

Appendix 1



Planning Committee Date	11 th June 2024
Report to	Cambridge City Council Planning Committee
Lead Officer	Joint Director of Planning and Economic Development
Reference	23/02127/FUL
Site	Mayflower House, Manhattan Drive, Cambridge, CB4 1JT
Ward / Parish	West Chesterton
Proposal	Erection of (i) 8 no. flats (4 no. studios, 2 no. one bed & 2 no. two bed flats) on the eighth floor on Mayflower House with removal of Electronic Communications Apparatus on the roof (ii) bin-store for proposed flats occupying one existing car parking bay (iii) bespoke structure to cover 20 no. existing cycle bays (iv) structures to cover 32 no. additional cycle bays.
Applicant Presenting Officer	Mr John Muir Dean Scrivener
Reason Reported to Committee	Third party representations
Member Site Visit Date	N/A
Key Issues	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Design/Visual Impact2. Conservation Area Harm3. Neighbour Amenity
Recommendation	APPROVE subject to conditions

1.0 Executive Summary

- 1.1 The application is for full planning permission for a roof extension on top of Mayflower House, which will provide no. 8 flats. This will entail the removal of the existing telecommunications which currently sits on top of the building. A condition is recommended to remove permitted development rights under Schedule 2, Part 16 of the General Permitted Development Order 2015, which would allow the LPA to formally assess any future application for the reinstallation of apparatus.
- 1.2 The application also proposes a bin and bike store, to serve the future occupants residing in the development.
- 1.3 The proposed roof extension is considered to constitute a form of development which will be modern in appearance but also be in keeping with the character and appearance of the local area, and not harm the setting of the adjacent De Freville Conservation Area, which surrounds the northern section of the site, from east to west.
- 1.4 Despite the roof extension being clearly visible from neighbouring buildings and properties, Officers are satisfied that the proposed extension would not result in any significant harm in terms of overbearing, overlooking or overshadowing impact, above and beyond which already exists.
- 1.5 Officers recommend that the Planning Committee approve the application, subject to the recommended conditions listed below.

2.0 Site Description and Context

None-relevant		Tree Preservation Order	
Conservation Area (Setting of)	X	Local Nature Reserve	
Listed Building (Setting of)	X	Flood Zone 2 and 3 (Moderate to High Flood Risk)	X
Building of Local Interest		Green Belt	
Historic Park and Garden		Protected Open Space	
Scheduled Ancient Monument		Controlled Parking Zone	X
Local Neighbourhood and District Centre		Article 4 Direction	

*X indicates relevance

- 2.1 The application site lies within Midsummer Meadows, which comprises a cluster of buildings which are occupied by residential units. Midsummer Court and Bridgacre are located closest to Mayflower House, situated to the east and west, respectively. Mayflower House is the tallest building

within this location, which is occupied by residential flats and comprises seven storeys in height (including ground floor level).

2.2 Lovers Walk is set directly to the north of the site and marks the boundary of the De Freville Conservation Area. The site is accessed via Manhattan Drive, further to the south west of Mayflower House. The south eastern boundary of the Chesterton Conservation Area lies on the far side of Elizabeth Way to the east, and the Riverside and Stourbridge Common Conservation Area boundary lies to the south, alongside the River Cam and including the open space of Midsummer Common. The site itself is not designated and lies outside these Conservation Area boundaries.

2.3 The immediate area around the building is mainly used for car parking and comprises large areas of hardstanding which are partly broken up by grassed areas with trees. The site is relatively well concealed from the surrounding area, however the tall buildings on the site can be seen from certain viewpoints.

3.0 The Proposal

3.1 This application is for full planning permission for a roof extension which will provide no. 8 flats, following the removal of the existing apparatus which currently sits on top of Mayflower House. The proposal will also provide bin and cycle stores for the future occupiers.

4.0 Relevant Site History

Reference	Description	Outcome
21/03999/PRIOR	Removal and replacement of 6 antennas, the installation of 10 antennas on 5 no. 2.1m high poles at a height of 21.85m agl and the installation of 4 microwave dishes and ancillary equipment.	Prior Approval Not Required
20/51004/PREAPP	Proposed replacement 7th floor to provide 4 studios, 1 x 1 bed flat and 3 x 2 bed flats.	Supported, subject to details submitted at application stage

5.0 Policy

5.1 National

National Planning Policy Framework

National Planning Practice Guidance

National Design Guide 2021

(Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) (LBCA) Act 1990

Environment Act 2021

Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017.

Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017

Equalities Act 2010

Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004

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

Technical Housing Standards – Nationally Described Space Standard (2015)

ODPM Circular 06/2005 – Protected Species

Circular 11/95 (Conditions, Annex A)

5.2 **Cambridge Local Plan 2018**

Policy 1: The presumption in favour of sustainable development

Policy 3: Spatial strategy for the location of residential development

Policy 28: 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

Policy 35: Human health and quality of life

Policy 36: Air quality, odour and dust

Policy 50: Residential Space Standards - internal Residential Space Standards

Policy 51: Accessible Homes

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 60: Tall Buildings and Skyline in Cambridge

Policy 61: Conservation and Enhancement of Cambridge's Historic Environment

Policy 62: Local Heritage Assets

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 84: Telecommunications

5.3 **Supplementary Planning Documents**

Biodiversity SPD – Adopted February 2022
Sustainable Design and Construction SPD – Adopted January 2020
Cambridgeshire Flood and Water SPD – Adopted November 2016
Cycle Parking for New Residential Developments SPD – Adopted 2010
De Freville Conservation Area Appraisal – Adopted 2009
Chesterton Conservation Area Appraisal – Adopted 2009
Riverside and Stourbridge Common Area Appraisal – Adopted 2009

6.0 **Consultations**

6.1 **County Highways Development Management**

6.2 No objections subject to conditions regarding a traffic management plan and a contractor's parking plan. An informative is also recommended to inform the applicant that the future occupiers will not benefit from residential parking permits.

6.3 **Environmental Health**

6.4 No objections subject to conditions regarding construction hours, noise/vibration impact and plant installation.

6.5 **Sustainability Officer**

6.6 No objections subject to conditions regarding a Carbon Reduction Statement and water efficiency.

6.7 Further comments were provided in response to the single aspect units being proposed, especially as they would face southwards. There is a concern of overheating however the proposed roof design would limit sunlight and reduce the amount of overheating. Further information on this would be helpful, to ensure the units would not overheat.

6.8 **Drainage Officer**

6.9 No objections subject to a condition regarding surface water and foul water drainage mitigation.

6.10 **Conservation Officer**

6.11 No objections subject to a condition requesting further details regarding the structural members, infill panels, edge, junction and coping details, colours, surface finishes/textures and relationships to glazing and roofing have been secured.

6.12 **Cambridgeshire Fire and Rescue Officer**

6.13 No objections subject to a condition to secure the provision of fire hydrants.

6.14 **Health and Safety Executive (HSE)**

6.15 Following receipt of the amended Fire Strategy and Statement, HSE is content with the fire safety design of the proposed development.

6.16 **Cadent Gas**

6.17 No objections subject to an informative to inform the applicant to ensure that no part of the development interferes with the operation of local assets.

7.0 Third Party Representations

7.1 15 letters of objection have been received. Their concerns are summarised as follows:

- Impact upon existing services within Mayflower House, i.e the lift, the shared laundrette – extra strain on these
- Asbestos removal within the roof
- Overshadowing impact
- The submitted Daylight/Sunlight Impact Assessment is inadequate and should include the Winter months
- Mayflower House is already the tallest building within the locality and the proposal would not be in scale with the surrounding development
- Overlooking impact
- The application is not clear on where the existing apparatus will be located. This is a concern as this would make the building even taller
- Noise impact from construction and use of external balconies
- Conservation Area impact
- The proposal lacks architectural merit
- Lack of additional car parking being provided for future occupiers would result in additional parking stress upon local streets
- Increase in vehicle movements, to and from the site which could result in hazard upon pedestrians, cyclists and children – alternative access should be conditioned to restrict vehicles using Manhattan Drive
- Potential reduction of light due to the erection of scaffolding

- The existing trees situated along Lovers Walk provide some screening along the northern boundary of Mayflower House however the roof extension would sit above the tree canopy and would not be screened
- Lack of planting incorporated within the proposal
- Insufficient time given to allow comments to be submitted
- Roof plant noise impact
- Location Plan lacks details for the contractor parking and storage of materials etc – also is Bridgacre part of the proposals? Location plan should be corrected
- Plant room should be incorporated within the roofscape to reduce visual impact
- Construction impacts upon local residents
- Painting the existing brick work may be difficult to achieve
- Impact upon existing internet connections
- Some form of change should be delivered to outweigh the disruptiveness upon existing residents – i.e. service charge responsibilities/compensation

7.2 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.

8.0 Assessment

8.1 Principle of Development

8.2 Policy 3 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2018) seeks to ensure that the majority of new development should be focused in and around the existing urban area, making the most effective use of previously developed land, and enabling the maximum number of people to access services and facilities locally.

8.3 Given the site is located within a sustainable location and in close proximity to the city centre, the proposed residential units are acceptable and is in accordance with Policy 3 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2018, subject to the below considerations.

8.4 Loss of Telecommunications

8.5 Policy 84 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2018) does not provide for any protection against the loss of existing telecommunications equipment. Neither does the NPPF. Nonetheless, the extent of loss of the telecommunications apparatus on the roof would be significant. This is partly a commercial arrangement in that the use of the rooftop is leased but the granting of planning permission would effectively curtail current provision in favour of additional residential use. The subsequent impact on telecommunications coverage in this part of Cambridge is unknown. At the time of writing this report there is no formal representation from the telecoms operator(s). The site, in forming a high point to large areas of well-used open amenity parkland/common and buildings, will provide

communications benefit to the public at large. There is not an alternative location for the telecommunications equipment approved and its loss must therefore be balanced against the merits of the proposal.

8.6 Skyline of Cambridge

8.7 Policy 60 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2018) aims to protect the existing skyline of Cambridge and sets out a number of criteria which need to be accorded with. Further guidance on how applicants should address each of these criteria is set out within Appendix F of the Local Plan. The supporting text of Policy 60 states that in developing any proposals for tall buildings, developers should make reference to Appendix F of the plan, which provides a more detailed explanation of the required approach, methodology and assessment to developing and considering tall buildings in Cambridge.

8.8 Paragraph F.10(ii) states that '*within the suburbs, buildings of four storeys and above (assuming a flat roof with no rooftop plant and a height of 13m above ground level) will automatically trigger the need to address the criteria set out within the guidance.*' The current application would trigger these thresholds and therefore Policy 60 is engaged.

8.9 The site is located outside of the historic core, as illustrated by Figure F.1. of Appendix F. Mayflower House is located outside of this area, to the west of Elizabeth Way and within an area where the prevailing height of residential buildings is generally two storeys with some more substantial three storey Victorian and Edwardian buildings on the main approach roads. Midsummer Meadows comprises the tallest buildings within this area of Cambridge however, these are relatively well concealed and can only be seen from certain viewpoints which will be addressed in the below paragraphs.

8.10 Paragraphs F.20 and F.21 list a number of sites which are classified as 'Long to Medium distance views towards Cambridge' and 'Local to short distance views.' Applications for tall buildings should carefully consider other local views on key approach roads. Ultimately, applicants need to submit a document that addresses all of the assessment criteria within Appendix F. Although the proposal is not for a new building, it proposes alterations and extensions to an existing tall building which would result in a change to the external appearance of the building, and therefore the assessment needs to follow the guidance set out within Appendix F.

Criterion a) of Policy 60: Location, Setting and Context

8.11 Paragraph F.29 states that the relationship of the proposed building, or buildings, to the surrounding context needs to be carefully examined. It

lists a number of features which need to be assessed as part of a townscape, landscape and urban design appraisal.

- 8.12 The applicant has submitted a Landscape, Townscape and Visual Assessment (LTVIA) (Jon Etchells Consulting, April 2023). The LTVIA declares that site visits and viewpoints were assessed during February 2022, when the building would be most visual within the townscape, as illustrated by the various photographs and accompanying visuals presented within the report.
- 8.13 The visibility of Mayflower House is limited by the other buildings within the Midsummer Meadows estate and also by the generally dense urban fabric of Cambridge around it, with the relatively narrow residential streets often limiting views of the taller buildings within Midsummer Meadows. The more open areas of Midsummer Common to the south and south west of the site allow more open (but also more distant) views of the upper parts of the building above intervening houses. Views of Mayflower House can be categorised into short distance public views from the area around the site; medium distance views from roads and open spaces within Cambridge; longer distance views from viewpoints around the edges of the city (the Strategic Viewpoints of Appendix F); and private views from buildings in the area around the site. These are summarised within the LTVIA.
- 8.14 Figure 3 of the LTVIA illustrates that the 'strategic viewpoints' as shown within Figure F.3 of Appendix F of the Local Plan, have been visited and accompanying photographs have been taken looking from these viewpoints towards the site. Of the total 15 strategic viewpoints visited, Mayflower House could only be seen from two of these viewpoints, at Wort's Causeway/ Shelford Road (viewpoint 9) and Castle Mound (viewpoint 1). The building would only be visible using a zoom lens and is indiscernible to the naked eye and has no significant visual presence in the context of this city-wide panorama when taken from viewpoint 9. In respect of views from Castle Mound, the majority of tall buildings are visible from this viewpoint and therefore the effect of the proposal in terms of visibility is considered to be minimal within the larger context of the townscape. As such, it is considered that the proposal would not result in visual harm upon the skyline of Cambridge when viewed from the 'strategic viewpoints' as shown in Figure F.3 of Appendix F.
- 8.15 The LTVIA infers that the proposal would be more visible from more short-medium distanced views, as illustrated in the accompanying photographs on pages 15-29. The key viewpoints identified are presented on Figure 2 of the LTVIA, which have been visited and accompanying photographs have been submitted. Of the viewpoints assessed and from looking at the accompanying photographs, the key views from where the proposal would have the most impact are considered to be the following:
- Viewpoint 2 (Elizabeth Way)

- Viewpoint 13 (Elizabeth Way over River Cam)
- Viewpoint 11 (St Andrews Road)
- Viewpoints 23, 24 and 26 (Midsummer Common)
- Viewpoint 1 (Midsummer Meadows/Manhattan Drive)

- 8.16 The remaining viewpoints are considered to be partially obscured by the existing built form within the area and the proposal would not result in a significant visual intrusion upon the existing skyline. This is clearly illustrated within the accompanying photographs and the photomontages provided within Appendix 1 of the Heritage Statement (HS) (Asset Heritage Consulting, January 2020, updated May 2023). These are taken from viewpoints 11 and 17 on Figure 2 of the LTVIA.
- 8.17 Officers did request that further photomontages were submitted with the application to demonstrate the visual prominence of the proposal from the above viewpoints. These were provided in respect of viewpoints 2, 13, 23, 24 and 26 (upload). It should be noted that photomontages from the other viewpoints within the surrounding residential streets have been included within Appendix 1 of the Heritage Statement, which clearly show the proposal would have a limited visual impact upon the existing skyline. These are viewpoints 11, 17 and 22 on Figure 2 of the LTVIA.
- 8.18 Viewpoints 2 and 13 are located on Elizabeth Way bridge. The photomontages provided for these viewpoints clearly show the proposal in clear views within the existing skyline. The site can be clearly seen which portrays a modern residential appearance, with a parkland character of large apartment blocks surrounded by well-tended open space and parking areas, and a number of mature trees. The apartment blocks vary in architectural style and materials, with Mayflower House being the tallest and also the most utilitarian in appearance, with a somewhat stark, rectilinear character and with the discordant collection of plant and equipment on its flat roof, detracting from its appearance.
- 8.19 It is considered that the proposed extension would create a sympathetic design and a more appropriate termination to Mayflower House, especially when compared to the existing apparatus and equipment which currently exists. It is confirmed that the proposed extension would be lightweight and would not be suitable for supporting any new telecommunications plant and aerials, so those features would be permanently removed and could not be replaced in the future, as recommended via condition.
- 8.20 The photomontages provided for viewpoints 23, 24 and 26 have also been provided. These are located along the boundary of Midsummer Common alongside the edge of residential properties further to the south. Only the top section of proposal would be seen from viewpoint 24 due to the presence of the existing block of flats within the foreground of this view. Therefore, the visual impact upon the skyline of Cambridge is not considered to be excessive from this viewpoint. The proposal would have more visibility when viewed from viewpoints 23 and 26, given the more

open nature of these views. Nonetheless, given the proposal is designed to provide a more satisfactory and attractive cap to the building than the existing apparatus and associated plant, the current view undermines the skyline at present. The additional floor has been designed to complement the fifth floor recently added to the adjacent Bridgacre building, and materials would be pale grey matt finished metal panels with extensive glazed areas. The existing dark brickwork of the seventh storey would be painted to blend with the floors below and emphasise the role of the additional floor in capping and completing the elevations in an attractive manner.

- 8.21 Lastly, View 1 of the photomontages in Appendix 1 of the HS presents a very close view of the site, whereby the proposal would be visually prominent. This view takes in modern development on Manhattan Drive and within Midsummer Meadows. In essence, the proposal is considered to be an upgrade when compared to the existing apparatus and associated clutter and would resemble a similar appearance to the roofscape of Bridgacre, overall complimenting the site.
- 8.22 In summary, the submitted LTVIA and accompanying photomontages clearly sets out the implications of the proposal in respect to the local context of the area, and demonstrates the limited impact which would result, as directed by criterion a) of Policy 60.

Criterion b) of Policy 60: Impact upon the historic environment

- 8.23 Lovers Walk is set directly to the north of the site and marks the boundary of the De Freville Conservation Area. The south eastern part of the Chesterton Conservation Area lies to the far side of Elizabeth Way to the east, and the Riverside and Stourbridge Common Conservation Area lies much further to the south, alongside the River Cam and includes the open space of Midsummer Common. Despite the site being located within the setting of these Conservation Areas, the site itself is not designated and lies outside the Conservation Area boundaries.
- 8.24 As well as the LTVIA, the applicant has also submitted a Heritage Statement (HS) (Asset Heritage Consulting, January 2020, updated May 2023). These documents outline the level of harm identified in respect to the settings of the local Conservation Areas.
- 8.25 The Midsummer Meadows site was always distinct from the De Freville estate to the north/north west, with the curving line of Lovers Walk still separating the two. The Midsummer Meadows estate represents an enclave of taller apartment buildings set between those roads and the earlier De Freville estate. Mayflower House's immediate context is Midsummer Meadows, a relatively small, four-acre, well-maintained estate of apartment blocks set within planted verges and gardens.

- 8.26 The De Freville Conservation Area comprises residential development, which primarily comprises two-storey houses (although commonly incorporating roof-level extensions), with this contrasting character a result of its distinct historical development. The HS refers to the eastward views along Aylestone Road where the proposal would be seen in between gaps of the residential properties. Although the proposal would be seen within these gaps, the proposed rooftop extension would sit below the parapet level of the existing lift overrun and below the top of the existing aerials (the centrally placed plant enclosure only would rise above the parapet level of the lift overrun but would remain below the top of the existing aerials). Therefore, it is considered that the proposal would be seen however this doesn't mean the proposal would result in significant harm when compared to the existing view.
- 8.27 View 2 of the photomontages presented in Appendix 1 of the HS shows the roofscape of the existing Bridgacre building being the prominent building when viewed from Aylestone Road. As can be seen, the proposal would be seen in the background above Bridgacre, however the amount of roofscape visible would not be significant within the existing skyline.
- 8.28 In relation to the views along Humberstone Road, which is located to the north of the site, there appears to be glimpse views in between the residential properties from this street. Most of the views are already obscured by extensions attached to these residential properties, of which already provide some level of harm to the existing skyline within this area of the Conservation Area. As such, the replacement of clear visibility of excessive rooftop clutter on what is perfectly legible as a modern building within these views, is considered to be a visual improvement to the skyline.
- 8.29 Turning now to the Chesterton Conservation Area, an important viewpoint is the view from St. Andrew's Road, located to the east on the other side Elizabeth Way. View 4 in Appendix 1 of the HS illustrates the presence of the existing modern apartment buildings which are of a larger scale than the earlier the two-storey residential properties along St Andrews Road and local vicinity. As stated within the Chesterton Conservation Appraisal, this viewpoint does not contribute to what is significant about this Conservation Area, and so, while the proposals would clearly represent a visual improvement, the benefits to the Conservation Area are limited. It should also be noted that St Andrews Road is a more recent addition to the Conservation Area, with the main core being located further to the east, where Mayflower House is not visible.
- 8.30 Notwithstanding this, the building would be clearly visible from this viewpoint and the apparatus and associate clutter is clearly visible at present within the skyline, and the proposals would result in an enhancement to the skyline from this viewpoint within Chesterton Conservation Area.

- 8.31 In respect of the River and Stourbridge Conservation Area, the most visible viewpoints have already been discussed in the above section, with reference to viewpoints 23, 24 and 26 within Midsummer Common. As concluded above, the proposal when viewed from within Midsummer Common is not considered to result in significant visual impact upon these open views and would deliver a form of development which would preserve visual appeal of these views.
- 8.32 In addition to the above, the Conservation Officer has been consulted on the application and has raised no objections, subject to a condition securing details the junction details and associated details including colours, surface finishes/textures and relationships to glazing and roofing. This condition is recommended.
- 8.33 In summary, the information provided within the Heritage Statement clearly demonstrates that the proposal would not significantly affect the settings of the surrounding Conservation Areas in respect of intruding the existing skyline and accords with criterion b) of Policy 60.

Criterion c) of Policy 60: Scale, Massing and Architectural Quality

- 8.34 Paragraph F.40 of Appendix F states that proposal should demonstrate through drawings, sections, models, computer-generated images (CGIs) etc., the design rationale of the building and how the form, materials and silhouette of the building will deliver a high quality addition to the city which will respond positively to the local context and skyline.
- 8.35 In addition to the LTVIA, the applicant has submitted a Design and Access Statement (DAS), (4D Studio, May 2023). This document outlines the rationale behind the architectural qualities and design approach for the proposal.
- 8.36 The proposed additional storey is attractively glazed with a distinctive 'butterfly' roof that will create a high-quality architectural statement to transform the block, the design of which was conceived in the 1960's. The butterfly roofs of the development are an appealing and distinctive contribution to the Cambridge skyline and are utilised at the development further along the River Cam to the west at Riverside Place. The proposal will significantly improve the architectural quality of Mayflower House; views inside and outside the estate will be enhanced by replacing the discordant clutter of telecoms equipment and plant buildings on its roof with a harmonious and well considered architectural intervention.
- 8.37 It is proposed to install a non-combustible lightweight rain screen wall cladding system faced with matt finish light grey colour (similar to Bridgacre) metal panels and significant areas of glass. The

photomontages reveal that with this cladding material the finished building will be much more effective and visually lighter than a roof extension finished in brick. The new facades are restrained but the grey metal gives them a high quality appearance, completing the building. The large planar windows also help to give the top storey a more contemporary architectural design quality, as well as providing a successful contrast to the existing brick. A condition is recommended to secure the details of the proposed materials.

- 8.38 The information provided in respect to criterion c) is acceptable given the scale of development proposed. Given the proposal would provide an additional storey on top of an existing building, as opposed to proposing a new building comprising eight storeys in height, the application has successfully demonstrated that the proposal would provide a development of high architectural quality and an acceptable scale and massing. As such, the proposal is in accordance with criterion c) of policy 60.

Criterion d) of Policy 60: Amenity and Microclimate

- 8.39 Criterion d) requests tall buildings to respect the amenities of neighbouring properties, in regards to overlooking, overshadowing and overbearing impacts. These matters will be discussed in further detail under the below section 'Amenity'.

Criterion e) of Policy 60: Public Realm

- 8.40 The design of space around buildings is crucial in the creation of a good public realm. Tall buildings need to be sensitively located so that they relate well to the space around them.
- 8.41 Mayflower House is situated within an area comprising car parking and hardstanding. There are trees planted within grassed areas which help break up the amount of hardstanding within the site but these have no statutory protection. Given the nature of the proposal, it is not considered that enhancements to the public realm are necessarily required in this instance. The public realm is therefore to remain the same with the exception of the provision of a bicycle and bin store, which will be discussed further below.
- 8.42 In summary, given the nature of the proposal, the level of information in respect of public realm enhancements is not required in this instance and is in accordance with criterion e) of Policy 60.

Conclusion

- 8.43 In conclusion, the application contains a sufficient level of information within the LTVIA and supplementary photomontages, as well within the

Heritage Statement and DAS, which successfully demonstrates that the proposed roof extension would not significantly intrude the skyline of Cambridge and would in fact be an enhancement. The proposal is therefore in accordance with Policy 60 and the guidance as set out within Appendix F of the Cambridge Local Plan 2018.

8.44 **Design, Context and External Spaces**

8.45 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.

8.46 These policies build upon the principles outlined within the above section in respect of Policy 60, which is the main overarching policy adopted in this instance.

8.47 The roof extension would comprise a height of 5.3m (including the roof plant) from the base of the existing roof. The extension will comprise a matt cladded material with a light tone set within a 'butterfly' style roof and areas of glazing. Although the extension would be seen in viewpoints as assessed above and depicted within the LTVIA, the scale of the extension is considered to resemble a proportionate and subservient extension to the building and would not result in a top heavy addition to the building. The height of the extension would not exceed the total height of the telecommunications apparatus approved under the prior approval and is considered to be betterment to the building aesthetically. Given a condition will be imposed to remove the permitted development rights for telecommunication apparatus to be installed on the building in the future, the scale of development proposed is considered to be an enhancement within the local area.

8.48 The extension would be in contrast with the existing brick materials of Mayflower House however the appearance and form of the roof extension would provide a more modern form of development which would be similar to that of the adjacent Bridgacre building. Furthermore, the proposed design is similar to roof forms seen at Riverside Place, further to the west of the site, and is therefore a design which is compatible with the local area.

8.49 As aforementioned, the photomontages reveal that with this cladding material the finished building will be much more effective and visually lighter than a top storey finished in brick. The cladding will be a highly durable non-combustible material with a long service life to avoid severe weathering effects, which is particularly important given the height of the building. Details of materials will be secured via condition.

Landscaping

- 8.50 As well as shrub beds laid out around apartment buildings and many mature trees at the estate, a large central area of landscaping laid to lawn provides an integral setting for the blocks at Midsummer Meadows.
- 8.51 It is noted that a new Yew hedge will be planted and retained at the same height within a small grass area to separate the bike store from the adjacent premises of Bridgacre. This will help provide screening and prevent any visual clutter within the site. A condition is recommended to retain this hedge for the lifetime of the development.

Conclusion

- 8.52 Overall, subject to the above conditions, the proposed development is a high-quality design that would not result in significant visual harm upon the character and appearance of the local area and be compatible to its surroundings. The proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policies 55, 57, 58 and 59 and the NPPF.

8.53 Impact Upon the Setting of the Conservation Area

- 8.54 As aforementioned, the site is located within setting of three Conservation Areas, however does not directly sit within the boundary of any of these. The De Freville Conservation Area lies directly to the north/north west of the site, terminating at the north boundary of the site. Policy 61 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2018, as well as Section 72 of the Listed Building and Conservation Area (LBCA) Act 1990, seek to development to preserve or enhance the visual appeal of Conservation Areas.

- 8.55 The submitted Heritage Statement addressed the main viewpoints into and out of the Conservation Areas, and how the proposal would not result in significant visual harm upon the setting of these conservation areas. Although the roof extension would be clearly seen in some views into and out the surrounding Conservation Areas, the proposal is considered to be an upgrade to the existing apparatus on top of the roof, which does not provide any merit to the character and appearance of the Conservation Areas. The Conservation Officer has been consulted on the application and has concluded that the proposal would preserve the character and appearance of the Conservation Areas subject to a condition securing the junction details of the extension.

- 8.56 In conclusion, subject to the above condition, the proposal is not considered to result in significant detrimental harm upon the character and appearance of the surrounding Conservation Areas and would preserve the settings of these Conservation Areas, in accordance with Policy 61 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2018 and the LBCA Act 1990, and the NPPF.

8.57 Impact Upon the Setting of Listed Buildings

8.58 There are a number of boathouses along the River Cam further to the south west of the site, which are Grade II listed. A photomontage within the Appendix 1 of the HS has been included and shows the proposed roof extension from this viewpoint with the boathouses in the foreground. Given the roof extension is of an appropriate scale and design and would not result in a significant intrusion within the existing skyline as addressed above, and would remain relatively discrete, the proposal is not considered to result in significant visual impact upon the setting of these listed boathouses, and the proposal is therefore in accordance with Policy 61 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2018, Section 66 of the LBCA Act 1990 and the NPPF.

8.59 **Carbon Reduction and Sustainable Design**

8.60 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.

8.61 Policy 28 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 pp per day and a 44% on site reduction of regulated carbon emissions.

8.62 Policy 29 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.

8.63 The Sustainability Officer has been consulted on the application and has raised no objections, subject to conditions securing carbon reduction statement and water efficiency. A combination of passive solar design, energy efficiency measures and the installation of air source heat pumps would reduce the dwellings' regulated CO2 emissions and ensure compliance with Building Regulations Part L 2021 and Policy 28 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2018. The roof will also be an upgrade to the existing roof which is not considered to have good insulation.

8.64 There is a concern raised by the Sustainability Officer in respect of the units facing southwards (Flats 5-8). These units could overheat but it is accepted that the roof overhang by virtue of the proposed butterfly style design and overhang, would limit the impact of overheating.

8.65 In order to mitigate overheating impact, the applicant has confirmed that the windows for these units would be fitted with solar control glass which would limit the solar rays absorbed and reduce the impact of overheating. It is intended to use high quality Pilkington Suncool (or glass of similar

specification) in the south facing units and where required, such as in openable skylights. The Proposed South Elevation drawing has been amended accordingly (Drawing no. PL115 – Rev C). Following discussions with the Sustainability Officer, this has been confirmed as an acceptable approach to mitigate the impact of overheating and a condition is recommended to secure the details of the glass specification in conjunction with an overheating impact assessment, to ensure the specification proposed effectively mitigates overheating, prior to occupation of the development.

- 8.66 In addition, an informative is recommended to ensure the development complies with parts O and F of Building Regulations, to ensure the building adopts a design to minimise overheating.
- 8.67 Subject to the above conditions, the issue of sustainability and renewable energy and the proposal is in accordance with Local Plan policies 28 and 29 and the Greater Cambridge Sustainable Design and Construction SPD 2020.
- 8.68 **Biodiversity**
- 8.69 The Environment Act 2021 and the Councils' Biodiversity SPD (2022) requires development proposals to deliver a net gain in biodiversity following a mitigation hierarchy which is 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.
- 8.70 Given the existing nature of the building and apparatus on top of the roof, the proposed roof extension is not considered to result in any significant harm upon local bats or birds, and therefore the absence of any ecological assessment being undertaken is not significant in this instance. The site does not form part of any designated ecological site.
- 8.71 Given the application proposes a roof extension to the existing building, as no habitat is affected, there is no BNG requirement. In addition, given the height at which the extension would be located and the fact that the roof is slightly pitched, it would be impractical and there is no policy requirement for any form of green roof. Notwithstanding this, a condition requesting details for securing ecological enhancements is considered reasonable and necessary and is recommended.
- 8.72 Subject to the above condition, Officers are satisfied that the proposed development would not result in adverse harm to protected habitats, protected species or priority species, and would taking the above into account, the proposal is compliant with policies 57 and 70 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2018), and the Biodiversity SPD.

8.73 **Water Management and Flood Risk**

- 8.74 Policies 31 and 32 of the Local Plan require developments to have appropriate sustainable foul and surface water drainage systems and minimise flood risk. Paras. 159 – 169 of the NPPF are relevant.
- 8.75 The site is partly located within Flood Zones 2 and 3 (Moderate to High Flood Risk). The Drainage Officer has been consulted on the application and has raised no objections, given the location of the proposed extension being on top of the roof. Conditions regarding surface water and foul water drainage are recommended.
- 8.76 Subject to the above conditions addressing the issues of water management and flood risk, the proposal is in accordance with Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policies 31 and 32 and the NPPF advice.

8.77 **Highway Safety and Transport Impacts**

- 8.78 Policy 80 supports developments where access via walking, cycling and public transport are prioritised and is accessible for all. Policy 81 states that developments will only be permitted where they do not have an unacceptable transport impact.
- 8.79 Para. 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.
- 8.80 The Local Highway Authority has been consulted on the application and have raised no objections, subject to conditions requesting a traffic management plan and a contractor's parking plan. Given the close proximity of neighbouring properties in and around the site, these conditions are reasonable and necessary and are recommended.
- 8.81 The proposed increase in the number of car movements in and out of Midsummer Meadows will be de minimis and materially below the design intent of the estate. The Highway Authority have raised no objections to the proposal and therefore the proposal is not considered to result in any detrimental impact upon the safe and effective operation of the adopted highway.
- 8.82 Subject to the above conditions, the proposal accords with the objectives of Policy 80 and 81 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2018 and is compliant with NPPF advice.

8.83 **Cycle and Car Parking Provision**

Cycle Parking

- 8.84 The Cambridge Local Plan (2018) supports development which encourages and prioritises sustainable transport, such as walking, cycling and public transport. Policy 82 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2018) requires new residential developments to comply with the cycle parking standards as set out within Appendix L of the Local Plan, which in this case is one cycle space per bedroom.
- 8.85 The application proposes an additional no. 32 cycle spaces to be provided, which will serve both the exiting residents and future residents of Mayflower House. This is in light of surveys at the estate since the early 1980s which have indicated a decline in car ownership and a concomitant rise in cycle ownership. This is also supported by Policy 82 which states that in instances where part of a site with a known shortfall in cycle parking is redeveloped, provision in excess of the standards will be strongly recommended.
- 8.86 Although the new provision of cycle parking will not be directly located at the entrance of Mayflower House, it will be incorporated amongst the existing cycle parking along then northern boundary. In the view of Officers, this is considered acceptable and would provide easy and convenient access for residents to use.
- 8.87 It is proposed to provide a pitched roofed structure for 10 existing cycle hoops (serving 20 cycles) that adjoin the boundary with Lovers Walk. It will be located on the axis between Mayflower House and Bridgacre and act as a foil. The design will be as that built at Broadmeadows. Materials will be seasoned oak posts and Keymer 'mixed farmhouse' plain clay handmade tiles. Materials will be secured via a condition to ensure that they are compatible within this location. It is noted that all existing cycle spaces will be covered within the site and that a separate application is to be submitted in due course.
- 8.88 Subject to the above condition, the application is in accordance with Policy 82 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2018) and the cycle parking standards as set out within Appendix L.

Car Parking

- 8.89 Policy 82 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2018) requires new developments to comply with, and not exceed, the maximum car parking standards as set out within appendix L. The site is within a designated Controlled Parking Zone. Policy 82 also states that Car-free and car-capped development is supported provided the site is within an easily walkable and cyclable distance to a District Centre or the City Centre, has high public transport accessibility and the car-free status can be realistically enforced by planning obligations and/or on-street controls. The Council strongly supports contributions to and provision for car clubs at new developments to help reduce the need for private car parking.

- 8.90 No additional car parking is proposed to serve the residential units and given the amount of cycle ownership of existing residents, as well as the drive to deliver more car free schemes within sustainable locations, the level of car parking is acceptable in this instance. Car ownership of existing residents is low. The over provision of cycle parking as mentioned above, will outweigh the lack of car parking in this instance.
- 8.91 An informative is recommend that future occupiers will not benefit from a Resident Parking Permit.
- 8.92 Therefore, the proposal is considered to accord with Policy 82 of the Local Plan and the standards set out under Appendix L.
- 8.93 **Amenity of Neighbouring Properties**
- 8.94 Policy 35, 55, 57 and 58 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. Criterion d) of Policy 60 is also of relevance to this section, as it refers to respecting the amenities of neighbouring properties.
- 8.95 The site is surrounded by neighbouring properties, both within and to the north and western, and southern boundaries.

Midsummer Meadows

- 8.96 Mayflower House is the tallest building within Midsummer Meadows and is set in a central location between other residential buildings. Bridgacre is set to the west; Midsummer Court is set to the east; Woodvale is set to the south, and Broadmeadows is set to the south west.
- 8.97 Given the existing massing and height of Mayflower House, and the modest proportions of the proposed roof extension, the proposal is not considered to result in significantly harmful impact upon Bridgacre and Midsummer Court. In addition, there is sufficient separation between the three buildings which would limit the effect of overbearing and overlooking from the proposal upon these buildings. A condition is recommended to secure details of the proposed 1.5m screening around the balconies which will further mitigate any impact in terms of overlooking.
- 8.98 The applicant has submitted a Daylight/Sunlight Impact Assessment (February 2023). This assesses windows within the east elevation of Bridgacre and on the seventh floor of Mayflower House itself. The vertical skylight reached by all of these windows was in accordance with BRE Guidance and there no significant loss of light would occur upon these neighbouring windows.

- 8.99 Given the distance at which Mayflower House is set in relation to Woodvale and Broadmeadows, no significantly harmful impact in terms of overlooking, overbearing or overshadowing impact upon these buildings.

Humberstone Road

- 8.100 There have been a number of representations received from the neighbouring properties along Humberstone Road. These properties are located to the north of the site, with nos. 58-68 being directly rear facing Mayflower House.
- 8.101 Although the proposed extension would be clearly seen from the rear garden areas and windows of these neighbouring properties, the existing height of Mayflower House already provides a sense of enclosure to these properties. The rear garden areas terminate at the boundary with Lovers Walk, which creates a separation between Mayflower House and these neighbouring garden areas. The distance between the rear boundary of these garden areas and Mayflower House is 16m. Given the rear garden areas are relatively large in size and provide a good level of external amenity for the residents, Officers consider that the level of any additional overbearing impact and sense of enclosure caused by the proposal would be minimal when compared to the existing circumstances.
- 8.102 Officers do note that there is a row of mature trees which are situated between Mayflower House and Lovers Walk. These provide some screening at present between the building and the neighbouring gardens and it is acknowledged that the proposed roof extension would project higher above the canopies of these trees. Despite this, these trees are not under the ownership of the applicant and could be removed at any time and as such, the screening provided by the trees at the current time could be removed at any time, regardless of the current proposal.
- 8.103 Moreover, in respect of overlooking impact, it is acknowledged that the flats would benefit from balconies which would directly face towards these neighbouring properties. As aforementioned, a condition is recommended to secure details of the proposed screening around the balconies which will further mitigate any impact in terms of overlooking impact. This would not completely remove overlooking from the balconies from occupants who are standing close to the edge, but it would rather minimise opportunities for and the perception of overlooking. There is already a degree of overlooking from the windows within the north elevation of Mayflower House, which are more directly in line with the rear elevations and gardens of the properties along Humberstone Road, than the proposed roof extension. The line of sight from the balconies will be offset as they will be located at a higher level and therefore with the addition of screening, the level of and opportunities for direct overlooking will not be significantly harmful.

- 8.104 Many of the representations received from these residents is concerning overshadowing of their rear garden areas.
- 8.105 Firstly, as aforementioned, the distance between Mayflower House and the rear boundary of the garden areas is 16m. In addition, the distance between Mayflower House and the neighbouring properties is approximately 40m. This distance varies when taking into account rear extensions, with the closest distance being 31m between the building and a rear extension at no. 62. These distances are significant.
- 8.106 In relation to the Vertical Sky Component (VSC), the assessment declares that given these distances, the proposal would not have an impact upon the neighbouring windows or gardens of these properties. There are outbuildings within the rear gardens which have skylights but these would retain at least 27% of the VSC due to their inclination in relation to Mayflower House. The closest window is set at 31m from Mayflower House, at No. 60, which will receive sufficient light as shown in Table 1 of the assessment. It is also noted that this calculation assumes a continuous obstruction and therefore will overestimate the impact of the proposed development.
- 8.107 Given that the former value of the VSC of the closest window has been calculated to be 0.89, it can be asserted that the proposal would not result in significant loss of light upon the other windows at the rear of these dwellings along Humberstone Road, which is acceptable.
- 8.108 Shadow maps have been submitted which shows the extent of sunlight received by the garden areas serving Humberstone Road. This illustrates that there would be a sufficient amount of sunlight received by the neighbouring gardens which is acceptable. There are comments received from the representations which allude to the fact that an assessment has not been undertaken in relation to the precited APSH, especially during the winter months. For the purposes of the assessment, the March equinox is considered the most appropriate month from which to draw any reasonable conclusions regarding such impact and the developers have provided this.
- 8.109 Given the existing height of Mayflower House and the relatively modest scale of the proposed extension, as well as the distance between the rear garden areas and Mayflower House, the proposal is not considered that the proposal would result in any more significant overshadowing impact when compared to the existing situation. A diagram on page 10 of the DAS does illustrate the extent of shadowing from the proposal when compared to the existing situation and confirms that the proposal would not result in any significant overshadowing upon these residential garden areas during the winter solstice. Therefore, the rear garden areas will be unaffected during the winter months as Mayflower House already blocks a significant amount of sunlight.

8.110 As such, Officers consider the applicant has undertaken an assessment which is in accordance with the BRE Guidance which demonstrates that the proposal will not have an adverse impact in terms of overshadowing.

Conclusion

8.111 Overall, subject to conditioning the screening of the balconies, the proposal would not result in any significantly harmful impact upon the amenities of neighbouring properties in respect of overbearing, overlooking or overshadowing impacts. As such, the proposed development would comply with Policies 55, 56, 57, 58 and Policy 60(d) of the Cambridge Local Plan 2018.

Amenity of Future Occupiers

8.112 The Daylight/Sunlight Impact Assessment concludes that the proposed flats will receive sufficient light levels and is therefore in accordance with BRE Guidance.

8.113 Policy 50 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2018) sets out internal residential space standards. All the proposed units exceed or are in accordance with the minimum standards. In this regard, the units would provide a high-quality internal living environment for the future occupants. The gross internal floor space measurements for units in this application are shown in the table below:

Flat No.	Number of bedrooms	Number of bed spaces (persons)	Number of storeys	Policy Size requirement (m²)	Proposed size of unit	Difference in size
1	2	4	1	70	71	+1
2	1	1	1	37	42	+5
3	1	2	1	50	50	0
4	1	1	1	37	42	+5
5	1	1	1	37	37	0
6	2	3	1	61	63	+2
7	1	1	1	37	37	0
8	1	2	1	50	50	0

- 8.114 Policy 50 of Cambridge Local Plan (2018) states that all new residential units will be expected to have direct access to an area of private amenity space. All flats will have access to private balconies and promotes a good design.

Accessible Homes

The development has been assessed for compliance with Policy 51 in relation to all the new units. The Design and Access Statement states the development will comply with the requirements of Part M4 (2) of the Building Regulations. A lift is shown to be provided to serve the upper floor to allow level access between all floors within the block. This is labelled as a lift suitable for fire fighters. It is unclear at this point in the writing of the report whether the lift would function for everyday use for all occupants and visitors to the apartments. Further clarity has been sought from the applicant on this basis, as it goes to the merits of the inclusivity of the scheme. Officers have assumed for the purposes of the recommendation that the lift would also be suitable for everyday use. The committee will be updated accordingly.

Noise Impact

- 8.115 Policy 35 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2018 safeguards 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 future occupiers. These conditions are considered reasonable and necessary to impose.
- 8.116 The Council's Environmental Health Team has been consulted and has raised no objections subject to conditions relating to the following:
- Construction hours
 - Construction Noise/Vibration Impact
 - Plant machinery/equipment
- 8.117 All of these conditions are recommended by Officers to safeguard the amenities of neighbouring properties and future occupiers. There is sufficient separation space between the residential units and the proposed ASHPs, this can be mitigated through condition.
- 8.118 An informative is also recommended to ensure the applicant is aware of their responsibilities to safely remove any associated asbestos when undertaking the construction of the development, as well as an informative to ensure the applicant is aware of the installation of ASHPs.
- 8.119 Overall, it is considered that for the above reasons, and subject to the above conditions, the proposed development would not result in any significant noise impact or disturbance upon the amenities of the

neighbouring properties. As such, the proposal is in accordance with Policy 35 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2018.

Fire Safety

8.120 In accordance with the guidelines as set out under the Health and Safety Executive (HSE), the LPA have formally consulted HSE for 21 days regarding the assessment of fire safety for the development. HSE have raised no objections to the proposed development as it promotes an appropriate design in terms of fire safety for future occupiers and it will be the responsibility of the applicant to demonstrate compliance with these measures at later regulatory stages. As such, Officers are satisfied that the development is acceptable in regard to fire safety and the application is acceptable.

8.121 Third Party Representations

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

Third Party Comment	Officer Response
The additional stress upon existing services – the laundrette and the existing lift	This issue is not considered to be a material planning consideration and will need to be addressed by the Management Company of the building who will be able to provide more services if needed.
The neighbouring properties should be eligible for compensation to offset the impacts of the development	This is considered to be an unreasonable request for the LPA to engage with. The LPA has assessed the impacts of the proposed development upon the amenities of the neighbouring properties and concludes that the proposal is acceptable, subject to the conditions recommended below.
Covenants	A planning permission would not override covenants and private rights. These are civil matters between different landowners and not a material planning consideration.
Site Location Plan	The site location plan submitted with the application shows the land under the ownership of the applicant. Certificate A has been submitted to declare this and the LPA has no right to declare otherwise.
Neighbour Consultation time inadequate	The LPA have formally consulted a range of neighbouring properties within and around the site, for a statutory period of 21 days.

Other Matters

8.123 The Site Plan shows refuse storage will be located further to the south of the site. A condition is recommended to secure the details of the refuse store to ensure that it is well screened and has sufficient capacity to serve Mayflower House. As such, the proposal is in accordance with Policy 57 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2018.

8.124 **Planning Balance**

8.125 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).

8.126 The application proposes to erect a roof extension on top of an existing building, which would provide 8 new flats. This would necessitate the removal of existing telecommunications apparatus which appears very unlikely to ever be relocated back onto the roof due to its structural integrity. Given the amount of telecommunication apparatus loss, whilst there is no policy basis to protect existing equipment (NPPF paras. 118 - 122), this is nonetheless a material consideration for members to consider because any loss of an operational site will impact on the network operators' cell coverage and would be likely to result in off-site proposals to mitigate this.

8.127 The proposal would result in the physical replacement of the existing apparatus on Mayflower House with a form of development which will enhance the character and appearance of the area, as well as preserve the character of the surrounding Conservation Areas. The proposed design, scale and architectural merit would facilitate in providing a sympathetic addition to the existing skyline of Cambridge and would provide more residential units within a sustainable location, whilst respecting the amenities of neighbouring properties.

8.128 Having taken into account the provisions of the development plan, NPPF and NPPG guidance, the views of statutory consultees and wider stakeholders, as well as all other material planning considerations, the proposed development is recommended for approval, subject to the conditions set out below.

9.0 **Recommendation**

9.1 **Approve** subject to:

-The planning conditions as set out below with minor amendments to the conditions as drafted delegated to officers.

10.0 **Planning Conditions**

As set out on the Addendum report