

1.0 SITE DESCRIPTION/AREA CONTEXT

- 1.1 27-29 Station Road, the Clayton Hotel, is a seven storey detached building, with the seventh storey stepped in from the front elevation, located on the north-eastern side of Station Road, approximately 30 metres south-east of Tenison Road. The building was part of the CB1 development of the station area. The building is mixed use, with a restaurant, bar, meeting rooms and a gymnasium at ground floor creating an active frontage, and en-suite hotel accommodation within the floors above. To the west of the site lies an office block currently occupied by Microsoft. There is also office space to the east of the site with residential flats sited to the north beyond the existing courtyard.
- 1.2 The application site falls within the New Town and Glisson Road Conservation Area and within Controlled Parking Zone T. There are no other site constraints.

2.0 THE PROPOSAL

- 2.1 The proposal seeks planning permission for the erection of an extension to the rear of the hotel to provide 37 additional guest rooms plus other associated works. This would result in a gross increase in internal floor space of 1,725 sqm.
- 2.2 The application is accompanied by the following supporting information:
1. Planning and Heritage Assessment
 2. Design and Access Statement
 3. Transport Statement
 4. BREEAM Pre-assessment
 5. Daylight Sunlight Assessment
 6. Plans
 7. Dust Risk Assessment and DMP
 8. Construction Environmental Management Plan
 9. Traffic Management Plan
 10. Travel Plan
 11. Energy Strategy
 12. Flood Risk and Drainage Strategy

3.0 SITE HISTORY

Reference	Description	Outcome
22/00696/FUL	Erection of rear extension to the existing hotel to create 19 new bedrooms over 5 floors	Permitted
20/0070/NMA2	Non material amendment of planning permission 20/0070/FUL (Internal alterations to relocate gymnasium and form 5 new en-suite guest bedrooms and associated external changes to the fenestration) for changes to cladding	Permitted

20/0070/NMA1	Non material amendment of planning permission 20/0070/FUL for an amendment to existing West Elevation to replace existing glazed vision panel with new insulated Spandrel panel.	Permitted
20/0070/FUL	Internal alterations to relocate gymnasium and form 5 new en-suite guest bedrooms and associated external changes to the fenestration.	Permitted

4.0 PUBLICITY

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

5.0 POLICY

5.1 Central Government Advice

National Planning Policy Framework 2023
 Planning Practice Guidance 2014
 Circular 11/95 – The Use of Conditions in Planning Permissions (Annex A)
 Planning Policy Statement – Green Belt protection and intentional unauthorised development August 2015
 Technical housing standards – nationally described space standard – published by Department of Communities and Local Government March 2015 (material consideration)

5.2 Cambridge Local Plan 2018

Policy 1: The presumption in favour of sustainable development
 Policy 14: Areas of major change and opportunity areas – general principles
 Policy 25: Cambridge Railway Station, Hills Road Corridor to the City Centre Opportunity Area
 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 34: Light pollution control
 Policy 35: Protection of human health from noise and vibration
 Policy 36: Air quality, odour and dust
 Policy 55: Responding to context
 Policy 56: Creating successful places
 Policy 58: Altering and extending existing buildings
 Policy 59: Designing landscape and the public realm
 Policy 61: Conservation and enhancement of Cambridge’s historic environment

- Policy 70: Protection of priority species and habitats
Policy 77: Development and expansion of visitor accommodation
Policy 80: Supporting sustainable access to development
Policy 81: Mitigating the transport impact of development
Policy 82: Parking management

- 5.3 **Supplementary Planning Documents** (prepared in parallel with the Local Plan preparation and shortly to be adopted by the Executive Councillor by an out of cycle decision)

Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Flood and Water
Greater Cambridge Biodiversity – Adopted February 2022

- 5.4 **City Wide Guidance**

Biodiversity Checklist for Land Use Planners in Cambridgeshire and Peterborough (2001).
Buildings of Local Interest (2005)
Cambridge and Milton Surface Water Management Plan (2011)
Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Level 1 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (2010)
Greater Cambridge Sustainable Design and Construction SPD (2020)
Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Waste Partnership (RECAP): Waste
Cambridgeshire Design Guide For Streets and Public Realm (2007)

Area Guidelines

New Town and Glisson Road Conservation Area Appraisal (2012)

- 6.0 **CONSULTATIONS**

Cambridgeshire County Council (Highways Development Control)

- 6.1 No objection subjection to a traffic management plan and a compliance condition restricting large vehicles during construction. The submitted Traffic Management Plan (TMP) contains much useful information it also contains other details which while of great importance have no direct bearing on how the site traffic (all modes) will interact with the users of the adopted public highway.

Conservation team

- 6.2 No objection. The application has been assessed and it is considered that the proposal would not give rise to any harm to any heritage assets.

Environmental Health

- 6.3 No objection subject to conditions:
- Plant noise insulation
 - Construction / demolition hours

- Demolition / construction collections / deliveries
- Demolition / construction impact compliance
- Contaminated land – gas risk
- SPD informative

Urban Design

- 6.4 1st Comment: Further information required in the form of a daylight sunlight assessment. The massing will significantly closer to the Vesta apartments to the north, the public courtyard and the Microsoft building and has the potential to overshadow these buildings. Public art in the courtyard space needs to be clarified.
- 6.5 The Location & Site Plan (rev P1) and Proposed Ground Floor Plan (rev P1) shows that the existing cycle storage located in the rear courtyard (20 spaces over 2 tiers) will be removed to allow for the proposed stair core that will serve the extension. It is not clear where these existing spaces will be reprovided on site, and the applicant will need to provide detail of this. The transport statement (pgs.17&18) notes that the 12 proposed spaces shown in the rear courtyard on the Proposed Ground Floor Plan are to serve the uplift in guests and staff resulting from the additional 37 rooms, and in line with Policy 82 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2018.
- 6.6 The revised elevations have created an additional bay to the rear of the building, with the proposed architectural language and external materials proposed to match the existing building. Whilst this approach is supported in principle, it is important that a match in materials and elevational detail is achieved, and the applicant should provide a schedule of proposed materials against the materials that were specified for the existing building (spec/colour/manufacturer/etc). This can be dealt with by way of a materials condition should the application be approved.
- 6.7 2nd Comment: Objection. The assessment reveals that the proposals will impact on Flat 106 in terms of VSC and 8 apartments in terms of Daylight Distribution. These impacts are not to bedroom spaces but to Living/Kitchen/Dining Rooms which form the main habitable space for each of the properties effected. Our conclusion is that the proposed scale and massing sought through this application is unacceptable because it will have a negative impact on these apartments which is contrary to Policy 55 (part c) and Policy 58 (part e). When reviewing daylighting assessments, BRE makes it clear that it is guidance and some flexibility is needed because ‘natural lighting is only one of many factors in site layout design’. Whilst acknowledging that this is an urban environment, the previous consented scheme demonstrated that it is possible to add accommodation without impacting on neighbouring residential properties.
- 6.8 A revised ground floor plan has been submitted that shows a more resolved approach to the courtyard space with a proposed bronze coloured metal fence

and high-lo bike stands. In our view, this approach will create a more secure and well resolved area.

- 6.9 3rd Comment: Objection. The revised VSC assessment concludes that the additional massing proposed to the Clayton Hotel will not result in an unacceptable impact to residential properties to the north. The % reduction experienced by Flat W8/100 does appear acceptable when assessed using this methodology. However, it is unclear how the assessment arrived at the revised conclusion, contrary to the previous report, which identified a number of properties impacted by the proposed development both in loss of VSC values and daylight distribution. With the previously submitted VSC and daylight distribution calculations taken into account, it is still apparent that the additional bulk and massing will have an impact beyond the BRE acceptable parameters.
- 6.10 4th Comment: Objection. The amended report demonstrates that all tested rooms meet the BRE VSC criteria. However, a number of assessed rooms at Vesta scheme north to the hotel fail to meet the BRE guidelines for NSL with 10 LKDs experiencing a change of over 20%, and in addition 2 LKDs have APSH reductions that are also above the BRE guidance threshold. We therefore continue to be concerned that the proposed additional scale and massing to the Clayton Hotel scheme will have a negative impact on properties at the Vesta Apartments, which is contrary to policies 55 and 58 of the Local Plan.

Landscape

- 6.11 No objection subject to a biodiverse roof condition.

Sustainability

- 6.12 No objection subject to BREEAM Design Stage Certification and Post Construction Certification conditions.
- 6.13 The proposals are supported from a sustainable design and construction perspective. The extension has been designed to achieve a BREEAM 'excellent' rating as required by policy 28 of the Cambridge Local Plan, with the BREEAM pre-assessment showing an overall score of 74.46% and achievement of all 5 credits related to water efficiency (Wat01).
- 6.14 Energy Strategy sets out the hierarchical approach to reducing carbon emissions associated with energy use, which achieves a 68% reduction in emissions when assessed under Building Regulations Part L 2021. In terms of renewable energy, air source heat pumps and photovoltaic panels are proposed (3.6 kWp with pv area of 22.1m²). This approach is welcomed. The only thing missing is an indicative location of the proposed photovoltaic panels on the roof plan, so it would be helpful if drawing number A-100-108 Rev P1 could be updated to provide this.

- 6.15 I would also echo the comments from landscape colleagues with regards to replacing the proposed sedum roof with a biodiverse roof which will deliver greater biodiversity benefits to the scheme.

S106 Officer

- 6.16 No objection. Following approval in July 2022 by the Executive Councillor for Planning Policy and Infrastructure and in line with procedures set out in the Council constitution this proposed development will require a fee of £700 towards the monitoring and administration of the section 106 agreement. A further additional fee of £500 would be required for each instance (if applicable) where the Council is required to provide written confirmation of an obligation.

Access Officer

- 6.14 The hotel was built with features that myself and the Disability Panel advised against, i.e. inward opening toilet doors, double doors not being asymmetrical et cetera. I didn't look at completed design of accessible rooms. They are building 43 new rooms of which 5% must be wheelchair accessible and therefore three new rooms. Until the design of these are submitted the application must be refused.

Cambridge Airport

- 6.15 No objection. The proposed development has been examined from an aerodrome safeguarding perspective and does not conflict with safeguarding criteria. Given the nature of the proposed development it is possible that a crane may be required during its construction. We would, therefore, draw the applicant's attention to the requirement within the British Standard Code of Practice for the safe use of Cranes, for crane operators to consult the aerodrome before erecting a crane in close proximity to an aerodrome.
- 6.16 The above responses are a summary of the comments that have been received. Full details of the consultation responses can be inspected on the application file.

7.0 REPRESENTATIONS

- 7.1 The owners/occupiers of the following addresses have made representations:
- 28 Great Northern Road
- 7.2 The representations can be summarised as follows:
- Increase in noise and traffic with regards to more people staying, more food delivered and more waste.
- 7.3 The above representations are a summary of the comments that have been received. Full details of the representations can be inspected on the application file.

8.0 ASSESSMENT

Principle of development

- 8.1 Policy 77 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2018 (Local Plan) relates to development and expansion of visitor accommodation and supports proposals for high quality visitor accommodation, particularly in areas around Cambridge Train Station. Therefore, the principle of extending the existing hotel to provide additional visitor accommodation is acceptable, in accordance with policy 77 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2018).

Context of site, design and external spaces

- 8.2 The proposed extension would extend over and above the existing four storey flat roof section to the rear, resulting in a stepped form comprising a 6 storey and 8 storey extension abutting the existing hotel building. The proposal would be of an appropriate scale and massing, responding to the high density of the surrounding context. The proposed extension would also adopt a similar rhythm and architectural quality to the existing form, resulting in the extension complementing and visually blending into the existing building. The materiality would match that of the existing building with large areas of glazing to minimize the length and using a metal clad at the upper levels to break down the massing vertically. To ensure that this is achieved, officers consider that a materials condition is considered reasonable and necessary to impose. The Urban Design Officer also considers that the proposal is appropriate to the surrounding context.
- 8.3 Policy 31 requires all flat roofs to be green or brown (e.g. sedum) provided that it is acceptable in terms of the impact on the historic environment and the structural capacity of the roof. This is to increase absorption and reduce run off rates, improving the water management. Green roofs have been incorporated into the design on the proposed extensions, complying with policy 31.
- 8.4 Taking the above into account, officers consider that the proposed extension would be high quality and well connected to, and integrated with, the existing form and surrounding context. Therefore, the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2018) policies 55, 56, 57, 59.

Impact on Heritage Assets

- 8.5 Noting that the Conservation Officer has no objections to the proposal, officers consider that the proposed development, given its scale, massing and design, would not adversely impact upon the character and appearance of the conservation area.
- 8.6 The proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2018) policy 61(62).

Residential Amenity

Impact on amenity of neighbouring occupiers

- 8.7 The proposed extension would be sited approximately 30m due south of the existing Vesta apartments on Great Northern Road. The proposed extension does breach the 25-degree plane from the lowest habitable window of the Vesta apartments on Great Northern Road, therefore, additional daylight and sunlight information is required to fully assess the impact of the development. Three daylight sunlight reports have been submitted for the revised plans: the first prepared by MES building solutions dated 4th August, the second prepared by 2 point dated October 2023 and the third prepared by 2 point dated December 2023. The third daylight sunlight assessment was submitted by the applicant to try to overcome officers concerns that the proposal would harm daylight and sunlight to the flats on Great Northern Road. This is the data assessed below.
- 8.8 Daylight sunlight assessment version 3 states that all rooms meet the meet the vertical sky component (VSC) BRE guidance. This is not disputed.
- 8.9 However, multiple rooms fail the no skyline (NSL) daylighting measure. The BRE guidelines state that the loss of more than 20% of direct skylight (less than 0.80 times its former value) is likely to be 'noticeable to the occupants' with more of the room appearing 'poorly lit'. 11 living kitchen dining rooms and 3 bedrooms exceed this threshold and fail the NSL test (as shown below). Therefore, these rooms are likely to experience a noticeable loss in daylighting (14 habitable rooms failing out of 123 assessed). The BRE Guidelines make it clear that if the value is 'less than 0.8 times the value before', then the 'daylighting [is] likely to be significantly affected' and as such occupants will experience a noticeable loss of daylight quality. Even when the NSL accounts for the balconies, 10 living kitchen dining rooms still exceed the BRE threshold and therefore, are significantly affected. These Living/Kitchen/Dining Rooms (LKD) form the main habitable space for each flat, are single aspect and as a result of the development would be appear poorly lit. Moreover, there are two one-bedroom flats which both the LKD and bedroom would be affected to a harmful level (R13/101 & R14/101; R12/102 & R13/102), significantly and disproportionately affecting these occupants.

Assessed room	NSL % reduction (with balcony)	NSL % reduction (balcony removed)
LKD		
R12/100	23.3	23.3
R4/101	21.9	23.0
R11/101	21.5	20.5
R12/101	26.6	23.6
R11/102	24.7	23.4
R12/102	25.1	21.3
R11/103	24.5	22.9
R12/103	22.6	20.2
R8/104	21.5	19.9
R9/104	19.9	20.1
R11/104	24.0	23.8

Bedroom		
R13/101	20.9	20.9
R14/101	22.6	22.6
R10/102	26.8	25.8

- 8.10 The BRE guidance states that NSL thresholds “need to be applied sensibly and flexibly. There is little point in designing tiny gaps in the roof lines of new development in order to safeguard no sky lines in existing buildings”. Further, it states that “if an existing building contains rooms lit from one side only and greater than 5m deep, then a greater movement of the no skyline may be unavoidable”. The daylight sunlight assessment (version 3) argues that as the affected LKDs are in excess of 5m deep, being between c.6.5m and 7m deep, NSL is not an informative measure of daylight amenity to the rooms. Officers disagree. The proposal would result in a significant exceedance of the NSL measure. The actual impact should be assessed here, these rooms are single aspect units which currently experience an acceptable level of daylight. The proposal would lead to a significant reduction which would be to the detriment of the occupiers amenity, particularly those flats with both the LKD and bedrooms affected. While the BRE guidance states that the measure should be applied flexibly, the thresholds would be materially and in some cases significantly exceeded. The actual conditions (single aspect, one-bedroom flats, deep floor plans) need to be considered.
- 8.11 The updated assessment includes APSH results, measured for 123 rooms at Vesta Apartments that contain a window orientated within 90 degrees south. The report concludes that all of these rooms ‘will experience BRE compliant alterations’. (p.15, 8.22) However, we have identified 2 LKDs that exceed the BRE guidelines with existing APSH of less than 5% in the winter months. 1 LKD in particular (R5/101) goes well beyond the recommended BRE guidelines of 20% reduction in winter months alongside the annual reduction of 4%, experiencing a 50% winter month reduction and 11.8% annual reduction. This room will experience a noticeable loss of sunlight and as the BRE guidance states, it is likely to make the room appear ‘colder and less pleasant and cheerful’. This would result in a significant amenity impact.
- 8.12 A smaller extension to the Clayton Hotel has been approved which did not exceed BRE guidance on VSC, NSL or APSH (22/00696/FUL). This therefore demonstrates that an extension to the hotel is possible without harm to surrounding residential occupiers and that the parameters of the proposed development can be reduced to an acceptable level. The business can extend without harm to neighbours.
- 8.13 Based on this information, officers concluded that the proposal, by virtue of its scale, massing and relationship with Vesta apartments, would reduce daylight to habitable rooms to the detriment of the occupiers of these flats.
- 8.14 With regards to overbearing and enclosure impacts, while the mass is stepped with an approximate separation distance of 30m, the proposed extension would result in a perceived sense of enclosure to the Vesta apartments to the north. The proposed extension would project beyond the

rear elevation of the existing hotel at significant height, so would appear more dominant over and above the existing mass of the Clayton Hotel. The Clayton Hotel was originally designed with a smaller three storey rear element within a high-density environment. It was designed as such as a relief to the taller massing behind, with the taller massing being sited further away from the Vesta residential flats.

- 8.15 The introduction of further windows on the northern elevation of the Clayton Hotel would increase the views of the Vesta apartments to the north. However, the separation distance of approx. 30m mitigates against significant overlooking impacts or invasions of privacy and views would be long range. Moreover, the proposed extension does not alter the existing mutual overlooking relationship between the Vesta apartments and the Clayton Hotel. Thus, officers consider that the proposal would not be significantly harmful to the amenity of the Vesta apartments in terms of overlooking or loss of privacy.
- 8.16 Murdoch flats are located to the south-east of the site on Station Road. Given the existing scale and massing alongside the separation distance between the proposal and Murdoch House, officers consider that the proposal would not adversely impact upon outlook of these residential flats. In terms of the impact on daylight and sunlight, the third daylight sunlight assessment states that all 25 windows assessed will remain unchanged in relation to VSC and NSL and no rooms contain a window orientated within 90 degrees south to assess APSH. The extension would not result in an overlooking impact to Murdoch House due to the siting, scale and massing of the proposal and the separation distance between the residential units and the proposal.
- 8.17 The Environmental Health Officer has not raised objection to the proposal on noise and disturbance grounds and considers that the noise resulting from the construction phases of development can be adequately mitigated against and controlled via the recommended conditions which include restrictions on construction hours. These conditions are considered reasonable and necessary to impose and will be enforceable against. Refuse arrangements would remain the same, the pedestrian flows would be predominately from Station Road and the additional northern windows would not result in a significant noise and disturbance issue.
- 8.18 The proposal fails to adequately respect the residential amenity of its neighbours and the constraints of the site and is not compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2018) policies 56 (58) and 35.

Impact on the open space

- 8.19 The open space to the north of the proposed extension is not designated as protected open space. It may well be designated as a protected open space in the future; however, currently it is not afforded additional protection through designation. Policy 67 requires development proposals to not harm the character of, or lead to the loss of, open space of environmental and/or recreational importance unless it meets certain criteria. After discussions with the Council's Policy team, it was concluded that this policy assesses the

physical impact of development on applications which include open space within the site. The proposed extension would not lead to a physical encroachment / consumption of open space.

- 8.20 Policy 55 and 56 requires high quality development to respond positively to existing features of natural and local importance that are also well integrated with the surrounding context. Officers consider that the proposal would respond to the scale of the surrounding high-density context and would not significantly adversely impact upon the enjoyment of the open space by virtue of the scale and massing of the proposed extension and high density. The open space is a pocket park within a high-density area, enclosed by 6-7 storey buildings on all sides aside from the smaller three storey element of the Clayton Hotel. Officers consider that given this context, the enclosure impact to this open space would not significantly harm the usability or character. A degree of overshadowing would occur however officers consider that this would not be to the detriment of the enjoyment of this space.
- 8.21 The proposal would be compliant with policy 55 and 56 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2018).

Impact on the Microsoft Building (office)

- 8.22 The Microsoft Building is sited directly adjacent to the site to the west and projects further north than the current built footprint of the Clayton Hotel. The existing form of the Clayton Hotel building steps down from six storeys adjacent to the western boundary to two-three storey. The proposal would result in this scale stepping up to six storeys adjacent to this boundary stepping up to eight storeys further away from this boundary. While this would have an impact on the commercial premises adjacent to the site, currently used by Microsoft, it is important to note that the BRE guidance states that *guidelines may also be applied to any existing non-domestic building where occupants have a reasonable expectation of daylight; this would normally include schools, hospitals, hotels and hostels, small workshops and some offices* (paragraph 2.2.2 Site Layout Planning for Daylight and Sunlight: A guide to good practice, 2nd ed). The Microsoft building is a non-domestic building; however, it is unclear whether it is classed as a non-domestic building where occupants have a reasonable expectation of daylight. Officers consider that due to the office use, the requirement for daylight may not be as high as for residential properties.
- 8.23 Nonetheless in the MES daylight sunlight report is the only daylight sunlight report which assesses the impact of the development on the Microsoft building.

Measure	Outcome
Vertical Sky Component	33 out of 47 the windows assessed meet the BRE guidance for VSC
Daylight Distribution	5 of the 6 rooms assessed within this building comfortably meet the BRE guidance for daylight distribution.

Available Sunlight Hours Result	42 out of 47 the windows assessed meet the BRE guidance for available sunlight
Overall daylight sunlight BRE	All rooms meet the BRE guidance

- 8.24 The table outlines that using the BRE guidance, one office room would fail to meet the BRE guidance, taking account of daylight distribution, VSC and available sunlight hours. This is using the standard for residential development. The offices are all open plan, with at least a dual aspect. The room which would fail the daylight distribution measure is the ground floor with the light retained being 0.69. This would result in a noticeable daylight loss impact to the ground floor of the commercial building. However, given the use and that the standard for daylight and sunlight for this building should not be as high when compared to residential, flexibility should be applied here. Therefore, given the use of the building and its location in a high-density area, officers consider that the proposal would not detrimentally impact upon the daylight sunlight levels to warrant refusal of the application.
- 8.25 Outlook from the open plan offices will, by virtue of the scale and proximity of the proposal to the offices, decrease the number of outlooks from the open plan office. However, other outlooks, e.g. to the north, west or south, would be present and unaffected by the development due to the open plan nature of the office. Given this, the non-domestic use and the louvres present on this elevation, officers consider that a reasonable outlook is retained from this office block and significant harm would not arise.
- 8.26 The proposal includes three windows on the western elevation which would be brought closer to the boundary with the Microsoft building. The existing western elevation contains 12 windows to the portion of the building which, while set further away from the Microsoft building, overlook the commercial neighbour. The proposal would therefore reduce the number of windows but bring them closer to the Microsoft building. Previously these side windows have had louvered screens to be neighbourly, a condition may be considered reasonable given the nature of the commercial work in the Microsoft building, if the proposal were acceptable. Officers when taking all factors into account, consider that this impact would not be considered significant given the existing situation.
- 8.27 In respect of the impact to the Microsoft building, the proposal would be compliant with policy 55 and 56 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2018).

Highway Safety

- 8.28 The Highway Authority have no objection to the proposed extension, subject to a traffic management plan condition. Therefore, officers do not consider that the proposed extension to the existing hotel would result in any significant impact to the safe functioning of the highway.
- 8.29 The proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2018) policies 80 and 81.

Car and Cycle Parking

- 8.30 The existing hotel comprises 160 bedrooms which would increase to 197 bedrooms as a result of the development. The existing site is car free with only provision for a drop off area / taxi bay and three disabled car parking spaces to the front (south) of the site. Officers consider that the increase in bedrooms would not trigger the need to increase car parking on site given the sites highly sustainable location within close proximity to Cambridge Train Station and several bus stops.
- 8.31 The existing hotel provides 20 cycle parking spaces within the area courtyard area and a further 10 cycle parking spaces to the south of the site near the main Station Road entrance. Appendix L of the Local Plan details the minimum cycle parking requirements for new developments, stating that hotels should provide a minimum of 2 cycle parking spaces for every 5 members of staff and 2 spaces for every 10 guest bedrooms. The existing 20 cycle spaces will be replaced within the rear courtyard and an additional 12 spaces would be provided in the form of Sheffield stands. The Design and Access Statement outlines that the proposed extension would lead to an additional 10 staff to serve the additional 37 rooms. The cycle provision for the additional rooms complies with the minimum requirements of policy 82.
- 8.32 The proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2018) policy 82.

Inclusive access

- 8.33 The proposal would utilize the existing access arrangements comprising step free access to the entrance lobby and lift access to the upper floors and would retain the existing DDA rooms (two on each of the second, third, fourth, fifth and sixth floors, 10 in total). As a result of the proposal, ratio would be greater than 5% which is considered acceptable. It is noted that the Access Officer is not satisfied with the ratio, however, this is policy compliant.
- 8.34 The proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2018) policy 56.

Sustainability

- 8.35 When constructed in 2016, the existing building achieved BREEAM level very good. Policy 28 requires all new non-residential development to achieve a minimum of BREEAM excellent, align with the minimum requirements associated with BREEAM excellent for onsite carbon reduction and achieve full credits for category WAT 01 of BREEAM. The proposed extension has been designed to achieve a BREEAM 'excellent' rating, with the BREEAM pre-assessment showing an overall score of 74.46% and achievement of all 5 credits related to water efficiency (Wat01). Energy Strategy sets out the hierarchical approach to reducing carbon emissions associated with energy use, which achieves a 68% reduction in emissions when assessed under Building Regulations Part L 2021. In terms of renewable energy, air source heat pumps and photovoltaic panels are proposed (3.6 kWp with pv area of 22.1m²). The plans now show that the PV panels will be on a small proportion

of the flat roof. Given it is an extension to an existing building and there are practical impediments to achieving the respective targets, it is commendable that the proposal meets the requirements of policy 28.

- 8.36 The proposal would, subject to conditions, be compliant with policy 28 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2018).

Drainage

- 8.37 The existing foul and surface water sewers would be utilized. Noting this alongside the extension not extending beyond the existing footprint, officers are satisfied that the proposal would not lead to any significant surface water or foul water drainage issues.

Refuse arrangements

- 8.38 The existing secure hotel refuse/ recycling area is located on the ground floor accessed from the service yard which is accessed directly off the public highway on Station Road. These arrangements (which will remain the same) would be acceptable given the scale of the extension.

Public Art

- 8.39 In order to accord with policy 56 of the Cambridge Local Plan and the Council's Public Art Supplementary Planning Document (SPD), the development should embed public art into the overall scheme. An addendum to the design and access statement (addendum 02 august 2023) shows that public art can be embedded into the proposed development and that an art consultant has been engaged to illustrate an initial concept. Officers commend the engagement with an art consultants however, further information would be required in the form of a public art delivery plan. This information includes:

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

- 8.40 Officers consider that these details can be secured via condition. Therefore the proposal would be compliant with policy 56 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2018 in respect of public art.

Third Party Representations

- 8.41 The third-party objection has been addressed throughout the above report.

Planning Balance

- 9.1 Harm to daylight and sunlight received to the Vesta apartments has been identified. The proposal significantly exceeds the BRE measures for NSL and APSH in the case of multiple habitable rooms. These are small flats with the spaces affected being their primary living areas (LKDs) that typically have a floorplan deeper than 5m, are single aspect and south facing. Given these conditions and as the evidence suggests, the reduction in daylight would be noticeable and significant. Similarly, there are also two LKD which would see reduced sunlight particularly in winter months.
- 9.2 There are many benefits of the proposed scheme, including additional employment and increasing visitor accommodation in a sustainable location. However, officers note that an extension has been approved on site which would not result in harm to surrounding residents, meaning an extension can be accommodated on site and these benefits can be achieved without harm to the Vesta apartments. Moreover, the number of additional rooms over and above the proposal already approved would not lead to a significant contribution to visitor accommodation in the city.
- 9.3 Taking this all into account, when weighing the harm outlined above against the benefits of the proposal, officers consider that the benefits would not outweigh the harm. Therefore, the proposal should be refused.

10.0 RECOMMENDATION

REFUSE