

**PLANNING COMMITTEE****DATE: 28<sup>TH</sup> MARCH 2018**

<b>Application Number</b>	18/0002/FUL	<b>Agenda Item</b>	
<b>Date Received</b>	9th January 2018	<b>Officer</b>	Rob Brereton
<b>Target Date</b>	10th April 2018		
<b>Ward</b>	Romsey		
<b>Site</b>	Romsey Labour Club Mill Road Cambridge CB1 3NL		
<b>Proposal</b>	Mixed use development comprising a Day Nursery at ground floor and 37 self-contained 1xbed student rooms at the rear and on the upper floors along with a vehicle drop-off zone, disabled car parking space, cycle parking and associated landscaping.		
<b>Applicant</b>	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"> <li>-The principle is acceptable</li> <li>-The design and impact on surroundings is acceptable</li> <li>-The impact on neighbour amenity is acceptable</li> <li>-The overall removal and new land uses is acceptable in principle.</li> </ul>
RECOMMENDATION	<b>APPROVAL</b>

**1.0 SITE DESCRIPTION/AREA CONTEXT**

- 1.1 The site is located on the south side of Mill Road, immediately east of the junction with Coleridge Road (to the south) and Hemingford Road (to the north). This site has an active frontage onto both Mill Road and Coleridge Road. Immediately south of the site is Ruth Bagnall Court, a four storey apartment building. The ground level rises from north to south across the site.

- 1.2 The site is located within the Central Conservation Area under the Mill Road Area Conservation Area Appraisal (2011). The building presently occupying the site was originally constructed in the 1920s. The building is known as Romsey Labour Club. This building has been designated a Building of Local Interest. Its description is as follows:

*‘The Labour Club is a single-storey red brick building on a corner site. It retains a stone cornice with the ‘Romsey Town Labour Club’ and some Venetian windows to either side of the front entrance with rubbed red brick arches. A decorative stone cartouche lies over the panelled double front doors and the flat roof hidden by a parapet. It was designed by E.W. Bond.’*

- 1.3 Originally, the principle central section of the building contained a Private Members Club which is a sui generis use. Until recently the central area of the building was used by the Arthur Rank Hospice as a second hand furniture store (Use class A1) granted temporary planning permission until August 2016. This shop has recently closed. The eastern wing is currently occupied by the Tsunami Fight Club, a non for profit gym and a D2 use. Above this gym is one self-contained residential apartment in C3 use. The Trumpington Boxing Club occupies the western wing. This is also a D2 use.
- 1.4 The majority of the site is covered in hardstanding, with some hedging between the building and Coleridge Road and some vegetation and small trees between the front façade of the building and Mill Road. The vehicular entrance to the site is to the rear off Coleridge Road.

## **2.0 THE PROPOSAL**

- 2.1 Planning permission is sought for a mixed use development comprising a Day Nursery at ground floor and 37 self-contained 1xbed student rooms at the rear and on the upper floors along with a vehicle drop-off zone, disabled car parking space, cycle parking and associated landscaping.
- 2.2 The proposed re-development involves the demolition of the majority of the existing building on the site. The front elevation along Mill Road and part of the west elevation along Coleridge

Road would be retained. Above these facades, two additional storeys are proposed within a gable ended pitched roof. This element is contemporary in design using zinc cladding and large box dormers. The ridge height is 10.5 metres and eaves is 7.5 metres. This building would contain a nursery for 0-2 year olds at ground floor and student accommodation in floors above including thirteen 1 bed flats.

- 2.3 To the south of this building two new student apartment blocks are proposed to replace the Labour Club's existing wings. The block facing Coleridge Road would be stepped from four stories in height or 10.8 metres closest to the junction with Mill Road, down to three stories or 8.6 metres in height and finally the section of this block closest to Ruth Bagnell Court is two storeys in height or 5.9 metres. This block would contain fifteen 1 bed student flats. The block adjoining the boundary with the rear garden of No. 276 Mill Road would be two storeys in height or circa 7 metres in height and contain a further nine one bed flats. Both are contemporary in appearance using large openings and flat roofs.
- 2.4 These proposed buildings all surround an internal landscaped courtyard which is split to cater for students and children using the nursery. Six student flats facing Coleridge Road have balconies.
- 2.5 All plant and cycle storage is located within the proposed basement which is similar in area to the existing basement. A vehicular drop off area is proposed between the proposed four storey block and Coleridge Road.
- 2.6 Some minor amendments have been received to the original proposal during the process of this original application to address some points of concern, these include:
- ☐ A zinc clad mansard roof has been introduced to the upper floor of the student accommodation block facing onto Coleridge Road.
  - ☐ The materials pallet has been simplified with the removal of the buff brick so that the majority of the scheme is clad in red brick.
  - ☐ The basement cycle ramp has been widened, moved back from the ground floor doors to the internal courtyard and a cycle lane was provided on both sides.

- Cycle stands have been amended from a diagonal orientation to a parallel orientation in the basement and four additional cycle spaces have been introduced to the Mill Road frontage.
- The refuse storage area has been rearranged to provide separate storage areas for the nursery and student accommodation.
- The speed limit quoted in the Transport Statement has been amended to the correct figure of 20mph.

### 3.0 RECENT RELEVANT SITE HISTORY

Reference	Description	Outcome
16/0821/FUL	Mixed used development comprising a Day Nursery at ground floor and 40 self-contained 1xbed student rooms at the rear and on the upper floors along with a vehicle drop-off zone, cycle parking and associated landscaping.	Refused by Planning Committee (5/07/2017)
14/0733/FUL	Temporary change of use of part of the ground floor of the Romsey Labour Club from a Sui Generis Private Members Club to A1 (Shop) use to be occupied by the Arthur Rank Hospice Charity.	Approved
C/03/1010	Installation of new pedestrian access and replacement of existing window with door.	Approved
C/01/0508	Change of use of west wing from Labour Club (Use Class D2) to mental health centre (Lifecraft: Use Class D1); erection of single storey extension and porch.	Approved

#### Overcoming previous reasons for refusal

- 3.1 The previous application planning reference 16/0821/FUL was refused (officer overturn) for the following reasons by Planning Committee dated 5<sup>th</sup> July 2017.

1. *The proposed development would be in close proximity to kitchen and living room windows within Ruth Bagnell Court. Due to the scale of the proposed building, it would result in the significant deterioration of daylight within north facing kitchen windows 4 and 7 (at first and ground floors) as identified in the 't16 Design Daylight and Sunlight Assessment' of June 2017. Given that existing daylight levels within the kitchens are already limited, the impact would be to significantly reduce daylight into the kitchens further and thus harm the residential amenity of existing occupants. In combination with the loss of light, the south facing 4 storey part of the development onto Coleridge Road would be within 4m and 6m of the north elevation of flats within Ruth Bagnell Court. Kitchen and living room windows of flats in this development face north towards the Coleridge Road wing and the outlook from the single aspect living room windows of flat 11 and corresponding flats above and below this would be dominated by the proposed development to the extent that it would significantly enclose and harm the amenity of existing occupants. As such, the proposal is contrary to Cambridge Local Plan (2016) policies 3/4 and 3/7 in that it has failed to properly respond to its context, has failed to have proper regard for the constraints of the site and would fail to provide an acceptable relationship between existing and proposed buildings. As such, the proposal is also contrary to NPPF (2012) guidance at paragraph 17 in that it would fail to safeguard the amenity of existing occupants.*
2. *The proposed courtyard space for the scheme would be small, cramped and feel hemmed-in for potential users. Given that the external environment to the site is onto a busy highway, the amenity space provided by the courtyard is inadequate and would provide little relief to the busy external environment. To this extent, the proposal represents a poor and inflexible layout and poor design and would fail to provide an external space that would be enjoyable to use for proposed existing and future users of it. As such, the proposal is contrary to Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 3/4, 3/7 and 3/11 and is contrary to the NPPF (2012) at paragraph 17 in that it would fail to secure a high quality external space design and good standard of amenity for future users.*

3.2 This proposal aims to overcome these two reasons for refusal.

1. To overcome the first reason the proposed block facing Coleridge Road has been amended from entirely four storeys to a stepped design of a mixture of four, three and two storeys. The element closest to Ruth Bagnell Court is now two storeys in height. The depth of this block has also been altered so that the two storey element closest to Ruth Bagnell Court is triangular in shape rather than the rectangular shape of the previous proposal. This has led to the loss of 3 student flats as the total number of flats for this scheme is 37. It is stated this design has been informed by the attached Sunlight Daylight Assessment which indicates more favourable impacts to the daylight of habitable rooms in adjoining flats in Ruth Bagnell Court.
2. The internal courtyard for student accommodation use of the previous scheme had an area of circa 204 square metres and this proposal has an area of circa 236 square metres. Six balconies that were not part of the previous scheme have also been introduced to student flats further adding to this proposal's amenity space. The internal courtyard for nursery use of the previous scheme had an area of circa 47 square metres and this proposal has an area of circa 85 square metres.

### 3.3 Other differences include:

- ☐ The addition of a disabled space and the removal of some grass verge in the south western corner of the site fronting onto Coleridge Road
- ☐ The proposed block adjoining No. 276 Mill road now stretches the full depth of the site, 1.7 metres more than the previous scheme.
- ☐ Additional cycle storage stands at ground floor level and improvements in accessibility to the basement cycle store.

## 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
		4/4 4/11 4/12 4/13 4/15
		5/1 5/4 5/5 5/7 5/11 5/12 5/14
		6/1
		7/10
		8/1 8/2 8/4 8/6 8/9 8/10 8/16 8/18
		10/1

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

Central Government Guidance	National Planning Policy Framework March 2012
	National Planning Policy Framework – Planning Practice Guidance March 2014
	Circular 11/95 (Annex A)
Supplementary Planning Guidance	Sustainable Design and Construction (May 2007)
	Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Waste Partnership (RECAP): Waste Management Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (February 2012)
	Affordable Housing (January 2008)

	Planning Obligations Strategy (March 2010)
Material Considerations	<u>City Wide Guidance</u> Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (November 2010)  Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (2005)  Cambridge City Council (2011) – Open Space and Recreation Strategy  Balanced and Mixed Communities – A Good Practice Guide (2006)  Cycle Parking Guide for New Residential Developments (2010)  Buildings of Local Interest (2005)
	<u>Area Guidelines</u>  Mill Road Area Conservation Area Appraisal (2011)

#### 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:



## Policy 46 - Development of student housing

This policy has been subject to a number of objections and so should be afforded only limited weight.

### 6.0 CONSULTATIONS

#### **Cambridgeshire County Council (Highways Development Management)**

- 6.1 No objection to highway safety. However, the local planning authority should take into account the potential for students to park vehicles on surrounding roads imposing additional parking demands upon the on-street parking. The Transport Statement has provided some information regarding the end-user, however this relies upon that user being the operator and retaining its nearby facility. Should this operator change, or the operator relinquish their existing site, the proposed arrangement will cease.

The following conditions are sought: No unbound material shall be used in the surface finish of the forecourt within 6 metres of the highway boundary of the site; no gates are erected without specific planning permission; the vehicular access where it crosses the public highway shall be laid out and constructed in accordance with the Cambridgeshire County Council construction specification; the access shall be constructed with adequate drainage measures to prevent surface water run-off onto the adjacent public highway; the manoeuvring area and access shall be provided as shown and retained free of obstruction; and a traffic management plan shall be provided prior to commencement.

The Local Highway Authority has also requested that a Travel Plan should be secured through a planning condition.

#### **Environmental Health**

- 6.2 No objection subject to conditions on controlling contaminated land, limiting demolition/construction hours, limiting collection and deliveries during demolition/construction, a construction/demolition noise and vibration assessment, mitigation of dust, hours of use of the nursery, a noise insulation scheme for external and internal and to control lighting.

## **Refuse and Recycling**

- 6.3 The Refuse and Recycling team stated regarding the original scheme prior to amendments: The Nursery bins and the HMO bins need to be in separate bin stores. The number on bins required for HMO flats is at least 2 x 1100 for refuse and 2 x 1100 for recycling, so space needs to be allowed for this.

*(Officer Note: the scheme has been amended to address this issue with separate stores)*

Any further comments on this amended scheme will be added to the amendment sheet dated 26/03/2017.

## **Sustainability Design and Construction**

- 6.4 No objection subject to standard renewable energy condition. Policy 8/16 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 requires major developments to meet at least 10% of their predicted energy requirements through the use of on-site renewable energy, with the policy measured in terms of carbon reduction. The Design and Access Statement makes reference to the use of photovoltaic panels, which are also shown on the roof plan of the building (drawing number PL-2-03 Rev P5), with reference also made to the potential use of air source heat pumps (it should be noted that MVHR is not a renewable technology and as such should not be counted towards the 10% requirement). While the general approach to renewable energy provision is supported, carbon calculations following the requirements set out in Section 2.4 of the Council's Sustainable Design and Construction Supplementary Planning Document have not been submitted, although they are referenced in the Sustainability Report. It is considered that this could be dealt with by way of condition.

## **Urban Design and Conservation Team**

- 6.5 The submitted application follows on from a previously refused scheme for the site 16/0821/FUL, which the Urban Design and Conservation team had previously commented on.

The key issues with the previous scheme that was refused by planning committee related to the size of the main courtyard

(considered too small) and the potential overbearing impact to Ruth Bagnall Court.

The Urban Design and Conservation Team have reviewed the new application in light of these issues.

#### Courtyard area

In comparison to the refused application (16/0821/FUL), the proposed courtyard area has been enlarged by reducing the width of the building on the eastern boundary. This has been facilitated by providing decked access arrangement for these rooms. The chamfering of the Coleridge Road block adjacent to Ruth Bagnall Court has also increased the sense of space at the southern end of the courtyard area. This approach is considered acceptable.

#### The impact on the Mill Road Conservation Area and Building of Local Interest

The changes to the scheme to address the previous reasons for refusal have resulted in a design development of the Coleridge Road block. When considering the impact of the scheme on the Mill Road Conservation Area (CA), the opportunities for long views towards the site are limited due to the tight enclosure of the surrounding streets and the deflections in the street alignment of Mill Road itself. The key view in terms of the CA, is that from the junction of Mill Road and Coleridge Road when looking north-east. The submitted CGI shows the relationship between the retained Romsey Labour Club and the proposed additions along with the immediate context of the site.

The Coleridge Road block has been reduced in height and length when compared to the refused application 16/0821/FUL. This has been beneficial in terms of the relationship with Ruth Bagnall Court. Whilst it is acknowledged that the scale relationship and proximity to the retained BLI and the proposed gable is similar to the previous scheme which was not considered harmful, the changes has created a more marked stepping of the massing towards the BLI than shown in the previous refused scheme.

However on balance, whilst there is an impact on the BLI and the appearance of the scheme from Mill Road, the level of harm is considered to be less than substantial. Given that the scheme is securing the beneficial reuse of the BLI overall, the

harm needs to be weighed against the public benefits of the scheme.

#### Relationship with Ruth Bagnall Court

The length and massing of the proposed Coleridge Road block has been reduced to address previous concerns regarding proximity and potential overbearing relationship with Ruth Bagnall Court. The proposed stepped form has produced a much greater gap between the proposed Coleridge Road block and Ruth Bagnall Court, than the previously refused scheme. In addition, the submitted Daylight and Sunlight Assessment shows that all of the windows assessed meet the 80% Vertical Sky Component (VSC) BRE criteria for daylight, as well as the BRE 80% criteria for sunlight, measured in the report through the Annual Probable Sunlight Hours. We therefore raise no objection with regards to the potential overshadowing or overbearing impact of the proposal on the existing Ruth Bagnall Court.

#### **Access Officer**

- 6.6 No comments received for this application but comments on the previous application can be summarised as follows:

*The proposal has a good access statement, however*

- ☐ *The entrance to the nursery should be powered or have one door leaf of a minimum of 900mm, making them asymmetrical.*
- ☐ *The nursery rooms should have hearing loops.*
- ☐ *The residential basement should have 2 secure mobility scooter charging points.*
- ☐ *As the site is remote from teaching facilities there should be at least 2 and possibly 5 Blue Badge parking spaces.*

Any further comments on this scheme will be added to the amendment sheet dated 26/03/2017.

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

- 6.7 No comments received for this application but comments on the previous application can be summarised as follows:

*No objection, as there is no loss of any significant trees.  
Replacement planting is sought where possible.*

Any further comments on this scheme will be added to the amendment sheet dated 26/03/2017.

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

- 6.8 No objection subject to conditions. The Landscape team feels the proposals need some minor adjustments to suit the hierarchy of spaces and end user needs but considers the development is broadly acceptable at this stage and finer details can be assessed by condition. Recommended details to be sought by condition include hard and soft landscaping, landscape maintenance and management plan and boundary treatment.

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

- 6.9 No comments received for this application but comments on the previous application can be summarised as follows:

*Acceptable subject to a standard condition on Surface Water Drainage.*

Any further comments on this scheme will be added to the amendment sheet dated 26/03/2017.

**Cambridge City Council Drainage Team**

- 6.10 No objection to standard surface water drainage conditions.

**Policy**

- 6.11 No Objection: Previous comments have been issued for a similar application on the same site under planning reference 16/0821/FUL but these comments did not take into account Counsel advice was received (on 18 May 2017) regarding the Romsey Labour Club, its relationship to Policy 7/10 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 and the status of Policy 46: Development of Student Housing. It is suggested that this advice is used as a basis for consideration in the determination of application 18/0002/FUL.

In relation to the protection of community facilities (Policy 5/11), the Council does not object in principle to the type of development being proposed on this site, as noted in previous comments to application 16/0821/FUL.

*(Officer Note: The Counsel Advice for the City Council from Douglas Edwards QC is summarised within the officer assessment between paragraphs 8.6-8.9).*

### **Developer Contributions Monitoring Unit (DCMU)**

#### **6.12 Indoor Sports:**

The proposed development is within a mile of the Abbey Sports Centre and Gym sporting facility, which is on the Councils 2016/17 target list of indoor sports facilities for which specific S106 contributions may be sought in order to mitigate the impact of development. This target list was agreed by the City Councils Executive Councillor for Communities in June 2016.

Given the scale of the proposed development on this site, and in line with the funding formula set out in the Councils Planning Obligations Strategy 2010, a specific S106 contribution of £9,146 (plus indexation) is requested towards the provision and/or improvement to the gym studio and/or gym equipment at Abbey Sports Centre and Gym, Whitehill Road, Cambridge CB5 8NT

Under the S106 pooling constraint regulations, no more than five specific S106 contributions can be agreed for the same project. So far, the council has formally agreed one other specific contribution for this project. The council has proposed, but not formally agreed two further specific contributions for this project, so there is still scope for this contribution (and one other) to be requested.

#### **Outdoor Sports:**

This proposed development is within 600m of Coleridge Recreation Ground, which is on the council's 2016/17 target list of outdoor sports facilities for which specific S106 contributions may be sought.

The Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Playing Pitches Strategy (2016) highlights scope for improving the capacity of

this facility there in order to mitigate the impact of local development.

Based on the funding formula set out in the council's Planning Obligations Strategy 2010, it is proposed that the council requests £8,092 (plus indexation) for the provision of and / or improvement of outdoor sports pitches and changing rooms at Coleridge Recreation Ground.

Under the S106 pooling constraint regulations, no more than five specific S106 contributions can be agreed for the same project. So far, the council has agreed only two specific contributions for this project, so there is still scope for this contribution (and up to two others) to be requested.

Informal Open Space:

This proposed development is within 400m of the Romsey Recreation Ground. Romsey Recreation Ground play area is on the councils target list of facilities for which specific S106 contributions will be sought. This highlights the scope for improving the informal open space equipment and facilities in order to mitigate the impact of local development.

Based on the funding formula set out in the council's Planning Obligations Strategy 2010, it is proposed that the council requests £8,228 towards the provision of and/or improvement of and/or access to informal open space facilities at Romsey Recreation Ground, Cambridge.

Under the S106 pooling constraint regulations, no more than five specific S106 contributions can be agreed for the same project. So far, the council has agreed only one specific contribution for this project, so there is still scope for this contribution (and up to three others) to be requested.

Play provision for children and teenagers:

This is a planning application for non-family student housing and, under the council's Planning Obligation Strategy SPD 2010, the council does not seek S106 contributions for play provision from such developments.

Any further comments on this scheme will be added to the amendment sheet dated 26/03/2017. Little change to these comments are envisaged as a short space of time has elapsed

since these comments were previously given and the scheme only contains 3 less 1 bedroom student flats than the previous scheme.

### **Cambridge County Council Growth & Development team**

- 6.13 No objection to amended scheme in terms of the provision of a nursery. The Growth and Development team agrees, after receiving further information that it would be acceptable for the child care provider Patacake to move its 0-2 age group in Sedly Court to the Romsey Labour Club as this would free up more space for other age groups in their Sedly Court premises. It also agrees that Ofsted guidance has informed the design of this 0-2 age group nursery space and it is acceptable for their needs.
- 6.14 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. Any further comments on amended scheme dated 26/03/2017 will be added to the amendment sheet.

## **7.0 REPRESENTATIONS**

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

Flat 11	Adam And Eve Court, Adam And Eve Street, Cambridge Cambridgeshire CB1 1DX
92	Ainsworth Street Cambridge Cambridgeshire CB1 2PD
3	Ashbury Close Cambridge Cambridgeshire CB1 3RW
8	Birdwood Road Cambridge Cambridgeshire CB1 3SU
1B	Brackyn Road Cambridge Cambridgeshire CB1 3PL
7A	Brackyn Road Cambridge Cambridgeshire CB1 3PL
51	Brookfields Cambridge Cambridgeshire CB1 3NZ
112	Brooks Road Cambridge Cambridgeshire CB1 3HR
12	Brookside Cambridge Cambridgeshire CB2 1JE
85	Burnside Cambridge Cambridgeshire CB1 3PA
95	Burnside Cambridge Cambridgeshire CB1 3PA
81	Burnside, The Brook, CB13PA
	Camcycle- The Bike Depot 140 Cowley Road Cambridge CB4 0DL
	Cambridge Past Present and Future
139	Catharine Street Cambridge Cambridgeshire CB1 3AP



2	Cavendish Road Cambridge Cambridgeshire CB1 3AF
96	Cavendish Road Cambridge Cambridgeshire CB1 3AF
29	Cherry Close Milton CB24 6BZ
134	Cherry Hinton Road Cambridge Cambridgeshire CB1 7AJ
268	Cherry Hinton Road Cambridge Cambridgeshire CB1 7AU
67	Cherry Hinton Road Cambridge Cambridgeshire CB1 7BS
43	Coleridge Road Cambridge Cambridgeshire CB1 3PH
69	Coleridge Road Cambridge Cambridgeshire CB1 3PH
3	Croft Cottages Croft Road Newmarket CB8 0AQ
31	Cyprus Road Cambridge Cambridgeshire CB1 3QA
5	Duck End Girton CAMBRIDGE CB3 0PZ
26	Elan House 20 Cherry Hinton Road Cambridge Cambridgeshire CB1 7BL
14	Elsworth Close St Ives Cambridgeshire PE27 5YB
20B	Fanshawe Road Cambridge Cambridgeshire CB1 3QY
2	Flamsteed Road Cambridge Cambridgeshire CB1 3QU
69	Glisson Road Cambridge Cambridgeshire CB1 2HG
61	Glisson Road CB12HG
75	Great Eastern Street Cambridge Cambridgeshire CB1 3AB
8	Great Eastern Street Cambridge Cambridgeshire CB1 3AD
64	Great Eastern Street Cambridge Cambridgeshire CB1 3AD
7	Greville Road Cambridge Cambridgeshire CB1 3QJ
25	Greville Road Cambridge Cambridgeshire CB1 3QJ
8	Greville Road Cambridge Cambridgeshire CB1 3QL
54	Greville Road Cambridge Cambridgeshire CB1 3QL
19	Gunhild Close Cambridge Cambridgeshire CB1 8RD
26	Haden Way Willingham Cambridge Cb245hb
18	Halifax Road Cambridge Cambridgeshire CB4 3PX
46	Harvey Goodwin Avenue Cambridge Cambridgeshire CB4 3EU
11	Hemingford Road Cambridge Cambridgeshire CB1 3BY
83	Hemingford Road Cambridge Cambridgeshire CB1 3BY
91	Hemingford Road Cambridge Cambridgeshire CB1 3BY
76	High street little wilbraham cambridge CB21 5JY

57	Hobart Road Cambridge Cambridgeshire CB1 3PT
71	Hobart Road Cambridge Cambridgeshire CB1 3PT
6	Hobart Road Cambridge Cambridgeshire CB1 3PU
9	Hobart Road Cambridge Cambridgeshire CB1 3PU
12	Holbrook Road Cambridge Cambridgeshire CB1 7ST
14	Holyoake Court Whitehill Road Cambridge Cambridgeshire CB5 8NB
49	Howard Close Cambridge Cambridgeshire CB5 8QU
51	Humberstone Road Cambridge Cambridgeshire CB4 1JD
13	Lady Jermy Way Teversham Cambridge CB19BG
43	London Road Stapleford Cambridge CB225DE
11	Lyndewode Road Cambridge Cambridgeshire CB1 2HL
11	Macfarlane Close Impington Cambridge cb24 9lz
6	Madras Road Cambridge Cambridgeshire CB1 3PX
5	Malta Road Cambridge Cambridgeshire CB1 3PZ
6A	Malta Road Cambridge Cambridgeshire CB1 3PZ
8A	Malta Road Cambridge Cambridgeshire CB1 3PZ
8	Malta Road Cambridge Cb1 3pz
69	Mawson Road Cambridge Cambridgeshire CB1 2DZ
173A	Mill Road Cambridge Cambridgeshire CB1 3AN
256	Mill Road Cambridge Cambridgeshire CB1 3NF
260	Mill Road Cambridge Cambridgeshire CB1 3NF
372	Mill Road Cambridge Cambridgeshire CB1 3NN
Mill Road History Society	
3	Montreal Road Cambridge Cambridgeshire CB1 3NP
6	Montreal Road Cambridge Cambridgeshire CB1 3NP
Montreal Square Cambridge Cambridgeshire CB1 3NR	
543	Newmarket Road Cambridge Cambridgeshire CB5 8PA
7	Northampton Close Ely CB6 3QT
13	Nuttings Road Cambridge Cambridgeshire CB1 3HU
39	Ravensworth Gardens Cambridge Cambridgeshire CB1 2XL
11	Ross Street Cambridge Cambridgeshire CB1 3BP
159	Ross Street Cambridge Cambridgeshire CB1 3BS
72	Ross Street Cambridge Cambridgeshire CB1 3BU
21	Royal Way Cambridge Cambridgeshire CB2 9AW
22	Ruth Bagnall Court Coleridge Road Cambridge Cambridgeshire CB1 3NU
104	Seymour Street Cambridge Cambridgeshire CB1 3DQ
32	Shirley Close Milton Cambridge CB24 6BG

1	Smithy Cottages Taunton TA1 5DT
7	South Terrace Sawston Cambridge CB22 3EL
79	St Matthews Gardens Cambridge Cambridgeshire CB1 2PH
9	Suez Road Cambridge Cambridgeshire CB1 3QB
82	Suez Road Cambridge Cambridgeshire CB1 3QD
18	Sunmead Walk Cambridge Cambridgeshire CB1 9YB
1	Swanns Terrace Cambridge Cambridgeshire CB1 3LX
36	Tenison Road Cambridge Cambridgeshire CB1 2DW
10	The Broadway Mill Road Cambridge Cambridgeshire CB1 3AH
21	Tiverton Way Cambridge Cambridgeshire CB1 3TU
21	Vinery Road Cambridge Cambridgeshire CB1 3DN
89	Vinery Road Cambridge Cambridgeshire CB1 3DW
11	Vinter Terrace Cambridge Cambridgeshire CB2 1LJ
151	Walpole Road Cambridge Cambridgeshire CB1 3UD
27	Warren Close Cambridge Cambridgeshire CB2 1LB
7a	West End Wilburton, Ely Cambridgeshire CB6 3RE
44	Windsor Road Cambridge Cambridgeshire CB4 3JN
104A	Wulfstan Way Cambridge Cambridgeshire CB1 8QJ

7.2 The representation in support can be summarised as follows:

- ☐ It is a huge improvement in design of the building.
- ☐ However there is concern that there is no space for occupants of the self-contained flats to socialise with other residents indoors.
- ☐ The grass verges around the building look as if they will be walked over. These should either be hard paving or have ground cover plants rather than grass.

7.3 The representations in objection can be summarised as follows:

*Loss of heritage*

- ☐ The existing building serves the local community and is also a historic part of the culture of Cambridge.
- ☐ The Romsey Labour Club was built by local residents for local residents - its historical significance as an iconic Romsey building and its legacy as a centre for the local community should be protected.

- It is imperative that we respect and celebrate our history to respect what has made our communities what they are today so we can foster deeper and more productive community values and connections.
- Romsey is a centre of culture and diversity that has long resisted the gentrification that has swept over much of the city.
- This building has served the local community and is also a historic part of the culture of Cambridge.
- Cambridge has historically made poor decisions for preserving its heritage and unique character - the destruction of Petty Cury comes to mind, as well as the fact that our high Street is regularly rated as one of the least unique in the country. There is a real risk of turning this end of Mill Road into nothing but character-less student flats, which would be an enormous, short-sighted mistake.
- Our social past is important to past and current residents and as such its character should be preserved and not destroyed.
- Romsey Labour club was built in 1925 and 1928 by volunteers of Romsey town and has been a valued part of Romsey Town ever since. It is a historic building and was built by volunteers for the use of local people. The new development is not community focused but profit focused.
- The building is irreplaceable as a historical asset. Both its distinctive 1920s style and the foundation Stone laid by Britain's first Labour Prime Minister, Ramsay Macdonald (which acknowledges the voluntary labour that built it) make it an important stop on any historical tour of the area.
- Romney Labour Club has until recently been a community hub: Not only as a Social Club but also as a great live music venue then more latterly as a charity shop. In my mind it would be best utilised as a community centre. The building itself should be listed and it should be reopened as a licenced social Club in the evenings.

### *Loss of building of architectural significance*

- Its buildings play a huge role in its character and individuality - Victorian and Edwardian houses on our iconic terraced streets are some of the most sought after properties in the city. Romsey Labour Club and its architectural significance to the local area should be protected.

- Replacing it with a soulless building, built with the cheapest (and most profitable materials for the developers) is a disgrace to everything that the Romsey community stand for.
- The Romsey Labour Club must be kept as a Building of Local Interest and for community use- which is what working people donated their time for almost 100 years ago.
- I agree the building should be modernised, however demolishing it for another generic 'new build' would be a real shame.
- With its history and character of the building should remain. Right next door on Coleridge road is an eye sore of a modern development cheaply constructed. Please consider the character and historic importance this building plays before agreeing to have it redeveloped.
- Keeping just the façade given the history of the building and what it represents within the social history of the immediate area and the wider context of the town, seems a wasted opportunity, and not within the spirit of the Local Plan 4/12.
- The Romsey Labour Club was constructed by the working railway men by fund raising and in their spare time. The Conservative Club, further down Mill Road, was then funded by Lord Claude Hamilton, the Director of the Great Eastern Railway in response to try and overshadow the Labour Club. This is an integral part of the history of Romsey Town. That is why it seems inconceivable that in an area where it is not possible to attach a satellite dish to the front of your house, the developer is proposing to make such a large change to this historic façade, making it insignificant.

*Loss of existing uses and failure to replace with a use of similar community benefit*

- The Tsunami Gym and Thomas Beckett boxing club are local businesses are run by residents for residents and serve a vital community function. Providing fitness and wellbeing facilities for everyone.
- The Tsunami Gym is one of the few places in the area Romsey neighbours can interact socially
- The Trumpington Boxing Club and Tsunami Gym are used by over 200 men, women and children of all ages.
- It is clear that the proposed nursery would cause a significant decrease in social inclusion in Cambridge compared to the current businesses operated in the Romsey Labour Club.

- In addition to the limited benefits associated with such a small nursery for only 24 babies, it is clear that the fees charged would make the nursery accessible to a very small proportion of the Cambridge community.
- This building was constructed with the volunteer labour of local people for community use, as stated on the outside of the building, and it would be ironical and wrong to have this building taken out of community use especially in this already built up area that is desperate need of community facilities.
- There are sadly only too few community spaces in Cambridge welcoming different generations under one roof; it would be totally unacceptable to destroy this one which is so valued and thriving.
- There seems to be a disconnect between the student accommodation and the provision of nursery facilities. Presumably it is not the children of the residents of these single room units who will be attending the nursery. Why is a nursery the choice of community facility when there is already a very successful Boxing Studio there, and a gym would probably be a more welcome resource for the residents.
- Businesses that bring people together, to do something for the benefit of their physical, mental and social health is absolutely essential for any town and for any area that can call itself a community. Without this, we, the community, are isolated and separate from each other.
- The proposed development is for profit only. The Romsey Mill club currently hold a non-profit community fitness club. The planning application states that the current Tsunami fight club is a commercial business. This is not true. The members' fees pay for the workers' wages at most. But there is no profit made from this club, it is a community group for the people and with the people. This is true to the value base of why the club was built.
- There is increasing concern that so many of Cambridge's leisure and small business facilities are being closed so that the council can maximise their profits through building yet more unsustainable and ethically dubious student accommodation.
- A core aspect of many lives is training and socialising at the Tsunami Gym.
- It is not stated where this gym will be re-located.

- To demolish this building is to leave employees of the gym currently there, with no work and to deprive local people of an opportunity to take exercise locally.
- The building is home to Tsunami gym, which offers a variety of specialised fitness and martial arts classes like MMA, BJJ, Jujitsu, and others. I do not know of any other close-by gym that offers the same variety and scope of training.

### *Poor design*

- Whilst the retention of the Labour club façade is welcome, the design and size of the rest of the development is out of keeping with the local Conservation Area and would overshadow surrounding properties, creating a 'closed in' feeling on that corner of Mill Rd.
- This is a historically significant building for the local area and deserves a more suitable plan that would benefit both the existing local community and potential residents of the site.
- It is an appalling design and will be a blight on the Coleridge Road/Mill Road junction for years to come. The tall building and the resulting change in the roofline will block out the sky and sunlight, and create aesthetic tension and street level claustrophobia.
- As regards the design and the scale. The design shows no sympathy with the surrounding vernacular, which is a Conservation Area.
- It is odd that the design takes the neighbouring block of flats as its reference.
- The 3rd floor extension has no design merit whatsoever and sits awkwardly on the roof.
- The scale, or massing, of the proposed building as it looms over the old Romsey Town Labour Club is unacceptable and represents a poor relationship with of the club's elegant design, and a mockery of the principles of the Conservation Area.
- Cambridge does not need more characterless glass and wood student accommodation.
- While the frontage being retained is welcomed the rest of the development is out of keeping in size, scale and style with the frontage and surrounding buildings and not in keeping with a Conservation Area.
- It is considered that the development as a whole has a disconnected relationship to the frontage and is unsympathetic to the Conservation Area.

- The architects have attempted to address the issue of overshadowing Ruth Bagnall Court, for which the previous proposal was refused, and also modified their choice of bricks as requested. But there still seem to be a range of problems to do with mass, scale, materials (eg. the overbearing metal clad hipped roof fronting Mill Road), treatment and usage, which illustrate the tension between the desire to maximise economic units and insufficient attention given to the quality of the built and living environment, both as a modern development and within its historical and cultural context.
- The Romsey Labour Club has always had a particular relationship with the urban character of Romsey. This proposal does not reflect or acknowledge that.
- The coldly utilitarian block that would replace the existing building is surely out of keeping with the Victorian buildings on either side of Mill Road.
- The four-storey 'square block' buildings dominating the view from Mill Road are out of scale with the predominant two-storey Victorian houses, and do not enhance the Conservation Area.
- The protruding square concrete balconies in this new application do not reflect any buildings nearby, and serve to exaggerate the 'blockiness' of the existing building.
- It neither preserves or enhances the character or appearance of the Conservation Area. In particular, the additional storey proposed to be added to the Labour club building footprint is completely out of keeping with the character of buildings in the area.

#### *Contrary to policy*

- The design thus does not comply with 3/4 Responding to context or 4/11 and 4/12 (Conservation Areas and How Buildings of Local Interest should be treated), and 5/11 (Protection of existing community facilities).

#### *Over provision of student accommodation*

- Cambridge does not require any more student accommodation of low architectural merit.
- Mill Road has had runner-up status in national high street competitions due to its diversity and community involvement, however this ecosystem would be seriously compromised if



there is too much student/affordable housing development up and down the length and breadth of the street.

- The seemingly unstoppable spread of student accommodation across Cambridge is blighting the city and obstructing opportunities for housing for families and local individuals.
- Student accommodation blights most of the town centre and serves only the few, mostly from outside of the local community.
- What the community needs is affordable family homes for rent not more student bedsits for a transient population.
- There is already too much development of student rooms along this side of Romsey: there is student room provision just next door at the Royal Standard development; not to mention the McLaren development further down the road which is scheduled to provide rooms for hundreds of students of the Anglian Ruskin University. Is there really a need for even more student housing when it is apparent to residents that there is a great lack of family housing in the area.
- This building should be preserved and affordable housing should be considered elsewhere.
- Having read the policy statement, which 'suggest[s]' that the previous advice (from May 2017) is still applicable. However, as the status of the emerging plan has moved on since May 2017, and is due to be adopted next year, and as the existing plan was meant to apply to only 2016, it would seem reasonable that the emerging plan and the principles underpinning it, which have changed since the Local Plan 2006 was adopted, is given more weight.
- Student flats do not pay any council tax.
- It cannot be possible to need more student accommodation. You could make an indoor market, a food hall for local food providers. or even heaven forbid some much needed social housing with a community hub.
- The addition of a further 37 student flats into a small section of Mill Road (from Coleridge to Brookfields) will overwhelm the character of the neighbourhood, turning it from a close-knit residential area into one with a predominantly transient population of students.
- Having worked in student accommodation for the last fifteen years the supply now outweighs the demand. New Student blocks built within the last three years are not being filled and adding to this stock will result in losses to investors and

empty accommodation, criminal with the homeless people sleeping on the street in Cambridge.

#### *Overdevelopment of the site*

- The proposed plans to incorporate 37 units onto a relatively small site are an example of overcrowding that would negatively impact both existing residents and potential residents in the area.
- The development also needs to be considered in the context of cumulative impact of other developments in the area as Mill Road has recently been highly developed.
- The development is too dense for the site and there is insufficient green space included in the development

#### *Poor quality accommodation*

- The proposed rooms are very small with little communal/amenity space, which would be cramped and isolating for residents.
- The student 'courtyard' appears to have no amenities, and this seems a wasted opportunity.
- The scheme designs in the potential for isolation and loneliness.
- With respect to the second ground for rejection of the previous proposal - that the amenity space is inadequate, and does not provide a high quality external space design - the new proposal provides barely more amenity space, and is still hemmed in, and thus is still inadequate.

#### *Poor drop off arrangements for both the Nursery and student accommodation*

- The corner with Coleridge Rd would be a difficult place to use for drop off.
- The Mill Road/Coleridge Road junction has long been a major congestion bottleneck - at peak times traffic is backed up beyond Mill Road bridge and far into Coleridge Road. It is also an accident hotspot and the addition of a nursery and the inevitable drop offs and pickups will add more congestion and increase the accident tally.
- Parents of nursery aged children cannot just 'drop' off their children in a drop off area. It takes time to take a child out of a car and hand them over to a nursery carer. Picking up

similarly takes 5-10 minutes and the proposed small drop off area would not be sufficient in size.

- Mill Road is already congested, and Coleridge is increasingly used as a "rat-run" therefore the drop off arrangements will be dangerous to traffic.
- The location of the site on a busy road junction is likely to produce more traffic congestion and parking problems to the area.
- The proposed development is bound to increase traffic at the already packed corner of Mill Road and Coleridge Road.
- The proposed development illustrates an inadequate provision for the increased traffic generated from the day nursery on what is an already very busy corner. The transport assessment states that the road next to the site is 30pmh in fact it is 20mph.
- There is already a Nursery close by and no dedicated parking will cause an issue with traffic especially on the busy Mill Road. Parents will be arriving in a constant stream, will block the pavements and road and cause traffic jams which will in turn cause chaos, accidents and increased pollution.

#### *Nursery use is not fit for purpose*

- The nursey space proposed is too small in size and the outdoor area dedicated to the nursery is also insufficient in size.
- The proposed development also hosts a ground floor day nursery. There is however already two day nurseries within 4 miles of the area. It therefore questions of displacement and possible job loss for staff of the other nurseries.
- The limited space and busy external road also holds in question the safety and well-being for children attending the nursery. With no clear drop off spot identified for the nursery it also puts children and families at risk and will likely cause illegal parking and obstructions which in turn may lead to more accidents.
- The directly opposite a nursery has just had its funding cut so addition of new nursery makes no sense here and seems as if lip service to have the accommodation plans signed off rather than for actual community benefit.
- Placing Nursery and student accommodation together is nonsensical and the two very different groups could encounter friction.

- What assurances are there that the ground floor will actually be used as a nursery when existing nurseries are either having funding cuts or becoming unviable as nursery places are not funded to the full cost of providing them.

### *Lack of parking*

- The lack of any parking provision could lead to further pressure on local streets where parking demand already exceeds supply.
- As Malta Road is the closest road to the proposed nursery to park on, most parents will park on Malta Road for drop off and pick up, thus making it very difficult for residents of Malta road to park on the roads they live on.
- Some of the students residing at the proposed development will also park on Malta road and surrounding roads. Even if restrictions are placed on them not being able to have a car in Cambridge, it definitely won't be policed.
- The students will have cars parked in adjacent streets together will increased traffic to the premises from delivery vehicles and taxis.
- The local business Cam Cycle have filled their objection to the application 18/0002/FUL because of the basement cycle park's non-compliance with Local Plan policy 8/6.
- Almost no provision of car parking spaces has been provided. As someone who already lives in an area with high student occupancy, they regularly can and do have cars. Therefore this proposal will further worsen the known congestion and parking issues in Romsey.
- The nursery and student accommodation will increase drastically the traffic and the needs to find car parking space. It will form queues in an already busy road. It will also result in more cars parked in the adjacent roads. All the demand from the students like their own cars, deliveries orders, night parties will cause a lot of disturbance in the surrounded areas and neighbourhood. It should take into account the fact that increasing even more the traffic at Mill road will also affect more extensive area off Mill Road.
- No parking has been provided. Romsey's roads are incredibly narrow, mostly one way, and parking is often oversubscribed, traffic milling around for a parking space will be exacerbated by this development.
- The residential cycle park is underground and requires access via a set of stairs with a wheeling ramp. We fear that

this arrangement may be difficult to use regardless of any improvements made to it, and therefore not meet the goal of policy 8/6.

*The overshadowing and enclosure of the amenity spaces of adjoining neighbours*

- ☐ The height and location of the proposal would significantly reduce natural light reaching the gardens of properties on Malta Road.
- ☐ It is questioned why no shadow study has been conducted regarding the effect on homes on Malta road.
- ☐ The building will overshadow several properties along Malta Road including 6A Malta Road.
- ☐ The consequences of this development hard up against the eastern boundary would be to deny residents at Malta Road the quite enjoyment of their properties due to overbearing visual impact and visual domination.

*Loss of daylight to habitable rooms*

- ☐ There are daylight issues with surrounding properties.
- ☐ The proposal would impact in terms of daylight very badly on windows of Ruth Bagnall Court where tenants already pay high rent.

*Impacts to neighbours from the occupiers of student accommodation*

- ☐ The development is not connected formally to any university, so there will be no easy control over noise and disturbances occurring on the site.
- ☐ There is a risk of noise pollution and based on some the student flats that we can see in the area, there is risk of the external environment becoming unsightly and a health and safety risk.
- ☐ While students are a welcome element, they are not a long term asset to the community. In large numbers they create problems due to factors such as noise, car parking and rubbish, all of which would surely exacerbate the chaotic and overcrowded nature of this busy road junction.
- ☐ Anti-social behaviour and littering may increase
- ☐ There are the potential issues of noise and general disruption, particularly after 10-11pm and what can

sometimes go on until the early hours/all night, depending on who is renting at any given time.

### *Landscaping*

- To respond to the rejection, a section of landscaping at the frontage has been removed to provide a disabled parking space, thus the external frontage now consists largely of parking spaces. This provides absolutely no green 'relief' between the site and road for pedestrians/residents.
- I note that the landscaping remains vague it must be stated how local ecology be protected through this process.
- There is insufficient landscaping and tree cover at the front of the building. This is needed to soften the corner of Mill Road and Coleridge Road.

### *Miscellaneous*

- The proposed development is likely to encourage the growing inequality in Cambridge and, specifically, whether the development will promote social inclusion in a way that is consistent with the Cambridge Local Plan.
- There seems to be no information about how the student accommodation will be managed. This is an important issue as it does not 'belong' to any one of the universities/colleges.
- Romsey Town has witnessed the loss of a number of public, common, open and shared spaces in recent years: examples include the Jubilee pub on Catherine Street, The Duke of Argyle Pub in Argyle Street, the open area at the end of Thoday Street and the old Junior School adjacent to the Labour Club are just a handful of examples. If we add the proposed development of the Cambridge Beds Centre and the Mosque development, both within about 300 metres of the Labour Club, it is clear that the problem of overcrowding is set to become a whole lot worse.
- Already overstretched local services such as GP surgeries cannot support yet further residents via new high density housing.
- This development will increase the traffic in Romsey and adversely affect the air quality of its residents.
- It seems the flats are not proposed, requested, managed, or owned by an educational institution. Are they guaranteed to remain student flats, or could they become available to the general public

- Romsey Labour Club has been a great part of the community for years and the council/government should help fund its refurbishment into a community centre and bar as it has always been. The city is lacking in community spaces and this one is in a perfect location.
- The recent report on Student Housing claimed that student flats would only be acceptable if allocated to a specific University or language school. These are not allocated to any educational establishment and are a unwelcome application.

7.4 A petition organised by No. 3 Mill Road objecting to the proposal was also received with signatures from the following addresses:

	Adam and Eve Court, Cambridge
22	Argyle Street, CB1 3LR
107	Arygle Street, CB1 3LS
6	Aston House, CB1 2BP
50	Beadon Drive, Braintree
	Beech House Adventurers Drove Oxloode Pymoor Ely, CB6 2DZ
11	Beye Road, CB2 8FP
53	Brewery Road, Pampisford
15	Bridge End, Earieh
10A	Buges Road, CB25 9ND,
9	Cavendish Court, CB4 3FC
	CB2 0AN
	CB23 3AN
12	Chalks Road, Great Abbington
230	Cherry Hinton Road
Flat 4, 132	Cherry Hinton Road, CB1 7AJ
Flat 3, 164	Coleridge Road, CB1 3PR
15	Ditton Fields
66A	Fallowfield, CB4 1PE
2	Flamsteed Road, Cambridge CB1 3QU
66	Gade Avenue, Watford
248	George Lambton Avenue
34	Grafton Street
64	Great Eastern Street CB1 3AS

35	Great Farthing Close, PE27 5JX
8	Greville Road, CB1 3QL
191	Gwydir Street, CB1 2LJ
17	Hatherdewe Close, CB1 3LQ
12	Helbrook Road, CB1 7ST
4	Hereward Road, CB2 9DZ
57	Hobart Road, CB1 3PT
14	Holyoake Court, CB5 8NB
1B	Houghton Road
10B	Houghton Road
61	Howard Close, CB5 8QU
67	Humberstone Road, CB4 1JD
20	John Street, CB1 1DT
26	John Street, CB1 1DT
43	London Road, Stapleford, CB2 2BE
32	Mill Road
6	Montreal Road, CB1 3NP
4	Natal Road, CB1 3NS
13	Nuttings Road, CB1 3HU
40	Otter Close, CB23 8EA
116	Oxford Road, CB4 2P2
39	Porson Road
59	Pybckbek, CM23 4DJ
2	Rathmore Road
44	Richmond Road, CB4 3AT
72	Ross Street
223	Ross Street
33	Saint Barnabas Road, CB1 2BX
93	Scholas Walk, CB4 1DU
5	Sherbourne Close, CB4 1RT
32	Shirley Close CB24 6BE
64	Speedwell Close, CB1 9YZ
3	The Lynx, Cambridge
32	Thorley Road, CB5 8NE
15	Whitgist Road, CB1 9AY
39	Whittle Avenue, CB2 9BU

7.5 The concerns of this petition can be summarised as the following:

- ☐ Objection to the development of this historic community building which was built by the community for the community.



- ☐ The city already has too many student flats and the proposed further flats are not required.
- ☐ The loss of Tsunami Fitness Gym and it not being replaced will lead to the over 200 members unable to improve the physical and mental health. Existing members cannot afford cooperate gyms to work out.
- ☐ Romsey is already adequately provided for in terms of nurseries and this use would not give community benefit when compared to the existing gym use.
- ☐ The proposal would add to traffic problems in the area.

7.6 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. Any further comments on amended scheme dated 27/03/2018 will be added to the amendment sheet.

## **8.0 ASSESSMENT**

### **Background**

8.09 Given the recent refusal of planning permission on the two grounds set out at para. 3.1 - residential amenity impact to Ruth Bagnell Court and insufficient courtyard space - officer advice to members of the Planning Committee is to be cautious in how they approach their consideration of the revised application. The applicants have amended their previous scheme to solely address the two reasons for refusal. It is important that Members are seen to be consistent in their approach to planning applications. The previous reasons for refusal are a material consideration.

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

1. Principle of development
2. Context of site, design and external spaces (and impact on heritage assets)
3. Renewable energy and sustainability
4. Disabled access
5. Residential amenity
6. Loss of leisure facilities
7. Refuse arrangements

8. Transport and Highway safety
9. Car and cycle parking
10. Third party representations
11. Planning Obligations (s106 Agreement)

## **Principle of Development**

- 8.2 There has been no change in terms of relevant local and national planning policy since the previous application which was taken to planning committee in July last year.

### Student Use

- 8.3 The application proposes the creation of 37 one-bed self-contained student studio flats. The proposal has come forward at a period in time when existing and emerging student accommodation policies are in a state of flux. Recently the Council has procured a Student Housing Demand and Supply Study (the Study) (January 2017) to form an evidence base for the emerging local plan. Emerging policy 46 has recently been amended to take account of the Study. The Study is a material consideration but has little weight in decision-making because it has not been subject to public consultation. Emerging policy 46 has little weight in decision making because it is subject to significant objection.
- 8.4 The key principle issues that arise from the application are that the applicants do not specify an end user for the student accommodation, such as Anglian Ruskin University (ARU) or the University of Cambridge; that they question whether it is necessary to enter into a S106 agreement to restrict occupation to either ARU or the University; and that they are seeking studio accommodation as opposed to hostel accommodation. The applicants state that no end user is in place (despite discussions) and as a result the application is speculative. It is also evident that the proposal is in direct conflict with emerging policy 46 (as modified) which seeks that:

*'Proposals for new student accommodation will be permitted if they meet identified needs of an existing educational institution within the city of Cambridge in providing housing for students attending full-time courses of one academic year or more. Schemes should demonstrate that they have entered into a*

*formal agreement with the University of Cambridge or Anglia Ruskin University or other existing educational establishments within Cambridge providing full-time courses of one academic year or more. This formal agreement will confirm that the proposed accommodation is suitable in type, layout, affordability and maintenance regime for the relevant institution. The council will seek appropriate controls to ensure that approved schemes are occupied solely as student accommodation for an identified institution and managed effectively....'*

- 8.5 Members will be aware that the Council's policy section in the previous application had raised an issue that there is no certainty that studio accommodation is acceptable to Anglia Ruskin University or the University of Cambridge and that it can be more expensive and less appealing to some students. They initially advised that in light of the evidence base on student accommodation, the application was not considered suitable to meet the identified accommodation needs of Anglia Ruskin University or the University of Cambridge and was contrary to policy 7/10.
- 8.6 Following the receipt of the policy advice, the applicants have sought Simon Bird QC's advice. The advice deals with two main issues, firstly in respect of the continuing legitimacy of 7/10 in seeking to discriminate in favour of ARU and the University of Cambridge in terms of occupancy restrictions and, secondly, the consideration as to whether 7/10 is at all applicable to the proposal given that it is for student *studio* units as opposed to *hostel* accommodation. Following the receipt of this advice, the Council has sought its own advice from Douglas Edwards QC, who also represents the Council regarding the examination (EIP) into the emerging local plan. Members of the Planning Committee were invited to a briefing on the subject of student policy (existing and proposed) on 14 June 17 to discuss the implications of the applicants and Council's QCs' advice, both of which concur on the key issues. The Council's QC's advice supersedes that provided initially by policy colleagues.
- 8.7 In summary, the outcome of Counsel advice is such that:
- ☐ 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 proposed scheme cannot be reasonably considered to be hostel accommodation as no communal facility to any material extent within the building is provided.
- ☐ The 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.
- ☐ In respect of the proposal, there is no conflict with the development plan and no objection to the principle or type of student accommodation (studios) can be sustained.

8.8 In light of the Counsel advice, whilst the application is clearly speculative, as the proposal is not for hostel accommodation and is for studio accommodation, 7/10 is not engaged for decision making purposes. It would therefore be unreasonable to seek an occupation restriction to either ARU or the University of Cambridge.

8.9 The question therefore arises as to whether it is reasonable to seek to control issues of car parking management, proximity to the education institution and provision for disabled students in so far as other policies of the local plan may be relevant. I deal with each of these matters in turn below.

## *Car Parking and Management*

- 8.10 In relation to car parking management, there are no car parking spaces provided on site for students. The proposal is located outside of the controlled parking zone. It is reasonable to assume that without any form of control over student ownership of cars at this site that students would own and park cars within the surrounding residential streets. From my site visit, it is clear that car parking within this part of Mill Road is at a premium. This part of Mill Road accommodates a good number of family housing in Victorian terraced streets which are reliant on on-street car parking within a tightly packed street frontage, with many cars straddling both pavement and highway in terms of parking provision. Being close to the city centre, the area is also subject to commuter parking. As a worst-case scenario, if 40 students were to own cars at this development, this would exacerbate local parking pressures and cause harm to the residential amenity of local residents, many of whom rely on on-street car parking. That harm could be defined as increased inconvenience in terms of finding space to park, the likely increased distance of a car parking space to a dwelling and noise and disturbance associated with increased car ownership and associated parking along the narrow streets of this part of Cambridge.
- 8.11 Policy 3/7 of the local plan requires at criterion K) that development proposals will be permitted where provision is made for the adequate management and maintenance of development. Supporting paragraph 3.22 states that new development will be expected to address or mitigate any impact it may have on community safety and the public realm. In my view, even in the absence of being able to continue to apply criterion b) of policy 7/10, policy 3/7 can be relied upon and there is sufficient evidence locally to suggest that without any form of management of car ownership by students living at this site that harm, to the day-to-day amenity of local residents, would result.
- 8.12 In this location, on a main route into the City by foot, cycle or bus and in close proximity to the ARU campus in particular (600m), there should be no need for students to own a car (except for purposes of impaired mobility). On this basis, I am of

the view that it is appropriate to seek a S106 agreement to seek to limit car parking ownership of future student occupiers.

- 8.13 The proposal incorporates studio units and no educational institution would be tied to the scheme through a S106. As such, students within the scheme could be attending multiple educational institutions at any one time. Those institutions may not be directly involved in the day-to-day management of the accommodation. It is therefore reasonable to approach a S106 clause on the following basis.

1: That it requires the appointment of a management company for *all* of the studio units comprised within the scheme to actively monitor and manage a stipulation that no students of the scheme, except for mobility reasons, shall be allowed to keep a car within Cambridge. The management company will need to be appointed prior to the occupation of any student unit and have an ongoing overarching management role for all of the student units.

2: That all students of the scheme prior to their occupation shall be required to sign a tenancy agreement that prohibits them from keeping a car in Cambridge.

3: That as part of the tenancy agreement, if a student is found to be keeping a car in Cambridge that an official warning is given and that following breaches result in the termination of the tenancy within a specified time period.

4: That the Council is able to request information concerning all breaches and action taken with regard to them, together with details as to what monitoring has taken place and any complaints that have been received.

- 8.14 I appreciate that even with an overarching management company in place, a S106 clause such as this can be difficult to enforce because there are many streets within this part of Cambridge that a student could choose to park a vehicle and it is difficult to relate any such parking to the occupation of the building. Ultimately, the control over the parking on the City's streets lies with the County Council and any such obligation could not remove a student car from a street. It could only go as far as seeking to limit student ownership of cars, put measures in place to make students aware of this and invoke penalties if a

breach of a tenancy agreement is found to have taken place. This is the practical limit of any such S106 clause.

8.15 With regard to overall management, I note that the application is accompanied by a draft management plan. The management plan sets out the following:

- ☐ Each room will be for a single student
- ☐ Tenancy agreements will be for 48-50 weeks
- ☐ Sub-letting will be prohibited
- ☐ The managing agent will be responsible for enforcing the tenancy agreement
- ☐ No car use by students (S106, Proctorial Control and Tenancy secured)
- ☐ Promotion of sustainable travel options
- ☐ Management of vehicle drop-off for term start/finish
- ☐ Bin collection

8.16 Subject to a S106 clause to seek the submission, agreement and implementation of a management plan to include these elements, I am satisfied that the application would accord with policy 3/7.

### *Proximity*

8.17 In the absence of any identified educational institution being associated with the grant of planning permission, the question arises on the grounds of sustainability as to whether the location of the site is suitable for most educational institutions within Cambridge. This part of Mill Road is well served by public transport, the city centre, the railway station and the Mill Road local centre are all accessible by foot or by cycle and it is likely that most students living at this site will find themselves able to travel with relative ease to their associated educational institution. On this basis, I do not consider it necessary for any permission to restrict, by name, the educational institution to which students could attend.

8.18 It is reasonable, however, to ensure that any students residing at the building are attending an educational institution on a full time course of at least an academic year within the City of Cambridge. I note that the applicant is proposing that tenancy agreements are to be no less than 48 weeks. Occupation by students attending educational institutions outside of Cambridge

would not be meeting the needs identified in the existing local plan and as evidenced in the Student Study to support the emerging local plan of Cambridge's education sector. It is reasonable to conclude also that such occupation would not necessarily be a sustainable use of the building. Likewise, it is still necessary to ensure that occupation is by students who are enrolled on full time courses of at least an academic year. The reason for this is two-fold. Firstly, any shorter term occupation – say for example by language school students or crammer students– over the course of the year would be likely to attract a higher turn-over of use of the property and could cause considerably more noise and disturbance to the local neighbourhood than full time students. These students are typically younger, gather in larger groups and due to their shorter time in Cambridge, can be less respectful of the established amenity of an area if not properly managed.

- 8.19 The S106 will have to ensure that a clause is required to ensure the City Council is able to request the names of any occupiers, the length of associated tenancy periods, the educational institution to which they attend and the title of the occupier's course and its length. This is to ensure that the Council can be satisfied that the building accommodates students and student only on full time courses for the minimum tenancy period as set out by the applicant.
- 8.20 It would, however, be reasonable to allow a more flexible use of the building during the summer recess when it is no longer required for its primary purpose and may be vacant. Any such temporary use would have to be agreed first with the Council to ensure that adequate management arrangements are in place to protect residential amenity.
- 8.21 On this basis and with these controls in place, I consider the occupation of the building by full time students of a Cambridge educational institution would be sustainable and that the impact on residential amenity would be mitigated in accordance with adopted policies 3/1 and 3/7.

#### *Provision for Disabled Students*

- 8.22 Policies 3/11 and 3/12 seek for new buildings to be convenient, safe and accessible to all users and visitors. The applicant's



Design and Access Statement states that all rooms are designed to be DDA compliant. The applicants confirm that:

- ☐ External surfaces and parking areas will be paved in a smooth hard material suitable for use by wheelchairs.
- ☐ All doors are to have level thresholds.
- ☐ Double doors are to have one leaf of minimum 900mm width.
- ☐ An internal lift is to be provided of sufficient size at 2m x 2m (minimum internal car size 1.8m x1.8m) for use by a wheelchair user and attendant. Control buttons are to be at a height suitable for wheelchair users and will include tactile indications and visual and audible indication of the floor reached.
- ☐ WC accommodation within each unit has been designed for use by the visiting disabled.
- ☐ Light switches, electrical socket outlets and intercom door entry systems are to be located at a height suitable for disabled use.
- ☐ One flat is fully kitted out for a wheelchair user including a wet room.
- ☐ Consideration is to be given to the interior colour contrast
- ☐ The communal garden is to be fully accessible.
- ☐ A charging point for disabled buggies is to be provided in the downstairs lobby.
- ☐ Hearing loops are to be provided in communal areas.

8.23 Notwithstanding that policy 7/10 is not engaged with regard to criterion d), policies 3/11 and 3/12 are still applicable. My view is that the applicants have suitably addressed this issue.

#### *Loss of Flat*

8.24 The existing building has one first floor flat on the rear south eastern wing above the Tsunami Fight Club. This will be lost as

part of the redevelopment of the scheme. A recent appeal decision at 115-117 Grantchester Meadows (16/1529/FUL) has clarified that the replacement of a dwelling with student accommodation does not conflict with policy 5/4 as both forms of accommodation are residential. Given that there would be an increase in residential floorspace overall the scheme complies with policy 5/4.

### *Affordable Housing*

- 8.25 The Council's adopted and emerging policies regarding student accommodation together with the Council's draft Affordable Housing SPD (2014) do not require student schemes to contribute towards the supply of affordable housing. As the proposal is for studio units which are a C3 use, without a S106 to ensure the units would remain in student use, adopted policy 5/5 would be engaged and the scheme would be required to provide 40% or more of the units or an equivalent site area as affordable housing. That notwithstanding, the scheme is clearly designed for student use and has limited amenity space associated with it. As such, I am doubtful that occupation other than by students on a temporary basis of an academic year would be appropriate.

### *Studio Units*

- 8.26 The Study evidence base suggests that the Colleges of the University predict an increasing demand for self-contained studio flats, that expansion of the post-graduate population is predicted and there is a lack of studio style accommodation for this sector (see paras 4.25, 4.27, 4.32, 4.42 and 4.57 of the Study). Provision for this sector could release existing housing stock (a position taken by the Inspector in the Mill Road appeal 14/1496/FUL and put forward by the applicants) albeit the Council policy position is that there is no evidence to support this. The applicant's QC's advice on this issue is that emerging policy in respect of studio accommodation 'sets its face against the provision of student flats' and that no weight can be given to this emerging policy. The Council's QC considers it 'doubtful that the 2017 Assessment [the Student Study], when considered as a whole, can properly be relied upon by the Council to oppose that element of Duxford's [the applicant] proposed development which seeks to provide self-contained student accommodation'.

8.27 As such, my conclusion is that the Study demonstrates an objectively assessed need for studio accommodation for students and there are no grounds to resist the application on this basis.

### *Summary of Principle of Student Use*

8.28 Policy 7/10 is not engaged by the proposal and no conflict therefore arises. The site is not presently allocated for any particular land use and no other adopted policy regarding the principle of the student accommodation is engaged. This is a mixed use area and student accommodation is capable of being provided in principle on this site. As such, the principle of student accommodation on this site raises no conflict with the development plan and the proposal would help to meet the identified student accommodation need within Cambridge. Whilst the proposed development is in conflict with emerging policy 46, only limited weight can be attached to this because substantial objection has been raised to it. There is no sustained basis for objection arising from the Student Study in relation to the studios. The site is located in a sustainable location. Measures can be put in place and secured through a S106 for the management of the accommodation in terms of full-time student occupation and the keeping of cars.

A S106 could secure the following:

- ☐ A management plan to be submitted, agreed and implemented for all units with a specific requirement for overarching control through appointment of a management company with responsibility for all the student units concerning the monitoring and management of car parking etc.
- ☐ Occupation only by full time students attending an educational institution within Cambridge.
- ☐ Requirement for minimum tenancy period of 48 weeks for all student occupants
- ☐ Requirement for request of information in relation to car parking management and occupier details (name, educational institution, tenancy length and course length)

Allowance for out of term time use subject to submission of management information to the satisfaction of the LPA regarding the protection of residential amenity.

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

#### Response to context

- 8.29 This scheme has gone through the pre-application process since the previous scheme was refused at Planning Committee. This section of Mill Road predominantly comprises of fine grain two storey domestic scaled terrace houses, whilst directly opposite the site lies the two storey Romsey Mill Community Centre which is also designated as a BLI. Directly to the south of the site, outside of the Conservation Area lies the Ruth Bagnall Court, a part three and four storey shallow pitched roof flat block. The scale and massing of this flat block forms a contrast to the prevailing two storey semi-detached properties on Coleridge Road. Opposite Ruth Bagnall Court lies a smaller two storey flat block (Denham Place) which is setback from the road frontage behind mature tree planting.

#### Mill Road frontage

- 8.30 In my opinion part of the reason for designating Romsey Labour Club as a Building of Local Interest (BLI) is because of its historic use and links to being a building for party members and built by local party members. This use is historic and the building has not been in this use for decades. All the most valuable architectural features as listed in the BLI description are located on the front façade and side elevations of the Romsey Labour Club. The rest of the building has been heavily altered and is not considered of particular architectural merit. I consider the rear of this building currently has little links to the aforementioned historic Labour Club use. The retention of the front façade and side elevations is welcomed as a link to an important social building in Romsey.
- 8.31 The proposed two storeys above this single storey element are contemporary in design using vertically proportioned box dormers and zinc cladding. This modern design is considered in keeping with the streetscene of the Conservation Area as it uses a gable ended pitched roof framed by two chimneys on

both side elevations and a third central chimney. Many other properties on Mill Road are of a similar pitched roof design, it is also noted the height is stepped down in line No. 276 where the building adjoins the boundary with this neighbour.

8.32 The proposed first and second floors are also considered subservient to the BLI below. This is because they are indented 2 metres from the ground floor front elevation and 2 metres from the side elevation. Its bulk is further assimilated by the second floor being within a pitched roof and the use of zinc cladding. The four dormer openings match the rhythm of the windows below within the BLI elevation. Similarly the proposed red brick treatment of the gable elevations is supported and forms a relationship with the retained BLI frontage. It is therefore considered that the proposed addition would complement the retained BLI ground floor elevations below.

8.33 The Urban Design and Conservation Team has no objection to this element of the development and state:

*‘whilst there is an impact on the BLI and the appearance of the scheme from Mill Road, the level of harm is considered to be less than substantial. Given that the scheme is securing the beneficial reuse of the BLI overall, the harm needs to be weighed against the public benefits of the scheme.’*

It is my opinion there is significant benefit to the public in terms of introducing a nursery use (which will be explained further in paragraphs below) and securing renovations for the BLI front façade which currently is in a state of disrepair.

#### Coleridge Road frontage

8.34 The block facing Coleridge Road was four storeys in height or 11.2 metres and 19.6 metres wide in the previous scheme. This block has been scaled back in height and depth. This scheme proposes a block which is stepped from four stories in height or 10.8 metres closest to the junction with Mill Road, down to three stories or 8.6 metres in height and finally the section of this block closest to Ruth Bagnell Court is two storeys in height or 5.9 metres. While the previous scheme had a uniform front façade the bulk of this proposal is broken up as the entrance and stairwell in the middle of the block is indented and four

balconies protrude from first and second floor studios either side of this central entrance. Different brick has been used to accentuate this indentation. I consider this adds visual interest to this scheme. The third floor of this block, amended to be contained within a mansard roof, gives this block an acceptable impact on the scale of existing houses opposite on Mill Road.

The proposed 2.6m gap between the Coleridge Road and Mill Road blocks at 2nd and 3rd floor level is considered acceptable and emphasises the two separate blocks. The block is contemporary in design with the mansard roof clad in zinc and the use of large glazed openings. Further examination of materials is recommended via condition.

#### Block adjoining the boundary with No. 276 Mill Road

- 8.35 The block proposed for this location would be very similar in form to the eastern wing of the Romsey Labour Club it replaces but is 7.6 metres deeper. It would be two storeys in height or 6 metres in height. The design of this block is considered acceptable and its sedum roof complementary to the contemporary design.
- 8.36 The Urban Design and Conservation Team has no objections to the scale and design of this proposal. In my opinion the proposal will have a positive impact on the heritage asset of the Building of Local Interest and surrounding Conservation Area. In my opinion is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 3/4, 3/7, 3/12, 4/11 and 4/12.

#### **Renewable Energy and Sustainability**

- 8.37 Policy 8/16 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 requires major developments to meet at least 10% of their predicted energy requirements through the use of on-site renewable energy, with the policy measured in terms of carbon reduction. The renewable energy officer has stated that the applicant's general approach is supported but further clarity is required, specifically in relation to carbon calculations. A condition requiring a fully calculated scheme of renewable energy is therefore recommended.

## **Disabled Access**

- 8.38 In terms of disabled access the only change to this proposal from the previous scheme is a designated disabled parking space has been added. The entrance doors to the nursery are powered, incorporating hearing loops at fit out stage and putting two mobility scooter charging points within the proposed basement. I consider this is sufficient, but the Disabled Access officer has been re-consulted and any further comments will be reported and responded to on the amendment sheet prior to planning committee.

## **Residential Amenity**

### *Impact on amenity of neighbouring occupiers*

Loss of daylight to habitable rooms

### Ruth Bagnall Court

- 8.39 The proposed two storey element (6 metres in height) of the block facing Coleridge Road is 4.7 metres from Ruth Bagnall Court. The three storey element (8.6 metres in height) of the block is set back a further 12.9 metres away. In the previous scheme the block facing Coleridge Road was four storeys high and between 4.7m and 12.9m away from the side elevation of Ruth Bagnall Court. The proposed two-storey block adjoining the boundary of No. 276 Mill Road is located 9.5 metres from the north facing units of Ruth Bagnall Court. This is similar to the existing wing of Romsey Labour Club it would replace. A daylight/sunlight assessment was sought to consider if the single aspect apartments of Ruth Bagnall Court facing north would be impacted by this scheme.
- 8.40 A BRE Daylight and Sunlight assessment accompanies the submitted amendments (dated December 2017). The report provides an analysis of the existing and proposed Vertical Sky Component (VSC) and No Sky Line (NSL) figures for 46 windows within Ruth Bagnall Court, 233-235 Mill Road and 229-231 Mill Road.
- 8.41 The previous application determined that 3 windows to habitable rooms in Ruth Bagnall Court would fail to meet the 80% BRE criteria for daylight and this was one of the reasons

for refusal. The amended design used the Sunlight and Daylight Assessment to inform where to scale back the bulk of this block facing Coleridge Road. This assessment confirms using the Vertical Sky Component (VSC) and No Sky Line (NSL) tests that all 25 windows of Ruth Bagnall windows facing the proposal would meet and in many cases exceed the 80% criteria. I am therefore of the opinion this scheme would have an acceptable impact upon the daylight entering these single aspect apartments of Ruth Bagnall Court and has overcome previous reason for refusal 1.

### Mill Road

- 8.42 All the windows within the front facades of Nos. 229, 231, 233 and 235 Mill Road where subject to a Sunlight Daylight Assessment including a Vertical Sky Component, Average Daylight Factor and Annual Probable Sunlight Hours. These properties are located across the street and the assessment found that the impact would be negligible to these properties. I therefore consider the minor level of loss of light to these properties to be acceptable.
- 8.43 No. 276 Mill Road is located immediately to the east of the subject side. It is an end of terrace property and has a single storey garage adjoining boundary. The rear garden of this proposal slopes downward toward the south and is at a lower level. No. 276 Mill Road has no windows in its side elevation. It has three windows in the side elevation of its rear return facing the proposal these are to a kitchen at ground floor and two obscurely glazed windows at first, one to a small bedroom and the other to a bathroom. All these windows would be located 10 metres away from the proposed side elevation of the scheme. Currently the elevation they face is between 1.5 metres lower than the proposal and 0.9 metres higher than the proposal, which is 6 metres tall. A first floor rear bedroom window and a ground floor dining room window is also located perpendicular to this elevation. The dining room is dual aspect so a loss of daylight to this window is considered acceptable. The aforementioned Sunlight Daylight Assessment concluded that these windows described above would receive a slight improvement in daylight as the flat above the Romsey Labour Club is removed and therefore reducing the height by 0.9 metres south west of these windows.



### Malta Road

- 8.44 The corner of the rear elevation of the proposed two storey block is nearly 16 metres west of the rear elevation of No. 6 Malta Road. This is considered a sufficient distance to dispel any potentially detrimental impacts to the rear windows to these properties on Malta road.

### Outlook

### Ruth Bagnall Court

- 8.45 This scheme has a setback to the southeast corner of the block facing Coleridge Road. The element of this block closest to the side elevation of Ruth Bagnall Court at 4.7 metres away is single storey and steps up to two storey 12.9 metres away. In my opinion the flats of Ruth Bagnall Court would have an acceptable outlook. Previously the ground floor flat in Ruth Bagnall Court facing the proposed rear elevation of the four storey block had a very poor north facing outlook but this has been significantly improved and now this flat would benefit from looking out onto the internal courtyard. I am therefore of the opinion this improved outlook has robustly overcome the previous reason for refusal. The Urban Design and Conservation Team's advice supports this conclusion.

### No. 276 Mill Road

- 8.46 The windows in the rear elevations of this property already have a poor outlook onto the eastern wing of the Romsey Labour Club and the flat above. The uniform height of the proposed elevation is considered to give a similar outlook and where height is lowered would improve outlook.

### Malta Road

- 8.47 Because of the aforementioned distances between the proposal, outlook to these properties is not considered to be unduly impacted.

### Enclosure of amenity space

### Ruth Bagnall Court

- 8.48 Three flats on the north-western corner of Ruth Bagnall Court have balconies which face the proposal. The setback to the southeast corner and stepping down of the block facing Coleridge Road to the south is considered to remove any potential detrimental enclosure impacts. It is also noted these balconies are all dual aspect and also face Coleridge Road.

### Mill Road

- 8.49 The sun path study (D&A Statement part 5) indicates that the two storey eastern 'wing' results in minor additional overshadowing to the rear garden of No. 276 Mill Road at 15:00 and 17:00 on the March and September equinox and June summer solstice. The proposals also result in minor additional overshadowing to the rear garden of No. 278 Mill Road at 17:00 on the June summer solstice. The level of overshadowing is considered acceptable as it would be minimal and comparable with the existing situation. Adjacent gardens west on Mill Road remain predominantly well-lit spaces.
- 8.50 The existing 2/3 storey elevation forming the eastern wing of the Romsey Labour Club already in my opinion encloses this neighbour, with several first floor windows overlooking the garden adding to this sense of enclosure. While the proposal adjoining this boundary is greater in height and 6 metres deeper the area adjoining the patio and outbuilding would be 0.9 metre less in height and the proposal would have no windows facing No. 276 Mill Road. It is therefore my opinion that this proposal would not have a greater overbearing impact on the garden to No. 276 Mill Road than is the current situation.
- 8.51 No. 274 Mill Road is currently used as a Language Institute. It is a large mock Tudor two storey red brick and wood panelling building. It is set within a large parcel of land bordered along Coleridge Road by mature trees. It is noted from the sun path study there would be additional overshadowing during the Winter Solstice at 9am and 11am on the north western corner of the plot of No. 274 Mill Road. This sun path and shadow study does not factor in the mature vegetation on the boundary which already creates some overshadowing. I am therefore of the opinion as this proposal will only impact a small proportion of No. 274's large grounds the impact is acceptable.

## Noise

- 8.52 The Environmental Health team is satisfied that subject to conditions, noise from this proposal will not create detrimental impacts to neighbouring properties. I concur with their assessment as this development is located on a busy junction. It is also noted the main amenity space will be contained within the middle of the proposed scheme. I have therefore recommended conditions requiring noise insulation and construction/demolition noise and vibration assessment to be submitted and examined prior to commencement as well as several standard conditions to ensure construction and demolition causes as minimal impact as possible. The team has asked for the nursery hours of use to be agreed and subject to a condition.
- 8.53 Patacake, the proposed end user for this nursery, proposes to be open 8am-6pm Monday to Friday and closed on Saturdays, Sundays and Bank Holidays. It is therefore recommended that these opening times are restricted by means of a planning condition since the impact of opening outside of these hours has not been considered. It is also noted the proposed nursery would be closed during the period between Christmas and New Year. In my opinion I consider the proposed opening hours would not cause any undue noise or disturbance to local residents.
- 8.54 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 and 4/13.

### *Amenity for future occupiers of the site*

## Outlook

### Mill Road Frontage

- 8.55 All windows to student apartments in this section of the proposal are considered to have an acceptable outlook. Six student flats would have acute views of the nursery's amenity space directly below. This relationship is considered acceptable. Having visited Patacake's nursery premise at Sedley Court, that also has student accommodation above, I

witnessed two uses that in my opinion work well together. These student flats also overlooked nursery open space. I am of the opinion therefore this overlooking is acceptable. First and second floor flats have very acute views diagonally of windows to student flats in the Coleridge Road block and the block adjoining the boundary with No. 276 Mill Road. Because of the location of glazing this impact is not considered detrimental.

Block facing Coleridge and block adjoining the boundary with No. 276 Mill Road

- 8.56 All windows to student apartments in this section of the proposal are considered to have an acceptable outlook. There is 11.5 metres between the two wings internally. The windows have been arranged so that they do not directly face one another. The arrangement is acceptable.

*Amenity space*

Nursery Courtyard

- 8.57 The central courtyard is 11.5 metres wide by 26.1 metres deep. Of this area the nursery has an amenity space of 85.4 square metres. The nursery courtyard is enclosed on the south side by a perforated metal screen and is partially covered by the 1st floor student accommodation above. This makes the space partially overshadowed. However, having spoken to Patacake, the potential future occupant, I understand this is purposely like this as children of the young age proposed to use this nursery cannot be too exposed to the weather and UV. Having been to their premises at the nearby Sedley Court I saw the outdoor amenity space currently used for the similar age group is well covered. I note the proposed space is 45% larger than the previous scheme and it would not be as overshadowed or enclosed as the previous scheme as it is of a greater depth. I am therefore of the opinion that this space is acceptable for this proposed nursery use and is now large enough and well enough lit to overcome the previous reason for refusal 2 as set out at paragraph 3.1. It is very relevant that Cambridge County Council Growth & Development team advise that the external space is compliant with Ofsted guidance for the 0-2 age group and it is acceptable for their needs. Given that Patacake are also satisfied with the proposed space provision, it is very

difficult to see how the Council could sustain the previous reason for refusal at appeal.

#### Student accommodation amenity space

- 8.58 The proposed central courtyard space is considered adequate for the future occupants of the student apartments. It is 236 square metres in area, 32 square metres larger than the previous scheme. The shadow path study shows this courtyard space will receive sufficient light from the south. I agree with the conditions the landscape officer has recommended that ensure this will be a high quality space. Buffer planting is sought as part of the recommended landscape condition to ensure there is no overlooking from this space into ground floor flats. I also note this scheme proposes six studios facing Coleridge Road that will have small private balconies. I therefore consider that the increased area of this communal amenity space and additional private balcony amenity spaces combine to give a sufficient amount of amenity space for the future student occupiers. The site is also a five minute walk to Coleridge Recreation Ground, an expansive and well equipped area of open space.
- 8.59 In reaching a conclusion on this issue, it may help members to consider how this scheme compares to other student schemes recently approved.

Site	Number of rooms	Area of approved usable amenity space (sq. m)	Usable amenity space per student (sq. m)
91-93 East Road 14/0764/FUL	33	76	2.3
100 Histon Road 12/1576/FUL	71	329	4.6
1 Milton Road 14/1938/S73	211	168	1.86
7-9 Abbey Street 11/1430/FUL	24	194	8.08
73 Humberstone Road 13/0115/FUL	15	67	4.46
Texaco Site	98	45	0.46
Primrose Street 15/0140/FUL	30	197.6	6.6
Romsey Labour Club 18/0002/FUL	37	236.8	6.4

Members will see from the table that the proposal compares favourably to other similarly sized student schemes across the City in terms of usable external amenity space per student. As

such, it is my view that the previous reason for refusal has been overcome.

- 8.60 No internal communal space has been provided for the student accommodation use. This is considered acceptable as there is no policy requirement to do so in such a central location surrounded by many amenities. Technical housing standards *nationally described space standards* published by Department of Communities and Local Government March 2015 does not apply to the size of these one bed units as they will be used for student accommodation and a Section 106 agreement would ensure this. I consider each of the proposed flats are large enough in floor area to cater for the needs of a single student occupier.
- 8.61 In my opinion the proposal provides a high-quality living environment and an appropriate standard of residential amenity for future occupiers, and I consider that in this respect it is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 3/7 and 3/12. I also consider this larger central courtyard along with 6 private balconies overcomes the previous reason for refusal as now in my opinion both future student occupiers and child and staff of the proposed Nursery have an adequate amount of amenity space.

### **Loss of leisure facilities**

- 8.62 Currently the east and west wings of the existing building are used as gymnasiums (Class D2) by Tsunami Gym (Mixed Martial Arts) and Becket Boxing Gym. 463sqm existing gross internal floorspace (Tsunami Gym space – 156.1sqm and Trumpington Community Boxing Club including basement – 307.2sqm) of D2 use will be removed and 260sqm gross new internal floorspace of D1 (nursery space) is proposed to replace this. Literature associated with the application indicates the basement area of Trumpington Community Boxing Club is used mainly for storage. It is also noted that neither existing gym operate with the benefit of planning permission however both appear to have been in situ for more than 10 years and, if so, are therefore established.
- 8.63 Policy 6/1 of the Cambridge City Local Plan (2006) states that development leading to the loss of leisure facilities will be permitted if:

- a. the facility can be replaced to at least its existing scale and quality within the new development; or
- b. the facility is to be relocated to another appropriate premises or site of similar or improved accessibility.

8.64 In my opinion, the gymnasiums are established and their loss would not be in compliance with this policy since neither policy criterion are met by the proposal. However, I consider there would be a public benefit to the proposed new nursery which would create a recognised need for additional 0-2yr spaces in the area (recognised by the Cambridge County Council Growth and Development team). I consider this to be a material planning consideration that, in this instance, outweighs the policy requirement. I also note that Patacake, as the proposed end user, intends these additional premises to free up their current 0-2yr unit at Sedley Court for more child care places. In addition, the proposed nursery would be of a greater floor area to the two gymnasiums it is proposed to replace.

8.65 The loss of the gyms/boxing club did not previously form a reason for refusal. Whilst I am aware that a significant number of objections have been received this time around in relation to this loss, I am of the opinion that the harm associated with the loss of these two small specialist gyms is outweighed by the public benefits of the proposed nursery. Whilst contrary to Policy 6/1 this is a material consideration that is sufficient to weigh in favour of the development.

### **Refuse Arrangements**

8.66 An adequate amount of bin storage has been provided in this scheme. The onus remains on the owner/users of the site to ensure that waste legislation, as enforced by the City Council, is followed when the dual-use site is operational. As per the City Council's Refuse Team's consultees comments the bin store has been separated so that the nursery and student accommodation have separate bin stores. The refuse officer is satisfied the loading bays provided are large enough to accommodate RCV emptying bins and the location of the bin store is satisfactory to accommodate this. Further comments from the refuse officer are awaited and Members will be updated prior to the committee meeting.

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

### **Transport and Highway Safety**

- 8.68 The Highway Authority is satisfied the proposal will not have an adverse impact on highway safety based modeling provided in the Transport Statement by Transport Planning Associates. However the Highway Authority and neighbours have pointed out that the speed limit on Mill Road is 20mph not 30mph. The Transport Statement has therefore been updated. The Transport Statement presents trip rates for a generic occupier taken from TRICS (Trip Rate Information Computer System). This forecast of trips by mode is modeled using local census data and has been accepted by the County Council. The conclusion is that a generic occupier might attract 3 arrivals by car in the morning and 2 in the evening.
- 8.69 The Transport Statement also presents an analysis using data taken from a local nursery (Patacake) which also happens to be the prospective end occupier. This forecasts four arrivals by car in the morning and 2 in the evening. The trip rates have been accepted by the County Council and given that the site is located in a highly sustainable location in a dense urban area, it is very likely that a significant number of parents would be dropping off by foot or by bicycle. Conditions are recommended to ensure highway safety is not unduly impacted by the development during its construction.

- 8.70 In my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policy 8/2.

### **Car and Cycle Parking**

- 8.71 One disabled space and a set down area are proposed as part of this application. This is less than the maximum parking standards outlined in Appendix C of the Cambridge Local Plan (2006). The City Council promotes lower levels of private car parking particularly where good transport accessibility exists. This site is located in a particularly sustainable location on the junction of Mill Road and Coleridge Road. Mill Road has many shops and services and the city centre is within walking distance or cycling distance. It is, therefore, my view that it would be unreasonable to refuse the application for this reason



on the basis of lack of parking. The impacts of off-site car parking are to be dealt with through the S106 as set out in the assessment of the principle of development.

8.72 All cycle parking for students is located in the basement. The scheme has been amended to make this area easier to access. The ramp down to the basement is over 5 metres long and 2.2 metres wide and has two indents for bicycle wheels either side of the ramp. In my opinion this is considered acceptable. 48 cycle spaces are proposed in this basement and 14 further visitor spaces are proposed outside facing Coleridge Road. These outdoor visitor spaces are well spaced for larger cargo bicycles that maybe used to drop off children to the proposed nursery. This amount of parking is in line with policy.

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

### **Third Party Representations**

8.74 The majority of third party representations are addressed in the report above, those issues that are not address are considered in the table below:

<b>Concern</b>	<b>Response</b>
The Tsunami gym is a non-profit community facility	The Tsunami gym is not a registered charity and its loss is addressed in paragraphs 8.63 - 865
Too much student accommodation will compromise the diversity on this street and in Cambridge.	There is no policy basis for refusing further student accommodation in this location and each scheme is dealt with on a case by case basis. See paragraphs 8.3 to 8.28
No council tax being collected	This is not a planning consideration
Ruth Bagnall Court is not comparable as it is outside of the Conservation Area	While it is agreed Ruth Bagnall Court is outside of the Conservation Area, it forms part of the context of the site and its relationship to the proposal is a planning consideration.

Site should be only used as a multi- purpose community centre.	There is no planning reason for the redevelopment of this site to a student accommodation and nursery use not to be considered. It is noted what is currently on site are two gyms, the loss of which is not considered under policy 5/11 but instead 6/1 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006.
Affordable housing is what is required in this location.	See paragraph 8.25
A nursery directly opposite has had its funding cut, therefore a nursery in this location is not warranted.	This is not a planning matter and it is noted the Cambridge County Council Growth and Development team has identified that there is a current need for the additional nursery places provided by this scheme in the area.
Loss of Nursery use in the future	If the proposed end user of the nursery were to go out of business the named use class of this area would remain. Therefore if a change of use were required in the future this would require planning permission.
Anti-social behaviour and littering may increase with the number of student occupiers	This is a management issue and not a planning consideration. How this development will be managed will be set out in the recommended Section 106.

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

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

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

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

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

#### City Council Infrastructure (Open spaces and Community facilities)

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

Three contributions are identified as being necessary. These are £9,146 (plus indexation) to Abbey Sports Centre and Gym, Whitehill Road, £8,092 (plus indexation) to Coleridge Recreation Ground and £8,228 to informal open space facilities at Romsey Recreation Ground, Cambridge.

- 8.78 I agree with the reasoning set out in paragraph 6.12 above that contributions towards these projects meet the requirements of the CIL regulations. Subject to the completion of a S106 planning obligation to secure this infrastructure provision, I am satisfied that the proposal accords with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 3/8, 5/14 and 10/1 and the Planning Obligation Strategy 2010.

#### Occupation

- 8.79 In accordance with my assessment regarding the principle of development, the following S106 provisions are required:

- ☐ A management plan to be submitted, agreed and implemented for all units with a specific requirement for overarching control through appointment of a management company with responsibility for all the student units concerning the monitoring and management of car parking etc.
- ☐ Occupation only by full time students attending an educational institution within Cambridge.
- ☐ Requirement for minimum tenancy period of 48 weeks for all student occupants
- ☐ Requirement for request of information in relation to car parking management and occupier details (name, educational institution, tenancy length and course length)
- ☐ Allowance for out of term time use subject to submission of management information to the satisfaction of the LPA regarding the protection of residential amenity.

### Planning Obligations Conclusion

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

## **9.0 CONCLUSION**

9.1 The larger size of the proposed central courtyard and addition of six balconies has overcome reason for refusal 1 on the previous scheme. Both the student accommodation use and nursery use would have an adequate amount of external amenity space. The County Council and the prospective occupant Patacake support the extent of provision proposed. The amount of external space for future students has been increased and given the location – close to Coleridge Rec. – and comparison with other student schemes, I consider that reason for refusal 1 has been robustly addressed and would be very difficult to sustain as a reason for refusal on appeal. With the recommended landscaping condition, a high quality space would be created.

- 9.2 The length and massing of the proposed Coleridge Road block has been reduced to address the previous reason for refusal regarding proximity and potential overbearing relationship with Ruth Bagnall Court. The proposed stepped form has produced a much greater gap between the proposed Coleridge Road block and Ruth Bagnall Court, than the previously refused scheme. All windows assessed would meet the BRE standards for daylight and sunlight.
- 9.3 Policy 7/10 is not engaged by the proposal and no conflict therefore arises. The site is not presently allocated for any particular land use and no other adopted policy regarding the principle of the student accommodation is engaged. This is a mixed use area and student accommodation is capable of being provided in principle on this site. As such, the principle of student accommodation on this site raises no conflict with the development plan and the proposal would help to meet the identified student accommodation need within Cambridge. Whilst the proposed development is in conflict with emerging policy 46, only limited weight can be attached to this because substantial objection has been raised to it. There is no sustained basis for objection arising from the Student Study in relation to the studios. The site is located in a sustainable location. Measures can be put in place and secured through a S106 for the management of the accommodation in terms of full-time student occupation and the keeping of cars.
- 9.4 The design of the development is considered to respect the context of the site and to be in keeping with the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. The works to the building respect its status as a Building of Local Interest and importantly retain existing architectural features of merit. The site lies in a sustainable location and the proposal can provide the required level of renewable energy, disabled access requirements, car and cycle parking and appropriate refuse arrangements. The proposal will not adversely impact on highway safety or harm the amenity of occupiers of nearby dwellings and will provide a high quality living environment for its future occupiers. The proposal will result in the loss of two small gymnasiums but this is outweighed by the benefits of providing a nursery use that meets a recognised need. Measures necessary to secure infrastructure provision and to mitigate the development can be secured through a S106 in full compliance of the CIL regulations.

## 10.0 RECOMMENDATION

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

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

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

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

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

3. Submission of Preliminary Contamination Assessment:

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

(a) Desk study to include:

- Detailed history of the site uses and surrounding area (including any use of radioactive materials)
- General environmental setting.
- Site investigation strategy based on the information identified in the desk study.

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

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

4. Submission of site investigation report and remediation strategy:

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

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

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

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

5. Implementation of remediation.

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

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

6. Completion report:

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

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

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

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

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

## 7. Material Management Plan:

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

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

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

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



8. Unexpected Contamination:

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

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

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

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

10. No development shall commence until details/specification of solar control glazing for all windows has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The windows shall be installed in accordance with the approved details and maintained thereafter.

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

11. No development shall commence until a method statement for the retention of the front and rear elevations of the existing Labour Club building has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The development works shall be undertaken in accordance with the approved method statement unless otherwise agreed in writing by the local planning authority.

Reason: to ensure the structural integrity of the elevations of the existing building to be retained are consistent with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) Policy 4/12.

12. Prior to demolition of the parts of the Labour Club building not due for retention, an archaeological building record by an approved archaeological contractor shall be undertaken and submitted to the LPA for approval.

Reason: to be consistent with NPPF paragraph 141.

13. Prior to any demolition works being undertaken, a schedule of works of repair or alteration of the Labour Club Building elements to be retained (front and return elevations) shall be submitted to and approved by the LPA. The schedule shall include for instance, any cleaning, repointing, brick or stone works and window repairs or replacement.

Reason: to protect the appearance of the retained elements of the BLI in accordance with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) Policy 4/12.

14. No development should take place until samples of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure that the appearance of the external surfaces is appropriate (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/4, 3/12 and 3/14).

15. No development shall commence until details of the proposed spandrel panels, including a schedule of the windows they are to be introduced to, have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The panels shall be erected in accordance with the approved details and thereafter maintained unless agreed otherwise in writing by the local planning authority.

Reason: To ensure that the appearance of the external surfaces of the development and levels of privacy achieved are appropriate (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/4, 3/7, 3/12 and 3/14).

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

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

17. No development hereby permitted shall be commenced until surface water drainage works in accordance with the December 2017 GH Bullard & Associates FRA and Drainage Strategy have been submitted to and approved in writing by 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 or flooding off site for a 1 in 100 year event + 40% an allowance for climate change. The submitted details shall:

- a. provide information about the design storm period and intensity, the method employed to delay and control the surface water discharged from the site and the measures taken to prevent pollution of the receiving groundwater and/or surface waters; and

- b. provide a management and maintenance plan for the lifetime of the development which shall include the arrangements for adoption by any public authority or statutory undertaker and any other arrangements to secure the operation of the scheme throughout its lifetime.

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

18. No building hereby permitted shall be occupied until drainage works have been implemented in accordance with details that have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The surface water drainage scheme shall be managed and maintained thereafter in accordance with the agreed details and management and maintenance plan for the lifetime of the development.

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

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

Reason: In the interests of visual amenity, privacy 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)

20. No unbound material shall be used in the surface finish of the forecourt 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

21. Prior to commencement of first use of the development, hereby permitted, the vehicular access where it crosses the public highway shall be laid out and constructed in accordance with the Cambridgeshire County Council construction specification.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety and to ensure satisfactory access into the site.

22. 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 in the interests of highway safety.

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

Reason: In the interests of highway safety.

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

Reason: in the interests of highway safety

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

28. The nursery use, hereby permitted, shall be carried out only between the hours of 8.00am - 6.00pm Monday to Friday. The use shall not be carried out on Saturdays, Sundays or Bank Holidays.

Reason: To protect the amenity of occupiers of nearby properties and because the merits of operation outside of these hours have not been considered (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 4/13)

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

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

Reason: To protect the amenity of the proposed new residential units (Cambridge Local Plan 2006; Policy 4/13).

30. Prior to occupation of the residential units above and adjoining the nursery, the applicant shall demonstrate to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority a scheme of noise insulation that adequately protects internal noise levels in habitable rooms in those units from noise associated with the day-to-day use of the nursery. 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 residential units adjoining the nursery (Cambridge Local Plan 2006; Policy 4/13)

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

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

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

32. Prior to the commencement of development, with the exception of the demolition of the existing buildings 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 energy sources, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The statement shall include the total predicted energy requirements of the development and shall set out a schedule of proposed on-site renewable energy technologies, their respective energy contributions, location, design and a maintenance programme. It shall also include an assessment of any air quality noise or odour impact and mitigation measures required to maintain amenity and prevent nuisance in accordance with the Council Sustainable Construction And Design Supplementary Planning Document to be submitted in writing and agreed with the LPA prior to installation. The approved renewable energy technologies shall be fully installed and operational prior to the occupation of any of the flats hereby approved and shall thereafter be maintained and remain fully operational in accordance with the approved maintenance programme, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the local planning authority.

Reason: In the interests of reducing carbon dioxide emissions and to ensure that the development does not give rise to unacceptable pollution. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 4/13 and 8/16).

33. Notwithstanding the provisions of the Use Classes Order (1987) and the Town and Country Planning General Permitted Development Order (2015) as amended, the proposed nursery use shall only be used as as nursery and for no other purpose, either in a different use class or within the D1 use class as set out in the Use Classes Order (1987) as amended.

Reason: The application has only been assessed on the basis of the nursery use and for no other purpose in relation to its impact or justification as a community facility in replacing the existing leisure use (Cambridge Local Plan policies, 5/11, 6/1, 4/13).



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

Reason: In the interests of highway safety.

**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:** Dust condition informative

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

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

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

-Guidance on the assessment of dust from demolition and construction

[http://iaqm.co.uk/wp-content/uploads/guidance/iaqm\\_guidance\\_report\\_draft1.4.pdf](http://iaqm.co.uk/wp-content/uploads/guidance/iaqm_guidance_report_draft1.4.pdf)

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

[http://www.iaqm.co.uk/wp-content/uploads/guidance/monitoring\\_construction\\_sites\\_2012.pdf](http://www.iaqm.co.uk/wp-content/uploads/guidance/monitoring_construction_sites_2012.pdf)

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

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

**INFORMATIVE:** If suspect ground conditions or contaminated materials are encountered whilst undertaking the development, works shall immediately cease on site until the Local Planning Authority has been notified and/or the additional contamination has been fully assessed and an appropriate remediation and validation/reporting scheme agreed with the LPA. Remedial actions shall then be implemented in line with the agreed remediation scheme and a validation report will be provided to the LPA for consideration.

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.

**INFORMATIVE:** In relation to Condition No. 4, it is recommended that consideration be given to the use of external shading, designed according to the elevation in question (e.g. vertical shading works better on west facing elevations, while horizontal brise soleil works better on south facing elevations).

**INFORMATIVE:** The principle areas of concern that should be addressed are:

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

In the event that the application is refused, and an Appeal is lodged against the decision to refuse this application, delegated authority is sought to allow officers to negotiate and complete the Planning Obligation required in connection with this development.