



<b>Planning Committee Date</b>	6 <sup>th</sup> September 2023 Cambridge City Council Planning Committee
<b>Lead Officer</b>	Joint Director of Planning and Economic Development
<b>Reference</b>	20/01426/FUL
<b>Site</b>	Anstey Hall, Maris Lane
<b>Ward / Parish</b>	Trumpington
<b>Proposal</b>	Construction of two blocks of retirement accommodation (Class C2) comprising 87 two-bedroom apartments. Change of use of land to public open space. Change of use of Anstey Hall to mixed uses including ancillary use on the lower ground, ground and first floor to serve the residential retirement community; 5x staff accommodation on the second floor; a C3 private flatted dwelling on the second floor; and 7x short -term guest accommodation on the ground and first floor. Demolition of greenhouses and flat-roof building and erection of Orangery to house an ancillary restaurant and swimming pool connected to the hall by an existing link, provision of pedestrian access onto Maris Lane and reconfiguration of wall, hard and soft landscaping, car parking and pedestrian access onto Old Mills Road
<b>Applicant</b>	Trumpington Investments Ltd (Mr John De Bruyne)
<b>Presenting Officer</b>	Tom Gray
<b>Reason Reported to Committee</b>	Called-in by Cllr Hauk Third party representations in support and opposition
<b>Member Site Visit Date</b>	Formal visit date TBC 1. Principle of development

## Key Issues

2. Impact upon the character/loss of protected open space
3. Impact upon the character and appearance of the Conservation Area and setting of the Listed Building
4. Tree impacts
5. Biodiversity impacts
6. Other Matters

## Recommendation

## REFUSE

### 1.0 Executive Summary

- 1.1 The application proposes the construction of two blocks of retirement accommodation and the change of use of the land to allow public access. In addition, it proposes the change of use of Anstey Hall to ancillary staff/guest accommodation and a private flatted dwelling. Moreover, the existing greenhouses and flat-roof building would be demolished and replaced with an Orangery. New pedestrian accesses are proposed in addition to hard and soft landscaping and car parking.
- 1.2 The existing site comprises a Grade II\* Listed Building, located within the Trumpington Conservation Area and adjacent to the Cambridge Green Belt. The site is protected open space for its environmental and recreational qualities. It is located to the north and east of the Trumpington Meadows residential development.
- 1.3 There is mature planting within the site with statutory protected trees along the site's eastern boundaries, and the site is located in close proximity to a City Wildlife Site. The site is subject to high surface water flooding.
- 1.4 Whilst the proposal would provide retirement accommodation for an ageing population, the proposed retirement blocks would consume a substantial portion of protected open space which would not be satisfactorily replaced in terms of quantity elsewhere. Moreover, the open character of this park and garden and setting of this Listed Building (Anstey Hall) would be eroded and the setting of the city would be adversely impacted.
- 1.5 The proposed retirement blocks would fail to appropriately relate to the Anstey Hall in terms of their design, siting and scale and therefore have an adverse impact upon the character and appearance of Trumpington Conservation Area and the setting of the Grade II\* Listed Building. Furthermore, the proposed Orangery would fail to be of a high-quality design which would be inappropriate in this location whilst insufficient information in terms of the Maris Lane wall reconfiguration has been provided. Overall, the proposal would fail to positively respond to the surrounding context, existing features of natural, historic and local importance and the setting and special character of the city. The harm to

the character and appearance of the Conservation Area and to the setting and significance of Anstey Hall is identified as a high-level of 'less than substantial' harm and it is not considered that the public benefits arising from the scheme would outweigh this identified harm.

- 1.6 Whilst the proposed car parking is sufficient and traffic movements are considered acceptable, the application fails to provide cycle and mobility vehicle storage for future occupiers, visitors and employees, whilst insufficient information has been submitted with regards an energy strategy to accord with the energy hierarchy. Moreover, insufficient refuse and archaeology information has been submitted.
- 1.7 Proposed block B would be sited in an area of high surface water risk and no sequential test has been submitted to inform the siting of this block.
- 1.8 Whilst the proposed development would achieve a biodiversity net gain within the site, the development would result in a loss of tree canopy cover, and it would have adverse lighting impacts upon protected species.
- 1.9 Whilst the proposed development would result in acceptable amenity impacts for neighbouring dwellings, due to lack of energy strategy, insufficient information has been provided to demonstrate that the proposed development would not have an adverse impact upon future occupiers on account of noise impacts.
- 1.10 Other potential impacts have been considered as part of this planning assessment.
- 1.11 Officers recommend that the Planning Committee refuse the application.

**1.12 Site Description and Context**

Conservation Area	X	Trees subject to Tree Preservation Orders and within the Conservation Area	X
Protected Open Space	X	Flood Zone 1 and High Surface Water Flood Risk	X
Grade II* Listed Building and within the setting of other Listed Buildings	X	Adjacent to Green Belt	X

- 1.13 The application site comprises a Grade II\* Building of Anstey Hall, a 17<sup>th</sup> Century Country House, and Historic Park and Garden. During the application process, the Hall was downgraded from Grade I. The site is Protected Open Space for both its environmental and recreational qualities.
- 1.14 The site is located approximately 4km west of Cambridge City Centre. Anstey Hall is located within the Trumpington Conservation Area and is adjacent to the Grade I Listed Church of St Mary and St Michael and its

associated Grade II Listed Vicarage. To the northeast of Anstey Hall are several curtilage Listed outbuildings that have largely been converted to businesses with the exception of the garaging and the Grade II Listed Lodge and Gate Piers, in addition to the Grade II Listed Building of Maris House.

- 1.15 The site is located to the south and Maris Lane, to the north/east of the Trumpington Meadows residential development (an area of major change) and Anstey Hall Barns and west of Waitrose supermarket and car park. There is mature tree planting, in particular on the western and eastern boundaries. The trees on the eastern boundaries in which have statutory protection (TPOs).
- 1.16 Trumpington Meadows Country Park, part of the Cambridge Green Belt is located further to the west whilst the application site is situated adjacent to the protected open space of Trumpington Church Cemetery, a public space. Grantchester Road Plantations is located 100 metres further to the northwest, which is designated as a City Wildlife Site.
- 1.17 The application site is located within Flood Zone 1 (lowest fluvial flood risk), however, 1 in 30-year (high) surface water flood risk, 1 in 100 year (medium) surface water flood risk and 1 in 1000 year (low) surface water flood risk exists within the application site.
- 1.18 Vehicular access to the site is achieved from Maris Lane. Uncontrolled parking exists on adjacent streets.
- 1.19 A listed building consent application has been submitted for the demolition of greenhouses and flat-roof building and erection of Orangery to house an ancillary restaurant and swimming pool connected to the hall by an existing link, in addition to the reconfiguration of wall to restore historic access onto Maris Lane. The impact upon the listed building is assessed under listed building consent application 20/01427/LBC.

## **2.0 The Proposal**

- 2.1 The proposed development would consist of two 3 storey accommodation blocks, containing a total of 87 retirement (C2 use) units, each of which would contain 2 bedrooms.
- 2.2 It is proposed to demolish the greenhouses and flat-roof building and replacement with an Orangery to house an ancillary restaurant and swimming pool connected to the hall by an existing link.
- 2.3 It is proposed to change the use of the existing Anstey Hall garden area to public open space, and the provision of pedestrian access onto Maris Lane, reconfiguration of the wall, hard and soft landscaping, car parking and pedestrian access onto Old Mills Road. A public park would be created to the south of the Hall within the grassed open space, which would be connected to the Trumpington Meadows residential development

beyond, through a stone belvedere flanked by two flights of stone steps.

2.4 Internally, Anstey Hall's lower ground floor, ground and first floor are proposed to serve the residential retirement community. On the second floor, five rooms would be provided for staff accommodation whilst elsewhere, a one-bedroom C3 flatted dwelling is proposed. In addition, seven short-term guest rooms are proposed on the ground and first floor.

2.5 The application has been amended to address representations and further consultations have been carried out as appropriate.

### 3.0 Relevant Site History

Reference	Description	Outcome
21/02332/FUL & 21/02333/LBC	Change of use of Anstey Hall from a wedding venue Use Class formerly D2 (now sui generis) with associated guest accommodation (Use Class C1) which is now collectively sui generis, to use as student accommodation (Use Class C2) for Sixth Form students taught at Dukes Education's St Andrews College, Cambridge	Withdrawn
21/01696/FUL	Change of use of Anstey Hall from Wedding Venue (D2, now F2) and Hotel (C1) to Residential Institution (C2) with ancillary visitor accommodation	Refused
19/5091/PREAPP	87 retirement apartments, new orangery containing catering and support services, use of Anstey Hall as central facilities and new vehicular and pedestrian accesses.	Advice Given
18/1537/FUL & 18/1538/LBC	Convert existing store rooms into bedrooms with ensuite on ground and first floor loft space, including a roof extension with dormer window on the south elevation. Two new conservation rooflights and internal chimney removed.	Permitted
16/0586/FUL	Installation of a new pedestrian link between Waitrose Store and Barratt development and associated works.	Permitted

15/0871/LBC	Form new door opening within bookshelves of the west wall of the library. Install "art nouveau" stained glass screen in passage.	Permitted
15/0101/ADV	External Seating Banners & Stainless Steel Posts	Permitted
14/0159/FUL & 14/0160/LBC	Demolition of modern barn and outbuildings and removal of temporary structures to allow conversion of barns, cart sheds and stables to eight residential units and erection of four dwellings, the creation of a spur access drive from Anstey Hall Drive and associated works.	Permitted
13/0950/FUL	Extension to front of store building (Use Class A1) and associated works and improvements.	Permitted
12/0504/FUL	Retrospective change of use from B1 (offices) to (D2) wedding venue and associated (C1) hotel and guest use for 12 bedrooms.	Permitted
12/0456/FUL	Request permission to continue use of Marquee for Wedding ceremonies etc for a period of at least 3 years.	Permitted
10/0180/FUL & 10/0181/LBC	Formation of extended vehicular driveway and new opening in boundary wall.	Refused, Appeal Dismissed
08/0631/FUL & 08/0708/LBC	Refurbishment and change of use of storage and greenhouse to office/light industrial.	Permitted
07/1335/FUL	Change of use of redundant carriage house to offices.	Permitted
07/1354/LBC	New south elevation wall and windows, replacement of floors, partitions and roof.	Permitted
07/1092/LBC	Form an opening of 6 metres wide with two new brick pillars constructed from the reclaimed bricks, stone plinths and two reclaimed stone balls.	Permitted

07/1094/FUL	Forming an opening 6 metres wide with two new brick piers in wall on west boundary of Anstey Hall.	Permitted
C/03/1090	Internal and external alterations to building within curtilage of Grade I Listed Building.	
C/03/1092	Retrospective application for the removal of an internal wall within grade I listed building.	
C/03/1093	Internal and external works to grade I listed building.	
C/03/0575	Internal and external alterations to stables (retrospective).	Permitted
C/03/0130	Change of use of ground floor unit of coach house building from B1 offices to D1 clinical practice.	Permitted
C/02/1160 & C/02/1090	Replacement entrance gates adjacent to Anstey Hall annexe retrospective.	Permitted
C/02/0118	Replacement of entrance gates and internal and external alterations to main hall and stable blocks.	Withdrawn
C/01/1031	Change of use of outbuilding within the grounds of Anstey Hall from retail (Class A1) to Ophthalmic Laser Clinic (Class D1) and external alterations to building.	Permitted
C/01/1032	Internal and external alterations to outbuilding within the grounds of Anstey Hall.	Permitted
C/00/0224	Internal alterations to Anstey Hall and part demolition of outbuildings.	Permitted

3.1 The application site's lawful use is as a wedding venue and hotel. Over recent years the applicant has sought alternative uses of the site including as a residential institution which was refused on a number of grounds and as an educational facility which was withdrawn.

#### 4.0 Policy

## **4.1 National**

National Planning Policy Framework 2021

National Planning Practice Guidance

National Design Guide 2019

Local Transport Note 1/20 (LTN 1/20) Cycle Infrastructure Design

Circular 11/95 (Conditions, Annex A)

Technical Housing Standards – Nationally Described Space Standard (2015)

EIA Directives and Regulations - European Union legislation with regard to environmental assessment and the UK's planning regime remains unchanged despite it leaving the European Union on 31 January 2020

Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017

Environment Act 2021

ODPM Circular 06/2005 – Protected Species

Equalities Act 2010

## **4.2 Cambridge Local Plan 2018**

Policy 1: The presumption in favour of sustainable development

Policy 3: Spatial strategy for the location of residential development

Policy 8: Setting of the city

Policy 18: Southern fringe areas of major change

Policy 28: Carbon reduction, community energy networks, sustainable design and construction, and water use

Policy 29: Renewable and low carbon energy generation

Policy 31: Integrated water management and the water cycle

Policy 32: Flood risk

Policy 33: Contaminated land

Policy 34: Light pollution control

Policy 35: Human health and quality of life

Policy 36: Air quality, odour and dust

Policy 45: Affordable housing and dwelling mix

Policy 47: Specialist housing

Policy 50: Residential space standards

Policy 51: Accessible Homes

Policy 55: Responding to context

Policy 56: Creating successful places

Policy 57: Designing new buildings



Policy 58: Altering and extending existing buildings  
Policy 59: Designing landscape and the public realm  
Policy 61: Conservation and enhancement of historic environment  
Policy 62: Local heritage assets  
Policy 67: Protection of open space  
Policy 70: Protection of priority species and habitats  
Policy 71: Trees  
Policy 80: Supporting sustainable access to development  
Policy 81: Mitigating the transport impact of development  
Policy 82: Parking management  
Policy 85: Infrastructure delivery, planning obligations and the Community Infrastructure Levy

#### **4.3 Supplementary Planning Documents**

Biodiversity SPD – Adopted February 2022  
Sustainable Design and Construction SPD – Adopted January 2020  
Cambridgeshire Flood and Water SPD – Adopted November 2016  
Health Impact Assessment SPD – Adopted March 2011  
Landscape in New Developments SPD – Adopted March 2010  
Open Space SPD – Adopted January 2009  
Public Art SPD – Adopted January 2009  
Trees and Development Sites SPD – Adopted January 2009  
Open Space and Recreation Strategy 2011

#### **4.4 Other Guidance**

Trumpington Conservation Area Appraisal 2010

#### **5.0 Consultations**

##### **5.1 County Highways Development Management – No objection**

5.2 Drawing number ZA961-PL-SK-001 P1 is sufficient to overcome objection.

5.3 Previous comments (17<sup>th</sup> January 2023) – Proposed access point off Maris Lane needs to be shown in more detail. Access width must be shown. Conditions recommended.

5.4 Previous comments (7<sup>th</sup> September 2020) – Transport statement provided should be reviewed by the County's Transport Assessment Team

5.5 Previous comments (9<sup>th</sup> April 2020) – Objection. Lack of suitable transport assessment. Inter-vehicle visibility splays required. Recommends Traffic Management Plan and construction vehicle weight conditions.

##### **5.6 County Transport Team – No objection**

5.7 No comments to make given the minimal additional traffic impact on the highway network.

5.8 Previous comments (14<sup>th</sup> September 2020) – Existing pedestrian and cycling links to key facilities and highlight areas for improvement are required. Should describe existing public transport services located at the vicinity of the site. Access junction layout and design should be considered. Accident data should be sought and appended to the transport statement. Proposed parking provision of 52 spaces is very low, as car ownership for residents may be higher than anticipated. Type of accommodation and expected age of residents to fully explain likely demands for parking. Should be considered further by the LPA. Trip forecast data is acceptable.

### **5.9 Lead Local Flood Authority – No objection**

5.10 No objection. Surface water can be managed through permeable paving, rainwater butts, infiltration basin. Request conditions including a detailed surface water drainage scheme for the site, details for the long-term maintenance arrangements for the surface water drainage system, details of how surface water run-off during construction can be managed, and survey and report to ensure SuDS have been constructed appropriately. Also recommends informatives.

5.11 Previous comments (25<sup>th</sup> January 2023) – Sequential test is required. Proposed layout must demonstrate safe access and egress. Hydraulic calculations and open basis is attributed for within the impermeable areas of the site. Policy 31 is not fully met.

5.12 Previous comments (21<sup>st</sup> August 2020) – drainage strategy is required.

### **5.13 Sustainable Drainage Engineer – Additional information required**

5.14 A surface water drainage strategy is required.

### **5.15 Environment Agency – No comment**

5.16 No comment to make on revised application.

### **5.17 Anglian Water – No objection**

5.18 Obligated to accept foul water flows.

### **5.19 Urban Design Officer – Objection**

5.20 No further comments on revisions.

5.21 Previous comments (2<sup>nd</sup> June 2020). Response to context – The Trumpington Conservation Area Appraisal (pg. 40&41) identifies a number of protected and significant features on the site that make up the special character and setting of Anstey Hall. This includes the Grade I listed Anstey Hall, Walls of Townscape Significance, TPO areas, individual

TPOs, significant tree groups, 8 individual significant trees and a significant viewpoint from the southern boundary of the site looking north towards Anstey Hall. The Trumpington Conservation Area Appraisal describes the gardens and the grounds of Anstey Hall as vital to the setting of the buildings and the character of the Conservation Area as a whole. Setting of Anstey Hall and identified significant view on the site was a key consideration in the master planning for the Trumpington Meadows development, which through the site layout, building form and appearance, responded directly to this view and the special character of the historic core of Trumpington village.

- 5.22 Fails to resolve the key constraints of the site and does not respond positively to the key qualities of the site's natural and historic context.
- 5.23 Layout, movement and access – Blocks B and C span between 85m and 95m in length and which appear to consume almost the entire western and eastern perimeter of the green open space. This along with associated alterations to the site access and parking significantly reduces the open character of this park and garden.
- 5.24 Removal of 8 significant trees identified in the Conservation Area Appraisal form an important part of the setting of Anstey Hall and frame key views from the southern boundary and their removal will erode the existing character of the park setting.
- 5.25 Existing TPO trees towards the eastern boundary may be under threat should the existing access need to be widened. These trees are key to the character and setting of the park and garden and in maintaining a barrier between the site and adjacent Waitrose development. Layout movements and access are unsupported.
- 5.26 Scale, massing and appearance – Blocks' footprints are a much larger and coarser grain than the surrounding fine grain context of Trumpington meadows and the Conservation Area which is characterised by smaller fine grained plot formations with varied pitched roofs and chimneys further articulating roofscapes. Continuous 3 storey flat roof form which appears excessively horizontal and would read as one long intrusive mass bear little resemblance to forms that characterise the Conservation Area nor reflect the key qualities of Anstey Hall itself. Scale, massing and appearance are unsupported.
- 5.27 Functional design – No provision of cycle and mobility scooter storage. Balconies are shallow and upper-level balconies exposed. Ground floor units adjacent to parking areas have poor thresholds between the car park, private amenity and bedroom windows, which we believe will compromise the quality of the amenity space. No demonstration on how accessibility and flexibility has influenced the design and internal arrangement of homes and how these could be adapted to respond to different levels of support. Application is incomplete and no plans for orangery or alterations to Anstey Hall have been provided.

5.28 Conclusion – Significant loss of existing open space and natural features that will harm the character of the site. Layout, scale and massing fail to respond positively to the key qualities of the site’s context. Concerns with functional design. Contrary to policies 55, 56 and 57 of the Local Plan.

**5.29 Access Officer – No objection**

5.30 Information demonstrating ease of access from entrance to flat doorway, charging points for mobility scooters and electric wheelchairs, wider doorways, lighting/colour, internal design, sliding doors, wet rooms. Part M of building regulations should be adhered to.

**5.31 Conservation Officer – Objection**

5.32 Elevations now consistent with roof plan. However, scant level of detail in what the appearance/level of quality of the orangery building would be and given its close proximity to the house, this is not an acceptable level of information. Overall level of harm deriving from these applications remains unchanged and in common with Historic England’s assessment.

5.33 Previous comments (3<sup>rd</sup> March 2023) – Anstey Hall has been regraded to Grade II\* and according to the listing description has a group value with the now Grade II listed lodge and gate piers which, along with the other (unlisted) associated outbuildings, form an important architectural and historic context to the Hall. Curtilage buildings apparently would not be used in association with the retirement complex.

5.34 Setting of Anstey Hall has changed recently with the nearby supermarket and housing. Nonetheless, the historical significance of house and its grounds is based in a village context rather than that of a town house. Typically, the church and vicarage and former farm are in close proximity to Anstey Hall. Hall and ground make an important contribution to Trumpington Conservation Area.

5.35 The form and appearance of the two large residential blocks is neither contextual with the house or estate buildings nor an elegant contemporary addition.

5.36 Proposals would encroach into one of the only surviving elements of the historic grounds which continue to contribute to the significance of the Hall and would compromise appreciation of what survives of its open setting.

5.37 Central vista would be framed by the new blocks and so would be of completely alien character (in contrast to the avenue of trees). Limited mitigation would result from the proposed set-back location and subsequent landscaping, in which the new blocks would nevertheless be unrelated to the Hall in terms of design, location and scale.

- 5.38 There is conflict within the submitted application regarding the degree of harm. The submitted DAS identifies 'low' degree of less than substantial harm, whereas the submitted supplementary HIA concludes 'moderate' degree. There is disagreement within the application material itself with the heritage specialist ascribing a greater level of harm.
- 5.39 Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning Note 3 (2<sup>nd</sup> Edition) advises that enhancement may be achieved by actions including introducing new views (including glimpses or better framed views) that add to the public experience of the asset, or improving public access to, or interpretation of, the asset including its setting.
- 5.40 The proposal would introduce a new view including the belevedere which is included as a 'but of fun' either in redbrick with stone accents or all Portland stone.
- 5.41 The proposal would increase the degree of public access (though there must already be a degree of access from the existing use). However, the access to/interpretation of the heritage asset including its setting would be compromised by, and the public park surrounded by, the large residential blocks.
- 5.42 Whilst the landscaping proposals could be a positive element of the scheme, these do not necessarily have the permanence of the proposed built elements.
- 5.43 Do not consider the demolition of the greenhouses and flat-roof building, erection of Orangery, Maris Lane pedestrian access and reconfiguration of the wall as providing weight in favour of the planning application.
- 5.44 Repairs to the listed building no longer form part of the application.
- 5.45 Principal issues remain despite the regrading of the Hall. Benefits of the scheme would be undermined by the extensive residential blocks within the grounds. Their design/appearance does not weigh in the scheme's favour.
- 5.46 Anstey Hall is listed as a Country House and this entails some contribution of space/grounds to its setting and significance. Regarding the residential blocks (derived according to the DAS from a town square or its piazza concept), this development would be inappropriate.
- 5.47 Level of harm to the setting and significance of Anstey Hall is at a high level of 'less than substantial harm'.
- 5.48 Previous comments (23<sup>rd</sup> June 2020) – Regrading of Anstey Hall do not change previous comments.
- 5.49 Previous comments (21<sup>st</sup> August 2020) – Southern meadow and ground make a positive contribution to the significance of Anstey Hall. They are a

historic component of the setting and the significance of the Hall and also still define a spatial relationship with the surrounding settlement. The attributes that contribute to significance include the existing buildings, structures; scale and 'grain' of the surrounding area within the conservation area; and a limited amount of formal design applicable to the garden; the openness of the meadow; the surrounding trees and vegetation. The experience (via its setting) of Anstey Hall is influenced by views from, towards, through, across and including the asset; its role as focal point (from the south); and a sense of privacy related to the house.

- 5.50 The development's impact is influenced by the sheer extent of the accommodation blocks which comprise two large three-storey buildings, the magnitude of each being comparable to or greater than the Hall itself and in positions where the open setting of Anstey Hall would be significantly changed and diminished. The experience of the setting /from the south and from the house (including having extensive open space of its own) would be curtailed. There are also spatial historic functional relationships between the layout of hall and grounds, the courtyards, walled garden, and farmyard barns, but the proposed accommodation blocks would disrupt this.
- 5.51 The Conservation Area Appraisal states of Trumpington that, "It maintains its historic context with the link between the manors and the land retained". The area is characterised by the grand manor houses of Trumpington Hall and Anstey Hall and a mixture of smaller buildings of different ages. Trumpington Hall and Anstey Hall are set in substantial private grounds, including parkland and paddocks. These spaces and views into the grounds of Trumpington Hall in particular, are important characteristics of the village. "The gardens and the grounds of Anstey Hall are vital to the setting of the buildings and the character of the Conservation Area as a whole." To diminish the setting of the Hall is also to affect the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.
- 5.52 Concerns with Block A and its proposed external appearance.
- 5.53 The Orangery would step well forward of the established southern boundary of the walled garden. It sits across the boundary at the same time occupying a large part of the walled garden thus reducing the walled garden as a component of the estate layout.
- 5.54 Proposed changes to the proposed Coach House are not sympathetic to the character of this building. It's proposed garden and wall enclosure would also be an arbitrary introduction into the open courtyard.
- 5.55 No details on how Anstey Hall would serve as central facilities for the retirement community nor details of the lift and its impact on historic fabric.
- 5.56 No archaeological assessment has been submitted.
- 5.57 Historic England – Objection**

- 5.58 Comprehensive schedule of renovations and repairs to the Hall and outbuildings no longer forms part of the application.
- 5.59 Anstey Hall is a fine late 17th century house with good interiors from this period and from the 18th century. The surviving landscape illustrates the status of the building and how it functioned, contributing to its significance. It is located on the site of a Medieval manor which had been rebuilt by Edmund Bacchus in the early 17th century. The Hall and grounds make an important contribution to the Trumpington Conservation Area.
- 5.60 Previous concluded that the scheme to build on land to the south of the Hall (one of the surviving elements of the historic grounds) would cause a high level of harm to its significance. The proximity of these blocks would compromise the appreciation of the Hall in what survives of its open setting.
- 5.61 Principle objection to the two new build residential blocks on residential blocks are maintained. They would encroach upon the open space and would cause a high level of less than substantial harm to the Hall's significance and setting.
- 5.62 Anstey Hall is listed as Grade II\* for the following principal reasons: Its historic interest being a country house of considerable architectural distinction; its architectural interest including its principal façade, rear garden elevation, panelling and plasterwork; and its group value with the Grade II listed Lodge and other unlisted outbuildings.
- 5.63 Anstey Hall as a mansion house was designed to be seen in a landscape setting with immediate pleasure grounds, beyond which was a wider, largely parkland landscape grazed by cattle. Formal pleasure gardens in the area north of the ha-ha had a functional, domestic relationship with the Hall providing an area of recreation, reflecting the status of the Hall. The area to the south was open landscape space, reflecting how the Hall was used and providing an attractive setting to the building.
- 5.64 Hall is adjacent to the Grade I Listed Church and associated Grade II listed Vicarage. The conservation area is characterised by the grand manor houses of Trumpington Hall and Anstey Hall and a mixture of smaller buildings of different ages, including 19th century houses under the ownership of Trumpington Hall. The LPA's Character Appraisal states that there are a total of 25 Listed Buildings and nine Buildings of Local Interest in the conservation area. There are several notable walls within the area.
- 5.65 The grounds and surrounding landscape of Anstey Hall form an important element of the character of Trumpington Conservation Area. The views into the grounds are an important characteristic of the conservation area, as well as the views along Grantchester Road and Maris Lane towards the

- listed building, which are bordered by boundary walls and the walls of the ancillary buildings.
- 5.66 This contributes to the narrow and enclosed nature that defines the streets within this part of the conservation area. As such, Anstey Hall is considered to make a major positive contribution towards the character and appearance of the conservation area.
- 5.67 The proposed Orangery building would have a moderate impact on the significance of the Hall, which would be mitigated to a certain extent by the 'replacement of a detrimental feature by a new and more harmonious one' (Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning Note 3).
- 5.68 New residential blocks would cause a high level of less than substantial harm to the immediate setting of the Grade II\* Listed Building, as the development would encroach into one of the only surviving elements of the historic grounds which continue to contribute to the significance of the Hall. The proximity of the proposed large residential blocks and their contextually inappropriate design would compromise the appreciation of the Hall in what survives of its open setting.
- 5.69 Whilst it is accepted that the wider setting of Anstey Hall has been incrementally eroded over the last 20 years, any development that would further encroach on the grassed open space to the south of the Hall would detract from its overall setting, causing a high level of harm to the significance of the listed building.
- 5.70 Supportive of the high-quality landscaping proposals but the benefits would be wholly undermined by the presence of the large scale residential blocks, with the result that they would not succeed in mitigating against their impact.
- 5.71 Discrepancy between the DAS and supplementary HIA regarding level of harm is noted.
- 5.72 Policy considerations for these proposals include NPPF presumption in favour of sustainable development, Para 197, 199, 200, 202. Setting of a heritage asset is not fixed and its surrounding evolve. More advice in Historic Environment planning notes.
- 5.73 Recommendation is that whilst the wider setting of the Hall is now urbanised, it would not be appropriate to treat the Hall as a town house, and we emphasise the importance of retaining the surviving garden setting. Remaining land in the ownership of the Hall makes a strong contribution to the setting and significance of the Hall itself and it is important that this is not further compromised by additional development.
- 5.74 Positive elements of the proposal including landscaping and connectivity. However, concerned that the refurbishment of the Hall involving works to both the interior and exterior of the Hall and outbuildings which would



assist in safeguarding their historic fabric into the future are no longer included in the proposals.

- 5.75 High level of less than substantial harm. Historic environment benefits resulting from the proposal would in no way outweigh the level of harm caused by the new build residential development.
- 5.76 It is for the LPA to weigh up the public benefits of the scheme however in our view it has not been demonstrated that providing central facilities for the proposed retirement community would constitute optimum viable use of the Grade II\* listed Hall, consistent with conservation.
- 5.77 NPPF states that great weight should be given to the asset's conservation (and the more important the asset, the greater the weight should be). The Grade II\* listing places it in the top 5.8% of all listed buildings and therefore advise that the weight afforded should be very great indeed.
- 5.78 Substantial encroachment of new buildings and do not meet the requirements of the NPPF, in particular paragraphs 197, 199, 200 and 202. Should bear in mind the statutory duties of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 and Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.
- 5.79 If minded to approve the listed building consent in its current form, in light of our objection you should treat this letter as a request to notify the Secretary of State of this application, in accordance with the above Direction.
- 5.80 Previous comments (12<sup>th</sup> June 2020) – A comprehensive schedule of renovations and repairs to the Hall and outbuildings would include repair and replacement of windows and doors, reinstatement of wooden gates, achieving access for all by installing a lift, installation of central heating to the second floor and a wide range of works to the outbuildings and cobbled courtyard. It is proposed that the Hall itself would provide further resident facilities and visiting guest accommodation associated with the proposed retirement scheme. We are supportive of the proposals for repair provided these are carried out in accordance with best practice and your Council is satisfied with the extent of the work. Where historic fabric survives, this should be repaired where possible rather than replaced. The installation of a lift within the Hall to allow access for all is supported in principle, but no details regarding its location or design have been provided which would enable the impact on the significance of the building to be assessed. Your Council should also be satisfied it has sufficient details of the proposed heating system, including pipe routes. With regard to the landscaping proposals, we are supportive of the new axial approach from the north and reinstatement of the avenue and ha-ha.
- 5.81 County Archaeology – Additional information required**

5.82 Very high archaeological potential. Recommend that the site is subject to an archaeological evaluation and geophysical survey prior to determination.

**5.83 Senior Sustainability Officer – Additional information required**

5.84 Additional information required. Energy strategy should provide an overview of approach to meet requirements.

5.85 Previous comments (2<sup>nd</sup> June 2020) – scheme shows a 15.5% reduction compared top Part L 2013 and as such does not meet the Local Plan. No indicative location of the solar panels is shown on any of the roof plans. Revised layout of PV panels and energy strategy is required.

**5.86 Landscape Officer – Objection**

5.87 Loss of protected open space. LVIA considered. Site contributes to ecological value of the area.

5.88 Previous comments (2<sup>nd</sup> June 2020) – Loss of protected open space. One of the aspects of public open space is views and visual amenity which was also a key feature of the Trumpington Meadows development. Ecological survey is required to assess ecological value of this large, open, natural area.

5.89 Consider that the site falls within the Environmental Importance category within Appendix I of the Local Plan. The grounds form an important element in the character of the local area/setting of the city.

**5.90 Nature Conservation Officer – Objection**

5.91 Very little margin of error in BNG in terms of future condition of habitats when viewed against habitats lost to development and increase in disturbance by new residents and visitors. Biodiversity improvements could go further with creation of a biodiverse attenuation pond etc.

5.92 Remain concerned about the proximity of the new buildings to the retained woodland boundaries, particularly with regards external lighting and internal light spill from unit windows. Request lux levels of current and proposed lighting prior to determination.

5.93 If minded to approve, recommend standard conditions.

5.94 Previous comments (26<sup>th</sup> January 2023) – Objection. BNG is below 10% and leaves little margin of error. Light sensitive bat species are highly likely to be negatively impacted by both external and internal light spill due to proximity of new blocks.

5.95 Previous comments (6<sup>th</sup> October 2021) – Objection. Acceptable survey effort. Local ecological value due to extensive area of grassland, woodland

and scrub. Biodiversity net gain assessment is required which should take into account greater public access to the site. Green roofs are welcomed but should be biodiverse roofs rather than purely sedum. Nest box provision is supported and can be secured via condition. Adaptation of existing bat roof is supported subject to NE mitigation licence. Ecological sensitive lighting scheme should be secured before determination or via condition.

5.96 Previous comments (28<sup>th</sup> April 2020) – Objection. Insufficient ecological information has been submitted. Required information includes an extended Phase 1 survey; protected species scoping report and any subsequent recommended surveys; a biodiversity net gain assessment; report detailing how biodiversity will be protected, mitigated, enhanced and maintained during the proposed construction and delivery of the scheme.

### **5.97 Tree Officer – Objection**

5.98 For a tree to be considered in category A, it would normally require a remaining life expectancy of 40+ years. There are 11 category A trees in the schedule. Proposal would result in a material loss of canopy. Limited space in which future trees will grow and therefore pressure for additional tree removal is anticipated. Elements of Block B will further impact on natural light to parts of remaining belt. Not clear where proposed new planting to compensate for loss of trees and habitat within the belt could be located. Additional tree removals would be required to accommodate access and parking in the northwest corner.

5.99 Previous comments (7<sup>th</sup> February 2023) – Removal of lower value central trees is acceptable subject to suitable replacement planting. However, significant concerns regarding level of tree removal to accommodate the proposal and impact of development on trees and woodland habitat to be retained and relationship between trees and building once complete. Tree life expectancy and greater value than suggested in AIA should be attributed.

5.100 Tree belts on part of boundaries are key characteristic of the site and offer very significant amenity to both the site and surrounding landscape. Proposals will narrow these belts and have a detrimental impact on their current and potential condition. Additional tree removals would be required to accommodate access and parking in the northwest corner and new footpaths.

5.101 Previous comments (1<sup>st</sup> May 2020) – Full Arboricultural Impact Assessment is required prior to determination.

### **5.102 Planning Policy Team – Additional information required**

5.103 Verbal comments – Addressed access and need. Clarification over access to public open space required.

- 5.104 Previous comments (2<sup>nd</sup> June 2020) – Site is protected area of open space for both its environmental and recreational qualities. It's environmental attributes warranting its protection include the major contribution it makes to the setting, character and the environmental quality of Cambridge. It is an important green break in the urban framework and has significant historical interest. Site contains a number of positive features such as mature trees and open grassland which gives it a sense of place sufficient to make a major contribution to the character of the local area.
- 5.105 The site's recreational attributes warranting its protection include its size, quality and accessibility.
- 5.106 Strategic objectives of local plan state that all new development should amongst other matters protect and enhance the city's biodiversity and network of habitats. Policy 8 does not support development on open spaces that fails to respond to, conserve and enhance the setting and special character of the city, in accordance with the Cambridge Landscape Character Assessment 2003 etc. Similarly, proposals will only be support that include landscape improvement proposals that strengthen or re-create the well-defined and vegetated urban edge, improve visual amenity and enhance biodiversity.
- 5.107 Policy 47 requires evidence of a demonstrable need for this form of development, and to avoid an excessive concentration of such housing within one area. 87 2-bed units would be an excessive concentration. Needs to have a very detailed understanding of the type of elderly people who would be interested in living in the proposed units. Evidence needs to be submitted to demonstrate that the accommodation is suitable for intended occupiers.
- 5.108 Compliance with Policy 51 needs to be demonstrated to ensure accessible homes.
- 5.109 Policy 69 – result in a loss of a number of trees, potentially lead to a negative biodiversity net gain. Additional information required.
- 5.110 Policy 61 and 67 needs consideration. Loss of open space occupied by a small woodland. Proposed open space mitigation includes the creation of a green break along the site's southern boundary and new trees in front of the residential properties. Lost open space would only be partially replaced in terms of a smaller area with similar features and made publicly accessible. No proposals to increase number of public entry points. If public access is in anyway restricted during the day or night, then the whole area cannot be considered as public open space. Any restriction will reinforce the opinion of local people that the open space is private. Site's environmental qualities will also be adversely affected.
- 5.111 Several trees would be lost and potentially improved green boundary treatments using native species. Detailed assessment required to

determine if the public benefits from the replacement trees will have a positive impact on the townscape and landscape including maintenance, measured in terms of health, well-being, social and microclimate.

**5.112 County Adult Social Care – No comment**

**5.113 Primary Care Team (Cambridge and Peterborough Commissioning Group) – No objection. Seeks developer contribution**

5.114 Additional primary healthcare provision required to mitigate the impacts of development. Total of £295,800 sought.

**5.115 Ambulance Service – No objection. Seeks developer contribution**

5.116 Total of £28,449 sought to absorb patient growth generated by this development.

**5.117 Environmental Health – Additional information required**

5.118 Proposed energy strategy remains outstanding. Further information required on whether ASHPs are proposed and that noise levels can be achieved for all noise sensitive receptors.

5.119 Insufficient data to support the statement of no higher noise emissions from the plant/car park. However, given that the plant impact reduces at night, on balance I consider the reasoning and justification around the monitoring duration and justification of the existing operational plant being 'low impact' is acceptable.

5.120 Further information is required on ASHPs in terms of energy strategy to inform noise impacts. Wider on-site noise from the community park has been clarified and whilst there is still potential conflict between park users and residents, the proposed opening hours and types of activities would go a long way in minimising this. Recommend controlling opening hours of the park.

5.121 Recommend that EV charging points are conditioned given lack of clarification and detail.

5.122 Previous comments (5<sup>th</sup> February 2023) – Clarification is sought on revised noise impact assessment including plan noise impacts, energy strategy and public park activities. Full suite of contaminated land conditions and external lighting details required via condition.

5.123 Previous comments (17<sup>th</sup> September 2021) – Revised noise impact assessment should be submitted prior to determination.

5.124 Previous comments (28<sup>th</sup> April 2020) – Additional information on proposals for public park; information to support conclusion that there are no significant noise sources including from Waitrose; submission of the

transport survey; and clarification on the number of car parking spaces and how they will be allocated.

#### **5.125 Shared Waste Team Officer – Additional information required**

5.126 Original advice has not been followed – refused swept path analysis have used the incorrect vehicle. Waste management plan showing residential walk distance to bin stores and collection crew distances has not been provided.

5.127 Previous comments (27<sup>th</sup> April 2020) – Refuse strategy and vehicle tracking is required. Information on bins stores.

#### **5.128 Police Architectural Liaison Officer – No objection**

5.129 Although crime figures for this ward are high, this area and surrounding streets have low risk to the vulnerability of crime. External lighting plan, well-lit and secure residential and visitor cycle storage. Information on storage of mobility scooters required. Design of bin stores should be considered. Footpath through open space should have good visibility and lighting. Lighting for parking court. Balcony supports should be considered. Other suggestions made to achieve secured by design standards.

#### **5.130 Fire Authority – No objection**

5.131 Provision of fire hydrants required.

#### **5.132 S106 Monitoring Officer – No objection**

5.133 No financial contributions required. Monitoring fee of £2,200 plus a further £500 for each and any obligation held.

### **6.0 Third Party Representations**

6.1 Representations from 35 addresses have been received (19 in objection, 13 in support, 3 neither supporting/objecting)

6.2 Those in objection have raised the following issues:

#### Public park proposals

- Land in the Anstey Hall Barns development is private residential land and can't be used as alternative protected open space
- Who will have access to area of open space?
- Security of public park and its impact upon neighbours
- Anti-social behaviour as a result of cut through from Waitrose and onto Piper Road
- Not clear how biodiversity net gain calculations have been applied
- East-west public access route is inappropriate. What justification is there for this?

- Lack of indicative design of these routes for all users and proposed lighting strategy
- Does the applicant have all the necessary access rights and land ownership to be able to make the access route connections?
- Alternative protected open space hatched blue should be provided

#### Biodiversity/Tree impacts

- Bat barn mentioned within PEA is part of Anstey Hall Barns development
- Destruction of woodland. Access road should be built on the Anstey Hall side of the wood
- No detail regarding lighting restrictions to protect bat species
- Damage to trees during construction
- Few mature trees proposed
- Thriving habitat for a number of species
- Area of woodland should be preserved

#### Car parking/highway safety

- How will parking be managed to prevent people parking at Waitrose?
- Insufficient parking provision for residents. Likely to have limited mobility so access to nearby shops and the park and ride unlikely to be achievable
- No parking for visitors/members to the swimming pool or restaurant
- Current road does not have capacity for proposed use either during construction or operation. How will current access road to Anstey Barns be modified?
- Shared access likely to increase traffic flow along access road. Already dangerous.
- May lead to increased parking on other streets such as Old Mills Road
- Concerns about waste disposal and access
- Traffic should be routed to the east side of Anstey Hall
- New access would pose road safety issues
- Effectively single carriageways with local roads offering little capacity for any overflow parking
- Lack of vehicular/pedestrian separation
- Increase traffic
- Residents would need transport assistance and significant delivery activity would be expected
- Missing traffic report

#### Scale/siting of development

- Ample room for Block C to be relocated more centrally
- Suggest removal of north west wing of Block C which is unnecessary
- Excessive heights in semi-rural location
- Intrusive/overbearing development
- Close proximity of Piper Road boundary and residents
- Cramped/high density development
- Scale, repetitive and monolithic appearance of the scheme is in stark contrast to the character of both the Grade I listed Anstey Hall as wider

conservation area and Trumpington Meadows estate. Detracts from surroundings

- Harmful impacts on setting and wider setting of listed building
- Blocks would destroy the garden which is an integral part of this English house
- Adverse visual impact and impact upon the Conservation Area
- Any view of the Hall would be permanently changed by the blocks' presence
- Important to retain protected open spaces
- Single storey building might work in this context
- Blocks are some distance from Hall's main facilities
- More erosion on setting of Hall is not acceptable
- Tranquil area would be adversely impacted

#### Residential/Neighbour amenity and environmental impacts

- Conflict between visitors and residents
- Overshadow residents within Trumpington Meadows
- Impact upon Anstey Barns' views
- Overlooking from belvedere
- Light, noise and air pollution due to proximity of western access road during both construction and operation. Access road next to Waitrose would be better
- Anti-social behaviour due to unrestricted access
- Privacy of residents along Piper Close will be affected

#### Other matters

- Inaccurate drawing of current access road
- Misleading drawing of woodland
- Request site visit along Piper Road
- Light pollution needed for cycle stores, parking and security lighting
- Scheme should be consulted upon more widely
- Unsupported assertions in Design and Access statement
- Not clear about how some of the facilities would work with the retirement complex
- Visitors to facilities would conflict with the use of residential apartments
- No details of Anstey Hall internal changes
- Not clear if existing entrance will remain open
- Unsustainable demands on local services and utilities
- Development needs for housing have already been met
- Bins likely would need collecting from the roadside which a considerable distance away
- Inadequate community involvement
- Water feature could be a hazard for children
- Confusing consultation process
- House value will be affected
- Contradictory information provided

6.3 Those in support have raised cited the following reasons

- Interested in flats if they are affordable/social housing



- Would like to see a small supermarket, hairdresser and café open to the public
- Swimming pool should be restricted to the public at certain times/day so that it is reserved for residents
- Location of clinic and health centre will be of benefit to development
- Provision of dedicated housing is supported
- Opening up of revised access would offer improved view of front elevation
- Wider community benefits through additional facilities
- Blocks would sit comfortably with Trumpington Meadows development
- Remedial work to Anstey Hall and surroundings
- Suggest variety of options from 1 bed flats to 3 bed houses
- Imaginative layout. Landscape opens up Anstey Hall to the north and south
- Well thought out and nicely framed views

6.4 Other third parties neither supporting/objecting have commented:  
Following amendments

- Overlooking from belvedere to houses on Old Mills Road
- Flats would overlook houses along Proctor Drive
- Number and arrangement of flats adjacent to Listed Building is a concern
- Use of facilities by residents of Trumpington Meadows such as a swimming pool would be appreciated
- Not able to view plans
- Provision of 40 parking spaces for 87 apartments is inadequate and makes no allowance for visitor parking
- Maris Lane would not cope with additional traffic
- One toilet per 2-bed apartment is inadequate
- Uncontrolled access to park
- Prefer restricted access to public park at night as this would deter vandalism

## **7.0 Member Representations**

7.1 Cllr Hauk has made a representation calling in the application to Planning Committee on the following grounds:

- Access for heavy vehicles
- Parking Spaces
- Future use of open spaces

## **8.0 Local Groups / Petitions**

8.1 Cambridge Past Present and Future has made a representation objecting to the application on the following grounds:

- Principle of subservience to the main building should be rigorously observed.
- Benefits of purpose-built accommodation of increasing population of elderly residents, opening up of southern end to provide clearer views and creation of new public park, availability of some (limited) public

access to swimming pool and creation of the new driveway from Maris Lane restoring views of the house from the public street, and general tidying up of buildings to the side of hall.

- Orangery will read of modern extension from the south. Reduction in scale is required and greater separation.
- Blocks need to be reduced in height and be broken up more. Currently the very dominant facades of brickwork introduce a strong urban feel. More rural setting on the edge of the city rather than at its heart so comparison with residential squares in major cities is unconvincing. Would compromise garden/park setting but could be mitigated to some extent by creating several smaller but separate blocks with garden spaces between them,
- Substantial residential activity from approximately 150 residents. Number of units need to be reduced.
- Negative impact on trees and vegetation. Inadequate information on site's ecological value and proposed biodiversity net gain. Arboricultural impact assessment is required. Greenspace is more valuable and no mitigation or public benefit.
- More information of public park provision needed. Safeguarding issues may require park night time closure. Swimming pool open to the public and fee information required.
- No offset for existing staff employed in Anstey Hall is provided.
- Lack of transport assessment. Entrance from Maris Lane into the site which is shared with Anstey Hall Barns is highly unsatisfactory. With considerably increased volumes of traffic that can be anticipated, these problems will only increase. More comprehensive analysis of access to and movement around the site is needed.
- Gas boilers are proposed but no consideration of alternatives. Insufficient information provided.

## 8.2 Trumpington Residents' Association comments as follows:

### Use/public open space

- Limited information on public use of facilities
- 24 hour access to the park would have security and crime implications
- Clarification of access paths
- Unclear about the use of the Hall by residents
- Little information about public membership and parking provision for orangery facilities

### Design/Scale/massing/siting and loss of open space

- Concerns with height and massing buildings. Block C would be very intrusive on woodland belt and houses along Piper Close. Should be reduced in scale and footprint
- Intrusive impact on green space
- Overbearing on the setting of the Hall and adjacent homes
- Scale is not justified in this location
- Sight lines across the park to House are important by this has largely been ignored in the application

- Views from Trumpington Meadows important. Adjacent development was conceived around a sensitive relationship with the Hall and grounds
- Belvedere will reduce the existing view of the Hall from the south
- Mitigation for the loss of existing open space is not convincing as this could happen anyway
- Orangery roofscape seems out of keeping with Hall and proposed apartments

#### Biodiversity/Tree impacts

- Trees and grassland important habitat and local landscape
- Loss of too much open space and trees with some trees having TPOs. Seek reassurance about the impacts on the existing tree belts
- Ecological impacts
- Support replanting of trees

#### Parking/highway safety impacts

- Significant increase in traffic
- Parking allocation is insufficient
- Risk of off-site parking during construction
- Transport assessment and travel plan not provided
- Construction route needs to be clarified and to the east of Hall
- Access route needs to be clarified

#### Other Matters

- Affordable housing?
- Hatched blue land should be designated protected open space
- Waste disposal access need clarifying
- Impact on residential amenities
- Future of clinic concerning
- Buildings to front should be improved
- Archaeology evaluation should be provided
- Unclear about the standard of support available for residents
- Proposed access route to Piper Road would negatively impact amenities
- Safety of children given that there is an open pool
- Little detail on Coachman's House, Coach House and Outbuildings

#### 8.3 Cam Cycle object and comments as follows:

- 73 cycle spaces should be provided for residents and visitors, greater than the 50 spaces proposed
- 64 staff expected to be employed and therefore would require 26 spaces, considerably more than the 10 proposed
- Apart from the Block A plan, no proposed cycle parking shown. Cannot see whether the locations are convenient and suitable for residents and staff
- Some users will require more space for non-standard parking and 5% of spaces should be suitable for these
- Detailed design of intended cycle parking provision should be provided in addition to how the amount of provision has been calculated

- 8.4 Trumpington Meadows Community Group comments as follows:
- Concerned about the scale of development being incompatible with Anstey Hall
  - 40% affordable housing?
  - Inaccurate drawings
  - Proximity of Block C to Piper Road and loss of wooded area
  - Block C would be an unwelcome addition
  - Prefer limited access to park rather than night time access
  - Excessive height of blocks
  - Some of planting would take a while to be established and may not be achievable
  - Overlooking from belvedere
  - Questions on management of space
  - Overlooking of houses along Proctor Drive
  - Way through to church would be appreciated
  - Access to swimming pool would be appreciated

- 8.5 Trumpington Meadows Delivery & Action Group Ltd (TMDAG) comments as follows:
- Concerns regarding proximity to Piper Road
  - Application is thorough and accommodation needed
  - Retirements homes are better than 6<sup>th</sup> form boarding house
  - New facilities would be appreciated
  - Access route and northwest corner needs amending
  - Green barrier needed on west as the loss of privacy is a concern
  - Existing residents need additional facilities

8.6 The above representations are a summary of the comments that have been received. Full details of the representations are available on the Council's website.

## **9.0 Assessment**

### **9.1 Principle of Development – Spatial Strategy**

9.2 The application site is designated as a Protected Open Space. The proposed development would be located adjacent to the Cambridge Green Belt and adjacent to the Protected Open Space of Trumpington Church Cemetery.

9.3 Policy 8 of the Local Plan 2018 states that:

Development on the urban edge, including sites within and abutting green infrastructure corridors and the Cambridge Green Belt, open spaces, and the River Cam Corridor, will only be supported where it (amongst other considerations):

- a. responds to, conserves and enhances the setting, and special character of the city, in accordance with the Cambridge Landscape

Character Assessment 2003, Green Belt assessments, Cambridgeshire Green Infrastructure Strategy and their successor documents;

- b. promotes access to the surrounding countryside/open space, where appropriate; and
- c. safeguards the best and most versatile agricultural land unless sustainable development considerations and the need for development are sufficient to override the need to protect the agricultural value of land; and
- d. includes landscape improvement proposals that strengthen or re-create the well-defined and vegetated urban edge, improve visual amenity and enhance biodiversity.

Proposals where the primary objective is to conserve or enhance biodiversity, particularly proposals for landscape-scale enhancement across local authority boundaries, will also be supported. The Council will support proposals which deliver the strategic green infrastructure network and priorities set out in the Cambridgeshire Green Infrastructure Strategy.

9.4 Supporting text to Policy 8 at paragraph 2.75 states that:

Cambridge is characterised by its compact nature, well-defined and vegetated edges, open spaces, and the green corridors that extend into the city centre from the countryside. These green corridors are protected as part of the Cambridge Green Belt or as Protected Open Space...studies have all highlighted that the interface between the urban edge and the countryside is one of the important and valued landscape features of the city, contributing to the quality of life and place enjoyed here.

9.5 Supporting text to Policy 8 at paragraph 2.77 states that:

Development on the urban edge of the city, adjacent to the Green Belt, has the potential to have a negative effect on the setting of the city. As such, any development on the edge of the city must conserve and enhance the city's setting.

9.6 The Trumpington Meadows residential development, built to the south and west of the application site following planning consent granted in 2009 replaced an otherwise rural landscape. Nevertheless, the Cambridge Green Infrastructure Strategy states that throughout the residential development, it was intended that areas of open space ('green fingers') that extend into the development from the arable fields to the south and the country park to the west would result.

9.7 Although it is recognised that its wider setting has changed somewhat over the years, the application site itself remains adjacent to Green Belt land and protected open space to the northwest along which mature trees penetrate its boundaries and are key feature from the which along with its open landscape provides a degree of biodiversity interest. The application

site's environmental qualities are recognised in the site's designation as a Protected Open Space. Whilst the applicant contends that the site is no longer on the urban edge, it is clear that on the basis of Policy 8 and the supporting text and taking into account the site constraints and open landscapes, this policy would directly apply to this development proposal.

- 9.8 With regards criterion a of Policy 8, this is discussed in detail within a subsequent design section of this planning assessment and concerns the impact of the development upon the setting and special character of the city. In this regard, it is considered that the proposed development would have an adverse impact.
- 9.9 With regards criterion b of Policy 8, the application proposes to change the use of the Hall's private grounds into a public space. A new pedestrian gate is proposed to the south to connect with the Trumpington Meadows residential development. A pedestrian gate is also proposed to connect with the Waitrose car park to the east whilst. A new pedestrian access would connect Maris Lane to the north through the grounds of the Hall. The proposed development would also connect to Trumpington Meadows Country Park via the existing Anstey Hall Barns drive. In so doing, the proposed development would meet the criteria within Policy 8(b) of the Local Plan 2018.
- 9.10 The existing land use is an historic park and garden and therefore it is not considered that the proposal would result in a loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land and therefore there is no conflict with Policy 8(c) of the Local Plan 2018.
- 9.11 Notwithstanding the presence and visual impact of the proposed residential blocks, the proposed development would provide some landscape improvements in terms of the reinstatement of Anstey Hall's pleasure gardens and ha-ha which could potentially improve the visual amenity of the space for the public. However, it is noted that significant numbers of tree removals would be required particularly on the western and eastern boundaries of the site which would reduce the current vegetated urban edge. In addition, whilst biodiversity net gain would be improved within the site, it is considered that as a whole, the proposed development would have an adverse impact upon protected species. This criterion (Policy 8(d)) is considered in more detail later within this planning assessment.
- 9.12 Therefore, by virtue of the adverse impact upon the setting and special character of the city, the loss of boundary vegetation and adverse impact upon biodiversity, the principle of this development on the edge of the city and within the Protected Open Space is contrary to Policy 8 of the Local Plan 2018.

### **9.13 Principle of Development – Flood Risk**

- 9.14 The application site is located within Flood Zone 1 (low risk); however, residential Block B would be located within a 1 in 30 year event (high risk) of surface water flood risk.
- 9.15 Paragraph 159 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2021 states that inappropriate development in areas at risk of flooding should be avoided by directing development away from areas at highest risk (whether existing or future). Where development is necessary in such areas, the development should be made safe for its lifetime without increasing flood risk elsewhere.
- 9.16 Paragraph 162 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2021 states that the aim of the sequential test is to steer new development to areas with the lowest risk of flooding from any source. Development should not be allocated or permitted if there are reasonably available sites appropriate for the proposed development in areas with a lower risk of flooding. The strategic flood risk assessment will provide the basis for applying this test. The sequential approach should be used in areas known to be at risk now or in the future from any form of flooding.
- 9.17 Paragraph 023 of the PPG 2022 states that the sequential approach is designed to ensure that areas at little or no risk of flooding from any source are developed in preference to areas at higher risk. This means avoiding, so far as possible, development in current and future medium and high flood risk areas considering all sources of flooding including areas at risk of surface water flooding. Avoiding flood risk through the sequential test is the most effective way of addressing flood risk because it places the least reliance on measures like flood defences, flood warnings and property level resilience features. Even where a flood risk assessment shows the development can be made safe throughout its lifetime without increasing risk elsewhere, the sequential test still needs to be satisfied. Application of the sequential approach in the plan-making and decision-making process will help to ensure that development is steered to the lowest risk areas, where it is compatible with sustainable development objectives to do so, and developers do not waste resources promoting proposals which would fail to satisfy the test. Other forms of flooding need to be treated consistently with river and tidal flooding in mapping probability and assessing vulnerability, so that the sequential approach can be applied across all areas of flood risk.
- 9.18 The application is accompanied by a flood risk and drainage assessment which states that whilst the site is subject to overland surface water flooding with the provision of adequate mitigation and resistance measures the risks can be reduced and considered low within the development design.
- 9.19 Whilst the findings of this report are acknowledged, no sequential test has been carried out to inform siting of the residential blocks by investigating alternative locations within the site at lower flood risk that would be more appropriate for Block B. It is therefore considered that the application fails

to comply with the sequential test as required by paragraph 162 of the NPPF 2021 and PPG national guidance.

9.20 Officers therefore consider that the principle of development is fails to accord with Policy 32 of the Local Plan 2018 and paragraphs 159-163 of the NPPF 2021. This is discussed further in the water management and flood risk section of this report.

### **9.21 Principle of Development – Protected Open Space**

9.22 Policy 67 of the Local Plan 2018 states that:

Development proposals will not be permitted which would harm the character of, or lead to the loss of, open space of environmental and/or recreational importance unless:

- a. the open space can be satisfactorily replaced in terms of quality, quantity and access with an equal or better standard than that which is proposed to be lost; and
- b. the re-provision is located within a short walk (400m) of the original site.

In the case of school, college and university grounds, development may be permitted where it meets a demonstrable educational need and does not adversely affect playing fields or other formal sports provision on the site. Where replacement open space is to be provided in an alternative location, the replacement site/facility must be fully available for use before the area of open space to be lost can be redeveloped.

9.23 The application site is designated as a Protected Open Space within the Cambridge Local Plan 2018. It is designated for both its environmental and recreational importance (Appendix 2 – List of Protected Open Spaces - Open Space and Recreation Strategy 2011). Following a formal consultation with the Council's Policy Team, it is considered that the existing site makes a major contribution to the setting, character and the environmental quality of Cambridge in that it is an important green break in the urban framework and has significant historical interest. A number of positive features such as mature trees and open grassland which gives it a sense of place is sufficient in making a major contribution to the character of the local area.

9.24 Furthermore, it's recreational attributes warranting its protection includes its size, quality and accessibility.

9.25 The proposed development would consist of two 3 storey residential blocks and associated car parks within the historic park and garden of Anstey Hall. In addition, an Orangery would be erected to the side of the Anstey Hall itself. Therefore, on this basis, the proposed development would result in a loss of protected open space.



- 9.26 Supporting text to Policy 67 at paragraph 7.47 states that there is a clear presumption against the loss of open space of environmental or recreational importance. However, there may be circumstances where development proposals can enhance the character, use and visual amenity of open space, and provide ancillary recreational facilities, such as changing facilities, or materially improve the recreational or biodiversity value of the site.
- 9.27 The submitted Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) states that the site at present is not used for recreation nor is it covered by any ecological designations. The applicant's submission also argues that many views do not extend beyond the vegetation on the site boundary whilst it would increase public access to the site.
- 9.28 Whilst increasing public access to the site is welcomed and would be beneficial, it is considered that the existing site already has recreational value as the Open Space and Recreation Strategy 2011 attests. Nevertheless, in this instance, the development proposals are considered to increase the use of the site to the wider public outside of the existing use as a hotel and wedding venue.
- 9.29 As Policy 67 states, there is a presumption against the loss of open space of environmental or recreational importance. Elsewhere with the Local Plan, within Appendix D which refers to the Southern Fringe Development Area (Policy 18), it is noted that one of the key development principles of Trumpington Meadows development is to maximise opportunities for views of Anstey Hall and garden from the public realm, while protecting and enhancing its setting.
- 9.30 In this instance, the proposed development would encroach upon a substantial portion of this protected space. Moreover, the character of this protected open space including the setting of Anstey Hall would be severely impacted through the siting of the residential blocks which would be highly visible particularly from the south. The proposed development therefore would undermine the approach taken with the adjacent Trumpington Meadows development.
- 9.31 The applicant claims that the existing open space would be more publicly accessible by providing multiple pedestrian access points. Third party and local member comments concerning the use of this space are acknowledged. Some details of opening times have been submitted which would restrict the public from accessing the public open space during night-time hours. This is to ensure that lighting is minimised and the potential for anti-social behaviour within the vicinity reduced. Notwithstanding this, this approach would reinforce the opinion that the open space is for private use as it would be more restricted than other public parks within the city and therefore only limited weight to the provision of this space for the public's use can be afforded.

- 9.32 In addition, the applicant claims that the new planting, water feature and belvedere would increase the quality of this space. Whilst some aspects of the landscaping scheme are supported, following a formal consultation with the Council's Policy Team and Landscape Officer in addition to a site visit, by virtue of its inappropriate siting, excessive scale and incongruous design, the proposed development would adversely impact the character and visual amenity of the protected open space.
- 9.33 Moreover, following a formal consultation with the Council's Trees Officer, it is considered that tree removals necessary to accommodate the development would result in a narrowing of the tree belt, therefore adversely affecting character of the site and the site's amenity value. Improvements to the green boundary treatments are not considered to outweigh the overall loss associated with the development. In addition, following a formal consultation with the Council's Nature Conservation Officer, it is noted that the site contributes to the ecological value of the area and insufficient information has been submitted to demonstrate that protected species on the site would not be adversely impacted by the proposed development including the effects of lighting on bat species.
- 9.34 Paragraph 7.48 states that replacement sites/facilities should be no more than a short walk (400m) from the site that is to be replaced unless it can be proved that a more accessible area of open space can be provided. Replacement sites/facilities should not increase any identified deficiencies in open space in the ward where the original site is located. Consideration should also be given to how they link with the wider ecological network and enhance biodiversity.
- 9.35 The applicant claims that the proposal would compensate for the loss of protected open space with an area to the west of the application site, within the applicant's ownership. However, this area is relatively small compared to the area developed for the new residential blocks and therefore the quantity of space would not outweigh the harm to the protected open space through the siting of the new residential blocks.
- 9.36 Taking all this into account, by virtue of the partial loss of protected open space and harm to its character, Officers consider that the principle of development is not supported with reference to Policy 67 of the Local Plan 2018.

### **9.37 Principle of Development – Specialist Housing Provision**

- 9.38 The proposal would result in a loss of visitor accommodation used in connection with the wedding venue. Whilst this is the case and Policy 78 is engaged, it is understood that this has not been in active use for several years since COVID.
- 9.39 Policy 78 seeks to prevent the loss of existing visitor accommodation (hotels, guesthouses and hostels to apart hotels and serviced apartments) unless the use is no longer viable. Given that the primary use of the

accommodation at the site is to support the wedding venue function (which is a sui generis use that is not protected by other local plan policies) the loss of the ancillary visitor accommodation use is considered acceptable in this instance. Moreover, as set out in the supporting text of policy 78 the focus of this policy is aimed at protecting visitor accommodation in city centre locations. The application site is considered to be on the edge of the city rather than a city centre site and the key focus is aimed at accommodation for users of the venue rather than tourists visiting Cambridge. Taking all this into account, Officers consider the loss of the existing form of visitor accommodation to be acceptable in this instance.

- 9.40 Policy 47 states that planning permission will be granted for the development of specialist housing, subject to the development being:
- a. supported by evidence of the demonstrable need for this form of development within Cambridge;
  - b. suitable for the intended occupiers in relation to the quality and type of facilities, and the provision of support and/or care;
  - c. accessible to local shops and services, public transport and other sustainable modes of transport, and community facilities appropriate to the needs of the intended occupiers; and
  - d. in a location that avoids excessive concentration of such housing within any one street or small area.

Where the development falls within use class C3 (dwelling houses), the development will be expected to contribute to the supply of affordable housing within Cambridge in accordance with Policy 45.

- 9.41 The proposal is for private 'extra care' provision and would not provide social care in which there is publicly available data on need. A Needs Assessment has been submitted with the application which details that there is demonstrable need for retirement accommodation within the Trumpington area in accordance with criterion a of Policy 47.
- 9.42 The proposed development would be purposely designed for occupation by older people and the submitted floor plans detail that these would be appropriate for the older population in accordance with criterion b of this policy. The submitted Design and Access statement confirms that the retirement blocks meet M4(2 and 3) requirements in such that access to each apartment would be step free. The apartments would be adaptable. In terms of the new Orangery, this would be fully M4(3) compliant with ramped access. No internal changes are proposed to Anstey Hall itself. The access officer has been consulted on the application and raised no objection to the development and offered suggestions for detailed design stage. On this basis, the proposal is in accordance with Policy 51 of the Local Plan 2018.
- 9.43 The use of Anstey Hall itself would be changed to mixed uses including ancillary use on the lower ground, ground and first floor to serve the residential retirement community; the provision of five rooms for staff

accommodation on the second floor, together with a private flatted dwelling on the second floor and seven short-term guest accommodation rooms on the ground and first floor.

- 9.44 Given the location of the application site in relation to a supermarket, services including a doctor's surgery and bus services to the city centre, the proposed development would meet the requirements of criterion c of this policy.
- 9.45 The surrounding context is one of predominately mixed residential C3 uses. Taking this into account, the proposed development would not result in an excessive concentration of this housing type in the area in accordance with criterion d of this policy.
- 9.46 Given that the proposed development comprises specialist housing (C2 use), no affordable housing is required to meet the requirements of Policy 45 of the Local Plan 2018 in this instance. This has been confirmed following a formal consultation with the Council's S106 Officer.
- 9.47 On this basis, Officers consider that the principle of providing retirement home accommodation and the change of use from existing hotel/wedding venue is acceptable in accordance with policies 78 and 47 of the Local Plan 2018. The details of such a use could be secured via a S106 obligation attached to any planning consent granted.

**9.48 Design, Layout, Scale and Landscaping and impact upon the character and appearance of the Trumpington Conservation Area and setting of Listed Buildings**

- 9.49 The application site is located within the Trumpington Conservation Area which is described within the Conservation Area Appraisal as "characterized by the grand manor houses of Trumpington Hall and Anstey Hall and a mixture of smaller buildings of different ages..."
- 9.50 The Appraisal continues by adding that Anstey Hall is set in substantial private grounds... "The gardens and the grounds of Anstey Hall are vital to the setting of the buildings and the character of the Conservation Area as a whole. However, there is no public access to these private grounds."
- 9.51 In addition, the Trumpington Conservation Area Appraisal identifies a number of protected and significant features on the site that make up the special character and setting of Anstey Hall. This includes the Grade II\* listed Anstey Hall, Walls of Townscape Significance, tree protection order (TPO) areas, individual TPOs, significant tree groups, 8 individual significant trees and a significant viewpoint from the southern boundary of the site looking north towards Anstey Hall.
- 9.52 The setting of the Hall makes an important contribution to its significance. There are panoramic views of the Hall and grounds from the southern end of the application site. Anstey Hall was designed to be seen in a

landscape setting with immediate pleasure grounds to the north of the ha-ha, beyond which was a wider largely parkland landscape. Historic England note that the reasons for this listing is its historic interest (a country house of considerable architectural distinction), its architectural interest and its group value with the Grade II listed Lodge which along with the other (unlisted) associated outbuilding, form an important architectural and historic context for the Hall.

- 9.53 Whilst the setting of the Conservation Area has changed to an extent over recent years, nonetheless, following a formal consultation with the Council's Conservation Officer and Historic England, the historical significance of the house and its grounds is based in a village context being a country house rather than that of a town house. Overall, the Hall and grounds make an important and major contribution to the Trumpington Conservation Area.
- 9.54 Indeed, the setting of Anstey Hall and the identified significant view on site was a key consideration in the master planning for the Trumpington Meadows development, which through the site layout, building form and appearance, responded directly to this view and the special character of the historic core of Trumpington Village. This is described in Appendix D of the Local Plan 2018.
- 9.55 The impact of the proposed two residential blocks (Blocks B & C) have been considered in respect of the following policy context and has been subject to formal consultations with the Council's Landscape, Urban Design and Conservation Officers. Third party comments concerning important views from Trumpington Meadows through the application site are noted.
- 9.56 Local Plan Policies 55, 56, 57, 58 and 59 seek to ensure that development responds appropriately to its context, is of a high quality, reflects or successfully contrasts with existing building forms and materials and includes appropriate landscaping and boundary treatment.
- 9.57 Policy 55 states that development will be supported where it is demonstrated that it responds positively to its context and has drawn inspiration from the key characteristics of its surroundings to help create distinctive and high-quality places.
- 9.58 Policy 57 states that high quality new buildings will be supported where it can be demonstrated that they (amongst other considerations):
- a. have a positive impact on their setting in terms of location on the site, height, scale and form, materials and detailing, ground floor activity, wider townscape and landscape impacts and available views;
  - b. are convenient, safe and accessible for all users;
  - c. are constructed in a sustainable manner and are easily adaptable;
  - d. successfully integrate functional needs such as refuse and recycling, bicycles and car parking;

- 9.59 Supporting text paragraph 7.10 of Policy 57 states that high quality building design is linked to context, in terms of appropriateness, and to place making in terms of how the proposed development will be sited. Without imposing architectural tastes or styles, it is important that a proposed development is considered in terms of site location, height, scale, form, and proportions, along with materials and detailing.
- 9.60 Policy 58 states that alterations and extensions to existing buildings will be permitted (amongst other considerations) where they:
- a. do not adversely impact on the setting, character or appearance of listed buildings or the appearance of conservation areas, local heritage assets, open spaces, trees or important wildlife features;
  - b. reflect, or successfully contrast with, the existing building form, use of materials and architectural detailing while ensuring that proposals are sympathetic to the existing building and surrounding area.
- 9.61 Policy 61 states that to ensure the conservation and enhancement of Cambridge's historic environment, proposals should:
- a. preserve or enhance the significance of the heritage assets of the city, their setting and the wider townscape, including views into, within and out of conservation areas;
  - b. retain buildings and spaces, the loss of which would cause harm to the character or appearance of the conservation area;
  - c. be of an appropriate scale, form, height, massing, alignment and detailed design which will contribute to local distinctiveness, complement the built form and scale of heritage assets and respect the character, appearance and setting of the locality;
  - d. demonstrate a clear understanding of the significance of the asset and of the wider context in which the heritage asset sits, alongside assessment of the potential impact of the development on the heritage asset and its context; and
  - e. provide clear justification for any works that would lead to harm or substantial harm to a heritage asset yet be of substantial public benefit, through detailed analysis of the asset and the proposal.
- 9.62 Section 66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires that a local authority shall have regard to the desirability of preserving features of special architectural or historic interest and in particular, listed buildings. Section 72 (of that Act) provides that special attention shall be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of a Conservation Area.
- 9.63 Paragraph 197 of the NPPF states that when determining applications local planning authorities should take account of the desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets and putting them to viable uses consistent with their conservation.

- 9.64 Paragraph 199 of the NPPF requires that when considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation, and the more important the asset, the greater the weight should be. Paragraph 200 (NPPF) goes on to state that any harm to, or loss of, the significance of a designated heritage asset [from its alteration or destruction, or from development within its setting] "should require clear and convincing justification".
- 9.65 Setting is then defined in the Framework as 'the surroundings in which a heritage asset is experienced. Its extent is not fixed and may change as the asset and its surroundings evolve. Elements of a setting may make a positive or negative contribution to the significance of an asset and may affect the ability to appreciate that significance or may be neutral'.
- 9.66 Paragraph 202 states that where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use.
- 9.67 Paragraph 206 of the NPPF states that local planning authorities should look for opportunities for new development within Conservation Areas and World Heritage Sites, and within the setting of heritage assets, to enhance or better reveal their significance. Proposals that preserve those elements of the setting that make a positive contribution to the asset (or which better reveal its significance) should be treated favourably.
- 9.68 Policy 62 seeks the retention of local heritage assets and where permission is required, proposals will be permitted where they retain the significance, appearance, character or setting of a local heritage asset.
- 9.69 Policy 71 requires development proposals to preserve, protect and enhance trees and hedges that have amenity value as perceived from the public realm.

*Residential blocks' siting/layout and landscaping*

- 9.70 Notwithstanding that the proposal fails to accord with the principle of development within an area of Protected Open Space, following a formal consultation with the Council's Conservation Officer and Historic England, by virtue of proposals on the land to the south of the Hall, it is considered that the encroachment into the Hall's grounds which continue to contribute to the significance of the Hall would considerably compromise the Hall's surviving open and garden setting. Third party comments regarding this are also acknowledged. Whilst it is accepted that the wider setting of Anstey Hall has incrementally been eroded, the proposed development would further encroach on this open space and thus detract from its overall setting.

- 9.71 Whilst the improvements in reinstating the ha-ha and the overall landscaping are supported, the proposed scheme would significantly reduce the open character of this park and garden and on this basis, and following formal comments from the Landscape and Urban Design Officers on the proposed layout the siting of the proposed development, it is considered that the proposal would be contrary to policies 55, 56, 57, 61 and 67 of the Local Plan 2018.

*Residential blocks' design, form and scale*

- 9.72 The context of Trumpington Meadows and the Conservation Area is characterised by smaller fine grained plot formations with varied pitched roofs and chimneys further articulating the roofscape. Conversely, the proposed buildings would measure between 85m and 95m in length and consist of a coarser grain that is further emphasized by the continuous three storey flat roof form which following a formal consultation with the Council's Urban Design Officer is considered to appear excessively horizontal and one intrusive mass.
- 9.73 The application has been subject to formal consultations with both the Council's Conservation Officer and Historic England. Third party comments concerning the excessive and intrusive building heights/scale, lack of subservience, their unsympathetic appearance and the resulting adverse impact upon the setting of the Hall and wider Conservation Area are noted. In considering the application, the proposed residential blocks' form and appearance would neither be an appropriate design in the context of Anstey Hall itself nor in the context of the local area and Trumpington Conservation Area.
- 9.74 The applicant's heritage responses are noted, however, the siting of large blocks would be an alien and incongruous addition that would fail to be related to the Hall in terms of its design, location and scale. Whilst landscape mitigation is proposed to soften and minimize the perceived visual impact, users' experience of the setting of the Hall, particularly from the public realm to the south and within the application site itself would be adversely impacted.
- 9.75 In addition, the proposed blocks would fail to reflect the key qualities of the local area, Trumpington Conservation Area nor Anstey Hall itself and therefore fails to positively respond to the surrounding context, contrary to policies 55, 57 and 61 of the Local Plan 2018. With reference to Paragraph 206 of the NPPF 2021, the proposal would fail to enhance or better reveal the significance of the Hall itself nor the Trumpington Conservation Area as a whole.
- 9.76 In addition, by virtue of the significant loss of trees within the site, following a formal consultation with the Council's Landscape, Trees and Urban Design Officer, it is considered that the proposed development would be detrimental to the link between the parkland of the site and the adjacent Trumpington Meadows development and therefore fail to respond



positively to existing features of natural and local importance, contrary to policies 55 and 71 of the Local Plan 2018.

- 9.77 Furthermore, whilst the applicant has considered inclusive access to the buildings, in terms of the scheme's functional design, third party comments are noted, and no facilities are provided within the blocks for the storage of bikes or mobility scooters. Given the retirement accommodation would likely be used by the elderly and those with limited mobility, the lack of mobility storage, parking and charging facilities to ensure that the needs of the elderly are met would be contrary to policies 55 and 57 of the Local Plan 2018.
- 9.78 Overall, it is considered that the proposed development would be contrary to policies, 55, 57, 61 and 71 of the Local Plan 2018 and the NPPF 2021.

#### *Proposed orangery*

- 9.79 The applicant proposes to demolish three free-standing greenhouses within the walled kitchen garden which appear to have had some small role in the function of the kitchen garden area and its relationship to the house. In addition, a flat roofed building is to be demolished which is considered to be a negative feature.
- 9.80 The applicant proposes to replace this existing flat roofed building and marquee with the proposed Orangery. Third party comments regarding the design and scale of this element and its relationship with the Hall are noted. This would have a very close visual relationship with the Hall and following a formal consultation with the Council's Conservation Officer, it is noted that there is a lack of detail with regards the Orangery's design and appearance.
- 9.81 Following a formal consultation with both the Council's Conservation Officer and Historic England, it is considered that although the proposed location would be away from main views towards Anstey Hall itself, and the removal of the flat roofed structure would be an improvement, by virtue of its excessive scale, siting forward of the southern elevation and elaborate design, it is considered that the proposal would have an adverse impact upon the setting and significance of the Listed Building, and the character and appearance of the Conservation Area, contrary to policies 55, 57 and 61 of the Local Plan 2018 and the NPPF 2021.

#### *Reconfiguration of wall onto Maris Lane*

- 9.82 The applicant proposes to introduce a new opening in the curtilage boundary wall along Maris Lane. The existing wall is half-height in brick and likely to be contemporary. No further details have been provided and whilst the principle may be acceptable, no details of the new wall piers have been provided and it is not appropriate for these details to be conditioned in this instance. Therefore, there is insufficient information

provided with regards the new wall opening to make an informed assessment.

*Other adaptations*

- 9.83 Whilst internal changes are subject to Listed Building Consent application, in planning terms, the proposal would involve a change of use to provide central facilities including a restaurant and swimming pool for the proposed retirement community and wider community via club membership.

*Harm v public benefits*

- 9.84 The NPPF states that great weight should be given to the asset's conservation (and the more important the asset, the greater the weight should be). Given the Grade II\* listing of Anstey Hall which places it in the top 5.8% of all listed buildings, the weight given to the asset's conservation including its setting should be great indeed.
- 9.85 Taking into account consultee comments including Historic England's comments, it is considered that the proposal would result in a high level of less than substantial harm upon the immediate setting and significance of Anstey Hall and upon the character and appearance of the Conservation Area, contrary to Policy 61 of the Local Plan 2018 and the NPPF 2021. Paragraph 202 of the NPPF is therefore engaged and the harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal.
- 9.86 The applicant has submitted a list of public benefits which include the following:
- Public open space whereby the public will be able to fully appreciate the asset.
  - A viable scheme of residential units for independent living for the elderly, with associated amenities/services nearby.
  - Removal of flat-roofed building by a more harmonious one.
  - Income generating scheme that will ensure a specific sum will be allocated to continuous maintenance and repair of the hall and continuous use of the hall by residents.
  - Maximise use of the existing asset.
  - Introducing new views and added landscape features.
  - Restoring views of the Hall from Maris Lane.
  - Free up other houses in Cambridge.
  - Providing employment.
- 9.87 In addition, the applicant contends that the central facilities for the retirement community would constitute optimum viable use and other uses for the Hall including for educational use have been explored, according to the applicant, the use of it as a hotel is not viable.
- 9.88 In terms of optimum viable use, the applicant states that the proposed development would enable the renovation of Anstey Hall and the

associated outbuildings by generating the necessary income. However, in this instance, internal works to the Anstey Hall itself and the outbuildings have been removed from the scope of the proposed development and therefore whilst there is an intention of the applicant to improve the Hall, limited weight can be afforded in this instance without this being secured.

- 9.89 Whilst these public benefits are noted in so far as providing publicly accessible public open space during daylight hours, removal of the negative flat roof building and potential for maximising the use of the existing asset to ensure optimum viable use, the public open space would be restricted to certain times of day and therefore would have limited public benefit to ensuring that there is unrestricted access. Secondly, whilst the removal of the negative flat roof building is welcomed, the proposed Orangery would be of an excessive scale and due to the lack of high-quality design is not considered to be an appropriate addition.
- 9.90 Whilst the proposed development would fulfil a need for specialist accommodation including central facilities, overall on the above basis, it is not considered that the public benefits arising from the scheme would outweigh the high-level of 'less than substantial' harm identified, contrary to Paragraph 202 of the NPPF and Policy 61 of the Local Plan 2018.
- 9.91 In addition, the proposed development would fail to accord with Section 66 and 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 which requires that a local authority shall have regard to the desirability of preserving features of special architectural or historic interest and in particular, listed buildings and ensures that special attention shall be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of a Conservation Area.
- 9.92 Tree impacts**
- 9.93 Policies 59 and 71 of the Local Plan 2018 seek to preserve, protect and enhance existing trees and hedges that have amenity value and contribute to the quality and character of the area and provide sufficient space for trees and other vegetation to mature. Paragraph 131 of the NPPF advocates that existing trees are retained wherever possible.
- 9.94 The application is accompanied by an Arboricultural Impact Assessment (AIA). To facilitate the development, the proposal requires a substantial loss of trees (approximately 65 trees). Whilst following a formal consultation with the Council's Trees Officer it is considered that the removal of lower value trees will have no material impact on the visual amenity of the site subject to tree replanting, by virtue of the close proximity of built form to woodland habitat and the loss of mature trees to facilitate the development, the resulting loss of trees on the site is unacceptable.
- 9.95 The proposed development would result in two TPO group areas to be removed and replaced (G8 and G9), T14 has already been removed, T15

to T26, G11 and part of G12 proposed to be removed and T8 considered to be removed. Significant trees within the avenue that effectively frame views of the Hall would be removed and replaced with a new landscaping scheme.

- 9.96 Furthermore, given the tree belts are of high visual significance, habitat value and their contribution to canopy cover, it is considered that greater value should be attributed to these trees. Consequently, more trees of higher value than suggested within the AIA would have to be removed. Third party comments on the extent of tree removals are also noted.
- 9.97 Whilst further information has been submitted by the applicant is noted, there is limited space on the eastern boundary closest to Waitrose supermarket into which canopies can grow without conflict with the proposed building or garden space and therefore would result in pressure for additional, future tree removal.
- 9.98 On this basis, the reduction and narrowing of these tree belts will have a detrimental impact upon the character of the site whilst the proposed layout to accommodate parking, access and footpaths would require additional tree removals. Due to the close proximity of remaining trees, it is considered that the proposal would result in additional pressure for future tree removals. Therefore, the proposed development is contrary to Policy 71 of the Local Plan 2018.

### **9.99 Carbon Reduction and Sustainable Design**

- 9.100 The Council's Sustainable Design and Construction SPD (2020) sets out a framework for proposals to demonstrate they have been designed to minimise their carbon footprint, energy, and water consumption and to ensure they are capable of responding to climate change.
- 9.101 Policy 28 of the Local Plan 2018 states development should take the available opportunities to integrate the principles of sustainable design and construction into the design of proposals, including issues such as climate change adaptation, carbon reduction and water management. The same policy requires new residential developments to achieve as a minimum water efficiency to 110 litres per person per day and a 44% on site reduction of regulated carbon emissions and for non-residential buildings to achieve full credits for Wat 01 of the BREEAM standard for water efficiency and the minimum requirement associated with BREEAM excellent for carbon emissions.
- 9.102 Policy 29 of the Local Plan 2018 supports proposals which involve the provision of renewable and / or low carbon generation provided adverse impacts on the environment have been minimised as far as possible.
- 9.103 The application is supported by a Design and Access Statement.

9.104 The application has been subject to formal consultation with the Council's Sustainability Officer who seeks more information to be in compliance to the requirements of Part L 2021 and Local Plan Policy 28 which requires a 31% improvement on Part L with the current energy strategy only showing a 15.5% improvement.

9.105 Third party comments regarding the sustainability approach are noted. In this case, insufficient information has been provided with regards an indicative location of any proposed renewable energy that follows the energy hierarchy. Therefore, the proposal fails to be in accordance with Policy 28 of the Local Plan 2018 and the Greater Cambridge Sustainable Design and Construction SPD (2020).

#### 9.106 **Biodiversity impacts**

##### *Impacts upon protected species*

9.107 Policy 70 of the Local Plan 2018 states that development will be permitted which:

- a. protects priority species and habitats; and
- b. enhances habitats and populations of priority species.

Proposals that harm or disturb populations and habitats should:

- c. minimise any ecological harm; and
- d. secure achievable mitigation and/or compensatory measures, resulting in either no net loss or a net gain of priority habitat and local populations of priority species.

9.108 Where development is proposed within or adjoining a site hosting priority species and habitats, or which will otherwise affect a national priority species or a species listed in the national and Cambridgeshire-specific biodiversity action plans (BAPs), an assessment of the following will be required:

- e. current status of the species population;
  - f. the species' use of the site and other adjacent habitats;
  - g. the impact of the proposed development on legally protected species, national and Cambridgeshire-specific BAP species and their habitats; and
  - h. details of measures to fully protect the species and habitats identified.
- If significant harm to the population or conservation status of a protected species, priority species or priority habitat resulting from a development cannot be avoided, adequately mitigated, or, as a last resort, compensated for, then planning permission will be refused.

9.109 The Environment Act 2021 and the Councils' Biodiversity SPD (2022) requires development proposals to deliver a net gain in biodiversity which follows a mitigation hierarchy focused on avoiding ecological harm over minimising, rectifying, reducing and then off-setting. This approach is embedded within the strategic objectives of the Local Plan and Policy 70. Policy 70 states that proposals that harm or disturb populations and habitats should secure achievable mitigation and / or compensatory

measures resulting in either no net loss or a net gain of priority habitat and local populations of priority species.

- 9.110 The application site is predominately grassland which is flanked on both sides by mature woodland. There are two statutory designated sites within 2km of the application site which are Byron's Pool and Nine Wells, both Local Nature Reserves (LNRs).
- 9.111 The River Cam, a County Wildlife Site (CWS) is situated 690m to the west, whilst Grantchester Road Plantations, Old Mill Plantation, Trumpington Road Woodland and Eight Acre Wood and Seven Acres which are all City Wildlife Sites (CiWS) are located within 1km from the application site.
- 9.112 Third party comments regarding light spill on bat species are noted. Following a formal consultation with the Council's Nature Conservation Officer, concerns have been raised with the impact from both external and internal light spill resulting from the development upon light sensitive bat species particularly given that the existing trees are well connected to the adjacent Trumpington Country Park, Byron's Pool Nature Reserve and the wider Cam Valley which would provide bats with suitable foraging habitat.
- 9.113 In this instance, no bat survey information on bat species likely to be affected nor a sensitive lighting scheme has been provided to mitigate likely impacts from internal light spill and external lighting within parking areas, footpaths including security lighting. Given that the proposed development would compromise two 3 storey blocks in an otherwise undeveloped area of land which is ideal foraging territory for bat species, it is considered that without additional information concerning an ecologically sensitive lighting scheme, the proposed development fails to be in accordance with policies 57 and 70 of the Local Plan 2018.

#### *Biodiversity net gain*

- 9.114 The submitted DEFRA Biodiversity Net Gain Calculation report predicts a gain of 8.14% (1.29 BU) biodiversity units and 175.70% (2.61 HU) hedgerow units from the proposal. This includes onsite habitat creation and enhancement, plus enhanced management of an adjacent offsite woodland block to the west. Whilst the Nature Conservation Officer has raised concerns given that this is below the recognised minimum 10% BNG requirement, there is currently no legal requirement for this minimum figure. On this basis, it is considered that the proposals would achieve a net gain in biodiversity. Conditions could be imposed to ensure that details of this are provided in addition to nest box provision in accordance with Policy 57 of the Local Plan 2018 and the Biodiversity SPD 2022.
- 9.115 Water Management and Flood Risk**
- 9.116 Policies 31 and 32 of the Local Plan 2018 require developments to have appropriate sustainable foul and surface water drainage systems and to minimise flood risk. Paragraphs 159 – 169 of the NPPF 2021 are relevant.

- 9.117 The application has been subject to a formal consultation with the Council's Drainage Officer and Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA). Whilst the Drainage Officer comments are noted, given that this is a major scheme, the LLFA's comments have been taken into account and reconsulted as appropriate.
- 9.118 The application site is located within Flood Zone 1 (low flood risk), however, a large part of the site is subject to medium and high risk of surface water flooding. The eastern Block B is sited within this surface flood risk area. Whilst the applicant has submitted a flood risk assessment and drainage strategy, the application has not demonstrated a sequential approach to flooding from all sources of flooding including surface water flooding and thus demonstrate why this blocks' location within the application site itself is appropriate.
- 9.119 Whilst the requirement of the sequential test and the geographical search area is a matter of planning judgement as noted in the *Wathen-Fayed v SoS* [2023] EWHC 92 (Admin) recent judgement, it is considered that a sequential approach within the site itself needs to be applied and in this case no evidence has been provided as to why other locations for Block B in particular have not been considered.
- 9.120 Paragraph 162 of the NPPF 2021 states that the aim of the sequential test is to steer new development to areas with the lowest risk of flooding from any source. Development should not be allocated or permitted if there are reasonably available sites appropriate for the proposed development in areas with a lower risk of flooding.
- 9.121 Paragraph 023 of the PPG (25<sup>th</sup> August 2022) states that the aim of the sequential approach is designed to ensure that areas at little or no risk of flooding from any source are developed in preference to areas at higher risk. This means avoiding, so far as possible, development in current and future medium and high flood risk areas considering all sources of flooding including areas at risk of surface water flooding. Avoiding flood risk through the sequential test is the most effective way of addressing flood risk because it places the least reliance on measures like flood defences, flood warnings and property level resilience features. Even where a flood risk assessment shows the development can be made safe throughout its lifetime without increasing risk elsewhere, the sequential test still needs to be satisfied.
- 9.122 In this instance, the application has failed to demonstrate that a sequential approach to flood risk has been taken within the application site itself. On this basis, insufficient information has been provided and is contrary to Policy 32 of the Local Plan 2018, Paragraph 162 of the NPPF 2021 and the Planning Practice Guidance 2022.
- 9.123 In terms of the approach to sustainable surface water drainage itself, the amended flood risk and drainage strategy submitted addresses the

concerns raised by the Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) and subject to conditions the drainage principles are acceptable in accordance with Policy 32 of the Local Plan 2018. However, as discussed, the principle of development in this location due to the lack of sequential test evidence outweighs any design considerations that might otherwise reduce the flood risk as advised by the PPG.

#### **9.124 Highway Safety and Transport Impacts**

- 9.125 The application site is located within a highly sustainable location where there is existing good cycle and public transport routes to the city centre and shops and services located nearby.
- 9.126 Policy 80 of the Local Plan 2018 supports developments where access by walking, cycling and public transport are prioritised and is accessible for all. Additionally, Policy 81 states that developments will only be permitted where they do not have an unacceptable transport impact.
- 9.127 Paragraph 111 of the NPPF advises that development should only be prevented or refused on highways grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or the residual cumulative impacts on the road network would be severe.
- 9.128 The application is supported by a Transport Technical Note and the plans and documents have been reviewed by the County Council's Local Highway Authority and the Transport Assessment Team.
- 9.129 Third party comments are noted. No new vehicular accesses onto the public highway are proposed but they would use existing access roads, one of which already service Anstey Hall Barns to the north-west of the application site and the other which currently serves the Cosmex Clinic to the north-east of the application site. Third party comments concerning the increase in traffic along the former access road are acknowledged, however, given that this is a private track and vehicles travel at low speeds, any changes to this internal route is a matter for the applicant.
- 9.130 Whilst third party and local member comments concerning the use of heavy construction vehicles are noted, following additional information, following a formal consultation with the Local Highway Authority, it is not considered that any adverse highway safety impacts would result from the proposed scheme subject to a traffic management plan and construction/demolition vehicle weight restriction which could be attached as conditions on any planning consent granted.
- 9.131 In terms of impact upon the highway network, whilst third parties have raised concerns, given the nature of the development and the review by the Transport Assessment Team, the proposed development would only have minimal additional traffic impact upon the highway network in this instance.



9.132 Taking all this into account, subject to conditions, it is considered that the proposal accords with the objectives of Policy 80 and 81 of the Local Plan 2018 and is compliant with the NPPF 2021.

### **9.133 Cycle and Car Parking Provision**

#### **9.134 Cycle Parking**

9.135 The Cambridge Local Plan (2018) supports development which encourages and prioritises sustainable transport, such as walking, cycling and public transport. Policy 82 requires new developments to comply with the cycle parking standards as set out within Appendix L of the Local Plan which, for retirement accommodation states that two cycle spaces should be provided for every 5 members of staff, whilst for nursing homes there should be an additional one visitor space for every 6 residents (minimum 2 spaces). These spaces should be located in a purpose-built area and be at least as convenient as car parking provision.

9.136 The application submission has not provided any details of cycle parking for employees. Given that the accommodation would be required to cater for a range of needs including the nursing of residents, and the additional bedroom in each unit being earmarked for relatives/friends/carer, it is considered that sufficient cycle parking is required within the site in compliance with Appendix L of the Local Plan 2018.

9.137 Moreover, on-site staff accommodation (5 rooms) and short-term guest accommodation (7 rooms) is proposed within Anstey Hall itself. No cycle provision has been indicated for these visitors and employees on the site in this instance. The Cam Cycle representation concerning the lack of cycle parking and space for non-standard cycles are also noted.

9.138 On this basis, it has not been demonstrated that cycle parking has been considered and can be satisfactorily sited within the application site in a convenient and accessible location, contrary to the requirements of Appendix L and Policy 82 of the Local Plan 2018.

#### **9.139 Car parking**

9.140 The application is located outside of the Controlled Parking Zone. Policy 82 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2018) requires new developments to comply with, not exceed the maximum car parking standards as set out within Appendix L. Outside of the Controlled Parking Zone the number of parking spaces for retirement homes in 1 space for every 4 units and 1 space for every 2 members of staff. For nursing homes, 1 space for every 8 residents and 1 space for every 2 members of staff are required.

9.141 Third party and local member comments regarding the number of parking spaces and possible future parking pressure on nearby roads are noted. The proposed development would provide 22 spaces for residents in accordance with Appendix L. 18 spaces would remain for employees and

visitors. It is also noted that there are several other car parking spaces at the front of Anstey Hall. On this basis and taking into account its highly sustainable location, the proposed car parking arrangement is considered to be acceptable in accordance with Policy 82 of the Local Plan 2018.

9.142 The Greater Cambridge Sustainable Design and Construction SPD outlines the standards for EV charging. In relation to air quality, all new developments require the provision of both active (slow, rapid and fast) and passive electric vehicle (EV) charge points provision where car parking is to be provided. At this stage no details have been provided to indicate EV charging points, however, this provision could be secured by condition as recommended by the Environmental Health Officer in accordance with Policy 36 of the Local Plan 2018.

9.143 Therefore, subject to conditions, the proposal is considered to accord with Policies 36 and 82 of the Local Plan 2018 and the Greater Cambridge Sustainable Design and Construction SPD 2020.

#### **9.144 Amenity**

9.145 Policies 35 and 58 of the Local Plan 2018 seek to preserve the amenity of neighbouring and / or future occupiers in terms of noise and disturbance, overshadowing, overlooking, or overbearing and through providing high quality internal and external spaces.

#### *Neighbouring Properties*

9.146 Whilst third party comments concerning overshadowing and privacy impacts upon occupiers in vicinity of the application site are noted, the proposed retirement home accommodation would be located a reasonable distance from the closest residential properties to the west, along Piper Road and to the south along Proctor Drive. The closest neighbouring residential dwelling would be approximately 42 metres from the balconies of Block C wing.

9.147 Third party comments concerning the potential for overlooking impacts from the belvedere are noted, however, given the likely low height, any potential overlooking impacts upon residential properties are not considered to be significant in this instance.

9.148 Third party comments concerning noise and disturbance as a result of the access route adjacent to Piper Road are noted. Given the reasonable separation distance from residential properties along this road, it is unlikely that the proposed development would negatively impact these nearby residential amenities.

9.149 On this basis and given the nature of Anstey Hall's change of use, it is not considered that the proposal would result in any significant overlooking, overbearing or loss of light impacts upon nearby neighbour amenities in accordance with policies 55 and 57 of the Local Plan 2018.

### *Future Occupants*

- 9.150 The proposed development would comprise specialist housing in the form of retirement accommodation (C2 use) and therefore Policy 50 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2018) is not relevant as this relates to C3 residential units.
- 9.151 Notwithstanding the above, the proposed retirement accommodation would provide generous internal space for future residents.
- 9.152 The proposed development would introduce new residential accommodation facing Waitrose Supermarket. Whilst it is a reasonable distance to not result in significant overbearing or loss of light impacts upon future residents, the proposed development would create new noise sensitive receptors at the boundary adjacent to the Waitrose Supermarket which includes balconies on the eastern elevation.
- 9.153 The application has been subject to a formal consultation with the Council's Environmental Health Officer. Whilst further information has been provided regarding reasoning and justification around the monitoring duration and justification of the existing operational plant on the adjacent site, given that no energy strategy has been submitted for the application site itself, it is unknown as to whether air source heat pumps (ASHPs) would have an adverse impact on future residential receptors on account of noise impacts.
- 9.154 Third party comments concerning the accessibility and security concerns are noted. It is understood that the public park created would be restricted to daylight hours. Whilst limited information has been provided regarding how the security and privacy of residents within the proposed accommodation would be managed, it is considered that these details could be dealt with via condition. According to the plans submitted, residents will each have their own private patio/balcony area, which is sufficient.
- 9.155 On this basis, insufficient information has been provided in terms of the proposed energy strategy and the potential for unacceptable noise impacts associated with ASHPs upon future residents.
- 9.156 Taking all this into account and on the basis of the information submitted, it is considered that there is insufficient information to satisfy Policy 35 of the Local Plan 2018.

### *Accessibility*

- 9.157 The application site allows for step free access to it. Level access is proposed at the entrances to the accommodation Blocks' cores in accordance with Part M4(2) Building Regulation standards. A lift is proposed within each of the blocks. Following a formal consultation with

the Council's Access Officer there are no objections to the scheme subject to internal design alterations which could be adjusted at detailed build stage to further meet the needs of all users. Therefore, the proposal is considered to be in accordance with Policies 56 and 57 of the Local Plan 2018.

#### *Construction and Environmental Impacts*

- 9.158 Policy 35 of the local Plan 2018 guards against developments leading to significant adverse impacts on health and quality of life from noise and disturbance. Noise and disturbance during construction would be minimized through conditions restricting construction hours and collection hours to protect the amenity of existing occupiers. These conditions are considered reasonable and necessary to impose in this case on any planning consent granted.

#### *Artificial lighting impacts*

- 9.159 In terms of impacts upon the local amenity and quality of life, no details of external lighting have been provided. Notwithstanding the concerns regarding impacts upon protected species, in terms of impacts upon human receptors, details could be conditioned in accordance with Policy 34 of the Local Plan 2018.

#### *Air quality impacts*

- 9.160 Notwithstanding that insufficient information has been provided in relation to the method of providing heating and hot water as detailed in a previous section of this planning assessment, boiler details and EV charging points will be required and could be conditioned in accordance with the Sustainable Design and Construction SPD 2020 and Policy 36 of the Local Plan 2018.

#### *Potential contamination*

- 9.161 A Phase 1 Desk Study has been submitted as part of the application. Following a formal consultation with the Council's Environmental Health Officer, given the sensitive end-use, conditions could be attached to safeguard workers and future residents in accordance with Policy 33 of the Local Plan 2018.
- 9.162 To ensure that any need to import ground-based materials to the application site is chemically suitable for use, a condition will be included to any planning permission requiring a material management plan in accordance with Policy 33 of the Local Plan 2018.

#### *Summary*

- 9.163 In conclusion, insufficient information has been provided to demonstrate that the energy strategy would not have an adverse impact upon future

occupiers of the residential blocks and therefore fails to be compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2018) policy 35.

### 9.164 Third Party Representations

9.165 The remaining third-party representations not addressed in the preceding paragraphs are summarised and responded to in the table below:

<b>Third Party Comment</b>	<b>Officer Response</b>
Alternative area of protected open space is private residential land.	The area is hatched blue and in the ownership of the applicant.
Access rights	The applicant has signed an ownership certificate which includes new access points within the red line of the application site. Any legal issues associated with the right of access is outside the planning assessment process.
Inaccurate drawings	Notwithstanding the inadequate drawings for the Maris Lane wall and Orangery, the remaining drawings are considered to provide an appropriate level of detail for the application to be considered.
Request for site visit	A site visit has been carried out by the case officer. A formal site visit will be carried out by committee members prior to the committee meeting.
Consultation/notification	The application has been publicised in the local press, through the posting of site notices and via neighbour letters.
Consultation process	The application has been subject to several rounds of consultations. All relevant information is available to view on the portal.
Those in support	Third party views in support citing reasons such as fulfilling housing need, appearance, landscaping, wider amenities/community benefits and framing views are noted.
Swimming pool use/other facilities	It is understood that these could be opened to the wider community.
Affordable housing	Affordable housing is not required for the C2 use specified.
Children's safety	This is a matter for the landowner and is outside the planning application assessment.
Works to Coachman's House, Coach House and outbuildings	No works are now proposed to these buildings.
Standard of support for residents	The applicant has provided information about the level of care that could be provided.

### 9.166 Planning Obligations (S106)

9.167 The Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010 have introduced the requirement for all local authorities to make an assessment of any planning obligation in relation to three tests. If the planning obligation does not pass the tests then it is unlawful. The tests are that the planning obligation must be:

- (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.

9.168 Policy 85 of the Local Plan 2018 states that planning permission for new developments will only be supported/permitted where there are suitable arrangements for the improvement or provision and phasing of infrastructure, services and facilities necessary to make the scheme acceptable in planning terms.

9.169 Following a formal consultation with the Developer Contributions Monitoring Officer, given that the accommodation would be for specialist housing (C2 use), there is no requirement for sports or open space contributions. However, monitoring fees are required for other obligations held as specified in the below table.

*Heads of Terms*

9.170 The Heads of Terms (HoT's) as identified are the basis for the proposed the S106 and are set out in the summary below:

<b>Obligation</b>	<b>Contribution / Term</b>	<b>Trigger</b>
Primary Health Care	£295,800 based on 87 units	Prior to occupation
Ambulance Service	£28,449	Prior to occupation
Monitoring fees	£2,200 plus further £500 per obligation	N/A

9.171 Following a formal consultation with the Cambridge and Peterborough Primary Health Care Team, taking into account the limited capacity of the closest GPs surgeries and given the nature of the proposed development and the number of units (87 residential units) would put more pressure on these existing services, it is considered that the proposed planning obligation is appropriate which will meet the tests set by the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010. The Ambulance Service has also requested a developer contribution which is under consideration.

**9.172 Other Matters**

*Refuse*

9.173 Policy 57 Local Plan 2018 requires refuse and recycling to be successfully integrated into proposals.

- 9.174 Three bin stores would be sited around the site and design details of these stores could be conditioned. Further details have been requested by the Shared Waste Team, however, the additional information including the submitted swept path analysis fails to demonstrate tracking for a 32 tonne/12 metre length vehicle and insufficient information regarding expected volumes of waste, walking distances for the crew and residents have been provided.
- 9.175 Following a formal consultation with the Council's Waste Team, given the lack of details provided as part of the application, the proposal fails to be in accordance with Policy 57 of the Local Plan 2018 and the RECAP Waste Guidance Document.

#### *Archaeology*

- 9.176 Third party comments concerning the lack of archaeology evaluation are noted.
- 9.177 Following a formal consultation with the County Council's Archaeological Officer, taking into account the submitted desk-based assessment and archaeological features found in other sites including Croft Gardens, along Barton Road, the application site is considered to be located in an area of archaeological potential and therefore survey information is required prior to determination before the principle of development in archaeological terms can be accepted. In this instance, the applicant has failed to provide the requested information and therefore insufficient information has been provided and is contrary to Policy 61 of the Local Plan 2018 and the NPPF 2021.

#### *Crime prevention*

- 9.178 Third party comments regarding potential anti-social behaviour from opening of the public park are acknowledged. Following a formal consultation with the Crime Prevention Design Officer, it is considered that subject to park opening times, details of external lighting and other elements, no objections are raised subject to details which could be conditioned.

#### *Fire safety*

- 9.179 No objections are raised with regards fire safety. Following a formal consultation with the Fire and Rescue Services, subject to provision of fire hydrants which could be conditioned, there is no objection.

#### *Public Art*

- 9.180 The applicant has submitted their intention to provide public art in the application site. Given its publicly visible location, in particular with the

access to the protected open space proposed to be made public, this could be supported subject to conditions.

### **9.181 Planning Balance**

- 9.182 Planning decisions must be taken in accordance with the development plan unless there are material considerations that indicate otherwise (section 70(2) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and section 38[6] of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004).
- 9.183 The proposed development would result in economic benefits through the construction of new buildings and servicing the retirement complex and social benefits through the creation of meeting specialist housing need in the form of retirement accommodation. These are given substantial weight in the planning balance in favour of the scheme. The scheme proposes public art which is attributed limited weight in favour of the scheme.
- 9.184 The proposal would convert existing private protected open space into publicly accessible land, albeit, this would be limited to daylight hours. This is attributed limited weight in favour of the development. Conversely, the proposal would consume a substantial portion of this protected open space which is important in views from Trumpington Meadows and is of high environmental value. This land would not be satisfactorily replaced and is attributed substantial weight in the planning balance against the scheme.
- 9.185 The proposal would result in a biodiversity net gain within the site slightly in excess of policy requirements and is attributed limited weight in the planning balance in favour of the development, however, lighting impacts from the proposed accommodation blocks would adversely impact protected species whilst the loss of trees of arboricultural and ecological value would result in adverse impacts on the character of the area and have an adverse impact upon protected species. This is attributed moderate weight in the planning balance against the scheme.
- 9.186 The application demonstrates an acceptable sustainable drainage strategy can be achieved on site, however the application has failed to approach the proposed retirement blocks sequentially in terms of flood risk. This is attributed minor weight in the planning balance against the scheme.
- 9.187 Furthermore, insufficient information has been provided concerning the application's approach to renewable energy, cycle/mobility vehicle storage provision, archaeology and refuse which are attributed minor weight against the scheme.
- 9.188 Finally, the proposed accommodation blocks would result in a high level of less than substantial harm. The proposed Orangery would result in moderate less than substantial harm. In addition, insufficient information has been provided to assess the reconfiguration of the Maris Lane wall. Overall, the public benefits of the scheme are not considered to outweigh



the harm to character and appearance of the Conservation Area and the setting of the Grade II\* Listed Building. This is attributed great weight in the planning balance against the scheme.

9.189 Having taken into account the provisions of the development plan, NPPF and NPPG guidance, the statutory requirements of sections 66 and 72 of the Town and Country Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, the views of statutory consultees and wider stakeholders, as well as all other material planning considerations, the proposed development is recommended for refusal.

### **9.190 Recommendation**

9.191 **Refuse** for the following reasons:

1. The proposed development would result in the loss of boundary vegetation, have an adverse impact upon biodiversity and fail to respond to, conserve or enhance the setting, and special character of the city. In addition, the proposal would fail to adequately replace the protected open space lost through the site's redevelopment. Therefore, the principle of this development on the edge of the city and within the Protected Open Space is contrary to policies 8 and 67 of the Local Plan 2018.
2. The proposed retirement accommodation blocks, by virtue of their siting within Anstey Hall's open and garden setting and loss of tree canopy cover required to facilitate the development and future pressure for tree removal, would significantly reduce the open character of this protected open space. Additionally, by virtue of the blocks' incongruous design and appearance, the proposal would fail to appropriately relate to Anstey Hall in terms of their design, siting and scale, resulting in adverse impacts upon the character and appearance of Trumpington Conservation Area and the setting of the Listed Building (Anstey Hall). Furthermore, the proposed Orangery would fail to be of a high-quality design appropriate to the Hall and insufficient information has been provided in terms of the Maris Lane wall reconfiguration. Therefore, overall, the proposal would fail to positively respond to the surrounding context, existing features of natural, historic and local importance and the setting and special character of the city, contrary to policies 8, 55, 56, 57, 61, 67 and 71 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2018. The harm to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area and to the setting and significance of Anstey Hall is identified as a high-level of 'less than substantial' harm and it is not considered that the public benefits arising from the scheme would outweigh this identified harm, contrary Policy 61 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2018 and Paragraph 202 of the NPPF 2021, and the provisions of section 66 and 72 of Planning (LBCA) Act 1990.
3. No facilities are provided for the storage of cycles or mobility vehicles. The proposal therefore fails to provide sufficient cycle and mobility vehicle storage sited in a convenient and accessible manner to meet the needs of

the elderly, employees and visitors, contrary to policies 55, 57 and 82 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2018.

4. Retirement accommodation block B would be located in an area of 'high' surface water flood risk. No sequential test has been submitted to inform the siting of this block and therefore the application fails to comply with the sequential test as required by Policy 32 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2018, and Paragraphs 159-163 of the NPPF 2021 including Paragraph 162.
5. Insufficient information has been submitted with regards an energy strategy for the site that follows the energy hierarchy. Therefore, the proposal fails to be in accordance with Policy 28 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2018 and the Greater Cambridge Sustainable Design and Construction SPD (2020).
6. The application site comprises substantial tree canopy cover and the submitted ecological appraisal identified several bat species that could be impacted. Insufficient information has been provided to demonstrate that the proposed retirement accommodation blocks would not have an adverse impact upon protected bat species as a result of both internal and external lighting impacts. The proposal therefore fails to be in accordance with policies 57 and 70 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2018.
7. Insufficient information has been submitted in terms of a proposed energy strategy to ensure that future occupiers of the retirement blocks are not adversely impacted on account of unacceptable noise impacts. The proposal therefore fails to be in accordance with Policy 35 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2018.
8. Insufficient information has been submitted in terms of refuge strategy and swept path analysis for the proposed development. Therefore, the proposal is contrary to Policy 57 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2018 and the RECAP Waste Guidance.
9. The site is located in an area of archaeological potential and therefore survey information is required. In this instance, insufficient information has been provided to demonstrate that the principle of the retirement accommodation blocks are acceptable in archaeological terms. Therefore, the proposal is contrary to Policy 61 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2019 and the NPPF 2021.

#### Background Papers:

The following list contains links to the documents on the Council's website and / or an indication as to where hard copies can be inspected.

- Cambridge Local Plan 2018
- Cambridge Local Plan SPDs