stepping down to 3 storeys (B3) and 2 storeys (B1) at the far south east corner of the site adjacent to the White Cottage.

- 8.19 The approach to scale and massing is supported by both the Urban Design and Conservation Team and the Design and Conservation Panel.

Elevations and materials

- 8.20 The submitted scheme includes narrow setbacks in brickwork to break up street frontages. The setbacks relate to the position of movement joints and are spaced at approximately 6.5m intervals and break the two street frontages into a series of 6 vertical ‘bays’. The approach is supported.
- 8.21 The original comments from the Urban Design and Conservation Team raised an issue with the northeast corner of Block A fronting the Huntingdon Road/Mount Pleasant junction as being too blank. Further detailed design of the corner elevations has been undertaken and has included amendments to introduce 2 slot windows and a ventilation grill on the upper ground level and a concrete frame with three openings has been introduced on the first, second and third floor levels with kitchen/gyp room windows behind. This helps articulate and add interest to this prominent corner of the building and positively addresses the suggestion of enlivenment of this corner put forward by the Design and Conservation Panel and the comments of the Urban Design and Conservation Team.
- 8.22 The window system has been developed to include the necessary requirements of ventilation, day lighting and solar gain. The building fenestration forms a simple grid with a variety of infill panels (glass, metal, louvers) depending on the orientation of the windows. 200mm deep reveal depths are proposed, which will provide depth and relief to the façade.
- 8.23 Proposed cladding materials have been developed to respond to the predominant reddish/brown brick colour of the Huntingdon Road to Madingley Road section of the West Cambridge Conservation Area. Materials include multi-red facing brickwork with natural coloured mortar laid to stretcher

bond. Panels of vertical stack bond brickwork are proposed for key infill panels. Subject to material samples, the proposed materials are acceptable.

- 8.24 My view is that the elevations and detailing are acceptable. Condition 16 seeks approval for a range of detailed aspects of the design and the use of materials, including brickwork, windows, cladding and roofing.

Daylight and shadow impacts

Internal daylight levels

- 8.25 A BRE daylight and sunlight assessment accompanies the submitted application. The internal daylight levels are concluded as acceptable.

Amenity spaces

- 8.26 Court A together with Court B have been redesigned as part of amendments suggested by the Urban Design and Conservation Team to improve their functionality and the nature of the spaces. Taken together, they achieve the recommended levels of sunlight contained in the BRE guidance. I have recommended condition 17 to secure a detailed landscaping scheme to ensure the space is fit for purpose.

Daylight and sunlight to existing surrounding buildings

- 8.27 Daylight and sunlight assessments have been carried out to assess the impact on existing buildings adjacent to the application site. The effects on daylight and sunlight to neighbouring properties has been assessed by the Council's Urban Design and Conservation Team and is considered acceptable.

Conclusion

- 8.28 There has been a considerable dialogue with the applicant, agents and Design and Conservation Panel leading up to the submission of the application which explored a range of site layouts and building forms and heights. The submitted proposal therefore represents the culmination of an extended dialogue with the Council. The proposal sets out a simple design solution based on a student accommodation use.
- 8.29 This use heavily drives the proposed building forms, however, the proposed building typology is not uncommon within the immediate street scene in this location given the presence of several colleges. The building design, choice of materials, and overall scale and massing responds to existing constraints of topography, landscape and local context. Though the main buildings facing Mount Pleasant and Castle Street are relatively long and flat in form, they are articulated along their length through the creation of individual ‘bays’ and are softened with existing and new street tree planting.
- 8.30 The application is acceptable in terms of its layout, scale and design. Subject to conditions, the proposal complies with policies 3/4, 3/7, 3/11, 3/12, 4/3 and 4/4 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2006).

Heritage Impact

- 8.31 The site is within the extreme north eastern corner of the West Cambridge Conservation Area. It is located just outside the boundary of the Castle and Victoria Conservation Area. The building is not listed or a building of local interest and is noted as a negative building in the West Cambridge Conservation Appraisal.
- 8.32 Diagonally opposite and to the south east are the Storey’s Almshouses (grade II listed buildings).

- 8.33 To the south of the site is White Cottage, a Building of Local Interest. St Edmund's College lies to the south west of the site. The Chapel to St Edmund's is grade II listed.
- 8.34 My view is that the relatively simple form of the blocks and their moderated height will preserve the character and appearance of this part of the Conservation Area and that adjacent. The setting of the nearby listed buildings, particularly the Almshouses, would also be preserved. The lowering of scale of the blocks adjacent to White Cottage is adequately respectful of its setting and surrounding landscaping. The Design and Conservation Panel support the relationship of the blocks to White Cottage.
- 8.35 I note the third party objections on the grounds that the existing building is a landmark and has character and presence - ribbon windows and brick courses - and a good example of a late modernist building compared to other office buildings in the area. There is a suggestion that the façade is retained (like Kettles Yard) or that the building is converted (like Study Inn at Castle Court). However, there is no evidence to suggest the building was designed by a notable architect or is in fact a good example of its type. None of the consultees seek the retention of the building. The Conservation Appraisal regards Mount Pleasant as a negative building and the proposed allocation of the site does not seek its retention. I do not think the acceptance of the demolition of the building is merely a case of what is currently fashionable to keep and what is not; a number of modernist buildings within the Council's suite of Conservation Appraisals are appraised and merit attributed accordingly.
- 8.36 My view is that the proposed demolition of the existing building is acceptable in heritage terms and, having special regard to the desirability of preserving and enhancing the character or appearance of the Conservation Areas and adjacent listed buildings including their setting, the proposal accords with policies 4/10, 4/11 and 4/12 and NPPG guidance at paragraphs 126-136. No harm to these heritage assets or their setting would arise. The demolition of Mount Pleasant House does not

amount to either substantial or less than substantial harm to a heritage asset and therefore the public interest test is not necessary in this case.

Public Art

8.37 The Design and Access Statement sets out that the applicants wish to progress a scheme for looking at opportunities for using the ceiling of the main entrance archway from Huntingdon Road as a canvas for a geometrically coloured and textured public art intervention. It states that a brief will be developed to consider the materiality, jointing and fixing type and pattern of the space. Several examples of embellished roofs at Cambridge Colleges is given.

8.38 I welcome this proposal and have recommended condition 20, which seeks to secure a public art delivery plan. Subject to this condition, 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

8.39 The applicant has submitted a Sustainability Appraisal. A variety of measures are proposed including:

- Targeting of BREEAM 'very good' with an aspiration of achieving an 'excellent' rating.

- The consideration given to the need to minimise internal summer heat gains and prevent overheating. Measures include building overhangs on the top floor of the main accommodation block, design of windows taking into account orientation and solar control glazing on elevations affected.

8.40 In order to meet the requirements of policy 8/16, gas fired Combined Heat and Power has been chosen as the preferred renewable energy technology choice. The approach is

supported by the Council's Sustainability Officer and is estimated to reduce carbon emissions by 15%.

- 8.41 Subject to conditions 18 and 21, the applicants have suitably addressed the issue of sustainability and renewable energy and the proposal is in accordance with policies 3/1 and 8/16 and the Sustainable Design and Construction SPD 2007.

Disabled access

- 8.42 The applicants have confirmed that 14 rooms would be designed as accessible rooms and are distributed throughout the buildings. They would be a mix of Part M compliant and Lifetime Homes accessible rooms. Car parking is limited to 4 disabled parking bays in the mews court with level access to all ground floor elements of the scheme. Lift access is provided to all accessible rooms on the upper floors. All central spaces are fully accessible via wheelchair. Ramps would be part M compliant. The Access Officer finds the provision acceptable and has asked to have further dialogue with the architects to make some of the 'Lifetime Homes Standard' rooms suitable for students with sensory impairment. An informative (no. 43) has been suggested to address these issues. The applicants are in agreement with this approach.

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

Amenity of Nearby Occupiers

- 8.44 The main blocks of the student accommodation (Block A) are no higher than the existing building. In terms of additional massing and visual impact, the main consideration is therefore the impact of the additional blocks ('B' blocks) proposed within the car park of Mount Pleasant House and how they relate to their neighbours.

8.45 Block B2 introduces new massing in the south western corner of the site. It is four storeys tall and has 15 west facing student bedroom windows above ground floor. To the immediate west of B2 is Blackfriars Priory, accessed from Buckingham Road. Blackfriars is set within substantial grounds and facing east towards block B2, it contains a number of first floor bedroom windows and a ground floor communal dining room. These face onto a 30m deep grassed lawn which in turn adjoins the boundary of the application site. The lawn is substantial and wraps around the south of Blackfriars. The boundary between Blackfriars and the site is populated with a linear form of semi-mature trees that will be retained as part of the development. The application site is marginally lower in level than Blackfriars. Block B2 is four storeys tall and is set some 7m off the boundary. Given the building-to-building distance is some 37m and the extent of landscaping in-between, my view is that block B2 would not result in any substantial harm in terms of enclosure, overlooking or loss of light.

8.46 To the north of Blackfriars adjacent to the site are Buckingham House, a more modern conference centre and student accommodation block and 1 Huntingdon Road, a Doctor's Surgery. Neither building relies on an easterly outlook and I do not consider the proposal would significantly affect the users of them.

8.47 To the south of the site is White Cottage, a Building of Local Interest. It is occupied by St Edmund's College students. The proposed return wing of block A alongside Mount Pleasant is shorter than the existing office building and the relationship of scale and space between the buildings is therefore improved. Tree planting and soft landscaping around the Cottage facing onto the car park will be retained and reinforced. To the immediate west of the Cottage is block B1, a proposed two storey student block of modest proportion. The distance between the two buildings is 6m. I do not consider any harm to the residential amenity of the occupiers of White Cottage would arise from the development.

Construction Impact

- 8.48 This is a significant proposal and its construction is likely to result in temporary noise and disturbance for nearby residents. In accordance with advice from my colleagues in Environmental Health and from the Highways Authority, I recommend a number of conditions to control the construction impact of the proposal (see proposed conditions 3-11).

Occupation and Impact

- 8.49 In terms of occupation, it is likely but not certain that St Edmund's College will be the main occupier. I have recommended condition 25 to secure the provision of a student management plan to ensure the impact of the use is appropriately managed, including term time drop-off and pick-up arrangements. Only car parking for disabled students would be allowed. The layout of the site does not allow for students other than those permitted to park within it. The S106 would secure arrangements to prevent student occupiers of the building from keeping cars. Given that the site is contained within the Controlled Parking Zone, I do not consider that it would be likely to generate any additional impact on on-street car parking.
- 8.50 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, 3/7, 3/12, 7/7 and 7/10.

Refuse Arrangements

- 8.51 The Council's Waste Team has assessed the proposal. Refuse is collected from the central courtyard space off Mount Pleasant. Space is provided within the site for refuse vehicles to turn. Bin capacity has been designed for a weekly or twice weekly collection in line with existing St Edmund's College arrangements. The Waste Team find that the development is acceptable in terms of waste and recycling.

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

Highway Safety and Transport Impact

8.53 The County Council Highways Officer originally objected to the scheme on the basis that a footway south of the access was not being shown on the plans and that the Mount Pleasant frontage footway should be widened to 2m. The applicants have confirmed their agreement to both of these requests and have amended the plans accordingly. The site currently has 145 car parking spaces and the reduction to only 4 disabled spaces will result in a substantial reduction in car based trips to the site.

8.54 The County Council Transport Team has accepted the findings of the trip generation set out in the applicant's Transport Assessment. This shows that the scheme will result in a significant increase (279) in cyclist movements to and from the site. The County Council Transport Team has highlighted that mitigation – secured through a S106 agreement - in the form of cycling improvements needs to be made locally. These include improvements to pedestrian and cycling crossing points and to cycle lane facilities along Castle Street. An indicative plan of the latter of these improvements has been provided by the County Council, but a detailed scheme has not been worked-up or costed. I will report any further development of these provisions on the amendment sheet or orally at the meeting.

8.55 Subject to these provisions being secured and delivered, in my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 8/2, 8/3 and 8/4.

Car and Cycle Parking

8.56 The site currently accommodates 145 car parking spaces. As a result of the development, 4 car parking for spaces for students with disabled needs will be provided together with space for a

delivery/maintenance vehicle and for space to turn. This will result in a substantial reduction in car based trips to the site. The level of provision is in accordance with the adopted standards.

8.57 Cycle parking would be provided on the site for students and staff in the form of one bicycle space for each bedspace (plus one), comprising a total of 278 spaces in dedicated, accessible and secure bicycle stores within the development; one on the eastern side of the site within the footprint of the building and one on the western side of the site in a covered shelter. These cycle parking facilities would comprise a mix of double stackers (40%) and Sheffield style hoops (60%).

8.58 Additional cycle parking in the form of 14 Sheffield stands (28 spaces) would be provided adjacent the front doors of each building for use by visitors. A total of 306 cycle parking spaces will therefore be provided.

8.59 The amount of cycle parking provision in terms of the quantum is acceptable and accords with the adopted standards. The layout of the internalised cycle park has been subject to correspondence with the Cycling and Walking Officer and has clarified that the internal isle width of 2.1m meets the City Council's guidance. It would be both accessible from Mount Pleasant and from Huntingdon Road, via stepped cycle ramps of suitable gradient and design. Access would be through power assisted doors, enabled with a swipe card. I have secured the cycle parking provision through proposed condition 24.

Environmental Impact

8.60 Environment Health officers have recommended conditions to control site contamination, demolition, construction and delivery hours, noise and vibration, dust and traffic management (conditions 3-11). These are all standard conditions and are appropriate. Conditions are also proposed to ensure the living environment for students is protected. These include road traffic

noise and pollution attenuation for student bedrooms (conditions 14-15). Both Environmental Health officers and the Council's Sustainability officer seek for a condition to ensure the proposed Combined Heat and Power system meets specified emissions standards relating to nitrogen dioxide and particulate matters given the location of the site adjacent to the Air Quality Management Area (condition 21). Other conditions seek to control plant noise insulation and lighting (conditions 19 and 22). The applicants have demonstrated that surface water can be dealt with on-site using permeable paving, attenuation tanks and potentially green roofs to store 145sqm of water and restrict discharge to 15l/s out-falling to the surface water sewer. Both Anglian Water, the Local Lead Flood Authority and the Council's Sustainable Drainage Engineer accept the applicant's proposed drainage proposals (condition 23).

8.61 These conditions all appear reasonably necessary to ensure the environmental impact of the scheme in the short to long term is mitigated.

8.62 In my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policy 4/13.

Third Party Representations

8.63 Issues concerning the merits of retaining the existing building are dealt with in paragraphs 8.34 - 8.35. Car parking control would be secured through the S106 set out in the subsequent paragraphs. One resident objects on the basis that they were not originally notified of the public exhibition. The applicant states that the leaflet drop for the exhibition included the address from which the objection has been made. No other matters have arisen from third parties in relation to the scheme.

Planning Obligations (s106 Agreement)

8.64 The Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Regulations 2010 have introduced the requirement for all local authorities to make

an assessment of any planning obligation in relation to three tests. Each planning obligation needs to pass three statutory tests to make sure that it is

(a) necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms;

(b) directly related to the development; and

(c) fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development.

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

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

8.67 I have consulted the service managers who are responsible for the delivery of projects to offset the impact of development and have summarised their consultation responses in the following table which sets out the mitigation and policy remit for the following Heads of Terms:

Heads of Obligation Term	
Occupation Restriction	A specific obligation to limit the occupation of the buildings to full time students of the University of Cambridge or Anglia Ruskin University only, including provisions relating to restriction on car ownership by students, as per policy 7/10.

Highways	<p>-Pavement widening on Mount Pleasant to 2m.</p> <p>-Provision of dedicated cycling lane facility on the east side of Castle Hill, subject to detailed design, to be delivered by the applicants.</p> <p>-Possible improvement of localised pedestrian crossing-points. The County Council are yet to confirm a scheme and I will report any further correspondence on the amendment sheet or orally at the meeting.</p> <p>The highways improvements are necessary to ensure additional cycling impact arising from the development is adequately mitigated as per policies 8/2, 8/3 and 8/4.</p>
Indoor sports	<p>Indoor sports provision for University of Cambridge students is provided at the West Cambridge site and is satisfactory to meet the needs of these students from this site.</p> <p>A specific S106 contribution if Anglia Ruskin University (ARU) students occupy of £74,513 (plus indexation) towards the provision of improvements to and enhancements of indoor sports and leisure facilities at Chesterton Community College, as per policy 3/8 is sought. This is because these students do not benefit from bespoke ARU indoor sports facilities and are likely to place additional demand upon the Community College facilities.</p>
Outdoor sports:	<p>Outdoor sports provision for University of Cambridge students is provided at the West Cambridge site and as part of individual college provision in and around the City to which St Edmunds College students have sole or shared access arrangements to, including for cricket, football, rugby and boat house provision. This level of outdoor provision is satisfactory to meet</p>

	<p>the needs of these students from this site.</p> <p>A specific S106 contribution if ARU occupy of £65,926 (plus indexation) towards the improvements to and enhancements of the outdoor pitches (for example better pitch drainage, ground levelling and enhancing the athletics provision on site) at Chesterton Community College, as per policy 3/8 is sought. This is because ARU students only benefit from very limited outdoor sports facilities and would be likely to access the publicly accessible outdoor facilities provided at the Community College site.</p>
Informal open space:	<p>Very limited open space, other than landscaped courtyards, is provided on-site. The site does however adjoin St Edmunds College, which has extensive landscaped grounds and is the likely main occupier of the buildings. A specific S106 contribution if anyone other than St Edmund's College students occupies as the main occupier of £67,034 (plus indexation) is sought towards the provision and/or improvement of and/or access to informal open space at Alexandra Gardens as per policy 3/8. Alexandra Gardens is the closest area of informal open space to the site and is likely to be impacted upon by students other than those from St Edmund's College.</p>

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

9.0 CONCLUSION

9.1 The principle of the proposed development is acceptable and accords with policies 7/7 and 7/10. The proposal would help meet identified purpose built student housing need. The design, scale and visual impact of the scheme has the support of both

the Council's Urban Design and Conservation Team and the Design and Conservation Panel. The simple approach to building form and design reflects the collegiate character of this part of the City. Impacts on occupiers of adjacent buildings are all acceptable. I recommend approval.