

Application Number	18/1930/FUL	Agenda Item	
Date Received	7th January 2019	Officer	Tony Collins
Target Date	8th April 2019		
Ward	Market		
Site	Redevelopment Area Of Mill Lane Cambridge Cambridgeshire		
Proposal	Redevelopment of site to form expansion of Pembroke College comprising repurposing of existing buildings, demolition and erection of new buildings for a mix of uses comprising 94no. student residential units, 1478sqm B1 College office floorspace, 1773sqm D1 teaching space, 1004sqm D2 College leisure and community floorspace, 363sqm commercial A1, A2, A3, A4 retail, food and drink floorspace; and ancillary uses comprising landscaping and hard surfacing, formation of new courtesy crossing at Trumpington Street, highways, vehicular and cycle parking, and associated works and infrastructure.		
Applicant	Pembroke College		

<p>SUMMARY</p>	<p>The development accords with the Development Plan for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It would enhance the character of the conservation area and secure the future of locally and statutorily listed buildings within the site through adaptive reuse and new buildings of high quality • It provides 94 additional student rooms in accordance with site-specific policy 26 of the local plan. • Buildings, routes and spaces would be arranged to make the site attractive accessible and safe
-----------------------	---

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It would contribute to the improvement of the public realm
RECOMMENDATION	APPROVAL

1.0 SITE DESCRIPTION/AREA CONTEXT

- 1.1 The site, close to the city centre, between Trumpington Street and the River Cam, is part of an area designated U1 in the Proposals Schedule of the Cambridge Local Plan (2018), and subject to a site-specific policy in the plan (Policy 26). The capacity of the U1 site is described as ‘Student accommodation (indicative capacity of 350 student rooms), up to 6,000 m² commercial use, up to 75 bedroom hotel and up to 1,000 m² other uses.’
- 1.2 The site falls within the Historic Core conservation area. There are, on and adjacent to the site, a number of statutorily and locally listed buildings, and buildings identified in the conservation area appraisal as ‘positive’. These are shown in Tables 1 and 2 below. The site occupies the major part of the irregular quadrilateral formed by Trumpington Street, Mill Lane, Little St Mary’s Lane and Granta Place. It has extensive frontages on the first two of those streets and minor frontages on Little St Mary’s Lane. Mill Lane and Granta Place are described as ‘significant’ streets in the Historic Core Conservation Area Appraisal, while Little St Mary’s Lane is accorded ‘high’ significance in the appraisal, and Trumpington Street ‘very high’ significance.
- 1.3 The surrounding area contains mixed uses, but College sites predominate. Pembroke College is immediately opposite the site on the east side of Trumpington Street; Peterhouse lies to the south beyond Little St Mary’s church. The site to the north on the other side of Mill Lane is in University use. Some of the buildings are not fully occupied, but there are a number of administrative functions. There are a small number of houses immediately adjacent to the southern boundary of the site. Some of these are owned by colleges and used as student accommodation.
- 1.4 There are four trees within the site. The first, termed T001 in the application, is a 13m high honey locust in the centre of the

Millers Yard courtyard. The other three (T002, T0003 and T004) are sycamores, 18m, 18m and 20m high respectively, grouped closely together in the extreme south-west corner of the site, between 13 Little St Mary's Lane and the rear of the University Centre. T004 is the subject of a TPO. The other three trees are not, but are protected by their conservation area location.

1.5 The site falls within the controlled parking zone.

1.6 Part of the Millers Yard building within the site formerly housed the Old Orleans restaurant. This is designated (PH057) as a protected public house site under Policy 76 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2018.

Table 1: existing buildings within the application site

Name	Status	Position
1 Mill Lane	Grade II listed	On the corner of Mill Lane and Trumpington Street; NE corner of site
4 Mill Lane	'positive building' in the conservation area	Abuts No.1, west of it on the Mill Lane frontage
Stuart House	Building of Local Interest	In the centre of the site; paved space in front faces Mill Lane
Mill Lane Lecture Rooms	'positive building' in the conservation area	West of Stuart House, east of Millers' Yard. Abuts the Mill Lane footway between these buildings.
Millers Yard	Building of Local Interest	West of the Lecture Rooms. Abuts the Mill Lane footway. Has a courtyard element to the rear.
Bailey Grundy Barratt building	'positive building' in the conservation area	South of Millers' Yard. Accessed from an opening off Little St Mary's Lane

Emmanuel United Reformed Church	Grade II listed	Corner of Trumpington Street and Little St Mary's Lane. SE corner of site.
Emmanuel URC Church Hall	Building of Local Interest	To the rear of the URC church.
Kenmare House, 74 Trumpington Street	Grade II listed	Faces Trumpington Street
74a Trumpington Street	Grade II listed	Faces Trumpington Street, to the north of No.74

Table 2: existing buildings adjacent to the application site

Peterhouse Library	'positive building' in the conservation area	South of the site, across Little St Mary's Lane
University Centre	Grade II listed	West of the site, facing the river.
The Mill PH	Grade II listed	Adjacent to the NW corner of the site, facing Mill Lane.
11 Mill Lane	Grade II listed	
12 Mill Lane	Grade II listed	
1-4 Little St Mary's Lane	Grade II listed	Immediately adjacent to the south side of the site, between the site and Little St Mary's Lane.
5-7 Little St Mary's Lane	'positive building' in the conservation area	
8-11 Little-St Mary's Lane	Grade II listed	
12 and 13 Little St Mary's Lane	Grade II listed	
16 Mill Lane	'positive building' in the conservation area	On the opposite side of Mill Lane
17 Mill Lane	'positive building' in the conservation area	On the opposite side of Mill Lane
Old Court, Pembroke College	Grade I listed	On the opposite side of Trumpington Street

2.0 THE PROPOSAL

2.1 The proposal is most easily described by considering the application site in three parts: west, centre and east.

- 2.2 In the western section of the site, it is proposed to demolish the Mill Lane Lecture Rooms building, the Bailey Grundy Barratt building, and all of Millers' Yard except for the section of the building which faces Mill Lane. In the rectangular space thus created, a new college court (Dolby Court), providing postgraduate accommodation for Pembroke College, would be created. The court would have four-storey residential blocks on the west and north sides, and a lower block on the south side.
- 2.3 The north block of this court would be 16m high, and the south elevation facing the courtyard would be 27.5m long (7 bays). The building would be faced in red brick, chosen to echo the predominant material of the existing Pembroke College site. The ground floor would form a cloister along the courtyard with two floors of student rooms above, their 1.9m x 2.2m windows framed in reconstituted stone. The uppermost floor would be set slightly back behind a low parapet at 11m above ground, with a series of brick bays reaching forward to the plane of the elevation below. The windows at this level would be narrower, again framed in stone, but to a different pattern. The pitched roof would be covered in copper.
- 2.4 The north elevation, facing Mill Lane, would be of a similar design, but would have retail space on the ground floor. There would be two such units, with shop windows and doors set into the brick façade, and five bays of student room windows above on each floor.
- 2.5 At its south end, this block would be joined to, and linked internally with, the existing frontage building at Millers' Yard. Within the Millers' Yard building, the ground floor areas would be retained as retail space, while the office space which currently occupies the first floor would be reconfigured as student rooms forming part of the proposed new Dolby Court. The present added second floor would be demolished and replaced with a new second floor within a metal-clad mansard roof containing further student rooms. The existing metal gates closing the southern archway would be refurbished, while those in the central archway would be replaced by a glazed screen.
- 2.6 The west block would be of a very similar design to the new north block, and the same height, but with student rooms on the courtyard side of the ground floor rather than an arcade. It would stretch 31m along the west side of the court (8 bays), and

would be joined to the retained Millers Yard frontage building by a short, glazed and copper-clad link

- 2.7 On the south side of the court would be a third postgraduate accommodation block, 32m in length (9 bays). The design of this block would be related to, but distinct from, the other two blocks, and on a smaller scale. The block, which would abut directly the high brick wall forming the northern boundary of residential properties in Little St Mary's Lane, would be of three storeys, with the uppermost storey set into a pitched roof and served by dormer windows. The apex of the roof would be at 10m above ground, the eaves at 6.6m. The block would have the same reconstituted stone dressings and copper roof as the other two blocks, but would be faced in reclaimed gault brick. A passageway through the ground floor of the building would provide a pedestrian link from the court out to Little St Mary's Lane.
- 2.8 The room and stairwell windows on the south elevation of the south block would all be obscure glazed, and the third storey rooms on this side would be served by rooflights rather than dormers.
- 2.9 The centre of the proposed new court would be landscaped, with a lawn, trees and other planting, including climbing plants on the building elevations.
- 2.10 In the central part of the site, the existing Stuart House building would be retained. It would now form an eastern side to the proposed new student accommodation court (Dolby Court). The building, currently used by the University Careers Service, would be reconfigured internally to serve Pembroke College purposes. It would have social spaces and a reading room on the first floor, a café on the ground floor, and kitchens, staff rooms, storage and study spaces of different types in the basement. The exterior of the building would be unaltered. To the north of the building, the area currently occupied by cycle storage would be re-landscaped, with pollarded lime trees. The wrought-iron gates at the northern edge of the site here would be relocated further back from the highway, and extended to fill the whole space between the new north block of Dolby Court and the retained buildings on the east part of the site.

- 2.11 The eastern part of the site is currently occupied by a complicated group of buildings. In the north-east corner are Kenmare House (74 Trumpington Street) and its north-eastward extension (74a), and Nos. 1 and 4 Mill Lane. It is proposed to demolish the two-storey, twentieth-century extension at the south-west corner of Kenmare, and the two-storey south-western extension to No.4 Mill Lane, and to remove the dwarf wall separating the paved area in front of Kenmare from the highway. All of the remainder of these buildings, which lie outside the application site boundary would be retained: their interiors reconfigured for College use, but their external appearance unaltered.
- 2.12 In the south-east corner of the site is Emmanuel United Reformed Church which dates from 1874. It has ancillary buildings and spaces on its north side and to the rear: the School Hall, to the rear, built at the same time as the church; the additional schoolroom, east of the Hall, added in 1897, and the single-storey narthex at the northeast corner of the church, and the corridor linking it to the schoolroom, which were added in the 1990s. Between the church and Kenmare are two three-storey buildings facing Trumpington Street (Nos. 75 and 76), until recently linked to Kenmare, and used with it by the University Estate Management Service.
- 2.13 It is proposed to retain the original church building (which lies outside the application site), No.76 Trumpington Street, and the southernmost section of the Church Hall building, including the whole of its south gable, but to demolish the remainder of the buildings in this group: No.75 Trumpington Street, the later rear extension of No.76, the modern narthex and northern corridor of the church, the 'schoolroom' building to the north of the church, and all of the northern part of the church hall.
- 2.14. On the site of the present No.75, a new College gatehouse would be erected. This building, faced in a red brick, with stone dressings, would replicate the height and mass of No.75 on Trumpington Street, and would, as No.75 does, fill the space between Kenmare and No.76. The new building would have a porters' lodge on the ground floor, alongside which a wide pedestrian passageway would lead into the interior of the site. A canted additional arch would lead into this passageway from the Kenmare forecourt. This lodge and passageway would form the

main entrance to the proposed new Pembroke College site. The upper floor of this building would house an exhibition gallery.

- 2.15 No.76 would be retained, but the interior would be converted to offices toilets and a lift shaft to serve the porters' lodge and the gallery above. To the rear of the new gatehouse, a long single-storey space (8m x 17m) would be created, with glazing all along the north wall facing the proposed new Kenmare garden. This space would serve as the principal entrance to, and foyer for, a proposed new performance space in the URC church building. The church would be retained largely unaltered. No changes to it at all are proposed in the present application, but a future listed building consent application is expected to make relatively minor alterations to the interior. The foyer would connect the gatehouse to a bar and toilets contained within the footprint of the present Church Hall. The existing south gable, and part of the fabric of the west wall of the Hall would be retained, a new pitched roof would be constructed at a similar height to the present roof, and a new north gable added, with doors leading out to the Kenmare garden. A new single-storey link, faced in stone, would replace the existing narthex.
- 2.16 The proposals would create three new outdoor spaces, a central garden in the residential Dolby Court, which would have substantial planting, and paved spaces in front of Stuart House and to the rear of Kenmare, which would both be mainly paved, with some trees.
- 2.17 It is expected that the proposed development would be delivered in two phases: the Trumpington Street buildings in Phase 1 and the Stuart House and residential court areas in Phase 2

3.0 SITE HISTORY

- 3.1 This is a large and complex site, with a lengthy planning history. I have limited the list below to applications made in the two decades prior to the present application. I do not consider that any of the earlier applications on the site are of relevance.

3.2

Ref.	Site	Description	Outcome
98/0186	Stuart House	Platform lift	Approved with conditions
98/0309	Kenmare	Internal alterations to reception area	Approved with conditions
01/0314	4 Mill Lane	Fire escape door	Approved with conditions
01/0315	4 Mill Lane	Fire escape door	Approved with conditions
01/0625	Kenmare	Security cameras	Approved with conditions
02/0067	Kenmare	Security cameras	Withdrawn
02/0068	Kenmare	Security cameras	Approved with conditions
04/0054	Kenmare and 4 Mill Lane	Cycle parking stands and shelter; installation of fire escape door.	Approved with conditions
04/0859	Bailey Grundy Barrett Building	Forming of new opening and installation of window.	Approved with conditions
05/0431	Mill Lane Lecture Rooms	External fire exit staircase and air handling unit.	Approved with conditions
12/0078	Kenmare	Internal alterations to ground floor and first floor.	Approved with conditions
14/0150	Millers' Yard	Proposed change of use of premises from a mixed use Class (B1(a) office) and Class A3 (restaurant use) to a sui-generis graduate student accommodation development, including alterations and extensions to provide a total of 97 study bedrooms including ancillary facilities.	Withdrawn

16/0011	Bailey Grundy Barrett Building	Vary condition 2 of C/98/0433 to allow the building to be used for general office (B1a) use rather than being limited to University use.	Approved with conditions
18/1011	Kenmare	External repairs and re-decorations and internal refurbishments.	Approved with conditions
18/1931	Whole block south of Mill Lane	Demolition of rear two storey extension to Kenmare House, dwarf wall of Kenmare House fronting Trumpington Street, narthex, foyer spaces, lobby, two storey school rooms and north gable end of Emmanuel United Reformed Church; and alterations to 1 Mill Lane, Kenmare House, and Emmanuel United Reformed Church, in connection with expansion of Pembroke College.	Under consideration

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 2018 policies, Supplementary Planning Documents and Material Considerations.

5.2 Relevant Development Plan policies

PLAN	POLICY NUMBER
Cambridge Plan 2018	Local 1 26 28 31 32 33 34 35 36 46 55 56 57 58 59 60 61 62 63 64 68 69 70 71 76 80 81 82 85

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

Central Government Guidance	National Planning Policy Framework July 2018 National Planning Policy Framework – Planning Practice Guidance from 3 March 2014 onwards Circular 11/95 (Annex A)
Supplementary Planning Documents	Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Flood and Water SPD
Previous Supplementary Planning Documents (These documents, prepared to support policies in the 2006 local plan are no longer SPDs, but are still material considerations.)	Sustainable Design and Construction (May 2007) Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Waste Partnership (RECAP): Waste Management Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (February 2012) Planning Obligation Strategy (March 2010) Public Art (January 2010) Old Press/Mill Lane Supplementary Planning Document (January 2010)

<p>Material Considerations</p>	<p><u>City Wide Guidance</u></p> <p>Air Quality in Cambridge – Developers Guide (2008)</p> <p>Arboricultural Strategy (2004)</p> <p>Biodiversity Checklist for Land Use Planners in Cambridgeshire and Peterborough (March 2001).</p> <p>Buildings of Local Interest (2005)</p> <p>Cambridge and Milton Surface Water Management Plan (2011)</p> <p>Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (November 2010)</p> <p>Cambridge City Council Draft Air Quality Action Plan 2018-2023</p> <p>Cambridge City Council Waste and Recycling Guide: For Developers.</p> <p>Cambridge City Nature Conservation Strategy (2006)</p> <p>Cambridge Walking and Cycling Strategy (2002)</p> <p>Cambridgeshire County Council Transport Assessment Guidelines (2017)</p> <p>Cambridgeshire Design Guide For Streets and Public Realm (2007)</p>
	<p><u>Area Guidelines</u></p> <p>Cambridge Historic Core Conservation Area Appraisal (2015)</p>

6.0 CONSULTATIONS

Cambridgeshire County Council (Highways Development Management)

First advice (31.01.2019)

6.1 Principle of providing an additional pedestrian crossing to Trumpington Street south of its junction with Pembroke Street and Mill Lane is acceptable. However, the Highway Authority requests that the application be refused on the grounds of highway safety in its present format, for the following reasons:

- Stage One Road Safety Audit must be undertaken and all problems that the audit may identify must be satisfactorily resolved.
- No guarantee that the applicants' interpretation of pre-application discussions matches that of the Highway Authority.
- Confusion as to whether proposed crossing is to be a 'courtesy' crossing or a Zebra Crossing. It must be made absolutely clear what type of crossing is being proposed.
- The proposed 'median strip' has the potential to create a sense of 'lane ownership' by drivers and thus increase vehicular speeds
- The proposed introduction of granite sett banding across the carriageway creates a potentially significant slip hazard

6.2 Additionally:

- descriptions of the proposed materials to be used within the highway are too generic
- the plans show private water draining onto the adopted public highway
- natural York stone should be laid with a cross fall of 1:30 and not 1:41 as shown

Second comments, following submission of revised crossing design (20.05.2019)

6.3 I would still seek a Stage One Road safety audit for the proposal as per my original comments of 31st Jan.2019.

- 6.4 I am concerned that the build outs are quite steep and given the level of cycle usage that Trumpington Street experiences this may easily lead to cyclists being 'pushed' into the path of cars traveling adjacent or behind them, creating 'side swipe' conflicts. There may be a requirement for some lining to create a more gentle integration movement.
- 6.5 The use of brass studs will not be acceptable. They have been used in the City Centre and have proven to be very slippery when wet and a significant hazard.
- 6.6 The use of any strips at right angles to the carriageway will not be acceptable as this could be read as a formal crossing.
- 6.7 I note there is no indication of the proposed materials.

Cambridgeshire County Council (Transportation)

- 6.8 The site is within Central Cambridge and is well connected to City cycle network, and key walking routes. The site is well connected to the City bus network.
- 6.9 The traffic and pedestrian surveys provided by the applicant are agreed.
- 6.10 The applicant has provided the 60 month road traffic accident record for the period January 2012 to January 2017. However, the applicant should update the road traffic accident record to the latest available date in summer 2018.
- 6.11 The number of cycle parking provision and location complies with the Cambridge City Council minimum cycle parking standards. However, consideration should be given for the cycle parking to be covered, and provisions should be made to enhance publicly accessible cycle parking. The applicant should provide further detail showing the type and the location of the cycle parking spaces, including details of any cycle parking to be covered.
- 6.12 The disabled car parking provision complies with the Cambridge City Council's standards and is recommended to be agreed.
- 6.13 The trip generation rates and mode provided by the applicant are agreed.

6.14 The Transport Statement includes a new pedestrian crossing to improve the pedestrian connection between the new student accommodation and the main Pembroke College site, on Trumpington Street. These improvements should be secured via a condition should approval be given. The proposed mitigation is agreed as being appropriate. Provision of loading space for servicing vehicles on Mill Lane outside Stuart House is appropriate. These improvements should be secured via a condition should approval be given. The proposals for the enhancement to the surfacing of Mill Lane and river are supported. These improvements should be secured via a condition should approval be given.

Environmental Health

6.15 This service has no objection in principle to this application providing the following environmental health issues and any associated effects / impacts are controlled by the imposition of the recommended conditions to protect the health and quality of life of existing and proposed residential units / premises and in particular residential close to the application site boundary and other premises in the area:

- Construction Phase Environmental Impacts / Pollution
- Noise and Vibration – Operational
- Habitable Rooms – Noise Insulation
- Air Quality – Operational
- Ventilation Extraction, Filtration and Abatement Scheme – Odour Operational
- Artificial Lighting – Operational
- Contaminated Land

6.16 The eighteen conditions recommended for these impacts will ensure that either no significant environmental health adverse impacts will arise or where there is the potential for any residual adverse impacts to arise they will be mitigated and reduced to a minimum and acceptable level.

Urban Design

75 Trumpington Street

- 6.17 In urban design and townscape terms the replacement building that forms the new gatehouse into new Pembroke College site is considered to be a well-designed and sensitive insertion into the existing streetscape.
- 6.18 The scale is not overly assertive and does not compete with the gatehouse of the existing College on the opposite side of Trumpington Street. At pre-application discussions, the junction with Kenmare House and No.76 Trumpington Street were discussed at length. The new gatehouse attaches itself to Kenmare House to maintain the continuity of the street frontage and containment of its threshold space. At the parapet level, the new gatehouse subtly asserts itself over the retained No. 76.
- 6.19 In terms of materials, the palette is well chosen with the predominant use of red brick. The textural quality of the brickwork will be crucial to the success of this building and the detailed bay studies provide a promising indication of the intent. The use of stone to accent the first floor windows is considered successful and helps to highlight the prominence of the new entrance in view looking up and down Trumpington Street. All materials will need to be covered by condition should the application be approved.

Trumpington Street crossing

- 6.20 With the addition of the new Pembroke College site on the west side of Trumpington Street, it is imperative that an easy connection is achieved between both sides of the street. The proposal for an informal crossing that reduces motor vehicle speeds through changes to carriageway materials and visual narrowing is supported in design terms if a below 20mph design speed can be achieved. We would have significant concerns about the impact of a signalised crossing in this location on the quality of the streetscape.

Stuart House public realm

- 6.21 The proposals introduce a significant improvement to the threshold and setting of Stuart House. The changes are supported in urban design terms and will provide an enhanced approach to Stuart House and a de-cluttered setting. The effective College management of this space will be needed to ensure that this remains the case. At a detailed level, the repaved footway on Mill Lane needs to be constructed to allow vehicle overrun because it will be used by delivery and refuse vehicles.

Mill Lane and Dolby Court (new buildings)

- 6.22 The replacement of the Lecture Block with the student accommodation and retail units is a significant change to the street but is considered to be acceptable in urban design terms. The materials palette goes some way to ensuring that the new building maintains a more muted quality. The new retail units will introduce a level activity to Mill Lane and have the potential to add to the vibrancy of the street. It is crucial that the signage for new units is sensitively handled and intended signage zones should be shown on the elevations. The proposed rendered stall risers should be changed to a more robust finish such as glazed bricks. The transparency of the glazed shop windows also needs to be maintained. We would suggest that the applicant devise a tenant-landlord strategy to maintain the quality of shopfront and ensure a consistency of approach.
- 6.23 At pre-application discussions we encouraged a subtly different approach to the south building in Dolby Court. The proposals have taken this approach and accordingly are supported in the urban design terms. All materials will need to be covered by condition should the application be approved.

Conservation Team

Introduction

- 6.24 The significance of establishing a Pembroke College court at Mill Lane should not be overlooked. For over 650 years the College, has contained its growth to the Trumpington Street/ Downing Street/ Tennis Court Road block. The current proposals represent a historic leap across Trumpington Street.

To the street's West side, the city block down to the river has equally historically, been an area of distinctly different character to the college sites. It is the only remaining large block of the city centre that retains a former industrial/commercial character and reminders of commercial links to the river.

- 6.25 The particular qualities of the streets comprising the Mill Lane locality are noted in the Council's street by street "Historic Core Conservation Area Appraisal" adopted on 27th June 2017.
- 6.26 The Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires special attention be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of a conservation area. (Section 72(1)).

SPD, NPPF & Conservation Area Appraisal

- 6.27 An SPD for the wider Old Press/Mill Lane area including this site was prepared from 2007 and adopted in 2010 includes that, "Buildings of Local Interest (BLI), together with other buildings identified as making a positive contribution to the Conservation Area, while not statutorily listed, will normally be retained unless there are clear public benefits arising from their redevelopment." (SPD 6.2.4). The proposals do not appear to be in line with the SPD in this respect (see SPD page 46, Plan 12a "Development Potential").
- 6.28 Whilst statutory Listed buildings are of course retained and the alterations proposed to various of the buildings on the site are acceptable, several of the demolitions proposed are of buildings of interest in the conservation area. Buildings that would be demolished are The Mill Lane Lecture Halls; Miller's Yard (except the front building); The Bailey Grundy Barrett (BGB) Building; most of the United Reformed Church school rooms.
- 6.29 In terms of justification for demolition in the submitted Heritage Statement, the BGB building is said to produce only a limited number of student units and would compromise the creation of a court. The lecture theatres, high ceilings and tall windows of the Lecture block are said to prevent its conversion to other uses. It is also said to be out of scale with the site. Conversion of Miller's Yard to student rooms it is said would result in sub-standard rooms and retaining the rear blocks would also compromise the proposed court.

- 6.30 The Heritage Statement considers the “harms” to be of the Less Than Substantial level. Loss of e.g. The Lecture Block and the BGB building are said to be minor Less Than Substantial harm. The proposed Dolby Court building is said to be an enhancement. Overall, it considers there would be a low level of harm to the conservation area (p.48).
- 6.31 The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) makes clear that conservation areas are designated heritage assets. When considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, the NPPF advises that *great weight* should be given to the asset’s conservation. “Positive buildings” make a positive contribution to the character or appearance of the Conservation Area, and therefore merit consideration in accordance with clause 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.

The Historic Core Conservation Area Appraisal

- 6.32 Following public consultation, the Historic Core Conservation Area Appraisal was approved by the Executive Councillor on the 27th June 2017. The appraisal uses a “street by street” format. Each has a section in the appraisal and a grade (in the range of significance: Very High/High/Significant/Low) for its importance in the Central Conservation Area.
- 6.33 The Trumpington Street (significance: Very High) section notes the Emmanuel United Reformed Church at the corner of Little St Mary’s Lane as a landmark building of importance; that “Scattered along the street are remaining groups of townhouses, many of which are now in college ownership“; and “The open channels of Hobson’s Conduit and crossings over in stone, cast iron, etc. help to emphasise this important historic feature of the street”. Notably, it does not assign any particular status to no75Trumpington Street. The Mill Lane (Significant) section indicates nos.4 and 8 (The Lecture Halls) as Positive Buildings and Stuart House and Millers Yard as BLIs. The Little St Mary’s Lane section (High) identifies the Bailey Grundy Barrett Building as a Positive Building. It also notes nos.5,6, and 7 within the otherwise Listed run of cottages as Positive Buildings. The Granta Place (Significant) section notes the various Listed Buildings (including The University Centre) and the Peterhouse Ward Library/former Museum of Classical Archaeology as Positive. The Coe Fen & Sheep’s Green (Very

High) section map indicates key positive views across the fen towards Mill Lane.

- 6.34 Beyond the Trumpington Street frontage, the character of the Mill Lane part of the conservation area is markedly different from the College dominated or the retail or housing dominated parts of the conservation area. This difference originates from Mill Lane's history as a commercial area related principally, both to the Mills and granaries, but also the 19th/early 20th century development of Cambridge University Press, and to still later University facilities of the first half of the 20th century. Its different character is exhibited in the appearance of the buildings that remain and is derived from these former uses.

Conservation Team Assessment

- 6.35 There are then, instances of conflict between the Historic Core Appraisal and the proposals i.e. the demolition of The Bailey Grundy Barrett Building and the Mill Lane Lecture Halls and much of the Miller's Yard buildings. Local Plan Policy 61: states: "(b) retain buildings and spaces, the loss of which would cause harm to the character or appearance of the conservation area;" and Policy 62: "The Council will actively seek the retention of local heritage assets,"
- 6.36 In terms of *appearance*, the Mill Lane Lecture Halls is clearly a prominent building in the street but simply because the Bailey Grundy Barrett Building is somewhat removed and Miller's Yard's off-street buildings are around a yard should not, in a City like Cambridge with many yards, lanes and courts, imply a lack of importance. In terms of *character* of the conservation area, the Mill Lane Lecture block is representative of the University's piecemeal 20th Century development in the conservation area. The Bailey Grundy Barrett Building and Miller's Yard are representative of the commercial uses that were part of the area's character. In SPD they were envisaged as suitable for re-use given sympathetic conversion. They also have associations with the wider conservation area:

In 1896, Addenbrooke's Hospital commissioners looked into lighting the hospital by electricity and engaged Bailey, Grundy & Barrett to install it (Bailey, Grundy & Barrett Co were electrical and mechanical engineers whose dynamo supplied the first public electricity in the town centre).

Similarly, the Lecture Halls building's significance in the CA is partly a link to the Fitzwilliam Museum via the same architects practice. The Miller's Yard buildings date from the mid-19th century, but part of the rear blocks to be demolished appear to be of earlier construction (and may reflect a building layout characteristic of the Custance 1798 map). These building's significance to the conservation area is not simply about visual contribution.

- 6.37 The contribution of these buildings to the varied grain and gradual development of the Mill Lane blocks has arguably not been fully considered and contrasts with courts on the scale and character of traditional college court layouts - which are uncharacteristic of the Mill Lane area, which has had a finer grain of development. The College presence on Trumpington Street would be signalled by a new entrance building/lodge. The resultant Mill Lane frontage would carry a prominent new college building where the Lecture Halls currently stand. At Little St Mary's Lane, the new college halls would be apparent behind and beside the Listed cottages and the University Centre. Much of the Mill Lane southern block would become a college site and therefore have a more homogenous character than currently or historically.

Impacts on the settings of Listed Buildings

- 6.38 University Centre: The setting to the rear would alter following demolitions with the new range of Dolby Court being taller than the buildings to be replaced (though slightly further back), comparable in scale to the University Centre; and due to tree removal. Nevertheless, this scale is unlikely to be apparent from the surroundings.
- 6.39 Little St Mary's Lane: The tall wall behind the houses is to be retained. Beyond this the existing tall Lecture Rooms building would be removed, the new south range buildings being much lower. Massing in the settings of the Listed houses would effectively be "relocated" further to the west by the new west range building.
- 6.40 12 & 13 Mill Lane and The Mill PH: No.12 adjoins Miller's Yard, the roof of which is to be remodelled. This new roof would not be characteristic of the existing buildings in the frontage setting and changes the relationships in this run of buildings (in which

No 12, the three story former town house, has been dominant). As it is immediately adjoining, I consider this will create some harm to the significance of no.12. The taller new north range building will also arise behind this building.

Summary

6.41 The overall character of the conservation area would undoubtedly be altered. With substantial demolitions of buildings identified as “positive”, in the Core Appraisal and for sympathetic conversion in the SPD there would be a considerable amount of demolition overall.

6.42 Even if the application’s assessment of the level of that harm was accepted at face value, that assessment is then subject to the NPPF statement thateven Less Than Substantial harm must be balanced against the “great weight” to be afforded to the conservation of the heritage asset. This must be considered in comparison to what the Planning Committee consider are the public benefits of the proposals (see 1.32 page 4 of the submitted Planning Statement). In doing so, NPPF guidance should be recognised requiring the balancing exercise to be a weighted balance (“great weight should be given to the asset’s conservation“) towards conservation of designated heritage assets (including the conservation area).

6.43 Should Planning Committee be minded to approve the application 18/1930/FUL with the extent of greater than expected demolitions in Mill Lane site South side, it is recommended that in order to help conserve the character of the conservation area across the mill Lane site as a whole, the committee resolve that when proposals for the North side of the wider Mill Lane site come forward these will be expected to incorporate greater retention and conversion of Positive and BLI buildings than the University’s masterplan framework currently indicates.

6.44 Conditions are recommended to require submission of:

- a demolition method statement for 75 Trumpington St to ensure support to adjoining buildings
- samples of new roof covering for Stuart House.
- the detailed design of grates over Hobsons Conduit

Senior Sustainability Officer (Design and Construction)

6.45 The proposed scheme integrates a number of approaches related to sustainable design and construction including:

- Designing Dolby Court to achieve the Building Research Establishment Environmental Assessment Method (BREEAM) 'excellent' standard. The BREEAM pre-assessment shows a predicted score of 75.59%, with a potential score of 88.05%.
- Implementation of a range of measures in existing buildings being refurbished to enhance their energy performance including improved insulation where appropriate, use of secondary glazing or replacement double glazing, LED lighting, Mechanical Ventilation with Heat Recovery (MVHR) and connection of buildings to a site wide heating and cooling network connected to the air source heat pumps being provided as part of the Dolby Court development.
- The use of air source heat pumps, and potentially photovoltaic panels, to reduce carbon emissions by up to 30% compared to baseline carbon emissions.
- Deep window reveals to reduce solar gain, alongside natural ventilation and high thermal mass through plastered concrete soffits. It will be important to ensure that night purge ventilation takes place and that windows facing Mill Lane and the UC yard can be opened as MVHR alone is not usually designed to help deal with overheating.

6.46 The measures above are all supported.

6.47 The one area where the proposals do not currently meet adopted policy requirements is in relation to water efficiency within Dolby Court. Policy 28 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2018 requires maximum credits from BREEAM Wat 01 to be achieved, an approach that normally requires the use of water reuse or rainwater harvesting. However, it is noted from the BREEAM pre-assessment that the scheme is currently only on target to achieve 2 Wat 01 credits, with a third credit possible. Given the level of water stress facing Cambridge, further information is required as to whether it is feasible or viable for the scheme to achieve maximum Wat 01 credits and if this is not the case, whether more confidence could be given that 3 credits, which would equate to a 40% reduction in baseline water use, could be achieved, which would get the scheme a

little closer to the 5 credits required by policy. I would suggest that condition wording be used to secure at least 3 credits, with wording suggested above.

Head of Streets and Open Spaces (Tree Team)

6.48 No comments made.

Head of Streets and Open Spaces (Landscape Team)

6.49 There is concern about the loss of the two large trees along Little Saint Mary's Lane. While only one has a Tree Protection Order, they all have a significant public presence and their loss would change the feel of this area dramatically. We would seek a solution which might retain more of the trees. Tree planting strategy should also seek to mitigate with the use of at least two large growing trees. There is scope within the design to achieve this and it would aid in mitigating the canopy loss incurred by the loss of 3 trees with wide and impactful canopies.

6.50 The landscape proposals on the whole are acceptable and sensitively considered. The resultant landscape is likely to provide a charming setting for the redeveloped area. Conditions recommended on landscape details and landscape maintenance and management.

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

6.51 Agree with County Highways comments regarding the need for additional visitor cycle parking given the lack of such parking in the area, and the demand from University buildings such as the University Centre.

6.52 This area is difficult for pedestrians and cyclists to negotiate, particularly those wanting to cross from Pembroke St to Mill Lane. The crossing should be a zebra, not a courtesy crossing which has no status and in this heavily trafficked environment is unlikely to be very effective unless the nature of the whole area is changed to create more of a shared space feel similar to the Oxford Frideswide Square scheme. The position of the zebra is set back a long way from the junction and does not serve the crossing of Pembroke St to Mill Lane and so if possible should be moved nearer to the junction.

6.53 Cyclists leaving the development, heading north have to negotiate a very difficult junction with Silver St coming into conflict with most of the traffic which is turning left. Consideration should be given to a change in priority at this junction to improve safety for cyclists.

6.54 Mill Lane footways are very narrow and any increase in numbers accessing the development will make the situation worse. Footways should be widened and passing spaces provided for vehicles or a shared space environment considered which increases space available to pedestrians.

Cambridgeshire County Council (Flood and Water Management)

6.55 At present we object to the grant of planning permission for the following reasons:

6.56 The proposals are not in accordance with policy 31 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2018 because:

- a) no surface drainage methods have been employed, only underground traditional drainage techniques.
- b) no green features have been proposed, despite the landscape areas offering opportunities for bio-retention features.
- c) no rainwater harvesting is proposed.
- d) drainage features do not contribute to making places for people.
- e) there are no multi-functional drainage features.
- f) there are small areas of flat roof that have not employed green or brown roofs.
- g) because of the use of traditional hard surfaces and absence of SuDs techniques, there will be discharge for all rainfall events.
- h) no treatment of run-off to minimise pollution has been proposed.
- k) none of the hard surfaces are permeable.

6.57 It is not clear what the overall discharge rate from the site will be. Table 1 within the submitted Drainage Feasibility Study indicates that the discharge from Phase 1 will be 28.87 l/s. However the drainage layout drawing indicates that the hydrobrake within manhole FCMH2 is restricting flow to 3 l/s as

do the flow control calculations. This should be clarified within the report.

Head of Streets and Open Spaces (Sustainable Drainage Officer)

6.58 The Drainage Feasibility Study for the proposed development was written in November 2017, since then the Cambridge Local Plan 2018 has been adopted. This has changed the requirements for the management of surface water run-off. Previously developed sites must now go back to greenfield run-off rates and substantive SuDs must be used throughout the development. It appears that only underground attenuation is proposed. This is traditional drainage as there is no water quality, biodiversity or amenity benefit provided by the SuDs. This was explained to the applicant in early pre-application meetings in 2017. The proposals do not meet the new planning policy requirements specifically:

6.59 The proposals are not in accordance with policy 31 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2018 because:

- a) no surface drainage methods have been employed, only underground traditional drainage techniques.
- b) no green features have been proposed, despite the landscape areas offering opportunities for bio-retention features.
- c) no rainwater harvesting is proposed.
- d) drainage features do not contribute to making places for people.
- e) there are no multi-functional drainage features.
- f) there are small areas of flat roof that have not employed green or brown roofs.
- g) because of the use of traditional hard surfaces and absence of SuDs techniques, there will be discharge for all rainfall events.
- h) no treatment of run-off to minimise pollutions has been proposed.
- k) none of the hard surfaces are permeable.

6.60 The proposals are not in accordance with policy 32 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2018 because:

- a) the peak rate of run-off is greater for the developed site than it was for the undeveloped site;
- b) given the above, the alternative of limiting discharge to 2 litre/s/ha for all events up to the 100-year return period event has not been achieved.
- c) the development has not been designed to avoid the flooding of property in and adjacent to the development for a 1 in 100 year event, plus an allowance for climate change and in the event of local drainage system failure;
- d) the discharge locations do not have the capacity to receive all foul and surface water flows from the development, including discharge by infiltration, into water bodies and into sewers;
- e) no management and maintenance plan for the lifetime of the development (including 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) has been submitted.

6.61 In conclusion, the proposals are a traditional surface water drainage strategy that is not compliant with current planning policy and may increase flood risk in certain areas due to an incorrect method of calculation existing discharge rates. There are no SuDs features employed and no biodiversity, water quality or amenity benefits to the scheme.

6.62 The proposals should be reviewed in the light of current planning policy.

Head of Streets and Open Spaces (Nature Conservation Officer)

6.63 Peregrine Falcons regularly use the Emmanuel United Reformed Church as a perch and feeding post. My understanding is that they have recently been nesting just offsite, but the church should be considered part of their immediate nesting territory. The submitted ecological report suggests protection of peregrine and redstart nests by survey and if necessary delay to demolition, and also suggests provision of bird boxes for redstarts and peregrines. These provisions should be secured by condition.

- 6.64 The report also recommends the installation of a Biodiverse roof. This would achieve biodiversity net gain, and is supported.
- 6.65 I have reviewed the submitted bat surveys and am content with the survey effort and recommendations. No bat roosts were discovered on site. The submitted ecology report suggests that should the works planned not commence before 2020 then, update surveys take place prior to the commencement of works. This is to account for the fact that bats are mobile species and the pattern of use of buildings and other structures for roosting can vary over time. Recommend a condition to secure this.
- 6.66 An opportunity is available to update the lighting scheme at this site to reduce current light spillage. The ecology report suggests that artificial lighting is only directed where necessary for health and safety reasons, that lighting should not illuminate any trees and lighting should only be used for the period of time for which it is required. This can be achieved by following accepted best practice. Recommend this be demonstrated prior to determination or via condition.

Historic England

Background

- 6.67 The existing buildings and their layout reflect the evolution of this edge of historic town area. The earliest structures appear to date from the Georgian era, although clearly plot divisions and other evidence reflect the earlier history of this area of the town, traditionally associated with the mills on the Cam, and lying outside the King's Ditch. Rebuilding schemes in the past have erased some aspects of the site's former character.

The Lecture Rooms Block

- 6.68 The Mill Lane Lecture Rooms building of 1931-3 is an interesting example of inter-war neo-Georgian design. The style, often to be found in civic buildings of the period, is here carried out with considerable finesse, including a frontispiece feature formed from a classical doorcase and linked first floor window, and stone first floor window surrounds. The quality of brickwork detailing is high, and the building makes a notable contribution to the varied street scene of Mill Lane, not least due to its remarkable proportions, having a storey height that is

nearly twice that of some of the earlier buildings on the street.

- 6.69 The scale and overall form of the Lecture Rooms block have been shown to be key elements in preventing it being incorporated into the new accommodation for Pembroke College. While noting its contribution to the conservation area, we accept that a case has been made for its loss. The proposed new block of accommodation on its site, facing both Mill Lane and Dolby Court, has the potential to make a positive contribution to the street scene. It has been designed to address the street, and the Mill Lane front, and particularly the key corner and side elevation towards Stuart House are well thought out and fully articulated.

75 Trumpington Street

- 6.70 Considerable thought and design focus has been given to the major issue of how Dolby Court will be accessed, and the appropriate status of such an entrance. Pembroke College have made clear in the course of negotiations the importance of an appropriate status to such an entrance, and their desire as client that it should be clear that this forms part of the wider college group of buildings, the main entrance to which is on the opposing side of Trumpington Street.
- 6.71 Following extensive analysis and design option appraisal we accept that a strong case has been made that the replacement of the existing late-nineteenth century former commercial premises at 75 Trumpington Street with a new entrance block is an appropriate approach to the challenges of providing the college's desired new entrance while respecting the character of this diverse block of the historic street. The existing building has been shown to be of little or no historical interest, and is undoubtedly the weakest building in the group in visual terms. Its partially rebuilt blank gable to the north, facing the forecourt of Kenmare House, is unattractive and has a negative impact on Kenmare's setting. Retention of parts of the existing building might have been possible but it was shown that such an approach would have little or no benefit, while only providing compromised accommodation.
- 6.72 The design of the proposed new Trumpington Street elevation for the entrance block has been the subject of design revision since our last pre-application meeting and we welcome the

revisions made. Both elevations of the entrance pavilion, both towards Trumpington Street and to the forecourt of Kenmare, are now more carefully scaled and articulated. Within a varied historic streetscape such as this, with diverse architectural styles and no consistent scale to the existing buildings, there exists the opportunity for a new intervention to complement the existing, while making a clear architectural statement of its own. That said, the success of any intervention will be highly dependent on its context, as it will be judged as part of the wider street scene. We believe that the design has now achieved an appropriate balance between new design intervention and contextual response.

Former United Reformed Church

- 6.73 The incorporation of the United Reformed Church within the Pembroke scheme gives the opportunity for considerable public benefits, which have been embraced by the evolving proposals. The location of the proposed entrance pavilion at 75 Trumpington Street also allows its facilities to be incorporated into the support spaces for the reuse of the URC building. Although intervention to the listed church itself would be minimal, the proposals include the replacement of almost all of its secondary buildings. Most of these are modern and of little or no heritage value. The former school block to the north-west corner of the URC site does, however, have some significance. Under the proposals this building would be largely demolished, with the exception of the southern gable and part of the side wall. The main historic interest is undoubtedly in the gable, and the powerful presence it has when seen from the south, from Little St Mary's Lane. The information supporting the scheme has shown that the remainder of the building has been heavily altered, to the point that what significance it might have had can be said to have been seriously compromised. In our opinion this level of demolition has been justified.

The wider scheme

- 6.74 The design of the main buildings of the new Dolby Court has been carried out in such a manner as to respect and enhance the key elements of the site and its wider context. The southern range of the court is stepped down in scale to respect the existing domestic buildings on Little St Mary's Lane, which lie outside the scheme. As noted above, we particularly note the

care with which the handling of the elevations of the block that will replace the Lecture Rooms building has been handled. This elevation, and particular its corner, are prominent in views down Mill Lane from Pembroke Street due to the shape of the street. The incorporation of Stuart House as the east side of the new court is also to be welcomed, as well as the conversion of Kenmare House and other Trumpington Street buildings and their conversion to appropriate new uses.

- 6.75 National policy as set out in the NPPF makes clear the government's commitment to sustainable development (para 7 & 8). Heritage assets are an irreplaceable resource, and should be conserved in a manner appropriate to their significance (para 184). When considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated asset, great weight should be given to the assets conservation (para 193). Harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal, including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use (para 196).

Summary

- 6.76 The proposed new Dolby Court and related facilities provide an opportunity to enhance this extensive site within the conservation area, involving both new buildings and the re-use of existing historic buildings, several of which are listed. The new build elements of the proposals are potentially a major addition to the distinguished group of buildings that make up Pembroke College, and should enrich the conservation area while respecting its character and grain. Although some buildings will be lost, most notably the Lecture Rooms block, we have considered the justification provided, and the evidence of the options explored for potential retention, and believe that a convincing case has been made for their removal.
- 6.77 Historic England has no objection to the application on heritage grounds.
- 6.78 We consider that the application meets the requirements of the NPPF, in particular paragraph numbers 184, 193 & 196.

Environment Agency

6.79 The Agency has no objection in principle to the proposed development. It offers the following recommendations and informatives.

6.80 Surface Water:

- All surface water from roofs shall be piped direct to an approved surface water system using sealed downpipes. Open gullies should not be used.
- Only clean, uncontaminated surface water should be discharged to any soakaway, watercourse or surface water sewer.

6.81 Pollution Control:

- Surface water from roads and impermeable vehicle parking areas shall be discharged via trapped gullies.
- Prior to being discharged into any watercourse, surface water sewer or soakaway system, all surface water drainage from lorry parks and/or parking areas for fifty car park spaces or more and hardstandings should be passed through an oil interceptor designed compatible with the site being drained. Roof water shall not pass through the interceptor.
- Site operators should ensure that there is no possibility of contaminated water entering and polluting surface or underground waters.

6.82 Foul Water Drainage:

- Foul water drainage should be discharged to the public foul sewer, with the prior approval of Anglian Water.
- Anglian Water Services Ltd. should be consulted by the Local Planning Authority and be requested to demonstrate that the sewerage and sewage disposal systems serving the development have sufficient capacity to accommodate the additional flows, generated as a result of the development, without causing pollution or flooding. If there is not capacity in either of the sewers, the Agency must be reconsulted with alternative methods of disposal.

6.83 Contaminated Land:

- Proposal not considered High Risk. No site-specific advice. The developer should address risks to controlled waters from contamination at the site, following the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework and the Environment Agency Guiding Principles for Land Contamination.
- If during development, contamination not previously identified is found to be present at the site then no further development (unless otherwise agreed in writing with the local planning authority) shall be carried out until the developer has submitted a remediation strategy to the local planning authority detailing how this unsuspected contamination shall be dealt with and obtained written approval from the local planning authority. The remediation strategy shall be implemented as approved.
- The water environment is potentially vulnerable and there is an increased potential for pollution from inappropriately located and/or designed infiltration (SuDS). The proposals will need to comply with EA Groundwater protection position statements G1 and G9 to G13.

6.84 General:

- Any oil storage tank shall be sited on an impervious base and surrounded by oil tight bunded walls. The installation must comply with Control of Pollution Regulations 2001, and Control of Pollution (Oil Storage) Regulations 2001.

Anglian Water

6.85 The surface water strategy/flood risk assessment submitted with the planning application relevant to Anglian Water is acceptable. We request that the agreed strategy is reflected in the planning approval [by means of a condition].

Greater Cambridge Shared Waste Service

Student accommodation element

6.86 Scheme proposes daily collection of:

- 4 x 1100 refuse
- 1 x 1100 recycling

1 x 240 green waste

- 6.87 On the other buildings the submission indicates refuse and recycling will be a 50/50 split; this should also apply to the residential units, so 4 x 1100 recycling are required.

Commercial element (retail + college admin, teaching, social and cultural elements)

- 6.88 This is a very comprehensive waste management plan, which is good to see. The application is a mixture of domestic and commercial uses. This plan covers everything I'd expect to see and can be agreed – as with all city centre sites the key to a successful waste scheme is the frequency of collection. The material mixture of bins can be changed easily as required by site users – the important thing is there being enough space to suitably store them in good and safe order.
- 6.89 The developer should be aware that for domestic collections – which are provided once fortnightly per material type – if there is not the capacity to last the fortnight then commercial rates are applied for any additional collections. These could quickly become a significant cost to the College.

Cambridgeshire Constabulary (Architectural Liaison Officer)

- 6.90 This office was contacted in December 2017 re BREEAM Security Needs Assessment and this was completed. The submitted documents and drawings accord with all our recommendations in relation to community safety and vulnerability to crime.

Cambridgeshire County Council (Archaeology)

- 6.91 The site is located in an area of high archaeological potential in the medieval core of the historic City of Cambridge. Archaeological research undertaken in support of this application indicates the potential for surviving archaeological remains from at least the 11th – 12th centuries. Of particular relevance is the projected line of the 12th century King's Ditch and its relationship with the southern access to the medieval town. Previous investigations in the vicinity are limited to observations during construction of the Pitt Press building in

1893. Although limited in scope, the investigation identified an intensive archaeological sequence of medieval and post-medieval date.

- 6.92 We have held discussions with the CAU, acting for the applicant, regarding the approach to the mitigation of the archaeological impacts of the proposed development. The results of these discussions are included in the document South Archaeology Deposit Model & Mitigation Discussion. We are in broad agreement with the approach described in this document and we would recommend that this programme of work is secured by a condition of planning permission.

Design and Conservation Panel

- 6.93 A Masterplan for the whole Mill Lane area, in line with which this proposal has been drawn up, was brought before Panel in November 2017 and again after further development in May 2018, at which time more specific details about proposals for the present application site were set out. A more detailed proposal for the present application site only was brought to Panel in October 2018. The conclusions of the Panel meetings were as follows:

(Reminder - CABE 'traffic light' definitions: GREEN: a good scheme, or one that is acceptable subject to minor improvements. AMBER: in need of *significant* improvements to make it acceptable, but not a matter of starting from scratch. RED: the scheme is fundamentally flawed and a fresh start is needed.)

November 2017

- 6.94 This Masterplan presents a 'once in a generation' opportunity to transform and enliven a part of the city long in need of investment. There are however a number of questions that remain unanswered.
- 6.95 The emerging Draft Local Plan stipulates the need to provide 350 student rooms within this site. How those rooms are to be provided, the extent of demolition and re-building, and the impact of any consequential gentrification of the area require further investigation to ensure the area's 'gritty' character is retained.

6.96 Although in general terms the Panel feel the design team are heading in the right direction, from this initial examination of the emerging Masterplan the Panel concluded that there should be greater retention of some of the older buildings

6.97 This would help preserve the character and appearance of the area and enhance the experience of those visiting it. Further work is clearly needed and the Panel would look forward to re-visiting these proposals at a future meeting.

6.98 VERDICT – GREEN (1), AMBER (5)

May 2018

6.99 The Panel applaud what in their view, is a thoughtful response to a challenging brief. The introduction of new courtyard spaces and the sacrificing of buildings for collegiate functions is a significant change but, in the Panel's view, that change was not necessarily harmful to the character or appearance of this part of the Conservation Area. The Panel felt it is more important for the northern parts of the Mill Lane development to retain its existing 'gritty' character, and there is scope for the internal parts of this site to adopt a more 'collegiate' character. Therefore, while this is considered an appropriate solution for the southern side of Mill Lane, it is not one that should be continued across onto the northern side of the lane.

6.100 At a future presentation, the Panel would welcome the inclusion of a fully developed landscape plan so that the interrelationship of the various elements of the new public realm, and the use of materials and planting can be fully understood.

6.101 VERDICT – GREEN (unanimous) subject to further development.

October 2018

6.102 The Panel generally welcomed the design developments that had taken place since their last consideration of these proposals, and in particular regarding their previous concerns about site access and cycle parking provision. The Panel also welcomed the interaction of the development with the public realm on Trumpington Street. However, the Panel considered that the proposals would benefit from further design

development for the top floor of Dolby Court and 75 Trumpington Street, together with refinement of the landscaping to Kenmare House forecourt.

6.103 VERDICT – GREEN (4), AMBER (2)

6.104 The full relevant sections of the minutes of the panel meetings are attached to this report as Appendices A, B and C

Disability Consultative Panel (Meeting of 26th February 2019)

6.105 The creation of more accessible rooms for the college is very positive, as is the scheme's approach of keeping the spaces flexible. The inclusion of rooms that might be readily converted to adjoining rooms for student and carer was encouraged.

6.106 The Panel greatly supported the inclusion of a crossing, especially as the pavements in that area can be treacherous for wheelchair users. With the majority of accessible rooms planned for the new scheme but the main college over the road, it is vitally important that students with disabilities have a safe crossing place. Safe drop-off from taxis will also need to be carefully considered.

6.107 The Panel was very interested in the scheme, and pleased by the design features included so far to enable accessibility. Plans to improve pedestrian crossing of Trumpington Street were especially welcome. The scheme was invited to return to Panel to discuss specific design aspects further when the scheme's design reaches the required level of detail.

Developer Contributions Monitoring Unit

6.108 On the basis that the accommodation is for Cambridge University students and they already provide IOS and Sports facilities there would be no City Council s106 financial contributions.

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

7.0 REPRESENTATIONS

7.1 The occupiers of the following addresses have made representations:

6 Dane Drive (owner of 6 Little St Mary's Lane)
15 Latham Close
2 Little St Mary's Lane
6 Little St Mary's Lane (two representations)
7 Little St Mary's Lane (two representations)
8 Little St Mary's Lane
9 Little St Mary's Lane
4 Pearce Close
4 Russell Street
52 Ealing Village, Ealing, W5

7.2 The representations can be summarised as follows:

Neighbour amenity

- Overlooking
- Overshadowing
- Loss of daylight
- Visual domination and sense of enclosure
- Impact of lighted rooms at night
- Views obscured
- Noise from student activity (exacerbation of existing issue)
- Odours from extracts
- Closeness of existing flue to proposed buildings would restrict existing residents' use of cooking facilities
- Loss of informal agreement for 'cherry-picker' access for roof maintenance
- Loss of opportunity to bring bulky items over the rear wall
- Loss of informal agreement for parking contractors and utility service vehicles
- Loss of access route through the site
- Loss of informal agreement allowing use of University cycle parking
- Unclear how access rights would be protected
- Narrow gap between boundary wall and South block would harbour rubbish
- Gap would harbour vermin
- Gap would make wall maintenance impossible

- Access point from Little St Mary's Lane might be used for smoking, drug abuse or rough sleeping
- Loss of tranquillity in lane
- Increased intrusion from greater pedestrian flows

Heritage

- Damage to listed buildings
- Damage to boundary wall
- Out of proportion

Construction process

- Disturbance and noise
- Need to ensure weekends are quiet
- Need to ensure phasing of development is adhered to
- Difficulty of enforcing time restrictions on construction

Traffic and parking

- Increased vehicle traffic and congestion in Little St Mary's Lane
- Loss of informal Parking agreement for Little St Mary's church

Highway safety

- Proposed new crossing is not safe because it is not a formal 'zebra'
- Proposed medial granite strip would increase vehicle speeds
- No improvement to junction at Pembroke St/Trumpington Street

Fire safety

- Loss of opportunity to use route over boundary wall for emergency rescue and evacuation

7.3 Representations have also been received from Camcycle. These representations can be summarised as follows:

- Median granite strip in Trumpington Street would be detrimental to highway safety

- Junction at Pembroke Street / Trumpington Road not improved
- Insufficient cycle parking
- Prediction of trip generation too low

7.4 Representations have also been received from Cambridge Past Present and Future. These representations can be summarised as follows:

- no objection to the general principle of the proposals
- quality of the design and materials must be high
- support the University's effort to make their sites more permeable to the public.

Concerns

- disappointed that there is no finalised Masterplan
- new pedestrian crossing does not address the major traffic issue at this junction: already unacceptable traffic situation will be made worse by the additional crossings generated by the redevelopment and also because of additional buses along Silver Street
- If the intention is to address these transport issues via the application for the northern part of the site, there would need to be reassurance that this would be forthcoming.
- insufficient cycle parking provision
- quality of design in Dolby Court is not ambitious enough.
- understand the reasons provided for the demolition of 75 Trumpington Street, but need reassurance that structural engineering advice on which this was based is correct.

7.5 Representations have also been received from the Trustees of Hobson's Conduit. These representations can be summarised as follows:

- The two wide bridges, both incorporating a long "taxi drop-off" will be very difficult to keep clear of obstructions and will add considerably to the cost of maintenance and the risk of flooding when the water is unable to flow freely.
- The appearance of all these bridges has not yet been specified. In earlier discussion with the college, the idea of metallic grids / grills / covers was mentioned, with a

dedicated pattern, design and possibly inscription about the Conduit. This should be considered further.

- Any approval for the “taxi drop-offs” may set an unfortunate precedent for other businesses and premises along Trumpington Street. Once it is admitted that the runnels can be covered over for convenience, rather than purely for access, we anticipate further proposals to do something similar, thereby weakening the status of these historic structures. We do not believe that this should be allowed; the runnels themselves should be visible and accessible over as great a distance as is possible.
- The latest drawing of the proposal for the new road crossing appears to show the “embedded granite kerb” crossing each runnel four times. That cannot happen, as it would interfere with the flow of water. We are also not clear if the proposed build-out into the road will require excavation of the runnels themselves; if so, then their status as a listed building must be very carefully taken into account.

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.

8.0 ASSESSMENT

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

1. Principle of development
2. Masterplan
3. Demolition
4. Context of site, design and external spaces (and impact on heritage assets)
5. Public Art
6. Carbon reduction and sustainable design
7. Light pollution, noise, vibration, air quality, odour and dust
8. Inclusive access
9. Fire safety
10. Residential amenity
11. Water management and flood risk
12. Refuse arrangements
13. Highway safety

14. Car and cycle parking
15. Trees
16. Archaeology
17. Third party representations
18. Planning Obligations (s106 Agreement)

Principle of Development

- 8.2 Because of its location and the nature of the buildings within and adjoining the site, the 'principle' of this development involves two distinct elements: the proposed uses, and the nature of the impact on the conservation area.
- 8.3 The Proposals Schedule of the Cambridge Local Plan 2018 identifies the area enclosed by Silver Street, Trumpington Street, Little St Mary's Lane and the river as site U1, which is the subject of site-specific policy 26 in the plan. The allocation of that site is for:

Student accommodation (indicative capacity of 350 student rooms), up to 6,000 m² commercial use, up to 75 bedroom hotel and up to 1,000 m² other uses.

- 8.4 The present application covers the southern half of site U1. It proposes 94 student residential units, 1478m² B1 College office floorspace (B1), 1773 m² D1 teaching space (D1), 1004 m² College leisure and community floorspace (D2), and 363 m² commercial retail, food and drink floorspace. This proposal is broadly in line with the allocation above, but it provides considerably more space for College use, and considerably less commercial space than the allocation might expect (recognizing that it is only approximately half of the allocated site). This is partly because the present application site includes the URC church and its associated buildings, and the buildings on the Trumpington Street frontage, which neither the 2010 SDP, nor the 2018 local plan anticipated coming forward in a comprehensive proposal of this sort.
- 8.5 The application proposes a total of student rooms well below half of the total envisaged in the allocation. However, in my view, the remaining part of the allocated site U1 has the potential to accommodate more units than the present site. The scale and layout of the student accommodation proposed here is appropriate to the context, and I do not consider that it

represents an underdevelopment of this part of the site. In my opinion, the uses proposed here are complementary and compatible with each other and the site constraints, and are in accordance with policy 26 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2018.

- 8.6 The proposed partial demolition and conversion of Millers Yard involves the removal of the building on a protected public house site (PH057 – former Old Orleans). Policy 76 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 prohibits the loss of protected public house sites except where it has been proved that the need for such use no longer exists. However, the policy allows for interchangeability between Class A4 use and A1 A2 and A3 retail uses on the basis that the potential for public house use in the future is thus retained. The present application proposes a number of new units for a range of A1/A2/A3/A4 uses facing onto Mill Lane. At least one of these units is considered large enough for a viable A4 public house use. This equivalent alternative unit in A1/A2/A3/A4 use replaces the former Old Orleans space. There is no loss of a safeguarded public house site, and the proposal is in accordance with policy 76 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2018.
- 8.7 The Emmanuel URC church is a building in use as a place of worship. The building is therefore defined as a community sports and leisure facility by policy 73 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2018. Policy 73 prohibits the loss of such facilities unless they are either replaced, relocated in full equivalence, or no longer needed. The Emmanuel congregation will be relocating to join the St Columba's URC congregation at the other end of Downing Street, but this relocation of the users does not meet the policy requirement to relocate the facility.
- 8.8 The proposal would use the existing church building as a performance and events space, enlarging the facility and improving its quality and accessibility by creating a new access and foyer to the north of the existing church. The application states that this building will provide a new shared space which can serve the College, the University and the wider city with a range of potential uses including concerts, recitals, speaker events and panel discussions. In my view, this would represent a retention of the existing community facility provided that the opportunity exists for people and organizations from 'the wider city' to make use of the facility in its new form. I recommend a condition requiring the submission of (and future adherence to)

a management plan for the new space in the URC building. This plan will be expected to make provision for outside bodies to use this space. Subject to such a condition, the proposal is in my view, in accordance with Policy 73 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2018.

- 8.9 The application involves significant demolition, including that of locally listed buildings. It also includes substantial new building within the conservation area, demolition and new building within the setting of listed buildings, and the felling of trees within the conservation area. It will therefore have an impact on heritage assets, both designated (listed buildings and the conservation area) and non-designated (locally listed buildings and unlisted buildings within the conservation area, including those designated as 'positive' in the conservation area appraisal). Neither local plan policy nor the NPPF prohibit development which would have such impacts, but they both make it clear that great weight should be given to the conservation of heritage assets, and that any harm to heritage assets requires clear and convincing justification. I set out my view about the extent of harm caused and the weight of benefit which can be set against such harm in the next two sections.

Masterplan

- 8.10 The 2010 Old Press/Mill Lane SPD calls for the first main planning application on the Old Press/Mill Lane site, which broadly corresponds to the allocated site U1 in the 2018 local plan, to be accompanied by a masterplan for the whole SPD area. This requirement is reiterated in the site-specific policy 26. Discussions on a masterplan have been continuing between the University of Cambridge (as the landowner of almost all of the SPD area) and the City Council for several years. A Masterplan Framework has emerged from these discussions, and has been subject to public consultation. The Masterplan Framework has been submitted with this application.
- 8.11 In my view, most elements of the submitted Masterplan Framework are in accordance with the aspirations of the SPD, and with the site allocation U1 in the Cambridge Local Plan 2018 and policy 26 of that plan. Generally, I consider that the masterplan responds appropriately to the challenge of reconciling the aim of enabling viable and appropriate development on the site with the heritage constraints. Although

there is one part of the wider Mill Lane area, outside the present application site, where differences between the Masterplan Framework's aspirations and Council officers' views are still the subject of continuing discussion, I do not consider that these differences pose any risk to the coherence between the present proposal and any future developments on the block to the north. That part of the masterplan which addresses the present application site is an appropriate response to the site's constraints and opportunities, and the present application is fully in accordance with the masterplan framework.

8.12 The physical cost of the framework for development which is set out in the masterplan, however, is a substantial amount of demolition, a level markedly greater than envisaged in the 2010 Old Press/Mill Lane SPD. On the present application site, the masterplan and the present application propose the demolition of the Bailey Grundy Barrett building, the rear section of Millers Yard, the extension to 4 Mill Lane, the rearmost extension of Kenmare, the Emmanuel Church Hall, and 75 Trumpington Street, none of which were considered to be appropriate subjects for demolition in the 2010 SPD, as well as the Mill Lane Lecture Rooms, which were considered as possibly appropriate for demolition. I have set out in the next section why I consider that demolition of these buildings is acceptable.

8.13 The fact that a masterplan has been submitted with this application does not mean, and should not be taken to mean, that the Council supports every element of the Masterplan Framework as it applies to the remaining part of the masterplan site. If and when an application for the adjacent site to the north of Mill Lane (which is also within the SPD and Masterplan areas) comes forward, it will need to be considered in the context of any demolition which has already taken place and the cumulative impact of demolition on the significance of the conservation area.

Demolition

8.14 The application proposes significant demolition on the site: the Bailey Grundy Barrett building, the rear section of Millers Yard, the extension to 4 Mill Lane, the rearmost extension of Kenmare, the Emmanuel Church Hall, 75 Trumpington Street, and the Mill Lane Lecture Rooms. I assess these separately below.

Bailey Grundy Barrett Building

- 8.15 This low two-storey brick building, erected sometime between 1899 and 1903 as a warehouse for an electrical company, is not statutorily or locally listed. It is labelled in the conservation area appraisal as a positive building. It was extended and probably partly rebuilt in 1926. The Historic Environment Analysis carried out in 2008 in preparation for the Old Press / Mill Lane SPD 2010 classifies the building as of 'moderate' significance, and the applicants' Design and Access Statement makes the same assessment, except for the western extension, which it classifies as of 'low' significance.
- 8.16 The building was vacated by the electrical company in 1973 and later acquired by the University who used it as offices from 1998 to 2016. The building was altered internally in the late twentieth century: internal partitions and a spiral staircase were added. It is currently let as offices to a pharmacology company.
- 8.17 In my view, the demolition of the Baily Grundy Barrett building would cause some harm to the conservation area, but that harm would be less than substantial. (I do not consider that the demolition would have any impact on the setting of any of the nearby listed buildings.) I agree with the conservation officer that the building is representative of the area's commercial and industrial past. I also agree with the conservation officer that its relatively 'hidden' location does not mean that the significance of its contribution to the character of the conservation area should be downgraded.
- 8.18 However, I consider that the harm caused to the conservation area by its demolition would be limited. Although the building has interesting features, and a distinctive industrial quality, it is neither architecturally distinguished, nor particularly unusual. It has also been extensively altered. I accept the applicants' argument that it would be difficult to convert to a residential building, and also that its position means that its retention would very severely compromise the possibility of developing the wider site. In my view, the harm caused to the conservation area by the demolition of this building would be outweighed by the public benefit of providing a substantial quantity of additional post-graduate student accommodation in the centre of the city, and securing a viable and efficient use of this part of the site. In my view the harm would also be mitigated by the erection of a

well-designed replacement building, which I discuss later in this assessment.

Mill Lane Lecture Rooms

- 8.19 This building, designed in neo-Georgian style by Dunbar Smith and erected in the early 1930's, is not statutorily or locally listed. It is labelled in the conservation area as a positive building. The Historic Environment Analysis carried out in 2008 in preparation for the Old Press / Mill Lane SPD 2010 classifies the building as of 'moderate' significance, and the applicants' Design and Access Statement concurs with this judgement. The Old Press / Mill Lane SPD labels the building as having 'the potential for either development or substantial alteration'. The building, which remains in use for teaching by the University, retains much of its interior detail, although there have been a number of modifications.
- 8.20 I accept the applicants' submission that the building does not have any discernible archaeological significance. The architectural significance of the building lies mainly in three elements: its origins as the work of Dunbar Smith; its Neo-Georgian architectural vocabulary, especially the heavy reticulated plinth and the pedimented central doorway; and its strong presence in the street, forming a key part of the definition of that space. I do not consider any of these three elements as being of major importance. I accept that it is a plain and generally utilitarian building, less distinctive than other works from the Smith and Brewer practice, and its visual role in the street is one which could be replicated by a replacement. (I discuss this later in my assessment). Its Neo-Georgian proportions and detailing are characteristic of the era and are generally regarded as well-executed, but its high parapet and the scale of its lower two storeys cause it to read awkwardly against its immediate neighbours. The historical significance of the building lies in the way it represents part of the great wave of new buildings erected to serve the growth of the University in the first half of the twentieth century, but it does not have any particular connections to individuals, academic developments or discoveries.
- 8.21 In my view, the demolition of the Mill Lane Lecture Rooms would cause some harm to the conservation area, but that harm would be less than substantial. (I do not consider that the

demolition would have any impact on the setting of any of the nearby listed buildings.) I concur with the view of Historic England that the applicants have made a convincing case that the specialised design of the building would make conversion to retail uses or residential accommodation or a combination of the two, very difficult. I also agree with the advice of Historic England that the limited harm caused to the conservation area by the demolition of this building would be outweighed by the public benefit of providing a substantial quantity of additional post-graduate student accommodation in the centre of the city, and securing a viable and efficient use of this part of the site. In my view the harm would also be mitigated by the erection of a well-designed replacement building, which I discuss later in this assessment.

Millers' Yard

- 8.22 Millers' Yard has two conjoined components: a two-storey buff brick building with additional space within dormers in a mansard roof, which abuts the footway on the south side of Mill Lane, and three connected three-storey ranges to the south, which surround a courtyard which can be reached via two archways in the frontage building.
- 8.23 The Millers' Yard buildings are a Building of Local Interest, and the conservation area appraisal states that the frontage building contributes to the atmosphere of a historic commercial area. The appraisal also identifies the view into the western of the two archways as a key view. The Historic Environment Analysis carried out in 2008 in preparation for the Old Press / Mill Lane SPD 2010 places the building in the middle or 'significant' category. The applicants' Design and Access Statement, which subdivides the building into several components, retains the 'significant' grading for the older, eastern, section of the frontage building, but grades the rear courtyard section and the western part of the frontage as of 'moderate' significance, and the external galleries and stairwell in the courtyard as of 'low' significance.
- 8.24 The history of the building is difficult to establish from available evidence. It seems that the courtyard element predates the frontage building. There is no satisfactory evidence of any connection to the milling activities which took place on the riverside and elsewhere nearby. There is apparently

considerable nineteenth-century fabric in the three ranges surrounding the courtyard, although it is obscured by the late twentieth-century walkways of the courtyard elevations, and much of it is hidden under recent interior finishes. It appears that almost all of the fenestration is relatively modern. The frontage element contains a limited amount of nineteenth-century fabric, but most of the eastern part of the street elevation dates from 1903, and all of the western part from the 1980s.

8.25 Apart from the elements of nineteenth-century fabric, the significance of the Millers Yard buildings lies in:

- The reference to earlier commercial uses suggested by the street elevation
- The remnant of nineteenth-century courtyard form remaining in the configuration of the rear ranges
- The historical association with the Eaden Lilley department store

8.26 In my view, the demolition of the rear part of Millers Yard would cause some harm to the conservation area, but that harm would be less than substantial. Although the building is locally listed, I am of the view that its limited architectural interest has largely been obscured by modern alterations, and that its historical significance is largely limited to its layout. I acknowledge that the courtyard form is an interesting link to the area's industrial past, but the fact that the 1980's conversion of this building was successful for only a very limited period underlines the case that a successful further conversion of this building for viable purposes would be difficult. I also recognize that the position of this building, like that of the Bailey Grundy Barrett building, makes viable redevelopment of the wider site very difficult

8.27 In my view the limited harm caused to the conservation area by the demolition of this building would be outweighed by the public benefit of providing a substantial quantity of additional post-graduate student accommodation in the centre of the city, and securing a viable and efficient use of this part of the site. In my view the harm would also be mitigated by the erection of a well-designed replacement building, which I discuss later in this assessment.

75 Trumpington Street

- 8.28 This three-storey brick building dates from 1897. It was either newly built, or almost wholly rebuilt, at that date as a furniture warehouse. It is not statutorily or locally listed, and the conservation area appraisal is silent about its merits. The Historic Environment Analysis carried out in 2008 in preparation for the Old Press / Mill Lane SPD 2010 classifies the building as of 'high' significance, but this is because that analysis did not disaggregate the group of buildings around Kenmare into its separate parts, and made no detailed separate analysis of No.75. The applicants' Design and Access Statement marks it as being of 'low' significance.
- 8.29 The building was requisitioned as a meat store after the first world war and used as a café from 1925 until 1950. At that time the University converted the building into offices for its Estate Management and Building Service (EMBS) as part of the Kenmare group. The front door was eliminated at this point, access being created through Kenmare itself. No.75 remained in use by EMBS until 2017.
- 8.30 The building is not a designated heritage asset in its own right, but it is part of the conservation area, which is a designated heritage asset. In my view, the contribution which the building makes is limited, and arises largely from its single plot width, its role in the group of buildings between Mill Lane and the church, and the limited traces of its commercial past visible on the frontage. The significance of its contribution is eroded in my view by its much-altered ground-floor façade, which is neither congruent with the rest of the building or its neighbours, nor readily legible.
- 8.31 In my view, the demolition of 75 Trumpington Street would cause some harm to the conservation area, but that harm would be less than substantial. (Subject to appropriate replacement, I do not consider that the demolition would cause harm to the setting of any of the nearby listed buildings.) I consider that the harm caused to the conservation area by this demolition would be limited. It would be outweighed in my view by the public benefit of providing appropriate access to additional student accommodation and a performance space which would be used by the public as well as the College, and securing a viable and efficient use of this part of the site. In my view the harm would

also be mitigated by the erection of a well-designed replacement building, which I discuss later in this assessment.

Emmanuel Church Hall

- 8.32 The Church Hall or School Hall to the rear of the URC church runs at right angles to the church building. It was erected at the same time as the church (1874) and was designed by the same architect, James Cubitt, but is architecturally far more limited. It has been altered on a number of occasions since; these alterations included severing the original roof trusses and probably altering the whole roof profile. The building is a Building of Local Interest.
- 8.33 In my view the significance of this building lies chiefly in two features: its conception and design as part of the original church project by James Cubitt, and the role of its southern gable in closing the view along the entrance alleyway from Little St Mary's Lane. The proposed scheme would retain and de-clutter this southern gable, but demolish most of the remainder of the building, incorporating some of the fabric of the east and west walls into a new building which would form an adjunct to the foyer of the new performance space.
- 8.34 In my view, the demolition of the Church Hall would cause some harm to the conservation area, but that harm would be less than substantial. (The loss of most of the building would cause a very limited harm to the listed church, by depriving it of part of its original outbuilding, but in my view the enhancement given to the setting of the church by the completion of the proposed foyer buildings on the same site would more than outweigh this loss). I consider that the harm caused to the conservation area by this demolition would be limited. It would be outweighed in my view by the public benefit of providing appropriate access to a performance space which would be used by the public as well as the College, and securing a viable and efficient use of this part of the site.

Other buildings and extensions associated with Emmanuel Church

- 8.35 The scheme also proposes the demolition of the 1897 Schoolroom inserted in the angle between the church and the hall, and the 1990's corridor and narthex which link the

Schoolroom to the street. With the exception of the street elevation, none of these elements is visible from the public realm, or even from the interior of the application site in its present form. The Schoolroom is a simple building, which has been amended on a number of occasions, It is not of great architectural interest, and little of the original fabric is visible in the interior. The narthex has features distinctive to its late-twentieth-century origin, but its dark timber frame and glazing read uncomfortably against both its neighbours, and in my view it does not make a positive contribution to the conservation area. I do not consider that the demolition of these elements would cause any harm to the conservation area, and the elimination of the narthex would in my view enhance the setting of the listed URC church.

Rear addition to Kenmare

- 8.36 The application proposes the demolition of the small westernmost extension to Kenmare. This two-storey, gable-roofed extension was added to the building in 1906. It is not architecturally distinguished, and reads against the earlier Victorian single-storey rear extension slightly awkwardly. I concur with the applicants' assessment that it is a component of low significance. I do not consider that its demolition would cause any harm to the conservation area. Although it is technically part of the listed Kenmare building, it is my view that it detracts from rather than adding to the significance of the building as a whole, and its demolition would not cause harm to the listed building.

Extension to 4 Mill Lane

- 8.37 4 Mill Lane, built in 1886 to designs by W M Fawcett, and extended eastwards by the same architect in 1893, is not statutorily or locally listed. It is labelled in the conservation area as a positive building. The Historic Environment Analysis carried out in 2008 in preparation for the Old Press / Mill Lane SPD 2010 classifies the building as 'significant' (the middle of the five categories). The applicants' Design and Access Statement also counts the main building as significant, but notes the small flat-roofed extension to the south, added in 1939 (basement and ground floor) and 1946 (first floor), as being of 'low' significance.

8.38 It is the mid-twentieth century south extension to this building which is proposed for demolition. This section was designed by a different architect, and although it uses a similar brick and loosely emulates the fenestration of the original building, its flat roof reads oddly against the gables of the original, and it is of lower architectural quality. It has no special part in the historic interest of this building as the home of the Local Examinations Syndicate. I concur with the applicants' assessment that it is a component of low significance. I do not consider that its demolition would cause any harm to the conservation area. Although it is part of a building considered to be 'positive' in the conservation area, it is my view that it detracts from rather than adding to the quality of the building as a whole, and its demolition would not detract from the positive quality of the original building.

Summary

8.39 In my view, the demolitions proposed would cause some harm to the conservation area, although that harm would in no case be substantial, and in most cases would be very limited. I have given full consideration to the instruction in Paragraph 193 of the National Planning Policy Framework ('the Framework') that great weight should be given to the conservation of any designated heritage asset (which includes a conservation area), and the instruction in Paragraph 194 of the Framework that any harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset should require clear and convincing justification.

8.40 I consider that the benefit of securing a viable and efficient use of this site by the creation of a student residential court, which would be impossible without the demolition of the majority of the demolitions proposed, and the conversion of other buildings to College purposes, is a significant public benefit for these reasons:

- It ensures effective and appropriately intensive use of this parcel of land which is in a highly sustainable location
- It enables the further development of an institution which makes a significant contribution to the city's economy and culture
- It creates the opportunity for the adaptive reuse of retained buildings on the site (as required by policy 26), securing appropriate use, care and maintenance of a significant group

of buildings; a group which includes statutorily listed buildings, locally listed buildings and buildings considered to be 'positive' elements of the conservation area. It would thereby protect the significance of the conservation area and the individual buildings into the long-term future

- It achieves development in accordance with the designation of this site in the Cambridge Local Plan 2018.
- As I explain further in the next section, it enables development which is of high quality, and which would maintain and enhance the significance of the conservation area, and improve the setting of statutorily- and locally-listed buildings.

8.41 For these reasons, it is my view that all the demolition proposed in the application is acceptable, and in accordance with policies 26, 58, 61 and 62 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006, and government advice in paragraphs 192, 193, 194, 196, 197 and 200 of the Framework.

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

Response to context

8.42 In my view the proposed new buildings respond in a positive and appropriate manner to their context.

Dolby Court

8.43 The scale and massing of the proposed new student residential buildings are appropriate to this location. The mixture of three-storey and two-storey form is respectful of the surrounding buildings, including Stuart House and the terraced houses in Little St Mary's Lane. In my view, the design, which closely emulates the traditional college courtyard, but uses crisp and distinctive detailing in a modern idiom, is successful. The proposed materials make an appropriate reference to the character of buildings elsewhere on the Pembroke site and would enhance the setting of Stuart House as the 'fourth side' of the court. The design incorporates a number of features which would add to the distinctiveness of the new courtyard, contribute incident to the townscape, and create an attractive and functionally successful space. These include the rooftop chimneys, the curved stairwell corners, the colonnade, and the

strongly articulated bays. The opportunity to create attractive landscaping is indicated. Conditions are necessary to ensure appropriate bricks, stone and external metal finishes, and to control the details of the proposed landscaping, including paving materials. I do not accept the view put forward in representations that the design quality of these buildings is insufficient.

Stuart House area

- 8.44 At present, the area in front of Stuart House confused in appearance, and cluttered, and functions poorly. The proposed relocation and extension of the railings and radically revised landscaping would considerably enhance the setting of Stuart House, improve the quality of this section of the street frontage, and create a space which would be attractive and function well as a secondary entrance to the site which could enable deliveries and taxi drop-offs.

Mill Lane elevation

- 8.45 The scale and proportions of the new frontage to Mill Lane between Millers Yard and the opening to Stuart House would be respectful of the existing buildings to the west and east. The proposed shop/café fronts are of an unobtrusive design, which would signal their function without interrupting the subtle profile and curve of the south side of Mill Lane. In my view, although the present Lecture Rooms building has a very distinctive character, and is of some architectural and historic interest, the proposed new buildings, which relate more sympathetically to the scale of the rest of the street and are in my view well-detailed would enhance the street scene and the appearance of this part of the conservation area.
- 8.46 In my view, the retention of the Millers Yard frontage building is also a positive feature of the scheme. Although this building has existed for less than 40 years in its present form, and its apparent role in the architectural history of the street is therefore something of an illusion, it does contain a fragment of the built form of the area's commercial past, and contributes to that element of the street's distinctive character. I note the concern expressed in representations about the dormers on the proposed third storey, but in my view, this roof extension, although not wholly congruent with the lower storeys, is an

improvement on the present form, and given its low prominence at street level, would not cause any discernible harm to the conservation area.

Trumpington Street

8.47 The proposed new gatehouse is respectful of its context in scale, detailing and materials. It would successfully replicate the closure to the south side of the Kenmare forecourt provided by the existing building, and it would act as a balanced partner for the retained building at No.76. It would be a clearly legible entrance to the proposed new section of the Pembroke College campus, but it would do this without creating an aggressive visual statement on the Trumpington Street frontage. The ground floor of the existing building on this site is an anomalous feature, which does not make a positive contribution to the conservation area; by comparison the new gatehouse would enhance this section of the street frontage.

8.48 The proposed new foyer area to the rear of the gatehouse and north of the church building is a simple and elegant design which would create a satisfying enclosure to the south side of the proposed Kenmare garden space, and lead the eye towards Stuart House. It would contrast with the existing buildings in a positive manner. In my view it would function very effectively as a part of the proposed performance space.

Movement and Access

8.49 The decision to create a new entrance to the application site on Trumpington Street facing the existing Pembroke site is a sound one. The two areas would thus be visually and functionally linked, and the existence and role of the application site as an extension to the Pembroke campus would be highly legible.

8.50 The safe and efficient functioning of the new site, which would generate a very large number of pedestrian movements across Trumpington Street, depends on the creation of a satisfactory route for pedestrians to make the crossing. A signalised crossing here would have a negative impact on the conservation area and the setting of listed buildings on both sides of the street, so an informal crossing is a preferable solution.

- 8.51 I agree with third party comments and the highway authority's advice that the original design for this crossing might have led to an increase in vehicle speeds and would not have been conducive to highway safety. The revised proposal seeks to address these concerns by eliminating the resemblance to a zebra crossing, avoiding granite setts on the crossing surface, dispensing with the median strip, and narrowing the carriageway at the crossing point.
- 8.52 The highway authority continues to have concerns about the crossing, despite this revision. The four principal areas of concern are the absence of the necessary safety audit, lack of clarity about materials, the unacceptability of transverse lines across the carriageway, and the shape of the build-out to narrow the carriageway. In my view, these concerns are all justified, but can all be addressed by conditions which require:
- The completion of the necessary audit and the satisfactory addressing of any issues which it reveals
 - The submission of a further revision to the crossing design which resolves the issues raised about materials and layout
 - The implementation of an approved revised crossing design before any occupation of the proposed student accommodation.
- 8.53 It is my view that the principle of a new highway crossing is acceptable, and I have confidence that an acceptable revised design which will meet the concerns of the highway authority, the conservation team and the drainage officer can be arrived at. In these circumstances, I do not consider the shortcomings of the present crossing proposal to be a reason for refusal, but I do recommend the conditions I have referred to in the previous paragraph.
- 8.54 The conservation officer, the sustainable drainage officer, and the Conduit Trustees are all critical of the revised proposal, because the proposed taxi drop-off points associated with it involve excessive covering over of Hobson's Conduit, which would be harmful to the listed conduit and the character of the conservation area, and make maintenance of the conduit more difficult. I concur with this view. Taxi access can be achieved elsewhere on both the existing and proposed new Pembroke sites, and I do not consider that drop-off points on Trumpington Street are necessary. This issue can in my view be resolved by

the condition requiring a redesign of the crossing which I refer to in paragraph 8.52, and via the separate listed building consent which would be required for any works on the Conduit. This condition (and the listed building application) will also address the Conduit Trustees' concerns about the design of proposed Conduit covers and the impact of new kerbs, both of which I share.

- 8.55 The cycling officer is also critical of the revised proposal, which she considers to be less acceptable than the original. This is a problematic area, because the solution favoured by the cycling officer (a formalised crossing) is incompatible with the advice of the conservation and urban design teams, who both consider that solution to be unacceptably harmful to the significance of the conservation area, a view which I share.
- 8.56 In this particular situation, it is my view that the preferences (but not the safety) of cyclists must be considered a lower priority than pedestrian safety and the character of the conservation area. Restricting the width of the carriageway at this point will be unwelcome to cyclists, but the highway authority considers that it would enhance highway safety, by reducing speeds, which would improve pedestrian safety. I consider it to be the preferable solution, but the revised design of the crossing necessary to meet the condition I have recommended will need to satisfy the highway authority that cyclist safety is adequately protected.
- 8.57 The retention of routes into the proposed new College site from Mill Lane in front of Stuart House, from Little St Mary's Lane through a pedestrian passage, and from Mill Lane through one of the Millers Yard archways is welcome, as is the College commitment to keep the Trumpington Street, Stuart House and south block passage entrances open to the public during the day most of the time, as the entrances on the main College site are. This would retain a degree of the permeability which exists on the site at present.
- 8.58 The application demonstrates a presumption in favour of walking and cycling and reduces the amount of vehicle parking space on the site

Open Space and Landscape

- 8.59 The three open spaces proposed in the scheme are well-proportioned and are linked in a way which would make them visually attractive and functionally successful. The decluttering of the space in front of Stuart House would enhance its setting, and the opening up of a 'Kenmare garden' space to the rear of the gatehouse would create interesting views to and from Trumpington Street, enable a new focus on the east side of Stuart House, and permit a number of the Trumpington Street buildings to be seen from a new angle. The space would also link well with the proposed new foyer alongside the performance space in the existing church.
- 8.60 The landscaping proposals would create an attractive environment, but in my view they have two significant defects. They do not take the opportunities available to manage surface water in a sustainable way, and they do not include sufficiently large-scale trees to replace those lost in Little St Mary's Lane and Millers Yard. In my view, a condition is necessary to ensure that a more sustainable set of landscaping proposals is submitted for these important spaces.
- 8.61 In my opinion the proposal is compliant in design terms with Cambridge Local Plan (2018) policies 55, 56, 57, 58, and 59.

Public Art

- 8.62 The Planning Statement submitted with the application indicates an expectation that all or some of the following elements will make up a contribution to public art by this development: sculpture in the new Kenmare Garden, new arts infrastructure in the form of a new gallery and a new performance space, new gates to Stuart House, new gratings to Hobson's Conduit, and new lighting within the development.
- 8.63 The Planning Statement asserts that the College is committed to the provision of public art, and its identification early on in the proposals. The Statement also expresses a commitment that the public art to be provided will be accessible; will be embedded into the design proposals and will help the scheme enhance the area's distinctive identity. I am concerned that the proposals for this site have reached planning application stage without more substantial progress along the public art route set

out in the Council's SPD, and I do not consider that all the suggestions made in the Planning Statement would readily fulfil the requirements of the SPD.

8.64 However, I do not doubt the applicants' commitment to public art, and I acknowledge that several of the items identified on the applicants' list could become elements of an appropriate public art contribution. At this stage, I would have hoped to see more progress towards realisation of a public art contribution on the site, but this is not a reason to refuse the application; the application documents demonstrate both the intention and the capacity of the proposal to provide public art. In my view, a condition to secure a Public Art Strategy and its implementation should be worded in such a way as to accelerate the process.

8.65 Subject to such a condition, which I recommend, the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2018) policy 56 and the Public Art SPD 2010

Carbon reduction and sustainable design

8.66 The proposal includes a number of significant measures to improve sustainability and reduce carbon emissions, including:

- Meeting BREEAM 'excellent' standard in the proposed Dolby Court buildings
- Glazing, lighting, and ventilation improvements in retained buildings, together with connection to a site-wide heating and cooling network
- Using air-source heat pumps and photovoltaic panels to reduce carbon emissions by 30% compared to baseline
- Deep window reveals
- Natural ventilation
- High thermal mass

8.67 I concur with the sustainability officer that these are all positive aspects of the scheme. The sustainability officer also advises that the original proposals do not include sufficient measures on water efficiency, and requests a condition to ensure this aspect of the scheme is improved. I concur with this and recommend the suggested condition, along with the other conditions she advises, to secure achievement of BREEAM criteria and the implementation and maintenance of the proposed renewable

energy technologies

- 8.68 In my opinion, subject to conditions, the applicants have suitably addressed the issues of sustainability and renewable energy and the proposal is in accordance with Cambridge Local Plan (2018) policies 28, 29 and 3, and the Sustainable Design and Construction SPD 2007.

Light pollution, air quality, noise, vibration, odour and dust

- 8.69 I note the advice of the environmental health team that the implications of the scheme for air quality, noise, vibration, odour and dust are acceptable, subject to a number of conditions. I accept this advice and recommend such conditions. I also note the environmental health officer's concerns about the impact of noise from external plant at the University Centre on occupiers of rooms on the west side of the west block of Dolby Court. This issue can be resolved by a condition requiring sealed windows in these rooms, but a preferable solution would be to secure mitigation of the plant noise at the University Centre via a clause in a Section 106 agreement.

- 8.70 In my opinion, subject to the conditions I have recommended, the applicants have suitably addressed the issues of air quality, noise, vibration, odour and dust, and the proposal is in accordance with Cambridge Local Plan (2018) policies 34, 35, 36.

Inclusive access

- 8.71 The scheme would create more accessible rooms for the college. The creation of the proposed gatehouse and foyer would improve the accessibility of the site. I agree with the panel's view that a satisfactory crossing is a key requirement for the safety of both disabled and non-disabled users of the site, and I am confident that the essential design of the revised crossing scheme provides this. I concur with the view of Disability Panel that the scheme as a whole is positive in terms of disabled access
- 8.72 In my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2018) policies 56 and 57.

Fire safety

- 8.73 I note that the Fire and Rescue Service are satisfied with the application, and do not consider that additional fire hydrants are required. I also note their concern that all existing hydrants be retained, kept in good condition and kept available both during and after development. I recommend a condition accordingly.
- 8.74 In my opinion the proposal is compliant in terms of fire safety with Cambridge Local Plan (2018) policies 56 and 57.

Residential Amenity

- 8.75 There is a row of houses the curtilages of which directly abut the southern boundary of the application site. These houses, Nos. 1-14 Little St Mary's Lane, are the only residential properties adjacent to the application site, and currently the only residential accommodation in the quadrilateral area enclosed by Silver Street, Trumpington Street, Little St Mary's Lane, and the river. The majority of these curtilages are separated from the application site by an existing brick wall, which is 2m high to the rear of No.11, rises to 2.5m high behind No. 10 and part of No.9, and then steps sharply up to be 5m high along the common boundary between the application site and the curtilages of Nos. 1-8. These houses all have very small rear yards, which are all differently configured. Typically they measure 2m x 2m or 2m x 2.5m, but some are smaller. No.12 and No.13/14 do not have any rear yard; the building abuts the application site directly.
- 8.76 There is some variation between these houses in terms of scale, footprint and fenestration. The impact of the proposed development on these houses will vary considerably, determined by these characteristics, and the precise relationship between each of the houses and the proposed new buildings.
- 8.77 Nos. 1-6 Little St Mary's Lane back on to Stuart House and the space around that building. The proposed development would not alter the mass or exterior of Stuart House, and would not insert any building or structure into the existing space which surrounds it to the south. There would therefore be no significant change to the relationship between these houses and the buildings adjacent to them.

- 8.78 Nos. 8-11 Little St Mary's Lane currently back on to the rear elevation of the Mill Lane Lecture Rooms building, and No.7 backs on to the space immediately to the east of that building. Under the proposals, the Lecture Rooms would be demolished, and the curtilages of Nos 8-11 would abut directly the south elevation of the south block of student accommodation. This block would also extend part-way along the rear boundary of No.7.
- 8.79 No.12 and No.13/14 currently back on to the Bailey Grundy Barratt building, across the driveway/parking space attached to that building. Under the proposals, No 11 would back on to the south block of Dolby Court, at a distance of 2.5m, and No. 12/13 would back on to the link between the south and west blocks and part of the south elevation of the west block, at a distance of 3.5m.

Sunlight

- 8.80 The proposed development lies to the north of the adjacent residential neighbours, and consequently, it is clear that the impact on sunlight is likely to be very limited. The applicants have submitted sunlight assessment data for all the windows in Nos. 7-12 Little St Mary's Lane which are not at an angle more than 90° from due south (These are all WSW-facing side windows). There are seven such windows: one in No.12, two in No.11, and four in No.9. Sunlight to three of these windows would not be affected by the proposed development at all. The windows which would be affected (living room and bedroom at No.11, and two bedrooms at No.9) would experience a reduction in summer sunlight of 19%, 15%, 13% and 4% respectively. There would be no reduction in winter hours.
- 8.81 BRE guidelines on protecting sunlight to the windows of existing dwellings (which are normally only applied to principal living rooms) suggest that a reduction in sunlight is acceptable if that window retains 80% of its previous level. All four of these windows would retain 80% of their existing level. I do not consider that there would be any unacceptable impact on sunlight to neighbouring occupiers.

Daylight

- 8.82 BRE guidelines on daylight to habitable rooms affected by development uses the measure Visible Sky Component (VSC). The guidelines suggest that where the VSC to a window is at 27% or more (the maximum possible is 40%), then daylight levels are acceptable. The guidelines also suggest that reductions below this level should be kept to a minimum, but reductions are only likely to be noticeable if the VSC after the development would be less than 80% of the VSC in the existing situation.
- 8.83 The application provides VSC data for all the 37 rear windows in Nos 6-13 Little St Mary's Lane. Because of the small yards, the proximity of the high boundary wall, and the position of the existing surrounding buildings, the existing VSC levels to these windows are low. Only six of the 37 windows have an existing VSC of 27% or more. Of the 37 windows, there are only three which would experience a reduction in VSC of more than 20%. They are all at No.13/14. Two ground-floor rooms would experience a 22% and 30% reduction in VSC, although the second of these has a second window, which would experience a very much smaller reduction in VSC. The westernmost of the first-floor bedrooms at No.12/13 would experience a 40% reduction in VSC, because of the height of the west block of Dolby Court in comparison with the existing buildings.
- 8.84 These reductions at No.13/14 exceed the BRE guidelines. I do not, however, consider that in any of these three cases, the reduction is unacceptable. The 22% reduction is only marginally in excess of the guideline. The 30% reduction is to a window serving a room which has an additional source of daylight. The 40% reduction is to a window serving a bedroom, not a living room. This would make the room noticeably less light, but in a context where the constrained urban environment already limits light to many surrounding rooms, including this one, I do not consider this reduction to be unacceptable. The BRE Guidelines indicate that a degree of flexibility should be used in interpreting the thresholds in any particular context, and that in highly built-up city-centre contexts, a lower level of daylight might be expected than in a more open suburban context.
- 8.85 In contrast, eighteen of the windows, including five of the seven at No.12, both of the first-floor windows at No.10, four of the

seven at No.9, two of the three at No.8 and all four rear windows at No.6, would experience an improved VSC (i.e. more daylight)

Enclosure/loss of outlook

- 8.86 It is not possible to use a numerical measure to judge the extent to which neighbours might experience an unacceptable degree of enclosure; it depends not only on the height and extent of proposed new buildings, but also on their proximity and on the existing context. All of the neighbouring houses experience a very strong sense of enclosure to the rear at present, because of the small size of their yards, the height of the rear boundary wall, and the size and position of the existing buildings on the application site, especially the Mill Lane Lecture Rooms, which are 19m high at the apex of the south gable and 16m high at the 'shoulders' on either side.
- 8.87 In my view, the only houses where the limited existing outlook is likely to be further restricted are those where the new south block would be sited directly against the common boundary between their curtilage and the application site (Nos. 8, 9, 10 and 11) and the western windows in No.13/14. The impact is likely to be greater at No.8 and No.11 than at Nos. 9 and 10, because the latter two houses are aligned with the highest point of the existing Mill Lane Lecture Rooms. The proposed new building, although much closer to windows in these houses, is also much less high; the angle above the horizontal at a rear ground-floor window of a line of sight to the apex of the Mill Lane Lecture rooms would be greater than the angle of a line of sight to the roof ridge of the proposed south block. Occupiers at No.13/14 already experience a considerable sense of enclosure from the proximity and bulk of the University Centre. Although views out of the western windows of No.13/14 would feel more enclosed if the proposal were implemented than they do at present, the eastern windows in this house would be much less affected.
- 8.88 In my view, occupiers of Nos. 8-11 and No.13/14 Little St Mary's Lane would experience an increased sense of enclosure, those at Nos. 8, 11, and 13/14 more than those in Nos. 9 and 10. In what is already a very tightly constrained and enclosed context however, where all occupiers have limited

outlook, I do not consider the degree of this increased enclosure to be so severe as to merit refusal of the application.

- 8.89 Some representations refer to the loss of views to particular buildings or elements of roofscape. The views available from most of the rear house windows in Little St Mary's Lane would be altered in some way by the proposal. There is no entitlement to retain a particular view however, and changes to views cannot be a reason for refusal of the application.

Overlooking

- 8.90 All of the proposed windows which face towards the neighbouring properties would be obscure-glazed and fixed shut (except for maintenance purposes). I do not consider that there would be any impact on the privacy of neighbouring occupiers.

Noise and disturbance

- 8.91 Representations are concerned about noise from two main sources: noisy student activities in the south block, and increased pedestrian and cycle traffic in the Lane. I do not consider the second of these to be well-founded. At present, the access point between Nos. 11 and 12 Little St Mary's Lane is open all the time, and provides a route for students and staff coming from the south to cycle parking areas, the University Careers Service, and the heavily-used Mill Lane Lecture Rooms. Were the development to go ahead, this access would only be open during the day, and would probably be by far the least-used of the three potential routes into the College residential court (although those 'in the know' could use it as a through route). In my view it is likely that the change would result in a reduction in pedestrian and cycle traffic in the Lane, rather than an increase.
- 8.92 As far as student activity noise is concerned, I accept that such noise could be generated in the south block, because it cannot be assumed that graduate students will automatically be quieter and more considerate than undergraduates. However, there are only six student rooms on each floor in this block, and the windows facing neighbouring houses will not be openable. In my view, the likelihood of unacceptable noise from these rooms causing loss of residential amenity to neighbours is limited. In

addition, as this block would be an integral part of the College site, it would be much easier for the College to monitor and control noise than it is at present in the Little St Mary's Lane houses, such as No.5, which are in use as College accommodation, and have apparently given rise to neighbour amenity issues in the recent past. I do not consider that the proposed development is likely to lead to an loss of amenity to neighbours through noise.

- 8.93 Representations also express concern that the entrance passageway from Little St Mary's Lane to the courtyard would attract smokers, people abusing drugs and alcohol, and rough sleepers. In my view, the opening between Nos. 11 and 12 would be less likely to attract anti-social behaviour after the development than it is now, as there would be a modest increase in the degree of natural surveillance. The College is not intending to leave the covered passageway open at night, so it would not be available to rough sleepers

Artificial light

- 8.94 Representations have raised concerns that the spillage of light from lighted windows in the south elevation of the south block would produce unacceptable glare. I do not consider this to be likely. Nos. 9, 10, and 11 Little St Mary's Lane would each have a first-floor student room window facing towards their windows. However, these windows would be obscure-glazed, which would diminish the glare. They would also be narrow windows (600mm wide), with deep reveals (500mm), which would further limit the emission of light. In my view the occupiers of these rooms would be very likely to close the blinds during the hours of darkness.

- 8.95 The stairwell windows, of which there would be four, are smaller still, with the same deep reveals. The level of lighting in the spaces within these windows would be less intense. I do not consider that the light from any of these windows is likely to result in a significant loss of amenity to neighbours.

Odours

- 8.96 There would be kitchens on the ground floor of the south block of Dolby Court, but these would be of a domestic type, not generating high levels of odour. I am satisfied that the condition

on ventilation and extraction which I have recommended is sufficient to ensure no loss of amenity to neighbours through odours.

- 8.97 One representation suggests that the proximity of the Dolby Court south block to the hoses to the rear would mean that existing kitchen equipment in those house could not be used, or would be subject to limitation. I do not consider this likely. The environmental health team have not raised concerns, and there would be no openable windows in the south elevation of the south block which could be affected by odours from existing extracts.

Problems arising from the very narrow space between the south elevation of the Dolby Court south block and the existing high boundary wall

- 8.98 This space, 21m long, would be approximately 150mm wide along the western half of its length, and at the eastern end would be divided by brick piers into three bays, which would be up to 600mm wide. I accept that this space would accumulate litter and tree debris. I would not expect it to accumulate significant food waste, however, and I do not consider it to be particularly attractive to rats. Any issues resulting from accumulations in this space would be likely to affect the College much more than neighbouring residents, and it would have a strong incentive to resolve them. I do not consider that this aspect of the development is likely to be harmful to neighbour amenity

Informal arrangements

- 8.99 Representations have pointed to informal arrangements which apparently exist at present, allowing residents in Little St Mary's Lane to:
- use University cycle parking
 - use University land off the Lane for contractors utility engineers and delivery drivers to park
 - use the land behind Stuart House to accommodate a cherry-picker for roof maintenance
 - bring bulky goods and appliances into houses over the rear boundary wall

8.100 The representations also indicate that residents walk through the application site as an access route, and that churchgoers at Little St Mary's are able to park on the application site at present.

8.101 I recognize that the loss of these arrangements would be inconvenient for residents and in some cases seriously problematic, but none of these arrangements is an entitlement; they could all be terminated at any point, regardless of this planning application, and their loss cannot be a reason to refuse the application nor to attach conditions to any permission.

Construction activities

8.102 I accept that construction activities would cause noise and disturbance for neighbours. This is unavoidable in almost any construction project, no matter what its size. The impact of construction can be mitigated however, by conditions to control working hours, the hours of deliveries and collections, construction noise levels, piling, and dust. I recommend such conditions. I do not accept the argument made in representations that it would not be possible to enforce these conditions, because they have been successfully enforced in many instances in the past. In my view, conditions are sufficient to ensure that the inevitable adverse impact of construction on neighbours is not at an unacceptable level.

8.103 Any damage to property caused by construction would be a civil matter between the applicants and other property owners. I note that representations urge the speedy carrying out of any works, and I recognize the benefit of this, but planning control does not enable the planning authority to impose a timescale on applicants, other than the deadline for commencement

8.104 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 (2018) policies 35, 55 and 56.

Amenity for future occupiers of the site

8.105 The proposed student rooms would be arranged around an open space and would be easily accessed. Rooms overlooking the courtyard would have a particularly attractive outlook, but

those overlooking Mill Lane would have interesting street views. The rooms on the west side of the west block, which would face out over the cycle storage towards the University Centre would have a less advantageous aspect, but I do not consider that they would have levels of daylight or enclosure which would be unacceptable.

8.106 I note that the environmental health team do not have concerns about the amenity of any future occupiers except for those in the west-facing rooms opposite the University Centre. These rooms would have mechanical ventilation, which would enable them to keep windows closed, but if they elected to open their windows, they might be subject to unacceptable levels of noise from plant at the rear of the University Centre. The environmental health officer has recommended a condition to require the windows to be sealed, to avoid this possibility, which might otherwise compel the local authority to take action to force the University Centre to limit its commercial activities.

8.107 I am reluctant to recommend the imposition of this condition, because it would deprive all future occupiers of these rooms of access to fresh air, and would increase the use of mechanical ventilation. A legal agreement which secured mitigation of the existing plant noise would be preferable for this reason, but if it cannot be achieved, then the condition recommended by the environmental health team will be necessary.

8.108 In my opinion, subject to conditions, the proposal provides a high-quality (and accessible) 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 (2018) policy 46.

Integrated water management and flood risk

8.109 The sustainable drainage officer's initial advice was that the scheme relied on traditional underground attenuation, using methods which fail to provide any water quality, biodiversity or amenity benefits. The officer indicated that the submitted Drainage Feasibility Study (DFS) failed to incorporate sufficient sustainable drainage measures to be in accordance with policy. This advice was echoed by the drainage officer at the Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA), Cambridgeshire County Council. A first revision to the DFS was submitted, but neither drainage

officer considered that the issues of concern had been resolved. Negotiations between the applicants' drainage team and the sustainable drainage officer are continuing, and I anticipate that additional measures will be brought forward before the date of Committee which will address the concerns of the sustainable drainage officer and the LLFA. I will report these measures and the drainage officers' advice on them on the amendment sheet or at the Committee meeting

8.110 At present the applicants have not suitably addressed the issues of water management and flood risk, but I anticipate that they may be able to do so by bringing forward additional drainage measures. Subject to such measures being provided in a manner satisfactory to the sustainable drainage officer and the LLFA, I am of the view that the proposal will be in accordance with Cambridge Local Plan (2018) policies 31 and 32.

Refuse Arrangements

8.111 The Shared Waste service are content with the application proposal but have raised some concerns about the exact configuration of bins. They have also alerted the applicants to the possibility that the residential element of the proposal might require supplementary collections, which would incur a cost. I recommend a condition to ensure that their concern is resolved, and an informative to relay the issue about extra collections to the applicants.

8.112 In my opinion, subject to condition, the proposal is compliant in respect of waste storage and collection with Cambridge Local Plan (2018) policy 57.

Highway Safety

8.113 The increase in pedestrian movements across Trumpington Street generated by this proposal makes it essential that a safer route for pedestrians is created. I concur with the urban design and conservation officers that to install a formalised zebra or light-controlled crossing here would cause significant harm to the conservation area. It is also very close to the existing light-controlled crossing outside the Pitt Building. The highway authority, the cycling officer and a number of respondents criticised the original proposal submitted for a crossing in front

of Kenmare both because of the confusion it would cause by giving the crossing an ambiguous appearance which might have misled pedestrians into treating it as a zebra, and also because the proposed median strip might have induced an increase in vehicle speeds rather than the opposite. I accept this advice. The applicants have submitted a revised proposal, in which the crossing is clearly not marked like a zebra, the median strip is eliminated and the carriageway is narrowed. The highway authority remains concerned about the revised proposal, as does the cycling officer. I share this view. I have indicated in my discussion of context and design in paragraphs 8.50-8.56 above why I consider that the remaining highway safety concerns can be addressed by conditions.

8.114 The proposed crossing needs to be secured by a Section 106 agreement and a Section 278 Agreement. In my opinion, subject to these, the proposal is compliant in highway safety terms with Cambridge Local Plan (2018) policy 81.

Car and Cycle Parking

8.115 The application proposal would reduce the number of car parking spaces available on site, leaving four disabled spaces. The proposal includes five rooms suitable for occupation by disabled users, and the level of disabled car parking is therefore technically in conflict with policy 82 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006. In my view, however, this is acceptable. Policy 46 does not require a specific proportion of disabled-occupation rooms in student accommodation, so the applicants could bring the application into accordance with policy 82 by reducing the number of rooms of this type to four. That outcome would be perverse; it is clearly preferable to retain the additional disabled-occupation room in the scheme. Disability panel do not criticise the scheme on these grounds, and in addition I accept the applicants' submission that not all disabled students require the use of a car.

8.116 The reduction in car parking space overall is in accordance with policy and the principles of sustainability.

8.117 In my opinion, although the proposal is not technically compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2018) policy 82 in terms of car parking, it is in accordance with the aspirations of that policy and should be considered effectively compliant.

8.118 The application proposes 136 cycle parking spaces. The City Council's cycle parking standards require one cycle parking space for every two bedspaces in student accommodation. 94 student rooms would therefore require 47 cycle parking spaces. Given that the development proposal eliminates the Mill Lane Lecture Rooms, which are currently a major inward destination for cycle journeys, and changes the use of Stuart House from a University-wide service to a College social and study area this reducing the likely number of cycle journeys towards it, it is my view that the cycle parking provision in the application is well above the level which policy would require, even allowing for people working in the proposed College administrative spaces. I do not accept the view of the cycling officer and County Transport that additional visitor parking spaces should be provided. I do share the concern of those consultees about the proportion of cycle parking space which would not be under cover, and I recommend a condition on cycle parking spaces to ensure that the proportion of covered spaces is increased.

8.119 Subject to such a condition, I am of the view that the proposal is compliant with policy 82 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2018 in terms of cycle parking.

Trees

8.120 The proposal involves the removal of three existing mature trees, one in the Millers Yard courtyard, and two in Little St Mary's Lane. The latter two trees have been discussed at length in pre-application meetings. I am satisfied that, because of UK Power Network requirements, it would be very difficult to provide the substation necessary for this development in a position which did not require the removal of trees.

8.121 I would have welcomed advice from the arboricultural officer on this application, but it has not been given. I concur with the landscape officer that the three existing trees in Little St Mary's Lane are of moderate amenity value, but in my view, the retention of the best of these three trees as proposed in the application would ensure that the harm to the conservation area is only limited; the glimpse of green in views up and down the Lane, and the shade, which the trees provide, would be retained, albeit reduced from their present extent. I concur with the landscape officer that the removal of three substantial trees calls for mitigation by the planting of trees of a mature scale

greater than those shown in the submitted proposals. The landscaping condition which I recommend enables such planting to be secured.

Archaeology

8.122 The advice of the county archaeology team is that there are likely to be significant archaeological remains on the site and that a condition to investigate this is necessary. I recommend such a condition.

Third Party Representations

8.123 I have addressed almost all the issues raised in representations in the paragraphs indicated below. In the cases where I have not, I indicate the reason in the table below

Amenity issues	
Overlooking	8.90
Overshadowing	8.80-8.81
Loss of daylight	8.82-8.85
Visual domination and sense of enclosure	8.86-8.89
Impact of lighted rooms at night	8.94-8.95
Views obscured	8.89
Noise from student activity (exacerbation of existing issue)	8.92
Disturbance and noise	8.91
Need to ensure weekends are quiet	8.102
Need to ensure phasing of development is adhered to	8.104
Difficulty of enforcing time restrictions on construction	8.102
Odours from extracts	8.96
Closeness of existing flue to proposed buildings would restrict existing residents' use of cooking facilities	8.97
Loss of informal agreement for 'cherry-picker' access for roof maintenance	8.99/8.101
Loss of opportunity to bring bulky items over the rear wall	8.99/8.101
Loss of informal agreement for parking contractors and utility service vehicles	8.99/8.101
Loss of access route through the site	8.100

Loss of informal agreement allowing use of University cycle parking	8.99/8.101
Unclear how access rights would be protected	8.100
Loss of opportunity to use route over boundary wall for emergency rescue and evacuation	8.73
Narrow gap between boundary wall and South block would harbour rubbish	8.98
Gap would harbour vermin	8.98
Gap would make wall maintenance impossible	8.98
Access point from Little St Mary's Lane might be used for smoking, drug abuse or rough sleeping	8.93
Loss of tranquillity in lane	8.91
Increased intrusion from greater pedestrian flows	8.91
Increased vehicle traffic and congestion in Little St Mary's Lane	8.91
Loss of informal Parking agreement for Little St Mary's church	8.100
Damage to boundary wall	8.104
Design and heritage issues	
Out of proportion	8.43
Design quality of Dolby Court not high enough	8.43
Questions about justification for demolition of 75 Trumpington Street	8.28-8.31
Insufficient cycle parking	8.118
Excessive taxi drop-off areas	8.54
Design of Conduit bridging covers	8.54
Impact of new kerbs on Conduit	8.54
Highways issues	
Proposed new crossing is not safe because it is not a formal 'zebra'	8.51-8.53 and 8.56
Proposed medial granite strip would increase vehicle speeds	8.51-8.53 and 8.56
No improvement to junction at Pembroke St/Trumpington Street	8.51-8.53 and 8.56
Other issues	
Damage to listed buildings	Addressed in report on 18/1931LBC
No finalised Masterplan	8.11

Planning Obligations (s106 Agreement)

8.124 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.

8.125 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 space and sports facilities)

8.126 The Developer Contribution Monitoring team has confirmed that the College provides sufficient open space and sports facilities for its students and that therefore no contributions for this purpose are required.

Public Realm

8.127 Because of the increased activity and movements which will result from the proposed new uses on the site, the development would have an impact on the public realm. Improvements to the public realm are therefore required in order to mitigate this impact. The improvements required are as follows.

1. Works to the highway in Trumpington Street to reduce traffic speeds, create a safe route for pedestrians between the

main Pembroke site and the proposed new gatehouse, and enhance the appearance of the conservation area.

2. New street lighting attached to proposed new and retained buildings in Mill Lane, to eliminate 'dark spots' in the Lane, and create a less cluttered highway surface.
3. Improvements to the footway/carriageway in Mill Lane to make the Lane more accessible and safer for pedestrians and cyclists.

8.128 The applicants have agreed that these elements should be included in a Section 106 Agreement. The agreement would require items 1 and 2 above to be completed in connection with the present application scheme. It would not be appropriate for the works in item 3 above to be carried out in connection with the present proposal, because the demolition and construction works which are likely to occur if a development scheme for the site on the north side of Mill Lane is brought forward in the near future, would cause damage to the highway.

8.129 The agreement would require the works in item 3 above to be carried out after and in connection with a development scheme on the north side of Mill Lane, but must also include a fallback provision, so that if such a scheme is not brought forward within a reasonable time, the works are carried out anyway.

8.130 In my view, subject to the completion of an agreement as indicated above, appropriate mitigation of the impact of the development will be achieved. All of these works will also require the completion of a Section 278 Agreement with the highway authority. The works in item 1 above will also require listed building consent, because they will involve intervention in the fabric of the Grade II listed Hobson's Conduit.

Planning Obligations Conclusion

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

9.0 CONCLUSION

- 9.1 In my view, the proposal integrates well-designed new buildings with the sensitive adaptation and alteration of existing buildings on the site. The intensity of use is appropriate to the context, and the proposal is in accordance with the site-specific policy, 26, in the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 and with the Old Press/ Mill Lane SPD 2010. The proposal would enhance the conservation area and improve the setting of the listed buildings within it.

10.0 RECOMMENDATIONS

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

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

Reason: In accordance with the requirements of Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended by 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 2018 Policy 33.

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 2018 Policy 33.

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 2018 Policy 33.

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 2018 Policy 33.

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 2018 Policy 33.

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 2018 Policy 33.

9. The phases of the development shall be Phases 1 and 2 as defined in the submitted drawing 1609_HT_P_71600 'Phasing Diagram G+0 College wide site' (enabling works for Phase 2 being part of Phase 2 for this purpose). No changes to the boundaries between Phase 1 and Phase 2 shall be permitted unless they have been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority.

Reason: To ensure appropriate thing for the discharge of other conditions. (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policies 35, 37, 55, 57, 59 and 70)

10. Prior to commencement of any phase of the development hereby permitted, details of the following matters for that phase shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority:
- i) contractors access arrangements for vehicles, plant and personnel,
 - ii) contractors site storage area/compound,
 - iii) the means of moving, storing and stacking all building materials, plant and equipment around and adjacent to the site,
 - iv) the arrangements for parking of contractors vehicles and contractors personnel vehicles.

The development shall be undertaken only in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To protect the amenity of the adjoining properties during the construction period (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policies 35 and 36).

11. 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 2018 policy 35).

12. There shall be no collections from or deliveries to the site arising from demolition or construction of the development hereby approved 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 2018 policy 35).

13. No development in any phase shall commence (including any pre-construction, demolition, enabling works or piling), until a written report, regarding the demolition / construction noise and vibration impact associated with that phase of the development, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning 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. The phase of development concerned shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details only.

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 2018 policy 35).

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

Reason: To protect the amenity of nearby properties (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policy 36).

15. Demolition of No.75 Trumpington Street shall not commence until a method statement for this element of the proposal has been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority. Demolition shall take place thereafter only in accordance with the approved method statement.

Reason: To protect the fabric of the adjoining buildings and avoid a harmful impact on the conservation area (Cambridge Local Plan policy 61).

16. Prior to the installation of any plant and equipment associated with the approved development, on a phased unit by unit basis if necessary, a noise impact assessment of plant, equipment and associated plant rooms (including all mechanical and electrical building services, combustion appliances / flues, air source heat pumps, ventilation systems / louvres, , refuse / recycling equipment within waste storage areas / rooms and electricity substations) and details of a noise insulation scheme as appropriate, in order to minimise the level of noise emanating from the said plant and equipment and associated rooms shall be submitted in writing for approval by the Local Planning Authority .

The noise insulation / mitigation scheme as approved shall be fully implemented before the use hereby permitted is commenced and shall be maintained and retained thereafter.

Reason: To protect the amenity of nearby properties (National Planning Policy Framework 2019 paragraphs 170, 180, 182 and Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policy 35).

17. Prior to commencement of superstructure works in Phase 2, a noise insulation scheme detailing the acoustic / noise insulation performance specification of the external building envelope of habitable rooms (having regard to the building fabric elements - including glazing and alternative ventilation provision) to reduce the level of noise experienced in these rooms as a result of external ambient noise levels in the area, shall be submitted in writing for approval by the local planning authority. Any alternative ventilation provision required shall be capable of achieving a minimum of 2 air changes per hour (ACH) and internal ventilation operational noise levels shall be considered. The scheme as approved shall be fully constructed and implemented before the use hereby permitted is commenced and shall be retained thereafter.

The noise insulation / mitigation scheme shall be in accordance with the principles, mitigation measures and recommendations detailed in the submitted 'Old Press Mill Lane South Noise Impact Assessment, November 2018 (Issue B - 09.11.18: ISSUED FOR PLANNING - MINOR CORRECTIONS, Max Fordham LLP)' apart from (i) below which shall form part of the noise insulation scheme:

- (i) With the exception of the need to open external windows / doors for cleaning and maintenance, under a building management regime, all external openings that is windows and doors or similar to the 18 x habitable rooms (bedrooms R.03W.1.04 to 09, R.03W.2.04 to 09, R.03W.1.04 to 07 plus 2 set study area rooms as detailed on drawing nos: 1609_HT_P_03101 (G+1), 1609_HT_P_03102 (G+2) and 1609_HT_P_03103 (G+3) respectively) on the West Elevation of the Dolby Court West Block directly facing / in the direct line of sight of The University Centre shall be locked in a fully fixed / closed position and shall not be openable by occupiers. No other openings in the facades of these rooms will be permitted.

Reason: To protect the amenity of properties (National Planning Policy Framework Feb, 2019 paragraphs 170, 180, 182 and Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policy 35).

18. Prior to any superstructure works (including any refurbishment works) commencing on site in any phase for any D1 - Non-residential Institutions and D2 - Assembly and Leisure class uses hereby approved, a noise impact assessment of these uses on neighbouring premises (to include existing residential premises in the area and the proposed habitable rooms of the development itself) and a noise insulation scheme or other noise control measures as appropriate, in order to minimise the level of noise emanating from the said D1 and D2 uses and associated internal and external spaces (having regard to nature / type of uses and events to be held, hours of use, typical noise generation - sound system setup with consideration of in system noise limiting devices / independent noise limiters, noise egress and airborne and flanking sound via building structural elements - fabric, glazing, openings and ventilation systems acoustic performance, premises entrances / acoustic lobbies and any associated external spaces and patron noise) shall be submitted in writing for approval by the Local Planning Authority.

The noise insulation / mitigation scheme as approved shall be fully constructed and implemented before the D1 and D2 uses hereby permitted are commenced and shall be retained thereafter.

Reason: To protect the amenity of nearby properties (National Planning Policy Framework 2019 paragraphs 170, 180, 182 and Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policy 35).

19. All service collections / dispatches from, and deliveries to, the approved development in the operational phase (including refuse / recycling collections) shall take place only between the hours of 0700 hrs and 2100 hrs Monday to Saturday and 0800 hrs and 1900 hrs on Sundays and any Bank / Public Holiday.

Reason: To protect the amenity of nearby properties (National Planning Policy Framework 2019 paragraphs 170, 180, 182 and Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policy 35).

20. All refuse, waste, and recycling material shall be deposited into receptacles inside the ground floor refuse and recycling storage rooms. Refuse and recycling receptacles shall only be taken outside, presented for collection or moved around the external area of the site between 0700 to 2100 hrs Monday to Saturday and 0800 hrs and 1900 hrs on Sundays and any Bank / Public Holiday.

Reason: To protect the amenity of nearby properties (National Planning Policy Framework 2019 paragraphs 170, 180, 182 and Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policy 35).

21. Prior to the installation of any electrical services, an electric vehicle charge point scheme demonstrating that at least one operational active electric vehicle charge point will be installed to 50% of the communal parking spaces (2 of 4 proposed), shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

The active electric vehicle charge point scheme as approved shall be fully installed prior to first occupation and maintained and retained thereafter.

Reason: In the interests of encouraging more sustainable modes and forms of transport and to reduce the impact of development on local air quality, in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF, 2019) paragraphs 110, 170 and 181, Policy 36 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2018) Cambridge City Council's adopted Air Quality Action Plan (2018).

22. Prior to the installation of any ventilation systems to buildings used for the provision and cooking of hot food (A3, A4 planning class uses) and on a phased basis as necessary, a ventilation scheme to include details of equipment and systems for the purpose of extraction / discharge, filtration, abatement and control of odours and smoke / fumes to discharge at an appropriate outlet level, including details of sound attenuation for any associated plant / equipment and the standard of dilution / dispersion expected, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The ventilation scheme details as approved shall be installed before the uses hereby permitted is commenced and shall be retained thereafter.

Any approved scheme or system installed shall be regularly maintained in accordance with the manufacturer's specifications / instructions to ensure its continued satisfactory operation to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To protect the amenity of nearby properties from odour and smoke / fumes or noise impacts. (National Planning Policy Framework, Feb 2019 - National Planning Policy Framework Feb, 2019 paragraphs 170, 180, 182 and Cambridge Local Plan 2018 - policy 36.

23. Prior to the installation of any artificial lighting an external and internal artificial lighting scheme with detailed impact assessment 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 (external and internal building lighting) and an artificial lighting impact assessment with predicted lighting levels at existing residential properties shall be undertaken (including horizontal / vertical isolux contour light levels and calculated glare levels). Artificial lighting on and off site shall meet the Obtrusive Light Limitations for Exterior Lighting Installations for an Environmental Zone - E2 in accordance with the Institute of Lighting Professionals - Guidance Notes for the Reduction of Obtrusive Light - GN01:2011 (or as superseded) and any mitigation measures to reduce and contain potential artificial light spill and glare as appropriate shall be detailed.

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

Reason: To protect the amenity of nearby properties (National Planning Policy Framework, Feb 2019 - paragraph 180 c and Cambridge Local Plan 2018 - policies 34 and 59).

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

Reason: To ensure that the appearance of the external surfaces is appropriate (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policies 55 and 57).

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

Reason: To ensure that the appearance of the external surfaces is appropriate (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policies 55 and 57).

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

Reason: In the interests of visual amenity and to ensure that the quality and colour of the detailing of the brickwork/stonework and jointing is acceptable and maintained throughout the development (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policies 55 and 57).

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

Reason: To ensure that the details of development are acceptable (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policies 55 and 57).

28. Full details of proposed signage in any phase of the development shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority before any works above ground in that phase commence. 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 2018 policies 55 and 57).

29. New roof coverings shall not be erected on Stuart House until details of the proposed material (including a sample) have been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority. Work shall proceed on this element only in accordance with the agreed details.

Reason: To avoid harm to the significance of the conservation area (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policy 61).

30. No development above ground level in any phase, other than demolition or alteration of existing buildings, shall commence until full details of both hard and soft landscape works for that phase have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority and these works shall be carried out as approved. These details shall include proposed finished levels or contours; means of enclosure; car parking layouts, other vehicle and pedestrian access and circulation areas; hard surfacing materials; minor artefacts and structures; proposed and existing functional services; retained historic landscape features and proposals for restoration, where relevant. Soft Landscape works shall include planting plans; written specifications (including cultivation and other operations associated with plant and grass establishment); schedules of plants, noting species, plant sizes and proposed numbers/densities where appropriate and an implementation programme.

Reason: In the interests of visual amenity and to ensure that suitable hard and soft landscape is provided as part of the development (Cambridge Local Plan 2018; Policies 55, 57 and 59).

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

Reason: In the interests of visual amenity and to ensure that suitable hard and soft landscape is provided as part of the development (Cambridge Local Plan 2018; Policies 55, 57 and 59).

32. No new construction above ground floor level shall take place until a scheme for the installation of a black redstart box and a peregrine box within the site has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The approved scheme shall be implemented before occupation of the first phase in which either of these boxes is to be placed.

Reason: To conserve biodiversity and protect priority species (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policy 70).

33. If demolition works are to be undertaken within the bird nesting season, a black redstart survey and pre-works check for nesting peregrine falcons shall be carried out to establish whether any active nests could be subject to disturbance during the works. If active nests are present and liable to be disturbed, the demolition and construction works within the proximity of the nests must be undertaken once breeding has ceased and all young have fledged.

Reason: To conserve biodiversity and protect priority species (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policy 70).

34. If development of any phase does not commence before 1st May 2020, a further bat survey shall take place, and if additional bat roosts are revealed by this survey, no demolition in that phase shall take place until a scheme of mitigation for bats has been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority. The approved mitigation scheme shall be implemented in full before any occupation of buildings in that phase.

Reason: To conserve biodiversity and protect priority species (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 Policy 70).

35. Within 6 months of commencement of development, a BRE issued Design Stage Certificate shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority demonstrating that BREEAM 'excellent' as a minimum will be met, with at least 3 credits for Wat 01 (water consumption). Where the interim certificate shows a shortfall in credits for BREEAM 'excellent', a statement shall be submitted identifying how the shortfall will be addressed. In the event that such a rating is replaced by a comparable national measure of sustainability for building design, the equivalent level of measure shall be applicable to the proposed development.

Reason: In the interests of reducing carbon dioxide emissions and promoting principles of sustainable construction and efficient use of buildings (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 Policy 28).

36. Prior to the occupation of the student accommodation hereby approved, or within 6 months of occupation, a BRE issued post-Construction Certificate shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, indicating that the approved BREEAM rating has been met. In the event that such a rating is replaced by a comparable national measure of sustainability for building design, the equivalent level of measure shall be applicable to the proposed development.

Reason: In the interests of reducing carbon dioxide emissions and promoting principles of sustainable construction and efficient use of buildings (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 Policy 28).

37. The approved renewable energy technologies and associated heating and cooling network infrastructure shall be fully installed and operational prior to the first occupation of the development and shall thereafter be retained and remain fully operational in accordance with a maintenance programme, which shall be submitted to and agreed in writing by the local planning authority.

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

Reason: In the interests of reducing carbon dioxide emissions (Cambridge Local Plan 2018, policy 28).

38. Prior to occupation, a water efficiency specification based on the Water Efficiency Calculator Methodology or the Fitting Approach set out in Part G of the Building Regulations 2010 (2015 edition) shall be submitted to the local planning authority. This shall demonstrate that all student rooms are able to achieve a design standard of water use of no more than 110 litres/person/day and that the development shall be carried out in accordance with the agreed details.

Reason: To ensure that the development makes efficient use of water and promotes the principles of sustainable construction (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 Policy 28).

39. Prior to the occupation of any part of Phase 2 of the development hereby permitted, the windows identified as having obscured glass on drawing No. 1609_HT_E_03405 REV P1 shall be obscure glazed to a minimum level of obscurity to conform to Pilkington Glass level 3 or equivalent and shall be locked completely shut in such a manner as they cannot be opened by occupiers. The windows shall be unlocked and opened only by the building's managers in accordance with a reasonable schedule of cleaning and maintenance. The glazing shall thereafter be retained in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: In the interests of residential amenity (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policies 55, 57/58).

40. Existing fire hydrants on the site must be retained. The hydrants must be kept in good condition and be available for emergency use during the development and after its completion, regardless of any works in the vicinity.

Reason: To ensure adequate resources to fight fires (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policy 56).

41. No occupation of any student rooms in the development hereby permitted shall take place until the proposed loading / drop-off area between the Mill Lane highway and the Stuart House gates has been laid out and completed.

Reason: To ensure satisfactory loading and unloading space at the site (Cambridge Local Plan policy 56).

42. No hard-standing areas in any phase shall be constructed until works have been carried out for that stage in accordance with the submitted surface water strategy.

Reason: To prevent environmental and amenity problems arising from flooding (Cambridge Local Plan policy 32).

43. Notwithstanding the approved drawings, no occupation of the student accommodation hereby approved shall take place until revised details of cycle parking which maximise the proportion of spaces under cover, have been submitted to and approved in writing by, the local planning authority. The approved details shall be implemented before occupation.

Reason: To ensure appropriate cycle parking (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policy 82).

44. Waste and recycling bins for the student accommodation hereby approved shall be provided so that there are equal numbers of recycling and residual waste bins.

Reason: To ensure appropriate storage for waste and recycling (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policy 57).

45. Within 90 days of the date of this approval, a Preliminary Public Art Plan shall be submitted to the local planning authority for approval. The Preliminary Plan shall include proposals for consultation with stakeholders, and a timetable for the submission of a final Public Art Strategy. Once approved, the timetable for the Public Art Strategy shall be adhered to unless the local planning authority agrees to a variation in writing. No part of the development shall be occupied until a timetable for full implementation of the agreed Public Art Strategy has been agreed, and that timetable shall then be implemented.

Reason: To ensure appropriate public art (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policy 56).

46. No development shall take place until an archaeological written scheme of investigation (WSI) has been submitted to and approved by the local planning authority in writing. For land that is included within the WSI, no demolition/development shall take place other than in accordance with the agreed WSI which shall include:

- a) the statement of significance and research objectives;
- b) The programme and methodology of site investigation and recording and the nomination of a competent person(s) or organisation to undertake the agreed works
- c) The programme for post-excavation assessment and subsequent analysis, publication & dissemination, and deposition of resulting material. This part of the condition shall not be discharged until these elements have been fulfilled in accordance with the programme set out in the WSI.

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

Reason: To protect archaeological remains (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policy 61).

47. No occupation of the former URC church building shall take place until an Access and Management Plan for the use of the building which sets out the opportunities for, and systems for the management of, community use of the building, has been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority. Use of the building shall take place thereafter in accordance with the approved Plan.

Reason: To ensure satisfactory replacement of the existing community sports and leisure facility (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policy 73).

48. No development shall take place until a Stage One Road Safety Audit has taken place, the results submitted to the highway authority, and any issues revealed by the audit resolved to the satisfaction of the highway authority.

Reason: To ensure highway safety (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policy 81).

49. Notwithstanding the drawings submitted with the application, no development shall take place until a revised design for an informal pedestrian crossing of Trumpington Street between the application site and the main Pembroke College porters' lodge has been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority. The approved crossing design shall be implemented prior to any occupation of the student accommodation hereby approved.

Reason: To ensure highway safety, to avoid harm to the conservation area, and to ensure the satisfactory operation of Hobson's Conduit (Cambridge Local Plan policies 31, 32, 61 and 81).

50. No demolition or construction works shall commence on site until a Traffic Management Plan (TMP) has been agreed in writing with the local planning authority

The TMP shall address:

- i. Movements and control of muck away lorries (all loading and unloading shall be undertaken off the adopted public highway.)

- ii. Contractor parking; provide details and quantum of the proposed car parking and methods of preventing on street car parking.
- iii. Movements and control of all deliveries (all loading and unloading shall be undertaken off the adopted public highway).
- iv. Control of dust, mud and debris, in relationship to the operation of the adopted public highway.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policy 81).

INFORMATIVE: Approved remediation works shall be carried out in full on site under a quality assurance scheme to demonstrate compliance with the proposed methodology and best practice guidance.

INFORMATIVE: The applicant is advised that the following considerations have been identified in relation to gas pipeline/s identified on site:

Cadent have identified operational gas apparatus within the application site boundary. This may include a legal interest (easements or wayleaves) in the land which restricts activity in proximity to Cadent assets in private land. The Applicant must ensure that proposed works do not infringe on Cadent's legal rights and any details of such restrictions should be obtained from the landowner in the first instance.

If buildings or structures are proposed directly above the gas apparatus then development should only take place following a diversion of this apparatus. The Applicant should contact Cadent's Plant Protection Team at the earliest opportunity to discuss proposed diversions of apparatus to avoid any unnecessary delays.

If any construction traffic is likely to cross a Cadent pipeline then the Applicant must contact Cadent's Plant Protection Team to see if any protection measures are required.

All developers are required to contact Cadent's Plant Protection Team for approval before carrying out any works on site and ensuring requirements are adhered to. Email: plantprotection@cadentgas.com Tel: 0800 688 588.

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

Hard copies can also be provided upon request

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

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

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

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

INFORMATIVE: As the premises is intended to be run as a business The applicant is reminded of their duty under the Construction (Design and Management) Regulations 2007 to ensure that the that all significant risks related to the design and operation of the premises are minimised. Contact the Commercial Team at Cambridge City Council on telephone number (01223) 457890 for further information.

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

INFORMATIVE: Dust condition informative

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

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

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

-Guidance on the assessment of dust from demolition and construction:

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

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

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

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

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

INFORMATIVE: 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 8389.

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

INFORMATIVE: Notwithstanding the provision of the Town and Country Planning General Permitted Development Order 1995 (or any order revoking or re-enacting that Order), any oil storage tank shall be sited on an impervious base and surrounded by oil tight bunded walls with a capacity of 110% of the storage tank, to enclose all filling, drawing and overflow pipes. The installation must comply with Control of Pollution Regulations 2001, and Control of Pollution (Oil Storage) Regulations 2001.

INFORMATIVE: The water environment is potentially vulnerable and there is an increased potential for pollution from inappropriately located and/or designed infiltration (SuDS). We consider any infiltration (SuDS) greater than 2.0 m below ground level to be a deep system and are generally not acceptable. All infiltration SuDS require a minimum of 1.2 m clearance between the base of infiltration SuDS and peak seasonal groundwater levels. All need to meet the criteria in our Groundwater Protection: Principles and Practice (GP3) position statements G1 to G13 which can be found here:

<https://www.gov.uk/government/collections/groundwater-protection>

In addition, they must not be constructed in ground affected by contamination and if the use of deep bore soakaways is proposed, we would wish to be re-consulted. The proposals will need to comply with our Groundwater protection position statements G1 and G9 to G13.

INFORMATIVE: Foul water drainage (and trade effluent where appropriate) from the proposed development should be discharged to the public foul sewer, with the prior approval of Anglian Water Services, unless it can be satisfactorily demonstrated that a connection is not reasonably available.

Anglian Water Services Ltd. should be consulted by the Local Planning Authority and be requested to demonstrate that the sewerage and sewage disposal systems serving the development have sufficient capacity to accommodate the additional flows, generated as a result of the development, without causing pollution or flooding. If there is not capacity in either of the sewers, the Agency must be reconsulted with alternative methods of disposal.

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

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

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

INFORMATIVE: Notification to the Environmental Growth and Quality team will be required under the Environmental Permitting Regulations if an onsite concrete crusher will be used during the demolition stage.

INFORMATIVE: It is a requirement of the Clean Air Act 1993 that no relevant furnace shall be installed in a building or in any fixed boiler or industrial plant unless notice of the proposal to install it has been given to the local authority. Details of any furnaces, boilers or plant to be installed should be provided using the Chimney Height Calculation form (available here: <https://www.cambridge.gov.uk/chimney-height-approval>).

INFORMATIVE: Asbestos containing materials (cement sheeting) may be present at the site. The agent/applicant should ensure that these materials are dismantled and disposed of in the appropriate manner to a licensed disposal site. Further information regarding safety issues can be obtained from the H.S.E.

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

INFORMATIVE: To satisfy the plant sound insulation condition, the rating level (in accordance with BS4142:2014) from all plant, equipment and vents etc. (collectively) associated with this application should be less than or equal to the existing background level (L90) at the boundary of the premises subject to this application and having regard to noise sensitive premises.

Tonal/impulsive sound frequencies should be eliminated or at least considered in any assessment and should carry an additional correction in accordance with BS4142:2014. This is to prevent unreasonable disturbance to other premises. This requirement applies both during the day (0700 to 2300 hrs over any one hour period) and night time (2300 to 0700 hrs over any one 15 minute period).

It is recommended that the agent/applicant submits an acoustic prediction survey/report in accordance with the principles of BS4142:2014 "Methods for rating and assessing industrial and commercial sound" or similar, concerning the effects on amenity rather than likelihood for complaints. Noise levels shall be predicted at the boundary having regard to neighbouring premises.

It is important to note that a full BS4142:2014 assessment is not required, only certain aspects to be incorporated into an acoustic assessment as described within this informative.

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

Any report shall include raw measurement data so that conclusions may be thoroughly evaluated and calculations checked.

- 10.2 **(In the event that the application is refused) RESOLVE that, if an Appeal is lodged against the decision to refuse this application, delegated authority is granted to officers to negotiate and complete the Planning Obligation required in connection with this development.**