

Application Number	18/1002/FUL	Agenda Item	
Date Received	27th June 2018	Officer	Lorraine Casey
Target Date	26th September 2018		
Ward	Abbey		
Site	211 - 213 Newmarket Road And 2 Godesdone Road Cambridge CB5 8HA		
Proposal	Demolition of existing buildings at 211-213 Newmarket Road and construction of a hotel (C1 use), with change of use and conversion of 2 Godesdone Road to C1 use, and provision of associated infrastructure.		
Applicant	MPMerchant (NR) Ltd and easyHotel C/O Agent		

A. Adjourned decision protocol

- A.1 At the Planning Committee meeting held on 17th June 2019, Members were minded to refuse the application, contrary to Officer recommendation, and therefore triggered the Adjourned Decision Protocol. I will set out and assess the three minded to refuse reasons in full below:
- 1: The proposed development would conflict with Policy 77 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2018 due to the location of the site partly on a residential road and as insufficient information has been submitted to demonstrate that there is a need for this type of accommodation in this location over and above that identified in the Hotel Futures Study, upon which this policy is framed.
 - 2: Insufficient information has been submitted with the application to demonstrate that the development would not have an unacceptable transport impact. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policy 81 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2018 and notably paragraph 8.22 which aims to achieve a zero increase or reduction in car traffic in locations including Newmarket Road.

3. Due to the absence of amenities in the proposed hotel and the absence of adequate drop-off and pick-up arrangements on site, the development would result in unacceptable levels of noise and disturbance to occupiers of adjacent residential properties through comings and goings, and visitors congregating in Godesdone Rd and through increased vehicle and notably taxi movements in the area. The proposal would therefore be contrary to Policy 35 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2018.
- A.2 Since the Committee meeting, the applicant's agent and representatives of the Residents' Association have submitted further representations. The residents' comments essentially collate concerns that have been raised in previous submissions insofar as they relate to these specific issues and both the residents' and agents' key comments have been referred to in the assessment below.

Reason 1

The proposed development would conflict with Policy 77 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2018 due to the location of the site partly on a residential road and as insufficient information has been submitted to demonstrate that there is a need for this type of accommodation in this location over and above that identified in the Hotel Futures Study, upon which this policy is framed.

- A.3 The first minded-to reason for refusal relates to Policy 77 which covers the development of visitor accommodation. During the discussion at Committee, Members were concerned that the policy only supports high quality hotels and not further budget hotels; that there is no proven demand for the type of accommodation proposed (the Cambridge Hotel Futures Study indicates that demand for budget accommodation in Cambridge has largely been satisfied); and that the location of the site, being accessed off a residential rather than main road, is not supported by Policy 77.
- A.4 With regards to the concern regarding the type/quality of accommodation proposed, the advice received from the Policy team and clarified within their presentation to Members prior to the 17th June Committee meeting is that the focus on 'high quality' is in specific locations within the City Centre including

new developments (Old Press/Mill Lane) and areas near the Stations, as well as other City Centre locations, NW Cambridge and the Biomedical Campus. This is set out in the first two paragraphs of Policy 77 and referred to in the supporting text to the policy (para 8.48) which states that the Hotel Futures Study (HFS) aspires to high quality hotels (namely 3-star rating and above) being located within the City Centre.

- A.5 The third paragraph of Policy 77 specifies other locations that may be suitable for visitor accommodation, with the key criteria being that accommodation should be located on the frontages of main roads, and within a mixed-use area within walking distance of bus route corridors and with good public transport accessibility. Paragraph 8.49 of the supporting text states that visitor accommodation covered by the policy takes many forms, including traditional hotels, guesthouses, hostels and serviced apartments.
- A.6 Taking the above into consideration, it is clear that the policy supports many forms of visitor accommodation. There is an aspiration to direct high-quality accommodation towards the City Centre but, outside this area (as the application site is), the policy supports a range of accommodation (not just high-quality hotels) and the key consideration relates to the sustainability of the location.
- A.7 Officers' advice to Members is that refusing the application on the basis that the proposal does not satisfy the requirement for 'high-quality' accommodation would be flawed as the policy does not specify this. Officers also consider that the location of the site satisfies the third paragraph of the policy by being located on the frontage of a main road (Newmarket Road), within a mixed use area, and in a location with good public transport, cycling and walking links. Whilst the road from which the site would be accessed (Godesdone Road) is a primarily residential street rather than a main arterial road, the emphasis of this part of the policy is upon new hotel accommodation being sited in a sustainable and accessible location, and the fact that the site bounds a residential road to one side does not alter its suitability from a sustainability point of view. As a result, Officers consider that it would not be justifiable to refuse the application on the basis that the location would be unacceptable insofar as it relates to Policy 77.

- A.8 The third element of this ‘minded-to’ reason relates to the lack of proven need for further budget accommodation. A consultancy study, entitled ‘Cambridge Hotel Futures’ was undertaken, and finalised in April 2012, in order to assess the supply of and demand for hotel and short-stay accommodation in Cambridge to 2031, and Policy 77 was framed upon the findings of this study. This study identified a strong demand for significant new hotel development in Cambridge, approximately 1500 new hotel bedrooms (based on a medium growth scenario), in order to widen the accommodation offer of the city, encourage longer stays and enhance the competitiveness of the city as a visitor destination. This included an anticipated requirement, based on a medium-growth scenario, for 460 budget rooms. 498 budget rooms have been delivered to date at Orchard Park and on Newmarket Road thereby satisfying the anticipated need in the study for budget accommodation. The high growth scenario stated a likely need for 594 budget rooms and, if the Grafton Centre hotel were to come forward (this is currently the subject of another application), this would deliver 153 rooms, taking the total above the need identified at the time of the study.
- A.9 Whilst it is understandable that these findings would lead Members to conclude that there is no need for a further budget hotel in Cambridge, the latest evidence available suggests that the situation has changed and evolved significantly, and that there is a much greater need and demand for budget accommodation than identified and anticipated at the time of the 2012 study. The findings of the 2012 study are therefore dated and a new Visitor Accommodation Study is being commissioned to inform the Greater Cambridge Local Plan. Planning applications are required to be determined in accordance with the Development Plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. The evidence provided both by the applicants in support of their application and by the Planning Policy Team regarding the City’s increased and changing accommodation needs are material issues that should be taken into account by Members in assessing the application.
- A.10 A ‘Hotel Needs Assessment’ was submitted with the application, and this explained that a combination of the following factors has resulted in an increased demand for hotel rooms:

- Average hotel room occupancy has increased from 73.8% in 2010 to 76.5% in 2017, and this exceeds the 70% threshold above which demand is considered to outstrip supply.
- Average Achieved Room Rates and Average Revenue per Available Room have both increased since 2010.
- There has been a higher forecast job growth in Cambridge than anticipated at the time of the study.
- There has been a higher growth rate in the UK Visitor Economy and an associated increase in accommodation and food/beverage services.
- There has been strong passenger growth at nearby airports including a 44% increase at Stansted from 2011 – 2016.

A.11 The Planning Policy team has advised that data available from 'Visit Cambridge and Beyond', and 'Gateway to the East: A position statement for the development and growth of the Greater Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Visitor Economy' shows that, from 2010 – 2017, the number of visitors to Cambridge increased from 4m to 8.1m (including 950,000 staying trips), with the economic value increasing from J393m to J835m and proportion of employment increasing from 14% to 22%. There is also a growing demand from Chinese visitors, with trips out of China forecast to increase to 132m by 2022 and 264m by 2030, with Cambridge being top of Chinese visitors' list of destinations to visit in the UK.

A.12 The Council's policy seeks to increase the number of tourists staying overnight in Cambridge, to help secure economic tourism benefits and to smooth out tourist activity caused by having so many day trips. The number of Airbnbs in Cambridge is estimated between 300-450 properties, and this represents an unmet demand for visitor accommodation some of which falls within the same price bracket as Easyhotel and Travelodge. Emerging trends such as Airbnb, serviced apartments, and whether hotels such as Easyhotel are another form of budget hotel or fall within a separate category of 'Superbudget' will be considered as part of the Visitor Accommodation Study that will update the Hotel Futures Study. Whilst this document has not yet been commissioned, and there is therefore no formally adopted document to counter the findings of the Hotel Futures Study and no specific figures on the need for overnight accommodation, it is anticipated that due

to the recent and projected rise in visitor numbers, the increased use of Airbnbs by local property owners, the fall in value of the J, and the increase in Cambridge's Average Daily Rate of accommodation to J95 in 2018 (obtained from Colliers UK Hotels Market Index), the Study is likely to conclude that there is insufficient hotel/visitor accommodation capacity to meet Cambridge's needs.

- A.13 As a result of this up-to-date evidence base, Officers are extremely concerned that refusing the application based upon the findings of/figures quoted within the Hotel Futures Study is highly unlikely to be successful at appeal. This is because, in the event of an appeal, Officers would be required to provide evidence demonstrating why there is no need for the category of hotel proposed in this application, and the most up-to-date evidence available simply does not support this position.

Reason 2

Insufficient information has been submitted with the application to demonstrate that the development would not have an unacceptable transport impact. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policy 81 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2018 and notably paragraph 8.22 which aims to achieve a zero increase or reduction in car traffic in locations including Newmarket Road.

- A.14 Local Plan Policy 81 states that developments will only be permitted where they do not have an unacceptable transport impact. New development will therefore require sufficient information to enable the transport impact to be assessed; a travel plan for all major development proposals; and reasonable and proportionate financial contributions/mitigation measures to make the transport impact acceptable. The supporting text to this policy explains that such documentation would need to be assessed by the County Council as the Highways Authority.
- A.15 A Transport Statement was submitted with the application and, in response to the request for further information from County Highways, additional Technical Notes were provided by the applicant's transport consultants. The assessment considered the impact upon highway safety (including the safety of pedestrians and cyclists) in comparison to the trip generation of the former retail use (which is the lawful/established use of the

site). This has demonstrated that the site is in a sustainable location, and that there are opportunities for employees, guests and visitors to travel to the site by modes other than by car. To encourage travel by sustainable means, the Travel Plan notes that bicycles would be provided for use by guests, that a map showing walking routes from local car parks would be provided to guests on booking, and that, at night, taxis will only stop on Newmarket Road.

- A.16 The applicant has also agreed to undertake a survey and that, if guests are found to be parking unlawfully in the CPZ, to meet the cost of increased charges to residents, and also to contribute J120,000 towards highways improvements.
- A.17 Residents have raised concerns that the TRICS data is flawed and vehicle trip estimates unrealistic; that the proposal increases the risk of vehicle collision and cyclist safety due to vehicles cutting across Godesdone Road to the layby; and that the bus and cycle lanes would be obstructed by taxis dropping off on Newmarket Road at night. These concerns have been relayed to the Highways Authority who have advised that it considers the information provided as part of the application to be sound and robust and that, when comparing the proposal to the traffic impacts associated with the lawful retail use and the already busy nature of Newmarket Road, the application is acceptable from a highway safety perspective subject to mitigation conditions and financial contributions.
- A.18 The Highways Authority has advised that it would have no basis upon which to recommend an objection to the proposals or the associated technical work presented. I would therefore recommend to Members not to refuse the application on highway safety grounds, as this would be contrary to the Highways Authority's advice (who are the statutory consultee on such matters) and, in the event of an appeal, could result in a successful challenge on cost grounds against the Council.

Reason 3

Due to the absence of amenities in the proposed hotel and the absence of adequate drop-off and pick-up arrangements on site, the development would result in unacceptable levels of noise and disturbance to occupiers of adjacent residential properties through comings and

goings, and visitors congregating in Godesdone Rd and through increased vehicle and notably taxi movements in the area. The proposal would therefore be contrary to Policy 35 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2018.

- A.19 Local Plan Policy 35 states that development will be permitted where it is demonstrated that it will not lead to significant adverse effects upon the health and quality of life/amenity from noise and vibration impacts to adjacent properties.
- A.20 The Council's Environmental Health Officer raised concerns during the course of the application regarding the potential impact of the development upon the amenities of adjacent residents. Further information was provided by the applicants that considered the impact compared to the lawful retail use and existing background noise levels. This predicted either a negligible or no change noise impact on Newmarket Road and River Lane in the short and long-term during weekdays and Saturdays; a negligible impact on Godesdone Road on weekdays; and a minor impact on Godesdone Road on Saturdays in the short term, reducing to negligible in the long term.
- A.21 There are two key issues to take into account in this instance when assessing the extent of harm on noise grounds. Firstly, the site lies in an area that experiences relatively high background noise levels, as a result of the estimated 30,000 cars that pass daily along Newmarket Road. Secondly, the site has an existing established retail use (Coopers furniture store) that has no restrictions relating to hours of use that would help to control noise levels. Whilst it appears that the use recently operated on a relatively low-key basis, it could be used more intensively without requiring planning permission and this fallback position needs to be taken into consideration. Local residents will have suffered noise and disturbance arising from collections and deliveries in Godesdone Road by large vehicles, customer car parking and comings and goings.
- A.22 The proposal includes a number of measures to minimise noise disturbance to nearby residents including:
- Additional noise insulation to No.4 Godesdone Road.
 - Restricted delivery hours (representing an improvement over the existing unrestricted situation).

- Location of drop-off layby opposite the commercial premises on the opposite side of Godesdone Road rather than outside No.4.
- Travel plan that would discourage guests from travelling by car.

A.23 The submitted documentation and proposed measures have satisfied the Environmental Health Officer that in terms of noise/vibration, air quality, odour and contaminated land considerations, the proposal is acceptable and can be mitigated against through planning conditions.

A.24 The one area that does differ from the previous use is that the proposed development is likely to result in a discernible increase in activity levels at night and after normal shop closing hours. The Environmental Health Officer has continually raised concerns regarding the noise impact from taxi movements and associated sounds such as slamming doors, voices, car stereos and engines revving, albeit has advised that a formal objection cannot be raised on such grounds given that these activities would take place off site.

A.25 In response to these concerns, the applicant's agent has advised that Easyhotel will require guests who use taxis to be dropped off at night (from 11pm onwards) on Newmarket Road, and I am satisfied this would therefore minimise disruption to local residents during the late evening hours.

A.26 Further concerns raised by Members at Committee centre around the fact that, as the proposed hotel has no associated amenities such as restaurant/café etc and, in particular, no amenity/break-out areas within the confines of the building for guests' use, this would result in guests congregating in the street to smoke/drink and consequent noise and disturbance to nearby residents. I cannot dispute that this is a likely consequence of the proposal but, in view of the high background noise levels, is not considered to constitute such a significant noise nuisance as to warrant refusal of the application on such grounds.

Additional consideration – Surface water drainage issues

A.27 Since Committee, concerns have been raised by Councillor Davey and local residents that, in response to queries raised by

Members at the meeting, Officers advised there had been no known sewage/drainage issues in the area. Councillor Davey has commented that this is incorrect and that there were two localised flooding events in Riverside in 2012 and 2015 (both caused by heavy summer rainfall and overloading of the drains). Since these events, remedial work was carried out (organised by the City Council in conjunction with Anglian Water, the Environment Agency and the Lead Local Flood Authority). He has commented that, as the site is at a higher level than Riverside, if surface water from the proposed development would go into the same storm drains and down to Riverside, it could compromise the remedial work that has been undertaken.

- A.28 I have forwarded these concerns onto the Council's Drainage Engineer who has advised that the team was aware of these issues in making its comments on the proposal, and that the proposal is considered acceptable following the submission of further details during the course of the application to address their initial concerns. The Drainage Engineer has advised that there will be a reduction in the amount of stormwater entering the sewers due to a restricted discharge rate, and that this is in line with local policy. The site currently outfalls at an unrestricted rate and is almost 100% impermeable, and the proposal would therefore result in an improvement as the current site use already increases the amount of rainwater entering the network.
- A.29 In light of the above advice, I am satisfied that consultees were aware of the recent nearby surface-water flood events, that their comments took this into consideration, and that the proposal is acceptable in terms of its surface water drainage impacts subject to the conditions recommended by the City and County Councils' Drainage teams.

Conclusion

- A.30 In conclusion, Officers reiterate the advice provided to Members at the 17th June Committee, namely that the proposal is considered acceptable, subject to conditions and a S106 Agreement. It is considered that a refusal on highway safety and policy 77 grounds cannot be substantiated, and that the noise impacts, whilst a valid concern, are not significant enough to justify a refusal on this basis.

APPENDIX 1 – REPORT CONSIDERED AT 17TH JUNE PLANNING COMMITTEE

SUMMARY	<p>The development accords with the Development Plan for the following reasons:</p> <p>The proposed hotel would be acceptable in principle and the building would be in character in the locality and would not result in any significant harm to existing residential amenity or highway safety.</p>
RECOMMENDATION	APPROVAL subject to conditions

1.0 SITE DESCRIPTION/AREA CONTEXT

- 1.1 The site comprises 211-213 Newmarket Road and 2 Godesdone Road. The site currently contains a collection of single-storey buildings and a lorry port which form J. H. Cooper and Son, a furniture shop, and a 2-storey (3-bed) end-of-terrace building (2 Godesdone Road) used for small furniture/flat pack and dressing item storage. The site area is 693 sq.m.
- 1.2 There is a vehicle access to Godesdone Road with staff/lorry/customer parking to the rear.
- 1.3 The surrounding area is residential in character to the north of Newmarket Road with mainly commercial uses to the main road frontage and on the opposite side of Newmarket Road to the south, including two hotels and a retail park.
- 1.4 The site lies within the Eastern Gate Opportunity Area and within the Riverside Section of the City of Cambridge Conservation Area No.1 (Central). The site is within a controlled parking zone.

2.0 THE PROPOSAL

- 2.1 The proposal is for the demolition of the existing buildings and the conversion of 2 Godesdone Road and the erection of a building, together forming a 90-bedroomed hotel. The hotel

would have a reception area near the front door but would not provide any eating or drinking facilities.

- 2.2 The new building would be two-storey to the Newmarket Road elevation with a three-storey section set back behind this. The three-storey section would also be set behind the retained (and converted) 2-storey house such that it would be well back from the frontage onto Godesdone Road.
- 2.3 No car parking spaces would be provided on site. A bicycle store would be provided with 24 spaces. It is proposed that any people arriving by private vehicles will park at The Grafton Centre and walk to the hotel or people will be dropped/picked up from the hotel by taxi/mini-cab. A refuse store would be provided.
- 2.4 In response to requests for additional information, the applicants submitted further details (including a letter from the proposed occupiers) and a supporting representation from a neighbouring occupier.
- 2.5 The application has been supported by the following documents:
 - Planning Statement and Site Sequential Assessment
 - Design and Access Statement (revision 4)
 - Built Heritage Statement
 - Archaeological Statement (desk based)
 - Daylight and Sunlight Assessment
 - Hotel Needs Assessment
 - Air Quality Statement
 - Noise Impact Assessment
 - Ecology Appraisal
 - Flood Risk Assessment and Surface Water Drainage Statement
 - Transport Statement
 - Contamination Statement (desk-based)
 - Ventilation Statement
 - Energy Statement
 - Utilities Statement
 - Statement of Community Engagement
 - Views (verified)
 - Letter from the proposed operator (Easyhotel)

3.0 SITE HISTORY

Reference	Description	Outcome
-----------	-------------	---------

None		
Relevant		

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 6
		23
		28 29 31 32 33 34 35 36
		42
		55 56 57 58 59
		61 62 64 65
		77
		80 81 82 85

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

Central Government Guidance	National Planning Policy Framework February 2019 National Planning Policy Framework – Planning Practice Guidance from 3 March 2014 onwards Circular 11/95 (Annex A)
Supplementary Planning Documents /Other	Sustainable Design and Construction (May 2007) Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Waste Partnership (RECAP): Waste Management Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (February 2012) Eastern Gate SPD (Oct 2011) (Management Framework) Cambridge Hotel Futures (April 2012)

6.0 CONSULTATIONS

Planning Policy

- 6.1 The NPPF includes a presumption in favour of sustainable development. Hotel uses are included within the NPPF's definition of main town centre uses. The NPPF also prioritises such uses in centres before other locations are considered such that at para.24 it requires a sequential test to be undertaken for any proposals in an "edge of centre" location.
- 6.2 Cambridge Hotel Futures Study (June 2012) indicates that when the study was undertaken, once Premier Inn and Travel Lodge (at Orchard Park and along Newmarket Road) were delivered, that this would meet the predicted need for budget accommodation. The report made no reference to "super-budget" operators which is a new type of hotel which has emerged since the Study was undertaken.

- 6.3 Policy 77 of the Local Plan allows for the expansion of visitor accommodation and requires that this is located on the frontages of main roads or in areas of mixed-use within walking distance of a bus route corridor with good public transport accessibility. The proposed site meets these criteria.
- 6.4 There is recognition that there are a number of hotels opened in recent years or in the pipeline amounting to some 1740 rooms with other potential sites coming forward which could deliver another 480 rooms with potential areas for new aparthotels/serviced apartments including Cambridge Railway Station (one is currently under consideration) and at Park Street car park.
- 6.5 Recently there has been substantial redevelopment to Newmarket Road to reinvigorate the area including offices, two hotels, residential and student accommodation and investment in the Grafton area including retail, leisure, hotel etc.
- 6.6 The site is considered to be in a suitable location in land-use planning terms in principle but this does need to be balanced against the cumulative total of hotel rooms in the two existing hotels with this hotel in close proximity. Nonetheless, the proposed “super-budget” hotel will not provide a bar or restaurant and, as such, is more likely to result in occupiers relying on and supporting the local pubs and restaurants bringing increased prosperity to the local economy.

Cambridgeshire County Council (Highways Development Management)

- 6.7 These comments are further to a Technical Note dated 29th November, provided by SLR Consulting Limited.

Forecast Trips – TRICS - In its previous response, CCC requested the full TRICS outputs to confirm that the sites used within the assessment are appropriate. The developer has provided further details of the TRICS assessment, which is now considered acceptable.

The vehicular trip generation to 27 trips in the weekday AM peak, 15 trips in the PM peak and 21 trips in the Saturday peak

period. The daily vehicular trip generation for a weekday/Saturday would be 279 trips.

Forecast Trips – Newmarket Road Travelodge and Liverpool easyHotel

To complement the TRICS assessment the applicant has also assessed (i) the Travelodge hotel site opposite, and (ii) an existing easyHotel on the edge of Liverpool. These sites were surveyed to understand arrivals and departures, and in the case of the Travelodge, taxi movements.

The vehicular trips associated with the assessment are lower than the TRICS assessment.

CCC have previously requested either (a) a junction assessment for the below junctions, or (b) a detailed technical note demonstrating why a junction assessment is not required.

Junction 1: Site Access / Godesdone Road; Junction 2: Godesdone Road/Newmarket Road Junction 3: River Lane/Newmarket Road; and Junction 4: Newmarket Road/Elizabeth Way Roundabout.

The additional information provided includes (b): a narrative relating to the impact at each junction. CCC accepts the rationale provided.

No objection subject to the mitigation package proposed relating to a contribution of J120,000 towards the Greater Cambridge Partnership's emerging scheme on Newmarket Road/East Road, a parking monitoring strategy (and if needed, J25,000 towards consultation relating to expansion of the Controlled Parking Zone), construction management plan and a Travel Plan.

Urban Design and Conservation

- 6.8 The site is within the Riverside and Stourbridge Common area of the Central Conservation Area. There have been pre-application discussions on the proposals for this site

Eastern Gate Development Framework - In March 2011, a Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) was adopted for the 'Eastern Gate Area'. The SPD provides clear guidance on the City Council's aspirations for the area by providing a framework to co-ordinate redevelopment. The document went through

significant public consultation with local residents and stakeholders to shape the content and aspirations contained within it.

With regards to the proposal site, the SPD provides guidance for the site on the overall heights likely to be acceptable and appropriate as well as articulating a number of more general good design principles that new development would need to respond to.

The SPD identifies the need for new development to repair street frontages in a coherent way to create fine grained active frontages (Section 3.4). The SPD also identifies the important visual cues that new development should pick up on to ensure that developments are compatible with the finer urban grain setting that characterise the Riverside and Stourbridge Common area.

1. Response to context: heritage and conservation area

The scheme has taken into consideration the existing fine grain of the properties in the conservation area which has resulted in a varied ridge height and use of a range of materials for the facades. It is considered that the proposals will preserve the character and appearance of the conservation area provided that appropriate materials are used and that the construction workmanship is of the highest order.

The retention of no. 2 Godesdone Road is welcomed as it is a building which is important to the character of the street and the conservation area. With the proposed new use of the building, the applicants should ensure that the ventilation for the refuse on the ground floor of this building is not on the front elevation or in a sensitive location on the roof. In addition, in order to preserve the character and appearance of the conservation area, the internal refuse use for the ground floor should not be clearly visible through the windows on the front façade.

The double gable end onto Godesdone Road breaks up the bulk and massing of the building, responding to the character and proportions of this part of the conservation area. The Urban Design and Conservation Team wait to be convinced that the composite cladding is of high enough quality for this location within the conservation area. The use of brick to create a

pattern to the elevations is considered to be a good way to create variation and interest.

2. Movement and Access

The main entrance for guests into the hotel is clearly defined and appropriately scaled. A highly transparent reception area is located in a logical location that will assist with the legibility of the proposal. The reception area and hotel room windows will help to activate the ground floor frontage of Newmarket Road. The reception area wraps around the corner of the building, presenting a large window onto the junction of Godesdone Road, which will provide a degree of surveillance onto the street. A recessed secondary entrance provides access for servicing as well as the opportunity for guests to borrow bikes. The treatment of this secondary access point, which will accommodate bike and bin movement, needs to be robust in order to prevent damage to the wall and finishes. This detail can be secured by way of condition. The location of the cycle store within the scheme is supported. However more information is required to understand how the provision meets the City Council's Cycle Parking Guide and the local plan requirements for guests and staff members. Conditions are to be attached in relation to detailed layout of the cycle storage area to demonstrate compliance with the Cycle Parking Guide and dedicated staff cycle provision requires.

3. Scale and massing

The SPD identifies in figure 39: Built Form, Scale and Massing Strategy (page 45) that the site could allow buildings up to 2+1 storeys (the +1 either being accommodation in the roofscape or a setback upper floor) along the Newmarket Road frontage. These heights were informed by the site's proximity to established residential properties and the character of the conservation area, as well as the wider intention of the SPD to create varied rooflines. The proposal is 2 storeys with the 3rd floor accommodated within the roofscape, which is in line with the SPD. Assuming 3m floor to floor heights the SPD guidance of 2+1 storeys equates to a maximum height of 9m or 10m with an increased 'commercial floor' height at ground floor. Measured to the top of the ridge the development is 10m along Newmarket Road which is consistent with the SPD in this regard. The approach taken to the scale and massing of the proposals along the frontages is to create a character and

appearance that reflects the fine grain diversity of the historic high street to the west and the narrow plots of the Conservation Area. The volume of the Newmarket Road frontage building is broken down through a stepped façade, consisting of distinct bay elements of varied widths reflecting the mixed but overall close grain plot character to west and north of the site. This plot based expression, has been further reinforced through the pitched roof forms which step to provide a subtle variation in roofscape. The incorporation of roof vents provides further articulation and interest to the roofscape. Along Godesdone Road the double gable ends successfully break up the bulk and massing of the building responding to the domestic proportions of a typical gable in this part of the Conservation Area. The glazed link between the retained No 2 Godesdone Road and the new development creates breathing space between the proposal and the existing terraced forms.

4. Biodiversity opportunities

The SPD under paragraph 3.3.6 promotes the enhancement of local biodiversity through new development in the area. Clearly, given the almost 100% site coverage enhancing local habitat through trees and shrub planting is going to be limited. However the roofscape could provide the opportunity for biodiversity enhancement, through a brown roof within the flat roofed plant area for example.

5. Elevations and Materials

The Eastern Gate SPD provides an analysis of the prevailing character of Newmarket Road in figure 40. It highlights how the buildings along this road are characterised by an *'orderly composition and grouping of elements which creates a strong vertical rhythm'*. It also highlights the variation in rooflines and local variation in the scale of adjacent buildings. The proposed elevations successfully translate these key contextual elements in a contemporary way. The fenestration is ordered and the roofscape articulated within a series of distinct bays, all of which reflect the plot based rhythm and vertical grain of the conservation area. The use of a buff brick is acceptable in principle, however we suggest that a darker buff-grey brick with multi variation would work better with the more the varied tones found within the conservation area.

A sample panel on site of the whole palette will need to form a condition to ensure that the external materials work for the entire scheme.

The scheme should preserve the character and appearance of the conservation area. The application is supported due to the proposals being appropriate in Urban Design and Conservation terms for this location in the conservation area.

The external materials/sample panel, window details, roof mounted equipment, piping/flues etc., secondary access and full cycle store details should be conditioned, should permission be granted.

Environmental Health

6.9 Concerns have been raised in previous responses regarding Plant impact assessment re-evaluation, structural separation from 4 Godesdone Road, and consideration of plant room noise/vibration emissions, air quality, contaminated land, odour, traffic/plant noise and deliveries. Additional information was also submitted concerning the taxi noise impact, basement plant & ground floor refuse and bike store including Technical Note dated 22nd October 2018 (002-Rev02).

- In relation to taxi noise, environmental health cannot object to taxi movements within the highway on noise grounds as this noise occurs off site. However, noise impact from taxi movements and patron use related to the application site is likely to adversely impact the locality such as from slamming doors, voices, car stereos and engine revving.
- In relation to the proposed basement plant, the Technical Note advises that the basement plant room is located 6m from the boundary. When considering this distance, along with the 200mm concrete perimeter wall and type of plant to be located within the plant room, the plant noise impact would be insignificant. This is reasonable.
- The ground floor refuse and bike store shares a party wall with 4 Godesdone Road. The noise impact associated with 2 tier cycle racking systems is difficult to quantify and no specific acceptability standard exists. The racks should be isolated from the party wall to prevent structural / ground-

borne vibrations and re-radiated building noise transmission. The addition of sound insulation on the party wall is recommended and a bike rack condition is recommended to ensure details of the bike rack and noise / vibration mitigation measures concerning the bike rack installation and bike store wall insulation are provided.

- The bin store should also contain additional sound insulation and practical measures to prevent excessive structural and air borne noise generated from the use. Doors to bin stores should be sufficient in widths to allow the movement of bins at their widest. A bin store condition is required.
- Standard construction/demolition/delivery noise/hours and dust conditions are recommended.
- An acoustic compliance condition is recommended to ensure the glazing and ventilation scheme, as recommended within the MLM assessment is fully implemented.
- A plant noise condition is recommended.
- There would be no dining onsite and therefore an odour impact assessment is not required.
- It is recommended that a condition is attached to limit deliveries to or dispatches from the site to only between 07:00 – 23:00hrs on Monday to Friday, 08:00 – 13:00hrs on Saturday and at no time on Sundays or public holidays.
- The site has a long history of commercial use and there is a risk that residual land contamination may be present. The applicant has fully acknowledged this and has already begun the risk assessment process. The completion of the risk assessment process can be secured with the imposition of the standard suite of contaminated land conditions.
- The development is for an intensification of use within the Air Quality Management Area (AQMA) with the proposed development consisting of a 90 bedroom four storey hotel. Based on predicted traffic movements, an air quality mitigation plan should be secured by condition.

Landscape

- 6.10 The development proposed is **acceptable** subject to the imposition of condition(s)/informative(s) relating to Hard and soft landscaping, boundary treatment and SUDS provision.

LLFA/Drainage

- 6.11 Comments following submission of additional information:

The proposal is acceptable on the basis that the proposed surface water drainage system includes a pumped outfall which is considered least sustainable and normally not supported by the local planning authority. However due to the shape, form and footprint of the development there are no other options. The proposals have been amended to include additional measures to ensure that the pumps and chamber can be managed and maintained. An indicative management and maintenance plan has been written which is acceptable at this stage but this would need further enhanced enhancement and information must be provided through the further detailed design of the system. If the pump can be adequately managed and maintained then the system should perform adequately and due to the previous site being unattenuated, may provide a local reduction in flood risk. A suitable condition should be attached to require the details.

Cambridgeshire Police

- 6.12 The application is supported. Based on details contained within the Design and Access Statement and the Company regarding their management of their chain of hotels across the UK and other countries, I am happy that if there were any incidents requiring the Police, they would not only contact them but have the management practices in place to deal locally. I am aware of the large number of complaints that this Application has provoked. I can only comment on crimes and incidents that have been reported to the Police regarding anti-social behaviour and drugs in the vicinity of the other hotels on Newmarket Road. I have spoken at length to both local shift officers and senior management. There are some calls regarding anti-social behaviour (mostly drunken behaviour) on Newmarket Road in the last 18 months – they amount to around 3 a month which are dealt with by officers. We see a similar number of reports across the County at other sites where budget hotels are based

in large towns or cities. The allegations made on this Application cannot be backed up by officers from their interaction with the hotel chains and other local businesses. That being said any serious allegation would of course be investigated, but there are no current concerns.

- 6.13 If planning approval is given, it is requested that a condition be applied regarding management plans, exterior lighting and use of CCTV on the grounds of promoting community safety and reducing vulnerability to crime. I am also happy to be consulted by the Applicant should there be a requirement for a Security Needs Assessment as part of any BREEAM accreditation being sought.

Archaeology

- 6.14 The application site lies in an area of high archaeological potential. Suitable conditions should be attached to require the submission and implementation of a programme of archaeological work to be undertaken.

Nature Conservation

- 6.15 The submitted document is acceptable in relation to ecological surveys and the recommendation to install integral bird boxes is supported. Given the location I would encourage the provision of an agreed number of swift boxes. The specification, number and location could be secured through condition. In addition I would request that the provision of a biodiverse green roof be explored on the flat section of roof proposed between the two linked pitches. As wider landscape is minimal this would provide the best opportunity to seek a net gain in biodiversity for the site.

Sustainability Officer

- 6.16 Following clarification that CHP would not be used, the development is acceptable subject to the imposition of conditions relating to renewable energy implementation and the requirement to submit a water efficiency specification.

Environment Agency

- 6.17 No objection in principle to the proposed development. In line with the recommendation of the MLM report we recommend that conditions are appended to any subsequent planning approval relating to contaminated land assessments and investigation, remediation measures and a verification plan, contamination found during development and surface water drainage scheme

Disability Panel

- 6.18 Accessible rooms - These seem particularly poor. Not only are they located as far from the lifts as possible; the size of the rooms and positioning of the furniture does not allow for a wheelchair turning circle or transfer from both sides of the bed.

Reception - This does not appear to include a hearing induction system.

Lifts - As these are not fire evacuation lifts, details need to be provided on the evacuation/refuge arrangements. (Particularly given the location of the accessible rooms as mentioned above.)

Kerb - There does not appear to be a level threshold at the entrance making access extremely difficult for wheelchair users

Conclusion - In the Panel's view, good quality accessible rooms should be provided.

Access Officer

- 6.19 Would ideally like one on site blue badge space for each accessible room, albeit it is not considered this could be conditioned. Details regarding where the hotel will park its cars should be secured by condition rather than relying on valet parking which is not good for disabled people. The design of the building should also seek to arrange all accessible rooms closer to the main entrance and on the ground floor if a fire fighting lift is not installed. The hoist is a great feature.

Developer Contributions Monitoring Unit

- 6.20 The Developer Contributions Monitoring Unit (DCMU) does not propose to seek specific S106 financial contributions under the Council's Planning Obligation Strategy SPD 2010, as Cambridge City Council does not seek S106 financial contributions from such developments. The Public Art Officer has indicated that this scheme should provide some public art.

MOD Safeguarding

- 6.21 No safeguarding objection to this proposal.

Anglian Water

- 6.22 No objection subject to a planning condition relating to surface water disposal.

7.0 REPRESENTATIONS

- 7.1 Councillor Richard Johnson has written to ask that the Design and Conservation Panel review the (originally submitted) application on the basis that the scheme needs to be in character in the Central Conservation Area, especially in respect to the scale, fine grain character, roof form and it acting as a gateway to the residential area beyond as part of the Eastern Gateway and also to raise concerns that the proposal would not meet Policies 77 or 22 (now 23) of the new local plan, in particular as the hotel does not meet the need for high end hotels identified in the Hotel Futures report and as it may not be of "domestic" scale as to be in character in this part of the Eastern Gate Opportunity Area and the Conservation Area.

- 7.2 Councillors Haf Davies and Nicky Massey, together with Councillor Richard Johnson, have written to indicate that they, as Abbey councillors, are aware that an application for a Premier Inn hotel at the Grafton Centre was submitted last month (19/0512/FUL). They ask that this new application should be treated as a material consideration when application 18/1002/FUL is determined at planning committee on the grounds that:

- The new application fundamentally undermines the case for a third hotel on Newmarket Road for the following reasons:

- it is sequentially superior,
- there is a City commitment to a hotel at the Grafton Centre (Grafton Centre Masterplan adopted at Full Council in December 2018),
- that no change of use is required to enable a hotel at the Grafton Centre (unlike at the Newmarket Road site) and the Grafton Centre better meets city centre need than the easyHotel site,
- a third hotel on Newmarket Road would result in a local monoculture, loss of local amenity and a loss of retail space in an area with a growing number of new residents.
- the Grafton Centre is a more sustainable location as The Grafton Centre has on-site shops and is a public transport hub, as well as being closer to the city, all factors likely to reduce vehicle use. It also has dedicated parking facilities and taxi access
- 18/1002/FUL provides no parking or taxi access and private cars are unlikely to park at The Grafton Centre 12-15 mins away such that they are likely to drive around the Riverside area looking for on-street parking, while taxis would idle outside residential properties then drive round the block or make u-turns to exit, or cause obstruction by waiting on the busy Newmarket Road.

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

- Riverside Residents group
- Camcycle
- Abbey Street – 10B, 14, 21
- Abbey Road – No.s 32, 35, 42, 46, 50, 60, 63, 69
- Ainsworth Place – No. 28
- Bartholomew Court – No.46
- Beacon Rise – No. 73
- Beche Court – No. 4
- Beche Road – No.s 15, 16, 19, 20, 24, 26, 36, 37, 39, 42, 52, 58, 60, 62, 64, 67, 68, 69, 70, 75, 83, 86, 92
- Brookside Lane – No.3
- Church Lane, Girton – No. 22

- Garlic Row – No. 18
- Godesdone Road – No.s 3, 7, 9, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 17, 18, 20, 22d
- Newmarket Road – No.s 151, 171/173, 251 (flat 3), 413
- New Street – No. 158A
- Priory Road – No.s 12, 22, 25, 27, 30, 33, 39, 40, 43, 92
- Riverside – No.s 15, 19, 21, 27, 31, 30, 33, 35, 40, 41, 42, 45, 47, 50, 37, 51
- Riverside Place – No.s 22, 35, 36, 34, 78, 42, 69
- River Lane – No.s 69, 77, 79
- Saxon Road – Nos. 1, 9, 12, 17, 18, 19, 20, 22
- Shelly Garden – No. 15
- Silverwood Close – No.s 26, 27, 64
- Stanley Road – No.s 58, 85
- The Mallards – No. 2

7.4 The representations can be summarised as follows:

- The use is inappropriate and would be contrary to national and local planning sustainability and hotel policies
- The proposed low-cost visitor accommodation would result in unacceptable levels of anti-social behaviour (including littering); and criminal activity, including prostitution and drugs
- There is no need for this hotel type in Cambridge
- Road safety issues, congestion and uncontrolled parking resulting in detriment to residential amenities; the Highway Authority's comments are not acceptable as they are based on the applicant's inaccurate assessments
- The hotel should provide communal indoor space to prevent people congregating outside and being a nuisance
- Unacceptable noise and disturbance caused by taxi drop-off and pick up, noise from guests of the hotel, noise associated with wheeled suitcases, idling vehicles and additional HGVs especially during quieter hours
- Noise and disturbance during construction (including piling)
- The cycle parking arrangements are unsuitable, there is a lack of visitor/guest cycle parking and there is no cycle hire available
- Unworkable arrangement for taxis and no on-site deliveries
- Inconsiderate parking will occur in residents only and private parking areas

- The loading bay is too close to the junction and will be used by taxis. It is dangerous for other road users, including pedestrians, cyclists and mobility scooter users
- The access officer's comments re mobility impaired access need to be addressed
- The Transport Assessment does not include vital details and is inaccurate; the existing use does not have high levels or large (HGV) vehicles accessing it
- The proposed Travel Plan will not work, as is clear from the existing two hotels nearby
- Taxis bringing people to the no-car hotel are likely to do so without due regard for highway safety, as is already the case with the two nearby hotels
- The application does not contribute to the Eastern Gateway projects (SPD)
- The applicant should pay for the residents parking zone to be extended, including the hours of use and pay for the existing resident's permits (both residents and visitors permits) in perpetuity
- Legal agreements and strong conditions would be needed to penalise the hotel for any non-compliance with any conditions set to prevent illegality including parking and waiting
- The supporting documents are factually incorrect
- The site is better used for affordable housing, community facilities or other uses
- Having no parking on site will not result in a limited impact from car/vehicle use as there will be cars attracted to the site to drop off and pick up customers
- Unacceptable levels of noise and disturbance
- Overlooking and loss of privacy
- Light and other pollution would increase while air quality would reduce
- overdevelopment
- The overall scale and height of the building would be overly dominant of the existing adjoining domestic scale development
- Adverse impact on the character of the Conservation Area/area generally due to form, appearance, height and scale and signage
- Loss of another shop results in a diminution of community feeling

- Those supporting the application are involved in the current business or live so far away that they won't be affected
- There are two other hotels proposed at the Grafton Centre and in East Road which are better located than this site
- The proposal will result in a clustering which could become a "hotel ghetto"
- There is no demonstrable need for a budget/super-budget hotel on this site
- Taxis will cause a danger to other road users, particularly in Godesdone Road and other surrounding residential streets
- The City should support affluent tourists rather than people who cannot afford to drink cappuccinos or dine out
- The two hotels on Newmarket Road have not benefitted the local economy and another hotel won't either
- With the two hotels and student accommodation there is already too much transient/short term accommodation to the detriment of the permanent resident's communities
- While the furniture store is not of high architectural merit, it is in keeping and should therefore be retained
- The proposal would be located hard against the back edge of the highway leaving no room for soft landscaping which would be detrimental to the area/Eastern Area (and relevant SPD)
- There would be unacceptable noise from plant and machinery associated with the hotel

7.5 The current owners of the site have written in support of the hotel proposal on the grounds that they can no longer support a viable business on the site, that the proposal would meet relevant policies and that the scheme would offer a long-term solution which would be in character with recent development along Newmarket Road.

7.6 Owners/occupiers of 2 Godesdone Road have written to support the application as it would remove an existing large asbestos building and increase light/daylight for the neighbouring property. Other occupiers writing in support of the application are: 54 High Street, Teversham, 44 George Street 16 Corona Road, 48 Pelham Close, Cottenham, 5 Burnham Close, 115 Speedwell Close, 69 High Street, Great Wilbraham and 33 Chartfield Road.

- 7.7 A Development Control Forum (DCF) was undertaken on Friday, 7 September 2018. Notes of the meeting are appended to this report (Appendix A).
- 7.8 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 relating to the planning application are:

1. Principle of development
2. Context of site and design, including impact on the Conservation Area
3. Residential amenity for existing occupiers
4. Inclusive access
5. Refuse arrangements
6. Highway safety
7. Car and cycle parking
8. Crime and fear of crime
9. Light pollution, noise and disturbance
10. Third party representations
11. Planning Obligations/Public Art

Principle of Development

- 8.2 The proposal is for the redevelopment of existing commercial buildings/land to provide a 90-bed hotel. It is not proposed to provide a restaurant or bar on site such that the type of facility is termed “super budget”. It is also not proposed to provide any car parking on site although a lay-by is proposed close to the proposed hotel entrance on Godesdone Road for pick-up/drop-off.
- 8.3 The principle issues are whether a hotel is acceptable in this location and, whether it would be in line with the aims of the Opportunity Area. Policies 23 and 77 of the Cambridge Local Plan are therefore the most relevant.

- 8.4 The site does not fall within an area where retail uses are protected, and the loss of the existing A1 Use (shop) is therefore acceptable in principle.
- 8.5 Policy 77 relates to the development and expansion of visitor accommodation. The policy indicates that high quality visitor accommodation will be supported in the city centre and identifies that larger high quality hotels may come forward beyond the city centre. It states that new visitor accommodation should be located on the frontages of main roads or in areas of mixed use or within walking distance of bus route corridors with good public transport accessibility.
- 8.6 The supporting text to the policy indicates that visitor accommodation takes many forms from traditional hotels, guesthouses and hostels to apart-hotels and serviced apartments and that policy 77 applies to visitor accommodation within any of these (or similar) formats.
- 8.7 The reasoned justification also indicates that a study was undertaken entitled “Cambridge Hotel Futures” which was published in 2012 which assessed the supply and demand for hotel and short-stay accommodation in Cambridge to 2031. This study showed that there is a very strong and continuing market demand for significant new hotel development in the city and on its outskirts which would include the need for new hotel bedrooms to widen the accommodation offer of the city, to encourage longer stays and to enhance the competitiveness of the city as a visitor destination. The Study indicated that there was a shortfall in higher-starred (3, 4 and 5 star) and boutique accommodation in the city.
- 8.8 Since the 2012 Study, latest tourism figures indicate a significant increase in visitor numbers to Cambridge since 2010. The overall demand for visitor accommodation is therefore greater than anticipated at the time the study was conducted, and it is therefore considered that a more flexible approach is required in order to adapt to the evolving market situation. As referred to in the Policy Officer’s response, the hotel market has also seen the emergence of a new type of hotel – the “super-budget” hotel, aimed at people travelling at low cost and are provided on a “no frills” basis. I note recent comments from Councillors Johnson, Davies and Massey querying the need for the development in light of the recently submitted application for

a Premier Inn at the Grafton Centre. However, in light of the increasing demand for a range of visitor accommodation in Cambridge, the need is considered to exceed that provided by a single development.

- 8.9 Policy 77 relates to all visitor accommodation types. While it clearly identifies a need for higher starred and boutique hotels, it does not preclude other hotels in seeking to provide for visitor bed-spaces during the plan period. Paragraph 3 of the policy is relevant to the type of visitor accommodation, i.e. that it should be located on main roads. On the basis that the Cambridge Hotel Futures Study was undertaken before super-budget hotels emerged, it is clear that the Study did not consider “super-budget” type of accommodation or take such accommodation into consideration. Planning Policy consider that the proposed hotel bedrooms would help meet the rising need for hotel accommodation in the City and, while it would not be likely to be 3-Star and above, it would meet the rising demand for cheaper accommodation. It would broaden the range of accommodation in the City.
- 8.10 The proposed hotel would meet the criteria identified in Policy 77 in respect of the scheme assisting in meeting the expected need, the site having a main road frontage location, being in an area of mixed-use (commercial, residential, public houses and a retail park with restaurants etc.) and within walking distance of bus routes/public transport and the City Centre’s facilities.
- 8.11 The proposed hotel would, as no bar or eating facilities would be provided, also help to support the local economy including existing retail outlets, public houses, restaurants etc. in the locality.
- 8.12 Policy 23 is an Opportunity Area policy which relates specifically to the Eastern Gate area. This policy requires that development proposals will be supported if they enhance the character of the area, improve connectivity and increase activity in line with Figure 3.9 of the Local Plan. Figure 3.9 indicates that the Opportunity Area extends approximately half way up Godesdone Road from its junction with Newmarket Road and, for the application site, that it is a potential development site, that there is an opportunity to improve the gateway to residential neighbourhoods and that it forms a primary frontage. The Figure shows a 2+1 storey height, adjacent to a site

indicated for a 3+1 storey height. It is proposed that there would be Highway Network improvements on Newmarket Road, outside the application site. While the details of the scheme are considered further in the section below, I consider that the proposal for a hotel on this site would be acceptable in principle in relation to Policy 23.

8.13 I consider that the proposal would be sustainable development which would regenerate an existing commercial site in line with Policy 23. While Policy 77 does indicate that high quality visitor accommodation will be supported and that the reasoned justification indicates that this would be to ensure that accommodation is provided to meet the needs identified in the study, it does not specifically exclude the provision of less than 3-star accommodation in the City, indicating in para 8.49 of the Local Plan that the policy applies to all types of hotel accommodation. It is a material consideration that super-budget hotels have emerged since the Cambridge Hotel Futures study was undertaken and that this proposal would provide a type of hotel accommodation which would be new to the City. Since super-budget hotels have become part of the range of hotel types, there is a need to consider whether such a hotel is acceptable in principle.

8.14 I consider that the proposal is acceptable in principle in accordance with Policies 23 and 77 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2018.

Context of site, design and external spaces

Response to context

8.15 The context is that the property already lies within a mixed area where there is commercial use to the main road frontage with residential to the rear (in this case to the north). The site comprises mainly one-storey accommodation, however, much of this is showroom with attendant greater floor-to-ceiling heights and the lorry “car”-port to the rear is equivalent to 2-storey height directly adjacent to the boundary with 4 Godesdone Road to the north. The two-storey former house used for commercial storage is of domestic scale.

8.16 In line with the Eastern Gate Opportunity Area policy (policy 23), it is expected that this site would be redeveloped and that

the character of the area would be enhanced by buildings being developed of a scale and massing which responds to the site's context. The proposed building height to the main road frontage would be 2+1 storey as indicated on Figure 3.9 of the Local Plan and is, of itself considered to meet the parameters for this site as indicated in Policy 23. The return element would be higher than the existing building's corner element and, as this would provide the entrance to the hotel, I consider that this would act as a new "gateway" to the residential area beyond.

- 8.17 To the rear of the 2+1 storey aspect of the scheme, the existing former residential property would be retained to the side road's, Godesdone Road, frontage. As such, from a streetscene view, there would be no increase in the impact of this building on visual amenities.
- 8.18 Behind the proposed frontage development, the hotel is proposed to increase in height and this would be located adjacent to the boundary with the adjoining Godesdone Road property and would be visible from the back of (albeit where windows are at right-angles to the application site) residential properties in Godesdone Road and especially from the rear gardens of these properties.
- 8.19 The nearest neighbor at No.4 Godesdone Road has written in support of the application as it would remove the existing 5m high flat roof asbestos structure (the lorry "car"-port) which would be replaced by a significantly lower eaves level.
- 8.20 I consider that while adjoining and nearby residents would be able to view the rear of the new hotel building, that it would not result in a building which has a significant overbearing impact or that it would be out of context, in part as there are larger scale buildings to the south on Newmarket Road (including the Premier Inn and Travel Lodge Hotels) which are 5-storey and also to the north-east abutting the Godesdone Road rear boundaries (identified as 2-3 +1 in Figure 3.9) and recently constructed student housing directly to the east of the site of 3+1 height (Anglia House). In addition, the residential properties to Godesdone Road are 2-storey as are buildings to the west of the site. It is acknowledged and accepted that redevelopment of this site would have a significantly greater impact than the current relatively small scale buildings fronting onto Newmarket Road, in line with Policy 23.

- 8.21 In my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2018) policies 23 and 55, 57.

Impact on the Conservation Area

- 8.22 The application site lies in Riverside Conservation Area. The River Cam is located to the north of the application site beyond the far end of Godesdone Road. The application site sits at the outside edge of the Conservation Area.
- 8.23 The Conservation Area comprises mainly residential properties to the north but also the commercial uses to the west of the application site fronting onto Newmarket Road. Consideration was given to the Conservation Area status of the site before including it in the Eastern Gate Opportunity Area. The application site was considered to make a contribution to the Conservation Area. However, the shop, made up from a number of buildings and the van-port with its corrugated roof are not considered to be a positive element in the Conservation Area. The end of terrace property at No.4 Godesdone Road would be retained. I consider that the loss of the commercial buildings would not result in significant harm to the Conservation Area. Providing the building is replaced by a building of a high quality of design and layout the less than substantial harm to the historic asset is acceptable. I consider that the proposal is of a high quality design and layout which would at least preserve, if not enhance, the special character and appearance of the Conservation Area in accordance with Policy 61 of the Local Plan.

Residential amenity for existing occupiers

- 8.24 The proposal would replace the existing buildings with a hotel building which would be larger in terms of footprint and height than the existing mainly single-storey commercial buildings.
- 8.25 The main neighbours affected are those in residential properties on the even side of Godesdone (eastern) Road. The proposed building would abut the garden of No.4 Godesdone Road. The occupiers of this property have written in support of the proposal, nonetheless the planning issues arising from the scheme must assess the impact on all adjoining occupiers.

- 8.26 Impact on neighbours – sunlight and daylight. An assessment was submitted which indicates that while there would be some loss of sunlight and daylight to the properties in Godesdone Road, that this would meet the BRE criteria. As such, and given that the proposal would result in the removal of the van/truck-port, I consider that it would be acceptable in this respect.
- 8.27 Overlooking and privacy - The applicants have confirmed that the rear dormer windows would be located at least 1.7m above the internal finished floor level, such that there would be no overlooking issues arising.
- 8.28 The hotel would result in an increase in the number of people visiting the site (although this is to be expected as the current use as a furniture store has been declining for some time). It would also result in activity in the evening and during the night both from the use of the bedrooms and from people arriving and departing. While most people would expect to arrive/depart from hotels during the day, there would clearly be some users of the hotel's 90 bedrooms who would arrive later and/or over night. A layby is proposed to be provided outside the hotel entrance in Godesdone Road. It would not extend in front of the residential properties in Godesdone Road to this side, nonetheless it is considered that there would be some noise and activity associated with both the use of the hotel entrance and use of this layby.
- 8.29 The hotel has indicated that it would require any taxi or private hire vehicles to drop off/pick up from Newmarket Road to avoid noise to adjoining properties' occupiers during later/over-night hours. While this is contested by a group of residents, given that travel along Newmarket Road does lessen at night, [stopping on double yellow lines for as long as is reasonably necessary for the purpose of picking up or dropping off passengers and their luggage is legal as long as no other restrictions are in force.](#)
- 8.30 The open car/lorry parking and loading area and open-sided van-port at the rear of the existing commercial property would be lost resulting in the removal of existing vehicle noise, fumes and activity from the rear gardens of properties in Godesdone Road. This is a positive benefit.
- 8.31 Concerns have also been raised regarding the plant room (including noise and vibration), separation between the hotel

and the attached residential property, 4 Godesdone Road, air quality, contaminated land, odour, traffic / deliveries. Environmental Health Officers have considered these aspects of the scheme and consider that suitable mitigation measures are proposed and/or that conditions could be attached to a planning approval and, on this basis, consider that the proposal would be acceptable. In relation to traffic noise/noise outside the hotel, they have confirmed that they have no authority to control such noise and that such activity etc. would need to be considered by planning as general noise and disturbance issues. I consider that, while there would be some noise associated with the proposal, that it would not result in so significant harm that the hotel should be refused planning permission.

8.32 Other properties in the locality are otherwise sufficiently distant from the application site or are across public areas such that I consider there would be no harmful loss of residential amenities to the other nearest properties.

8.33 In my opinion the proposal is in accordance with Cambridge Local Plan (2018) policies 35, 57 and 58.

Inclusive access

8.34 Further to initial concerns raised by the Access Officer, a meeting was held with the architect, and the following details confirmed:

- The hotel would comply with Building Regulations.
- A valet parking service will be offered for disabled guests.
- There will be a hearing loop at reception and a low level reception desk.
- All rooms located near to refuge points and as close as possible to lifts and reception.
- One electrically operated hoist to be installed.
- Use of colour contrasting throughout.
- Dropped kerb allowing level entrance to the hotel.

8.35 In my opinion, subject to the conditions I have recommended, the applicants have suitably addressed the issues, and the proposal is in accordance with the Cambridge Local Plan (2018).

Refuse Arrangements

- 8.36 Suitable refuse and recycling bins are to be provided. A suitable condition requiring provision and retention will need to be attached to any planning permission. In my opinion the proposal is compliant in this respect with Cambridge Local Plan (2018) policy 57.

Highway Safety

- 8.37 The proposal involves the demolition of the existing commercial use which had a dropped kerb access onto Godesdone Road leading to an existing car and van parking/servicing area and van-port to the rear of the shop and a dropped kerb (mainly unused) onto Newmarket Road.
- 8.38 The applicants indicate that the proposal would not provide any car parking, also known as “car-free” development. It is nonetheless clear that both customers and staff would use some form of transport to access the hotel and make trips while in Cambridge from it, whether this be by private car, taxi/mini-cab, bicycle or on foot.
- 8.39 The applicants have therefore included within the proposal a lay-by outside the proposed hotel in Godesdone Road and a cycle store. They have also clarified that they expect people (and that they will direct customers) arriving by private car would park in The Grafton Centre car park during their visit to Cambridge and walk to the hotel from there.
- 8.40 On the basis of the initial details submitted, the Highway Authority raised concerns regarding the proposed traffic implications of the proposal. However, additional information was submitted (Technical Note by MLM and a letter from the proposed operator Easyhotel). In light of the additional information submitted the Highway Authority have subsequently withdrawn their objection instead requesting that conditions are attached to any approval, together with a legal agreement to be signed in relation to a Travel Plan being finalised and to require that monies are paid towards some environmental/highway improvements.

8.41 Objectors have objected to the Highway Authority's comments suggesting that the information submitted by the applicants cannot be relied upon. However, the Highway Authority is the Council's expert highway engineers and, while the objectors have raised concerns, the Highway Authority have considered both the submitted documentation and their own/public databases (such as accident data from the Police) and knowledge of the Highway landscape in making their recommendation that the proposal is acceptable in highway traffic and transport terms.

8.42 In my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2018) policy 81.

Car and Cycle Parking

8.43 No car parking is proposed. A cycle store would be provided.

8.44 The proposal would provide a suitable cycle store within the converted existing store (formerly 2 Godesdone Road). A suitable condition would be attached to require that the store is provided and retained and a condition requiring details of any mechanical racking arrangements is also proposed to be attached.

8.45 In my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2018) policy 82.

Crime and the fear of crime

8.46 It is reasonable to consider whether a particular land use results in concerns over the fear of crime or crime itself. There have been recent concerns raised regarding the provision of budget hotels as being the possible source of both anti-social behaviour and also criminal activities such as those relating to the drug trade and prostitution.

8.47 Crime itself is a Police matter and planning alone cannot either safeguard people from nor prevent entirely any crime being committed whether in a hotel, in the surrounding area, or indeed, in any residential or commercial property nearby. Of itself a hotel building, whether high class or budget, does not cause crime. Nonetheless people using such facilities could be capable of committing either anti-social behaviour or crime. The

Police have written in support of the application which they do not view as unduly likely to be a source of crime.

- 8.48 Without any Policy backing, uses such as hotels cannot be refused permission on the grounds of possible crime as this needs to be balanced against the positive benefits of the proposal. Such positive benefits include increase in visitors to Cambridge resulting in economic benefits such as direct employment, indirect employment (nearby shops and public houses for example), boosting the local and City economy.
- 8.49 While the Police are the Authority for dealing with crime and criminal activity and the Council deals with much of the anti-social behaviour in the City, Planning can help to reduce any such occurrences by, for example, requiring the provision of CCTV cameras, management arrangements for when crime is reported which can be attached to any consent. Suitable conditions can be attached to any approval to require details to be submitted.

Light pollution, noise and disturbance

- 8.50 The proposal will increase level of activity at the site which would change from an existing furniture store to a 90-bed hotel. The activities, apart from sleeping, would include arrivals and departures, general noise and activities from the use of the rooms for other purposes (such as talking, music playing etc.), people congregating on the street outside the hotel, for example to smoke and vehicle noises associated with deliveries/servicing and collecting/dropping off guests. Cycles will also be used and mechanical racks can also cause noise. Plant and laundry services are provided within the building and ventilation of the internal spaces may also be mechanical resulting in some noise.
- 8.51 The current use is not operating at its maximum capacity and as a result levels of noise and activity at the furniture store are lower than might normally be associated with such a commercial use. However, the use is not controlled by conditions such that it could operate at any hours. It should also be noted that planning permission would not be required for changes to uses which have a higher noise and activity level than currently, such as restaurants or (subject to prior approval)

residential or assembly and leisure uses including trampoline parks and other indoor sport uses.

- 8.52 The proposed building and its use would result in increased light especially after normal shop closing hours. However, the level of lighting within the hotel from windows is not considered to amount to light pollution and external lighting could be controlled by a suitably worded condition. It does need to be noted that Policy 23 for the regeneration of this site identifies development of 2+1 storeys such that light from windows at second and third floor levels would be expected in accordance with this policy.
- 8.53 In relation to activity levels, hotels are generally quieter during night hours due to sleeping guests and the hotel management can control activities of guests so that they are restricted from high levels of noise within rooms at such quieter times – ultimately being able to eject any unruly occupiers. A condition can be attached to require details of how guests would be managed to control possible noise/disturbance to existing residents.
- 8.54 As with any hotel there are likely to be guests who arrive late or leave early – if they are dropped off by taxi/mini-cab, then there is likely to be some noise/disturbance associated with this. Objections have been raised that either this would result in neighbours being disturbed or that dropping off/pick-ups on Newmarket Road itself would be dangerous for other highway users. The proposed layby would be located directly outside the hotel and double yellow lines do allow for pick-up and drop off, as such, no vehicles would need to stop outside any residential property in Godesdone Road. Newmarket Road is a main road and while traffic noise levels are likely to diminish overnight, I do not consider that the noise/disturbance associated with guest arrival/departure during the night hours on such a main road would be so unacceptable as to refuse planning permission on this ground alone.
- 8.55 There will be some noise and disturbance etc. caused during the construction process which is expected and will be controlled through the attachment of suitable conditions.

Third Party Representations

- 8.56 The issues raised by the neighbouring occupiers are substantial and relate to every facet of the proposal including making objections to the Council's consultee's comments; where these relate to the planning issues identified, they have been addressed above. Where comments relate to other authorities, such as the Police in dealing with criminal acts, only those aspects which can be secured through the planning process such as the provision of a management plan to ensure that any anti-social behavior or criminal activity is reported and the provision of CCTV cameras can be provided to deter criminal activity; it is recognized that the planning system is not the authority responsible for crime and the Police have recommended that the scheme is acceptable subject to suitable conditions.

Planning Obligations (s106 Agreement)

- 8.57 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.

- 8.58 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 (Traffic and Transportation)

- 8.59 The Highway Authority has recommended that contributions be made to the following projects: highway mitigation package, a parking monitoring strategy (and if needed, J25,000 towards consultation relating to expansion of the Controlled Parking Zone), a construction management plan and a Travel Plan
- 8.60 I agree with the reasoning set out above that contributions towards these projects meet the requirements of the CIL regulations. Subject to the completion of a S106 planning obligation to secure this infrastructure provision, I am satisfied that the proposal accords with Cambridge Local Plan (2018) policy 81 and the Planning Obligation Strategy 2010.

Planning Obligations Conclusion

- 8.61 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.

Public Art

- 8.62 While there is no formal requirement for public art, an etched glass feature will be provided which is welcomed.

9.0 CONCLUSION

- 9.1 The proposal would assist in meeting a need for visitor accommodation in Cambridge and is acceptable in principle in line with Policy 77 of the Local Plan. The hotel would provide visitor accommodation which is transient in nature, nonetheless it would be located on an existing commercial site at the southernmost edge of a residential area and on a busy arterial route between the City centre and the Airport. The proposal would therefore represent a sustainable development which would regenerate the area resulting in an improvement in the Eastern Gateway Area in line Policy 23 of the Local Plan. The proposal would be acceptable in terms of its impact on the Conservation Area and surrounding area.

- 9.2 While it is recognised that there would be some impact on existing residential amenities, subject to a legal agreement and the attachment of suitable conditions to regulate the use, I do not consider that this would be so harmful as to refuse planning permission.

10.0 RECOMMENDATION

APPROVE subject to the signing of a legal agreement in relation to a highway mitigation package and a parking monitoring strategy (and if needed, J25,000 towards consultation relating to expansion of the Controlled Parking Zone) and subject to 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 set out what works/clearance of the site (if any) is required in order to effectively carry out site investigations.

Reason: To adequately categorise the site prior to the design of an appropriate investigation strategy in the interests of environmental and public safety in accordance with Cambridge Local Plan 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. Prior to any demolition/ground clearance of the site, a demolition method statement shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. This method statement shall demonstrate how the hard standing across the site will be removed in order to prevent the rupturing of, and retain the integrity of, all existing underground fuel and storage tanks, equipment, and supply lines. The removal of the hard standing shall then be carried out in accordance with the approved method statement.

Reason: To ensure the integrity of the below ground condition of the site is not compromised (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 Policy 33)

10. 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)

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

Reason: To protect the amenity of the adjoining properties.
(Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policy 35)

12. In the event of the foundations for the proposed development requiring piling, prior to the development taking place, other than demolition, the applicant shall provide the local authority with a report / method statement for approval detailing the type of piling and mitigation measures to be taken to protect local residents from noise and/or vibration. Potential noise and vibration levels at the nearest noise sensitive locations shall be predicted in accordance with the provisions of BS 5228-1&2:2009 Code of Practice for noise and vibration control on construction and open sites. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

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

Reason: To protect the amenity of the adjoining properties.
(Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policy 35)

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

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

14. Prior to the occupation of the development or the commencement of the use, a noise assessment detailing noise levels emanating from all plant, equipment and vents, relative to background levels, shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority.

If the assessment demonstrates that noise levels exceed the background level at the boundary of the premises, having regard to adjacent noise sensitive premises, a mitigation scheme for the insulation of the plant in order to minimise the level of noise emanating from the said plant shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and the scheme as approved shall be fully implemented before the use hereby permitted is commenced.

Reason: To protect the amenity of nearby properties (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policy 35)

15. Prior to the commencement of development a cycle / bike store noise insulation scheme to include full details of the two-tier or 'double-stacker' cycle storage racks, including measures to minimise airborne noise and structural / ground-borne vibrations and re-radiated building noise transmission shall be submitted in writing to, and approved by, the local planning authority. Details shall also include the sound insulation of the bike store internal walls to prevent adverse noise impacts and structural anti-vibration / isolation mounting for cycle racks. The noise insulation scheme and cycle racks shall be installed in accordance with the approved details prior to bringing into use of the development, and shall be maintained thereafter to remain in accordance with those details

Reason: To protect the amenity of nearby properties (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policy 35)

16. Prior to the commencement of development, a bin store noise insulation scheme and full details of the on-site storage facilities for waste including waste for recycling shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Such details shall identify the specific positions of where wheeled bins will be stationed and the noise insulation measures of the bin store to minimise noise emanating from the store.

Reason: To protect the amenity of nearby properties (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policy 35)

17. No refuse / waste or recycling material associated with the approved use / site shall be emptied into external refuse / waste or recycling receptacles or refuse / waste or recycling stores and the said receptacles shall not be taken out externally or moved around the external of the site between the hours of 2100-0700 hours.

Reason: To protect the amenity of nearby properties (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policy 35)

18. The noise insulation scheme and mitigation requirements as stated within the MLM "noise impact assessment" dated 21st May 2018 (doc ref: 101975-MLM-ZZ-XX-RP-U-0001) shall be fully implemented prior to commencement of the use and shall be maintained thereafter.

Reason: To protect the amenity of nearby properties (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policy 35)

19. Deliveries to or dispatches from the site shall not be made outside the hours of 07:00 - 23:00hrs on Monday to Friday, 08:00 - 13:00hrs on Saturday or at any time on Sundays or public holidays.

Reason: To protect the amenity of nearby properties (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policy 35)

20. No external lighting or floodlights shall be installed without the prior written consent of the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In order to preserve the amenity of the locality (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policies 34 and 55).

21. No development shall take place above ground level, other than demolition, until samples of the external materials to be used in the construction of the development have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Development shall thereafter be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure that the external appearance of the development does not detract from the character and appearance of the area. (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policies 55, 57 (for new buildings) and/or 58 (for extensions))

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

Reason: To avoid harm to the special interest of the Conservation Area. (Cambridge Local Plan 2018, policy 61).

23. No development above ground level, other than demolition, shall commence until full details of both hard and soft landscape works have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The 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 (eg furniture, play equipment, refuse or other storage units, signs, lighting); 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.

All hard and soft landscape works shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details. The works shall be carried out prior to the occupation of any part of the development or in accordance with a programme agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The maintenance shall be carried out in accordance with the approved schedule. Any trees or plants that, within a period of five years after planting, are removed, die or become in the opinion of the Local Planning Authority, seriously damaged or defective, shall be replaced as soon as is reasonably practicable with others of species, size and number as originally approved, unless the Local Planning Authority gives its written consent to any variation.

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

24. No development above ground level, other than demolition, shall commence until there has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority a plan indicating the positions, design, materials and type of boundary treatments to be erected. The boundary treatment shall be completed in accordance with the approved details prior to the first occupation or the bringing into use of the development (or other timetable agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority) and retained as approved thereafter.

Reason: To ensure an appropriate boundary treatment is implemented in the interests of visual amenity and privacy (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policies 55, 57 and 59)

25. Prior to the commencement of installation of any roof mounted equipment, full details of all roof top plant and solar panels and/or photovoltaic cells, including type, dimensions, materials, location, fixing, etc. 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 avoid harm to the special interest of the Conservation Area. (Cambridge Local Plan 2018, policy 61).

26. No boiler flues, soil pipes, waste pipes or air extract trunking, etc. shall be installed until the means of providing egress for all such items from the new or altered bathrooms, kitchens and plant rooms has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Flues, pipes and trunking, etc. shall be installed thereafter only in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To avoid harm to the special interest of the Conservation Area. (Cambridge Local Plan 2018, policy 61).

27. No external windows or doors shall be installed until drawings at a scale of 1:20 of details of sills, lintels, transoms, mullions and spandrel panels have been submitted and full details of all glass to be installed in doors/windows shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority.

Reason: To avoid harm to the special interest of the Conservation Area. (Cambridge Local Plan 2018, policy 61).

28. All new window frames shall be recessed at least 50 / 75mm back from the face of the wall / façade. The means of finishing of the 'reveal' is to be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority prior to installation. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To avoid harm to the special interest of the Conservation Area. (Cambridge Local Plan 2018, policy 61).

29. Prior to commencement of development, full details of the secondary access to the site from Godesdone Road shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be constructed thereafter only in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To avoid harm to the special interest of the Conservation Area. (Cambridge Local Plan 2018, policy 61).

30. Prior to first occupation of the development, hereby permitted, or commencement of the use, full details of facilities for the covered, secure parking of bicycles for use in connection with the development shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be constructed thereafter only in accordance with the approved details. The facilities shall be provided in accordance with the approved details before the development is occupied or the use commences and shall be retained in accordance with the approved details thereafter.

Reason: To ensure appropriate provision for the secure storage of bicycles and to avoid harm to the special interest of the Conservation Area. (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policies 61 and 82)

31. Prior to the occupation of the development, hereby permitted, or the commencement of the use, a management plan shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The management plan shall include provisions relating to travel advice; check-in time slots in order to stage the impact of the check-in/out process; site security; crime reduction and reporting measures; the management of deliveries; and the external display of contact information for on-site management and emergencies. The scheme shall be managed in accordance with the approved details thereafter.

Reason: In order to ensure the occupation of the site is well managed and does not give rise to significant amenity issues for nearby residents (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policies 35 and 46).

32. Prior to the occupation of the development, hereby permitted, or the commencement of the use, full details of CCTV provision shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Such details shall identify the specific positions of where CCTV cameras will be located. The approved CCTV shall be provided prior to the commencement of the use hereby permitted and shall be retained thereafter for their intended use.

Reason - To provide a means of preventing and/or recording possible crime in the interests of users of the hotel facility and adjoining residential occupiers. (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policy 57)

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

Reason: To ensure that an appropriate archaeological investigation of the site has been implemented before development commences. (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policy 61)

34. No development hereby permitted shall be commenced until a surface water drainage scheme for the site, based on sustainable drainage principles and in accordance with Cambridge City Council local plan policies, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The scheme shall subsequently be implemented in accordance with the approved details before the development is occupied.

The scheme shall include:

- a) Details of the existing surface water drainage arrangements including runoff rates for the QBAR, 3.3% Annual Exceedance Probability (AEP) (1 in 30) and 1% AEP (1 in 100) storm events;
- b) Full results of the proposed drainage system modelling in the above-referenced storm events (as well as 1% AEP plus climate change) , inclusive of all collection, conveyance, storage, flow control and disposal elements and including an allowance for urban creep, together with a schematic of how the system has been represented within the hydraulic model;
- c) Detailed drawings of the entire proposed surface water drainage system, including levels, gradients, dimensions and pipe reference numbers, pump details and hydrodynamic separator details;
- d) A plan of the drained site area and which part of the proposed drainage system these will drain to;
- e) Full details of the proposed attenuation and flow control measures;

- f) Details of overland flood flow routes in the event of system exceedance, with demonstration that such flows can be appropriately managed on site without increasing flood risk to occupants;
 - g) Full details of the maintenance/adoption of the surface water drainage system;
 - h) Measures taken to prevent pollution of the receiving groundwater and/or surface water
 - i) Formal agreement from a third party if discharging into their system is proposed, including confirmation (and evidence where appropriate) that sufficient capacity is available.
- The drainage scheme must adhere to the hierarchy of drainage options as outlined in the NPPF PPG

Reason: To ensure that the proposed development can be adequately drained and to ensure that there is no increased flood risk on or off site resulting from the proposed development (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 Policies 31 and 32)

35. Details for the long term maintenance arrangements for the surface water drainage system (including the pumps, storage areas and proprietary features) to be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to the first occupation of any of the buildings hereby permitted. This should build on the approved management and maintenance plan by MLM reference: 618971-MLM-ZZ-XX-RP-C-0002. The submitted details should identify runoff sub-catchments, control structures, pumps and access routes for the under building attenuation and pumps, flow routes and outfalls. In addition, the plan must clarify the access that is required to each surface water management component for maintenance purposes. The maintenance plan shall be carried out in full thereafter.

Reason: To ensure the satisfactory maintenance of drainage systems that are not publicly adopted, in accordance with the requirements of Cambridge Local Plan policies 31 and 32, and the National Planning Policy Framework.

36. No development approved by this planning permission shall take place until a scheme that includes the following components to deal with the risks associated with contamination of the site shall each be submitted to and approved, in writing, by the local planning authority:
- 1) Based on the reviews and results of the submitted MLM Contamination Assessment - JW/775621/MH, a quantitative risk assessment of the risk to controlled waters will be required and an acceptable remedial target will need to be determined for the soils remaining on site, which will be protective of controlled water. The conceptual model of the site should also be refined indicating absent/existing sources, pathways and receptors and potentially unacceptable risks arising from contamination at site.
 - 2) A further site investigation scheme, based on (1) to provide information for a detailed assessment of the risk to controlled waters as we are not confident that the initial site investigation sampling and the results of the risk assessment provides sufficient evidence to prove that there is no risk to controlled waters on site.
 - 3) The results of the site investigation and detailed quantitative risk assessment referred to in (2) and, based on these, an options appraisal and remediation strategy giving full details of the remediation measures required and how they are to be undertaken.
 - 4) A verification plan providing details of the data that will be collected in order to demonstrate that the works set out in the remediation strategy in (3) are complete and identifying any requirements for longer-term monitoring of pollutant linkages, maintenance and arrangements for contingency action. Any changes to these components require the express written consent of the local planning authority. The scheme shall be implemented as approved. Reason. To protect and prevent the pollution of controlled waters from potential pollutants in line with NPPF paragraphs 109 and 121, and the Environment Agency Groundwater Protection Policy.
- (National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) paragraph 109 states that the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by preventing both new and existing development from contributing to or being put at unacceptable risk from, or being adversely affected by unacceptable levels of water pollution. Government policy also states that planning policies and decisions should also ensure that adequate site investigation information, prepared by a competent person, is presented (NPPF, paragraph 121).

37. No development above ground level, other than demolition, shall commence (or in accordance with a timetable agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority), until a Public Art Delivery Plan (PADP) has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The PADP shall include the following:

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

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

Reason: To accord with the provisions of Cambridge City Council Public Art SPD (2010) and policies 55 and 56 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2018.

38. Prior to the commencement of construction or conversion of the proposed development full details of a mitigation scheme to address the impacts on air quality arising from the development shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The Air Quality mitigation scheme shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details before the first occupation of the development and shall thereafter be retained as such.

Reason: To protect human health in accordance with policy 36 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2018)

39. Implementation of Renewable Energy Statement

The approved renewable energy technologies 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 and to ensure that the development does not give rise to unacceptable pollution. (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 Policy 29)

40. Water efficiency

Prior to occupation, a water efficiency specification shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. This shall demonstrate that the proposed use is able to achieve at least a 25% improvement over baseline water consumption using the BREEAM Wat 01 water calculator 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 policies 28 and 31 and Supplementary Planning Document 'Sustainable Design & Construction' 2007).

41. Prior to above ground works commencing, details shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority relating to the installation of integral bird boxes including the specification, number and location of swift boxes. Once agreed in writing the approved details shall be implemented prior to first use of the hotel hereby approved.

Reason: In the interests of ecology and in accordance with Policy 70 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2018.

42. Prior to above ground works commencing, details for a biodiverse green roof shall be submitted in writing to the Local Planning Authority. Once approved, the details shall be implemented prior to the first use of the hotel hereby permitted. Should any of the green roof planting fail during the first 5 years after first planting, it shall be replaced.

Reason: In the interests of biodiversity in accordance with Policy 70 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2018.

43. No occupation of the building shall commence until a Travel Plan has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The Travel Plan shall specify the methods to be used to discourage the use of the private motor vehicle and the arrangements to encourage use of alternative sustainable travel arrangements such as public transport, car sharing, cycling and walking. The Travel Plan shall be implemented as approved upon the occupation of the development and monitored in accordance with details to be agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In the interests of encouraging sustainable travel to and from the site (Cambridge Local Plan 2018, policies 80 and 81).

44. No demolition or construction works shall commence on site until a traffic management plan has been submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: in the interests of highway safety (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 Policy 81)

45. To satisfy the noise 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 noise 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 guard against any creeping background noise in the area and prevent unreasonable noise 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 a noise 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 a noise assessment as described within this informative.

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

46. Environment Agency - Other Environmental issues.

Surface Water Drainage:

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

Surface Water Drainage and Infiltration Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS). 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, drainage systems 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. Only clean, uncontaminated surface water should be discharged to any soakaway, watercourse or surface water sewer.

Foul Water Drainage:

An acceptable method of foul drainage disposal would be connection to the public foul sewer.

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.

Pollution Prevention:

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.

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.

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

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: Anglian Water has assets close to or crossing this site or there are assets subject to an adoption agreement. Therefore the site layout should take this into account and accommodate those assets within either prospectively adoptable highways or public open space. If this is not practicable then the sewers will need to be diverted at the developers cost under Section 185 of the Water Industry Act 1991. or, in the case of apparatus under an adoption agreement, liaise with the owners of the apparatus. It should be noted that the diversion works should normally be completed before development can commence.

INFORMATIVE: This planning permission should be read in conjunction with the associated deed of planning obligation prepared under s.106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) dated as this decision notice.

Notwithstanding any consent granted under the relevant planning act/s, the applicant is advised that before any works are carried out on any footway, carriageway, verge or other land forming part of the public highway the express consent of Cambridgeshire County Council as the Local Highway Authority will be required. All costs associated with any construction works will be borne by the developer. The developer will not be permitted to drain roof water over the public highway, nor across it in a surface channel, but must make arrangements to install a piped drainage connection. No window or door will be allowed to open over a highway and no foundation or footing for the structure will be allowed to encroach under the public highway.

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.

New development can sometimes cause inconvenience, disturbance and disruption to local residents, businesses and passers by. As a result the City Council runs a Considerate Contractor Scheme aimed at promoting high standards of care during construction. The City Council encourages the developer of the site, through its building contractor, to join the scheme and agree to comply with the model Code of Good Practice, in the interests of good neighbourliness. Information about the scheme can be obtained from The Considerate Contractor Project Officer in the Planning Department (Tel: 01223 457121).

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

Development Control Forum DCF/1 Friday, 7 September 2018

DEVELOPMENT CONTROL FORUM 7 September 2018

10.00 am - 12.15 pm

Present

Planning Committee Members: Councillors Blencowe, Hipkin, Smart and Thornburrow

Ward Councillors:

Councillor Massey

Councillor Johnson

Officers:

Delivery Manager: Eileen Paterson (Chair)

Senior Planner: Charlotte Burton

Committee Manager: Sarah Steed

FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE COUNCIL

18/14/DCF Declarations of Interest

The Chair outlined the role and purpose of the Development Control Forum. She stated no decisions would be taken at the meeting.

18/15/DCF Application and Petition Details 18/1002/FUL - 211-213 Newmarket Road & 2 Godesdone Road Cambridge Cambridgeshire CB5 8HA

Application No: 18/1002/FUL

Site Address: 211-213 Newmarket Road & 2 Godesdone Road Cambridge Cambridgeshire CB5 8HA

Description: Demolition of existing buildings at 211-213 Newmarket Road and construction of a hotel (C1 use), with change of use and conversion of 2 Godesdone Road to C1 use, and provision of associated infrastructure.

Applicant: MPMerchant (NR) Ltd and easyHotel

Agent: Savills (UK) Ltd

Address: Unex House 132-134 Hills Road Cambridge CB2 8PA United Kingdom

Lead Petitioner: Resident of Riverside

Case Officer: Charlotte Burton

Text of Petition:

This site is not suitable for budget hotel use and in any case is not in accordance with the policy describing the need for hotel bedrooms. The application is overdevelopment of this small site on primarily residential Godesdone Road in the Riverside and Stourbridge Conservation Area. The overall quality of the design is not in keeping with such an important site. The building is at a gateway to the conservation area explicitly identified as critical in the Eastern Gateway Policy. There is no landscaping to soften the impact of the building.

The transport statement and hotel travel plan are completely inadequate to avoid negative impact on residential amenity over a wide area as it will jeopardise road safety; increase existing overnight parking stress; and generate many extra journeys in an area already experiencing severe congestion.

Approval of this application would add to anti-social behaviour issues including drug dealing associated with budget hotels. To address public safety there is a need for design changes to the entrance as well as additional street lighting to avoid street disturbance and noise. The application does not show how deliveries in the street rather than a courtyard and guests using taxis to arrive and waiting for departure would not increase air pollution to unsafe levels. The application does not address the loss of residential amenity from increased noise.

Do you think there are changes that could be made to overcome your concerns? Yes

The site could be suitable for a boutique hotel with a reasonable number of rooms, and internal courtyard for drop offs; provision for disabled parking; and the reception / delivery entrance, and a much better travel plan either with on-site parking / compulsory valet parking / or a commitment in perpetuity to fund the extra costs of the council rather than residents to enforce an extension to the restriction hours of the neighbouring CPZs.

Case by Applicant

A representative on behalf of the applicant made the following points:

- i. Did not think that any new issues arose from the revised NPPF which had been issued that week.
- ii. Images were inserted in the presentation to give context of the site.
- iii. Commented that there had been a large number of third party representations, he went through the statutory consultation responses.

- iv. The Planning Policy Team had considered the application and said it was acceptable.
- v. The Urban Design and Conservation Team considered the scale and massing of the proposal was acceptable.
- vi. Commented that there was no landscaping on site at the moment but the scheme incorporated external planters along Newmarket Road / Godesdone Road to enhance the public realm. There would be an internal courtyard area which would include planters.
- vii. Amenity issues were addressed through a technical note. The Transport Assessment considered road safety as part of its scope. A travel plan had been submitted to address parking issues.
- viii. The applicant had spoken with the Environmental Health Team regarding air quality.
- ix. Easyhotel operated a zero tolerance policy in respect of anti-social behaviour.
- x. Noted that the Petitioner's view was that the site was suitable for a boutique hotel however the proposal was for an Easyhotel with 90 rooms.
- xi. There was an internal courtyard for drop offs and their proposal had been accepted by the Highways Department.
- xii. There was a travel plan in place to manage guests.
- xiii. Pre-application discussions directed the reception / delivery entrance towards the commercial frontage.
- xiv. Design changes had been considered following the public exhibition and consultation with residents and further design ideas could be considered.

Case by Petitioners

A representative on behalf of the petitioners made the following points:

- i. This was the third budget hotel on this small congested stretch of Newmarket Road.
- ii. First major concern was overdevelopment, the site was not large enough to support budget hotel use.
- iii. The development's Godesdone Road frontage would be 50% of the length of the Newmarket Road frontage.
- iv. There was a blind junction from Newmarket Road into Godesdone Road so vehicles took a wide line when turning.
- v. The 90 bedrooms proposed was more than all the bedrooms in the whole of Godesdone Road.
- vi. The application proposes to step back the Godesdone Road frontage to accommodate a drop off bay.

- vii. The site was smaller than the Travelodge or Premier Inn sites.
- viii. There were already 340 budget hotel rooms on this junction.
- ix. Easyhotel wants to locate 41% as many bedrooms as Travelodge onto a site that is only 17% of the Travelodge site area and 74% as many bedrooms as Premier Inn into a site that is only 31.5% of the Premier Inn's site.
- x. If the same ratios were applied to site area as Travelodge and Premier Inn, the site would support 38 bedrooms.
- xi. The reception area had no seating for guests to socialise.
- xii. The pavement at entrances was narrow and it was also narrow around the drop off bay.
- xiii. Budget hotel guest's behaviour can be disruptive for neighbours. This type of hotel usually operated a lean staff model but with large numbers of guests which could include stag / hen parties.
- xiv. Fire alarms were set off in the Travelodge; guests were evacuated at 2am which was disruptive to Godesdone residents. One on-site staff member cannot deal with all behavioural issues.
- xv. Coaches regularly parked on Newmarket Road despite travel plans providing for drop offs at the rear of premises.
- xvi. The second concern expressed was that this was unsustainable development which provided no social or environmental benefit to the community.
- xvii. This stretch of Newmarket Road was the resident's 'high street' and supported a rich mix of uses. Reference was made to the new local plan policy 22 which provided that development should reflect the predominantly residential nature of the area.
- xviii. Commented that if the site was given to hotel use it would take the opportunity away for other local uses.
- xix. The city had already satisfied its projected budget hotel need set until 2031, it was 11 rooms away from this projected need despite the growth period being 13 years away.
- xx. The Local Plan Inspector had identified a need for quirky 5* hotels. The development did not meet the needs of residents or those in the local plan.
- xxi. The third concern was traffic impact, questioned if the site was appropriate at all and commented on the impact on road safety and the local road network.
- xxii. Questioned how taxi drop offs would be enforced, following the Travelodge development.
- xxiii. The trip numbers on Godesdone Road will double.
- xxiv. Resident's fourth concern was the overbearing effect of the proposed development on the Conservation Area.

Members Questions and Comments

Ward Councillor Massey made the following points:

- i. Referred to anti-social behaviour associated with budget hotels and also TripAdvisor comments regarding drug dealing, prostitution and human trafficking.
- ii. Police were notified of drug dealing, mugging and prostitution issues in the East Area and these issues were made a police priority at the last East Area Committee.
- iii. Budget hotels cut costs to the bone, which limited resources to tackle anti-social behaviour, this was why budget hotels should not be located in residential areas.
- iv. Budget hotels attracted stag / hen parties, the wheeling of suitcases late at night had an adverse effect on residents.
- v. Referred to an increase in greenhouse gas emissions.
- vi. Could not see any benefit of the proposed development to the ward, which was the most diverse ward in the city.

Ward Councillor Johnson made the following points:

- i. Referred to policy 77 of the new local plan, more weight could be attached following the Planning Inspector's letter.
- ii. Referred to paragraph 8.47 of the Local Plan, the Hotel Future Study influenced policy 77.
- iii. 1500 bedrooms were identified in the Hotel Future Study (completed in 2012), the budget hotel room provision nearly exceeded the projected growth identified up to 2031.
- iv. Referred to a shortfall in 3-5* hotel sector.
- v. Easyhotel was a budget hotel brand, new hotels should be supported if they were at the upper end of hotel provision.

Case Officer comments

- i. There were over 150 third party objections and some representations in support received for this application. The application would go to Planning Committee for determination.
- ii. Following the publication of the Planning Inspector's report on Monday, the case officer would need to go through and address issues against the local plan policies.
- iii. The Planning Policy Team had said that the proposal was compliant with the adopted and emerging policy 77 but further discussions were needed with the Planning Policy Team.
- iv. In considering the impact on transport, an objection had been received from Highways particularly looking at Godesdone Road,

further information had been submitted by the Applicant and comments were waited from Highways.

v. It was difficult to make a clear link between anti-social behaviour and the budget hotel use proposed.

vi. Commented on the availability of spill out space and residential amenity.

vii. The Urban Design and Conservation team is supportive of the proposal in terms of scale and massing and the design of the frontage.

viii. Cycle parking was in the process of being assessed by the Landscape Officer.

ix. Environmental Health Team was satisfied with information submitted regarding air quality but other concerns remain outstanding.

x. The Council's Sustainable Drainage Engineer had raised issues which needed to be addressed by the Applicant.

xi. The Council's Access Officer had raised issues regarding the lack of accessible parking and the location of rooms within the hotel.

During the Case Officers comments the fire alarm sounded and the council building was evacuated, the meeting reconvened at 11.32am.

Planning Committee Members' questions and comments:

The Applicant responded to Members' questions as follows:

i. The Applicant was still in discussions with Highways but would keep Members' comments about traffic in mind.

ii. The site would have its own bicycles for guests to use so they should not need to use other bikes for example Ofo bikes.

iii. No food or beverages would be available on site.

iv. A single laundry van would be present daily and would have a stay of 20 minutes, the layby should be suitable to accommodate the laundry van.

v. It was proposed to have weekly refuse collections.

vi. Bird boxes and the technical aspects of a green roof were being explored.

vii. The applicant had had pre-application discussions with the Planning Officers and had considered SPD requirements. This was a considered application bearing in mind the Conservation Area.

viii. The design model of EasyHotel was to provide a place for guests to sleep, guests would go out to eat so would not be hanging around the hotel and would be enjoying the city.

ix. The ethos of the hotel was to accommodate people in small rooms it was not expected that people would stay for a long period of time.

There were some rooms without windows, this was common in London. Some people liked to take advantage of the discount price for a room without windows.

- x. A typical room was 12-14sqm but disabled rooms were bigger.
- xi. Members of the public who were registered disabled and had blue badges could park their cars in the local area. The information on the booking system would make it clear that this was a car free site.
- xii. The site was in an urban area so the applicant would need to be mindful of construction timings and issues. Basement excavation would take one week.

Summing up by the Applicant's Agent:

- i. Expressed thanks for holding the Development Control Forum.
- ii. The application was a detailed application for demolition and construction of a hotel.
- iii. The application contained a significant amount of information.
- iv. Referred to the public exhibition which was well attended at the beginning of the year.
- v. The statutory consultees either supported the proposal, had no objections or issues could be addressed through condition.
- vi. There were comprehensive representations from third parties but they would have to agree to disagree on certain issues.
- vii. Pre-application advice pre-dated the planning application.
- viii. Referred to policy 20 in the SPD.
- ix. Acknowledged the discussion regarding the Hotel Needs Assessment but commented that it was difficult to forecast hotels and market issues.
- x. Commented that this was a real opportunity to bring forward redevelopment.

Summing up by the Petitioners:

- i. Pre-application advice to the applicant about the intensity of use did not reassure the petitioners.
- ii. The site was embedded in a residential street, if people stayed daily this was 77-80 people staying daily, questioned how this could be accommodated on a tiny street.
- iii. Questioned if the drop-off bay was full what guests did.
- iv. Questioned what disabled guests would do if the drop off bay was occupied.
- v. Commented that there was not enough existing resident's parking.
- vi. Questioned why Travelodge was used by the applicant in the travel plan if it was not a comparator.

- vii. Amenity space was not addressed by Easyhotel.
- viii. Conservation Area legislation was clear, development should preserve or enhance, there was no half way house compromise.
- ix. This application would set a precedent for the rest of Newmarket Road.
- x. Regeneration should support the residential area.

The applicant agreed to provide a construction plan for digging the basement and a table to show the sqm of rooms.

Final Comments of the Chair

The Chair observed the following:

- i. Notes of the Development Control Forum would be made available to relevant parties.
- ii. Application to be considered at a future Planning Committee.

The meeting ended at 12.15 pm

CHAIR